Tensile instabilities and loss of ellipticity for a fiber-reinforced nonlinearly elastic solid. CISM-course material.

P. Neff

Department of Mathematics,
Technische Universität Darmstadt
Schlossgartenstr. 7, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany

September 15, 2007

Abstract

In this paper we examine loss of ellipticity and associated failure for fiber-reinforced compressible nonlinearly elastic solids under deformations that give fiber extension. In particular, the analysis concerns a material model that consists of an isotropic base material augmented by a reinforcement depending on the fiber direction and referred to as reinforcing model. We examine a reinforcement that introduces additional stiffness under simple shear deformations in the fiber direction. In previous contributions it was shown for this material that loss of ellipticity under uniaxial tensile loading in the fiber direction requires a non-convex reinforcing model. Here we generalize this result and show that loss of ellipticity under plane deformations not associated to uniaxial loading in the fiber direction but that also create fiber extension may occur for convex reinforcing models. The implications of this result in the mechanical response curves of these materials are discussed. Furthermore, failure is interpreted in terms of matrix failure for polymer composites.

Keywords: Nonlinear elasticity; Loss of ellipticity; Fiber reinforcement;
Reinforcing models; Transverse isotropy

Abbreviated title: Instabilities in fiber-reinforced elastic solids

E-mail addresses: neff@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de (P. Neff).

paper based on joint work with J. Merodio [22]

1 Introduction

In the last few years, different materials are being analyzed in the context of anisotropic finite-strain elasticity. These include among other, biological, composite and synthetic solids. In particular, many of these materials are being modelled as fiber reinforced nonlinearly elastic solids since these materials often exhibit non-linear behavior during service and are anisotropic. In nonlinear elasticity, the constitutive equation of the material can be given in terms of a strain-energy function that depends on independent deformation invariants. In this framework, some of the studies that can be found in the literature just focus on certain characteristics of the strain energies, for instance, polyconvexity [2, 5, 6, 3, 7, 1], ellipticity [4] or deformation invariant formulations [8] (see also the references therein). Other works focus on the mechanical response of the constitutive equations since these are used to model different materials, for instance, [9] and [10]. Furthermore, a variety of phenomena related to the behavior of fiber-reinforced materials have been captured. These include, among other topics, residual stress [11], piecewise deformations [12, 13], fiber kink broadening [14] and cavitation instabilities [15].

A recent series of articles [16]–[21] within the framework of nonlinear elasticity has developed a continuum mechanical model to capture fiber failure or fiber instabilities in fiber-reinforced nonlinearly elastic solids under plane deformation. The onset of failure is assumed to occur at loss of ellipticity of the governing differential equations. At the breakdown of ellipticity surfaces of discontinuity may arise inside the material. Depending on the loading regime and on the direction of the normal to these surfaces of discontinuity relative to the fiber direction, the mechanism of failure was interpreted in terms of fiber kinking, fiber splitting, fiber de-bonding or matrix failure. Furthermore, the loss of ellipticity condition was related to both the convexity of the function that gives the strain energy of the material as well as the convexity and monotonicity of the nominal stress in particular directions of that material. Fiber kinking and fiber splitting were associated to fiber compression. Fiber de-bonding and matrix failure were associated to fiber extension. The failure mechanisms were captured under uniaxial loadings in the fiber direction. For plane deformations that give fiber compression the loss of ellipticity analysis and associated failure was also carried out. On the other hand, the loss of ellipticity analysis and associated failure in these materials under plane deformations giving fiber extension but not related to uniaxial loading in the fiber direction was left opened. Here we will focus on this analysis, namely, we will study the loss of ellipticity in fiber reinforced compressible nonlinearly elastic solids under plane deformations that give fiber extension. This analysis is intimately related to the matrix failure mechanism.

The anisotropy of homogeneous fiber reinforced nonlinearly elastic solids is characterized by two independent deformation invariants in three dimensions. We denote these invariants by I_4 and I_5. The invariant I_4 represents the square of the stretch in the direction of the fiber reinforcement. The invariant I_5 is related to the fiber stretch but registers, additionally, the reaction of the reinforcement to shear deformations and to deformations of surface area elements normal to the fiber direction [17]. It is well known that the isotropy of a compressible material is characterized by the three invariants I_1, I_2, I_3 of the Cauchy-Green deformation tensors. The combination of these five invariants give the more general homogeneous transversely isotropic nonlinearly elastic solid. For fiber-reinforced nonlinearly elastic materials, the strain energy function is considered to be given by two terms: one term that reflects the isotropic character of the material, i.e. a function that depends only on the three invariants I_1, I_2, I_3; and another term that reflects the transversely isotropic character of the material, i.e., a function that depends on the two direction-dependent invariants I_4, I_5. The second anisotropic term is referred to as the reinforcing model. In our analysis and following [16] a constitutive model consisting of an isotropic base material augmented by a uniaxial reinforcement depending on only one of the two anisotropic invariants has been used.

