arXiv:2301.13744v2 [math-ph] 17 Feb 2023

ELASTIC SOLIDS WITH STRAIN-GRADIENT ELASTIC BOUNDARY SURFACES

C. RODRIGUEZ

Abstract. Recent works have shown that in contrast to classical linear elastic fracture mechanics, endowing crack fronts in a brittle solid with Steigmann-Ogden surface elasticity yields a model that predicts bounded strains at the crack tips for plane-strain problems. However, a logarithmic singularity is still present in general for anti-plane shear (mode-III fracture) even when Steigmann-Ogden surface elasticity is incorporated.

Motivated by obtaining a model of brittle fracture capable of predicting bounded strains for all modes of loading, we formulate an exact general theory of a bulk solid containing a boundary surface with strain-gradient surface elasticity. For planar reference surfaces parameterized by flat coordinates, the form of surface elasticity reduces to that introduced by Hilgers and Pipkin, and when the surface energy is independent of the surface gradient of the stretching, the theory reduces to that of Steigmann and Ogden. We give a full discussion of material symmetry using Murdoch and Cohen's extension of Noll's theory. We present a model quadratic surface energy that incorporates resistance to geodesic distortion, satisfies strong ellipticity, and requires the same material constants found in the Steigmann-Ogden theory.

Finally, we derive and apply the linearized theory to mode-III fracture in an infinite plate. We prove that there always exists a unique classical solution to the governing integro-differential equation, and in contrast to using Steigmann-Ogden surface elasticity, our model is consistent with the linearization assumption in predicting finite strains at the crack tips.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Surface stressed solid bodies.** The study of surface tension for solids was initiated by Gibbs in 1857, and it is now widely accepted that surface tension and more general surfaces stresses must be accounted for when modeling mechanical structures at small length scales. In particular, interfaces[1] between a bulk solid and its environment can form due to various mechanisms including coating or atomic rearrangement during fracture. A way to mathematically model such an interface is by endowing part of the three-dimensional body's two-dimensional boundary with it's own thermodynamic properties that are distinct from the bulk (such as energy).

Motivated by modeling the apparent compressive surface stresses in certain cleaved crystals, Gurtin and Murdoch [4, 5] developed a rigorous general theory of material surface stresses that accounts for the surface's resistance to stretching (but not flexure). Their celebrated theory has been used to model a wide arrange of phenomena over the past 45 years, especially recently due to advances in nanoscience and nanotechnology. In the special case of a hyperelastic, three-dimensional bulk

[1]By an interface, we mean a thin region separating either two distinct materials or two distinct phases of a material.

solid with reference configuration $\mathcal{B}$ and material surface $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \partial\mathcal{B}$, the field equations for the current configuration $\boldsymbol{\chi} : \mathcal{B} \to \boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{B})$ are the Euler-Lagrange equations associated to the total strain energy

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}[\boldsymbol{\chi}] = \int_{\mathcal{B}} W(\boldsymbol{C})\, dA + \int_{\mathcal{S}} U(\mathbf{C})\, dA,$$

where we omit the possible explicit dependence of the functions W and U on points in $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ (see Figure 1). Here $\boldsymbol{C}$ is the left Cauchy-Green stretch tensor and $\mathbf{C}$ is the left Cauchy-Green surface stretch tensor, the pullbacks by $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ of the metric tensors on $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{B})$ and $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$, respectively. In particular, the material surface stress tensor is derived from the surface energy density $U(\mathbf{C})$ in analogy with the bulk's Piola stress being derived from the bulk energy density $W(\boldsymbol{C})$.

However, Steigmann and Ogden showed in their seminal works [22, 23] that equilibrium states under compressive surface stresses obtained from the Gurtin-Murdoch theory do not satisfy an associated Legendre-Hadamard condition, and thus, these equilibrium states cannot be local energy minimizers.[2] Steigmann and Ogden [22, 23] rectified this inadequacy and incorporated the material surface's resistance to flexure by including curvature dependence in the surface energy:

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}[\boldsymbol{\chi}] = \int_{\mathcal{B}} W(\boldsymbol{C})\, dA + \int_{\mathcal{S}} U(\mathbf{C}, \boldsymbol{\kappa})\, dA,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is the pullback of the second fundamental form on $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$. Since $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ depends on the second derivatives of $\boldsymbol{\chi}$, the surface energy is of *strain-gradient* type. In recent years, the Steigmann-Ogden theory has attracted considerable interest from various perspectives including the study of contact problems [10–13, 31, 32, 37] and inclusion problems [2, 6, 14, 15, 27, 35]. The theory has also been used to model fracture in brittle materials [30,33,34], the main phenomenon motivating this work.

One of the most successful and practical theories for modeling fracture in brittle materials is classical linear elastic fracture mechanics. The governing linear partial differential equations are derived from finite elasticity under the assumption of *infinitesimal* strains (linearized elasticity), but the theory predicts *unbounded* singular strains at the crack tips, a striking inconsistency and physically impossible prediction. There have been a vast number of suggestions for supplementing

[2]The fact that a pure membrane, a special type of Gurtin-Murdoch material surface, in equilbrium and under compressive surface stresses cannot by locally energy minimizing is due to Pipkin [20].




FIGURE 1. The reference configuration of a bulk solid $\mathcal{B}$ with strain-gradient elastic surface $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \partial\mathcal{B}$.

classical linear elastic fracture mechanics to correct this defect in the theory (see, e.g., [1]).

A more recent approach aimed at eliminating these crack tip singularities is to modify the boundary conditions of classical linear elastic fracture mechanics by endowing the crack fronts with material surface stresses. Beginning with [19] and developed further by Sendova and Walton [21], one line of thought has been to prescribe the crack front's surface stresses as a curvature dependent surface tension. Although able to remove the singularities completely in a diverse range of settings (see [3, 26, 28, 29, 36]), it is unclear if the surface stresses from the Sendova-Walton theory can be derived from a surface energy density,[3] a reasonable definition of "elastic-like" behavior. Deriving the material stresses for the crack fronts from a Gurtin-Murdoch surface energy *does not* completely remove the crack tip singularities (see [9, 25]), but however, endowing the crack fronts with Steigmann-Ogden surface energy *does* completely remove the singularities for plane-strain problems [30, 33] and axisymmetric penny shaped cracks [34]. Unfortunately, for anti-plane shear (mode-III loading), Steigmann-Ogden surface energy reduces to Gurtin-Murdoch surface energy and crack tip singularities *persist*. The fact that the Steigmann-Ogden theory reduces to the Gurtin-Murdoch theory for mode-III loading is due to the fact that the linearized curvature vanishes for anti-plane shear, i.e., for displacement fields tangent to the material surface.

1.2. **Main results and outline.** Inspired by [3] and motivated by obtaining a model of brittle fracture capable of predicting bounded crack tip strains for *all modes* of loading, this work proposes an augmentation of the Steigmann-Ogden theory that is of strain-gradient type and includes the derivative of stretching in the surface energy:

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}[\boldsymbol{\chi}] = \int_{\mathcal{B}} W(\boldsymbol{C})\, dA + \int_{\mathcal{S}} U(\mathbf{C}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \nabla \mathbf{C})\, dA, \tag{1.1}$$

where ∇ is the Levi-Cevita connection on $\mathcal{S}$. For $\mathcal{S}$ contained in a plane and parameterized by flat coordinates, the surface energy is equivalent to that introduced by Hilgers and Pipkin [7].

In Section 2, the relevant kinematics of the boundary surface $\mathcal{S}$ convected by a deformation of the bulk solid $\mathcal{B}$ are first summarized. In particular, we introduce a third order tensor $\mathbf{L}$ that is obtained from certain transposes of $\nabla\mathbf{C}$ and has components in terms of the difference of Christoffel symbols on $\mathcal{S}$ and $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$. This tensor is used in a model surface energy proposed in Section 3. Physically, the tensor $\mathbf{L}$ furnishes the rate of stretching of convected geodesics and locally characterizes *geodesic distortion*, i.e., how convected geodesics fail to be geodesics on $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$ (see Proposition 2.1). The general form of (1.1) that we consider is then introduced (see (2.4)), and inspired by Murdoch and Cohen's extension to surfaces of Noll's classical theory of material symmetry, we introduce material symmetry for the surface energy density U (see 2.2). In the final subsection of Section 2, we derive the field equations (2.13) governing equilibrium states of the solid $\mathcal{B}$ with strain-gradient elastic surface $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \partial\mathcal{B}$ from a Lagrangian energy functional (2.10) including the boundary relations between the boundary tractions and the surface stresses.

[3]Equivalently, it is unclear if the governing field equations from the Sendova-Walton model can be derived from a Lagrangian energy functional.

In Section 3, we present a model hemitropic, quadratic surface energy that requires the same number of material constants (with the same physical interpretations) as found in the Steigmann-Ogden theory (see (3.1)). In contradistinction, however, the surface energy we propose satisfies the strong ellipticity condition (see (3.6), (3.7)). We then derive the linearized field equations governing infinitesimal displacements of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{S}$, including the boundary relations connecting the linearized boundary tractions and the linearized surface stresses.

Finally, in Section 4, we apply the linearized theory (3.11) to the problem of a brittle infinite solid with a straight, non-interfacial crack of finite length, under mode-III loading. Using the explicit Dirichlet-to-Neumann map, the problem is reduced to solving a fourth order integro-differential equation for the crack profile along the boundary crack front (see (4.5)). Analytically, it is the surface energy satisfying the strong ellipticity condition that implies that this integro-differential equation is fourth order in the surface derivative of the displacement.[4] The dimensionless form of the equation implies that the behavior of the displacement depends on the size of the crack, and for macro cracks, we expect the displacement to be well-approximated by the solution given by classical linear elastic fracture mechanics except in small regions near the crack tips (boundary layers). Finally, using the Lax-Milgram theorem and regularity afforded by the presence of the fourth order derivative, we prove that there always exist a unique classical solution to the governing integro-differential equation, and in contrast to using the Steigmann-Ogden theory, our model predicts bounded strains up to the crack tips (see Theorem 4.4).

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Jay R. Walton for several fruitful discussions related to fracture, surface elasticity and interfacial physics. He would also like to thank Jeremy Marzuola for his help generating numerical solutions to the mode-III fracture problem discussed in Section 4.

2. Kinematics and field equations

In this section formulate a general mathematical model for a hyperelastic bulk solid containing a boundary surface with strain-gradient surface elasticity. For planar reference surfaces, the form of surface elasticity reduces to that introduced by Hilgers and Pipkin [7], and when the surface energy is independent of the surface gradient of the stretching, the theory reduces to that of Steigmann and Ogden [22, 23].

