

Irreversibility condition and stability of equilibria in the inverse-deformation approach to fracture

Arnav Gupta^{1,*}

¹Field of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA

*Corresponding author e-mail: ag2592@cornell.edu

Dedicated to Timothy J. Healey on the occasion of his 70th birthday

Abstract

We derive the irreversibility condition in fracture for the inverse-deformation approach using the second law of thermodynamics. We consider the problem of brittle failure in an elastic bar previously solved in [29]. Despite the presence of a non-zero interfacial/surface energy, the third derivative of the inverse-deformation map is discontinuous at the crack faces. This is due to the presence of the inequality constraint ensuring the inverse strain is nonnegative and the orientation of matter is preserved. A change in the material location of a crack results in negative entropy production, violating the second law. Consequently, such changes are disallowed giving the irreversibility condition. The inequality constraint and the irreversibility condition limit the space of admissible variations. We prove necessary and sufficient conditions for local stability that incorporate these restrictions. Their numerical implementation shows that all broken equilibria found in [29] are locally stable.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The inverse-deformation approach to fracture	3
2.1	Smoothness of weak solutions	5
2.2	Work done by external forces	7
3	Entropy production during quasistatic motion	8
3.1	End cracks	11
3.2	Internal cracks	11
3.3	Irreversibility condition	11
4	Stability of quasistatic equilibria	12
5	Numerical results	16
5.1	Stability analysis	17
5.2	Results	18
6	Concluding remarks	21

1 Introduction

The problem of fracture in solids is difficult due to the presence of cracks as discontinuities in the deformation map. This issue is tackled using the inverse-deformation approach to fracture in [29]. The inverse deformation h maps the deformed configuration to a material reference. It is extendable to a continuous,

piecewise smooth function even in the presence of cracks. A nonconvex constitutive model is introduced and regularized using the gradient of inverse strain. This regularization equips the model with a surface energy. The method is used to solve the problem of brittle failure in elastic bars. Failure under hard loading occurs due to an elastic instability at a critical load. Spontaneous nucleation of sharp cracks is predicted without using any damage/phase variables or pre-existing cracks. The stress in the bar drops to zero and the crack faces in the deformed configuration precisely delineate the material from empty space.

The nucleation and development of multiple cracks in coaxial composite bars is studied using the inverse-deformation method in [16]. Multiple cracks nucleate simultaneously in the brittle outer layer of such composites [25]. The outer layer continues to interact with the stiff inner core as the cracks open. In comparison to [29], the issue of development of cracks is nontrivial in [16]. Between [29, 16], the issue of nucleation and development of cracks in 1D bars is solved using rigorous bifurcation methods. In [21], the two problems are studied in the Γ -limit of the small parameter characterizing the inverse-strain gradient energy going to zero. In this limit, the crack surfaces are endowed with a constant surface energy, akin to the Griffith's theory of fracture.

We address two new questions in this article. First, how is the notion of irreversibility in fracture resolved for the inverse-deformation approach? Second, can an elastic bar as in [29] being stretched incrementally in tension result into a broken solution with internal or multiple cracks?

The study of fracture via an energetic approach is attributed to the seminal work of Griffith [15]. In this work, the propagation of crack is due to a competition between the energy required in creating new surfaces and the bulk elastic energy built in a solid due to the application of external forces. This viewpoint became the bedrock of modern fracture mechanics and inspired various new works in the field. The notion of irreversibility is introduced ad-hoc in Griffith's theory [27]. In modern terms, it is defined as follows: If at time t , $\Gamma(t)$ is the set of all material points on a crack surface, then

$$\Gamma(s) \subseteq \Gamma(t) \text{ for all } s \leq t.$$

The common loading results of equilibrium cracks in the Griffith's theory become unstable without this condition [27]. Irreversibility in the linear elastic fracture mechanics is incorporated by postulating pre-existing cracks that never shorten in length.

The physical intuition, and the necessity of an irreversibility condition in a model of fracture is clear. It is a fundamental building block for models proposed in the finite deformation fracture mechanics as well. The equilibrium equations in the finite deformation elasticity by incorporating Griffith's surface energy are derived using variational methods in [24, 31]. The authors incorporate irreversibility by limiting the admissible space. A broken configuration is considered admissible if the new surface of discontinuity contains or coincides with that of the previous state. Similar condition on irreversibility is also assumed in the works of Gurtin and Podio-Guidugli on fracture [18, 19, 20].

More recently, the phase-field method provided a viable regularization to sharp-crack, fracture models and rejuvenated the field of both analytical and computational fracture mechanics. This method circumvents the issue of discontinuous deformations by relying on the degradation of the elastic stiffness resulting in diffused cracks. The irreversibility condition is added ad-hoc in the form of an evolution law [14, 6]. It is assumed that the 'Griffith-like' potential goes to infinity if the crack set $\Gamma(t)$ decreases [7]. In other works like [10], the change in phase variable is *a priori* constrained to be unidirectional to incorporate irreversibility within the model.

The irreversibility condition is usually incorporated as a ad-hoc assumption in previous models. In contrast, we show that irreversibility is a consequence of the second law of thermodynamics in the inverse-deformation approach. We revisit the problem of failure in a elastic bar solved in [29]. For a broken solution, the inverse deformation and its first two derivatives are continuous but its third derivative is discontinuous at the crack faces. We study the effect of the motion of such discontinuities on the entropy of the system.

Entropy production due to the motion of discontinuities is well studied in the context of phase transitions [1, 4]. In the absence of interfacial energy, a multiphase solution has discontinuities in strain. The motion

of such discontinuities in the material configuration causes change in entropy of the system. Additional kinetic relations are postulated to ensure that the second law is satisfied and a unique solution path exists during a quasistatic motion of such materials.

Unlike in phase transitions, the third derivative h''' is discontinuous in the problem of fracture even in the presence of the higher-gradient energy. This is due to the inequality constraint $h' \geq 0$ that ensures the inverse strain is nonnegative and the orientation of matter is preserved. We show that the changes in the location of cracks in the material configuration decrease entropy and violate the second law of thermodynamics. The quasistatic motions that increase entropy are kinematically inadmissible. Consequently, the motion of the crack is restricted in the material reference and the entropy remains unchanged. The crack set $\Gamma(t)$ contains the cracks set of all times prior to it, resulting in the irreversibility condition.

The inequality constraint and the irreversibility condition have profound consequences on the stability of equilibria. They limit the admissible space and make the issue of stability non trivial. We study the stability of the broken equilibria of the elastic bar. Their stability is also studied in [29]. The authors show that the solution with an end crack at either of the two ends of the bar is the only stable broken solution. They construct a variation in h for which the second variation of the total energy is strictly negative for all other broken solution [29, Proposition 4.7]. This variation does not satisfy the restrictions due to the inequality constraint and the irreversibility condition. Consequently, it is inadmissible. We correct the error and provide rigorous necessary and sufficient stability conditions that incorporate these restrictions.

We show that the variations that have non-zero derivative in the vacuum region ($h' = 0$) are either inadmissible or are directions of increasing energy. Barring them, the variations that are non-zero in this region violate the irreversibility condition. We are only required to check for variations with support in the unbroken region, i.e. $h' > 0$. We show that a broken solution h is stable if each of the unbroken parts of the bar are independently stable. An unbroken part is independently stable if the energy increases locally for all admissible variation in h with support restricted to that part. This result aligns with our physical intuition of the problem. Furthermore, an unbroken part with crack faces on both its ends can freely translate within the empty spaces created due to opening of cracks. At a given stretch, these translations result into a one-parameter family of equilibria that have the same total energy. If the second variations of the total energy is positive for all variations that satisfy aforementioned restrictions and are perpendicular to such translations in the L^2 sense, we show that the solution is locally stable.

We implement this sufficient condition numerically using finite element methods and determine the stability of broken solutions found in [29]. We show that all broken solutions, including those with multiple cracks, are locally stable. The global minima appears in the first bifurcating branch with an end crack at one of the two ends of the bar and is energetically preferred, cf. [21]. The solutions with multiple cracks appear in the higher modes and are local minimizers. When an elastic bar is stretched incrementally, the bar may break and lock into any one of these minimizers, opening the possibility of internal or multiple cracks at failure.

We give an outline of the article here. In section 2, we provide the formulation to the inverse-deformation approach to fracture and describe the problem solved in [29]. We prove that h''' is discontinuous at crack faces. We end the section by finding the work done on a part of the body by forces external to it. We use this in section 3 to calculate the entropy production in the system during a quasistatic motion and derive the irreversibility condition. In section 4, we prove the necessary and sufficient second-order conditions for local stability. We determine the stability of broken solution using numerical methods in section 5 and find that all of them are stable. We end the article with some concluding remarks in section 6.

2 The inverse-deformation approach to fracture

Consider a bar occupying the region $\Omega := [0, 1]$ in the reference configuration. We fix one end of the bar and stretch the other to a length λ using a hard-loading device. The deformation map $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the boundary conditions

$$f(0) = 0, \quad f(1) = \lambda. \quad (2.1)$$

The stored-energy density function of the brittle material $W : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfies the conditions [29]

$$\begin{aligned} W &\in C^2(0, \infty); W(F) \nearrow \infty \text{ as } F \searrow 0; W(F) \nearrow \gamma > 0 \text{ as } F \nearrow \infty; \\ W(1) &= 0; W(F) > 0 \text{ for all } F \neq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

In contrast with standard 1D nonlinear elasticity, the function W is a Lennard-Jones type potential that asymptotes towards a constant γ as $F \nearrow \infty$. The total energy of the body is

$$E[\lambda, f] = \int_0^1 W(f'(x)) dx. \quad (2.3)$$




Figure 1: The deformation f maps the reference Ω onto the deformed configuration Ω_* . The inverse deformation $h = f^{-1}$ maps the deformed configuration Ω_* onto the reference domain Ω .

