

An essay on deformation measures in isotropic thin shell theories. Bending versus curvature.

Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba¹, Peter Lewintan², Adam Sky³,
Patrizio Neff⁴

December 20, 2023

Abstract

It has become commonplace for the stored energy function of any realistic shell model to align “within first order” with the classical Koiter membrane-bending (flexural) shell model. In this paper, we assess whether certain extended Cosserat shell models are consistent with the classical linear Koiter model. In doing this, we observe that there are numerous reasons why a modified version of the classical Koiter model should be considered, a consensus reached not only by Koiter himself but also by Sanders and Budiansky, who independently developed the same theory during the same period. To provide a comprehensive overview of the strain measures employed in our Cosserat shell models, this paper presents them in a unified manner and compares them with the strain measures previously utilized in the literature. We show that all our new strain tensors either generalize (in the case of nonlinear constrained or unconstrained models) or coincide (in the case of the linear constrained model) with the strain tensors recognized as the “best” or those possessing a well-defined geometric interpretation connected to bending or curvature.

Keywords: Cosserat shell, 6-parameter resultant shell, in-plane drill rotations, constrained Cosserat elasticity, isotropy, linear theories, deformation measures, change of metric, bending measures, change of curvature measures

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Shell-kinematics and strain measures in nonlinear and linearised Cosserat-shell models	6
2.1	Shell-like thin domain and reconstructed 3D deformation	6
2.2	Shell strain tensors in Koiter type models	8
2.3	Kinematics in the Cosserat shell model	9
2.4	Kinematics in the constrained Cosserat shell model	11
3	Concise description of the family of Cosserat-shell models	14
3.1	Variational problem for nonlinear and linear Koiter models	14
3.2	Variational problem for geometrically nonlinear and linear Cosserat-shell models	14
3.3	Variational problem for the modified nonlinear and modified linear constrained Cosserat shell model	15
4	The change of metric tensor	17
5	What does bending mean? Scaling invariance of bending tensors	17
5.1	Idealized invariance requirements for a bending strain tensor	17
5.2	The bending measures of the first-order linear shell theory	21
6	What does the change of curvature tensor describe?	24
7	Transverse shear in Cosserat, Reissner-Mindlin and Naghdi shell models	30

¹Corresponding author: Ionel-Dumitrel Ghiba, Department of Mathematics, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Blvd. Carol I, no. 11, 700506 Iași, Romania; and Octav Mayer Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, Iași Branch, 700505 Iași, email: dumitrel.ghiba@uaic.ro

²Peter Lewintan, Lehrstuhl für Nichtlineare Analysis und Modellierung, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Thea-Leymann Str. 9, 45127 Essen, Germany, email: peter.lewintan@uni-due.de

³Adam Sky, Institute of Computational Engineering and Sciences, Department of Engineering, Faculty of Science, Technology and Medicine, University of Luxembourg, 6 Avenue de la Fonte, L-4362 Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg, email: adam.sky@uni.lu

⁴Patrizio Neff, Head of Lehrstuhl für Nichtlineare Analysis und Modellierung, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Thea-Leymann Str. 9, 45127 Essen, Germany, email: patrizio.neff@uni-due.de

8 Drilling appears only in Cosserat shell models	30
9 Conclusions of this paper	30
References	31
A Appendix	34
A.1 Acharya's blog-entry on iMechanica from 2007	34
A.2 The stretch U_e that leaves tangent planes invariant	34

1 Introduction

Recent papers published by Šilhavý [57] and Virga [62] together with the novel shell strain tensors obtained by us using various dimensional reduction methods [25, 26, 27, 9, 28, 51, 50, 24] have prompted us to undertake a more detailed examination of the physical and geometric significance of various strain tensors used in shell models. Anicic and Léger also explored this question, some time ago in the context of linear models, as documented in [6], along with references [4] and [5]. The issue of appropriate nonlinear shell bending strain measures was also already addressed by Acharya in [1].