2.1. **Kinematics.** Let $\mathbb{E}^3$ be three-dimensional Euclidean space with Cartesian coordinates $(X^1, X^2, X^3) = \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{E}^3$ and coordinate vector fields given by a fixed orthonormal basis $\{\boldsymbol{e}_i\}_{i=1}^3$ of $\mathbb{R}^3$. We define the following operations for elementary

[4]Physically, it is the model incorporating resistance to geodesic distortion that implies that this integro-differential equation is fourth order in the surface derivative of the displacement.

tensor products of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$,

$$(\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2)\boldsymbol{b}=(\boldsymbol{a}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{b})\boldsymbol{a}_1,\quad (\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3)\boldsymbol{b}=(\boldsymbol{a}_3\cdot\boldsymbol{b})\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2,$$
$$(\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3)(\boldsymbol{b}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{b}_2)=(\boldsymbol{a}_3\cdot\boldsymbol{b}_1)\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{b}_2,$$
$$(\boldsymbol{b}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{b}_2)(\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3)=(\boldsymbol{b}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{a}_1)\boldsymbol{b}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3,$$
$$(\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3)[\boldsymbol{b}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{b}_2]=(\boldsymbol{a}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{b}_1)(\boldsymbol{a}_3\cdot\boldsymbol{b}_2)\boldsymbol{a}_1,$$
$$(\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2)[\boldsymbol{b}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{b}_2]=(\boldsymbol{a}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{b}_1)(\boldsymbol{a}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{b}_2),$$
$$(\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3)[\boldsymbol{b}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{b}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{b}_3]=(\boldsymbol{a}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{b}_1)(\boldsymbol{a}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{b}_2)(\boldsymbol{a}_3\cdot\boldsymbol{b}_3),$$
$$(\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2)^T=\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_1,\quad (\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3)^T=\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2,$$
$$(\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3)^{\sim}=\boldsymbol{a}_2\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_1\otimes\boldsymbol{a}_3.$$

These operations are extended to general second and third order tensors on $\mathbb{R}^3$ by linearity.

Let $\mathcal{B}\subseteq\mathbb{E}^3$ be a domain with smooth boundary $\partial\mathcal{B}$, the reference configuration of a three-dimensional body, and let $\mathcal{S}\subseteq\partial\mathcal{B}$ be a closed surface with smooth boundary. Let $\boldsymbol{\chi}:\mathcal{B}\to\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{B})\subseteq\mathbb{E}^3$ be a smooth, invertible deformation of $\mathcal{B}$. We denote the current position of the reference particle $\boldsymbol{X}\in\mathcal{B}$ by

$$\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{X})=(\chi^1(\boldsymbol{X}),\chi^2(\boldsymbol{X}),\chi^3(\boldsymbol{X})).$$

The deformation gradient $\boldsymbol{F}:\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}^3$ is the second order tensor field

$$\boldsymbol{F}=\frac{\partial\chi^i}{\partial X^a}(\boldsymbol{X})\boldsymbol{e}_i\otimes\boldsymbol{e}^a$$

where $\boldsymbol{e}^a:=\boldsymbol{e}_a$, $a=1,2,3$. We denote the left Cauchy-Green stretch tensor by $\boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{F}^T\boldsymbol{F}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{Y}=\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}(\theta^1,\theta^2)$ be a local parameterization of the reference surface $\mathcal{S}\subseteq\partial\mathcal{B}$. Then

$$\boldsymbol{y}=\hat{\boldsymbol{y}}(\theta^1,\theta^2)=\boldsymbol{\chi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}(\theta^1,\theta^2))$$

is a local parameterization of the current surface $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})\subseteq\boldsymbol{\chi}(\partial\mathcal{B})$. The (local) tangent vector fields on the reference and current surfaces are then given by

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\in T_{\boldsymbol{Y}}\mathcal{S},\quad \boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}=\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\in T_{\boldsymbol{y}}\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S}),$$

where $\cdot_{,\alpha}:=\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta^\alpha}$. The dual tangent vector fields on the reference and current surfaces are denoted by $\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}^{,\beta}$ respectively and satisfy

$$\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}=\delta^\beta{}_\alpha,\quad \boldsymbol{y}^{,\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}=\delta^\beta{}_\alpha.$$

We remark that we may also write

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}=\mathsf{F}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}$$

where $\mathsf{F}=F^k{}_\beta\,\boldsymbol{e}_k\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}:=y^k_{,\beta}\boldsymbol{e}_k\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}=\boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}$ is the *surface deformation gradient*. The first fundamental forms for the reference and current surfaces are then given by

$$\mathsf{G}=\mathsf{G}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta},\quad \mathsf{G}_{\alpha\beta}=\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta},$$
$$\mathsf{g}=\mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{y}^{,\alpha}\otimes\boldsymbol{y}^{,\beta},\quad \mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta}=\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta},$$

and we note that

$$\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha}=(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta},\quad \boldsymbol{y}^{,\alpha}=(\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta}$$

The Christoffel symbols of the second kind for the reference and current surfaces are denoted by

$$\Gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\beta\delta} = \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta\delta}, \quad \gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\beta\delta} = \boldsymbol{y}^{,\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta\delta}.$$

The *left Cauchy-Green surface stretch tensor* on $\mathcal{S}$ is the second order tensor

$$\mathbf{C} := \mathbf{F}^T\mathbf{F} = \mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta},$$

and the *s*urface Green-St. Venant tensor is the second order tensor $\mathbf{E} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{G})$. We assume that the reference and current surfaces are orientable with unit normals to the reference and current surfaces (locally) given by

$$\boldsymbol{N} = |\boldsymbol{Y}_{,1} \times \boldsymbol{Y}_{,2}|^{-1}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,1} \times \boldsymbol{Y}_{,2}, \quad \boldsymbol{n} = |\boldsymbol{y}_{,1} \times \boldsymbol{y}_{,2}|^{-1}\boldsymbol{y}_{,1} \times \boldsymbol{y}_{,2}$$

respectively. The second fundamental forms on the reference and current surfaces are given by

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathsf{B}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}, \quad \mathsf{B}_{\alpha\beta} := \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha\beta} \cdot \boldsymbol{N},$$
$$\mathbf{b} = \mathsf{b}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{y}^{,\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{y}^{,\beta}, \quad \mathsf{b}_{\alpha\beta} := \boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\beta} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}.$$

The *relative curvature tensor* on $\mathcal{S}$ is the second order tensor $\mathbf{K} = \mathsf{K}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}$ given by

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{F}^T\mathbf{b}\mathbf{F} - \mathbf{B} = [\mathsf{b}_{\alpha\beta} - \mathsf{B}_{\alpha\beta}]\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}.$$

As discussed by Steigmann and Ogden [23], $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{K}$ furnish local differences in length and scaled extrinsic normal curvature between a given curve on $\mathcal{S}$ and the convected curve on $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$, where $\dot{} := \frac{d}{ds}$. Indeed, if $\boldsymbol{Z}(s)$ is a a curve on $\mathcal{S}$ with unit tangent vector field $\mathbf{T}$ and $\boldsymbol{z}(s) = \boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{Z}(s))$ is the convected curve, then the tangent to the convected curve is given by $\mathbf{t} = \dot{\boldsymbol{z}} = \boldsymbol{F}\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{T}$. The *stretch* ν of the convected curve is

$$\nu = |\mathbf{t}|^2 - 1 = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{F}\mathbf{T} - 1 = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{T} - 1 = 2\mathbf{E}\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{T}.$$

The extrinsic normal curvature of the convected curve is

$$\kappa = \mathbf{b}\mathbf{t} \cdot \mathbf{t} = |\mathbf{t}|^{-2}\mathbf{b}\mathbf{F}\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{F}\mathbf{T} = (\nu + 1)^{-1}(\mathbf{F}^T\mathbf{b}\mathbf{F})\mathbf{T},$$

and thus, the difference in scaled extrinsic normal curvature of the convected curve and the original curve is given by

$$|\mathbf{t}|^2\kappa - |\mathbf{T}|^2\mathbf{B}\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{T}.$$

The Levi-Cevita connection on $\mathcal{S}$ is denoted by ∇, so

$$\nabla\mathbf{E} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla\mathbf{C} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla_\delta \mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta} \otimes \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\delta},$$

where

$$\nabla_\delta \mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta} := \mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta,\delta} - \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\alpha\delta}\mathsf{g}_{\mu\beta} - \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\beta\delta}\mathsf{g}_{\mu\alpha}.$$

For later use, we define the following third order tensor on $\mathcal{S}$,

$$\mathbf{L} = \nabla\mathbf{E} + (\nabla\mathbf{E})^T - (\nabla\mathbf{E}^{\sim})^T,$$

with components

$$\mathsf{L}_{\alpha\beta\delta} = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_\delta \mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta} + \nabla_\beta \mathsf{g}_{\alpha\delta} - \nabla_\alpha \mathsf{g}_{\beta\delta}) = (\gamma^{\mu}{}_{\beta\delta} - \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\beta\delta})\mathsf{g}_{\mu\alpha}.$$

Physically, the tensor $\mathbf{L}$ (and thus $\nabla\mathbf{E}$) furnishes the rate of stretching of convected geodesics, and more generally, it quantifies *geodesic distortion*, i.e. how convected geodesics fail to be geodesics on $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$. More precisely, we have the following.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{Z}(s) : I \to \mathcal{S}$ be a geodesic on $\mathcal{S}$ with unit tangent vector field $\mathbf{T} = \dot{\boldsymbol{Z}}$. Then $\mathbf{L}$ yields the rate of stretching of the convected curve $\boldsymbol{z}(s) = \boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{Z}(s))$,*

$$2\mathbf{L}[\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}] = \frac{d}{ds}|\dot{\boldsymbol{z}}|^2. \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover, the convected curve $\boldsymbol{z}(s)$ is a geodesic on $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$ if and only if for each $s_0 \in I$,

$$\forall \mathbf{U} \in T_{\boldsymbol{Z}(s_0)}\mathcal{S}, \quad \mathbf{L}[\mathbf{U}\otimes\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}]\big|_{s=s_0} = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. To prove (2.1), we simply note that since $\boldsymbol{Z}$ is a geodesic, $\nabla_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{0}$ so

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{ds}|\dot{\boldsymbol{z}}|^2 &= \frac{d}{ds}[\mathbf{C}\mathbf{T}\cdot\mathbf{T}]\\ &= \nabla\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}] + 2\mathbf{C}\nabla_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{T}\cdot\mathbf{T}\\ &= \nabla\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}] = 2\mathbf{L}[\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}].\end{aligned}$$

We now prove (2.2). The convected curve $\boldsymbol{z}$ on $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$ has tangent vector field $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{T} = \mathsf{t}^\mu \boldsymbol{y}_{,\mu}$ and acceleration vector field

$$\mathbf{a} = \big(\dot{\mathsf{t}}^\mu + \gamma^\mu{}_{\beta\delta}\mathsf{t}^\beta\mathsf{t}^\delta\big)\boldsymbol{y}_{,\mu}.$$

The acceleration is zero and $\boldsymbol{z}$ is a geodesic if and only if for each $s_0 \in I$,

$$\forall \mathbf{u} \in T_{\boldsymbol{z}(s_0)}\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S}), \quad \mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{a}|_{s=s_0} = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

We now show that (2.3) is equivalent to (2.2). We assume without loss of generality that $s_0 = 0$, and we choose normal coordinates (θ^1, θ^2) centered at $\boldsymbol{Z}(0)$. Then for all $\alpha, \beta, \delta = 1, 2$,

$$\mathsf{G}_{\alpha\beta}|_{s=0} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \Gamma^\mu{}_{\beta\delta}|_{s=0} = 0,$$

and there exist $\mathsf{T}^1, \mathsf{T}^2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\delta_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{T}^\alpha\mathsf{T}^\beta = 1$ such that $\boldsymbol{Z}(s) = \hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}(s\mathsf{T}^1, s\mathsf{T}^2)$. In particular, we conclude that

$$\mathbf{a} = \gamma^\mu{}_{\beta\delta}\mathsf{T}^\beta\mathsf{T}^\delta\boldsymbol{y}_{,\mu}.$$

