Athermal Fracture of Elastic Networks: How Rigidity Challenges the Unavoidable Size-Induced Brittleness
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By performing extensive simulations with unprecedentedly large system sizes, we unveil how rigidity influences the fracture of disordered materials. The largest damage is observed close to rigidity points when the rupture thresholds are small. Fewer bonds are broken when the thresholds are increased. Irrespective of network and spring properties, a more brittle fracture is observed upon increasing system size, even in sub-isostatic networks where the underlying force chains govern the mechanical response. Most of the fracture descriptors show power-law size-scaling dependent on rigidity properties. Strikingly, the maximum stress drop, a proxy for brittleness, displays a universal doubly-non-monotonic dependence on system size and can be used as a novel parameter to identify different failure regimes. Our results indicate how to tune these regimes. Finally, we speculate how the size-induced brittleness is influenced by thermal fluctuations.

Irremediable stress concentration leading to crack nucleation and propagation is the hallmark of brittle fracture. The stress (re)distribution before and after bond-breaking events is intimately related to the microscopic structure of a material (especially when thermal fluctuations are not relevant). Since the pioneering work of Griffith on crack nucleation around isolated defects [1], the last 30 years have witnessed a still-growing interest for fracture occurring in intrinsically disordered materials [2–9]. Biopolymer networks, such as collagen, are ubiquitous examples of disordered structures, with a peculiarly low connectivity that places these materials below the isostatic point of mechanical stability [10]. Without their fiber bending stiffness, responsible for their soft linear modulus, these networks would not be rigid. However, their strain-stiffening response is a consequence of an athermal strain-driven rigidity transition: above a certain value of deformation, the mechanical response is controlled by stretching and the system becomes rigid even without bending contributions [11–19]. In fact, when deformed, these diluted elastic networks exhibit a very heterogeneous stress distribution with emerging force chains [20–24] (see Fig. 1(a)), similarly to deformed granular and porous materials [25–28]. The effects of these heterogeneous stresses on fracture have been only partially addressed. In particular, in Ref. [23] it was argued that a continuous breakage and formation of force chains leads to a complete suppression of stress concentration for networks below the rigidity point, thereby preventing crack nucleation at all length-scales. This conclusion clashes with a recent theory that predicts crack nucleation for any disordered system approaching the thermodynamic limit [8]. This raises the question whether sparse fiber networks show fracture behavior that differs qualitatively from that of other disordered materials. Indeed, evidence based on simulations of small to moderate system size [23, 29] and fracture experiments on small meta-materials [29, 30] shows that rigidity cannot be neglected if one wishes to understand fracture in these materials. More generally, despite recent progress [28, 32–36], a clear link between structure and fracture is still missing, even for a cornerstone such as the central-force spring network model. Here we aim to fill this knowledge gap and understand once and for all if the tuning of rigidity can actually suppress crack nucleation or not.

We perform extensive off-lattice simulations of diluted spring networks with different topologies, connectivity, rupture thresholds, and unprecedentedly large system sizes. We first consider triangular networks made of \( L \times L \) nodes in which a fraction \( 1 - p \) of the bonds is removed. All bonds are harmonic springs with unit stiffness and unit rest length. The bonds break irreversibly when their deformations exceed the threshold \( \lambda \) (same for all springs). We deform the networks uniaxially under ather-
eral and quasistatic loading conditions, using the FIRE algorithm for the energy minimization. We characterize the network response using the stress $\sigma$ - strain $\epsilon$ curve. We identify the strain at which the network rigidifies $\epsilon_R$, the maximum stress $\sigma_c$ and its associated strain value $\epsilon_p$, and the maximum stress drop $\Delta\sigma_{\text{max}}$, as shown in Fig. 1(b). Furthermore, we calculate the fraction of broken bonds at final failure (defined when the network is broken in two parts) $n_f = N_f/N_{\text{in}}$, with $N_f$ and $N_{\text{in}}$ the number of broken bonds at failure and number of intact bonds at rest, respectively. All these quantities are expressed in reduced units and averaged over many configurations (see Supplemental Material for more details).

