How heat controls fracture
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While of paramount importance in material science, the dynamics of cracks still lacks a complete physical explanation. The transition from their slow creep behavior to a catastrophic propagation regime is a notable key, as it often leads to full material failure. We show how simple statistical physics, coupled with the dissipation of heat at the fracture front, can actually account for the entire dynamics in a unified framework. Such a model fits indeed the reported rupture of two different materials, for the first time over eight decades of propagation velocities. Thus, we explain how matter suddenly fails in a brittle manner, by inferring that cracks can reach thousands of Kelvins at their tips. Such extreme temperatures also elucidate the fractoluminescence phenomenon, the emission of visible light sometimes observed during rupture.

I. INTRODUCTION

The rupture of solids is often described by empirical observations rather than by fully understood physical models. The earliest formalism is probably that by Griffith in 1921 [1]: the propagation of cracks is described as a threshold phenomenon, only obtained when fractures are loaded above a critical fracture energy. This view matches the behaviour of brittle matter, which suddenly snaps passed a certain elastic deformation. It was proposed that such instability arises from the discrete nature of matter [2], notably as a minimum propagation velocity, similar to that of mechanical waves, is necessary for rupture induced phonons to break molecular bonds ahead of the crack tip [3]. It is however acknowledged that a crack loaded below the mentioned threshold is still growing, but at rates that are orders of magnitude below that of a ‘dynamic’ fracture. One possible approach is to consider that the fracture energy is dependent on the propagation velocity [4, 5], rather than being a strict medium property. Alternatively, these slow creep regimes are well modelled by thermally activated sub-critical laws such as Arrhenius-like growth rate [6–10]. It was suggested [11] that the description of both the slow and the fast regimes, as well as that of the threshold phenomena, could be qualitatively unified if accounting for the plasticity around the crack tip [12], in particular as the associate induced heat might locally soften the matter [13, 14]. We here propose a quantitative unifying model which neglects such an effect of the thermal dissipation, but focuses instead on how temperature affects the front sub-critical growth.

II. FROM THERMAL CREEPING TO THERMAL WEAKENING

We consider that the velocity $V$ of cracks is ruled by the competition, at their tips, between breaking and healing processes [10, 15], both following an Arrhenius law. The activation energy of these laws is modelled proportional to the difference between the energy release rate $G$ (in J m$^{-2}$) and the intrinsic energy barriers for breaking and healing the atomic bonds of a surface unit, $G_c$ and $G_h$. While $G$ arises from the mechanical load on the fracture, $G_c$ and $G_h$ are media properties (i.e., notably independent of the propagation velocity). Such a model defines the velocity as:

$$V = V_0 \left[ \exp \left( -\frac{\alpha^2(G_c - G)}{k_B(T_0 + \Delta T)} \right) \right. - \left. \exp \left( -\frac{\alpha^2(G_h + G)}{k_B(T_0 + \Delta T)} \right) \right]$$

when $G < G_c$

$$V = V_0 \left[ 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{\alpha^2(G_h + G)}{k_B(T_0 + \Delta T)} \right) \right]$$

when $G \geq G_c$, (1)

where $k_B$ is Boltzmann’s constant, $V_0$ the thermal bath molecular velocity, typically in the order of the Rayleigh velocity in the medium [16], and $\alpha^2$ is an area that links $G$ to the local elastic energy stored in the tip atomic bonds before failure. We explain, in the supplemental
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material (or see Vanel et al. [17]), how this area is only an equivalent parameter, that depends on the volume \(d_0^3\) of one bond \((d_0 \sim 1\ \text{Å})\) and a cut-off length \(\xi\), preventing the divergence of the stress at the crack front, which is predicted by linear elastic fracture mechanics:

\[
\alpha^2 \sim \frac{d_0^3}{2\xi}.
\]  

We moreover assume that a fraction \(\phi\) of the mechanical energy is dissipated into heat in a zone \([18, 19]\) of radius \(t\) around the front, and therefore write the absolute tip temperature as \(T_0 + \Delta T\), where \(T_0\) is the level of the ambient thermal bath and \(\Delta T\) follows the diffusion equation \([19]\):

\[
\frac{\partial(\Delta T)}{\partial t} = \frac{\lambda}{C} \nabla^2 (\Delta T) + \frac{\phi GV}{C \pi t^2} f.
\]  

