

# On stickiness of multiscale randomly rough surfaces

G. Violano,<sup>1</sup> L.Afferrante,<sup>1</sup> A.Papangelo,<sup>1,2</sup> and M. Ciavarella<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Mechanics, Mathematics and Management,  
Politecnico of Bari, V.le Japigia, 182, 70126, Bari, Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*Hamburg University of Technology,  
Department of Mechanical Engineering,  
Am Schwarzenberg-Campus 1, 21073 Hamburg, Germany*

## Abstract

We derive a very simple and effective stickiness criterion for solids having random roughness using a new asymptotic theory, which we validate with that of Persson and Scaraggi and independent numerical experiments. Previous claims that stickiness may depend on small scale quantities such as rms slopes and/or curvatures, obtained by making oversimplified assumptions on the contact area geometry, are largely incorrect, as the truncation of the PSD spectrum of roughness at short wavelengths is irrelevant. We find stickiness is destroyed typically at roughness amplitudes up to three orders of magnitude larger than the range of attractive forces. With typical nanometer values of the latter, the criterion gives justification to the qualitative well known empirical Dalhquist criterion for stickiness which demands adhesives to have elastic modulus lower than about 1MPa. The results clarifies a much debated question in both the scientific and technological world of adhesion, and may serve as benchmark for better comprehension of the role of roughness.

Keywords: Roughness, Adhesion, Dalhquist criterion, DMT model

## I. INTRODUCTION

Contact mechanics with roughness has made tremendous progress in recent years, and adhesion has become increasingly relevant with the interest on soft materials, nano-systems and the analysis of bio-attachments (for two recent reviews [1, 2]). Contact between solids occurs via large van der Waals forces, usually represented, for example, by the well known Lennard-Jones force-separation law. These force give rise to a theoretical strength much higher than the typical values to break bulk materials apart. Hence, it appears as an "adhesion paradox" [3] that all objects in the Universe should stick to each other. This does not happen due to inevitable surface roughness at the interface, and Nature has developed different strategies to achieve nevertheless robust stickiness, including contact splitting and hierarchical structures ([4–6]). At macroscale, it appears that the only solution to maintain stickiness is to reduce the elastic modulus. This is well known in the world of Pressure-Sensitive Adhesives (PSA), soft polymeric materials showing instantaneous adhesion on most surfaces upon application of just a light pressure [7]. Dahlquist [8, 9] proposed that to achieve a universal stickiness, the elastic Young modulus should be smaller than about 1MPa (at 1Hz, as adhesive are strongly viscoelastic, their modulus depends on frequency). This criterion has no scientific validation, but appears to be largely used in the world of adhesives.

There have been various attempts to study the problem of elastic contact with roughness and adhesion. Fuller and Tabor (FT, [10]) used the Greenwood and Williamson [11] concept of describing a rough surface with a statistical distribution of identical asperities of radius  $R$ , together with JKR theory for the sphere contact [12]. FT found that adhesion was easily destroyed with RMS amplitude of roughness  $h_{\text{rms}}$  of a few micrometers in spherical rubber bodies against rough hard plastic surfaces. Their theory depends only on a single dimensionless parameter  $\theta_{FT} = h_{\text{rms}}^{3/2} \Delta\gamma / (R^{1/2} E^*)$  where  $E^*$  is the plane strain elastic modulus,  $\Delta\gamma$  is interface energy. The choice of  $R$  seems critical in view of its sensitivity to "resolution" or "magnification" [13], i.e. on the shortest wavelength in the roughness spectrum. In the "fractal limit", i.e. for an infinite number of wavelength  $R \rightarrow 0$ , there would be *no stickiness for any surface*, irrespective of the geometrical characteristics, like fractal dimension, or root mean square heights (rms) amplitude. Hence, FT apparent good correlation with the theory despite the many limitations (see [14]), may have been due to a fortuitous choice of  $R$  at a

relatively coarse scale where measurements were made at that time.

The JKR theory is not appropriate when contact spots become very small, and another theory is more promising in this case, which takes the name of DMT for the case of the sphere [15]. It makes it possible to solve contact problems with adhesion using results from the adhesionless problem, by assuming that the adhesive stresses do not alter the pressure in the contact area (which therefore remains purely under compression, and remains defined in the same way as "repulsive") nor the gaps outside the contact. The external pressure is therefore the difference of the repulsive and an adhesive pressure  $p_{ext} = p_{rep} - p_{ad}$ .

Pastewka & Robbins (PR, [16]) presented a criterion for adhesion between randomly rough surfaces after interpreting simulations of adhesive rough contact with relatively narrow band of roughness (as limited by present computational capabilities, see the Contact Mechanics Challenge of Muser *et al.* [17]), i.e. with wavelength from subnanometer to micrometer scales. Defining "magnification" as the ratio  $\zeta = q_1/q_0$  between the high  $q_1$  and the low  $q_0$  truncating wavevectors defining the spectrum of roughness, this means from  $\zeta \sim 100$  and up to  $\zeta \sim 1000$ . PR attempted to interpret the results on the (repulsive) area vs (external) load slope on the basis of a simplified DMT-like model using only the asymptotic expression for gaps at the edge of cylindrical regions defining a 'boundary layer' surrounding the 'repulsive' contact zone, which we shall here generalize removing some of the strong assumptions in the original derivation. PR obtained then a criterion that depends mainly on local slopes and curvature, i.e. on the tail of the PSD spectrum, and leads to a condition for stickiness  $\zeta^{-4+5D/3} < c$ , where  $c > 0$ . This implies all surfaces with fractal dimension  $D < 2.4$  should be *always* sticky in the fractal limit. This conclusion seems quite counterintuitive, and in a sense *more paradoxical* than the Fuller and Tabor one, as most natural surfaces and surfaces of engineering interest, e.g., polished or sandblasted, are indeed fractals over a wide range of scales and with  $D < 2.4$  [18]. So, this, again, would lead to the "sticky Universe" of Kendall [3]. Other recent theories by Ciavarella [19] with the so-called BAM model (Bearing Area Model) and Joe, Toughless and Barber (JTB, [20]) seem less paradoxical as estimate the pressure at pull-off between surfaces does not depend much on local slopes and curvature.