In Fig. 1, we show results at fixed system size $L = 128$. In panel (c), we observe for small $\lambda$ a non-monotonic dependence of $n_f$ on the network connectivity, with a maximum around the isostatic point $\lambda = 0.05$ ($\rho_{\text{iso}} \simeq 0.66$), consistently with Ref. [29]. Approaching the limit of a fully connected network ($\lambda = 1$), the number of bonds involved in the fracture process drastically diminishes, as expected for localized crack nucleation. Analogously, fewer bonds are required to break networks close to the geometric percolation limit ($p_g \simeq 0.347$), being already loosely connected. Interestingly, when increasing $\lambda$, that is the strength of the individual springs, $n_f$ decreases for all $p$ and the maximum disappears. Therefore, a general gradual transition to a more localized type of failure, i.e. a cross-over to brittle fracture, is obtained when the breaking process starts at larger deformations (or equivalently when the system response is higher, i.e. the system is more rigid).

At fixed $\lambda$, a larger number of broken bonds can correspond to stronger materials. Indeed, as we report in the Supplemental Material, the work needed to break the material exhibits a maximum around $\rho_{\text{iso}}$ when $\lambda \leq 0.10$, suggesting that networks close to the isostatic point are tougher, as also found in [23]. However, when considering $\sigma_c$, the more intuitive monotonic dependence on $p$ — the more the bonds, the stronger the material — is observed, as shown in Fig. 1(d). Finally, to further quantify the role of the network architecture on the fracture process, we plot in Fig. 1(e) the hidden length emerging during the deformation, defined as the strain interval $\epsilon_p - \epsilon_R$ in which the (rigidified) network reaches the stress peak normalized by the stretchability of the individual elements $\lambda$. For small $\lambda$, networks around and below the isostatic point can be stretched significantly more than their elements. This is a macroscopic consequence of the underlying complex and heterogeneous stress (re)distribution during the deformation, involving non-affine displacements and formation/breakage of force chains [16, 20, 23, 39]. On the contrary, for large $p$ and/or for large $\lambda$ the hidden length is less than unity, indicating that significant stress concentration occurs before exploiting all the possible bonds stretchability. Overall, for $L = 128$ the nature of the fracture can be evidently tuned by varying $p$ and $\lambda$. This conclusion is also supported by looking at $\Delta\sigma_{\text{max}}$ (shown in the Supplemental Material) or quantities related to the spatial or temporal distribution of broken bonds (not reported here).

To investigate the universality of the observed behavior, we perform simulations for different two- and three-dimensional diluted networks and repeat the analysis above. In Fig. 2 we only show $n_f$ as a function of the network average connectivity $<z>$ for a single small value of $\lambda$. We observe that the position of the maximum in $n_f$ depends not only on the dimensionality but also on the network topology (in particular the maximum number of bonds per node $z_{\text{max}}$) and on the network geometry (e.g. network orientation). For example, despite the fact that the diluted square (SQ) and the 2D diamond (D2) networks have the same connectivity properties, SQ is more brittle (fewer bonds are broken) because it features more bonds already aligned with the direction of deformation. Analogously, because of geometric effects (a large number of system-spanning bonds at small connectivity) in the honeycomb (HC) and in the 3D diamond (D3) networks, a larger number of bonds is broken when approaching the limit of undiluted lattices. Only for the diluted triangular (TR) and face-centred-cubic (FCC) networks, that are sufficiently isotropic, the maximum of $n_f$ roughly corresponds to the isostatic point $z_{\text{iso}}$, whereas for the other networks they do not coincide. Our results enrich the data reported in Refs. [29, 29, 30] and we can summarize that damage is maximized close to rigidity points, either
of isostatic or geometric nature, when $\lambda$ is small.
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**FIG. 3.** (a) Size scaling of number of broken bonds $N_f$ for triangular networks with $p = 0.65$, $\lambda = 0.03$. Black circles indicate single-run values, red squares averages and dashed line best power-law fit. (b) Damage fractal dimension $d_f$ as a function of $p$ and $\lambda$. (c) Single-run stress-strain curve for increasing system size. (d) Size scaling of the network strength $\sigma_c$ (log-log plot). Symbols correspond to averages and lines are the best fits. Three functional forms were used to fit the decay: logarithmic (dotted black), DLB [40] (dashed red), power-law (solid green). The latter fits the data the best.