More specifically, the results obtained in [16]–[21] are the following. The analysis for incompressible materials was contained in [16], where, for anisotropy characterized solely by I_4, under uniaxial loading in the fiber direction, it was shown that (a) the failure mechanism captured in compression is fiber kinking, and (b) in tension it is fiber de-bonding. On the other hand, for anisotropy characterized solely by I_5 under the same loading conditions, we found that (a) compressive failure is associated with fiber kinking and fiber splitting, and (b) tensile failure is associated with shear bands in the sense that the discontinuity surfaces are not close to either the fiber direction or its normal. In [17] and [21], the same analysis was carried out for compressible materials. In [17], for I_4-based anisotropy, it was shown that the results are similar as for incompressible materials. In [21] I_5-based anisotropy was chosen, and, as for incompressible materials, it was shown that compressive failure may be associated with fiber kinking and fiber splitting. On the other hand, tensile failure was related to matrix failure as opposed to the incompressible case. For both invariants, loss of ellipticity cannot be avoided under fiber compression. Furthermore, for I_4-based anisotropy, failure can be avoided under fiber extension if the reinforcing model is convex. Nevertheless, as distinct from the results obtained for the I_4-based anisotropy, it was found that loss of ellipticity is possible for convex reinforcing models when $I_5 > 1$. However, this is not so in the special case of uniaxial tensile loading in the fiber direction, for which loss of ellipticity does require loss of convexity of the reinforcing model. This particular case is associated to fiber extension. Nevertheless, $I_5 > 1$ may involve fiber extension, i.e $I_4 > 1$, or fiber compression, i.e $I_4 < 1$. It follows that the reinforcing model may lose ellipticity under deformations obeying simultaneously $I_5 > 1$ and $I_4 < 1$. This is a parallel result to the one obtained just with the invariant I_4. On the other hand a question remained open: whether or not for plane deformations not related to uniaxial loading in the fiber direction and obeying simultaneously $I_5 > 1$ and $I_4 > 1$ the loss of ellipticity requires non-convex reinforcing models. This is on what we focus here, and, in particular, we show that for I_5-based anisotropy, convex reinforcing models may lose ellipticity under those circumstances.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the basic notation and some necessary relations in nonlinear elasticity. The material model and the ellipticity condition are introduced in Section 3. In Section 4, the main result of the paper is established, namely, it is shown that a convex reinforcing model depending on I_5 may lose ellipticity under plane deformations not related to uniaxial tensile loading in the fiber direction but that also create fiber extension. The analysis is not restricted to plane deformations. Nevertheless, a non elliptic plane deformation is given as an example to clarify the result. In Section 5 we summarize and discuss briefly the results obtained in the previous sections. Furthermore, the implications of these results on the stress strain curves of these materials are discussed.

2 Notation

For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we let $\langle a, b\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}$ denote the scalar product on $\mathbb{R}^3$ with associated vector norm $\|a\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^3} = \langle a, a\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}$. We denote by $\mathbb{M}^{3\times3}$ the set of real 3×3 second order tensors, written with capital letters. The standard Euclidean scalar product on $\mathbb{M}^{3\times3}$ is given by $\langle X, Y\rangle_{\mathbb{M}^{3\times3}} = \operatorname{tr}\left[XY^T\right]$, and thus the Frobenius tensor norm is $\|X\|^2 = \langle X, X\rangle_{\mathbb{M}^{3\times3}}$. In the following we omit the index $\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{M}^{3\times3}$. The identity tensor on $\mathbb{M}^{3\times3}$ will be denoted by $\mathbb{1}$, so that $\operatorname{tr}[X] = \langle X, \mathbb{1}\rangle$. We let Sym and PSym denote the symmetric and positive definite symmetric tensors respectively. With $\operatorname{Adj} X$ we denote the tensor of transposed cofactors Cof(X) such that $\operatorname{Adj} X = \det[X]\, X^{-1} = \operatorname{Cof}(X)^{\mathrm{T}}$ if $X \in \mathrm{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})$. For vectors $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have the tensor product $(\xi \otimes \eta)_{ij} = \xi_i\, \eta_j$. In general we work in the context of nonlinear, finite elasticity. For the total deformation $\varphi \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ we have the deformation gradient $F = \nabla\varphi \in C(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{M}^{3\times3})$. The first and second differential of a scalar valued function $W(F)$ are written $D_F W(F).H$ and $D^2_F W(F).(H, H)$, respectively.