Since $\mathbf{F}|_{\boldsymbol{Z}(0)} : T_{\boldsymbol{Z}(0)}\mathcal{S} \to T_{\boldsymbol{z}(0)}\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$ is an isomorphism, (2.3) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}&\forall \mathbf{U} = \mathsf{U}^\mu \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\mu}|_{\boldsymbol{Z}(0)} \in T_{\boldsymbol{Z}(0)}\mathcal{S}, \quad \mathbf{F}\mathbf{U}\cdot\mathbf{a}\big|_{s=0} = 0\\ \iff\ &\forall \mathbf{U} = \mathsf{U}^\mu \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\mu}|_{\boldsymbol{Z}(0)} \in T_{\boldsymbol{Z}(0)}\mathcal{S}, \quad \mathsf{g}_{\mu\alpha}\mathsf{U}^\alpha\gamma^\mu{}_{\beta\delta}\mathsf{T}^\beta\mathsf{T}^\delta\big|_{s=0} = 0\\ \iff\ &\forall \mathbf{U} = \mathsf{U}^\mu \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\mu}|_{\boldsymbol{Z}(0)} \in T_{\boldsymbol{Z}(0)}\mathcal{S}, \quad \mathbf{L}[\mathbf{U}\otimes\mathbf{T}\otimes\mathbf{T}]\big|_{s=0} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

□

As an illustrative example, consider

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(X^1, X^2, 0) \mid X^1 \in [a, b], X^2 \in [0, \pi]\} \subseteq \mathcal{B} = [a, b]\times[0, \pi]\times[0, \infty),$$

and the deformation

$$\boldsymbol{\chi}(X^1, X^2, X^3) = (e^{X^1}\cos X^2, e^{X^1}\sin X^2, X^3).$$

Then

$$\mathsf{E} = \frac{1}{2}(e^{2X^1} - 1)\big(\boldsymbol{e}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_1 + \boldsymbol{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_2\big), \quad \mathsf{K} = \mathbf{0},$$

$$\mathsf{L} = e^{2X^1}\big(\boldsymbol{e}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_1 + \boldsymbol{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_2 + \boldsymbol{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_1 - \boldsymbol{e}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_2\big).$$

The image of the coordinate curve $X^2 = d$ is a straight, radially outward traveling curve in the x^1x^2-plane parameterized by $X^1 \in [a, b]$ with

$$\mathsf{L}[\boldsymbol{e}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_1] = e^{2X^1}, \quad \mathsf{L}[\boldsymbol{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_1] = 0.$$

In particular, the stretch is not constant along the convected curve. The image of the coordinate curve $X^1 = c$ is the upper-half of the circle in the x^1x^2-plane centered at $(0, 0)$ of radius e^c. The convected curve is parameterized by $X^2 \in [0, \pi]$, has constant stretch but nonzero curvature relative to the convected surface (i.e., the x^1x^2-plane), and it satisfies

$$\mathsf{L}[\boldsymbol{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_2] = 0, \quad \mathsf{L}[\boldsymbol{e}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_2] = -e^{2c}.$$

2.2. **Strain energy and material symmetry.** In our mathematical model, a hyperelastic elastic body $\mathcal{B}$ with strain-gradient elastic surface $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \partial\mathcal{B}$ is prescribed a strain energy of the form

$$\Phi[\boldsymbol{\chi}] = \int_{\mathcal{B}} W(\boldsymbol{C})\, dV + \int_{\mathcal{S}} U(\mathsf{E}, \mathsf{K}, \nabla\mathsf{E})\, dA, \tag{2.4}$$

where we omit listing the possible dependence of W on $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{B}$ and of U on $\boldsymbol{Y} \in \mathcal{S}$. We note that the strain energy is frame indifferent, i.e., it is invariant with respect to super-imposed rigid motions.[5]

Although our main motivation for considering a strain-gradient elastic surface is when it forms part of the boundary of a bulk solid $\mathcal{B}$, we will treat material symmetry of $\mathcal{S}$ independently of that of $\mathcal{B}$. The notion of material symmetry for the energy density W of the bulk three-dimensional solid $\mathcal{B}$ is well-known, see [18, 24], so, we will limit our discussion to that of $\mathcal{S}$.

Consider a material point with reference position $\boldsymbol{Y}_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. Our discussion of material symmetry for the surface energy per unit reference area U at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$ is inspired by the framework introduced by Murdoch and Cohen [16,17] which was later advocated for and summarized by Steigmann and Ogden [23] using local coordinate parameterizations. We will follow Steigmann and Ogden's style of exposition, and unless specified otherwise, all quantities in what follows are evaluated at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} : \mathbb{E}^3 \to \mathbb{E}^3$ be a rigid motion with deformation gradient $\boldsymbol{R} \in SO(3)$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{Y}_0) = \boldsymbol{Y}_0$, and $\boldsymbol{RN} = \boldsymbol{N}$. We define a second reference surface $\mathcal{S}^* = \big\{\boldsymbol{Y}^* = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{Y}) \mid \boldsymbol{Y} \in \mathcal{S}\big\}$. It follows that $T_{\boldsymbol{Y}_0}\mathcal{S}^* = T_{\boldsymbol{Y}_0}\mathcal{S}$, at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0 \in \mathcal{S}^*$ the unit normal $\boldsymbol{N}^*$ to $\mathcal{S}^*$ satisfies $\boldsymbol{N}^* = \boldsymbol{N} = \boldsymbol{RN}$, and

$$\mathsf{R} := \boldsymbol{R}|_{\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{Y}_0}\mathcal{S}} : T_{\boldsymbol{Y}_0}\mathcal{S} \to T_{\boldsymbol{Y}_0}\mathcal{S}$$

is a rotation. A local parameterization on $\mathcal{S}^*$ is given by $\boldsymbol{Y}^* = \hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}^*(\theta^1, \theta^2) := \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{-1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}(\theta^1, \theta^2))$, so then

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha} = \boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^*_{,\alpha}, \quad \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha} = \boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^{*,\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2,$$

and at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$, $\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha} = \mathsf{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^*_{,\alpha}$, $\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha} = \mathsf{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^{*,\alpha}$, for $\alpha = 1, 2$.

[5] In the case of $\mathcal{S}$ contained in the plane, Hilgers and Pipkin showed in Section 7 of [7] that $U(\mathsf{E}, \mathsf{K}, \nabla\mathsf{E})$ is the most general form of a surface energy density that is frame indifferent.

Let $\boldsymbol{\chi} : \mathbb{E}^3 \to \mathbb{E}^3$ be a smooth invertible deformation of Euclidean space. Since a superimposed rigid motion does not affect the value of the surface energy, we will assume without loss of generality that

$$\boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{Y}_0) = \boldsymbol{Y}_0 \text{ and at } \boldsymbol{Y}_0,\ \mathsf{F} : T_{\boldsymbol{Y}_0}\mathcal{S} \to T_{\boldsymbol{Y}_0}\mathcal{S}.$$

Following [17] we will impose the stronger requirement that

$$\boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{Y}_0) = \boldsymbol{Y}_0 \text{ and at } \boldsymbol{Y}_0,\ \boldsymbol{F} = \mathsf{F}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta} + \boldsymbol{N} \otimes \boldsymbol{N}. \tag{2.5}$$

In particular, it follows that at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$, $\mathsf{F} = \mathsf{F}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{n} = \boldsymbol{N} = \boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{N}$. The deformation $\boldsymbol{\chi}^*(\cdot) := \boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\cdot))$ when restricted to $\mathcal{S}^*$ has the same image as $\boldsymbol{\chi}|_{\mathcal{S}}$, and in particular, the convected tangent vector fields are the same,

$$\boldsymbol{y}^*_{,\alpha} := \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta^\alpha}\boldsymbol{\chi}^*(\boldsymbol{Y}^*) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta^\alpha}\boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{Y}) = \boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}.$$

Then the surface deformation gradients of $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\chi}^*$ at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$ are related by

$$\mathsf{F} = \boldsymbol{y}_\alpha \otimes \boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha} = \boldsymbol{y}^*_\alpha \otimes \mathsf{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^{*,\alpha} = \mathsf{F}^*\mathsf{R}^T \implies \mathsf{C} = \mathsf{R}\mathsf{C}^*\mathsf{R}^T.$$

The components of the first and second fundamental forms associated to $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}^*$ satisfy

$$\mathsf{G}_{\alpha\beta} = \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta} = \boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^*_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^*_{\beta} = \boldsymbol{Y}^*_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}^*_{\beta} = \mathsf{G}^*_{\alpha\beta} \implies \mathsf{G} = \mathsf{R}\mathsf{G}^*\mathsf{R}^T,$$
$$\mathsf{B}_{\alpha\beta} = \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{N} = \boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^*_{,\alpha\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{N}^* = \boldsymbol{Y}^*_{,\alpha\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{N}^* = \mathsf{B}^*_{\alpha\beta} \implies \mathsf{B} = \mathsf{R}\mathsf{B}^*\mathsf{R}^T,$$

and thus, $\mathsf{E} = \mathsf{R}\mathsf{E}^*\mathsf{R}^T$. Since $\mathsf{b} = \mathsf{b}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{y}^{,\alpha} \otimes \boldsymbol{y}^\beta$ is the same for both deformations, we conclude that the relative curvature tensors K and K^* associated to $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\chi}^*$ satisfy at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$,

$$\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{R}\mathsf{K}^*\mathsf{R}^T.$$

Finally, since the components of the first fundamental forms associated to $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\boldsymbol{\chi}^*(\mathcal{S}^*)$ satisfy

$$\mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta} = \boldsymbol{y}_\alpha\cdot\boldsymbol{y}_\beta = \boldsymbol{y}^*_\alpha\cdot\boldsymbol{y}^*_\beta =: \mathsf{g}^*_{\alpha\beta},$$

we conclude that $\nabla\mathsf{E}$ and $\nabla^*\mathsf{E}^*$ at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla\mathsf{E} &= \frac{1}{2}\nabla_\delta\mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\delta}\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\nabla^*_\delta\mathsf{g}^*_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^{*,\alpha}\otimes\mathsf{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^{*,\beta}\otimes\mathsf{R}\boldsymbol{Y}^{*,\delta}\\ &= \mathsf{R}[(\nabla^*\mathsf{E}^*)^T\mathsf{R}^T]^T\mathsf{R}^T.\end{aligned}$$

We denote the surface energy per unit reference area relative to $\mathcal{S}^*$ by U^*. For the surface energy per unit mass to be independent of the reference surface used, we must have

$$\begin{aligned}U^*(\mathsf{E}^*,\mathsf{K}^*,\nabla^*\mathsf{E}^*) &= U(\mathsf{E},\mathsf{H},\nabla\mathsf{E})\\ &= U\Big(\mathsf{R}\mathsf{E}^*\mathsf{R}^T,\mathsf{R}\mathsf{K}^*\mathsf{R}^T,\mathsf{R}\big[(\nabla^*\mathsf{E}^*)^T\mathsf{R}^T\big]^T\mathsf{R}^T\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

We now view $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ also as a deformation of $\mathcal{S}^*$, but we denote its values by $\bar{\boldsymbol{\chi}}$,

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\chi}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{X}), \quad \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{E}^3,$$

and the associated kinematic variables relative to $\mathcal{S}^*$ are denoted with an over-bar. We will now derive relationships between $\bar{\mathsf{E}}$, $\bar{\mathsf{K}}$, $\nabla^*\bar{\mathsf{E}}$ and E, K, $\nabla\mathsf{E}$.