What is the effect of system size, known to be crucial in fracture [6, 21, 11, 32]? Does the locally inhomogeneous stress (re)distribution still have macroscopic implications in larger systems? To address these questions, we consider again triangular networks and extract the damage fractal dimension $d_f$ by fitting the number of broken bonds as a function of the system size using $N_f \sim L^{d_f}$, as shown in Fig. 3(a) for $p = 0.65$, $\lambda = 0.03$. In Fig. 3(b), we plot $d_f$ for several connectivities and thresholds. We observe that $d_f$ is larger close to the isostatic point and for small $\lambda$; it then gradually decreases and approaches the expected $d_f = 1$ for (linear) crack nucleation when increasing $\lambda$ and/or moving away from $p_{iso}$. The upper bound of $d_f = 2$ for which damage is completely delocalized [17] might be expected only when $\lambda \to 0$. In Fig. 3(c), we report the stress-strain curve for typical simulations at different system sizes and observe that the network response is evidently more brittle at large system size. Interestingly, this implies that when increasing $L$, bonds break only before and at the peak stress, despite having a fractal dimension $d_f > 1$. This is distinct from the scalar random fuse models [4], or models assuming linear elasticity [13], where the number of broken bonds (at peak load) scales at most linearly with the system size. As exemplary shown in Fig. 3(d), the material strength $\sigma_c$ decreases upon increasing system size (and similarly does $\varepsilon_p$, as shown in [3]), as commonly observed in fracture studies. Differently from previous models where it is assumed that the material strength is zero in the thermodynamic limit [6], in our case we have an offset value $\sigma_c(\infty) \neq 0$ corresponding to a finite network strength that depends on $p$ and $\lambda$. Our data also suggest that the functional form of the decay shown in Fig. 3(d) is different from scalar models [3] [10, 11] (see Supplemental Material [3] for details).

Next, we quantify the failure abruptness by looking at the maximum stress drop $\Delta\sigma_{max}$. Strikingly, instead of a conventional monotonic decay with increasing system size, we observe a non-monotonic trend for networks close to the isostatic point and $\lambda = 0.03$, as shown in Fig. 3(a). For a second-order transition we would expect a continuous vanishing of the system response, implying $\Delta\sigma_{max} \to 0$ for $L \to \infty$. However, the decrease in abruptness stops around $L \approx 128$. At the same time, the increase of $\Delta\sigma_{max}$ observed up to networks containing a few million bonds ($L = 1024$) cannot continue for even larger (computationally inaccessible) system sizes since $\Delta\sigma_{max} \leq \sigma_c$ must hold and we found that $\sigma_c$ decreases with increasing $L$. Indeed, when simulating networks with $p = 0.75$ and $\lambda = 0.10$, as shown in Fig. 3(b), we observe a slower increase of $\Delta\sigma_{max}$ when approaching the limiting value of $\sigma_c$. The expected third region where $\Delta\sigma_{max} \sim \sigma_c$, indicative of brittle fracture, becomes clear in panel (c) when simulating $p = 0.90$ and $\lambda = 0.30$. There must therefore exist a relation between the rigidity-controlled damage and the extent of the three size-dependent fracture regimes. When plotting the abruptness for simulations at fixed $p = 0.65$ and increasing $\lambda$ (going down in the associated $d_f$, panel (d)), it seems that each individual curve represents a different part of a universal response. In fact, we were able to manually rescale and collapse the data onto a master curve [35], schematically depicted in panel (e). At present, we are unable to provide an analytical expression for the scaling function. Nevertheless, the transitions between the three regimes must reflect the underlying stress (re)distribution processes. For small $L$, the mechanical response is dominated by breakage and reformation of force chains and $\Delta\sigma_{max}$ initially decreases when more force chains (larger $L$) are present. However, above a certain length-scale $L^*$ (either the maximum or the minimum of the curve) the force chains are ineffective in avoiding stress concentration and (quasi-)brittle fracture is observed. Both network structure and spring properties control these transitions. Indeed, when considering additional disorder in networks with $p = 0.75$ by drawing random thresholds from a uniform distribution with average $\lambda = 0.10$ (with two different variance, see Fig. 3(b)), we observe that the minimum in $\Delta\sigma_{max}$ shifts to larger sizes. In short, the more the (connectivity or threshold) disorder the larger the size at which brittleness kicks in. We find that the non-monotonic size-scaling of failure abruptness is universal, irrespectively of network
Finally, we conclude this Letter by showing an unexpected dependence on the tolerance \( F_{\text{RMS}} \) used in the energy minimization. \( F_{\text{RMS}} \) is the maximum force per node when the system is numerically considered in mechanical equilibrium [37-38], and it is chosen small enough to ensure that the zero-temperature condition is satisfied. In Fig. 5, we plot the size scaling of \( N_f \) for different \( F_{\text{RMS}} \) and we surprisingly observe that for the huge system sizes investigated here a great number of additional bonds are broken when a larger \( F_{\text{RMS}} \) is used. Correspondingly, a more ductile response is obtained due to the formation of multiple macro-cracks. Therefore, we remark that (i) to reach the athermal limit when a large \( d_f \) is expected, an increasingly smaller \( F_{\text{RMS}} \) might be needed to simulate increasingly larger networks; (ii) since using a larger \( F_{\text{RMS}} \) corresponds to push the system away from but close to its energy minimum, the tolerance \( F_{\text{RMS}} \) could be a proxy for temperature. According to this interpretation, thermal fluctuations would couple with large rigid-
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ity fluctuations around the isostatic point, giving raise to ductile behavior even for large system sizes. Further studies are needed to confirm the latter intriguing speculation.