In order to derive a better criterion than FT an PR, it becomes imperative to dispose of a theory with enough accuracy for very broad spectra, typical of real surfaces which can be expected to have features from millimeter to nanometer scale, hence showing perhaps five

decades of roughness wavelengths, or more. Persson and Scaraggi (PS theory, [21]) provided a full theory based on the DMT assumption which, with some refinements [22], can be used for the purpose of deriving a "stickiness" criterion and its convergence in the fractal limit, finding the correct parameters dependences.

## II. A DMT THEORY BASED CRITERION

The Lennard-Jones force-separation law is usually represented as

$$\sigma_{ad}(u) = \frac{8\Delta\gamma}{3\epsilon} \left[ \frac{\epsilon^3}{g^3} - \frac{\epsilon^9}{g^9} \right] \quad (1)$$

where  $\Delta\gamma = \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \sigma(g)dg$  is the *interface energy* or, by definition, the work done in separating two bodies from the equilibrium position  $g = \epsilon$ , at which  $\sigma_{ad} = 0$ , per unit area of interface. The maximum tensile traction happens at a separation  $g = 3^{1/6}\epsilon$  and is  $\sigma_{th} = 16\Delta\gamma / (9\sqrt{3}) \epsilon$ . A possible simplification is to use a constant force-law [23]. Considering gaps from the equilibrium point namely  $u = g - \epsilon$ , imposing the same interface energy  $\Delta\gamma$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{ad}(u) &= \sigma_0, \quad u \leq \epsilon \\ \sigma_{ad}(u) &= 0, \quad u > \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\sigma_0 = 9\sqrt{3}\sigma_{th}/16 \simeq \sigma_{th}$  and  $\epsilon$  is the same range of attraction, so obviously  $\Delta\gamma = \sigma_0\epsilon$ .

Notice that if  $E^*$  is the plane strain elastic modulus,  $l_a = \Delta\gamma/E^*$  defines a characteristic adhesion length which for the typical Lennard Jones description of an interface between crystals of the same material is  $l_a \simeq 0.05\epsilon$ . The theoretical strength in this case,  $\sigma_0 = l_a E^*/\epsilon = 0.05E^*$  represents a very high value.

In DMT theories, the adhesive pressure is computed by convolution of the elementary tension-separation law  $\sigma_{ad}(u)$  with the distribution of gaps  $P(u)$ , which for the Maugis potential (2), simplifies to

$$p_{ad} = \sigma_0 \int_0^{\epsilon} du P(u) = \sigma_0 \frac{A_{ad}}{A_{nom}} \quad (3)$$

where  $A_{ad}$  is the "adhesive" contact area, i.e. the region where tensile stress are applied, and  $A_{nom}$  is the "nominal" or "apparent" contact area. An elaborate expression for  $P(u)$  (for

the purely repulsive problem, i.e. in the absence of any adhesion) is obtained in Persson's theory (see [22]).




FIG. 1: (A) Distribution of gaps  $P(u)$  (black, blue and red line respectively for  $\zeta = 10, 100, 1000$ ) with an asymptotic fit  $P(u) \sim u^{-1/3}$  as guide to the eye (dashed black line).

Case with fractal dimension  $D = 2.2$  (or Hurst exponent  $H = 0.8$ ). interfacial mean separation  $\bar{u}/h_{rms} = 2$  and pure power law power spectrum random roughness. (B) Convergence of  $P(u)$  with increasing magnifications for various values of gap  $u/h_{rms}$ . Case with  $H = 0.8$ ,  $\bar{u}/h_{rms} = 1.37$ .

Results of the stickiness criterion of PR seem to suggest that there should be no asymptotic expression (in the fractal limit) to  $P(u)$ . However, Fig. 1 shows that there is a convergence in the distribution for increasing magnification  $\zeta$  and furthermore there is an asymptotic scaling at low separations  $P(u) \sim u^{-1/3}$ . Results in Fig. (1a) are given for pure power law PSD (Power Spectrum Density), fractal dimension  $D = 2.2$  (i.e. Hurst exponent  $H = 3 - D = 0.8$ ) and for a mean gap  $\bar{u}$  equal to twice the RMS amplitude of roughness,  $\bar{u}/h_{rms} = 2$ . We define a non-dimensional pressure  $\hat{p}_{rep} = p_{rep}/(E^*q_0h_{rms})$  and we remark that, for typical real surfaces  $H \gtrsim 0.6$ , in the limit of relatively large  $\zeta$  and small pressures, Persson's theory reduces to  $\hat{p}_{rep} \simeq \exp(-2\bar{u}/h_{rms})$  ([24, 25]). As we are essentially interested in the region of the area-load relationship near the axes origin, we disregard  $\bar{u}/h_{rms} < 1$ , and also  $\bar{u}/h_{rms} > 3$  where we are likely to have finite effects due to poor statistics of the Gaussian surfaces and very few asperities in contact. This corresponds therefore to the range

$$\widehat{p}_{rep} = 10^{-3} \div 10^{-1}.$$

Furthermore, the range of attractive forces of interest is  $\epsilon \ll h_{rms}$ , where we can assume that the main contribution to the gaps and hence to adhesion comes from the asymptotic value of  $P(u)$  at low  $u$ , namely from the regions close to the contact boundaries. We can obtain this asymptotic form of  $P(u)$  from standard contact mechanics theory, and from the asymptotic part of Persson's theory [26], whereas we shall use the full Persson's theory only for the actual calculation of the prefactors (see Methods).

Specifically, as in detail shown in Methods, the attractive area can be given as

$$\frac{A_{ad}}{A_{nom}} = \frac{3}{2} a_V \widehat{p}_{rep} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{h_{rms}} \right)^{2/3} \quad (4)$$

being the coefficient  $a_V$

$$a_V = \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{4}{9} \right)^{1/3} \frac{9}{32\beta^{8/3}} \frac{\langle d^{1/3} \rangle}{\langle d \rangle} E^{*3} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi V^3}} q_0 h_{rms}^{5/3} \quad (5)$$

where  $V = \frac{1}{2} E^{*2} m_2$  is the variance of full contact pressures,  $m_2$  is the mean square profile slope along any direction (for a isotropic surface),  $d$  is a local characteristic length scale,  $\beta$  is a geometrical factor of order 1, and  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  denotes the mean value of the argument. Notice, in eqt. (4),  $A_{ad}/A_{nom}$  is proportional to the external mean pressure if  $\langle d^{1/3} \rangle / \langle d \rangle$  does not depend on pressure.