3 Constitutive equations and ellipticity

We consider a homogeneous transversely isotropic compressible elastic solid. The transverse isotropy is characterized by the existence of a single fiber direction defined by a unit vector field denoted by $\mathbf{a}$ in the reference configuration. The strain-energy function (defined per unit reference volume) W depends on the five independent invariants mentioned in Section 1, i.e. on I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4 and I_5. Whence, we write

$$W = W(I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4, I_5). \tag{1}$$

The invariants I_1, I_2 and I_3 are the principal invariants of the left Cauchy-Green deformation tensor $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{F}^T$, or of the right Cauchy-Green deformation tensor $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{F}^T\mathbf{F}$, where $\mathbf{F}$ is the deformation gradient tensor relative to the natural or undeformed configuration. Therefore,

$$I_1(C) := \operatorname{tr}[C], \quad I_2(C) := \frac{1}{2}\left[(\operatorname{tr}[C])^2 - \operatorname{tr}\left[C^2\right]\right], \quad I_3(C) := \det[C]. \tag{2}$$

The invariants I_4 and I_5 are associated with the fiber reinforcement and depend on $\mathbf{a}$ as well as on $\mathbf{C}$. They are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} I_4(F) &:= \langle C, a\otimes a\rangle = \langle a, C.a\rangle = \langle F.a, F.a\rangle = \|F.a\|^2\,, \\ I_5(F) &:= \langle C^2, a\otimes a\rangle = \langle a, C^2.a\rangle = \langle C.a, C.a\rangle = \|C.a\|^2\,, \quad C = F^TF\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We note that $\sqrt{I_4}$ has an immediate interpretation as the stretch in the direction $\mathbf{a}$, as can be seen from $(3)_1$. Thus, I_4 registers deformations that modify the length of the fiber. In particular, in terms of rectangular Cartesian basis vectors $\mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{i}_2, \mathbf{i}_3$, with $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{i}_1$, we have simply $I_4 = C_{11}$. Similarly, $I_5 = C_{11}^2 + C_{12}^2 + C_{13}^2$. Hence, in general, I_5 registers changes in the fiber reinforcement length by means of the indicator C_{11} and shear deformations via the indicators C_{12} and C_{13}. In a more general sense, the invariant I_5 is related to the fiber stretch but registers, additionally, the reaction of the reinforcement to shear deformations and to deformations of surface area elements normal to the fiber direction [17]. It follows that $I_4 > 1$ implies that $I_5 > 1$. The argument above is sufficient to establish this latter condition in the case $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{i}_1$. Nevertheless, we provide a proof for any fiber direction $\mathbf{a}$. To see this point, use Cauchy-Schwarz to obtain

$$1 < I_4(F) := \langle C, a \otimes a \rangle = \langle a, C.a \rangle \leq \|a\| \, \|C.a\| \,. \tag{4}$$

Since $\|a\| = 1$ we have $\|C.a\| > 1$ which implies $I_5(F) > 1$.

For fiber reinforced materials, it is customary to simplify the general expression of the constitutive equation and consider that the strain energy is given by two terms: one associated to the isotropic base of the material and another associated with the anisotropic character of the material. Therefore, the strain energy can be represented as

$$\widehat{W}(F) := W_{\text{iso}}(I_1, I_2, I_3) + W_{\text{aniso}}(I_4, I_5) \,. \tag{5}$$

where W_{iso} characterizes the isotropic base and W_{aniso} characterizes the anisotropic part of the material model. The latter term is referred as **reinforcing model**. It follows that W_{iso} is a function that depends at most on the three invariants I_1, I_2, I_3. Similarly, W_{aniso} is a function that depends at most on the two invariants I_4, I_5. In our ellipticity analysis we will further restrict W_{aniso} to be a function of just I_5. Furthermore, we will discard W_{iso} as it may be appropriate for strongly anisotropic materials. It follows that the nominal stress S_1 corresponding to $\widehat{W}(F)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{S_1} &= 2W_{\text{iso}1}\mathbf{F}^T + 2W_{\text{iso}2}(I_1 1\!\!1 - \mathbf{C})\mathbf{F}^T + 2I_3 W_{\text{iso}3}\mathbf{F}^{-1} \\ &+ 2W_{\text{aniso}4}\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{FA} + 2W_{\text{aniso}5}(\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{FCA} + \mathbf{CA} \otimes \mathbf{FA}),\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where the subscripts $1, \ldots, 3$ on W_{iso} indicate differentiation with respect to $I_1, \ldots, I_3$, respectively, the subscripts $4, 5$ on W_{aniso} indicate differentiation with respect to I_4 and I_5 and $\mathbf{I}$ is again the identity tensor.