In summary, our study shows that athermal networks unavoidably break in a (quasi-)brittle fashion when approaching the thermodynamic limit. These results are consistent with the idea of crack nucleation as limiting fracture behavior for disordered materials [8]. In contrast with the conclusions of Ref. [23], we show that also sub-isostatic networks must flow to the nucleation fixed point. However, we found that the fractal dimension of the damage zone $d_\ell$ can be very large close to the isostatic point [22,29], which can be interpreted as a critical point for fracture. Furthermore, differently from the finite-size criticality [8] that manifests itself as a smooth crossover in exponents associated to (avalanche or crack size) distributions, the size-induced brittleness studied here gives rise to a doubly-non-monotonic size-dependence of $\Delta\sigma_{\text{max}}$. The extreme point(s) of such a trend can be used to define the critical size $L^*$ at which the transition to brittle crack nucleation occurs, and is also coupled with the extent of damage $d_\ell$. We have shown that $L^*$ can be controlled by tuning individual elements or their assembly, with larger disorder increasing $L^*$. These considerations are relevant not only for metamaterials (for which $L$ is small but $\lambda$ or the network geometry can be easily tuned) but also for biological samples, since they are often far away from the thermodynamic limit. For example, biopolymer networks between two cells should have sizes well below $L^*$ to prevent catastrophic failure, and even reconstituted collagen networks inside a rheometer have shown size-dependent fracture behavior [40].
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[38] See Supplemental Material at [URL will be inserted by publisher] for details on simulation methods and additional results.
SIMULATION METHODS

We generate networks by diluting regular lattices consisting of \(L \times L\) nodes with spacing \(l_0\) and different topologies. A fraction \(p\) of all possible nearest-neighbor bonds is present. The associated average network connectivity is therefore \(\langle z \rangle = p z_{\text{max}}\), with \(z_{\text{max}}\) depending on network topology as indicated in the text. All bonds are harmonic springs with stiffness \(\mu\) and rest length \(l_0\) and break irreversibly when exceeding the threshold \(\lambda\) (same for all springs). By setting \(l_0 = 1\) and \(\mu = 1\), we can express all quantities in reduced units, and \(\lambda\) can be equivalently considered as deformation or force threshold. The energy of the system reads \(\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(ij)} (l_{ij} - l_0)^2\), where \(\langle ij \rangle\) indicates bonded pairs of nodes and \(l_{ij}\) the distance between them. We deform the networks uniaxially under athermal and quasistatic loading conditions, using the FIRE algorithm for the energy minimization [37]. The tolerance \(F_{\text{RMS}}\) is typically set at \(10^{-5}\) for \(L \leq 256\), but it is varied for larger sizes as discussed in the text. In our case, \(F_{\text{RMS}}\) is the maximum numerical tolerance for both the system root-mean-square force [37] and the maximum force on each single node. The networks are deformed uniaxially in the \(y\)-direction by employing a very small strain increment \(\Delta \epsilon = 0.001\), after which the energy minimization procedure is performed to obtain the equilibrium (off-lattice) node positions. Based on the mechanically equilibrated configuration, we identify the bonds that exceed \(\lambda\) (if any) and remove the weakest defined as the one that exceeds the threshold the most, i.e., the one with the largest \(l_{ij} - l_0\)/\(\lambda\). In most of the simulations, we additionally allow the strain increment to be reduced by up to two order of magnitude (\(\Delta \epsilon = 0.00001\)) if the most stressed bond is very close to \(\lambda\), to ensure that we are in the quasistatic condition and only one bond at the time can be broken. Typically, we use periodic boundary conditions in all directions. However, following Ref. [23], we also perform simulations in which the nodes on the top and bottom boundaries are free to move only in the \(x\)-direction and move affinely in the \(y\)-direction, without noticing any appreciable qualitative difference. Furthermore, as detailed below, we also perform simulations by employing different boundary conditions in the \(x\)-direction. We confirmed that the conclusions of our study are robust with respect to all the variations on the simulation protocol.