We first note that since $\boldsymbol{C} = \bar{\boldsymbol{C}}$, we immediately conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{E} &= \frac{1}{2}[(\boldsymbol{C}-\boldsymbol{I})\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta}]\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}\\ &= \frac{1}{2}[(\bar{\boldsymbol{C}}-\boldsymbol{I})\boldsymbol{Y}^{*}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}^{*}_{,\beta}]\boldsymbol{Y}^{*,\alpha}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{*,\beta} = \bar{\mathsf{E}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Let

$$\operatorname{Grad}\boldsymbol{C} = \frac{\partial C_{ij}}{\partial X^a}\boldsymbol{e}^i\otimes\boldsymbol{e}^j\otimes\boldsymbol{e}^a,$$

a third order tensor on $\mathbb{R}^3$. The identity $\mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta} = \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta}$, the Gauss equations $\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha\delta} = \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\alpha\delta}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\mu} + \mathsf{B}_{\alpha\delta}\boldsymbol{N}$ on $\mathcal{S}$, and the symmetry of $\boldsymbol{C}$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta,\delta} &= \operatorname{Grad}\boldsymbol{C}[\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\delta}] + \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha\delta}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta} + \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta\delta}\\ &= \operatorname{Grad}\boldsymbol{C}[\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\delta}] + \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\alpha\delta}\mathsf{g}_{\mu\beta} + \mathsf{B}_{\alpha\delta}\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{N}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta}\\ &\quad + \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\beta\delta}\mathsf{g}_{\mu\alpha} + \mathsf{B}_{\beta\delta}\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{N}\cdot\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

By (2.5), we have $\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{N} = \boldsymbol{N}$, and thus, at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$,

$$\nabla\mathsf{E} = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Grad}\boldsymbol{C}[\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\delta}]\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\alpha}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\beta}\otimes\boldsymbol{Y}^{,\delta}.$$

In particular, since $\bar{\boldsymbol{C}} = \boldsymbol{C}$ we conclude that

$$\nabla^{*}\bar{\mathsf{E}} = \nabla\mathsf{E}. \tag{2.8}$$

Finally, as shown in Section 6 of [23], we have

$$\bar{\mathsf{K}} = \mathsf{K}. \tag{2.9}$$

Inspired by Murdoch and Cohen's extension of Noll's theory of material symmetry, we say that $\boldsymbol{Y}_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ is symmetry related to $\boldsymbol{Y}_0 \in \mathcal{S}^*$ if the mechanical responses to the arbitrary deformation $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ are identical, i.e.,

$$U(\mathsf{E},\mathsf{K},\nabla\mathsf{E}) = U^{*}(\bar{\mathsf{E}},\bar{\mathsf{K}},\nabla^{*}\bar{\mathsf{E}}).$$

By (2.6), (2.7), (2.8), (2.9), this requirement leads to the following definition: the rotation R is in the *symmetry set* of $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$ relative to $\mathcal{S}$ if for every smooth, invertible deformation $\boldsymbol{\chi} : \mathbb{E}^3 \to \mathbb{E}^3$ satisfying (2.5), we have

$$U(\mathsf{E},\mathsf{K},\nabla\mathsf{E}) = U\Big(\mathsf{R}\mathsf{E}\mathsf{R}^T, \mathsf{R}\mathsf{K}\mathsf{R}^T, \mathsf{R}\big[\nabla\mathsf{E}^T\mathsf{R}^T\big]^T\mathsf{R}^T\Big).$$

As in the case of the standard theory of Noll [18], one can verify that the symmetry set of $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$ relative to $\mathcal{S}$ is a subgroup of the group of proper rotations of $T_{\boldsymbol{Y}_0}\mathcal{S}$. In the case that the symmetry set of $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$ relative to $\mathcal{S}$ equals the group of proper rotations of $T_{\boldsymbol{Y}_0}\mathcal{S}$, we say that the surface energy density U is *hemitropic* at $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$.

2.3. **Field equations.** The field equations for the body $\mathcal{B}$ with strain-gradient elastic surface $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \partial\mathcal{B}$ are defined to be the Euler-Lagrange equations for the Lagrangian energy functional

$$\mathcal{A}[\boldsymbol{\chi}] = \Phi[\boldsymbol{\chi}] + V[\boldsymbol{\chi}] \tag{2.10}$$

where $V[\boldsymbol{\chi}]$ is the potential energy associated to the applied forces. In this work, we assume that the Gâteaux derivative of the load potential takes the form

$$\dot{V} = -\int_{\mathcal{B}}\boldsymbol{f}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}\,dV - \int_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{t}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}\,dA,$$

where $\boldsymbol{f}$ is a prescribed external body force on $\mathcal{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{t}$ is a prescribed boundary traction on $\mathcal{S}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\cdot;\epsilon)$ be a one-parameter family of deformations of $\mathcal{B}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\cdot;\epsilon)|_{\partial\mathcal{B}\backslash\mathcal{S}} = \boldsymbol{\chi}_0(\cdot)$, and denote

$$\dot{\cdot} := \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\Big|_{\epsilon=0}, \quad \boldsymbol{u} := \dot{\boldsymbol{\chi}}(\cdot;\epsilon).$$

Then $\boldsymbol{u}|_{\partial\mathcal{B}}$ vanishes to first order on $\partial\mathcal{B}\backslash\mathcal{S}$. Using the chain rule and integration by parts we have the classical identity

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}} \dot{W}\, dV = \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} \boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{N}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}\, dA - \int_{\mathcal{B}} \operatorname{Div}\boldsymbol{P}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}\, dV \tag{2.11}$$

where $\boldsymbol{P} = P_i{}^a \boldsymbol{e}^i\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_a$ is the Piola stress with $P_i{}^a = \frac{\partial W}{\partial F^i_a}$ and $\operatorname{Div}\boldsymbol{P} = \big(\partial_{X^a} P_i{}^a\big)\boldsymbol{e}^i$. Using the chain rule we have that

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} \dot{U}\, dA = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \Big(\mathsf{T}^\alpha\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\alpha} + \mathsf{M}^{\alpha\beta}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\alpha\beta}\Big) dA, \tag{2.12}$$

$$\mathsf{T}^\alpha := \frac{\partial U}{\partial y^k_\alpha}\boldsymbol{e}^k, \quad \mathsf{M}^{\alpha\beta} := \frac{\partial U}{\partial y^k_{,\alpha\beta}}\boldsymbol{e}^k.$$

We define surface stress vectors P^α by

$$\mathsf{P}^\alpha := \mathsf{T}^\alpha - G^{-1/2}(G^{1/2}\mathsf{M}^{\alpha\beta})_{,\beta},$$

and use (2.11), (2.12) and integration by parts to obtain the Euler-Lagrange equations associated to the Lagrangian energy functional (2.10),

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Div}\boldsymbol{P} + \boldsymbol{f} = \boldsymbol{0}, \quad \text{on } \mathcal{B},\\ &\boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{N} = G^{-1/2}(G^{1/2}\mathsf{P}^\alpha)_{,\alpha} + \boldsymbol{t}, \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S},\\ &\boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \boldsymbol{\chi}_0(\boldsymbol{X}), \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{B}\backslash\mathcal{S}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

3. Small strain models

Our principle motivation for modeling an elastic solid with strain-gradient elastic boundary surface is the study of brittle fracture. In this setting (to be discussed more in the following section), the surface $\mathcal{S}$ possessing strain-gradient surface elasticity will be the crack front and strains will be linearized, motivating the introduction of a quadratic surface energy density. In this section, we present a model uniform, hemitropic, quadratic surface energy density that requires the same material constants (with the same physical interpretations) as found in the narrower Steigmann-Ogden theory. In contradistinction, the surface energy incorporates the surface's resistance to geodesic distortion and satisfies the strong ellipticity condition. Moreover, the surface energy density may be viewed as a geometric generalization of that introduced and advocated for by Hilgers and Pipkin in [7, 8].

3.1. Hilgers-Pipkin surface energy.

For the surface $\mathcal{S}$, we propose the uniform, quadratic, hemitropic surface energy density

$$\begin{aligned} U = {}& \frac{\lambda_s}{2}(\mathsf{E}^\alpha{}_\alpha)^2 + \mu_s \mathsf{E}_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{E}^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\zeta}{2}\Big[(\mathsf{K}^\alpha{}_\alpha)^2 + (\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}\mathsf{L}_{\mu\alpha}{}^\alpha \mathsf{L}_{\nu\beta}{}^\beta\Big]\\ &+ \eta\Big[\mathsf{K}_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{K}^{\alpha\beta} + (\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}\mathsf{L}_{\mu\alpha\beta}\mathsf{L}_\nu{}^{\alpha\beta}\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Here λ_s, μ_s, ζ and η are positive numbers that can be interpreted as the surface Lamé constants and pure bending moduli. Indices are raised and lowered using the

reference metric $\mathbf{G}$, but note that $\boldsymbol{y}^{,\alpha}$ are the dual vector fields to $\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}$ and are not given by $\boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}$. In the case that $\mathcal{S}$ is contained in a plane with flat coordinates (θ^1,θ^2), we have

$$\mathsf{E}_{\alpha\beta}=\frac{1}{2}(\mathsf{g}_{\alpha\beta}-\delta_{\alpha\beta}),\quad \mathsf{L}_{\mu\alpha\beta}=\boldsymbol{y}_{,\mu}\cdot\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\beta},$$

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\beta}=\mathsf{L}_{\mu\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{y}^{,\mu}+\mathsf{K}_{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{n},\quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\alpha}=\mathsf{L}_{\mu\alpha}{}^{\alpha}\boldsymbol{y}^{,\mu}+\mathsf{K}^{\alpha}{}_{\alpha}\boldsymbol{n},$$

$$\Big|\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\alpha}\Big|^2=(\mathsf{K}^{\alpha}{}_{\alpha})^2+(\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}\mathsf{L}_{\mu\alpha}{}^{\alpha}\mathsf{L}_{\nu\beta}{}^{\beta},$$

$$\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{2}|\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\beta}|^2=\mathsf{K}_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{K}^{\alpha\beta}+(\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}\mathsf{L}_{\mu\alpha\beta}\mathsf{L}_{\nu}{}^{\alpha\beta},$$

and (3.1) becomes

$$U=\frac{\lambda_s}{2}(\mathsf{E}^{\alpha}{}_{\alpha})^2+\mu_s\mathsf{E}_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{E}^{\alpha\beta}+\frac{\zeta}{2}\Big|\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\alpha}\Big|^2+\eta\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{2}|\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\beta}|^2. \tag{3.2}$$