It is not worth to compute  $a_V$  directly from (5) because of the problematic term  $\langle d^{1/3} \rangle / \langle d \rangle$ , and therefore we fit the global  $A_{ad}/A_{nom}$  vs.  $(\epsilon/h_{rms})^{2/3}$  curves obtained from numerical results of the adhesionless contact problem with a BEM code, or with the full Persson's theory.

Fig. 2 shows, for a self-affine fractal surface, the repulsive area vs. external pressure predictions as obtained by the BEM code of Pastewka [27, 28] and the modified Persson's theory given by Afferrante *et al.* [22]. It is clear that for nonadhesive contact the area vs. load relation is approximately linear with a coefficient  $\kappa \simeq 2$  (as shown in [29, 30]). However, increasing  $l_a/\epsilon$  the area increases more rapidly with load and a threshold value of  $l_a/\epsilon$  exists above which the slope  $\kappa$  becomes negative (Fig. 2b) and a nonzero pull-off force exists. Notice that under load control, upon approach, surfaces are expected to jump into contact resulting in a finite area of contact, and this may explain why PR obtained the slope never

higher than the vertical. In principle, "displacement control" is not well defined for infinite surfaces which have no defined stiffness.

Furthermore, in Fig. 2 the contacting regions (in black/red the repulsive/adhesive contact area) as obtained with BEM are given with (Fig. 2G-H-I) and without adhesion (Fig. 2D-E-F). It is clear that at increasing pressures contacts become larger and new contacts appear, but even to the eye, there is no constant representative diameter of contact.

Fig. 3 shows that in terms of actual adhesive area, the convergence with  $\zeta$  is very rapid (Fig. 3A) and is not modified by the load (Fig. 3B). Accordingly, the prefactor  $a_V$  rapidly converges with magnification (Fig. 3C), and weakly depends on pressure (Fig. 3D) or indeed on fractal dimension in the range  $D = 2.1 - 2.3$ . This is the most interesting range[18]. In particular, in Fig. 3C, we also show PR prediction which corresponds to a non-converging  $[a_V]_{PR} \sim \zeta^{1/3}$  for  $D = 2.2$  (see the Supp Information for mathematical details) and hence results in arbitrarily large error for large magnifications (an order of magnitude is likely). This depends on the factor  $\langle d^{1/3} \rangle / \langle d \rangle$  which has a weaker dependence on magnification than what they assume with their estimate on the mean diameter of the contact area  $d_{rep}$ .

### A. Criterion for stickiness

Starting again from (4), and assuming the independence on pressure of the quantity  $a_V$ , we find that both repulsive mean pressure and adhesive mean pressure are proportional to the repulsive contact area, which can therefore be grouped as

$$\frac{p_{ext}}{E^*} = \frac{p_{rep}}{E^*} - \frac{\sigma_0}{E^*} \frac{A_{ad}}{A_{nom}} = \frac{A_{rep}}{A_{nom}} \frac{\sqrt{2m_2}}{2} \left[ 1 - \frac{l_a}{\epsilon} \frac{3}{2} \frac{a_V}{q_0 h_{rms}} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{h_{rms}} \right)^{2/3} \right] \quad (6)$$

where we used the identity  $l_a/\epsilon = \sigma_0/E^*$  and the actual value of the factor correlating the relative contact area  $A_{rep}/A_{nom}$  with the external pressure  $p_{ext}$  (see, for example, [29]) instead of the factor  $2/\sqrt{\pi}$  of the original Persson's theory.

If we define the slope of the repulsive area vs. external pressure as  $A_{rep} = k p_{ext}/E^*$  clearly in the fractal limit because of  $m_2 \rightarrow \infty$  in (6), for  $\zeta \rightarrow \infty$ . Instead, we define "slope"




FIG. 2: Geometry of surfaces and contacting regions. (a) Example of self-affine fractal surface with  $D = 2.2$ . (b) Dependence of the relative contact area  $A_{rep}/A_{nom}$  on the normalized external pressure  $p_{ext}/E^*$  as obtained by the numerical BEM code of Pastewka [27] for the adhesionless and the adhesive case. (D-F) Evolution of contact spots area for various loads in the linear range and in absence of adhesion as obtained by BEM. (G-I) Evolution of contact spots area for various loads in presence of adhesion ( $l_a/\epsilon = 0.2$ ,  $\epsilon/h_{rms} = 7.5 \times 10^{-3}$ ) as obtained by BEM.

rather as  $\frac{1}{\kappa} = \frac{p_{ext}/(E^*\sqrt{2m_2})}{A_{rep}/A_{nom}}$ , and

$$\frac{1}{\kappa} = \frac{1}{\kappa_{rep}} - \frac{1}{\kappa_{ad}} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3a_V}{4q_0 h_{rms}} \frac{l_a}{\epsilon} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{h_{rms}} \right)^{2/3} \quad (7)$$






FIG. 3: (A) Comparison of the attractive area  $A_{ad}/A_{nom}$  estimated by Persson's theory (with  $\zeta = [10, 100, 500, 1000, 5000, 10000, 20000, 50000]$ ,  $H = 0.8$ ). (B) Comparison of the attractive area  $A_{ad}/A_{nom}$  estimated by Persson's theory (with  $p_{rep} = [6.5 * 10^{-3}, 0.03, 0.07, 0.13, 0.20, 0.26, 0.33, 0.39, 0.46, 0.52]$  and  $\zeta = 1000$ ). (C) Estimates of the prefactor  $a_V$  from Persson's theory for  $H = [0.7 - 0.8 - 0.9]$  vs PR estimate ( $H = 0.8$ ) (black dashed line,  $[a_V]_{PR} = 0.252\zeta^{1/3}$  as obtained in Supp. Information), as a function of magnification  $\zeta$  for  $\hat{p}_{rep} = 0.065$ . (D) Estimates of the prefactor  $a_V$  for  $\zeta = 1000$  from Persson's theory as a function of for  $\hat{p}_{rep}$ .