OBSERVABLES, DATA ANALYSIS AND ADDITIONAL RESULTS

We define the mechanical response of the network by considering the stress along the direction of the deformation. In particular, we use the \(yy\)-component of the virial stress tensor \(\sigma = \sigma_{yy} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{(ij)} f_{ij,y} r_{ij,y}\), where the sum runs over all the bonded pairs of nodes \((ij)\), \(f_{ij}\) is the force acting on node \(i\) due to \(j\), \(r_{ij}\) is the vector connecting the two nodes, \(d\) is the dimensionality of the network and \(V\) is its (instantaneous) volume. Using a different definition for the macroscopic stress (e.g. \(\sigma^{\text{vir}}_{xx} + \sigma^{\text{vir}}_{yy}\)) does not change the conclusions of the paper. A network is defined rigid if \(\sigma\) is greater than a small value (\(10^{-4}\)) and \(\epsilon_R\) is the first strain for which this condition is satisfied. \(\sigma_c\) is the maximum in the stress response and \(\epsilon_p\) the associated strain. The work of extension \(W_t\) is calculated as the integral of the stress-strain curve until fracture (network broken in half). \(\Delta \sigma_{\text{max}}\) is the maximum stress drop and it is calculated following a procedure highlighted in Ref. [36]. It consists of (i) calculating the derivative of the stress-strain curve; (ii) identifying the strain interval for which the derivative is greater than a certain threshold (here we use zero, but we checked that our results are robust using different thresholds); (iii) for each strain interval, calculate the stress drop as the difference in the stress associated to the extremal values of the interval; (iv) the maximum stress drop is \(\Delta \sigma_{\text{max}}\). In most of the cases, this procedure gives the same result as just considering the difference in stress between two consecutive strains. All quantities are averaged over many configurations to ensure proper statistical sampling of the disorder. Errors are calculated as standard deviation divided by the number of sampled configurations (standard error on the mean) and are shown when they are larger than the symbols displayed in the graphs. For example, for the size scaling analysis for networks close to the isostatic point (\(p = 0.65\) and \(p = 0.70\)) and for small \(\lambda\) we employ more than 2000 configurations for small system sizes (\(L \leq 32\)); 1000 for \(L = 50\); 500 for \(L = 64\); 200 for \(L = 128\), 256; 50 for \(L = 512\); and \(10\) configurations for larger system sizes (\(L = 640, 768, 1024\)) that are statistically sufficient due to the self-averaging nature of the fracture process in such large systems. In general, for all networks we average quantities over at least 200 configurations when \(L = 128\) and a larger number (typically 500) for \(L = 64\) or smaller sizes. Results for different network geometries are also averaged over approximately 200 configurations for 2D networks and over 20 to 100 configurations for 3D networks, depending on system size.

Some additional results at fixed system size \(L = 128\) and different \(p\) and \(\lambda\) are shown in Fig. S6. In particular, we note in Fig. S6(b) that the work of extension, i.e. the energy needed to break the material, shows a maximum around the isostatic point for small \(\lambda\) and this has been observed also in Ref. [23] and implies that networks close...
to the isostatic point can be counterintuitively considered tougher than networks with more bonds. However, as shown in the main text of this paper, we show that the maximum sustainable load $\sigma_c$ does not exhibit a maximum as a function of connectivity $p$. This discrepancy between the dependence on connectivity of two quantities describing resistance to fracture is an effect of the size-dependent brittleness demonstrated in this study: at small system size, the networks are ductile and significant energy is dissipated in bond-breaking events occurring after the peak stress.

