

# New model for surface fracture induced by dynamical stress

Jørgen Vitting Andersen and Laurent J. Lewis<sup>y</sup>

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College, Huxley Building, 180 Queen's Gate, London SW 7 2BZ, England

<sup>y</sup>Department de physique et Groupe de recherche en physique et technologie des couches minces (GCM), Université de Montréal, Case postale 6128, Succursale Centre-Ville, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7

We introduce a model where an isotropic, dynamically-imposed stress induces fracture in a thin film. Using molecular dynamics simulations, we study how the integrated fragment distribution function depends on the rate of change and magnitude of the imposed stress, as well as on temperature. A mean-field argument shows that the system becomes unstable for a critical value of the stress. We find a striking invariance of the distribution of fragments for fixed ratio of temperature and rate of change of the stress; the interval over which this invariance holds is determined by the force fluctuations at the critical value of the stress.

PACS numbers: 46.30.Nz, 62.20.Mk

By experience most, if not all, materials will sooner or later develop cracks. Yet, a profound understanding is largely missing of phenomena such as how cracks initiate, the formation of networks of cracks and the resulting distribution of fragments, the dynamics of crack propagation, and the collective behavior of many interacting cracks. In this Letter we propose a new model that addresses, at least in part, some of these questions. In the model, an isotropic, dynamically-imposed stress, caused by material properties changing in time, induces fracture in a surface material. The problem is solved using molecular-dynamics simulations for a set of beads interacting with one another via a continuous potential. This model should be relevant to many phenomena that are known to lead to macroscopic fracture, such as desiccation [1,4] or expansion [5,6], changes in chemical composition [7], changes in temperature [8], or change of phase of the surface layer.

On the basis of a mean-field argument, we demonstrate that the system becomes unstable for a critical value of the stress. We find a striking invariance of the distribution of fragments for a fixed ratio of temperature and rate of change of the stress; the interval over which this invariance holds is determined by the force fluctuations at the critical value of the stress.

**Model** We represent the thin film on a coarse-grained scale by beads that mutually interact via a continuous potential which we take to be of the Lennard-Jones form,  $4[(\sigma/r)^{12} - (\sigma/r)^6]$ , where  $r = |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$  is the distance between two particles. An isotropic stress is imposed by having change in time  $\dot{\epsilon}(t)$ , reflecting a change in the range of the interactions on the surface [9]. For simplicity we limit ourselves to the case where the material is initially unstressed and  $\dot{\epsilon}(t)$  decreases monotonically with time. This corresponds to a surface where the induced stress makes the material rupture in a state of tension.

The dynamics of the beads obeys Newton's second equation, i.e., the system is simulated using molecular

dynamics (MD). We assume the surface layer to be in contact with a heat bath at temperature  $T$ ; this is done by periodically rescaling the velocities to a fixed kinetic energy [10]. The units are chosen so that the mass  $m = 1$ . In its initial (stress-free) state, the surface layer consists of a triangular lattice with lattice constant  $a_0 = 2^{1/6} \sigma$ , where  $\sigma = \sigma(t_0)$ . Periodic boundary conditions are used to eliminate surface effects. The consequence of decreasing  $\dot{\epsilon}(t)$  is to put all beads under tensile stress, i.e., each bead feels attracted by its neighbors. We assume  $\dot{\epsilon}(t)$  to decrease linearly in time until it attains a final value  $\dot{\epsilon}_f$  at time  $t_f$ , whereafter it remains constant. An effective strain parameter of the overlayer is defined by  $s(t) = [\sigma(t) - \sigma_0]/\sigma_0$ . The rate of change ("speed") of  $s$  is denoted  $v = \dot{s}(t) = \dot{\epsilon}(t)$ .