Up to a choice of constants, the surface energy density (3.2) is precisely that introduced by Hilgers and Pipkin in [7], and therefore, we refer to (3.1) as a *quadratic Hilgers-Pipkin surface energy*. In [7,8], Hilgers and Pipkin advocated for the use of (3.2) over the classical surface energy

$$\begin{aligned}U&=\frac{\lambda_s}{2}(\mathsf{E}^{\alpha}{}_{\alpha})^2+\mu_s\mathsf{E}_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{E}^{\alpha\beta}+\frac{\zeta}{2}\mathsf{K}^{\alpha}{}_{\alpha}+\eta\mathsf{K}_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{K}^{\alpha\beta}\\&=\frac{\lambda_s}{2}(\mathsf{E}^{\alpha}{}_{\alpha})^2+\mu_s\mathsf{E}_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{E}^{\alpha\beta}+\frac{\zeta}{2}\Big|\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}(\boldsymbol{n}\cdot\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\alpha})\Big|^2+\eta\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{2}(\boldsymbol{n}\cdot\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\beta})^2\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

on the basis of (3.2) being analytically simpler than (3.3). Indeed, with little effort one sees that for (3.2),

$$\mathbf{T}^{\alpha}=(\lambda_s\mathsf{E}^{\gamma}{}_{\gamma}\delta^{\alpha\beta}+2\mu_s\mathsf{E}^{\alpha\beta})\boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mathbf{M}^{\alpha\beta}=\zeta\Big(\sum_{\gamma}\boldsymbol{y}_{,\gamma\gamma}\Big)\delta^{\alpha\beta}+2\eta\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\beta}. \tag{3.5}$$

Moreover, it is simple to see that (3.2) satisfies the strong ellipticity condition,

$$\forall(\mathsf{a}_1,\mathsf{a}_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2\backslash\{(0,0)\},\boldsymbol{b}\in\mathbb{R}^3\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\},\quad \mathsf{a}_\alpha\mathsf{a}_\beta\boldsymbol{b}\cdot\Big(\boldsymbol{C}^{\alpha\beta\delta\gamma}\mathsf{a}_\delta\mathsf{a}_\gamma\boldsymbol{b}\Big)>0, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\boldsymbol{C}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}:=\frac{\partial^2U}{\partial y^i_{,\alpha\beta}\partial y^j_{,\delta\gamma}}\boldsymbol{e}^i\otimes\boldsymbol{e}^j,$$

while (3.3) does not (see (3.7) and (3.8) below). Physically, this may be viewed as a consequence of the surface energy (3.1) incorporating the surface's resistance to geodesic distortion via also including dependence on the tensor $\mathbf{L}$.

In general, for (3.1) we have

$$\mathbf{T}^{\alpha}=\frac{\partial U}{\partial\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}}=\frac{\partial U}{\partial\mathsf{E}_{\beta\gamma}}\frac{\partial\mathsf{E}_{\beta\gamma}}{\partial\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}}+\frac{\partial U}{\partial\mathsf{K}_{\delta\nu}}\frac{\partial\mathsf{K}_{\delta\nu}}{\partial\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}}+\frac{\partial U}{\partial\mathsf{L}_{\beta\gamma\delta}}\frac{\partial\mathsf{L}_{\beta\gamma\delta}}{\partial\boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}}.$$

Using

$$\frac{\partial \mathsf{E}_{\beta\gamma}}{\partial \boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\delta^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\boldsymbol{y}_{,\gamma} + \delta^{\alpha}{}_{\gamma}\boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta}\Big),$$
$$\frac{\partial \mathsf{K}_{\mu\nu}}{\partial \boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}} = -\gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\mu\nu}\boldsymbol{n}, \quad \frac{\partial \mathsf{K}_{\mu\nu}}{\partial \boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\beta}} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\alpha}{}_{\mu}\delta^{\beta}{}_{\nu} + \delta^{\alpha}{}_{\nu}\delta^{\beta}{}_{\mu})\boldsymbol{n},$$
$$\frac{\partial \mathsf{L}_{\beta\gamma\mu}}{\partial \boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha}} = \delta^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\boldsymbol{y}_{\gamma\mu} - (\delta^{\alpha}{}_{\nu}\boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta} + \delta^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\boldsymbol{y}_{,\nu})\Gamma^{\nu}{}_{\gamma\mu},$$
$$\frac{\partial \mathsf{L}_{\gamma\mu\sigma}}{\partial \boldsymbol{y}_{,\alpha\beta}} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta^{\alpha}{}_{\mu}\delta^{\beta}{}_{\sigma} + \delta^{\alpha}{}_{\sigma}\delta^{\beta}{}_{\mu})\boldsymbol{y}_{\gamma},$$

we readily compute that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{T}^{\alpha} = &\Big[\lambda_s \mathsf{E}^{\mu}{}_{\mu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\gamma} + 2\mu_s \mathsf{E}^{\alpha\gamma} \\
&\quad - (\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\alpha}(\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\nu\gamma}(\zeta \mathsf{L}_{\mu\delta}{}^{\delta}\mathsf{L}_{\nu\sigma}{}^{\sigma} + 2\eta \mathsf{L}_{\mu\delta\sigma}\mathsf{L}_{\nu}{}^{\delta\sigma})\Big]\boldsymbol{y}_{,\gamma}, \\
&- \Big[\zeta \mathsf{K}^{\mu}{}_{\mu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\delta\nu}\gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\delta\nu} + 2\eta \mathsf{K}^{\delta\nu}\gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\delta\nu}\Big]\boldsymbol{n}, \\
&+ \Big[\zeta(\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\alpha}\mathsf{L}_{\mu\nu}{}^{\nu}(G^{-1})^{\gamma\delta} + 2\eta(g^{-1})^{\mu\alpha}\mathsf{L}_{\mu}{}^{\gamma\delta}\Big]\boldsymbol{y}_{,\gamma\delta} \\
&- \zeta\Big[(\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\alpha}\mathsf{L}_{\mu\nu}{}^{\nu}\Gamma^{\beta}{}_{\delta}{}^{\delta} + (\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\beta}\mathsf{L}_{\mu\nu}{}^{\nu}\Gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\delta}{}^{\delta}\Big]\boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta} \\
&- 2\eta\Big[(\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\alpha}\mathsf{L}_{\mu}{}^{\delta\sigma}\Gamma^{\beta}{}_{\delta\sigma} + (\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\beta}\mathsf{L}_{\mu}{}^{\delta\sigma}\Gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\delta\sigma}\Big]\boldsymbol{y}_{,\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{M}^{\alpha\beta} = &\Big[\zeta \mathsf{K}^{\mu}{}_{\mu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta} + 2\eta \mathsf{K}^{\alpha\beta}\Big]\boldsymbol{n} \\
&+ \Big[\zeta(\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\gamma}\mathsf{L}_{\mu\nu}{}^{\nu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta} + 2\eta(\mathsf{g}^{-1})^{\mu\gamma}\mathsf{L}_{\mu}{}^{\alpha\beta}\Big]\boldsymbol{y}_{,\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

To see that the strong ellipticity condition is satisfied for (3.1), we compute

$$\boldsymbol{C}^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = \Big(\zeta(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\mu\nu} + 2\eta[(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\mu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\beta\nu} + (\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\nu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\beta\mu}]\Big)\boldsymbol{I},$$

and thus, for all $(\mathsf{a}_1, \mathsf{a}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2\backslash\{(0,0)\}$ and $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3\backslash\{\boldsymbol{0}\}$,

$$\mathsf{a}_{\alpha}\mathsf{a}_{\beta}\boldsymbol{b} \cdot \Big(\boldsymbol{C}^{\alpha\beta\delta\gamma}\mathsf{a}_{\delta}\mathsf{a}_{\gamma}\boldsymbol{b}\Big) = (\zeta + 2\eta)[(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{a}_{\alpha}\mathsf{a}_{\beta}]^2|\boldsymbol{b}|^2 > 0. \tag{3.7}$$

For the classical surface energy (3.3) of Steigmann-Ogden type, we have

$$\boldsymbol{C}^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = \Big(\zeta(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\mu\nu} + 2\eta[(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\mu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\beta\nu} + (\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\nu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\beta\mu}]\Big)\boldsymbol{n} \otimes \boldsymbol{n},$$

and thus, for all $(\mathsf{a}_1, \mathsf{a}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\mathsf{a}_{\alpha}\mathsf{a}_{\beta}\boldsymbol{b} \cdot \Big(\boldsymbol{C}^{\alpha\beta\delta\gamma}\mathsf{a}_{\delta}\mathsf{a}_{\gamma}\boldsymbol{b}\Big) = (\zeta + 2\eta)[(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{a}_{\alpha}\mathsf{a}_{\beta}]^2(\boldsymbol{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{b})^2. \tag{3.8}$$

In particular, (3.8) shows that the surface energy (3.3) satisfies the Legendre-Hadamard condition but not the strong ellipticity condition since the right side of (3.8) is 0 for $\boldsymbol{b} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$ and orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{n}$.

3.2. **Linearized equations.** We now compute the linearization of (4.1) about the reference configuration. For the bulk solid, we adopt a classical quadratic, isotropic energy density

$$W = \frac{\lambda}{2}(E^i{}_i)^2 + \mu E_{ij}E^{ij}.$$

Here indices are raised using the flat metric on $\mathbb{R}^3$, and λ and μ are the Lamé constants for the bulk solid. For the surface $\mathcal{S}$, the surface energy density is given by (3.1).

Let $\boldsymbol{u} : \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ be a displacement field such that $\boldsymbol{u}|_{\partial\mathcal{B}\setminus\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{0}$ and

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{X}\in\mathcal{B}}\Big[|\boldsymbol{u}(X)| + |\operatorname{Grad}\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{X})|\Big] + \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{2}\sup_{\boldsymbol{Y}\in\mathcal{S}}|\boldsymbol{u}_{,\alpha\beta}(\boldsymbol{Y})| \le \delta_0. \tag{3.9}$$

Assume that the body force $\boldsymbol{f}$, boundary traction $\boldsymbol{t}$, and Dirichlet condition $\boldsymbol{\chi}_0$ satisfy

$$|\boldsymbol{f}| = O(\delta_0), \quad |\boldsymbol{t}| = O(\delta_0), \quad |\boldsymbol{\chi}_0 - \mathrm{Id}| = O(\delta_0).$$