In the classical shell-models of order $O(h^3)$ the total energy is given in the form

$$\int_{\omega} \left(h W_1(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{h^3}{12} W_2(\mathcal{F}) \right) da, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is the planar reference domain, \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} are strain tensors measuring the deformation of the shell, and W_1 and W_2 are energy densities. The strain tensor \mathcal{E} , through the $O(h)$ energy $W_1(\mathcal{E})$, measures the change of metric and it is called *a membrane shell term*. There is complete agreement which strain tensor should be used as measure of the change of metric in the linearised models, while in the non-linear models there still are some differences. For instance, the strain tensors for measuring the change of the metric after the derivation approach [43, 25] and in the expression of the Gamma-limit [45, 51] starting from the Biot-type quadratic parental 3D energy¹ $W_{\text{Biot}} := \mu \|\sqrt{F^T F} - \mathbb{1}_3\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} [\text{tr}(\sqrt{F^T F} - \mathbb{1}_3)]^2$ is² $\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^b := [\nabla\Theta]^T \left(\sqrt{[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \widehat{\mathbb{I}}_m \mathbb{1}_2^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}} - \sqrt{[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \widehat{\mathbb{I}}_{y_0} \mathbb{1}_2^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}} \right) [\nabla\Theta]$, other classical models which are derived starting from the Saint-Venant-Kirchhoff energy $W_{\text{SVK}} := \mu \|1/2(F^T F - \mathbb{1}_3)\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} [\text{tr}(1/2(F^T F - \mathbb{1}_3))]^2$ lead to the difference between the first fundamental form of the unknown midsurface parametrized by m and the first fundamental form of the referential midsurface configuration parametrized by y_0 , i.e., $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0})$. It is clear that the linearisation of these two strain measures for the change of metric are equal³ [28], but in the nonlinear case they are different.⁴

On the contrary, no agreement exists on the names and about which strain tensors should be used for \mathcal{F} , as well as what \mathcal{F} really measures. Sometimes the energy term of order $O(h^3)$, i.e., $W_2(\mathcal{F})$ is called

- *bending energy* (\mathcal{F} is called bending strain tensor) [32, 49, 1],

¹In this paper, for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we let $\langle a, b \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ denote the scalar product on \mathbb{R}^n with associated vector norm $\|a\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 = \langle a, a \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}$. The standard Euclidean scalar product on the set of real $n \times m$ second order tensors $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is given by $\langle X, Y \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}} = \text{tr}(X Y^T)$, and thus the (squared) Frobenius tensor norm is $\|X\|_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}}^2 = \langle X, X \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}}$. The identity tensor on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ will be denoted by $\mathbb{1}_n$, so that $\text{tr}(X) = \langle X, \mathbb{1}_n \rangle$, and the zero matrix is denoted by 0_n .

²For a given matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ we define the lifted quantities $M^b = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & 0 \\ M_{21} & M_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ and $\widehat{M} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & 0 \\ M_{21} & M_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$.

Here, as specified in the next section, $[\nabla\Theta]$ means the value for $x_3 = 0$ of the gradient of the diffeomorphism $\Theta : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, describing the reference configuration (i.e., the curved surface of the shell), $\Theta(x_1, x_2, x_3) = y_0(x_1, x_2) + x_3 n_0(x_1, x_2)$, $n_0 = \frac{\partial_{x_1} y_0 \times \partial_{x_2} y_0}{\|\partial_{x_1} y_0 \times \partial_{x_2} y_0\|}$, where $y_0 : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is a function of class $C^2(\omega)$. This specific form of the diffeomorphism Θ maps the midsurface ω of the fictitious Cartesian configuration parameter space Ω_h onto the midsurface $\omega_{\xi} = y_0(\omega)$ of Ω_{ξ} and n_0 is the unit normal vector to ω_{ξ} .

³In the linearisation process we express the total midsurface deformation as $m(x_1, x_2) = y_0(x_1, x_2) + v(x_1, x_2)$, with $v : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, the infinitesimal shell-midsurface displacement and we find that $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} := \frac{1}{2}[\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}]^{\text{lin}} = \text{sym}[(\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v)] = \mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$

⁴Note that the Biot-energy W_{Biot} is physically more realistic than the Saint-Venant-Kirchhoff energy W_{SVK} .

- *change of curvature energy* (\mathcal{F} is called change of curvature strain tensor) [39, 6, 4, 57],
- *flexural energy* (\mathcal{F} is called change of curvature strain tensor) [17].

Therefore, the question arises: does the strain tensor \mathcal{F} in a shell model correspond to the physical significance of the given name, bending versus change of curvature? One source of the confusions is the fact that for $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = 0$ (infinitesimal pure flexure) or for plates (flat shells), no difference between bending and change of curvature measures can be observed.

In this respect, on one hand, Acharya’s essential early invariance requirement from [1] should be recalled: *A vanishing bending strain at a point should be associated with any deformation that leaves the orientation of the unit normal field locally unaltered around that point.* We consider relevant the conclusions given by Acharya on the iMechanica’s blog⁵ (the entire blog’s text is given in the Appendix).