The deformed configuration is defined as $\Omega_* := [0, \lambda]$. Let $h : \Omega_* \rightarrow \Omega$ be the inverse deformation, as shown in Fig. 1. We use Shield's [30] change of variable $x = h(y)$, $f' = 1/h'$ in (2.3) and redefine the total energy

$$E^*[\lambda, h] := E[\lambda, h^{-1}] = \int_0^\lambda W^*(h'(y)) dy, \quad (2.4)$$

where $y \in \Omega_*$ and $W^*(H) = HW(1/H)$. In the inverse-deformation approach, we seek minimizers h of (2.4) that satisfy the boundary conditions

$$h(0) = 0, \quad h(\lambda) = 1. \quad (2.5)$$

We include the inequality constraint $h' \geq 0$. This ensures the orientation of matter is preserved.

The inverse-deformation formulation is mathematically equivalent to the usual *forward* formulation where we seek minimizers f of (2.3). However, the inverse-deformation formulation is better suited to the problem of fracture [29, 16]. Cracks in a 1D bar are characterized by jump discontinuity in the deformation map, viz. $F := f' \sim \infty$, rendering both analysis and numerical computation difficult. In contrast, cracks appear as zero slope region in the inverse deformation, i.e. $H := h' = 0$. Even when the actual deformation f may be discontinuous due to failure, the inverse deformation h maintains continuity. Furthermore, the Lennard-Jones type potential W appears as a double-well potential in W^* with the two wells at $H = 0$ and $H = 1$ [29]. This is similar to phase-transition problems, but here in terms of the inverse strain. The $H = 1$ well is the unbroken or ‘material phase’ while the $H = 0$ well represents empty space or the ‘vacuum phase’. Conservation of mass implies $H\rho = \rho^*$ where ρ and ρ^* are mass density in the reference and deformed configurations respectively. Consequently, the region in the deformed configuration where $H = 0$ has zero mass.

The energy in (2.4) doesn't penalize the creation of new surfaces, i.e. jump discontinuities in f . The minimizers h of (2.4) have arbitrary number of cracks and cannot sustain tension. This issue is resolved in [29] by introducing a higher-gradient energy in (2.4)

$$E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h] = \int_0^\lambda \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (h'')^2 + W^*(h') dy, \quad (2.6)$$

where ϵ is a small parameter. This higher-gradient energy endows the model with Griffith's surface energy in the limit of $\epsilon \searrow 0$, cf. [21]. The problem reduces to solving for the minimizers of (2.6), where h satisfies the boundary conditions (2.5) and the unilateral constraint $h' \geq 0$.

2.1 Smoothness of weak solutions

We define the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} := H^2(\Omega_*, \Omega)$. The admissible set is a closed convex cone defined as

$$\mathcal{K} = \{h \in \mathcal{H} : h(0) = 0, h(1) = \lambda, h' \geq 0\}. \quad (2.7)$$

Using the Sobolev embedding $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow C^1(0, \lambda)$, we characterize the inequality in (2.7) pointwise. For any $h \in \mathcal{K}$, we define the broken set

$$\mathcal{B}_h := \{y \in [0, \lambda] : h'(y) = 0\}, \quad (2.8)$$

and the good set

$$\mathcal{G}_h := [0, \lambda] \setminus \mathcal{B}_h \equiv \{y \in [0, \lambda] : h'(y) > 0\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Let $h, g \in \mathcal{K}$. The convexity of \mathcal{K} implies that $(1-t)h + tg \in \mathcal{K}$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. For a fixed λ , we define $e_\lambda(t) := E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, (1-t)h + tg]$. The function h is an equilibrium solution if $[de_\lambda(t)/dt]|_{t=0} \geq 0$. This gives the Euler-Lagrange inequality

$$\int_0^\lambda \{\epsilon^2 h''(g'' - h'') + S^*(h')(g' - h')\} dy \geq 0 \text{ for all } g \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $S^*(H) = \frac{dW^*}{dH}$.

We derive the Euler-Lagrange equation in h in Propositions 2.1 and 2.2. These results are already in [29] in terms of a different variable. We use them to prove new properties about the smoothness of fractured solutions in Theorem 2.1.

Proposition 2.1. *A point $h \in \mathcal{K}$ is a solution of (2.10) if and only if there exist a nonnegative Radon measure μ such that $\text{supp } \mu \subseteq \mathcal{B}_h$ and h, μ satisfy*

$$\int_0^\lambda \{\epsilon^2 h''\psi'' + S^*(h')\psi'\} dy = \int_{\mathcal{B}_h} \psi' d\mu \text{ for all } \psi \in H^2(0, \lambda) \cap H_o^1(0, \lambda). \quad (2.11)$$

Furthermore, $h \in C^2(0, \lambda)$.

Proof. Consider $\phi \in H^2(0, \lambda) \cap H_o^1(0, \lambda)$ such that $\phi' = 0$ in \mathcal{B}_h . There exists sufficiently small α such that $g := h \pm \alpha\phi$ is in \mathcal{K} . We substitute these in (2.10) and get

$$\int_0^\lambda \{\epsilon^2 h''\phi'' + S^*(h')\phi'\} dy = 0 \quad (2.12)$$

for all such ϕ . Let $\psi \in H^2(0, \lambda) \cap H_o^1(0, \lambda)$ such that $\psi' \geq 0$ in \mathcal{B}_h . We set $g = h + \psi$ in (2.10) and get

$$\int_0^\lambda \{\epsilon^2 h''\psi'' + S^*(h')\psi'\} dy \geq 0 \quad (2.13)$$

for all such ψ . The left side of (2.13) is a linear functional in $\psi' \in C^0(0, \lambda)$. By a version of the Riesz-Schwarz theorem [22] and (2.12), there exist a nonnegative Radon measure μ with $\text{supp } \mu \subseteq \mathcal{B}_h$, such that h, μ satisfy (2.11).

From (2.11), h''' in the sense of distributions is given by

$$\epsilon^2 h''' = S^*(h') - C_1 - \mu. \quad (2.14)$$

where C_1 is a constant. Integrating (2.14), we get

$$\epsilon^2 h'' = \int_0^y S^*(h'(\xi)) d\xi - C_1 y - C_2 - \nu, \quad (2.15)$$

where C_2 is another constant and $\nu' = \mu$ in the distributional sense. Since $h \in C^1(0, \lambda)$ and ν is non-decreasing, h'' is continuous using the same argument as in [29, Theorem 2.3]. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let h, μ be a solution of (2.11) and $G \subseteq \mathcal{G}_h$ be an open connected set. The solution h restricted to G is in $C^4(G, \mathbb{R})$ and satisfies*

$$\epsilon^2 h^{iv} - \mathcal{M}^*(h')h'' = 0, \quad (2.16)$$

where $\mathcal{M}^* := \frac{d^2 W^*}{dH^2}$.

Proof. Since $\mu \equiv 0$ in \mathcal{G}_h , (2.14) implies

$$\epsilon^2 h''' = S^*(h') - C_1 \quad (2.17)$$

in G . In view of $h \in C^2(0, \lambda)$, the right side of (2.17) is continuously differentiable yielding h restricted to G is in $C^4(G, \mathbb{R})$. Differentiating (2.17) once gives (2.16). \square

Although h is C^4 restricted to \mathcal{G}_h , we show that h''' is discontinuous at crack faces. An interface point or crack face $y_c \in [0, \lambda]$ separates the broken set from the good set. It is defined such that $h'(y_c) = 0$ and there exists no $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $h'([y_c - \alpha, y_c + \alpha]) = 0$. Let \mathcal{C}_h be the set of all crack faces of h . We assume no crack face is degenerate. For all $y_c \in \mathcal{C}_h$ there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $[y_c, y_c + \alpha] \in \mathcal{B}_h$ and $(y_c - \alpha, y_c) \in \mathcal{G}_h$ or vice-versa. This excludes the case when $h' = 0$ at a singular point, and the two faces of a crack touch each other.