If $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \boldsymbol{X} + \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{X})$, then $E_{ij} = \varepsilon_{ij} + O(\delta_0^2)$, $\mathsf{E}_{\alpha\beta} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} + O(\delta_0^2)$, and $\mathsf{K}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathsf{k}_{\alpha\beta} + O(\delta_0^2)$ where

$$\varepsilon_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\boldsymbol{e}_i \cdot \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{u}}{\partial X^j} + \boldsymbol{e}_j \cdot \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{u}}{\partial X^i}\Big) = O(\delta_0),$$

and on $\mathcal{S}$,

$$\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}\big(\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\beta} + \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\beta}\big) = O(\delta_0), \quad \mathsf{k}_{\alpha\beta} = \boldsymbol{N}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{;\alpha\beta} = O(\delta_0),$$

see (3.12) in [23]. Now we observe that $\mathsf{L}_{\alpha\beta\delta} = \mathsf{l}_{\alpha\beta\delta} + O(\delta_0^2)$, with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{l}_{\alpha\beta\delta} &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\beta\delta} + \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta\delta}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\alpha} - \Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\beta\delta}\big(\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\mu} + \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\mu}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\alpha}\big)\\ &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{;\beta\delta} + \boldsymbol{Y}_{;\beta\delta}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\alpha}\\ &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{,\alpha}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{;\beta\delta} + (\boldsymbol{N}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{,\alpha})\mathsf{B}_{\beta\delta} = O(\delta_0).\end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathbf{T}^\alpha = \mathbf{t}^\alpha + O(\delta_0^2)$ and $\mathbf{M}^{\alpha\beta} = \mathbf{m}^{\alpha\beta} + O(\delta_0^2)$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{t}^\alpha &:= \Big[\lambda_s\epsilon^{\mu}{}_{\mu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\gamma} + 2\mu_s\epsilon^{\alpha\gamma}\Big]\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\gamma} - \Big[\zeta\mathsf{k}^{\mu}{}_{\mu}\Gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\nu}{}^{\nu} + 2\eta\mathsf{k}^{\delta\nu}\Gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\delta\nu}\Big]\boldsymbol{N},\\ &\quad + \Big[\zeta\mathsf{l}^{\alpha}{}_{\nu}{}^{\nu}\mathsf{B}^{\delta}{}_{\delta} + 2\eta\mathsf{l}^{\alpha\delta\sigma}\mathsf{B}_{\delta\sigma}\Big]\boldsymbol{N} - \Big[\zeta\mathsf{l}^{\beta}{}_{\nu}{}^{\nu}\Gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\delta}{}^{\delta} + 2\eta\mathsf{l}^{\beta\delta\sigma}\Gamma^{\alpha}{}_{\delta\sigma}\Big]\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta},\\ \mathbf{m}^{\alpha\beta} &:= \Big[\zeta\mathsf{k}^{\mu}{}_{\mu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta} + 2\eta\mathsf{k}^{\alpha\beta}\Big]\boldsymbol{N} + \Big[\zeta\mathsf{l}^{\gamma}{}_{\nu}{}^{\nu}(\mathsf{G}^{-1})^{\alpha\beta} + 2\eta\mathsf{l}^{\gamma\alpha\beta}\Big]\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\gamma}.\end{aligned}$$

The linearization of (2.13) about the reference configuration is obtained by omitting the $O(\delta_0^2)$ terms from $\boldsymbol{P}$, $\mathbf{T}^\alpha$ and $\mathbf{M}^{\alpha\beta}$, yielding

$$\begin{aligned}&\operatorname{Div}\boldsymbol{\sigma} + \boldsymbol{f} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{on } \mathcal{B},\\ &\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{N} = G^{-1/2}(G^{1/2}\mathbf{p}^\alpha)_{,\alpha} + \boldsymbol{t}, \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S},\\ &\boldsymbol{u} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{B}\setminus\mathcal{S},\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \lambda(\mathrm{tr}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\boldsymbol{I} + 2\mu\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ and $\mathbf{p}^\alpha = \mathbf{t}^\alpha - G^{-1/2}(G^{1/2}\mathbf{m}^{\alpha\beta})_{,\beta}$. We observe that solutions to the linearized equations (3.10) are critical points of the energy functional

$$\mathcal{A}_L[\boldsymbol{u}] = \int_{\mathcal{B}}\Big[\frac{\lambda}{2}(\varepsilon^i{}_i)^2 + \mu\varepsilon_{ij}\varepsilon^{ij}\Big]dV - \int_{\mathcal{B}}\boldsymbol{f}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}\,dV + \int_{\mathcal{S}}\Big[\frac{\lambda_s}{2}(\epsilon^\alpha{}_\alpha)^2 + \mu_s\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}\Big]dS$$
$$+ \int_{\mathcal{S}}\Big[\frac{\zeta}{2}\Big((\mathsf{k}^\alpha{}_\alpha)^2 + \mathsf{l}_{\mu\alpha}{}^\alpha\mathsf{l}^\mu{}_\beta{}^\beta\Big) + \eta\Big(\mathsf{k}_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{k}^{\alpha\beta} + \mathsf{l}_{\mu\alpha\beta}\mathsf{l}^{\mu\alpha\beta}\Big)\Big]dA - \int_{\mathcal{S}}\boldsymbol{t}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}\,dA$$

over the set of $\boldsymbol{u}$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{u}|_{\partial\mathcal{B}\setminus\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{0}$.

In the case of the classical Hilgers-Pipkin surface energy (3.2), we see from (3.4) and (3.5) that

$$\mathbf{t}^\alpha = (\lambda_s\epsilon^\gamma{}_\gamma\delta^{\alpha\beta} + 2\mu_s\epsilon^{\alpha\beta})\boldsymbol{Y}_{,\beta}, \quad \mathbf{m}^{\alpha\beta} = \zeta\delta^{\alpha\beta}\boldsymbol{u}_{,\gamma}{}^\gamma + 2\eta\boldsymbol{u}^{,\alpha\beta}.$$

Writing $\boldsymbol{u} = \mathbf{u} + \mathsf{u}^3\boldsymbol{N} = \mathsf{u}^\gamma\boldsymbol{Y}_\gamma + \mathsf{u}^3\boldsymbol{N}$, it follows that (3.10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Div}\,\boldsymbol{\sigma} + \boldsymbol{f} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{on } \mathcal{B},\\
&\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{N} = \mu_s\mathbf{u}_{,\alpha}{}^\alpha + (\lambda_s+\mu_s)\mathsf{u}^\gamma{}_{,\alpha\gamma}\boldsymbol{Y}^\alpha - (\zeta+2\eta)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta\boldsymbol{u}^{,\alpha\beta} + \boldsymbol{t}, \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S},\\
&\boldsymbol{u} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{B}\setminus\mathcal{S}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

4. Mode-III Fracture Problem

In this section, we apply the linearized theory (3.11) to the problem of a brittle infinite plate, with a straight crack $\mathcal{C}$ of length 2ℓ, under far-field anti-plane shear loading σ. As discussed in the Introduction and in contrast to ascribing either a quadratic Gurtin-Murdoch or Steigmann-Ogden surface energy (3.3) to the crack fronts, the use of (3.1) yields a model that predicts bounded strains and stresses up to the crack tips (see Theorem 4.4).

4.1. **Formulation and governing equations.** We consider a brittle, infinite plate under anti-plane shear loading, $\lim_{x^2\to\pm\infty}\sigma_{13} = 0$ and $\lim_{x^2\to\pm\infty}\sigma_{23} = \sigma$, with a straight crack $\mathcal{C} = \{(x^1, 0, x^3) \mid x^1 \in [-\ell, \ell]\}$ of length 2ℓ (see Figure 2). For anti-plane shear, the displacement field takes the form

$$\boldsymbol{u}(x^1, x^2, x^3) = u(x^1, x^2)\boldsymbol{e}_3,$$

Then the only nonzero components of the stress are

$$\sigma_{13} = \mu u_{,1}, \quad \sigma_{23} = \mu u_{,2}$$

By the symmetry of the problem, u can be taken to be even in x^1 and odd in x^2, so we will focus only on the strain and stress fields for $x^2 \geq 0$. The governing field equations are (3.11) on $\mathcal{B} = \{(x^1, x^2, x^3) \mid x^2 \geq 0\}$ with $\mathcal{S} = \{(x^1, 0, x^3) \mid x^1 \in [-\ell, \ell]\}$, $\boldsymbol{t} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\boldsymbol{f} = \mathbf{0}$.

We define dimensionless variables

$$x = \frac{x^1}{\ell}, \quad y = \frac{x^2}{\ell}, \quad z = \frac{x^3}{\ell}, \quad w(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{\ell}\Big(u(x^1, x^2, x^3) - \frac{\sigma}{\mu}x^2\Big).$$

Then the field equations take the dimensionless form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta w(x, y) = 0, \quad y > 0,\\
&-w_y(x, 0) = \alpha w_{xx}(x, 0) - \beta w_{xxxx}(x, 0) + \gamma, \quad x \in (-1, 1),\\
&w(x, 0) = 0, \quad |x| \geq 1,\\
&w_x(\pm 1, 0) = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

with the decay condition $\lim_{y\to\infty}|\nabla w(x,y)| = 0$. We note that the boundary conditions $w_x(\pm 1, 0) = 0$ imply that the crack opening is cusp shaped rather then blunted (see also Figure 3 and Figure 4). The dimensionless parameters α, β and γ are given by

$$\alpha = \frac{\mu_s}{\mu\ell} > 0, \quad \beta = \frac{\zeta + 2\eta}{\mu\ell^3} > 0, \quad \gamma = \frac{\sigma}{\mu}, \tag{4.2}$$

and in particular, we see from (4.2) that the behavior of the displacement w depends on the length of the crack, ℓ. For macro cracks satisfying $\beta \ll \alpha \ll 1$, we expect $w(x, 0)$ to be well-approximated by the singular, rounded opening profile from the classical linear elastic fracture mechanics except in small regions near the crack tips (boundary layers). See Figure 4.

We remark that in using the Steigmann-Ogden surface energy (3.3) rather than (3.1), the boundary conditions at $y = 0$ are replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} -w_y(x,0) &= \alpha w_{xx}(x,0) + \gamma, \quad x \in (-1,1), \\ w(x,0) &= 0, \quad |x| \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

One may view this loss of higher order derivatives in the boundary conditions as a consequence of the fact that the Steigmann-Ogden surface energy does not satisfy the strong-ellipticity condition (3.6): for anti-plane shear, $\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{u}(x^1, 0, x^3)$ is orthogonal to the surface's normal $\boldsymbol{n} = -\boldsymbol{e}_2$ (see (3.8)). As discussed in [9, 25], the boundary conditions (4.3) *do not* lead to a model predicting bounded strains up to the crack tips $x = \pm 1$, i.e., the displacement field satisfies

$$\sup_{y>0} |\nabla w(\pm 1, y)| = \infty.$$

We see that (4.1) is the system of Euler-Lagrange equations for the energy functional

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_L[w] = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty |\nabla w(x,y)|^2 dxdy + \int_{-\infty}^\infty \Big(\frac{\alpha}{2}|w_x(x,0)|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}|w_{xx}(x,0)|^2\Big)dx \\ - \gamma\int_{-\infty}^\infty w(x,0)dx \end{aligned}$$

defined for w with $\nabla w \in L^2(\{y > 0\})$, $w(\cdot, 0) \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $w(x, 0) = 0$ for all $|x| \geq 1$. Motivated by this observation, we define the Hilbert space H to be the




FIGURE 2. Schematic of the mode-III problem with the crack $\mathcal{C}$ appearing in blue.

completion of $C_c^\infty((-1,1))$ under the norm

$$\|f\|_H^2 := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \big(\alpha|f'(x)|^2 + \beta|f''(x)|^2\big)dx.$$

It is straightforward to verify the following facts using the fundamental theorem of calculus and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

- (Sobolev embedding) If $f \in H$ then $f \in C_c^{1,1/2-}(\mathbb{R})$ and $f(x) = 0$ for all $|x| \geq 1$, and for all $\delta \in [0, 1/2)$, there exists a constant $A > 0$ depending on α, β and δ, such that for all $f \in H$,

$$\|f\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\mathbb{R})} \leq A\|f\|_H.$$

- $f \in H$ if and only if $f \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $f(x) = 0$ for all $|x| \geq 1$. Moreover, there exist $b, B > 0$ depending on α and β such that for all $f \in H$,

$$b\|f\|_H \leq \|f\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq B\|f\|_H. \tag{4.4}$$

The problem (4.1) can be reduced completely to a problem on the boundary by using the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map $-w_y(x,0) = \mathcal{H}w_x(x,0)$ where $\mathcal{H}$ is the Hilbert transform

$$\mathcal{H}f(x) = \frac{1}{\pi}\,\text{p.v.}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{f(s)}{x-s}ds, \quad f \in H.$$

Then finding w with $\nabla w \in L^2(\{y > 0\})$ and $w(\cdot, 0) \in H$ satisfying (4.1) is equivalent to determining $w(\cdot, 0) =: f \in H$ satisfying[6]

$$\beta f''''(x) - \alpha f''(x) + \mathcal{H}f'(x) = \gamma, \quad x \in (-1, 1). \tag{4.5}$$

By using the Plancherel theorem, the Fourier representation of the Hilbert transform (see (4.13)), and (4.4), we have for all $f \in H$,

$$\|\mathcal{H}f'\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|f'\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|f\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq B\|f\|_H. \tag{4.6}$$

Definition 4.1. A function $f \in H$ is a *weak solution* to the integro-differential equation (4.5) if for all $g \in H$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \big[\beta f''(x)g''(x) + \alpha f'(x)g'(x) + \mathcal{H}f'(x)g(x)\big]dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma g(x)dx. \tag{4.7}$$

We remark that since $f, g \in H$, the integrals appearing in (4.7) are in fact over the interval $(-1, 1)$.