The energy function and the stress must vanish in the reference configuration (where $I_1 = I_2 = 3$ and $I_3 = I_4 = I_5 = 1$). Restrictions on $\widehat{W}$ in the reference configuration can be found in [17].

For plane deformations only two of I_1, I_2, I_3 are independent. Furthermore, if the fiber direction is taken to be in the considered plane, I_4 and I_5 are connected through I_1 and I_3 [17]. The in-plane part of the material response depends then just only on I_1, I_2 and I_4 or on any equivalent set of three independent invariants. The ellipticity of the governing two-dimensional equations also depends on only one anisotropic invariant, either I_4 or I_5. Nevertheless, reinforcing models depending on either of the invariants I_4, I_5, or a combination of both introduce a distinct anisotropic character to the material model due to the splitting of the strain energy. Whence, and from that point of view, the ellipticity analysis of the different reinforcing models have to be considered separately.

3.1 Equilibrium and ellipticity

In the absence of body forces the equation of equilibrium can be written as

$$\text{Div}\, S_1 = \mathbf{0} \,, \qquad S_1 = \frac{\partial \widehat{W}}{\partial \mathbf{F}} = D\widehat{W}(F) \,, \tag{7}$$

where S_1 is the nominal stress tensor. We say that $\widehat{W}(F)$ induces a (strictly) Legendre-Hadamard elliptic system or that the equations of equilibrium $(7)_1$ are elliptic if

$$\forall\, \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^3,\ \xi, \eta \neq 0 : \quad D_F^2 \widehat{W}(F).(\xi \otimes \eta, \xi \otimes \eta) \geq 0 \quad (>) \,, \tag{8}$$

where $D_F^2 \widehat{W}(F).(H, H)$ denotes the second differential of $\widehat{W}(F)$ evaluated in the direction H. In what follows we will consider the very special, simplified, case in which $W_{\text{iso}} \equiv 0$. This assumption is taken since we are interested in highly anisotropic materials. The effect of the matrix in a composite material material in different analysis is disregarded with respect to the effect of the fiber reinforcement. For instance, it is usually the case that the elastic modulus of the fiber is much higher than the one of the matrix and the fiber is assumed to bear the loads in the fiber direction. Whence, the constitutive equation is

$$\widehat{W}(F) = W_{\text{aniso}}(I_5(F)) = W_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,. \tag{9}$$

We focus on the ellipticity analysis of this strain energy function, i.e on the ellipticity analysis of the invariant I_5. To this end we need to compute the second differential of $\widehat{W}(F)$, namely $D_F^2\widehat{W}(F).(H,H)$ and evaluate the second differential for rank-one tensors $H = \xi\otimes\eta$. First, we compute the first differential. It is

$$D_F\widehat{W}(F).H = W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\; 2\langle C.a, (F^TH + H^TF).a\rangle\,. \tag{10}$$

Hence, the second differential is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} D_F^2\widehat{W}(F).(H,H) &= W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\;\left[2\langle C.a, (F^TH+H^TF).a\rangle\right]^2 \\ &\quad + 2\,W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\;\left[\langle (F^TH+H^TF).a, (F^TH+H^TF).a\rangle \right.\\ &\qquad \left. +\langle C.a, (H^TH+H^TH).a\rangle\right] \\ &= 4\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\langle C.a, (F^TH+H^TF).a\rangle^2 \\ &\quad + 2W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\;\left[\|(F^TH+H^TF).a\|^2 + 2\langle C.a, H^TH.a\rangle\right]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Now we specify the direction H as $H = \xi\otimes\eta$. Since for arbitrary $v\in\mathbb{R}^3$

$$H^TH.v = (\xi\otimes\eta)^T(\xi\otimes\eta).v = (\eta\otimes\xi)\,\xi\langle\eta,v\rangle = \eta\,|\xi|^2\langle\eta,v\rangle\,, \tag{12}$$