We are interested in the fracture pattern at  $t = t_f$  which is obtained in practice by choosing a large enough  $t_f$ , whose value depends on  $s(t_f)$ ,  $v$ , and  $T$ ; the latter three parameters determine completely the fracture pattern. In order to calculate the probability  $P(f)$  for having a fragment of size  $f$ , we discretize the system into cells of size  $\ell(t)$ . A fragment is then defined as a cluster of beads that are nearest or next-nearest neighbors to one another.

As  $s$  changes with time, each bead will evolve from a position of global energy minimum to a local minimum state. The local minimum energy state is stable, however, for  $\dot{\epsilon}(t)$  close to  $\dot{\epsilon}_0$ , since the system would need instant cooperative motion of all the beads in order to rearrange into the global minimum-energy state whose lattice parameter is  $a = 2^{1/6} \ell(t)$ . Due to the many body nature of the system, each bead will see an energy landscape that changes as the positions of neighboring beads change, and as  $s$  changes in time. The cooperative motion of the beads create dynamical and spatial barriers between, on the one hand, local metastable minimum energy states, and, on the other hand, the global minimum energy state.

For increasing values of  $\sigma$ , the initial configuration eventually become unstable. Neglecting fluctuations in the positions of the beads, each will experience a mean field potential from its nearest neighbors given by:

$$V(r; \sigma) = 12 \left[ \left( \frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^{12} - \left( \frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^6 + \left( \frac{\sigma}{2a} \right)^{12} - \left( \frac{\sigma}{2a} \right)^6 \right];$$

We are interested in the behavior of  $V(r; \sigma)$  at the point  $r = a + \delta$  with  $\delta$  small. Expanding the above to fourth order in  $\delta$ , we find:

$$V(\delta; \sigma) = 12 \left( \frac{\sigma}{a} \right)^6 f_2 \left[ \left( \frac{\delta}{a} \right)^6 - 1 \right] + [156 \left( \frac{\sigma}{a} \right)^6 - 42] \left( \frac{\delta}{a} \right)^2 + [32760 \left( \frac{\sigma}{a} \right)^6 - 3024] \left( \frac{\delta}{a} \right)^4 + O \left( \left( \frac{\delta}{a} \right)^6 \right) g;$$

Thus, for  $\delta$  small, the potential seen by a bead changes from a harmonic single-well to a double-well potential as  $\sigma$  decreases. This happens when  $V''(\delta; \sigma)|_{\delta=0}$  changes sign, that is for  $\sigma_c = (7=26)^{1/6} a_0 = (7=13)^{1/6} a_0 = 0.90 a_0$ . In general, the existence of a critical  $\sigma_c$  for an arbitrary interaction  $V(r; \sigma)$  is equivalent to  $V''(\delta; \sigma)|_{\delta=0} = 0$  having a solution. As  $\sigma(t)$  approaches  $\sigma_c$  from below, one large fluctuation eventually takes place bringing one of the beads close to its new local minimum energy position. A cascade of similar events then spreads out from beads adjacent to that which first broke the configurational symmetry. The extent of the propagation of this cascade of events, and the subsequent fracturing of the system, depends, as we will see, on  $s(t_f)$ ,  $T$ , and  $v$ , as well as on the fluctuations of forces when  $\sigma = \sigma_c$ .

Results | Figs. 1a-c show snapshots of one system for different values of stress but fixed temperature and stress speed. Fig. 1a corresponds to a stress  $\sigma(t)$  slightly larger than  $\sigma_c$ . The very first cracks have appeared and shortly after the system completely disintegrates into many pieces, characterized by a macroscopic Young's modulus that goes to 0 [6,11]. This has happened in Fig. 1b. In Fig. 1c, we have the final state of the system when the stress no longer varies in time. The effect of varying the speed  $v$  can be seen in Figs. 1d and 1e: here, the initial conditions are the same as in Figs. 1a-c, but  $v$  is 8 times smaller. The stress in Fig. 1d is the same as in Fig. 1b; clearly, a smaller rate of change of the stress gives the system longer time to respond so that the positions of the beads are correlated over a longer distances and the cracks are straighter. As a result, the fragments in the final configuration, Fig. 1e, are larger than they are under a rapidly-varying stress (compare Fig. 1c).