\(\lambda\) is the medium’s thermal conductivity, and \(C\) is the volumetric heat capacity. \(f\) is the support function of the heat production zone (here, \(f = 1\) in it and \(f = 0\) otherwise). Although governed by Eq. (3), \(\Delta T\) can approximate to far simpler expressions \([19]\). At low propagation velocities, the thermal elevation is only governed by the diffusion skin depth upon the passage of the heat production zone, while, for fast cracks, the generated heat can barely diffuse away and \(\Delta T\) is constrained by \(f\):

\[
\Delta T_{\text{slow}} \sim \frac{\phi GV}{\lambda}, \quad \Delta T_{\text{fast}} \sim \frac{\phi G}{\pi C l}.
\]  

See Fig. 1 for the general evolution of \(\Delta T\) with \(V\) and the validity of these approximations. Solving Eq. (1) and (3) simultaneously and focusing on their steady state, one can show the existence of two stable phases for the crack propagation (as shown in Figs. 2 and 3). The first phase is a slow one as \(\Delta T\) stays small compared to \(T_0\), such that the growth rate is mainly governed by the medium toughness. The second phase is reached when the generated heat significantly overcomes the background temperature. The propagation rate significantly increases and the crack is said to be thermally weakened. Both phases coexist for a certain range of energy release rate: a hysteresis situation holds and the model also predicts a third, unstable, phase, unlikely to be recorded experimentally.

### III. COMPARISON TO EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Interestingly, this phase description matches key observations of fracturing experiments. The abrupt transition, passed a load threshold, from slow to fast cracks, can indeed be interpreted as a phase transition, and the stick-slip of fronts, when avalanches are bigger than the typical medium’s quenched disorder, is a good indicator for hysteresis.

Let us first compare our model to data acquired when breaking Poly-methyl methacrylate sheets (PMMA) at room temperature \((T_0 = 296\ \text{K})\). A wedge is forced into Perspex® bodies, resulting in cracks for which two stable \((G, V)\) branches are recorded, as shown in Fig. 2. A fast branch, as reported by Scheibert et al. [20] and a slow one, which is here published for the first time (see the supplemental material). When forcing the velocity between these two regimes (i.e., above a specific velocity of \(4\ \text{cm s}^{-1}\) and below \(100\ \text{m s}^{-1}\)), some stick-slip is observed [22]. Figure 2 compares both sets of data with the model, and we now pursue by detailing how each parameter was fitted, based on asymptotic read-offs. First, notice the linear \(\ln(V)\) to \(G\) relationship that holds at low velocity, between \(10^{-4}\) and \(10^{-2}\ \text{m s}^{-1}\). There, \(\Delta T \ll T_0\) and \(G\) is high enough for healing processes to be secondary, leading to:

\[
\ln(V) = G \left[ \frac{\alpha^2}{k_B T_0} \right] + \left[ \ln(V_0) - \frac{\alpha^2 G c}{k_B T_0} \right],
\]