Let ϕ be a field in Ω_* . We define the notation $[[\phi]]$ for $y_c \in \mathcal{C}_h$

$$[[\phi]] := \lim_{y \rightarrow y_c^+} \phi - \lim_{y \rightarrow y_c^-} \phi.$$

The function W is a Lennard-Jones type potential. This potential was originally designed to study intermolecular forces and is of the form

$$W_{LJ}(F) = \frac{A}{F^m} - \frac{B}{F^n} + C,$$

where A, B and C are constants and n, m are positive integers. Let $S_{LJ}(F) = \frac{dW_{LJ}}{dF}$. It is not difficult to show that $\lim_{F \rightarrow \infty} F S_{LJ}(F) = 0$. We use this observation in the following theorem:

Theorem 2.1. *Let h, μ be a solution of (2.11) and $y_c \in \mathcal{C}_h$ be a crack face. Then h''' and μ are piecewise continuous with jump discontinuity at y_c . Furthermore, at y_c*

$$\epsilon^2 [[h''']] = -[[\mu]] \neq 0. \quad (2.18)$$

Proof. Consider $B \subseteq \mathcal{B}_h$ be open and connected. Since $h' = 0$ in \mathcal{B}_h , we deduce $h''' = 0$ in B . Without loss of generality, we assume that $y_c \in \mathcal{C}_h$ is a crack face such that for $\alpha > 0$, $[y_c, y_c + \alpha] \in \mathcal{B}_h$ and $(y_c - \alpha, y_c) \in \mathcal{G}_h$. Using (2.17)

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow y_c^-} \epsilon^2 h''' = S_0^* - C_1, \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow y_c^+} \epsilon^2 h''' = 0, \quad (2.19)$$

where $S_0^* = S^*(0)$ is a constant. Similarly, we deduce that $\mu = 0$ in \mathcal{G}_h and $\mu = S_0^* - C_1$ in B . This implies,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow y_c^-} \mu = 0, \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow y_c^+} \mu = S_0^* - C_1. \quad (2.20)$$

Assume that h''' is continuous at y_c . This implies, $S_0^* = C_1$ and $\mu \equiv 0$ everywhere. Consider $\psi \in H^2(0, \lambda) \cap H^1_0(0, \lambda)$ such that $\psi' > 0$ in \mathcal{B}_h . The Euler-Lagrange equation (2.11) gives

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}_h} \{\epsilon^2 h'' \psi'' + S^*(h') \psi'\} dy + \int_{\mathcal{B}_h} \{\epsilon^2 h'' \psi'' + S^*(h') \psi'\} dy = 0 \quad (2.21)$$

The integral over the domain \mathcal{G}_h is zero due to (2.17) and the remainder implies

$$S_0^* \int_{\mathcal{B}_h} \psi' dy = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

Since $W^*(H) = HW(1/H)$, we get $S^*(H) = W(1/H) - S(1/H)/H$, where $S = \frac{dW}{dF}$. We evaluate in the limit of $H \rightarrow 0$, i.e. $F \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{H \rightarrow 0} S^*(H) = \lim_{F \rightarrow \infty} W(F) - FS(F), \implies S_0^* = \gamma > 0. \quad (2.23)$$

Moreover, $\int_{\mathcal{B}_h} \psi' dy > 0$ because $\psi' > 0$ in \mathcal{B}_h . This contradicts (2.22). Consequently, h''' is discontinuous at y_c with the jump given in (2.18). \square

Remark 2.1. The fact that $\lim_{F \rightarrow \infty} FS(F) = 0$ for a Lennard-Jones potential is used to show that $S^*(0) \neq 0$. Notwithstanding that, Theorem 2.1 is true for all W that satisfy hypothesis (2.2) and $S^*(0) \neq 0$.

2.2 Work done by external forces

The Euler-Lagrange equation (2.11) is the Eshelby's law or the configurational force balance [12, 13, 18]. In this section, we derive the linear momentum balance using the forward formulation. Our goal is to find an expression of work done on a part of the body by the forces external to it.

Consider for this subsection that $f : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_*$ is sufficiently smooth. By definition,

$$h = f^{-1}, \quad h'(y) = 1/f'(h(y)).$$

for all $y \in \Omega_*$. On further differentiating, we determine [29]

$$h''(y) = -\frac{f''(h(y))}{(f'(h(y)))^3}. \quad (2.24)$$

Substituting these in (2.6), the total energy equals [29, 8]

$$E_\epsilon[\lambda, f] := E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, f^{-1}] = \int_0^1 \frac{\epsilon^2 f''^2}{2 f'^5} + W(f') dx. \quad (2.25)$$

We determine the equation for linear momentum balance by evaluating

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\alpha} E[\lambda, f + \alpha\eta] \right|_{\alpha=0} = \int_0^1 \epsilon^2 \left\{ \frac{f''}{f'^5} \eta'' - \frac{5}{2} \left(\frac{f''}{f'^3} \right)^2 \eta' \right\} + S(f') \eta' dx = 0 \quad (2.26)$$

where η is an admissible variation in f and $S := \frac{dW}{dF}$. Using integration by-parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\epsilon^2 \frac{f''}{f'^5} \eta' \right]_0^1 - \left[\left\{ \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{f''}{f'^5} \right)' + \frac{5}{2} \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{f''}{f'^3} \right)^2 - S \right\} \eta \right]_0^1 + \\ & \int_0^1 \left\{ \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{f''}{f'^5} \right)'' + 5 \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{f''}{f'^3} \right) \left(\frac{f''}{f'^3} \right)' - S' \right\} \eta dx = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

The integrand in the second line of (2.27) provides the strong form equation. The first line of (2.27) equals the work done by external forces at the boundary.

Consider a domain $[x_1, x_2] \subseteq \Omega$. Let Δ_1 and Δ_2 be the change in displacements and v_1 and v_2 be the change in strain at points x_1 and x_2 respectively. The work done by forces external to the domain $[x_1, x_2]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} = & \epsilon^2 \frac{f''}{f'^5} \Big|_{x=x_2} v_2 - \left\{ \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{f''}{f'^5} \right)' + \frac{5}{2} \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{f''}{f'^3} \right)^2 - S \right\} \Big|_{x=x_2} \Delta_2 \\ & - \epsilon^2 \frac{f''}{f'^5} \Big|_{x=x_1} v_1 + \left\{ \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{f''}{f'^5} \right)' + \frac{5}{2} \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{f''}{f'^3} \right)^2 - S \right\} \Big|_{x=x_1} \Delta_1 \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

In terms of the inverse deformation, (2.28) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} = & \epsilon^2 H' H^2 \Big|_{y=f(x_2)} v_2 + \left\{ \epsilon^2 \left(H'' H - \frac{H'^2}{2} \right) + W^* - H S^* \right\} \Big|_{y=f(x_2)} \Delta_2 \\ & - \epsilon^2 H' H^2 \Big|_{y=f(x_1)} v_1 - \left\{ \epsilon^2 \left(H'' H - \frac{H'^2}{2} \right) + W^* - H S^* \right\} \Big|_{y=f(x_1)} \Delta_1 \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

where $H = h'$. The Cauchy stress in the bar equals

$$\sigma = \epsilon^2 \left(H'' H - \frac{H'^2}{2} \right) + W^* - H S^*$$

and is a constant due to the balance of linear momentum [29, Equation 5.6]. Hence, (2.29) simplifies to

$$\mathcal{W} = \epsilon^2 H' H^2 \Big|_{y=f(x_2)} v_2 - \epsilon^2 H' H^2 \Big|_{y=f(x_1)} v_1 + \sigma (\Delta_2 - \Delta_1). \quad (2.30)$$

We use this expression to determine the entropy produced in the system during a quasistatic motion.

3 Entropy production during quasistatic motion

Consider a quasistatic, time-dependent family of equilibrium solutions $h(y, t) : \Omega_*(t) \times [0, T] \rightarrow \Omega$, where

$$\Omega_*(t) := [0, \lambda(t)], \quad h(0, t) = 0, \quad h(\lambda(t), t) = 1.$$

The function $\lambda(t)$ gives the stretch value at time t . No inertia effects are considered here.




Figure 2: The domain $\mathcal{D}_*(t) := [\Delta_1(t), \Delta_2(t)] \subset \Omega_*$ with a simple crack face at $y = y_c(t)$.

Let $\mathcal{D}_*(t) := [\Delta_1(t), \Delta_2(t)] \subset \Omega_*$ be a domain in the deformed configuration as shown in Fig. 2. The point $y_c(t) \in \mathcal{D}_*(t)$ is a crack face such that $h' > 0$ for $y \in [\Delta_1(t), y_c(t))$ and $h' = 0$ for $y \in [y_c(t), \Delta_2(t)]$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. The elastic energy of the material in $\mathcal{D}_*(t)$ equals

$$U_\epsilon^* = \int_{\Delta_1(t)}^{\Delta_2(t)} \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (H')^2 + W^*(H) dy. \quad (3.1)$$

where $(')$ represents partial derivative with respect to y and $H = h'$.