and then stickiness is obtained when  $1/\kappa < 0$  leading to the suggested criterion

$$\frac{\epsilon}{l_a} \left( \frac{h_{rms}}{\epsilon} \right)^{2/3} < \frac{3}{2} \frac{a_V}{q_0 h_{rms}} \quad (8)$$

In particular, neglecting the weak dependences on pressure, magnification and fractal dimension, we can take from the results in Fig. 3  $a_V \simeq 3$  and rewrite the criterion (8) as

$$\frac{h_{rms}}{\epsilon} < \left( \frac{9 l_a / \epsilon}{4 \epsilon q_0} \right)^{3/5} \quad (9)$$

As it can be seen eq. (9) does not depend *at all* on local slopes  $h'_{rms}$  and curvatures  $h''_{rms}$ , hence truncation of the PSD roughness, but *only* on RMS amplitude of roughness  $h_{rms}$  and the largest wavelength in the roughness  $q_0$  (both concepts which are completely absent in PR criterion).

Fig. 4A shows some comparison with BEM numerical calculations (solid lines) and Persson theory (cross). In particular, the inset shows a typical loading cycle for sticky surfaces, which shows why PR could obtain only vertical lines in their numerical simulations in the sticky range: under zero external pressure, upon loading the surfaces jump into contact and reach a finite repulsive contact area. In our case, we obtain the entire curve and hence Fig. 4B shows the estimated adhesive slope  $1/\kappa_{ad}$  fits well the data obtained from BEM numerical simulations over six order of magnitude and in a wide range of parameters. The shaded area identifies the region where randomly rough surfaces are expected to be sticky, i.e.  $1/\kappa_{ad} > 1/2$ .

The large wavelength wavevector cutoff of roughness  $q_0$ , which for our scopes was defined for a pure power law fractal PSD spectrum, could in principle take arbitrarily low values for large surfaces, which would result in increasingly loose boundary of stickiness. For example, for a flat surface not of micrometer size as in PR simulation, but of *mm* size, we have  $\epsilon q_0 \sim 10^{-6}$  and our criterion gives  $h_{rms}/\epsilon \lesssim 1000$ , so the actual stickiness could persist even for roughness three orders of magnitude larger than the range of attraction, i.e. on the order of nearly one micron. With roughness of meters size  $h_{rms}/\epsilon \lesssim 67000$  and for *km* size,  $h_{rms}/\epsilon \lesssim 10^6$  which means almost *mm* amplitude of roughness. Of course these extrapolations will have some limitation on the concept of the ideally flat surface with a pure power law PSD of roughness. But clearly, this concepts about stickiness are qualitatively




FIG. 4: (A) Contact area vs external pressure as obtained by BEM numerical calculations (solid lines) and Persson theory (cross). The inset shows a typical loading cycle for sticky surfaces: under zero external pressure, a finite repulsive contact area is reached. Unloading under load control leads to pull-off for non zero contact area. (B) Comparison between numerical estimated  $1/\kappa_{ad}$  as obtained from BEM numerical simulations and our analytical estimate  $\frac{1}{\kappa_{ad}} = \frac{3a_V}{4q_0 h_{rms}} \frac{l_a}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{h_{rms}}\right)^{2/3}$ . Open symbols for  $\zeta = 64$ ,  $h_{rms} = 5 \mu\text{m}$ , while closed symbols for  $\zeta = 128$ ,  $h_{rms} = 0.1 \mu\text{m}$ , range of attraction  $\epsilon/h_{rms} = [1, 1/10, 1/50, 1/100]$  respectively diamond, circle, triangle, square. We used  $a_V = 2.8$ ,  $H = 0.8$  and  $q_0 = 2\pi/L$  with  $L = 100 \mu\text{m}$ . The shaded area identifies the region where randomly rough surfaces are expected to be sticky, i.e.  $1/\kappa_{ad} > 1/2$ .

new, and completely different from those of FT and PR.

From JTB's results, we know that complex instabilities and patterns form at very low RMS amplitude of roughness, and hence in the sticky range, DMT type of analysis can be expected to hold only for approximately

$$\frac{h_{rms}}{\epsilon} > \frac{4}{75} \frac{l_a/\epsilon}{\epsilon q_0} \quad (10)$$

It is also likely, from JTB predictions, that stickiness is lower if this condition is violated and a more refined analysis is needed anyway, which is outside the possibilities of both JTB and our model. Fig. 5 shows stickiness map obtained with the present criterion. The shaded region in Fig. 5A individuates the couple  $(\frac{\epsilon q_0}{l_a/\epsilon}, \frac{h_{rms}}{\epsilon})$  which would give a stickiness.

Underneath the dashed line pattern formation is expected, and our DMT model may not be accurate. In Fig. 5B the slope angle  $\alpha = \arctan(\kappa)$  is plotted as a function of  $h_{rms}/\epsilon$  for varying  $\frac{\epsilon q_0}{l_a/\epsilon}$ .




FIG. 5: (A) Adhesion map for multiscale rough surfaces according to the present criterion (9). In the plane  $\frac{\epsilon q_0}{l_a/\epsilon}$  vs  $\frac{h_{rms}}{\epsilon}$  the sticky region is shaded. According to JTB analysis in the region below the dashed black line pattern formation is expected with possible reduction of stickiness. (B) The slope angle  $\alpha = \arctan(\kappa)$  is plotted as a function of  $h_{rms}/\epsilon$  for varying  $\frac{\epsilon q_0}{l_a/\epsilon} = [1, 3/4, 1/2, 1/4, 1/10]$  and  $a_V = 3$ .