it follows that

$$H^TH = |\xi|^2\;\eta\otimes\eta\,. \tag{13}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} (F^TH+H^TF).a &= (F^T(\xi\otimes\eta) + (\xi\otimes\eta)^TF).a = F^T(\xi\otimes\eta).a + (\eta\otimes\xi)F.a \\ &= F^T.\xi\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \eta\,\langle\xi,F.a\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Using (13) and (14), the second differential (11) can be written finally as

$$\begin{aligned} D_F^2\widehat{W}(F).(\xi\otimes\eta,\xi\otimes\eta) &= 4\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\langle C.a, F^T.\xi\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \eta\,\langle\xi,F.a\rangle\rangle^2 \\ &\quad + 2W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\;\left[\|F^T.\xi\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \eta\,\langle\xi,F.a\rangle\|^2 + 2\langle C.a, |\xi|^2\,\eta\otimes\eta\rangle\right] \\ &= 4\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\langle C.a, F^T.\xi\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \eta\,\langle\xi,F.a\rangle\rangle^2 \\ &\quad + 2W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\;\left[\|F^T.\xi\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \eta\,\langle\xi,F.a\rangle\|^2 + 2\,|\xi|^2\,\langle\eta,a\rangle\,\langle F.a,F.\eta\rangle\right] \\ &= 4\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\;\left(\langle C.a, F^T.\xi\rangle\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \langle C.a,\eta\rangle\,\langle F^T.\xi,a\rangle\right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\;\left[\|F^T.\xi\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \eta\,\langle\xi,F.a\rangle\|^2 + 2\,|\xi|^2\,\langle\eta,a\rangle\,\langle F.a,F.\eta\rangle\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

A simple proof of the necessary and sufficient conditions for $\widehat{W}$ to be elliptic in the reference configuration can be found in [18]. In what follows we just note the reinforcing model that we will be considering. We require that $W_{\text{aniso}}(I_5(F))$ obeys

$$W'_{\text{aniso}}(I_5) > 0\;(<0) \quad \text{for} \quad I_5 > 1\;(<1), \quad W'_{\text{aniso}}(1) = 0, \tag{16}$$

and that

$$W'_{\text{aniso}}(I_5) \to -\infty\,(\infty) \quad \text{as} \quad I_5 \to 0\,(\infty). \tag{17}$$

Without loss of generality we may take $W_{\text{aniso}}(1) = 0$. These conditions guarantee that $W_{\text{aniso}}(I_5(F))$ is elliptic in the reference configuration. Furthermore, by continuity, it is elliptic in some neighbourhood of the reference configuration in the space of deformation gradients $\mathbf{F}$. These conditions also guarantee that the strain energy and the stress vanish in the reference configuration.

4 Ellipticity of I_5-reinforcing models

We are now concerned with the ellipticity of the energy function (9). More in particular, we focus on the ellipticity analysis of this strain energy function when the fiber is extended, i.e. when $I_4 > 1$ (that implies $I_5 > 1$). Since by (16) the strain energy function is initially convex in some neighbourhood of the reference configuration we try to establish if the strain energy needs to lose convexity in order to lose ellipticity, i.e. we try to construct non elliptic deformations that give fiber extension when $W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)$ and $W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)$ are positive. It was proved in [21] that under uniaxial loading in the fiber direction the loss of ellipticity implies that the strain energy is not convex. Here we focus on deformations that are not uniaxial load in the fiber direction. It is shown that the strain energy may lose ellipticity and that W_{aniso} be convex simultaneously.

4.1 Simple cases: uniaxial load in the principal directions

Let us investigate first two simple cases: uniaxial load in the fiber direction and uniaxial load transverse to the fiber direction. For the former case, $\eta = \lambda\, a$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Under these circumstances, the second differential (15) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} D_F^2\widehat{W}(F).(\xi\otimes\eta,\xi\otimes\eta) &= 4\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\big(\langle C.a, F^T.\xi\rangle\,\lambda\,\|a\|^2 + \lambda\,\langle C.a,a\rangle\,\langle F^T.\xi,a\rangle\big)^2 \\ &\quad + 2W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\big[\|F^T.\xi\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \eta\,\langle\xi,F.a\rangle\|^2 \\ &\quad +2\,|\xi|^2\,\lambda^2\,\langle a,a\rangle\,\langle F.a,F.a\rangle\big]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

It follows that if $W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)$ and $W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)$ are positive, then (18) is positive and loss of ellipticity is not possible.