The function H'' has a jump discontinuity at $y = y_c(t)$, cf. Theorem 2.1. Let (\cdot) represent partial derivative with respect to t . Using Leibniz's integral rule, the rate of change of energy during the motion is

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{U}_\epsilon^* &= \int_{\Delta_1(t)}^{y_c(t)} \{\epsilon^2 H' v'' + S^* v'\} dy + \int_{y_c(t)}^{\Delta_2(t)} \{\epsilon^2 H' v'' + S^* v'\} dy \\ &\quad - \left\| \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^*(H) \right\| \dot{y}_c \\ &\quad + \left\{ \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^*(H) \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_2(t)} \dot{\Delta}_2 - \left\{ \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^*(H) \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_1(t)} \dot{\Delta}_1,\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

where $v = \dot{h}$. Note that $\left\| \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^*(H) \right\| \dot{y}_c = 0$ because H' and H are continuous in y . We use integration by-parts and find

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{U}_\epsilon^* &= [\epsilon^2 H' v' + S^* v]_{\Delta_1(t)}^{y_c(t)} + [\epsilon^2 H' v' + S^* v]_{y_c(t)}^{\Delta_2(t)} \\ &\quad - \int_{\Delta_1(t)}^{y_c(t)} \{\epsilon^2 H'' v' + S^{*'} v\} dy - \int_{y_c(t)}^{\Delta_2(t)} \{\epsilon^2 H'' v' + S^{*'} v\} dy \\ &\quad + \left\{ \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^*(H) \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_2(t)} \dot{\Delta}_2 - \left\{ \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^*(H) \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_1(t)} \dot{\Delta}_1.\end{aligned}\tag{3.3}$$

Using integration by-parts once again yields

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{U}_\epsilon^* &= \llbracket \epsilon^2 H'' v \rrbracket + \int_{\Delta_1(t)}^{y_c(t)} \{\epsilon^2 H'' - S^*\}' v dy + \int_{y_c(t)}^{\Delta_2(t)} \{\epsilon^2 H'' - S^*\}' v dy \\ &\quad + \left\{ \epsilon^2 H' v' + S^* v - \epsilon^2 H'' v + \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^*(H) \right) \dot{\Delta}_2 \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_2(t)} \\ &\quad - \left\{ \epsilon^2 H' v' + S^* v - \epsilon^2 H'' v + \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^*(H) \right) \dot{\Delta}_1 \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_1(t)}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

The Euler-Langrange equation implies that $\{\epsilon^2 H'' - S^*\}' = 0$ in $(\Delta_1(t), y_c(t))$. Furthermore, $\{\epsilon^2 H'' - S^*\}' = 0$ in $(y_c(t), \Delta_2(t))$ because here $H = 0$.

We assume that h maps $\mathcal{D}_*(t)$ to a fixed domain $[x_1, x_2] \in \Omega$ such that

$$h(\Delta_1(t), t) = x_1, \quad h(\Delta_2(t), t) = x_2.\tag{3.5}$$

Differentiating these conditions with respect to t gives

$$v(\Delta_1(t), t) = -H(\Delta_1(t), t) \dot{\Delta}_1(t), \quad v(\Delta_2(t), t) = -H(\Delta_2(t), t) \dot{\Delta}_2(t).\tag{3.6}$$

We substitute (3.6) in (3.4) and get

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{U}_\epsilon^* &= \llbracket \epsilon^2 H'' v \rrbracket \\ &\quad + \left\{ \epsilon^2 H' (v' + H' \dot{\Delta}_2) + \left(\epsilon^2 H'' H - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^* - S^* H \right) \dot{\Delta}_2 \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_2(t)} \\ &\quad - \left\{ \epsilon^2 H' (v' + H' \dot{\Delta}_1) + \left(\epsilon^2 H'' H - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^* - S^* H \right) \dot{\Delta}_1 \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_1(t)},\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

The balance of linear momentum [29, Equation 5.6] implies that

$$\sigma = \epsilon^2 H'' H - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} H'^2 + W^* - S^* H,\tag{3.8}$$

where σ is the Cauchy Stress and is independent of y . Hence, (3.7) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{U}_\epsilon^* = & \llbracket \epsilon^2 H'' v \rrbracket + \sigma(\Delta_2 - \Delta_1) \\ & + \left\{ \epsilon^2 H'(v' + H' \dot{\Delta}_2) \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_2(t)} - \left\{ \epsilon^2 H'(v' + H' \dot{\Delta}_1) \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_1(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

We now determine the rate of work done by the forces external to the domain \mathcal{D} . Using (2.30)

$$P = \epsilon^2 H' H^2 \Big|_{y=\Delta_2(t)} \frac{dF(x_2, t)}{dt} - \epsilon^2 H' H^2 \Big|_{y=\Delta_1(t)} \frac{dF(x_1, t)}{dt} + \sigma(\Delta_2(t) - \Delta_1(t)). \quad (3.10)$$

where $F(x_1, t) = 1/H(\Delta_1(t), t)$ and $F(x_2, t) = 1/H(\Delta_2(t), t)$. Differentiating these with respect to t yields

$$\frac{dF(x_1, t)}{dt} = \left(\frac{1}{H(\Delta_1, t)} \right)^2 \left(v'(\Delta_1(t), t) + H'(\Delta_1(t), t) \dot{\Delta}_1 \right), \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\frac{dF(x_2, t)}{dt} = \left(\frac{1}{H(\Delta_2, t)} \right)^2 \left(v'(\Delta_2(t), t) + H'(\Delta_2(t), t) \dot{\Delta}_2 \right). \quad (3.12)$$

Substituting (3.11) and (3.12) in (3.10) gives

$$P = \left\{ \epsilon^2 H'(v' + H' \dot{\Delta}_2) \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_2(t)} - \left\{ \epsilon^2 H'(v' + H' \dot{\Delta}_1) \right\} \Big|_{y=\Delta_1(t)} + \sigma(\Delta_2 - \Delta_1). \quad (3.13)$$

The rate of energy dissipation from the domain \mathcal{D} is

$$D = P - \dot{U}_\epsilon^* = -\llbracket \epsilon^2 H'' v \rrbracket \quad (3.14)$$

Let $x_c(t) = h(y_c(t), t)$ be the location of the crack in the reference configuration. The *material velocity* of the crack is equal to

$$V = \dot{x}_c = v(y_c(t), t) + H(y_c(t), t) \dot{y}_c(t). \quad (3.15)$$

Since V and y_c are independent of y , (3.14) simplifies to

$$D = -\epsilon^2 \llbracket H'' \rrbracket V - \epsilon^2 \llbracket H'' H \rrbracket \dot{y}_c \quad (3.16)$$

From (3.8), we determine that $\llbracket H'' H \rrbracket = 0$. Hence,

$$D = -\epsilon^2 \llbracket H'' \rrbracket V = \phi V. \quad (3.17)$$

where $\phi = -\epsilon^2 \llbracket H'' \rrbracket$ is the “force on an interface” or “force on a defect” [11, 12, 23]. It is necessary that the dissipation is nonnegative during a quasistatic motion. This gives the condition

$$D = -\epsilon^2 \llbracket H'' \rrbracket V \geq 0. \quad (3.18)$$

This condition ensures that entropy production is positive at constant temperature, and is equivalent to the second law of thermodynamics [23]. Similar conditions are used in problems with discontinuous deformation gradient, such as in phase transitions, to determine *entropy admissibility criteria* [2, 3, 4]. Depending on the sign of ϕ for a given equilibria h , the direction of V is such that the inequality (3.18) is satisfied. Using (2.18) and (3.18), we determine that

$$\phi = \llbracket \mu \rrbracket, \quad D = \llbracket \mu \rrbracket V \geq 0. \quad (3.19)$$

Since μ is nonnegative, the sign of ϕ , and subsequently V is easily determined. We show that (3.19) requires $V = 0$. In the following two subsections we discuss cases of an end crack and an internal crack separately and determine this criteria of admissibility. These two cases cover all situations possible in the failure of the elastic bar.




Figure 3: The domain $[\Delta_1(t), \lambda(t)] \subset \Omega_*$ with a simple crack face at $y = y_c(t)$. The picture shows the deformation configuration of an end crack located at $x_c = 1$.

3.1 End cracks

We consider the domain $[\Delta(t), \lambda(t)] \subset \Omega_*$, as shown in Fig. 3. The point $y_c(t)$ is the crack face of an end crack such that the region $[y_c(t), \lambda(t)]$ is empty space. That is, $h'(y) = 0$ for all $y \in [y_c(t), \lambda(t)]$. Since μ is nonnegative and $\text{supp } \mu \subseteq \mathcal{B}_h$, we establish that $\llbracket \mu \rrbracket > 0$ at $y = y_c(t)$. From (3.19), $V \geq 0$ for entropic admissibility.

Since $h(\lambda(t), t) = 1$ and $h'(y) = 0$ for all $y \in [y_c(t), \lambda(t)]$, the location of crack $x_c(t) := h(y_c(t), t)$ equals 1. If $V > 0$, then x_c increases beyond 1 and jumps out of Ω . This is kinematically inadmissible. Hence, the only option possible is $V = 0$.

Similarly, if the end crack was at $x_c = 0$, the sign of the driving force ϕ is switched and $V \leq 0$ for entropic admissibility. However, $V < 0$ is kinematically inadmissible by the same argument. We conclude once again that $V = 0$.

3.2 Internal cracks

Consider the domain $[\Delta_1(t), \Delta_2(t)] \subset \Omega_*$, as shown in Fig. 4. The points $y_1(t)$ and $y_2(t)$ represent the two crack faces of an internal crack such that $h'(y) = 0$ for all $y \in [y_1(t), y_2(t)]$. Let $\phi_1 = \llbracket \mu \rrbracket|_{y=y_1(t)}$ and $\phi_2 = \llbracket \mu \rrbracket|_{y=y_2(t)}$ be the driving forces at the two crack faces. Using the nature of μ , we determine that $\phi_1 > 0$ and $\phi_2 < 0$. From (3.19), the material velocities at the two crack faces satisfy $V_1 \geq 0$ and $V_2 \leq 0$.




Figure 4: The domain $[\Delta_1(t), \lambda(t)] \subset \Omega_*$ with a simple crack face at $y = y_c(t)$. The picture shows the deformation configuration of an internal crack located at $x = x_c$.

Since $h'(y, t) = 0$ for all $y \in [y_1(t), y_2(t)]$, the crack faces map to the same material point, i.e. $h(y_1(t), t) = x_c(t) = h(y_2(t), t)$. This implies, the two material velocities satisfy $V_1 = \dot{x}_c(t) = V_2$. This is true if and only if $V_1 = V_2 = 0$. Therefore, the admissibility criterion in this case also requires $V = 0$.