### III. APPLICATION TO REAL SURFACES

Considering our result (9), it is clear that to improve stickiness, for a given range of attractive forces  $\epsilon$ , we need to make  $q_0$  as small as possible – this is however going to increase  $h_{rms}$  as for a power law PSD  $C(q) = C_0 q^{-2(H+1)}$ , we have  $h_{rms} \simeq \sqrt{\pi C_0/H} q_0^{-H}$ . It may be useful to rewrite the criterion in terms of the PSD multiplier  $C_0$  (as usual, for  $H = 0.8$ )

$$C_0 < \frac{0.8}{\pi} \epsilon^{4/5} q_0^{2/5} \left( \frac{9 l_a}{4 \epsilon} \right)^{6/5} \quad (11)$$

It appears clear that we need as small roughness as possible, for a given  $q_0$  which is presumably dictated by size of the specimen up to some extent, or by the process from

which the surface originates. Also, we need to have  $l_a/\epsilon$  as high as possible, and this means obviously high  $\Delta\gamma$  and low  $E^*$  (being  $l_a = \Delta\gamma/E^*$ ).

Given  $\Delta\gamma$  is in practice strongly reduced by contaminants and various other effects to values of the order  $\sim 50\text{mJ}/\text{m}^2$ , the only reliable way to have high stickiness is to have very soft materials.

As reported by Persson [18], most polished steel surfaces for example, when measured on  $L \sim 0.1\text{mm}$ , show  $h_{rms} \sim 1\mu\text{m}$ . This means  $q_0 h_{rms} \sim 0.1$ . This incidentally satisfies JTB condition for "DMT"-like (10) practically in the entire range of possible materials. Hence, contrary to the recent emphasis on measuring entire PSD of surfaces, it seems therefore that for stickiness, the most important factors are well defined, and macroscopic quantities, which are easy to measure. For a wide range of surfaces (asphalt, sandblasted PMMA, polished steel, tape, glass) reported in [18], see Fig. 6,  $C_0$  is at most  $10^{-3}\text{m}^{0.4}$ . Then, assuming  $\epsilon = 0.2\text{nm}$  and  $\Delta\gamma = 50\text{mJ}/\text{m}^2$  as a typical value, even with the uncertainty in the choice of  $q_0$ , in the range of  $q_0 \sim 10^3[\text{m}^{-1}]$ , our criterion predicts  $E^* < 0.2\text{MPa}$ . This is for asphalt which clearly is one of the most rough surface we can consider, and indeed outside the normal application of PSA. Our criterion is therefore entirely compatible with the empirical criterion by Carl Dahlquist from 3M which suggests to make tapes only with low modulus materials  $E^* < 1\text{MPa}$ , whose generality was so far still scientifically unexplained. The stickiness criterion of PR is instead further commented in the Supplementary information, and shown to have occurred by a fitting of numerical results in a very narrow range of magnifications  $\zeta \simeq 1000$  covering just from micrometer to nanometer scales (see Fig. 3).

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have defined a new stickiness criterion, whose main factors are the low wavevector cutoff of roughness,  $q_0$ , and the rms amplitude of roughness  $h_{rms}$ . This is in striking contrast with previous theories such as Fuller and Tabor or Pastewka and Robbins, which found a never-ending change of stickiness with growing cutoff of PSD spectrum  $\zeta$ . We find that, in principle, it is possible to have effective stickiness even with quite large rms amplitudes, orders of magnitude larger than the range of attractive forces. Stickiness may depend weakly on local quantities such as rms slopes and curvatures only for narrow PSD spectra, but for realistic spectra which are typically beyond the present brute-force simulations, the




FIG. 6: PSD of typical real surfaces from ([18]): blue squares for a sandblasted PMMA, orange triangles for grinded steel, purple diamonds and red dots are two asphalt surfaces. Black dashed line has  $C_0 = 10^{-3} \text{ m}^{0.4}$ , black dot-dashed line has  $C_0 = 10^{-5} \text{ m}^{0.4}$ .

truncation of the PSD spectrum of roughness is irrelevant. For robust adhesion with different possible levels of roughness, the main characteristic affecting stickiness is the elastic modulus, in qualitative and quantitative agreement with Dahlquist criterion.

## V. METHODS

For BEM simulations, we use the Contact App from Pastewka (see [27]) with the following geometry: longest wavelength  $L = 100\mu\text{m}$ ,  $h_{rms} = 0.1\mu\text{m}$ ,  $H = 0.8$ ,  $\zeta = 128$  and averaging over 8 different realizations of the surface. There is no roll-off in the PSD and periodical b.c. are applied for the window of size  $L$ . For the "precise" and broad-band PSD spectrum, we use calculations with the Persson's contact mechanics theory, in the version reported by Afferrante *et al.*[18]. Since Persson's theory does not permit an immediate understanding of the main parameters involved, we here derive an asymptotic theory for the attractive

area  $A_{ad}$ . Consider the relationship between (repulsive) contact area ratio  $\frac{A_{rep}}{A_{nom}}$  and mean pressure  $p_{rep}$  which holds for  $\frac{A_{rep}}{A_{nom}}$  up to almost 30%, where  $A_{nom}$  is the nominal contact area (original Persson's theory, [26])

$$\frac{A_{rep}}{A_{nom}} \simeq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{p_{rep}}{\sqrt{2V}} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{p_{rep}}{E^* \sqrt{m_2}} \quad (12)$$

where  $V = \frac{1}{2}E^{*2}m_2$  is the variance of full contact pressures, and  $m_2$  is the mean square profile slope along any direction (for a isotropic surface). The distribution of pressures  $P(p)$  near the boundaries of contact (on the contact side) is at low  $p$  [31]

$$P(p) \simeq \frac{pp_{rep}}{V} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi V}} \quad (13)$$

Suppose the perimeter of the actual contact area [not necessarily simply-connected] is  $\Pi$ . We define position on  $\Pi$  by a curvilinear coordinate  $s$ . In view of the asymptotic behaviour at the edge of the contact area [32], as noticed also by PR, we must have at every point on  $\Pi$ , pressure  $p$  and gap  $u$  as

$$p(x) = B(s)x^{1/2}; \quad u(x) = C(s)x^{3/2}; \quad (14)$$

where  $x$  is a coordinate perpendicular to the boundary and  $C(s) = \beta d(s)^{-1/2}$  where  $\beta$  is a prefactor of order 1,  $B(s) = \frac{3E^*\beta}{4}d(s)^{-1/2}$  and  $d(s)$  is a local characteristic length scale.