To extract the damage fractal dimension $d_l$ and generate the plot of Fig. 3(b) of the main text, we simulate at least six different system sizes (typically seven up to $L = 256$) and we fit $N_t \sim N_{in}^{d_l/2}$ where $N_{in}$ is the number of initial springs. This is analogous to $N_t \sim L^{d_l}$ but sometimes better fits are obtained with the previous expression since the values on the x-axis span more orders of magnitude. Examples and additional results from the size scaling are shown in Fig. [S7]. Furthermore, inspired by previous works [3, 40, 44], we fitted the decay of $\sigma_c$ with three functional forms: (i) logarithmic decay $\propto 1/\ln(L)$; (ii) Duxbury-Leath-Bale (DLB) $\propto 1/\sqrt{\ln(L^2)}$; (iii) power-law decay $\propto 1/L^\beta$. We found that the power-law decay fits our data the best, with an exponent $\beta$ that clearly depends on $p$ and $\lambda$. For example, we obtain $\beta = 0.73$ for $p = 0.65$, $\lambda = 0.03$ (Fig. 3(d) of main text) and $\beta = 0.89$ for $p = 0.70$, $\lambda = 0.03$ (Fig. [S7]).

We find that the non-monotonic size-dependence of failure abruptness $\Delta \sigma_{max}$ is universal and robust with respect to the simulation procedure. In Fig. [SS](a), we compare the trend for the same set of configurations simulated when the small strain increment is kept fixed at $\Delta \epsilon = 0.1\%$ and when it can be adjusted to much smaller values (up to $\Delta \epsilon = 0.001\%$) if the most stressed bond is very close to $\lambda$. A minimum is observed in both cases for similar values of $L$. A slightly smaller $\Delta \sigma_{max}$ is observed for large $L$ when $\Delta \epsilon$ can be reduced by two orders of magnitude. Next, we check if the choice of boundary conditions in the $x$-direction, transverse to the deformation direction, has some qualitative effect on the failure abruptness. We tested three different boundary conditions: (i) periodic (mimicking an infinitely large system); (ii) free, i.e. without bonds crossing the $x$-direction (the system is finite in that direction); (iii) with periodic bonds and with adjustable size in the $x$-direction such that the area is kept constant during the uniaxial deformation. As shown in Fig. [SS](b), the qualitative trends are robust and independent of the fundamentally different boundary conditions employed (the first one seems the most computationally efficient). Furthermore, we confirm that the non-monotonic trend persists when changing network topology. As already highlighted in the main text, the minimum and the maximum do depend on network properties. This can be appreciated in Fig. [SS](c) where we report selected cases for various 2D and 3D networks. Finally, preliminary results confirm the non-monotonic trend also for shear deformation, supporting the conclusion that it is an intrinsic size-dependent feature of dilated networks. As shown in Fig. [SS](c) we also succeeded in manually collapsing the curves of $\Delta \sigma_{max}$ obtained for networks close to (just below and slightly above) the isostatic point and various $\lambda$ into a single master curve. The rescaling $L \rightarrow \alpha L$ and $\Delta \sigma_{max} \rightarrow \beta \Delta \sigma_{max}$ was performed by imposing that the different curves approximately share the same $x$-value for the minimum. We obtained values for $\alpha$ that are inversely proportional to $\lambda$, suggesting that the “critical” system size $L^* \sim 1/\alpha$ at which brittleness kicks in decreases by making the springs stronger. On the other hand, $\beta$ increases more than linearly with $\lambda$, consistently with the idea that due to inhomogeneous stress distribution, the increase of the springs strength has non-linear consequences on the overall network.