3.3 Irreversibility condition

The material velocity $V = \dot{x}_c$ describes the motion of the crack in the reference continua. The admissibility criterion $V = 0$ implies that if a crack nucleates at $x = x_c$ in the reference domain, that breakage point remains the same throughout the motion. New cracks may nucleate during a motion but the *material* location of already nucleated cracks does not change. We define the crack set

$$\Gamma(t) = \{x \in [0, 1] : x = h(y, t) \text{ for } y \in \mathcal{B}_h\}. \quad (3.20)$$

The entropic admissibility criterion implies that

$$\Gamma(s) \subseteq \Gamma(t) \text{ for all } s \leq t. \quad (3.21)$$

Condition (3.21) is the irreversibility condition. Due to the non-classical nature of the broken solution h and the presence of inequality constraint $h' \geq 0$, h''' is discontinuous at the crack face. Motions of this

discontinuity that result into negative dissipation are disallowed. Certain motions may result into positive dissipation. However, these motions are found to be kinematically inadmissible. As a result, the cracks remain stationary in the reference configuration, resulting in (3.21).

This condition is used to define the space of admissible variations. At a crack face, $H(y_c(t), t) = 0$ for all t . We substitute this in (3.15) and find

$$V(t) = v(y_c(t), t) = \left. \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} \right|_{y=y_c(t)}. \quad (3.22)$$

The value of h at y_c does not change due to the irreversibility condition $V = 0$. The space of admissible variations at h is

$$\mathcal{V}_h := \{\eta \in H^2(0, \lambda) \cap H_o^1(0, \lambda) : \eta'(y) \geq 0 \text{ for all } y \in \mathcal{B}_h, \eta(y_c) = 0 \text{ for all } y_c \in \mathcal{C}_h\}. \quad (3.23)$$

The condition $\eta(y_c) = 0$ for all $y_c \in \mathcal{C}_h$ excludes variations that change the location of a crack in the reference domain. This has many consequences in the analysis of stability of equilibria. We discuss them in detail in the following section.

4 Stability of quasistatic equilibria

A solution $h \in \mathcal{K}$ is locally stable if it is a local minimizer, i.e. there exists an open, convex set $U \subset \mathcal{K}$ such that $h \in U$ and $E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, g] \geq E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h]$ for all $g \in U$. In this section, we prove the necessary and sufficient conditions for the stability of a quasistatic equilibria. The total energy $E_\epsilon^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in (2.6) at a given value of λ is twice Fréchet differentiable such that,

$$\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] = \int_0^\lambda \{\epsilon^2 (\eta'')^2 + \mathcal{M}^*(h')(\eta')^2\} dy \text{ for } \eta \in \mathcal{V}_h, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\mathcal{M}^* = \frac{dS^*}{dH}$.

Theorem 4.1 (Necessary condition). *Let $h \in \mathcal{K}$ be a local minimizer satisfying (2.11). Then for all $\eta \in \mathcal{V}_h$ such that $\eta' = 0$ in \mathcal{B}_h , it follows that $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] \geq 0$*

Proof. Let $\eta \in \mathcal{V}_h$ such that $\eta' = 0$ in \mathcal{B}_h . And let there exist $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $h + \alpha\eta \in U$, implying

$$E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h + \alpha\eta] \geq E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h] \quad (4.2)$$

. The definition of Fréchet differentiability [32] gives

$$E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h + \alpha\eta] - E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h] = \alpha \delta E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta] + \alpha^2 \delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] + o(|\alpha\eta|^2) \quad (4.3)$$

Since h satisfy (2.11), $\delta E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta] = \int_{\mathcal{B}_h} \eta' d\mu = 0$. Therefore, (4.2) and (4.3) mean $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] \geq 0$ for sufficiently small α . \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let $h \in \mathcal{K}$ be a solution of (2.11) at stretch length λ . If $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] > 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{V}_h$ that satisfy*

(A) $\eta'(y) = 0$ for all $y \in \mathcal{B}_h$,

(B) $\eta(y) = 0$ for all $y \in \mathcal{B}_h$,

then h is locally stable.

Proof. We first consider variations $\eta \in \mathcal{V}_h$ with $\eta' > 0$ in some $B \subseteq \mathcal{B}_h$. Using (2.11), the first variation of the energy $\delta E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta] = \int_{\mathcal{B}_h} \eta' d\mu > 0$. Substituting this in (4.3) for sufficiently small α gives $E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h + \alpha\eta] > E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h]$ locally for all such η irrespective of the sign of $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta]$.

The admissible variations that remain in \mathcal{V}_h satisfy the condition (A). For these η , $\delta E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta] = 0$ and the sign of $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta]$ determines stability. Condition (B) is a consequence of the irreversibility condition. For all $\eta \in \mathcal{V}_h$, $\eta(y_c) = 0$ for all $y_c \in \mathcal{C}_h$. In conjunction with condition (A), this gives condition (B). Let $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] > 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{V}_h$ that satisfy conditions (A) and (B). Then using (4.3), $E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h + \alpha\eta] > E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h]$ for sufficiently small α . We conclude that the solution h is locally stable. \square

Although the admissible space is \mathcal{K} and admissible variations are in \mathcal{V}_h , we show that second-order condition is satisfied by a minimizer in a smaller space of variations that satisfy conditions (A) and (B). We define this space as

$$\mathcal{S}_h := \{\eta \in \mathcal{V}_h : \eta \text{ satisfies conditions (A) and (B)}\}. \quad (4.4)$$

The conditions (A) and (B) have further physical interpretations. Cracks in a broken equilibria h result to multiple unbroken parts that are separated by empty space from each other. Theorem 4.2 implies that an equilibrium h is stable if each of these unbroken parts are independently stable. We show this in the following corollary:

Corollary 4.1. *Let $h \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfy (2.11) and $G_i := (r_i, s_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ be open, disjoint, connected subsets of \mathcal{G}_h such that $r_i, s_i \in \mathcal{C}_h \cup \{0, \lambda\}$. Furthermore, $\bigcup_{i=1}^N G_i = \mathcal{G}_h$. If $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta_i, \eta_i] > 0$ for all $\eta_i \in \mathcal{S}_h$, $\text{supp } \eta_i \subseteq G_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, then h is locally stable.*

Proof. Let $G_i := (r_i, s_i) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_h$ as defined in the statement and $\eta \in \mathcal{S}_h$. The second variation in (4.1) equals

$$\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] = \int_{\mathcal{G}_h} \{\epsilon^2(\eta'')^2 + \mathcal{M}^*(h')(\eta')^2\} dy + \int_{\mathcal{B}_h} \epsilon^2(\eta'')^2 dy, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{G_i} \{\epsilon^2(\eta'')^2 + \mathcal{M}^*(h')(\eta')^2\} dy \quad (4.6)$$

Let $\eta_i \in \mathcal{S}_h$ such that $\text{supp } \eta_i \subseteq G_i$, $\eta_i = \eta$ in G_i . The equation (4.5) further simplifies to

$$\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{G_i} \{\epsilon^2(\eta'')^2 + \mathcal{M}^*(h')(\eta')^2\} dy = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{G_i} \{\epsilon^2(\eta_i'')^2 + \mathcal{M}^*(h')(\eta_i')^2\} dy = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta_i, \eta_i] \quad (4.7)$$

Let $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta_i, \eta_i] > 0$ for all $\eta_i \in \mathcal{S}_h$, $\text{supp } \eta_i \subseteq G_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, then $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] > 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{S}_h$. Theorem 4.2 gives h is locally stable. \square

The subsets G_i defined in Corollary 4.1 are the unbroken parts of h separated by empty spaces. If the second variation in (4.1) is positive for all variations restricted to an unbroken part, we say that this part is independently stable. Corollary 4.1 allows us to determine the stability of the full solution by studying the unbroken parts individually.