Virga [62, Section II] recently rediscovered the problem posed by Acharya and he introduced a definition for a pure bending measure of nonlinear shells: *a deformation measure is a pure bending measure if it undergoes bending-neutral deformations*, i.e. finite incremental changes of the plate’s shape bearing no further bending (in other words only rotations about the unit normal to the midsurface and stretches, that leave the tangent plane invariant). Acharya’s and Virga’s minimal requirements on the bending strain measures are in fact equivalent. In [27] we already touched upon the proper invariance conditions for bending tensors in the framework of Cosserat shells. On the other hand, the change of curvature strain tensor should measure the variation of the mathematical quantities defining the curvature of a surface [57, 4].

In our family of Cosserat shell models, we have the advantage to offer a greater level of generality compared to other frameworks. These models with rotational degree of freedom can then easily be specialized into more classical models by imposing specific constraints. This flexibility places us in an advantageous position to explore a wide range of model variants within a unified framework. See also [53] and [42] for numerical simulations in comparisons to experiments.

In our current study, we illustrate that the strain measures utilized in all our recent Cosserat shell models, as discussed in references such as [25, 26, 27, 9, 28, 51, 50, 24], have well-defined mathematical and physical interpretations that are consistent with the geometric explanations presented in references such as [57, 4, 5] and [1]. To provide a comprehensive overview of the models under consideration, the initial section of this paper introduces all the relevant strain tensors and establishes their connections to variational problems that define the shell models.

To the best of our knowledge, it appears that the models developed in [25, 27, 9], and [28] (see also [7, 8]) are the first instances in the literature to possess the unique capability of explicitly specifying the influence of both bending and (different) curvature measures. It is worth noting that there has been some confusion between these two distinct measures, a confusion that will be clarified in this present paper. A comprehensive contrast between our shell strain energy density and the one utilized in the 6-parameter shell theory, as described in [15, 22], and [33], has been provided in [26, Sect. 6].

In the subsequent sections of this paper, we progressively demonstrate that our models encompass an entire family of models. Ultimately, the linearization of the deformation measures within our constrained Cosserat-shell model corresponds to the approaches advocated in later works by Sanders and Budiansky in [13, 14], as well as by Koiter and Simmonds in [31]. They referred to the resulting theory as the “best first-order linear elastic shell theory.” However, our change of the curvature measure aligns with those used by Anicic and Legér in [6].

Given the varying terminology and interpretations of certain tensors in the existing literature, we start offering the comparative Table 1 for shells and for a simplified overview in Table 2 for plates, too.

⁵<https://imechanica.org/node/1408>

Names and tensors used in the literature for linear and nonlinear shell models (factor 2 at places is correct)

authors	change of metric	the candidate for “the bending strain tensor”	the candidate for “the change of curvature tensor”	bending strain/ change of curvature measures variations in H and K
linear Koiter model [32]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}]^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = [\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}]^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$	\times
Sanders [54]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times	\times
Budianski & Sanders [14]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] = \text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}})$	\times	\times
Koiter & Simmonds [31]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] = \text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}})$	\times
Anić & Léger [6]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}]$	\times
Kirchoff-Love from Silhavy [57]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times
Acharya [1]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times	\times	\times
our linear modified constrained Cosserat model	$\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] = \text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}})$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] = \mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times
our linear Cosserat model	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} = (\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v - \vartheta \times \nabla y_0) \notin \text{Sym}(2)$, $\text{sym } \mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} = -(\nabla y_0)^T (\partial_{x_1} \vartheta \times n_0 \mid \partial_{x_2} \vartheta \times n_0) \notin \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} - \mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}$, additional vectors: $\mathcal{T}^{\text{lin}}, \mathcal{N}^{\text{lin}}$	\times
classical nonlinear Koiter [17]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}} = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}]$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}} = [\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2)$	\times	\times
our nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat model	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{b}} = [\nabla \Theta]^T (\sqrt{ \nabla \Theta }^{-T} \hat{\mathbb{I}}_m \mathbb{1}_2^{\text{b}} [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} - \sqrt{ \nabla \Theta }^{-T} \hat{\mathbb{I}}_{y_0} \mathbb{1}_2^{\text{b}} [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}) [\nabla \Theta] \in \text{Sym}(3)$	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{b}} = [\nabla \Theta]^T (\sqrt{ \nabla \Theta }^{-1} \hat{\mathbb{I}}_m^{-1} \nabla \Theta ^T [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \mathbb{I}_m^{\text{b}} [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} - \sqrt{ \nabla \Theta }^{-1} \hat{\mathbb{I}}_{y_0}^{-1} \nabla \Theta ^T [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \mathbb{I}_{y_0}^{\text{b}} [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}) \nabla \Theta \notin \text{Sym}(3)$	$\text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_{\infty} - \mathcal{G}_{\infty} L_{y_0})$, additional vector: \mathcal{N}_{∞}	\times
generalized non-linear Naghdi-type [37]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}} = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}]$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Naghdi}} = -\text{sym}[\nabla m]^T \nabla d - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}$ additional vectors: transverse shear $(d, \partial_{x_1} m)$, $(d, \partial_{x_1} m)$	\times
our nonlinear Cosserat model	$\mathcal{G} = (\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R} = -(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla (\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{e,s} n_0) - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}$	$\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{G} L_{y_0}$, additional vectors: \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}	\times