Let us focus now on uniaxial load transverse to the fiber direction. In this case $\langle\eta,a\rangle = 0$. Under these circumstances, the second differential (15) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} D_F^2\widehat{W}(F).(\xi\otimes\eta,\xi\otimes\eta) &= 4\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\big(\langle C.a,\eta\rangle\,\langle F^T.\xi,a\rangle\big)^2 \\ &\quad + 2W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\|\eta\,\langle\xi,F.a\rangle\|^2\,. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

As in the previous case, if $W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)$ and $W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)$ are positive, then (19) is positive and loss of ellipticity is not possible. These results are in agreement with the results given in [17]

4.2 The case with $I_4 \geq 1$ as side condition

Now, loss of ellipticity for (9) is analyzed when the condition $I_4(F) = \|F.a\|^2 \geq 1$ is imposed. We take the second differential from (15) as

$$\begin{aligned} D_F^2\widehat{W}(F).(\xi\otimes\eta,\xi\otimes\eta) &= 4\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\big(\langle C.a,F^T.\xi\rangle\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \langle C.a,\eta\rangle\,\langle F^T.\xi,a\rangle\big)^2 \\ &\quad + 2W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\Big[|F^T.\xi|^2\,\langle\eta,a\rangle^2 + 2\langle F^T.\xi,\eta\rangle\,\langle\eta,a\rangle\,\langle F^T.\xi,a\rangle \\ &\quad +|\xi|^2\,\langle F^T.\xi,a\rangle^2 + 2\,|\xi|^2\,\langle\eta,a\rangle\,\langle F.a,F.\eta\rangle\Big]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Without loss of generality, we consider that $|\xi| = 1$. It follows that the second differential (20) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} D_F^2\widehat{W}(F).(\xi\otimes\eta,\xi\otimes\eta) &= 4\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\big(\langle C.a,F^T.\xi\rangle\,\langle\eta,a\rangle + \langle C.a,\eta\rangle\,\langle F^T.\xi,a\rangle\big)^2 \\ &\quad + 2W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\Big[|F^T.\xi|^2\,\langle\eta,a\rangle^2 + 2\langle F^T.\xi,\eta\rangle\,\langle\eta,a\rangle\,\langle F^T.\xi,a\rangle \\ &\quad +\langle F^T.\xi,a\rangle^2 + 2\,\langle\eta,a\rangle\,\langle F.a,F.\eta\rangle\Big]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We try to find F and directions ξ, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that (21) is nonpositive. We additionally assume $|\eta| = 1$. The deformation gradient $F \in \mathbb{M}^{3\times3}$ has to satisfy the following nonlinear two conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &\det[F] > 0\,, \quad \text{non singular deformation}\,, \\ &\|F.a\|^2 \geq 1\,, \quad \text{the side condition } I_4 \geq 1\,. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

We further look for F that obey

$$\begin{aligned} &\|F^T.\xi\|^2 = \varepsilon^2\,\|\xi\|^2\,, \quad \text{compression, but not in the fiber direction}\,, \\ &\langle\eta,a\rangle < 0\,, \qquad \langle C.a,\eta\rangle = \langle F.a,F.\eta\rangle > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where ε is a small positive number. The nine components of $F \in \mathbb{M}^{3\times 3}$ have to obey the five conditions in (22)–(23). After a straight forward computation, the second differential (21) using (22), $(23)_1$ and $|\eta| = 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} D_F^2 \widehat{W}(F).(\xi\otimes\eta,\xi\otimes\eta) &\leq 4\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\left(\|C.a\|\,\|F^T.\xi\| + \|C.a\|\,\|F^T.\xi\|\right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\left[\|F^T.\xi\|^2 + 2\,\|F^T.\xi\|^2 + \|F^T.\xi\|^2 + 2\,\langle\eta,a\rangle\,\langle F.a, F.\eta\rangle\right] \\ &= \|F^T.\xi\|^2\,\left(16\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\|C.a\|^2 + 8\,W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\right) \\ &\qquad + 4\,W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\langle\eta,a\rangle\,\langle F.a,F.\eta\rangle \\ &= \varepsilon^2\,\left(16\,W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\|C.a\|^2 + 8\,W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\right) \\ &\qquad + 4\,W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)\,\langle\eta,a\rangle\,\langle F.a,F.\eta\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Now use $(23)_2$ in (24) and take ε small enough. It follows that, since $W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2) > 0$,

$$D_F^2 \widehat{W}(F).(\xi\otimes\eta,\xi\otimes\eta) < 0\,. \tag{25}$$

Let us complete the proof by showing that the five conditions (22)–(23) can be met in the **planar case**. For some $\alpha > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, we take