If  $T = 0$  the absence of thermal fluctuations would mean that the system remains in its initial state and never breaks, despite the fact that the energy difference between initial and stressed states increases as  $\sigma(t)$  decreases. For  $T \neq 0$  [12] and  $v \neq 1$ , on the other hand, the rupture of the system is completely dominated by fluctuations, in which case the probability density  $P(f)$

for having a fragment of given size  $f$  is given by a binomial distribution  $P(f) = K_{(6,f)} \left( \frac{1}{6} \right)^f \left( \frac{5}{6} \right)^{6-f}$ , since each of the 6 neighbors of a given bead has probability  $\frac{1}{6}$  of forming a cluster with that bead. For finite  $(T; v)$ , finally, the fracturing is determined by the coherent motion of the  $N$  beads. In Fig. 2a-b we show the cumulative probability distribution  $P_>(f)$  for a given  $T$  and different  $v$ ; as we have seen above, the smaller the value of  $v$ , the larger the fragments. In Fig. 2a,  $s(t_f) = 0.5$ , whereas  $s(t_f) = 0.75$  in Fig. 2b. In order to calculate  $P_>(f)$ , we have averaged over 200 { 500  $N = 100$  } systems with different initial configurations, all at the same temperature  $T$ . (We chose to use many small systems rather than few large ones in order to get better statistics). Finite-size scaling of  $P_>(f)$  is shown in the inset of Fig. 2a, which allows us to extend our results (for the given  $(T; v)$ ) to the case  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . The lines are fits to a log-normal distribution; clearly, the data suggest this form of  $P_>(f)$  for large  $v$ . This is the signature of a fracturing process that happens in a multiplicative manner [13], where a given piece at a random point breaks into two pieces, which themselves randomly break into two other pieces, etc. For very small  $v$ ,  $P_>(f)$  crosses over to a Heaviside theta function, since in this case breakdown happens due to one large crack spanning the whole system. The speed for which  $P_>(f)$  can no longer be described by a log-normal distribution depends on  $T$  and  $N$ , and is due to finite size effects.

An instantaneous change in  $\sigma$  means a change in both the magnitude and the fluctuations of the forces. We find the system to respond in a qualitatively different manner to changes in  $\sigma$  depending if it is  $< \sigma_c$  or  $> \sigma_c$ . For a broad range of speeds  $v$ , we find the average magnitude of the force on the beads,  $F = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i$ , and its fluctuation,  $F^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i^2 - \bar{F}^2 = N$ , to be independent of  $v$  for  $\sigma(t) < \sigma_c$ . We have also calculated the characteristic length,  $\xi(t)$ , of the stress field  $F[\mathbf{r}(t)]$  by taking the first moment of the radial averaged structure factor  $S(k; t)$ . In [4], a coarsening phenomenon of  $F[\mathbf{r}(t)]$  prior to the first fracture was found to be crucial for the subsequent rupture of the system; in the present model, we observe no time evolution of  $\xi(t)$  for  $\sigma(t) < \sigma_c$ , and  $\xi(t) \propto a$ . (however, when the first macro cracks appear,  $\xi(t)$  increases dramatically). Therefore, the observed dependence of  $P_>(f)$  on  $v$  must be due to the way the system responds to changes in  $\sigma$  after the  $\sigma_c$  point has been passed.