Table 1: Here, y_0 denotes the initial surface and $m = y_0 + v(x)$ is the midsurface deformation, with v the midsurface displacement, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{e,s}$ is the Cosserat rotation, $\mathbb{I}_m := [\nabla m]^T \nabla m \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ and $\mathbb{I}_m := -[\nabla m]^T \nabla n \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ are the matrix representations of the *first fundamental form (metric)* and the *second fundamental form*, respectively, $n = \frac{\partial_{x_1} m \times \partial_{x_2} m}{\|\partial_{x_1} m \times \partial_{x_2} m\|}$, L_m is the *Weingarten map (or shape operator)* defined by $L_m = \mathbb{I}_m^{-1} \mathbb{I}_m$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, with similar definitions for L_{y_0} , \mathbb{I}_{y_0} , n_0 and L_{y_0} , ϑ is the infinitesimal rotation and denotes the axial vector of $\overline{A}_\vartheta = \exp(\overline{A}_\vartheta) = \mathbb{1}_3 + \overline{A}_\vartheta + \text{h.o.t.}$, $\mathcal{T}^{\text{lin}} = n_0^T (\nabla v - \vartheta \times \nabla y_0)$ is the transverse shear deformation vector, $\mathcal{N}^{\text{lin}} = n_0^T (\nabla \vartheta)$ is the vector of drilling bendings. We note that $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}, L_{y_0} \in \text{Sym}(2)$ represents an additional constraint in the model. In the nonlinear models: $\mathcal{T} := (\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{e,s} n_0)^T \nabla m \notin \text{Sym}(2)$ is the transverse shear deformation vector and the *vector of drilling bendings* in our nonlinear model is $\mathcal{N} = n_0^T (\text{axl}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_1} \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{e,s}) \mid \text{axl}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_2} \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{e,s}))$.

Names and tensors used in the literature for linear and nonlinear plate (flat shell) models (factor 2 at places is correct)

authors	change of metric	the candidate for “the bending strain tensor”	the candidate for “the change of curvature tensor”	bending strain/ change of curvature measures in H and K
linear Koiter model [32]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_2]^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = [\mathbb{I}_m]^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$	\times
Sanders [54]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times	\times
Budianski & Sanders [14]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}} = \text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}})$	\times	\times
Koiter & Simmonds [31]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = \text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}})$	\times
Anić & Léger [6]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\checkmark
Kirchoff-Love from Šilhavý [57]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$	\checkmark
Acharya [1]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = \text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}})$	\times	\times
our linear modified constrained model	$\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	$\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$ additional vectors: $\mathcal{N}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{x_1} \text{cur}(v_1, v_2)^T \partial_{x_2} \text{cur}(v_1, v_2)^T)$	\checkmark
our linear Cosserat model	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} v_1 & \partial_{x_2} v_1 - \partial_3 \\ \partial_{x_1} v_2 + \partial_3 & \partial_{x_2} v_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $\text{sym } \mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} \phi_2 & -\partial_{x_2} \phi_2 \\ \partial_{x_1} \phi_1 & -\partial_{x_2} \phi_1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} \phi_2 & -\partial_{x_2} \phi_2 \\ \partial_{x_1} \phi_1 & -\partial_{x_2} \phi_1 \end{pmatrix}$, additional vectors: $\mathcal{T}^{\text{lin}} = (\partial_{x_1} v_3 + \phi_2 \partial_{x_2} v_3 - \phi_1)$, $\mathcal{N}^{\text{lin}} = (\partial_{x_1} v_3 \partial_{x_2} v_3)$	\checkmark
classical nonlinear Koiter [17]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}} = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_2]$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}} = \mathbb{I}_m$	\times	\times
our nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat model	$\mathcal{G}_{\infty} = \sqrt{\mathbb{I}_m} - \mathbb{I}_2$ $\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$	$\mathcal{R}_{\infty} = \sqrt{\mathbb{I}_m} \mathbb{I}_m$	$\text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_{\infty})$, additional vectors: $\mathcal{N}_{\infty} = e_3^T (\text{axl}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\infty}^T \partial_{x_1} \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\infty}) \text{axl}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\infty}^T \partial_{x_2} \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\infty}))$	$?$
generalized non-linear Naghdi-type [37]	$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}} = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_2]$	\times	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Naghdi}} = -\text{sym}[\nabla m]^T \nabla d$ additional vectors: transverse shear $(d, \partial_{x_1} m), (d, \partial_{x_1} m)$	\times
our nonlinear Cosserat model	$\mathcal{G} = (\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_1 \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_2)^T \nabla m - \mathbb{I}_2 \notin \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R} = -(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_1 \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_2)^T \nabla \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_3$, additional vectors: $\mathcal{T} = \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_3^T \nabla m$, $\mathcal{N} = e_3^T (\text{axl}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}^T \partial_{x_1} \overline{\mathcal{Q}}) \text{axl}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}^T \partial_{x_2} \overline{\mathcal{Q}}))$	$?$	$?$