where \(\ln\) is the natural logarithm. The slope of this data hence constrains \(\alpha^2\), and the length \(\xi\) can then be determined from Eq. (2) to be about 10 nm. Additionally, the intercept of Eq. (5) with the \(V\) axis links \(V_0\) and \(G_c\). As we consider the former to be similar to the medium Rayleigh velocity \([20]\), 880 m s\(^{-1}\), we deduce \(G_c \sim 1275\ \text{J m}^{-2}\). \(G_h\) can next be inferred from the asymptote at \(G = 300\ \text{J m}^{-2}\), below which healing prevails and cracks cannot propagate. Equation (1) predicts it for \(G = [G_c - G_h]/2\) such that \(G_h \sim 650\ \text{J m}^{-2}\). Let us focus now on the local \(G\) maximum, around \(V = 4\ \text{cm s}^{-1}\). It is modelled by Eq. (1) once \(\Delta T\) stops being negligible compared to \(T_0\), which, as per (4), depends on the \(\lambda/\phi\) ratio. By tuning this ratio, we deduce it to be around \(0.9\ \text{J s}^{-1}\ \text{m}^{-1}\ \text{K}^{-1}\). As the PMMA conductivity, \(\lambda = 0.18\ \text{J s}^{-1}\ \text{m}^{-1}\ \text{K}^{-1}\), is known, we can approximate \(\phi \sim 20\%\). Note that this particular point, where \(\partial G/\partial V = 0\) and which is directly related to the medium heat conductivity, is the macroscopic critical energy release rate at which the polymer suddenly breaks [13, 23].
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**FIG. 1.** Steady thermal elevation at a crack tip for various propagation velocities, as per Eq. (3) (plain plot). Approximations \(\Delta T_{\text{fast}}\) and \(\Delta T_{\text{slow}}\) are shown for comparison (dotted plots). Axes are unlabelled for the sake of generality.
FIG. 2. Crack velocity $V$ as a function of the energy release rate $G$ as predicted by Eq. (1) and (3) and fitted to the PMMA experimental data [20, 21]. The grey arrows indicate which model parameters each part of the curve is mainly sensitive to. (a): Fractography of secondary micro-cracks on a postmortem fracture surface [20]. White areas mark their nucleation centres. (b): Atomic Force Microscopy of a cavity at the centres of micro-cracks. (c): Modelled temperature field around the crack front, for $V \sim 100 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ and $G \sim 600 \text{ J m}^{-2}$. The circle corresponds to the tip of radius $l$. We here show how it happens at a value less than the actual microscopic $G_c$ barrier. Lastly, as the crack needs to be hot enough to explain fast fronts at low $G$ (the slower part of the fast branch in Fig. 2), we can estimate the limiting factor of $\Delta T_{\text{fast}}$, $Cl$. Matching the data set in this area, we deduce $l$ to be at most in the nanometer range, which happens to be consistent with the value of $\xi$. We hence predict that most of the induced molecular agitation is introduced on the closest atoms around the crack tip, and, with the discussed parameters, our simple sub-critical model matches most of the rupture dynamics.

In Fig. 2 however, a slope break holds passed $G = G_c$, and is not accounted for. For this particular PMMA, ant at this load, it was shown [21] that micro-cracks [2, 5, 24] start to nucleate ahead of the front (as illustrated in Fig. 2), while the crack advances at around 165 m s$^{-1}$. The apparent macroscopic speed of the main crack, $V$, then increases with the growing density of these secondary defaults. However, the individual velocity of each micro-crack was inferred to stay constant, which is compatible with the model. Equation (1) actually explains why the plateau velocity $V_{\text{lim}}$, modeled at high mechanical loads, stays below the one of Rayleigh waves: when the tip temperature is high, the healing processes do significantly limit the growth rate. By inserting $\Delta T_{\text{fast}}$ (4) and Eq. (2) in Eq. (1), and by looking at the high loads asymptotic regime, we more specifically predict $V$ to be limited by the individual heat capacity of atom bounds:

$$V_{\text{lim}} \sim V_0 \left[1 - \exp \left( - \frac{\alpha^2 (1 + G_h/G_c)}{k_B (T_0/G_c + \phi/[\pi Cl])} \right) \right]$$

$$\sim V_0 \left[1 - \exp \left( - \frac{d^2 C}{k_B \phi} \frac{l}{\xi} \right) \right],$$

where the crossed out terms are neglected. Since $l$ and $\xi$ have been inferred to be similar, this expression simplifies further. Note that $V_{\text{lim}} \sim 100 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ is smaller than the actual maximum individual propagation velocity $V_{\text{max}} \sim 160 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, which is obtained for $G = G_c$ rather than for $G \to +\infty$.