Whether or not the system has time to counteract the imposed stress passed  $\sigma_c$  depends on the timescale over which changes in  $\sigma$  take place compared to the response time of the system; the latter is determined by the random thermal motion, i.e., kinetic energy  $E_k$ , of the beads. The ratio of these two timescales is thus given by  $v^{-1} = (m^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma = E_k^{1/2}) = \frac{\sigma}{E_k} = v$ . One therefore expects systems with the same value of  $v$  to fracture in the same way. The fracture is expected to be dominated by fluctuations for  $v \ll 1$ , whereas for  $v \gg 1$  it will have

time to respond to the changing stress in a correlated manner. This is in fact verified in Fig. 3 which shows a remarkable invariance of  $P_{>}(f)$  over almost 3 decades in temperature for systems with two different values of  $\sigma$ . The lowest and highest temperature in Fig. 3 for which the invariance of  $P_{>}(f)$  no longer holds, and the subtle temperature dependence at intermediate values, can be understood from the dependence on stress of the force fluctuations  $F$ , shown in Fig. 4 for the same values of  $T$  as Fig. 3. Because of fluctuations, different temperatures lead to a critical  $s_c$  (defined as the  $s$  for which  $F$  has its minimum) slightly different from the mean field value of  $s_c = (s_0 - s_c) = 0 = 0.10$ . The small temperature dependence of  $P_{>}(f)$  at intermediate temperatures can then be understood in terms of a slight increase of  $F(s_c)$  with  $T$ , since one would expect larger force fluctuations at  $s_c$  to lead to smaller fragments. As seen in Fig. 4, the only exception to this is the case of the highest  $T$  where, on the contrary, a large  $F(s_c)$  leads to a large-fragment tail in  $P_{>}(f)$ . The reason for this is that  $T$  is so high that coalescence of already-formed fragments takes place; coalescence is not observed for lower  $T$ . Finally one also notes from Fig. 3 that deviations in  $P_{>}(f)$  occur for very low temperatures, where the simple scaling argument leading to invariance of  $P_{>}(f)$  under a given apparently no longer holds.

**Conclusion** | We have introduced a model where a dynamically-imposed stress induces fracture in a thin film. Using molecular-dynamics simulations, we have shown the accumulated fragment distribution function to obey a log-normal distribution characteristic of fracturing processes which happen in a random multiplicative manner. A mean field argument shows how the system undergoes an instability for a critical value of the imposed stress. We find a striking invariance of the fragment distribution function for a given ratio of temperature and speed of stress; the interval over which this invariance holds, is determined by the force fluctuations at the critical value of the stress.

J.V.A. wishes to acknowledge support from the European Union Human Capital and Mobility Program contract number ERBCHBGCT 920041 under the direction of Prof. E. Aifantis, as well as the hospitality of the D partement de Physique de l'Universit  de Montr al, where part of this work was carried out. This work was also supported by grants from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada and the "Fonds pour la formation de chercheurs et l'aide   la recherche" of the Province of Qu bec.

- [3] P. Meakin, *Thin Solid Films* 151, 165 (1987); A.T. Skjeltorp and P. Meakin, *Nature* 335, 424 (1988).
- [4] J.V. Andersen, Y. Brechet, and H.J. Jensen, *Europhys. Lett.* 26, 13 (1994); J.V. Andersen, *Phys. Rev. B* 49, 9981 (1994); K.-t. Leung and J.V. Andersen, *Europhys. Lett.* (in press June 1997).
- [5] J.-C. Anifrani, C. Le F loch, D. Somette and B. Souillard, *J. Phys. I France* 5, 631 (1995).
- [6] J.V. Andersen, D. Somette and K.T. Leung, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78, 2140 (1997).
- [7] E. Namgong and J.S. Chun, *Thin Solid Films* 120, 153 (1984).
- [8] A.J. Becker and J.H. Blanks, *Thin Solid Films* 119, 241 (1984).
- [9] Since the Lennard-Jones potential only depends on the ratio  $\sigma/r$ , an alternative interpretation is to have constant  $\sigma$  and  $r$  change in time either due to an expansion or inflation of the system [5,6].
- [10] M.P. Allen and D.J. Tildesley, *Computer Simulation of Liquids* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1987).
- [11] F.F. Abraham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77, 869 (1996).
- [12] We choose in all cases  $T < T_c$ , where  $T_c$  is the temperature for the solid-liquid phase transition of the overlayer.
- [13] J. Aitchison and J.A.C. Brown, *The Lognormal Distribution* (Cambridge, 1957); G. Ouilhon, D. Somette, A. Genter, and C. Castaing, *J. Phys. I France*, 6, 1127 (1996).