Table 2: For plate models, $\nabla \Theta(x_3) = \mathbb{I}_3$, $y_0(x_1, x_2) = (x_1, x_2, 0)$, $n_0 = e_3$, $\mathbb{B}_{\text{id}} = 0_3$, $\mathbb{I}_{\text{id}} = \mathbb{I}_2$, $\mathbb{I}_{\text{id}} = 0_2$, $\mathbb{L}_{\text{id}} = 0_2$, $m = \mathbb{1} + v$ is the midsurface deformation, v is the midsurface displacement, ϑ is the infinitesimal rotation and denotes the axial vector of \overline{A}_{ϑ} , such that the Cosserat microrotation $\overline{Q} = \exp(\overline{A}_{\vartheta}) = \mathbb{1}_3 + \overline{A}_{\vartheta} + \text{h.o.t.}$. In the nonlinear models: \mathcal{T} is the transverse shear deformation vector, and \mathcal{N} is the vector of drilling bendings, with their corresponding vector in the linearised models denoted by \cdot^{lin} . We observe that the difference between “bending tensors” and “curvature tensors” disappears completely for classical flat shell models.

The key findings of the paper highlight several advantages of our new Cosserat shell models:

1. The shell models are of order $O(h^5)$ concerning the thickness parameter, denoted as h . It is worth noting that while the linear model developed by Anicic and Léger [6] also includes higher-order terms in the thickness parameter, these terms are not explicitly stated. However, Anicic and Léger’s model does not account for Cosserat effects, and it does not stem directly from a parental 3D nonlinear theory. We assert that determining the internal energy for a shell model is challenging without first having a parent nonlinear model derived from a nonlinear 3D-model. It is important to remember that a shell, despite being a 2D-approximation of a 3D model, is fundamentally a 3D object with inherent 3D properties.
2. In addition to Anicic and Léger’s model, our model, even in its linearised form, includes energy terms describing generalized transverse shear and drilling bendings. This is a result of the presence of Cosserat effects from the outset. Furthermore, the change of curvature measure utilized by Anicic and Léger is not suitable as a measure for bending, whereas our model accounts for both these measures: one for bending and another dedicated one for the change of curvature.
3. After linearization, our nonlinear constrained Cosserat shell theory reduces to the shell model with the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure. This bending measure, when compared to other bending tensors proposed in the literature, has the property of vanishing in cases of infinitesimal pure stretch deformations of a quadrant of a cylinder. In contrast to Anicic and Léger’s model, it appears natural that the three-dimensional Biot-type energy leads, after dimensional reduction, to in-plane deformation-bending coupling terms rather than a quadratic form involving only the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure or the Koiter bending measure.
4. The inclusion of bending measures in our shell models stems from the incorporation of the Cosserat-curvature 3D energy within the parental 3D energy. It appears that without considering a Cosserat model or a couple stress model, a 3D energy derived solely from classical elasticity (e.g., W_{Biot} or W_{SVK}) the appropriate strain measure for pure bending measures will not appear. Instead, a measure of curvature is present after dimension reduction.
5. The internal energy within our nonlinear Cosserat shell theory contains quadratic expressions in strain tensors, which, after linearization, lead to a quadratic form akin to that proposed by Anicic and Léger. The coercivity of the internal energy in the strain tensors indicates that vanishing energy implies no change in the initial curvatures. These quadratic terms under discussion align with the recent study by Šilhavý [57].
6. In our model we also include quadratic energies in terms of the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure due to the presence of the 2D approximation of the 3D Cosserat curvature energy.
7. In our linearised constrained Cosserat-shell model, the constitutive coefficients are derived from the three-dimensional formulation. Additionally, the curved initial shell configuration explicitly factors into the expression of the coefficients for the energies in the reduced two-dimensional variational problem.