We now pursue the comparison with the reported rupture of another material, acrylic based pressure sensitive adhesives (PSA), typically happening when unrolling office tape. For Scotch® 3M 600 rolls, two propagation modes are indeed measured [26], and some stick-slip is observed passed a specific velocity [25] $V \sim 15 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$. The full $(G, V)$ data and model fit is shown in Fig. 3. As no significant healing threshold displays at low velocity, we assume that $G_h$ is high enough to neglect the healing term (see the supplemental material for further discussion), and we invert the model’s parameters with the same asymptotic analysis as for PMMA. First, $\xi$ is given by the slope of the slow phase: $\xi \sim 1 \text{ nm}$. The highest velocity records gives $V_0 \sim 30 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ and the intercept at low velocity indicates $G_h \sim 146 \text{ J m}^{-2}$. Satisfyingly, $V_0$ compares with the mechanical wave velocity in PSA, $\sqrt{\mu/\rho}$, where $\mu$ is its shear modulus [27], 0.1 to 1 MPa, and $\rho$ its volumetric
FIG. 3. Crack velocity $V$ as a function of the energy release rate $G$ as predicted by Eq. (1) and (3) and fitted to the tape experimental data [25, 26]. The unstable branch cannot be measured and the data points there are only averaged $V$ versus $G$ for a crack that undergoes stick-slip, in the given set-up, between the slow and the fast phase. The arrows indicate to which model parameters each part of the curve is mainly sensitive. (a): Modelled temperature field around the crack front, at the onset of the fast to slow phase shift ($V = 20 \text{ m s}^{-1}$). (b): Blue radiation emitted when quickly peeling tape in the dark, as captured by a reflex camera.

mass [28], about $10^3 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$. From the local $G$ maximum at the higher end of the slow datum, we infer $\lambda/\phi$ in the order of $0.1 \text{ J s}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$ and, as the adhesive’s conductiv-
ty lives in the same range [29], a consequent portion of $G$ should be released into heat: $\phi \sim 1$. Finally, we estimate $l$ to be in the nanometer range, based on the coolest points of the fast phase, consistent with the value of $\xi$ and similar to what was inverted for PMMA.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We thus have shown how statistical physics, together with the dissipation and diffusion of heat, can simply ex-
plain the dynamics of both creeping and fast cracks, as well as the shifts from one state to the other. Such novel match, over eight decades of propagation velocities and with only very simple physics considerations, is to shed a new light on fracture mechanics, as thermal effects are often discarded. While giving valuable insights on the rupture of both the studied media, our quantification for each model parameter stays rather approximate (i.e. we mainly derived orders of magnitude). They were notably considered to be constant while most could be velocity or temperature dependent [13, 14, 30]. We also consid-
ered PMMA and PSA as homogeneously tough while $G_c$ is likely to present some quenched disorder. While this should not affect the stable propagation branches, as long as $G$ and $V$ are understood as averaged over a few $G_c$ correlation lengths, it could be of importance for the ac-
curacy of the phase transitions, as slow cracks shall preferen-
tially avalanche on weaker zones and fast cracks stop on stronger locations. We illustrate further, in the sup-
plemental material, the parameters sensitivity. Besides these assumptions, the high temperature gradients (see Figs. 2 and 3) and high excitation frequencies ($V/l$), that are at stake in our model, might call for a more compi-
licated heat transport description [31] than the plain dif-
fusion described by Eq. (3).

We still predict the thermal elevation to reach several thousands of degrees, although experimentally confirm-
ing this temperature on a few nanometers is challenging.

We also infer that the release of the heat is concentrated in the dark, is also model consistent: we indeed expect a radiated power [37] $s(T_0 + \Delta T)^4 h l \sim 1 \mu\text{W}$ to $1 \text{ mW}$, with $s = 5.67 \times 10^{-8} \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4}$ the Stefan–Boltzmann constant and $h$ the tape width ($\sim 2 \text{ cm}$).
on nanometers around the tip and, that this is interestingly similar to the cut-off scale, that relates the tip elastic energy to $G$ (i.e., $l \sim \xi$). Thus, the release of heat might be the main mechanism shielding the stress at the front [12], and the nanometric scale may well correspond to the typical entanglement density in polymers, below which atoms have more freedom to vibrate, and which is known to affect rupture properties [38]. The usual predictions for the shielding process zones are yet far larger than $l$, in the order of $GE/\sigma^2_y \sim 100 \mu$m in PMMA, $\sigma_y$ being the tensile yield stress of the solid and $E$ its Young modulus. However, some residual heat, together with other dissipation processes, can surely be introduced at this scale, as $\phi G$ shall not account for all plastic phenomena. A hundred micrometers is actually similar to the distance at which micro-cracks nucleate from the main front in PMMA [21], and the imaging of the postmortem surfaces of this material reveals spherical cavities in the centres of those micro-cracks (see Fig. 2). We propose that it could correspond to bubbles, forming by sublimation [39] from high enough temperatures sparsely reached on weak locations of the process zone, and leading to fractures once having grown to a critical size. Thus, in addition to explaining the full dynamics of singular fronts, thermal processes could be responsible for their complication at high propagation velocity. The appearance of secondary fronts, for loads passed our inferred $G_c$, might indeed correspond to the onset of new dissipation processes, when cracks propagate over-critically and some extra energy is brought to the system.