It is clear that, as load is increased, existing contacts grow larger and some new form, and the shape is very irregular. Already Greenwood and Williamson [11] in their simple asperity theory suggested that the *average* radius of contact should remain constant with load, as a result of competition between growing contacts and new contacts forming, and this is correctly captured despite the strong approximations in the asperity model. In [33] it was shown, again with a simple asperity model, but with an exponential distribution of asperity heights,  $d_{rep}$  seems indeed completely independent on load, and that  $d_{rep} = bh'_{rms}/h''_{rms}$ , where however  $b \simeq 1.63\alpha^{1/4}$  where  $\alpha$  is Nayak parameter bandwidth parameter  $\alpha = m_0m_4/m_2^2 \sim \zeta^{2H}$  and hence grows without limit with  $\zeta$ . So while PR find a range of  $d_{rep}$  within a factor two from  $d_{rep} = 4h'_{rms}/h''_{rms}$ , we find much larger discrepancies could be found in general for broadband PSD, i.e. larger  $\zeta$  than their explored.

Hence, we shall leave the quantity  $d(s)$  to vary arbitrarily along the perimeter, and the probability PDF for the pressure is easily found as

$$P(p) = \frac{2p}{A_{nom}} \int_{\Pi} \frac{ds}{B(s)^2} = \frac{2p\Pi}{A_{nom}} I_p \quad (15)$$

where  $I_p = \int_0^1 d\hat{s}/B(\hat{s})^2 = [4/(3\beta E^*)]^2 \langle d \rangle$ ,  $\hat{s} = s/\Pi$  is a normalized coordinate along the perimeter, and  $\langle d \rangle$  means the mean value of  $d$ . A similar argument with the gap expression yields

$$P(u) = \frac{1}{A_{nom}} \left( \frac{4}{9u} \right)^{1/3} \Pi I_u \quad (16)$$

where  $I_u = \beta^{-2/3} \int_0^1 d(\hat{s})^{1/3} d\hat{s} = \beta^{-2/3} \langle d^{1/3} \rangle$ . Eliminating the perimeter from the (15,16) and using (13) results in  $\Pi = \frac{pA_{nom}}{2I_p} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi V^{3/2}}}$  and hence

$$P(u) = \left( \frac{4}{9u} \right)^{1/3} \frac{I_u}{2I_p} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi V^3}} p_{rep} \quad (17)$$

Finally upon integration, we obtain (4), (5).

**Author contributions.** MC designed research, LA wrote the Persson code and GV run the Persson code, while AP run the BEM code, and prepared the figures. MC wrote the draft MS and all authors revised the MS up to its final form.

**Acknowledgement 1** *A.P. is thankful to the DFG (German Research Foundation) for funding the projects HO 3852/11-1 and PA 3303/1-1. MC is thankful to Proff. JR Barber, Costantino Creton and Steven Abbott for some discussions.*

## VI. REFERENCES

- 
- [1] Ciavarella, M., Joe, J., Papangelo, A., Barber, JR. (2018) The role of adhesion in contact mechanics, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04455>
  - [2] A.I. Vakis, et al., (2018), Modeling and simulation in tribology across scales: An overview. Tribology International, Vol. 125, pp 169-199. DOI: 10.1016/j.triboint.2018.02.005



- [3] Kendall K (2001) *Molecular Adhesion and Its Applications: The Sticky Universe* (Kluwer Academic, New York).
- [4] Autumn, K., Sitti, M., Liang, Y. A., Peattie, A. M., Hansen, W. R., Sponberg, S., ... & Full, R. J. (2002). Evidence for van der Waals adhesion in gecko setae. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(19), 12252-12256.
- [5] Gao, H., Wang, X., Yao, H., Gorb, S., & Arzt, E. (2005). Mechanics of hierarchical adhesion structures of geckos. *Mechanics of Materials*, 37(2-3), 275-285.
- [6] Gao, H., Ji, B., Jäger, I. L., Arzt, E., & Fratzl, P. (2003). Materials become insensitive to flaws at nanoscale: lessons from nature. *Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences*, 100(10), 5597-5600.
- [7] C. Creton, L. Leibler, *Journal of Polymer Science: Part B: Polymer Physics* 1996, 34, 545
- [8] Dahlquist, C. A. in *Treatise on Adhesion and Adhesives*, R. L. Patrick (ed.), Dekker, New York, 1969,2, 219.
- [9] Dahlquist, C., Tack, in *Adhesion Fundamentals and Practice*. 1969, Gordon and Breach: New York. p. 143-151.
- [10] Fuller, K.N.G., Tabor, D., (1975), The effect of surface roughness on the adhesion of elastic solids. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 345(1642), 327-342.
- [11] Greenwood, J. A., & Williamson, J. P. (1966). Contact of nominally flat surfaces. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 295(1442), 300-319.
- [12] Johnson, K.L. , Kendall, K. , Roberts, A.D. (1971), Surface energy and the contact of elastic solids. *Proc R Soc Lond*;A324:301–313. doi: 10.1098/rspa.1971.0141
- [13] M. Ciavarella & A. Papangelo, (2017), Discussion of “Measuring and Understanding Contact Area at the Nanoscale: A Review” (Jacobs, TDB, and Ashlie Martini, A., 2017, *ASME Appl. Mech. Rev.*, 69 (6), p. 060802). *Applied Mechanics Reviews*, 69(6), 065502.
- [14] Greenwood, J. A. (2017). Reflections on and Extensions of the Fuller and Tabor Theory of Rough Surface Adhesion. *Tribology Letters*, 65(4), 159.
- [15] Derjaguin, B. V., Muller V. M. & Toporov Y. P. (1975). Effect of contact deformations on the adhesion of particles. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, 53, pp. 314–325
- [16] Pastewka, L., & Robbins, M. O. (2014). Contact between rough surfaces and a criterion for macroscopic adhesion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(9), 3298-3303.
- [17] Muser, M. H., Dapp, W. B., Bugnicourt, R., Sainsot, P., Lesaffre, N., Lubrecht, T. A., Persson,