A function $f \in H$ is a *classical solution* to (4.5) if $f \in C^4((-1,1)) \cap H$ and f satisfies (4.5) pointwise.

We note that by (4.6) and Cauchy-Schwarz, (4.7) is well-defined for each $f, g \in H$.

[6]Once f is found, w is determined on the upper half plane using the standard Poisson kernel for the upper half plane.




FIGURE 3. Numerical solutions for the equivalent formulation of (4.5) as a Fredholm problem (4.10). The parameters (β, α, γ) range over $(1,1,1)$, $(5,1,5)$ and $(10,1,10)$. For $\gamma = \beta$ and $\beta \gg 1 \simeq \alpha$, the opening profile is well approximated by the limiting opening profile $f_\infty(x) = \frac{1}{24}(1-x^2)^2$ on $[-1,1]$.

4.2. **Solution of the integro-differential equation.** We now establish that there exists a unique classical solution to (4.5), and the solution's behavior is consistent with the linearization assumption (3.9). We denote the following Green function

$$G(x,\tau) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{24}(x-1)^2(\tau+1)^2(1+2x-2\tau-x\tau) & \tau \in [-1,x], \\ \frac{1}{24}(\tau-1)^2(x+1)^2(1+2\tau-2x-x\tau) & \tau \in [x,1], \end{cases}$$

satisfying $G_{xxxx}(x,\tau) = \delta(x-\tau)$, $G(\pm 1,\tau) = 0$, $G_x(\pm 1,\tau) = 0$. We note that $G(x,\tau) = G(\tau,x)$ for all $\tau, x \in [-1,1]$, $G \in C^2([-1,1]\times[-1,1])$ and $\int_{-1}^{1} G(x,\tau)d\tau = \frac{1}{24}(1-x^2)^2$. In particular, we have for all $f \in H$,

$$\int_{-1}^{1} G_{\tau\tau}(x,\tau) f''(\tau) d\tau = f(x). \tag{4.8}$$

Lemma 4.2. *A function $f \in H$ is a weak solution to* (4.5) *if and only if f satisfies*

$$\beta f(x) + \int_{-1}^{1} G(x,\tau)(-\alpha f''(\tau) + \mathcal{H} f'(\tau))d\tau = \frac{\gamma}{24}(1-x^2)^2, \quad x \in [-1,1]. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. Let $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $h(x) = 0$ for all $|x| > 1$, and set

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \int_{-1}^{1} G(x,\tau)h(\tau)d\tau & \text{if } |x| \le 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| > 1. \end{cases}$$

Since $G \in C^2([-1,1]\times[-,1,1])$, $G(\pm 1,\tau) = 0$, and $G_x(\pm 1,\tau) = 0$, g is twice continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}\backslash\{\pm 1\}$ and continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$ with

$$g'(x) = \chi_{\{|x|\le 1\}}(x) \int_{-1}^{1} G_x(x,\tau)h(\tau)d\tau,$$

$$g''(x) = \chi_{\{|x|\le 1\}}(x) \int_{-1}^{1} G_{xx}(x,\tau)h(\tau)d\tau,$$

where χ_E is the indicator function of a subset $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. In particular, we conclude that $g \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$ and thus, $g \in H$. Inserting g into (4.7), integrating by parts in the second term and using that $g(\pm 1) = 0$ yield

$$\begin{aligned}\beta \int_{-1}^{1}\int_{-1}^{1} G_{xx}(x,\tau) f''(x) h(\tau) d\tau dx \\ + \int_{-1}^{1}\int_{-1}^{1} G(x,\tau)(-\alpha f''(x) + \mathcal{H} f'(x)) h(\tau) d\tau dx \\ = \gamma \int_{-1}^{1}\int_{-1}^{1} G(x,\tau) h(\tau) d\tau dx.\end{aligned}$$

Interchanging the order of integration, using the symmetry of G and relabeling the integration variables lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\beta \int_{-1}^{1}\int_{-1}^{1} G_{\tau\tau}(x,\tau) f''(\tau) d\tau\, h(x) dx \\ + \int_{-1}^{1}\int_{-1}^{1} G(x,\tau)(-\alpha f''(\tau) + \mathcal{H} f'(\tau)) d\tau\, h(x) dx \\ = \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{\gamma}{24}(1-x^2)^2 h(x) dx.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by (4.8) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-1}^{1} \Big[\beta f(x) + \int_{-1}^{1} G(x,\tau)(-\alpha f''(\tau) + \mathcal{H} f'(\tau)) d\tau\Big] h(x) dx \\ = \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{\gamma}{24}(1-x^2)^2 h(x) dx,\end{aligned}$$

for all $h(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $h(x) = 0$ for all $|x| > 1$, proving (4.9).

Conversely, if $f \in H$ and (4.9) holds, then for all $g \in H$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f''(x) g''(x) dx = \int_{-1}^{1}\int_{-1}^{1} G_{xx}(x,\tau)(\alpha f''(\tau) - \mathcal{H} f'(\tau)) g''(x) dx \\ + \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{\gamma}{6}(3x^2 - 1) g''(x) dx.\end{aligned}$$

We again interchange the order of integration and use integration by parts and $\int_{-1}^{1} G_{xx}(x,\tau) g''(x) dx = g(\tau)$ to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-1}^{1}\int_{-1}^{1} G_{xx}(x,\tau)(\alpha f''(\tau) - \mathcal{H} f'(\tau)) g''(x) dx + \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{\gamma}{6}(3x^2-1) g''(x) dx \\ = \int_{-1}^{1} (\alpha f''(\tau) - \mathcal{H} f'(\tau)) g(\tau) d\tau + \int_{-1}^{1} \gamma g(x) dx \\ = -\int_{-1}^{1} (\alpha f'(x) g'(x) + \mathcal{H} f'(x) g(x)) dx + \int_{-1}^{1} \gamma g(x) dx\end{aligned}$$

This proves $f \in H$ satisfies (4.7) and concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Via integration by parts and straightforward computations, we conclude from Lemma 4.2 that the crack opening profile f must satisfy the following Fredholm integral equation of the second kind (4.10). We will show in Theorem 4.4 that this




FIGURE 4. Numerical solutions for the macro-crack regime $\beta \ll \alpha \ll 1$. The parameters (β, α, γ) range over $(10^{-1}, 10^{-1}, 1)$, $(10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 1)$, $(10^{-5}, 10^{-2}, 1)$ and $(10^{-6}, 10^{-3}, 1)$. For $\beta \ll \alpha \ll 1$, we expect the crack opening $f(x)$ to be well-approximated by the singular, rounded opening profile predicted by classical linear elastic fracture mechanics away from the crack tips where $f'(\pm 1) = 0$ (and the profile is cusped).

equation is uniquely solvable for *arbitrary* $\alpha, \beta > 0$ and γ. We remark that since the kernel extends to a continuous function on $[-1,1] \times [-1,1]$ (the singularities are removable), the numerical computation of solutions is relatively straightforward via the Nÿstrom method with the trapezoidal rule to approximate the integral (see Figure 3 and Figure 4).

Corollary 4.3. *A function $f \in H$ is a weak solution to* (4.5) *if and only if f satisfies the Fredholm equation*

$$\beta f(x) + \int_{-1}^{1} K(x,s) f(s) ds = \frac{\gamma}{24}(1-x^2)^2, \quad x \in [-1,1], \tag{4.10}$$

where $K(x,s) = -\alpha G_{ss}(x,s) + \frac{1}{\pi} p.v. \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{G_\tau(x,\tau)}{s-\tau} d\tau$,

$$G_{ss}(x,s) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{4}(x-1)^2(2s+xs+1) & s \in [-1,x], \\ -\frac{1}{4}(x+1)^2(-2s+xs+1) & s \in [x,1], \end{cases}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\pi}p.v.\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{G_\tau(x,\tau)}{s-\tau}d\tau=\frac{1}{4\pi}(sx-1)(x^2-1)+\frac{1}{2\pi}(s-x)^2\log|x-s|$$
$$-\frac{1}{8\pi}(x-1)^2(-x+2s+sx)(1+s)\log(1+s)$$
$$-\frac{1}{8\pi}(x+1)^2(x-2s+sx)(1-s)\log(1-s).$$

Theorem 4.4. *There exists $C>0$ depending on α and β such that the following hold. There exists a unique classical solution f to (4.5), and f satisfies*

$$\|f\|_{C^4([-1,1])}\le C|\gamma|. \tag{4.11}$$

Moreover, the displacement field $w(x,y)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}P_y(x-s)f(s)ds$, where $P_y(\cdot)$ is the Poisson kernel for the upper half plane, has bounded strains up to the crack tips:

$$\|w\|_{C^1(\{y\ge 0\})}\le C|\gamma|. \tag{4.12}$$

Proof. In what follows, C will denote a positive constant depending only on α and β that may change from line to line, and we denote the Fourier transform and inverse Fourier transform by

$$\hat f(\xi)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}f(x)e^{-2\pi ix\xi}dx,\quad \check f(x)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}f(\xi)e^{2\pi ix\xi}\,d\xi.$$

We recall that

$$\widehat{f'}(\xi)=2\pi i\xi\hat f(\xi),\quad \widehat{\mathcal{H}f}(\xi)=-i\mathrm{sgn}(\xi)\hat f(\xi), \tag{4.13}$$

the latter relation following from the Fourier representation of w on the upper half plane (see (4.15)).