Consider the unbroken part that has crack at its two ends. Let $G := (r, s) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_h$ such that $r, s \in \mathcal{C}_h$. Consider the function

$$\xi := \begin{cases} h' & y \in G \\ 0 & y \in \Omega_* \setminus G \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

Since $h \in C^2$ and $r, s \in \mathcal{C}_h$, we conclude $\xi(r) = \xi'(r) = \xi(s) = \xi'(s) = 0$. Therefore, $\xi \in \mathcal{S}_h$ with $\text{supp } \eta \subseteq G$. For $\tau > 0$ sufficiently small, consider $\phi := \xi + \tau\psi \in \mathcal{S}_h$ for some $\psi \in \mathcal{S}_h$. Evaluating (4.1) for

variation ϕ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2 E[\lambda, h; \phi, \phi] &= \int_0^\lambda \{ \epsilon^2 (\xi'')^2 + \mathcal{M}^*(h') (\xi')^2 \} dy + 2\tau \int_0^\lambda \{ \epsilon^2 \xi'' \psi'' + \mathcal{M}^*(h') \xi' \psi' \} dy \\
&\quad + \tau^2 \int_0^\lambda \{ \epsilon^2 (\psi'')^2 + \mathcal{M}^*(h') (\psi')^2 \} dy, \\
&= \int_r^s \{ \epsilon^2 (h''')^2 + \mathcal{M}^*(h') (h'')^2 \} dy + 2\tau \int_r^s \{ \epsilon^2 h''' \psi'' + \mathcal{M}^*(h') h'' \psi' \} dy \\
&\quad + \tau^2 \delta^2 E[\lambda, h; \psi, \psi].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Restricted to G , the solution $h \in C^4(G, \mathbb{R})$, cf. Proposition 2.2. We use integration by-parts in first two terms and get

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2 E[\lambda, h; \phi, \phi] &= [\epsilon^2 h''' h'']_r^s + \int_r^s \{ -\epsilon^2 h^{iv} h'' + \mathcal{M}^*(h') (h'')^2 \} dy \\
&\quad + 2\tau [\epsilon^2 h''' \psi']_r^s + 2\tau \int_r^s \{ -\epsilon^2 h^{iv} \psi' + \mathcal{M}^*(h') h'' \psi' \} dy \\
&\quad + \tau^2 \delta^2 E[\lambda, h; \psi, \psi].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Since $r, s \in \mathcal{C}_h$ are crack faces, we know that $h''(r) = h''(s) = 0$ and $\psi'(r) = \psi'(s) = 0$. Moreover, h satisfies (2.16) in G . Substituting these in (4.10) gives

$$\delta^2 E[\lambda, h; \phi, \phi] = \tau^2 \delta^2 E[\lambda, h; \psi, \psi], \tag{4.11}$$

also implying that $\delta^2 E[\lambda, h; \xi, \xi] = 0$. We show that ξ is tangent to a one-parameter family of equilibria that have the same total energy (2.6).

Theorem 4.3. *Let h be a solution of (2.11) at stretch length λ such that there exist an open, connected, unbroken region $G := (r, s) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_h$, $r, s \in \mathcal{C}_h$. Consider a region $R := (q, t)$, $q < r, t > s$ such that $R \setminus G \subseteq \mathcal{B}_h$, $h((q, r]) = x_1$, $h([s, t)) = x_2$ as shown in Fig. 5. A one-parameter family of functions $T : (q - r, t - s) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ is defined as*

$$T(\theta) = \begin{cases} x_1 & y \in (q, r + \theta) \\ h(y - \theta) & y \in (r + \theta, s + \theta) \\ x_2 & y \in (s + \theta, t) \\ h(y) & y \in \Omega_* \setminus R \end{cases} \tag{4.12}$$

where $\theta \in (q - r, t - s)$. Then T is a family of non-isolated equilibrium solutions that have the same total energy.




Figure 5: As defined in Theorem 4.3, the domain $G := (r, s) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_h$ is unbroken region and region $R := (q, t)$ such that $(q, r], [s, t) \in \mathcal{B}_h$.

Proof. Let $h_\theta := T(\theta)$ for some $\theta \in (q - r, t - s)$. We first show that h_θ is an equilibrium solution. We evaluate (2.10) for h_θ and get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\lambda \{ \epsilon^2 h_\theta'' (g'' - h_\theta'') + S^*(h_\theta') (g' - h_\theta') \} dy &= \int_{\Omega_* \setminus R} \{ \epsilon^2 h'' (g'' - h'') + S^*(h') (g' - h') \} dy + S_0^* \int_q^{r+\theta} g' dy \\
&\quad + \int_{r+\theta}^{s+\theta} \{ \epsilon^2 h''(y - \theta) (g''(y) - h''(y - \theta)) + S^*(h'(y - \theta)) (g'(y) - h'(y - \theta)) \} dy + S_0^* \int_{s+\theta}^t g' dy,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

where $g \in \mathcal{K}$. We use the change of variable $z = y - \theta$ and define function $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, $\varphi(z) = g(z + \theta)$ in the second integral. Equation (4.13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\lambda \{ \epsilon^2 h_\theta''(g'' - h_\theta'') + S^*(h_\theta')(g' - h_\theta') \} dy &= \int_{\Omega_* \setminus R} \{ \epsilon^2 h''(g'' - h'') + S^*(h')(g' - h') \} dy + S_0^*(g(t) - g(q)) \\ &+ \int_r^s \{ \epsilon^2 h''(z)(\varphi''(z) - h''(z)) + S^*(h'(z))(\varphi'(z) - h'(z)) \} dz + S_0^*(\varphi(s) - \varphi(r)), \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

We construct $\zeta \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\zeta = g$ in $\Omega_* \setminus R$ and $\zeta = \varphi$ in G . Substituting this in (4.14) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\lambda \{ \epsilon^2 h_\theta''(g'' - h_\theta'') + S^*(h_\theta')(g' - h_\theta') \} dy &= \int_0^\lambda \{ \epsilon^2 h''(\zeta'' - h'') + S^*(h')(\zeta' - h') \} dy \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

because h is an equilibrium solution. Therefore, h_θ are also equilibrium solutions. We find the total elastic energy (2.6) for h_θ

$$\begin{aligned} E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h_\theta] &= \int_{\Omega_* \setminus R} \left\{ \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (h'')^2 + W^*(h') \right\} dy + \int_{r+\theta}^{s+\theta} \left\{ \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (h''(y - \theta))^2 + W^*(h'(y - \theta)) \right\} dy \\ &= E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h], \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

due to a simple change of variable. The energy is independent of θ and equals $E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h]$ for all $\theta \in (q - r, t - s)$. \square




Figure 6: The black and grey rectangles are used to show the unbroken regions of the bar. The black region can translate within the empty space between the two grey regions.

It is not difficult to show that $T'(0) = -\xi$. The family of equilibria $T(\theta)$ defines the translational motion of the unbroken region G within the empty space, as shown in Fig. 6. Such translations do not affect the solution energetically and are equivalent. An equilibrium h is stable if (4.1) is positive for all $\eta \in \mathcal{S}_h$ that are perpendicular to ξ in the L^2 sense. We show this to prove the following sufficient condition:

Theorem 4.4 (Sufficient condition). *Let $h \in \mathcal{K}$ be a solution of (2.11) at stretch length λ . Let $G_i := (r_i, s_i) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_h$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ be all the unbroken region such that $r_i, s_i \in \mathcal{C}_h$ and $\xi_i \in \mathcal{S}_h$ be defined as*

$$\xi_i := \begin{cases} h' & y \in G_i \\ 0 & y \in \Omega_* \setminus G_i \end{cases} \quad (4.17)$$

If $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta] > 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{S}_h$ such that $\int_{\Omega_*} \eta \xi_i dy = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, then h is locally stable.

Proof. Consider the interval $G_i := (r_i, s_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ define the L^2 inner-product in G_i such that $\langle u, v \rangle = \int_{r_i}^{s_i} uv dy$ for all $u, v \in L^2(G_i)$. We consider the variations $\varphi, \psi \in H_o^2(G_i)$ and note that

$$\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \varphi, \psi] = \int_{G_i} \{ \epsilon^2 \varphi'' \psi'' + \mathcal{M}^*(h') \varphi' \psi' \} dy = \langle \varphi, A\psi \rangle = \langle A\varphi, \psi \rangle, \quad (4.18)$$

where

$$A\varphi = \epsilon^2 \varphi^{iv} - (\mathcal{M}^*(h') \varphi')' \text{ for } \varphi \in C_o^4(G_i) \quad (4.19)$$

is a self-adjoint operator. Consider the eigenvalue problem $A\phi = \beta\phi$. The eigenvalues β_k are real and countable with no finite cluster point. The eigenfunctions ϕ_k are orthogonal in the L^2 sense and form a Schauder basis of $L^2(G_i)$. We point the interested reader to [9, Chapter 7] for a detailed exposition of these classical results.

Since h satisfy (2.16) in G_i , ξ_i is an eigenfunction of A with eigenvalue 0. We re-number the eigenvalues and eigenfunction such that $\beta_1 = 0$ and $\phi_1 = \xi_i / \|\xi_i\|_{L^2}$. Due to orthogonality of eigenfunctions, $\langle \xi_i, \phi_k \rangle = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$. For $\psi \in H_0^2(G_i)$,

$$\psi = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle \psi, \phi_k \rangle \phi_k = a_1 \xi_i + \zeta \quad (4.20)$$

where a_1 is a constant and $\zeta = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \langle \psi, \phi_k \rangle \phi_k$. Using (4.11), we conclude

$$\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \psi, \psi] = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \langle \psi, \phi_k \rangle^2 \delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \phi_k, \phi_k] = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \langle \psi, \phi_k \rangle^2 \beta_k \quad (4.21)$$

If $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \psi, \psi] > 0$ for all $\psi \in H_0^2(G_i)$ such that $\langle \xi_i, \psi \rangle = 0$ then the unbroken region G_i is stable. If this is true for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, the solution h is locally stable due to Corollary 4.1. \square

The stability of solutions of (2.11) was also studied in [29, Theorem 4.7]. The authors constructed a variation η for which $\delta^2 E_\epsilon^*[\lambda, h; \eta, \eta]$ is strictly negative for all solutions in bifurcation branches $n \geq 2$. From a careful reading of their proof we find that this η doesn't necessarily satisfy condition (A). Moreover, condition (B) was unknown to the authors and is also not satisfied. As a result, they incorrectly concluded that the only stable fractured solution appear in the $n = 1$ branch with an end crack. In the next section we numerically evaluate the solutions and check for stability using Theorem 4.4 and find that all broken equilibria in [29] are stable. The conditions (A) and (B) are relevant when the solution is broken $\mathcal{B}_h \neq \emptyset$. For the nonhomogeneous solutions that are unbroken, i.e. $\mathcal{B}_h = \emptyset$, the stability result in [29] holds and they are unstable. Therefore, we are interested in the stability of only the broken solutions here.