Supplemental material is available.
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I. DOWN-SCALING FROM THE ENERGY RELEASE RATE TO THE TIP ELASTIC ENERGY

We presented an Arrhenius based model which activation energy $E_a$ is written as a function of the energy release rate $G$:

$$E_a = \alpha^2 (G_c - G),$$  (1)

where $\alpha^2$ is an area related to the typical size of the breaking sites and $G_c$ the critical energy release rate above which the sites of a given surface break. This law fits well observed crack dynamics [1], but for a value of $\alpha$ which is however less than the typical inter-atomic distance (i.e., about an ångström), making its physical meaning questionable. It was proposed [2] that for a crack to advance by a nominal surface, several off-plane bonds have to be broken, and hence that $\alpha$ holds a projective information. Vanel et al. [3], however, proposed another reason for $\alpha$ to be only an ad-hoc scale: the sub-critical growth rate is to be written at the microscopic scale, rather than using the macroscopic $G$. If we consider the link undergoing the rupture process to be elastic and that it breaks passed a critical elastic energy, we can then write the Arrhenius activation energy as:

$$E_a = d_0^3 \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2E} - \frac{\sigma^2_{tip}}{2E} \right),$$  (2)

where $\sigma_{tip}$ is the stress at the tip of the crack, $\sigma_c$ the rupture threshold, $d_0$ the characteristic volume of the link ($d_0 \sim 1 \text{ Å}$), and $E$ an elastic modulus, say the Young modulus for cracks that open in mode I. To scale Eq. (2) back to Eq. (1), we use the general elasticity theory [4], predicting that the stress around a crack tip is governed by:

$$\sigma(r) \sim \frac{K}{\sqrt{r}},$$  (3)

where $K$ is the fracture toughness, $G \sim K^2/E$, and $r$ is the distance to the tip. While this expression nonphysically diverges for $r \to 0$, we introduce a scale $\xi$ below which the divergence is prevented. The stress at the tip is then given by:

$$\sigma_{tip} \sim \sqrt{\frac{GE}{\xi}}.$$  (4)

It is often considered [5] that such a cut-off is related to some shielding plasticity around the tip. In the manuscript, we have indeed shown how it could be related to some release of heat, as $\xi$ is similar to the radius of the main heat production zone $l$. While $\sigma_{tip}$ is often thought to be fixed at a characteristic yield value, with variations in $G$ that are balanced by variations in $\xi$, we have oppositely considered $\xi$ to be a constant, such that
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the stress at the tip always increases with $G$. Inserting Eq. (4) into Eq. (2) and comparing with Eq. (1), an expression is deduced for the $\alpha$ parameter [3]:

$$\alpha \sim \sqrt{\frac{d^3_0}{2\xi}},$$

making it as announced less than an ångström, as $\xi$ is bound to be larger than $d_0$. In particular, for PMMA and PSA, we inverted $\xi$ to be nanometric. The extent of the plastic process zones that surround crack fronts shall yet be far bigger. We have thus, here, assumed that expression (3) approximately holds despite this longer range plasticity (i.e., the stress is not a homogeneous quantity of the plastic zone, but grows when approaching the tip, up to the cut-off scale $\xi$).

If not assuming perfectly elastic bonds between atoms (i.e., Eq. (2)), the relation between the stress and the energy release rate can still most generally be written as:

$$G = \int_{d_0}^{d} \sigma(d') dd',$$

de being the nominal separation of atoms in an unloaded matrix (i.e., at $G = 0$) and $d$ the actual atom separation at the crack tip. Figure 1 illustrates this relation, as well as how the thermal bath allows to overcome the energy barriers, $G_c - G$ and $G_h + G$.