---

[1] A. Groisman and E. Kaplan, *Europhys. Lett.* 25, 415 (1994).

[2] C. Allain and L. Limat, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 74, 2981 (1995).

FIG .1. Snapshots of a  $N = 1600$  system at different times  $t$ , with different change of strain rate  $v$  and different final strain  $s(t_f)$ . The initial configuration is the same, and  $T = 6.25 \cdot 10^5$ , in all cases. (a)  $s(t) = 0.14; v = 0.0125$ , (b)  $s(t) = 0.25; v = 0.0125$ , (c)  $s(t = t_f) = 0.5; v = 0.0125$ , (d)  $s(t) = 0.25; v = 0.0015625$  and (e)  $s(t = t_f) = 0.5; v = 0.0015625$ .

FIG .2. Cumulative probability distribution  $P_{>}(f)$  for finding a given fragment of area larger than  $f$ , and  $T = 6.25 \cdot 10^5$  (a)  $s(t_f) = 0.5; v = 0.025$  ( ),  $0.0125$  (+),  $0.00625$  (2),  $0.0042$  ( ),  $0.003125$  (4) and  $0.0015625$  ( ). The lines to are fits to a log-normal distribution. Inset: finite size scaling with  $s(t_f) = 0.5, v = 0.0125; N = 100$  ( ),  $400$  (4) and  $900$  ( );  $s(t_f) = 0.75, v = 0.0125; N = 100$  ( ),  $400$  (+) and  $900$  (2). (b)  $s(t_f) = 0.75; v = 0.0375$  ( ),  $0.01875$  (+),  $0.009375$  (2),  $0.0046875$  ( ),  $0.003125$  (4),  $0.002679$  ( ) and  $0.002344$  (small white circle). The lines to are fits to a log-normal distribution.

FIG .2. Inset to Fig. 2a.

FIG .2. Fig 2b

FIG .3.  $P_{>}(f)$  versus  $f$  for fixed value of  $E_k^{1=2} = v$  and  $s(t_f)$  for a  $N = 100$  system. (i)  $\beta = 1.03, s(t_f) = 0.75$ , and  $(T; v) = (6.4 \cdot 10^2, 0.30)$  ( ),  $(1.6 \cdot 10^2, 0.15)$  (+),  $(4 \cdot 10^3, 0.075)$  (2),  $(10^3, 0.0375)$  ( ),  $(2.5 \cdot 10^4, 0.01875)$  (4) and  $(6.25 \cdot 10^5, 0.009375)$  (\*). (ii)  $\beta = 1.55, s(t_f) = 0.5$ , and  $(T; v) = (6.4 \cdot 10^2, 0.20)$  (large black circle),  $(1.6 \cdot 10^2, 0.10)$  (black circle),  $(4 \cdot 10^3, 0.05)$  (small white circle),  $(10^3, 0.025)$  (white circle),  $(2.5 \cdot 10^4, 0.0125)$  (large white circle) and  $(6.25 \cdot 10^5, 0.00625)$  (small black circle).

FIG .4.  $F$  versus  $s$  for  $\beta = 1.55$  and  $(T; v) = (6.4 \cdot 10^3, 0.20)$  ( ),  $(1.6 \cdot 10^2, 0.10)$  (+),  $(4 \cdot 10^3, 0.05)$  (2),  $(10^3, 0.025)$  ( ),  $(2.5 \cdot 10^4, 0.0125)$  (4) and  $(6.25 \cdot 10^5, 0.00625)$  (\*).

FIG .4. Fig 4-inset