5 Numerical results

We use the finite element and active-set methods described in our previous work [16, Section 4]. We solve (2.11) using numerical continuation in the stretch parameter λ . Since the domain Ω_* is dependent on λ , we change variables to solve on a fixed domain. We define $\Omega_s := [0, 1]$ and introduce the variable $s \in \Omega_s$, $s = y/\lambda$. Furthermore, we define $u \in H^2(0, 1) \cap H_o^1(0, 1)$, $u' \geq -1$ such that $u(s) := h(\lambda s) - s$. The Euler-Lagrange equations (2.11) reduces to

$$\int_0^1 \left\{ \epsilon^2 u'' \phi'' + \lambda^3 S^* \left(\frac{1+u'}{\lambda} \right) \phi' \right\} ds = \lambda^4 \int_{\mathcal{B}_u} \{ \mu \phi' + \zeta(u' + 1) \} ds \text{ for all } \phi \in H^2(0, 1) \cap H_o^1(0, 1), \quad (5.1)$$

where μ is assumed to be in $L^\infty(0, 1)$ and $\zeta \in L^\infty(0, 1)$ is an admissible variation in μ . The set $\mathcal{B}_u := \{s \in \Omega_s : \lambda s \in \mathcal{B}_h\}$. The function μ now is the Lagrange multiplier for the inequality constraint $u' + 1 \geq 0$ and satisfies the Kuhn-Tucker conditions [16, 26]

$$\mu \geq 0, \quad \mu(u' + 1) = 0.$$

It is clear that $u \equiv 0$ is the homogeneous solution. A complete global bifurcation analysis of this problem is given in [29]. Consider a solution u on the n^{th} -bifurcation branch. If the broken region is excised, u is odd and $\frac{2\lambda_n^*}{n\lambda}$ periodic, where $\lambda_n^* = \text{len } \mathcal{G}_h$ [29]. Redistribution of the empty space \mathcal{B}_h between crack faces gives equivalent solutions, cf. Theorem 4.3. Without loss of generality, we consider the case where the empty space is distributed to give u odd and $2/n$ periodic. This allows us to compute the solution restricted to the domain $\Omega_n := [0, 1/n]$ and construct the complete solution u on the domain Ω_s using reflection symmetry.

Let the unknowns be $\bar{u} \in H^2(0, 1/n) \cap H_o^1(0, 1/n)$, $\bar{\mu} \in L^\infty(0, 1/n)$ such that $\bar{u} = u$ and $\bar{\mu} = \mu$ in Ω_n . We discretize the domain Ω_n in N elements and use piecewise cubic Hermite polynomials to interpolate \bar{u} . This interpolation allows the approximation of \bar{u} to be in $H^2(0, 1/n)$. At each node, there are three unknowns: \bar{u}_k , \bar{u}'_k , $\bar{\mu}_k$, where subscript k denotes the value of the function at the k^{th} -node. The right side of (5.1) is evaluated as follows:

$$\lambda^4 \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\bar{u}}} \{\bar{\mu} \bar{\phi}' + \bar{\zeta}(\bar{u}' + 1)\} ds \approx \lambda^4 \sum_{s_k \in \mathcal{B}_{\bar{u}}^d} \{\bar{\mu}_k \bar{\phi}'_k + \bar{\zeta}_k(\bar{u}'_k + 1)\} \quad (5.2)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{u}}^d := \{s_k : k = 1, 2, \dots, N+1; \lambda s_k \in \mathcal{B}_u\}$ is the finite dimensional approximation of \mathcal{B}_u . The broken set $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{u}}^d$ is also unknown. We determine it along with \bar{u} using the active-set method [16, Section 4.1]. Once we obtain \bar{u} , we construct its $2/n$ -periodic, odd extension and find u in the domain Ω_s . The function μ is obtained from the even extension of $\bar{\mu}$.

5.1 Stability analysis

Given a solution u in the n^{th} -branch obtained above, we determine its stability numerically using Theorem 4.4. We define the set of variations for u equivalent to those for h in \mathcal{S}_h as

$$\mathcal{S}_u := \{v \in H^2(0, 1) \cap H_o^1(0, 1) : v'(s) = 0, v(s) = 0 \text{ for all } s \in \mathcal{B}_u\} \quad (5.3)$$

The second variation of the total energy (4.1) in terms of u equals

$$SV[\lambda, u; v, v] = \frac{1}{\lambda^3} \int_0^1 \left\{ \epsilon^2 (v'')^2 + \lambda^2 \mathcal{M}^* \left(\frac{1+u'}{\lambda} \right) (v')^2 \right\} ds \text{ for } v \in \mathcal{S}_u. \quad (5.4)$$

We consider the discretization of $\Omega_s = [0, 1]$ with nN elements. The solution u obtained through our numerical procedure is in the form of a vector U of length $2(nN+1)$. This vector is

$$U = [u_1 \quad u'_1 \quad u_2 \quad u'_2 \quad \dots \quad u_k \quad u'_k \quad \dots \quad u_{nN+1} \quad u'_{nN+1}]^T, \quad (5.5)$$

where subscript k denotes the value of the function at the k^{th} -node. We use the same interpolation for $v \in \mathcal{S}_u$ as we do for u . Therefore, v is approximated using the vector

$$V = [v_1 \quad v'_1 \quad v_2 \quad v'_2 \quad \dots \quad v_k \quad v'_k \quad \dots \quad v_{nN+1} \quad v'_{nN+1}]^T, \quad (5.6)$$

The values $v_k = v'_k = 0$ for all $s_k \in \mathcal{B}_u^d$ by definition and $v_1 = v_{nN+1} = 0$ due to the boundary condition. Let \tilde{V} be a vector of size $M \leq 2(nN+1)$ obtained by removing the known entries from vector V . The second variation in (5.4) is approximated as

$$SV[\lambda, u; v, v] \approx \tilde{V}^T G(U) \tilde{V} \quad (5.7)$$

where $G(U)$ is a $M \times M$ matrix assembled using our finite element discretization. The eigenvalues of $G(U)$ determine the stability of the solution. If the solution u has P number of broken regions such that both ends of the region are crack faces, then $G(U)$ has atleast P zero eigenvalues. If the remaining eigenvalues of G are positive, we conclude using Theorem 4.4 that u is stable.

5.2 Results




Figure 7: (a) Total energy E_ϵ^* versus stretch length λ . (b) Stress σ versus stretch length λ . The solid lines are locally stable and dashed lines are unstable solutions

We compute results for $\epsilon = 0.1$ and the constitutive law

$$W(F) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{F}\right)^2, \quad \implies W^*(H) = H(1 - H)^2. \quad (5.8)$$

We compute the $n = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ bifurcating branches. We use $N = 600/n$ elements and relative and absolute tolerances of 10^{-9} in the Newton's method. Figure 7a shows the total energy E_ϵ^* and Fig. 7b shows the stress σ in the bar as a function of stretch length λ . The solid lines show stable solutions and the dashed lines show unstable solutions. The homogeneous solution $h \equiv y/\lambda$, $u \equiv 0$ is shown in black. It loses stability at critical load $\lambda = 1.5163$. Subcritical pitchfork bifurcations branch out from the homogeneous solution and are shown in different colors. The two sides of the pitchforks are equivalent in terms of energy and stress and overlap each other in the two bifurcation diagrams.

In Fig. 7b, the bifurcation points on the black curve are marked with letters B_n . Along the bifurcating branches, the value of stress decreases until it reaches zero at the point N_n . These nonhomogeneous solutions with non-zero stress are not broken ($\mathcal{B}_h = \emptyset$) and are unstable. Cracks appear at a finite number of material points at N_n . Beyond this, the solutions are broken ($\mathcal{B}_h \neq \emptyset$) and locally stable. Since the stress is zero in all the broken solutions, the branches overlap each other in Fig. 7b even though the solutions are different, cf. Fig. 7a.

We incorporate Theorem 4.4 numerically and find that broken solutions in all bifurcation branches are locally stable. Beyond $\lambda = 1.2409$, the broken solutions in the branch $n = 1$ have the lowest total energy and are energetically favorable. This was also shown true in the limit of $\epsilon \searrow 0$ using Γ -convergence in [21]. The broken solutions in $n \geq 2$ branches are local minimizers and have higher total energy in comparison to broken solutions in the $n = 1$ branch. This is because more cracks require more surface energy to nucleate. An unbroken bar undergoing incremental loading transitions from the homogeneous solution branch to a branch with broken solutions. This may happen at loadings at which the branch has lower energy than the homogeneous solution or when the homogeneous solution loses local stability. The total energy in the system drops and stress goes to zero. Due to imperfections, inertial effects, randomness or other factors, the bar may transition into the a broken solution of $n \geq 2$ branch and lock into a local minimizer. In those cases, multiple cracks appear in the bar.