**II. PARAMETERS SENSIBILITY FOR THE DATA FIT**

We here show, on the PMMA data, how varying the model’s parameters around their inferred values impacts the model fit, thus giving the reader a better feeling for their individual effect and sensitivity. In each of the figures 2 to 8, a unique parameter of the model varies while the others are kept to the values used for the fit presented in the main manuscript: $\alpha = 8.3 \text{pm}$, $V_0 = 880 \text{m s}^{-1}$, $G_c = 1275 \text{J m}^{-2}$, $G_h = 650 \text{J m}^{-2}$, $\phi = 20\%$, $\lambda = 0.18 \text{Js}^{-1} \text{m}^{-3} \text{K}^{-1}$, $Cl = 1.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{J m}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1}$ and $T_0 = 296 \text{K}$. The plots show the data up to the appearance of the secondary micro-cracks, after which the model does not apply as such.

**FIG. 1.** (Left): simplified atomic view of the breaking/healing site at the crack tip. (Top right): Generic tip stress to atom separation function for the active breaking link. $G$ is the grey area, $G_c$ the area below the curve for $d > d_0$. (Bottom right): Generic tip stress to atom separation function for the active healing link. Under a load $G$, and although the link is initially broken, an energy input is still required to move the two atoms closer to each other, due to the neighbouring unbroken links. In addition, when the atoms separation gets smaller, one also needs to overcome a repulsive energy barrier $G_h$ before reforming the bond.

**FIG. 2.** Effect of varying the nominal velocity, $V_0$, on the fit to the PMMA data. The propagation velocity is roughly proportional to $V_0$, but also modifies the positions of the phase transitions.

**FIG. 3.** Effect of varying the breaking energy barrier, $G_c$, on the fit to the PMMA data. At a given load, the higher $G_c$, the slower the crack. The transitions between the three propagation modes (fast, slow, and dominated by healing) are also affected: a medium with a stronger barrier needs a heavier load to transit to a weaker state.
FIG. 4. Effect of varying the healing energy barrier, $G_h$, on the fit to the PMMA data. A crack that heals more easily needs a higher load to actually propagate forward or to stay in the high velocity regime.

FIG. 5. Effect of varying the characteristic size of a breaking link, $\alpha$, on the fit to the PMMA data. $\alpha$ mainly controls the slope and the intercept of the low velocity branch. A small change in $\alpha$ significantly modifies this branch as well as the threshold to the fast regime.

FIG. 6. Effect of varying the ratio of energy converted to heat, $\phi$, on the fit to the PMMA data. The maximum velocity increases with $\phi$ as the tip temperature is higher. The threshold from the slow to the fast branch shifts towards lower $G$ as a lighter load is required for the temperature to significantly deviate from $T_0$.

FIG. 7. Effect of varying the thermal conductivity, $\lambda$, on the fit to the PMMA data. With higher $\lambda$, the heat is better evacuated: the slow to fast branch threshold shifts towards higher $G$ and $V$. The fast regime is not sensitive to $\lambda$, as $\Delta T$ is there constrained by $l$.

FIG. 8. Effect of varying the heat production zone radius, $l$, on the fit to the PMMA data. $l$ mainly impacts the plot curvature on the high velocity branch. No effect is observed on the slow branch as the thermal elevation is there constrained by the diffusion skin depth rather than by the radius of the heat production zone.

Investigating the relative sensitivity of each parameter, we thus assess the uncertainty of their inverted value, which is: a few picometers for $\alpha$ and a few nanometers for $l$, about 10% for $\phi$, a few hundreds of Joules per square meter for $G_s$ and $G_h$, and $V_0$ assumed to be in the order of the mechanical waves velocities. To this relatively high uncertainties, adds up the experimental inaccuracy for $V$ and $G$, as well as the limitation of our very first order physical model. Still, the data is overall well explained over eight decades of velocities, for two different materials and with parameters that are in credible orders of magnitude.
III. HEALING PROCESSES IN TAPE