We define a bilinear form $B(\cdot,\cdot):H\times H\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$B(f,g)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\Big[\beta f''(x)g''(x)+\alpha f'(x)g'(x)+\mathcal{H}f'(x)g(x)\Big]dx,\quad f,g\in H.$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz, (4.6), and (4.4) we conclude that for all $f,g\in H$,

$$|B(f,g)|\le(1+B^2)\|f\|_H\|g\|_H,$$

so that $B(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a bounded bilinear form on H. Moreover, by the Plancherel theorem and (4.13), we have for all $f\in H$,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\mathcal{H}f'(x)f(x)dx=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}2\pi|\xi||\hat f(\xi)|^2d\xi\ge 0.$$

Thus, the bilinear form is coercive. Since for all $g\in H$,

$$\Big|\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\gamma g(x)dx\Big|\le|\gamma|\|g\|_{C([-1,1])}\le|\gamma|A\|g\|_H,$$

the classical Lax-Milgram theorem implies that there exists a unique weak solution $f\in H$ to (4.5), and moreover,

$$\|f\|_H\le A|\gamma|. \tag{4.14}$$

To prove (4.12), we express w via the Fourier transform,

$$w(x,y)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}e^{-2\pi y|\xi|}e^{2\pi ix\xi}\hat f(\xi)d\xi. \tag{4.15}$$

Since $f \in H \subset H^2(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\int (1+|\xi|)^4 |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \leq C_0 \|f\|^2_{H^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|f\|^2_H.$$

Thus, by Cauchy-Schwarz

$$\begin{aligned}
&|w(x,y)| + |\nabla w(x,y)| \\
&\qquad \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1 + 2\pi|\xi|\sqrt{2})|\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 \, d\xi \\
&\qquad \leq 2\pi\sqrt{2}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\xi|^2 (1+|\xi|)^{-4} d\xi\Big)^{1/2} \Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1+|\xi|)^4 |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi\Big)^{1/2} \\
&\qquad \leq C\|f\|_H \leq C|\gamma|.
\end{aligned}$$

We now show that the weak solution f is a classical solution, and (4.11) holds. By a density argument in H, we have that $\int_{-1}^{1} G(\cdot,\tau)(\alpha f''(\tau) - \mathcal{H}f'(\tau))d\tau \in H^3([-1,1])$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d^k}{dx^k} \int_{-1}^{1} G(x,\tau)(\alpha f''(\tau) - \mathcal{H}f'(\tau))d\tau \\
&\qquad = \int_{-1}^{1} \partial_x^k G(x,\tau)(\alpha f''(\tau) - \mathcal{H}f'(\tau))d\tau, \quad k = 1, 2, \\
&\frac{d^3}{dx^3} \int_{-1}^{1} G(x,\tau)(\alpha f''(\tau) - \mathcal{H}f'(\tau))d\tau \\
&\qquad = \int_{-1}^{x} \frac{1}{4}(2-\tau)(\tau+1)^2(\alpha f''(\tau) - \mathcal{H}f'(\tau))d\tau \\
&\qquad\quad - \int_{x}^{1} \frac{1}{4}(2+\tau)(\tau-1)^2(\alpha f''(\tau) - \mathcal{H}f'(\tau))d\tau. \qquad (4.16)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.2, we conclude that $f \in H^3([-1,1])$, and by (4.9) (4.16), Cauchy-Schwarz, and (4.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f'''\|_{L^2([-1,1])} &\leq C(\|f''\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \|\mathcal{H}f'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + |\gamma|) \\
&\leq C(\|f\|_H + |\gamma|) \leq C|\gamma|. \qquad (4.17)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (4.14), (4.17) and the fundamental theorem of calculus, $f \in C^2([-1,1])$ with

$$\|f\|_{C^2([-1,1])} \leq C|\gamma|. \qquad (4.18)$$

By (4.7) and integration by parts, it follows that for all $g \in C_c^\infty((-1,1)) \subset H$,

$$\int_{-1}^{1} f'''(x)g'(x)dx = \frac{1}{\beta}\int_{-1}^{1} [-\alpha f''(x) + \mathcal{H}f'(x) - \gamma]g(x)dx,$$

and, thus, $f \in H^4([-1,1])$ and

$$\beta f''''(x) - \alpha f''(x) + \mathcal{H}f'(x) = \gamma, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in (-1,1). \qquad (4.19)$$

Then by (4.19), (4.18), and the fact that $\mathcal{H}f' \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow C(\mathbb{R})$, we conclude that $f'''' \in C([-1,1])$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\|f''''\|_{C([-1,1])} &\le C\Big(\|f\|_{C^2([-1,1])} + \|\mathcal{H}f'\|_{C([-1,1])} + |\gamma|\Big)\\ &\le C\Big(\|\mathcal{H}f'\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} + |\gamma|\Big)\\ &\le C\Big(\|f\|_H + |\gamma|\Big) \le C|\gamma|. \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

By (4.17), (4.18) and (4.20), it follows that $f \in C^4([-1,1])$ is a classical solution to (4.5) and (4.11) holds. □

References

[1] K. B. Broberg. *Cracks and Fracture*. Academic Press, San Diego, 1999.

[2] M. Dai, A. Gharahi, and P. Schiavone. Analytic solution for a circular nano-inhomogeneity with interface stretching and bending resistance in plane strain deformations. *Appl. Math. Model*, 55:160–170, 2018.

[3] L. A. Ferguson, M. Muddamallappa, and J. R. Walton. Numerical simulation of mode-III fracture incorporating interfacial mechanics. *Int. J. Fract.*, 192(1):47–56, 2015.

[4] M. E. Gurtin and A. I. Murdoch. A continuum theory of elastic material surfaces. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 57:291–323, 1975.

[5] M. E. Gurtin and A. I. Murdoch. Surface stress in solids. *Int. J. Solids. Struct.*, 14(6):431–440, 1978.

[6] Z. Han, S. G. Mogilevskaya, and D. Schillinger. Local fields and overall transverse properties of unidirectional composite materials with multiple nanofibers and Steigmann–Ogden interfaces. *Int. J. Solids. Struct.*, 147:166–182, 2018.

[7] M. G. Hilgers and A. C. Pipkin. Elastic sheets with bending stiffness. *Quart. J. Mech. Appl. Math.*, 45(1):57–75, 1992.

[8] M. G. Hilgers and A. C. Pipkin. Bending energy of highly elastic membranes. II. *Quart. Appl. Math.*, 54(2):307–316, 1996.

[9] C. I. Kim, C. Q. Ru, and P. Schiavone. A clarification of the role of crack-tip conditions in linear elasticity with surface effects. *Math. Mech. Solids*, 18(1):59–66, 2013.

[10] X. Li and C. Mi. Effects of surface tension and Steigmann–Ogden surface elasticity on hertzian contact properties. *Int. J. Eng. Sci.*, 145:103165, 2019.

[11] X. Li and C. Mi. Nanoindentation hardness of a Steigmann–Ogden surface bounding an elastic half-space. *Math. Mech. Solids*, 24(9):2754–2766, 2019.

[12] X. Li and C. Mi. Nanoindentation of a half-space due to a rigid cylindrical roller based on Steigmann–Ogden surface mechanical model. *Int. J. Mech. Mater. Des.*, 17, 03 2021.

[13] C. Mi. Elastic behavior of a half-space with a Steigmann–Ogden boundary under nanoscale frictionless patch loads. *Int. J. Eng. Sci.*, 129:129–144, 2018.

[14] S. G. Mogilevskaya, V. Kushch, and A. Zemlyanova. Displacements representations for the problems with spherical and circular material surfaces. *Quart. J. Mech. Appl. Math.*, 72:449–471, 11 2019.

[15] S. G. Mogilevskaya and A. Y. Zemlyanova. On spherical inhomogeneity with Steigmann-Ogden interface. *ASME J. Appl. Mech.*, 85, 2018.

[16] A. I. Murdoch and H. Cohen. Symmetry considerations for material surfaces. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 72(1):61–98, 1979/80.

[17] A. I. Murdoch and H. Cohen. Addendum: "Symmetry considerations for material surfaces" [Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **72** (1979/80), no. 1, 61–98; MR 81d:73003]. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 76(4):393–400, 1981.

[18] W. Noll. A mathematical theory of the mechanical behavior of continuous media. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 2:198–226, 1958.

[19] S. Oh, J. R. Walton, and J. Slattery. A theory of fracture based upon an extension of continuum mechanics to the nanoscale. *J. Appl. Mech.*, 73:792–780, 09 2006.

[20] A. C. Pipkin. The relaxed energy density for isotropic elastic membranes. *IMA J. Appl. Math.*, 36(1):85–99, 1986.

[21] T. Sendova and J. R. Walton. A new approach to the modeling and analysis of fracture through extension of continuum mechanics to the nanoscale. *Math. Mech. Solids*, 15(3):368–413, 2010.
[22] D. J. Steigmann and R. W. Ogden. Plane deformations of elastic solids with intrinsic boundary elasticity. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 453:853–877, 1997.
[23] D. J. Steigmann and R. W. Ogden. Elastic surface-substrate interactions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 455:437–474, 1999.
[24] C. Truesdell and W. Noll. *The Nonlinear Field Theories of Mechanics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1992.
[25] J. R. Walton. A note on fracture models incorporating surface elasticity. *J. Elast.*, 109:95–102.
[26] J. R. Walton. Plane-strain fracture with curvature-dependent surface tension: mixed-mode loading. *J. Elast.*, 114(1):127–142, 2014.
[27] J. Wang, P. Yan, L. Dong, and S. N. Atluri. Spherical nano-inhomogeneity with the Steigmann-Ogden interface model under general uniform far-field stress loading. *Int. J. Solids. Struct.*, 185-186:311–323, 2020.
[28] A. Y. Zemlyanova. The effect of a curvature-dependent surface tension on the singularities at the tips of a straight interface crack. *Quart. J. Appl. Math.*, 66:199–219, 07 2012.
[29] A. Y. Zemlyanova. Curvilinear mode-I/mode-II interface fracture with a curvature-dependent surface tension on the boundary. *IMA J. Appl. Math.*, 81:1112–1136, 09 2014.
[30] A. Y. Zemlyanova. A straight mixed-mode fracture with the Steigmann-Ogden boundary condition. *Quart. J. Mech. Appl. Math.*, 70:65–86, 2017.
[31] A. Y. Zemlyanova. Frictionless contact of a rigid stamp with a semi-plane in the presence of surface elasticity in the Steigmann–Ogden form. *Math. Mech. Solids*, 23(8):1140–1155, 2018.
[32] A. Y. Zemlyanova. An adhesive contact problem for a semi-plane with a surface elasticity in the Steigmann-Ogden form. *J. Elast.*, 136:103–121, 2019.
[33] A. Y. Zemlyanova. Interaction of multiple plane straight fractures in the presence of the Steigmann-Ogden surface energy. *SIAM. J. Appl. Math.*, 80(5):2098–2119, 2020.
[34] A. Y. Zemlyanova. An axisymmetric problem for a penny-shaped crack under the influence of the Steigmann–Ogden surface energy. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 477, 04 2021.
[35] A. Y. Zemlyanova and S. G. Mogilevskaya. Circular inhomogeneity with Steigmann–Ogden interface: Local fields, neutrality, and Maxwell's type approximation formula. *Int. J. Solids. Struct.*, 135:85–98, 2018.
[36] A. Y. Zemlyanova and J. R. Walton. Modeling of a curvilinear planar crack with a curvature-dependent surface tension. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 72(5):1474–1492, 2012.
[37] A. Y. Zemlyanova and L. M. White. Axisymmetric frictionless indentation of a rigid stamp into a semi-space with a surface energetic boundary. *Math. Mech. Solids*, 27(2):334–347, 2022.

C. Rodriguez
Department of Mathematics, University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA
crodrig@email.unc.edu