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \begin{pmatrix}1\\0\end{pmatrix}, \quad \eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\alpha^2}}\begin{pmatrix}-\alpha\\1\end{pmatrix}, \quad \xi = \begin{pmatrix}0\\1\end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle a,\eta\rangle = \frac{-\alpha}{\sqrt{1+\alpha^2}} < 0\,, \\ F &= \begin{pmatrix}\beta & \gamma\\ 0 & \sqrt{\delta-\gamma^2}\end{pmatrix}, \quad C = F^TF = \begin{pmatrix}\beta^2 & \beta\,\gamma\\ \beta\,\gamma & \delta\end{pmatrix}, \quad \det[F] = \beta\,\sqrt{\delta-\gamma^2}\,, \\ F^T &= \begin{pmatrix}\beta & 0\\ \gamma & \sqrt{\delta-\gamma^2}\end{pmatrix}, \quad F^T.\xi = (\sqrt{\delta-\gamma^2})\cdot\xi\,, \quad \|F^T.\xi\|^2 = \delta-\gamma^2\,, \\ \langle C.a,\eta\rangle &= \frac{-\alpha\,\beta^2 + \beta\,\gamma}{\sqrt{\delta-\gamma^2}}, \quad \langle C.a,a\rangle = \beta^2\,. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Now choose

$$\beta > 1\,, \quad -\alpha\,\beta^2 + \beta\,\gamma > 0\,, \quad \delta - \gamma^2 = \varepsilon^2\,. \tag{27}$$

This example shows a nonelliptic deformation gradient obeying $I_4 \geq 1$ for positive $W''_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)$ and $W'_{\text{aniso}}(\|C.a\|^2)$ and finishes our argument.

5 Discussion and Summary

This analysis has been motivated by instability phenomena in fiber-reinforced composite solids. In particular, the materials under consideration are isotropic base materials augmented by a function that accounts for the existence of fiber reinforcement (the reinforcing model). The onset of fiber failure is established on the basis of loss of ellipticity of the governing differential equations for the considered elastic materials. A detailed analysis of the ellipticity status of the compressible I_5 reinforcing model without restricting to plane strain deformation has been provided under fiber extension. In particular, it has been found that loss of ellipticity (and hence fiber failure) is to be expected under fiber extension for which $I_4 > 1$ and $I_5 > 1$. Nevertheless, this is not the situation *under uniaxial tensile loading in the fiber direction*, for which loss of ellipticity does require that convexity of the reinforcing model $W_{aniso}(I_5)$ has been lost at a prior deformation. It follows then that the mechanical response curves of these materials will be convex at loss of ellipticity. This situation is not analogue to the one established for reinforcing models depending on I_4 for which ellipticity loss was related to loss of convexity or monotonicity of the nominal stress in the fiber direction [20].

The materials studied here would correspond to materials with a strong transversely anisotropic character, as e.g. in fiber composites. Fiber composite materials whose fiber reinforcement introduces sufficient additional stiffness in the composite shear modulus were considered. In the literature, [23, 24, 25] different experimental results have focused on failure in polymer composites and some remarks are appropriate. These analysis have shown that in fiber composites fiber tensile failure occurs either prior to the critical stretch at which fiber tensile failure occurs or close to the critical stretch at which fiber tensile failure occurs. The latter failure is captured when the fiber de-bonds from the matrix under tensile loading and has been the focus of [17]. More in particular, it was established that I_4-reinforcing models could model this kind of failure. The former failure is captured when the matrix fails under tensile loading and is further associated to the so called shear failure or combined tensile-shear failure, i.e. it is predicted that these materials fail in a shear type of mode. In our analysis of I_5-reinforcing models, loss of ellipticity and the associated failure may involve convex reinforcing models. Furthermore, convex reinforcing models do not lose ellipticity *under uniaxial tensile loading in the fiber direction*. Whence, failure is intimately related to fiber shearing as it is the case for polymer composites that fail in a shear type of mode. We conclude that the materials under consideration here in our analysis are sensitive to a possible fiber misalignment when loading is in the fiber direction. Furthermore, combined tensile-shear failure could be the failure mode.

References

[1] S. Hartmann, P. Neff. Polyconvexity of generalized polynomial type hyperelastic strain energy functions for near incompressibility. Int. J. Solids Struct. 40, 2767–2791 (2003).

[2] J. Schröder, P. Neff. Invariant formulation of hyperelastic transverse isotropy based on polyconvex free energy functions. Int. J. Solids Structures 40, 401–445 (2003).