In our letter, we considered the healing processes to be negligible in order to describe the dynamics of unrolling tape, as no low velocity constant $G$ asymptote arising from crack healing displays in the $(G, V)$ data. We here temper this assertion by showing fits that do not disregard their effect (i.e., we do not assume $G_h \gg G_c$). Indeed, the asymptote could be present, but at a load smaller than the measured ones, or even at a negative load (when compressing the medium). The latter happens if $G_c$ is smaller than $G_h$, as the asymptote is obtained for $(G_c - G_h)/2$. Thus, the healing energy barrier could still be comparable to the breaking one, and so significantly impact the high velocity propagation branch, when the crack tip is hot enough. Of course, an accurate quantification of this effect suffers from the absence of the asymptote as it is a good constrain for $G_h$. Figure 9 for instance shows a model not disregarding healing, and compares it with the tape data. The match is improved compared to the fit presented in the main manuscript as we have here an additional degree of freedom. The parameters are as follow: $\alpha = 21 \text{ pm}$, $V_0 = 70 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, $G_c = 154 \text{ J m}^{-2}$, $G_h = 200 \text{ J m}^{-2}$, $\phi = 60\%$, $\lambda = 0.3 \text{ J s}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$, $Cl = 10^{-3} \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-1}$, and $T_0 = 296 \text{ K}$.

Note that Barquins et al. [8], who released part of the data presented in Fig. 9, also provided similar measurements for another type of roller tape, Scotch® 3M 602. For this new medium, the $(V, G)$ cross-plot at low velocity do call for healing processes, as shown in Fig. 10, and we then propose a fit with the following parameters: $\alpha = 10 \text{ pm}$, $V_0 = 200 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, $G_c = 500 \text{ J m}^{-2}$, $G_h = 480 \text{ J m}^{-2}$, $\phi = 60\%$, $\lambda = 0.3 \text{ J s}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$, $Cl = 10^{-3} \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-1}$, and $T_0 = 296 \text{ K}$.

IV. COMPATIBILITY WITH THE SECOND LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

It should be emphasised that, although we allow for microscopic crack healing, crack propagation is not considered as a reversible phenomenon, as rupture is a dissipative process. One does not recover a fully cured PMMA or PSA body, by waiting for some time after an initial damage.

Our model is inline with Rice’s theorem [4, 9], that is, the condition deriving from the application of the second law of thermodynamics to the propagation of quasi-static cracks:

\[(G - R)V \geq 0, \quad (7)\]

where $R$ is the work per unit of area of reversible separation of the surfaces to be fractured, in a given active environment.

In our model, and as per our parameters definitions, we can define: $R = (G_c - G_h)/2$. For this particular value, Eq. (7), and hence irreversible thermodynamics, are respected.

Of course, while assuming a quasi-static propagation over the slow creep regime is reasonable, it might not be as such for the fast propagation, where the rupture velocity approaches that of mechanical waves, and healing plays an important role. For such quick/hot regime, the second law of thermodynamics might be oversimplified by Eq. (7).
V. METHOD: MEASUREMENT OF CRACK VELOCITY VS ENERGY RELEASE RATE IN PMMA

Wedge splitting fracture tests were used to measure both the slow and fast $V(G)$ branches in PMMA [10, 11]. Rectangular plates of size $140 \times 125 \times 15$ mm$^3$ are first machined from a plate of moulded PMMA (Perspex®). A $25 \times 25$ mm$^2$ notch is subsequently cut out on one of the two lateral edges and a 8-mm-long 800-µm-thick groove is finally introduced in the middle of the notch with a diamond saw.