Finally, in Fig. [S10] we report the size scaling of the ductility interval for two different values of the tolerance $F_{RMS}$ and various networks. Brittle fracture is observed in the athermal limit, whereas a non-monotonic size-dependence of the ductility interval is observed for larger $F_{RMS}$. The system size at which ductility is increasing again (the minimum in $\Delta \sigma_{duct}$ as a function of $L$) does strongly depend on $\lambda$ and therefore seems to be coupled with the network rigidity. If a variation of the tolerance in the energy minimization protocol $F_{RMS}$ is interpreted as a variation of the thermal effects in the system (that would keep the system not exactly at the energy minimum), these results might suggest that by increasing temperature it is possible to observe a more ductile fracture occurring via many large cracks. Future research should further investigate the intriguing possibility that the minimum temperature at which such ductile behavior is first observed, and the material rigidity are strongly coupled. However, to precisely assess the role of temperature, more traditional simulation methods for thermal systems should be employed.
FIG. S6. (a) Strain $\epsilon_R$ at which the network is rigid upon uniaxial extension as a function of $p$ for triangular networks with $L = 128$. (b) Work of extension $W_f$, defined as the integral of the stress-strain curve, for different $p$ and $\lambda$. (c) Strain $\epsilon_p$ corresponding to the stress peak as a function of $p$ for various $\lambda$ (same legend as in (b)). (d) Maximum stress drop $\Delta\sigma_{max}$ versus $p$ for different $\lambda$. 
FIG. S7. (a) Number of broken bonds at failure $N_f$ as a function of number of initial intact springs $N_{in}$ for various combination of $p$ and $\lambda$. Dashed lines are best power-law fits from which the damage fractal dimension $d_f$ is extracted. (b) Size scaling of broken bonds for triangular network close from above to the isostatic point with small $\lambda$. Black circles indicate single-run values, red squares averages and dashed line best power-law fit. (c) Size scaling of strain at peak stress $\epsilon_p$ for networks in the proximity of the isostatic point with small $\lambda$. Symbols represent averages and lines are best fits. Data are well fitted by a power-law decay with an offset $\epsilon_p = \epsilon_p^{(\infty)} + A/L^\beta$, with $\epsilon_p^{(\infty)}$ the strain at peak in the thermodynamic limit. For $p = 0.65$, we obtain $\epsilon_p^{(\infty)} = 0.050$ and $\beta = 0.47$. For $p = 0.70$, we obtain $\epsilon_p^{(\infty)} = 0.016$ and $\beta = 0.24$. (d) Size scaling of the network strength $\sigma_c$ (log-log plot). Symbols correspond to averages, error bars show the standard deviations and lines are the best fits. Three functional forms were used: logarithmic decay (dotted black line), DLB decay (dashed red line), and power-law decay $\sigma_c = \sigma_c^{(\infty)} + A/L^\beta$ (green solid line). The latter fits the data the best, we obtain $\sigma_c^{(\infty)} = 0.0053$ and $\beta = 0.89$. 
FIG. S8. (a) Size scaling of maximum stress drop for two different simulation protocols. Black circles represent data from simulations where the strain step can be adjusted (reduced) to smaller steps when there are bonds very close to their thresholds (see section on simulation methods); whereas blue squares are data from simulations where the strain step is kept fixed at a small value. (b) Size scaling of maximum stress drop for four networks with $p$ and $\lambda$ as indicated in the legend, and three different simulation protocols for which periodic boundary conditions in the $x$ direction (normal to the deformation direction) are present (solid lines) or not (dashed lines), or for which the $x$ direction is adjusted to keep the system area constant (dotted lines). (c) Size scaling of failure abruptness for diluted 2D honeycomb (HC), 2D square (SQ) and 3D FCC (inset) networks with averaged connectivity $\langle z \rangle$ and $\lambda$ as indicated.
FIG. S9. Rescaled maximum stress drop $\Delta \sigma_{\text{max}}$ as a function of rescaled system size $L$ for (a) $p = 0.65$ (see also Fig. 4(d) of main text) and (b) $p = 0.70$, color-coded according to $\lambda$. Symbols represent averages and error bars are standard deviations. (c) Both data sets combined (circles for $p = 0.65$, squares for $p = 0.70$). The values used for the rescaling parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are shown in the insets as a function of $\lambda$. $\beta$ grows (more than linearly) with increasing $\lambda$. $\alpha$ is related to the transition system size $L^*$ discussed in the main text and decreases by two order of magnitudes in the simulated range of $\lambda$. 
FIG. S10. Size scaling of the ductility interval $\Delta \varepsilon_{\text{duct}} = \varepsilon_{\Delta \sigma_{\text{max}}} - \varepsilon_p$, where $\varepsilon_{\Delta \sigma_{\text{max}}}$ is the strain at which the maximum stress drop is observed (see also Fig. 5 of the main text), for simulations with (a) $F_{\text{RMS}} = 10^{-5}$ and (b) $F_{\text{RMS}} = 10^{-6}$ for different $p$, $\lambda$ as indicated in the legend. For small $F_{\text{RMS}}$ (panel (b)), it is evident that fracture becomes more brittle upon increasing system size. For larger $F_{\text{RMS}}$ (panel (a)), that are nevertheless three orders of magnitude smaller than $\lambda$, a non-monotonic trend is observed and networks with large $L$ reacquire ductility. At a first glance, the minima in $\Delta \varepsilon_{\text{duct}}$ seem to roughly correspond with the minima in $\Delta \sigma_{\text{max}}$ (see Fig. 4(a) of main text), but further studies are needed to confirm this correspondence.