[3] J. Schröder, P. Neff. Construction of polyconvex, anisotropic free-energy functions. Proc. Appl. Math. Mech. 2, 172–173 (2003).

[4] J. Schröder, P. Neff, D. Balzani. A variational approach for materially stable anisotropic hyperelasticity. to appear in Int. J. Solids Struct. (2005)

[5] J. Schröder, P. Neff. On the Construction of Polyconvex Anisotropic Free Energy Functions. IUTAM-Symposium on Computational Mechanics of Solid Materials at Large Strains. Ed. C. Miehe, Solid Mechanics and its Applications 108, 171–180 Kluwer Academic Publisher (2003)

[6] J. Schröder, P. Neff. Application of Polyconvex Anisotropic Free Energies to Soft Tissues. Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress on Computational Mechanics (WCCM V) in Vienna 2002, Eds. H.A. Mang and F.G. Rammerstorfer and J. Eberhardsteiner (2002)

[7] D.J. Steigmann, Frame-Invariant polyconvex strain-energy functions for some anisotropic solids, Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids, 8 (2003) 497-506.

[8] J.C. Criscione, A.S. Douglas, W.C. Hunter, Physically based strain invariant set for materials exhibiting transversely isotropic behavior, J. Mech. Phys. Solids 49 (2001) 871–897.

[9] J. Merodio, R.W. Ogden. Mechanical response of fiber-reinforced incompressible nonlinearly elastic solids. Int. J. Nonlinear Mech. 40, 213–227 (2005).

[10] G. A. Holzapfel, T. C. Gasser and R. W. Ogden, A new constitutive framework for arterial wall mechanics and a comparative study of material models, J. Elasticity 61 (2000) 1–48.

[11] A. Hoger, The elasticity tensor of a transversly isotropic hyperelastic material with residual stress, J. Elasticity 42 (1996) 115-132.

[12] Y.B. Fu and A.B. Freidin, (2004) Characterization and stability of two-phase piecewise-homogeneous deformations, Proc. Royal Soc. Lond. 460 3065-3084.

[13] J. Merodio and T.J. Pence, Kink surfaces in a directionally reinforced neo-Hookean material under plane deformation: I. Mechanical equilibrium. J. Elasticity 62, 119–144 (2001).

[14] J. Merodio and T.J. Pence, Kink Surfaces in a directionally reinforced neo-Hookean material under plane deformation: II. Kink band stability and maximally dissipative band broadening. J. Elasticity 62, 145–170 (2001).

[15] Polignone, D. A. and Horgan, C. O., 1993a. Cavitation for incompressible anisotropic nonlinearly elastic spheres. J. Elasticity 33, 27-65..

[16] J. Merodio, R.W. Ogden. Material instabilities in fiber-reinforced nonlinearly elastic solids under plane deformation. Arch. Mech. 54, 525–552 (2002).

[17] J. Merodio, R.W. Ogden. Instabilities and loss of ellipticity in fiber-reinforced compressible non-linearly elastic solids under plane deformation. Int. J. Solids Structures 40, 4707–4727 (2003).

[18] J. Merodio, R.W. Ogden. A note on strong ellipticity for transversely isotropic linearly elastic solids. Q. J. Mech. Appl. Math. 56, 589–591 (2003).

[19] J. Merodio, R.W. Ogden. On tensile instabilities and ellipticity loss in fiber-reinforced incompressible nonlinearly elastic solids. Mech. Res. Comm., in press (2005).

[20] J. Merodio, R.W. Ogden. Tensile instabilities and ellipticity in fiber-reinforced compressible nonlinearly elastic solids. Int. J. Engng Sci., to appear (2005).

[21] J. Merodio, R.W. Ogden. Remarks on tensile instabilities and ellipticity for a compressible reinforced nonlinearly elastic solids. Q. Appl. Math., to appear (2005).

[22] J. Merodio, P. Neff. A note on tensile instabilities and loss of ellipticity for a fiber-reinforced nonlinearly elastic solid. Arch. Mech. 58, 293-303, (2006).

[23] M.R. Piggott. Why interface testing by single-fibre methods can be misleading. Composites Science and Technology 57, 965–974 (1997).

[24] M.R. Wisnom. Size effects in the testing of fibre-composites materials. Composites Science and Technology 59, 1937–1957 (1999).

[25] C.K. Moon, W.G. McDonough. Multiple fiber technique for the single fiber fragmentation test. J. Appl. Polymer Sci. 67, 1701–1709 (1998).