- B.N.J., Harris, K., Bennett, A., Schulze, K., Rohde, S., Ifju, P., Sawyer, W.G., Angelini, T., Sfahani, H.A. E., Kadkhodaei, M., Akbarzadeh, S., Wu, J.-J., Vorlaufer, G., Vernes, A., Solhjoo, S., Vakis, A.I., Jackson, R.L., Xu, Y., Streater, J., Rostami, A., Dini, D., Medina, S., Carbone, G., Bottiglione, F., Afferrante, L., Monti, J., Pastewka, L., Robbins, M.O., and Greenwood, J.A. (2017), Meeting the contact-mechanics challenge. *Trib. Letters*, 65, 118.
- [18] Persson, B. N. J. (2014). On the fractal dimension of rough surfaces. *Tribology Letters*, 54(1), 99-106.
- [19] Ciavarella, M. (2018) A very simple estimate of adhesion of hard solids with rough surfaces based on a bearing area model. *Meccanica*, 1-10. DOI 10.1007/s11012-017-0701-6
- [20] Joe, J., Thouless, M.D. , Barber, J.R. (2018), Effect of roughness on the adhesive tractions between contacting bodies, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2018.06.005
- [21] Persson, B. N., & Scaraggi, M. (2014). Theory of adhesion: rôle of surface roughness. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 141(12), 124701.
- [22] Afferrante, L., Bottiglione, F., Putignano, C., Persson, B. N. J., & Carbone, G. (2018). Elastic Contact Mechanics of Randomly Rough Surfaces: An Assessment of Advanced Asperity Models and Persson’s Theory. *Tribology Letters*, 66(2), 75.
- [23] Maugis, D. (1992). Adhesion of spheres: the JKR-DMT transition using a Dugdale model. *Journal of colloid and interface science*, 150(1), 243-269.
- [24] Persson, B. N. J. (2007). Relation between interfacial separation and load: a general theory of contact mechanics. *Physical review letters*, 99(12), 125502.
- [25] Papangelo, A., Hoffmann, N., & Ciavarella, M. (2017). Load-separation curves for the contact of self-affine rough surfaces. *Scientific reports*, 7(1), 6900.
- [26] Persson, B. N. (2001). Theory of rubber friction and contact mechanics. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 115(8), 3840-3861.
- [27] Pastewka, Lars, Tristan A. Sharp, and Mark O. Robbins. 2012. “Seamless Elastic Boundaries for Atomistic Calculations.” *Physical Review B: Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* 86: 075459. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.86.075459>.
- [28] <http://tribo.iam-cms.kit.edu/contactapp/>
- [29] Putignano, C., Afferrante, L., Carbone, G. & Demelio, G. (2012). Putignano, C., Afferrante, L., Carbone, G., & Demelio, G. (2012). A new efficient numerical method for contact mechanics

- of rough surfaces. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 49(2), 338–343.
- [30] Putignano, C., Afferrante, L., Carbone, G. & Demelio, G. (2012). The influence of the statistical properties of self-affine surfaces in elastic contacts: A numerical investigation. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 60(5), 973-982.
- [31] Manners, W., & Greenwood, J. A. (2006). Some observations on Persson’s diffusion theory of elastic contact. *Wear*, 261(5-6), 600-610.
- [32] Johnson, K. L., (1985). *Contact mechanics*. Cambridge university press, Cambridge (UK).
- [33] Ciavarella, M. (2017). On Pastewka and Robbins’ criterion for macroscopic adhesion of rough surfaces. *Journal of Tribology*, 139(3), 031404.
- [34] Luan, B., & Robbins, M. O. (2005). The breakdown of continuum models for mechanical contacts. *Nature*, 435(7044), 929.
- [35] Violano, G., & Afferrante, L. (2019). On DMT methods to calculate adhesion in rough contacts. *Tribology International*, 130, 36-42.
- [36] Longuet-Higgins, M. S. (1957). The statistical analysis of a random, moving surface. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 249(966), 321-387.
- [37] Nayak, P. R. (1971). Random process model of rough surfaces. *Journal of Lubrication Technology*, 93(3), 398-407.

## Supplementary Information

### S1 - Comparison with PR theory

The PR criterium is summarized in the following equation (eqt. 10 in their paper)

$$\frac{h'_{rms}\Delta r}{2l_a} \left( \frac{h'_{rms}d_{rep}}{4\Delta r} \right)^{2/3} < \pi \left( \frac{3}{16} \right)^{2/3} \simeq 1 \quad (18)$$

where  $d_{rep}$  is a characteristic diameter of repulsive contact areas, which they estimate as  $d_{rep} = 4h'_{rms}/h''_{rms}$ , and  $h'_{rms}$  and  $h''_{rms}$  are the rms slopes and curvature. Finally,  $\Delta r$  is the attractive range which is of the order of atomic spacing (very close to  $\epsilon$  for the Lennard-Jones potential). When the condition (18) is satisfied, the surfaces in mutual contact are suggested to be "sticky" and a finite value of the pull-off force should occur. As we have seen

in the introduction, in the fractal limit  $\zeta \rightarrow \infty$ , PR predict (paradoxically) stickiness for most engineering made and natural surfaces which for Persson [18] have  $H = 0.8 \pm 0.15$ . PR did not incur in this paradox since they argued in their eqt. 9 that atomic steps limit imply  $h''_{rms} \simeq (h'_{rms})^2 / \epsilon$  which simplifies their criterion as  $l_a / \epsilon > h'_{rms} / 2$ . However, in turn this condition becomes extremely difficult to satisfy or even to check, since it is hard to define the  $h'_{rms}$  at atomic scale, where surfaces having finite steps of atoms, see [? ].