To grow slow cracks, an additional seed crack (~2 mm-long) was added at the end of the groove via a razor blade. This crack is loaded in tension by pushing a steel wedge (semi-angle of 15°) in the notch. Two steel blocks equipped with rollers are placed in between the wedge and the specimen notch to limit the parasitic mechanical dissipation through plastic deformations or friction at loading contacts. As a result, the vicinity of the crack tip can be assumed to be the sole dissipation source for mechanical energy in the system. The wedge speed is first set to 1.6 µm/s$^{-1}$. The force $F$ applied by the wedge to the specimen increases linearly with time up to a point $F_c$ above which the seed crack starts to propagate. Above this point, $F$ decreases with time. We let the crack propagate over a distance of about 10 mm. This ensures reproducible initial conditions with a long-enough well-defined sharp seed crack. The specimen is then unloaded (unloading wedge speed: 16 µm/s$^{-1}$). The specimen is then loaded again at a constant prescribed wedge speed $V_{\text{wedge}}$, which has been varied from 1.6 µm/s$^{-1}$ to 1.2 mm/s$^{-1}$. For $V_{\text{wedge}} < 300$ µm/s$^{-1}$, stable, continuous, crack growth is observed all along the experiment up to the complete breakdown of the specimen. Above 300 µm/s$^{-1}$, the dynamics is intermittent, with successive phases of fast growth [11] interspersed with periods of slow growth.

During each fracture test, the force $F(t)$ is monitored in real-time via a cell force mounted on the system (S-type Vishay load cell, maximum force of 100 N, measured accuracy of 1 N at 50 kHz acquisition rates, and 0.001 N at 1 Hz). A camera (USB2 uEye from IDS Imaging Development) is also used to image crack propagation at the specimen surface (space and time accuracy of 125 µm and 0.1 s). A coarse approximation of the crack speed can be obtained by differentiating the position of the crack tip observed on the successive images. However, a more accurate signal $V(t)$ is obtained from the force signal (see Barés et al. [12] for details on the method). Indeed, in a linear elastic isotropic material like PMMA, the specimen stiffness $k(t) = F(t)/(V_{\text{wedge}} t)$ is a continuous decreasing function of the crack length, $c(t)$, that is set by the specimen geometry only. This function has been obtained using finite element calculations on the exact experimental geometry (Cast3M software, 2D simulation assuming plane stress conditions); it was checked that the obtained $k$ vs $c$ curve coincides with the experimental curves obtained by plotting $k(t)$ as a function of the crack length measured by the camera. The idea is then to use this curve $k(c)$ to infer the time evolution of crack length from the signal $F(t)$: $c(t) = k^{-1}[F(t)/(V_{\text{wedge}} t)]$.

Time derivation of the so-obtained $c(t)$ provides a signal $V(t)$ about 50 times less noisy than that directly obtained from the camera images. The knowledge of $c(t)$ and $F(t)$ also allows determining the time evolution of elastic energy release, $G(t)$. Indeed, the total amount of mechanical energy provided to the specimen is $F^2(t)/[2k(c(t))]$. Differentiating this stored energy with respect to $c$ directly provides $G(t)$. The plot of $V(t)$ as a function of $G(t)$ provides the different points observed in the slow stable phase of figure 2 in the main text. Twelve fracture experiments are gathered there and differ by their $V_{\text{wedge}}$ value: 1.6 nm/s$^{-1}$, 32 nm/s$^{-1}$, 400 nm/s$^{-1}$, 800 nm/s$^{-1}$, 1.6 µm/s$^{-1}$, 4 µm/s$^{-1}$, 8 µm/s$^{-1}$, 16 µm/s$^{-1}$, 40 µm/s$^{-1}$, 80 µm/s$^{-1}$, 160 µm/s$^{-1}$, 240 µm/s$^{-1}$ and 320 µm/s$^{-1}$.

To grow fast cracks and measure $V(G)$ in the fast stable phase, the seed crack has been replaced by a hole of tunable radius (1 to 4 mm) drilled at the end of the groove [10]. This delays fracture and increases the potential energy stored in the specimen at the initiation of crack growth. The time evolution of $V(t)$ is measured by monitoring, via an oscilloscope, the successive rupture of parallel 500-µm-large metallic lines (Chromium/Gold) deposited on the surface and that of the quasi static stress intensity factor is obtained via finite element analysis (see Scheibert et al. [10] for details). The time evolution of the mechanical energy release rate is then deduced: $G = K^2/E$ where the Young modulus $E$ in our PMMA have been measured to be $E = 2.8$ GPa. The plot of $V(t)$ as a function of $G(t)$ provides the different points observed in the fast stable phase of figure 2 in the main text. Five fracture experiments are gathered there and differ by the amount of stored elastic energy at crack growth initiation: 2.0 J, 2.6 J, 2.9 J, 3.8 J and 4.2 J.