Figure 8: The deformation map f and inverse strain H for $n = 1$ to 4 branches at $\lambda = 1.9$. The letters A and B differentiate the two sides of the same pitchfork branch. The black solid lines shows the material and the red dashed lines show empty space




Figure 9: The deformation map f and inverse strain H for $n = 5$ and 6 branches at $\lambda = 1.9$. The letters A and B differentiate the two sides of the same pitchfork branch. The black solid lines shows the material and the red dashed lines show empty space

We show the deformation map f and inverse-strain H of broken solutions at $\lambda = 1.9$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ in Figs. 8 and 9. The letters A and B in the figures are used to identify the two different sides of the pitchfork branch. The black solid lines shows the material, i.e. $h' > 0$, and the red dashed lines show empty space with $h' = 0$. The crack faces precisely delineate the two regions.

In 1A, the crack appears at the right end of the bar, i.e. at $x = 1$. After the crack nucleates and λ is increased, the hard loading device moves further away. The unbroken region remains as it is. In contrast, the crack is at $x = 0$ in 1B. The unbroken region is attached with the hard loading device and moves along with it as λ is increased. The elastic, unbroken region in 1A, 1B and 2A are attached with one of the boundaries. None of the broken pieces in these solutions can translate within the empty space. Therefore, in these cases $P = 0$ and we find numerically that $G(U)$ has all positive eigenvalues. The solution 2B has two end cracks. The unbroken region in this case can translate within the empty space, cf. Theorem 4.3. In this case, $P = 1$ and $G(U)$ has one zero and all other positive eigenvalues. The remaining solutions can be seen as a combination of the above. Solutions 3A, 3B and 4A have one unbroken region each that can translate within empty space. Solutions 4B, 5A, 5B and 6A have two such regions and 6B has three such unbroken regions. The matrix $G(U)$ in each of these cases have the same number of zero eigenvalues as the number of such unbroken regions.

Transitions between local minima on different branches must satisfy the irreversibility condition (3.21). Consequently, transitions to a lower n -valued branch from a higher one are not possible. The transitions that satisfy the irreversibility condition are towards a higher n -valued branch and require an increase in the total energy of the system. Such transitions are not possible without an external intervention that results in this increase. A broken bar undergoing incremental loading using a hard loading device as in [29] remains locked into the same branch. The hard-loading device continues to move forward and the empty space between the crack faces increases without any change in the total energy.

6 Concluding remarks

The irreversibility condition in the inverse-deformation approach to fracture is derived using the second law of thermodynamics. We consider the problem of failure of an elastic bar solved in [29]. We show that the third derivative of the inverse-deformation map h''' is discontinuous at the cracks faces even in the presence of the higher-gradient, surface energy. This is due to the inequality constraint $h' \geq 0$ that ensures the orientation of matter is preserved. We derive the change in entropy of the system during a quasistatic motion. The motion of a crack in the material reference results in negative entropy production. Consequently, the cracks are not allowed to move in the material reference due to the second law. This results in the irreversibility condition (3.21).

We revisit the issue of stability of broken equilibria found in [29]. We show that the variations that may result in loss of stability are limited by the inequality constraint $h' \geq 0$ and the irreversibility condition. The support of such variations is restricted to the unbroken region \mathcal{G}_h of the bar. We show that a bar is stable if each of its unbroken parts are independently stable. We also show that the unbroken regions in a solution with a crack face at both of its ends are free to translate within the empty space created by opening of cracks. This results in one-parameter families of equilibria that have the same total energy. We prove necessary and sufficient second-order conditions for the local stability of equilibria. We implement the sufficient condition using a finite element method and show that all broken solutions obtained in [29] are locally stable. During incremental loading, an elastic bar fails and locks into one of the minimizers. The broken solutions in a $n \geq 2$ bifurcation branch result in internal or multiple cracks in the bar.

Using an appropriate oscillation or comparison theorem, it may be possible to show that all eigenvalues β_k in Theorem 4.4 are nonnegative. This will provide an analytical confirmation to the numerical stability results in this work. Such comparison theorems exist in the second-order Sturm-Liouville theory but are limited for a fourth-order ODE [9].

The second law of thermodynamics was previously used in fracture in [17, 19, 20, 18]. The authors assume irreversibility and determine a condition for the propagation of the crack tip akin to the J-integral [5, 28]. The issue of propagation doesn't arise here because there exists no crack tip in the failure of a 1D continua. In the fracture of a 2D elastic solid using the inverse-deformation approach, we expect that the second law will result in a condition for the propagation of the crack tip in addition to the irreversibility condition. We plan to explore this issue in a future work.

Acknowledgements

I am thankful to Timothy J. Healey and Phoebus Rosakis for many stimulating and helpful conversations. Their encouragement and advice was vital for the completion of this work.

References

- [1] R. ABEYARATNE AND J. K. KNOWLES, On the dissipative response due to discontinuous strains in bars of unstable elastic material, International journal of solids and structures, 24 (1988), pp. 1021–1044.
- [2] —, On the propagation of maximally dissipative phase boundaries in solids, Quarterly of applied mathematics, 50 (1992), pp. 149–172.
- [3] —, Nucleation, kinetics and admissibility criteria for propagating phase boundaries, Shock induced transitions and phase structures in general media, (1993), pp. 1–33.
- [4] —, Evolution of phase transitions: a continuum theory, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [5] C. ATKINSON AND J. D. ESHELBY, The flow of energy into the tip of a moving crack, International Journal of Fracture Mechanics, 4 (1968), pp. 3–8.

- [6] B. BOURDIN, G. A. FRANCFORT, AND J.-J. MARIGO, Numerical experiments in revisited brittle fracture, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 48 (2000), pp. 797–826.
- [7] —, The variational approach to fracture, *Journal of elasticity*, 91 (2008), pp. 5–148.
- [8] D. E. CARLSON AND R. T. SHIELD, Inverse deformation results for elastic materials, *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik ZAMP*, 20 (1969), pp. 261–263.
- [9] E. A. CODDINGTON AND N. LEVINSON, Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations, McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1955.
- [10] M. N. DA SILVA JR, F. P. DUDA, AND E. FRIED, Sharp-crack limit of a phase-field model for brittle fracture, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 61 (2013), pp. 2178–2195.
- [11] J. D. ESHELBY, The force on an elastic singularity, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 244 (1951), pp. 87–112.
- [12] —, Energy relations and the energy-momentum tensor in continuum mechanics, in *Inelastic behavior of solids*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1970, pp. 77–115.
- [13] —, The elastic energy-momentum tensor, *Journal of elasticity*, 5 (1975), pp. 321–335.
- [14] G. A. FRANCFORT AND J.-J. MARIGO, Revisiting brittle fracture as an energy minimization problem, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 46 (1998), pp. 1319–1342.
- [15] A. A. GRIFFITH, Vi. the phenomena of rupture and flow in solids, *Philosophical transactions of the royal society of london. Series A, containing papers of a mathematical or physical character*, 221 (1921), pp. 163–198.
- [16] A. GUPTA AND T. J. HEALEY, Nucleation and development of multiple cracks in thin composite fibers via the inverse-deformation approach, *Journal of Elasticity*, (2023), pp. 1–18.
- [17] M. E. GURTIN, Thermodynamics and the griffith criterion for brittle fracture, *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 15 (1979), pp. 553–560.
- [18] —, Configurational forces as basic concepts of continuum physics, Springer, 2000.
- [19] M. E. GURTIN AND P. PODIO-GUIDUGLI, Configurational forces and the basic laws for crack propagation, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 44 (1996), pp. 905–927.
- [20] —, Configurational forces and a constitutive theory for crack propagation that allows for kinking and curving, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 46 (1998), pp. 1343–1378.
- [21] T. J. HEALEY, R. PARONI, AND P. ROSAKIS, Sharp-interface limits for brittle fracture via the inverse-deformation formulation, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 190 (2024), p. 105717.
- [22] D. KINDERLEHRER AND G. STAMPACCHIA, An introduction to variational inequalities and their applications, SIAM, 2000.
- [23] J. K. KNOWLES, On the dissipation associated with equilibrium shocks in finite elasticity, *Journal of Elasticity*, 9(2) (1979), pp. 131–158.
- [24] K. C. LE, Variational inequalities in brittle fracture mechanics, in *Brittle Matrix Composites 2*, Springer, 1989, pp. 144–151.
- [25] S. K. MORANKAR, Y. MISTRY, D. BHATE, C. A. PENICK, AND N. CHAWLA, In situ investigations of failure mechanisms of silica fibers from the venus flower basket (*euplectella aspergillum*), *Acta Biomaterialia*, 162 (2023), pp. 304–311.

- [26] J. NOCEDAL AND S. J. WRIGHT, Numerical optimization, Springer, 2006.
- [27] J. R. RICE, Mathematical analysis in the mechanics of fracture, Fracture: an advanced treatise, 2 (1968), pp. 191–311.
- [28] ———, A path independent integral and the approximate analysis of strain concentration by notches and cracks, Journal of Applied Mechanics, 35 (1968).
- [29] P. ROSAKIS, T. J. HEALEY, AND U. ALYANAK, The inverse-deformation approach to fracture, Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, 150 (2021), p. 104352.
- [30] R. T. SHIELD, Inverse deformation results in finite elasticity, Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik ZAMP, 18 (1967), pp. 490–500.
- [31] H. STUMPF AND K. C. LE, Variational principles of nonlinear fracture mechanics, Acta Mechanica, 83 (1990), pp. 25–37.
- [32] M. M. VAINBERG, Variational methods for the study of nonlinear operators, Holden-Day series in mathematical physics, Holden-Day, Inc., 1964.