Comparison with the PR results is best done considering the attractive area (their eqt. 6), reading

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ad} &= A_{rep} \left( \frac{16}{9\pi} \right)^{-1/3} \left( \frac{\pi \Delta r}{h'_{rms} d_{rep}} \right)^{2/3} \\ &= 2 \left( \frac{16}{9\pi} \right)^{-1/3} p \frac{A_{nom}}{h'_{rms} E^*} \left( \frac{\pi a_0 \sqrt{24l_a / \epsilon} h''_{rms}}{4h'^2_{rms}} \right)^{2/3} \end{aligned}$$

where we used their equation  $A_{rep} = 2pA_{nom} / (h'_{rms} E^*)$  and  $\Delta r / \epsilon = \sqrt{24l_a / \epsilon}$  from Supplementary Information of PR paper so that for  $l_a / \epsilon = 0.05$ . Hence, it can be shown that, compared to our (4), their estimate corresponds to

$$[a_V(\zeta)]_{PR} = 1.4622q_0 h_{rms} \left( \frac{h'^2_{rms}}{h'^7_{rms}} \right)^{1/3} h'^{2/3}_{rms} \quad (19)$$

Now for power law tail of the PSD  $C(q) = C_0 q^{-2(H+1)}$ , estimating  $h'_{rms} = \sqrt{2m_2}$ ,  $h''_{rms} = \sqrt{8m_4/3}$  (see Suppl.Info S2) we obtain as for  $H = 0.8$

$$[a_V(\zeta)]_{PR} = 0.252\zeta^{1/3} \quad (20)$$

which results in a magnification dependence much stronger than the real dependence we find (see Fig. 3C). Hence, the comparison show that their prediction happen fortuitously approximately true only for a very narrow range of  $\zeta$ . Indeed, PR's numerical results are themselves affected by numerical errors both in the statistics of the surface, and on the level of discretization: with a mesh of atoms of spacing  $a_0$  and contact diameters which are a fraction of smallest wavelength  $\lambda_s = 4..64a_0$ , we have only few atoms to describe the contact area. However, at very high but realistic  $\zeta$ , the difference grows arbitrarily large since the correct value converges, while the PR estimate continues to grow suggesting stickiness

in all cases. The largely smaller area of adhesion was confirmed already by independent assessment [35] with yet other models.

## S2 - On random process theory

Assume the surface  $h(x, y)$  has a continuous noise spectrum in two dimensions and is described by a Gaussian stationary process. In such case, we write

$$h(x, y) = \sum_n C_n \cos [q_{x,n}x + q_{y,n}y + \phi_n] \quad (21)$$

where the wave-components  $q_{x,n}$  and  $q_{y,n}$  are supposed densely distributed throughout the  $(qx, qy)$  plane. The random phases  $\phi_n$  are uniformly distributed in the interval  $[0, 2\pi)$ . The amplitudes  $C_n$  are also random variables such that in any element  $dq_x dq_y$

$$\sum_n \frac{1}{2} C_n^2 = C(q_x, q_y) dq_x dq_y. \quad (22)$$

The function  $C(q_x, q_y)$  is the Power Spectral Density (PSD) of the surface  $h$ , whose mean-square value can be calculated as

$$m_{00} = \int \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} C(q_x, q_y) dq_x dq_y \quad (23)$$

For isotropic roughness, using Nayak [37] definitions for the surface

$$m_{rs} = \int \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} C[q_x, q_y] q_x^r q_y^s dq_x dq_y \quad (24)$$

where  $m_{00}$  is by definition  $h_{rms}^2$ . It can be shown by defining the PSD and the ACF (auto-correlation function) of the partial derivatives of  $h$  with respect to  $x$  and  $y$  coordinates, and using a relationship with the PSD of the surface, that the above spectral moments are (see [36])

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \left( \frac{\partial^{r+s} h}{\partial x^r \partial y^s} \right)^2 \right\rangle &= m_{2r, 2s} \\ \left\langle \left( \frac{\partial^{r+s} h}{\partial x^r \partial y^s} \right)^2 \right\rangle &= (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}(r+s-r'-s')} m_{r+r', s+s'} \quad \text{or} \quad 0, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

depending on  $(s + r - r' - s')$  is even or odd.

Nayak finds for isotropic surface,

$$\begin{aligned} m_{20} = m_{02} = m_2; \quad m_{11} = m_{13} = m_{31} = 0 \\ m_{00} = m_0; \quad 3m_{22} = m_{40} = m_{04} = m_4 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

meaning when there is no second subscript the *profile statistics for isotropic surface*, which is independent on the direction chosen.

For slopes, with the common definition of their rms value is (also used by PR)

$$h'_{rms} = \sqrt{\langle |\nabla h|^2 \rangle} = \sqrt{\left\langle \left( \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} \right)^2 \right\rangle} = \sqrt{2m_2} \quad (27)$$

where the equality depends on the result that, for an isotropic surface, the orthogonal components  $\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}$  and  $\frac{\partial h}{\partial y}$  are uncorrelated.

The definition of RMS curvature  $h''_{rms}$  is less common, but we shall follow PR in defining

$$\begin{aligned} h''_{rms} &= \sqrt{\langle (\nabla^2 h)^2 \rangle} = \sqrt{\left\langle \left( \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial y^2} \right)^2 + 2 \left( \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial x^2} \right) \left( \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial y^2} \right) \right\rangle} \\ &= \sqrt{m_{40} + m_{04} + 2m_{22}} = \sqrt{8m_4/3} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

PR do not recur to asperity theories to define the mean radius involved in the contact areas  $R$ , which is defined for asperities by Nayak's theory [37]. In this case,  $R$  would vary between  $1/(2\sqrt{m_4})$  at low bandwidths and  $1/(4.73\sqrt{m_4})$  at high bandwidths, a change of a factor 2.3. PR rather estimate  $R$  from the rms curvature which indeed results in  $R = 2/h''_{rms} = 1/\sqrt{2m_4/3}$  as it can be easily verified, and which, incidentally, is larger than the entire range expected from Nayak's analysis. Using the Nayak estimate however would only improve the results in some range as it would increase the area of attraction, but in the fractal limit, it would also not work correctly. In their limited band of investigation, PR found  $d_{rep}$  to be always within a factor of 2 of their estimate, but this factor may largely change were they to consider broader band of roughness.