2 Shell-kinematics and strain measures in nonlinear and linearised Cosserat-shell models

2.1 Shell-like thin domain and reconstructed 3D deformation

Let $\Omega_\xi \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a three-dimensional curved *shell-like thin domain*. Here, the domain Ω_ξ is referred to a fixed right Cartesian coordinate frame with unit vectors e_i along the axes Ox_i . A generic point of Ω_ξ will be denoted by (ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3) . The elastic material constituting the shell is assumed to be homogeneous and isotropic and the reference configuration Ω_ξ is assumed to be a natural state. The deformation of the body occupying the domain Ω_ξ is described by a vector map $\varphi_\xi : \Omega_\xi \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ (called *deformation*) and by a *microrotation* tensor

$\bar{R}_\xi : \Omega_\xi \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$ attached at each point⁶. We denote the current configuration (deformed configuration) by $\Omega_c := \varphi_\xi(\Omega_\xi) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

We also need to consider the *fictitious Cartesian (planar) configuration* of the body Ω_h , see Figure 2. This parameter domain $\Omega_h \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a right cylinder of the form

$$\Omega_h = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid (x_1, x_2) \in \omega, -\frac{h}{2} < x_3 < \frac{h}{2} \right\} = \omega \times \left(-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2} \right),$$

where $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\omega$ and the constant length $h > 0$ is the *thickness of the shell*. For shell-like bodies we consider the domain Ω_h to be thin, i.e., the thickness h is small.

In the formulation of the minimization problem we will consider the *Weingarten map (or shape operator)* defined by $L_{y_0} = I_{y_0}^{-1} \Pi_{y_0} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, where $I_{y_0} := [\nabla y_0]^T \nabla y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ and $\Pi_{y_0} := -[\nabla y_0]^T \nabla n_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ are the matrix representations of the *first fundamental form (metric)* and the *second fundamental form* of the surface, respectively⁷. Then, the *Gauß curvature* K of the surface is determined by $K := \det L_{y_0}$ and the *mean curvature* H through $2H := \text{tr}(L_{y_0})$. We will also use the tensors defined by $A_{y_0} := (\nabla y_0|0) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, $B_{y_0} := -(\nabla n_0|0) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, and the so-called *alternator tensor* [63] of the surface

$$C_{y_0} := \det \nabla\Theta [\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1|0 \\ -1 & 0|0 \\ 0 & 0|0 \end{pmatrix} [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}. \quad (2.1)$$




Figure 1: Kinematics of the 3D-Cosserat model. In each point $\xi \in \Omega_\xi$ of the curvy reference configuration, there is the deformation $\varphi_\xi : \Omega_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ and the microrotation $\bar{R}_\xi : \Omega_\xi \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$. We introduce a fictitious flat configuration Ω_h and refer all fields to that configuration. This introduces a multiplicative split of the total deformation $\varphi : \Omega_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ and total rotation $\bar{R} : \Omega_h \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$ into “elastic” parts ($\varphi_\xi : \Omega_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\bar{R}_\xi : \Omega_\xi \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$) and compatible “plastic” parts (given by $\Theta : \Omega_h \rightarrow \Omega_\xi$ and $Q_0 : \Omega_h \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$). The “intermediate” configuration Ω_ξ is compatible by construction.

Now, let us define the map $\varphi : \Omega_h \rightarrow \Omega_c$, $\varphi(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \varphi_\xi(\Theta(x_1, x_2, x_3))$. We view φ as a function which maps the fictitious planar reference configuration Ω_h into the deformed configuration Ω_c . We also consider the *elastic microrotation* $\bar{Q}_{e,s} : \Omega_h \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$, $\bar{Q}_{e,s}(x_1, x_2, x_3) := \bar{R}_\xi(\Theta(x_1, x_2, x_3))$, see Figure 2.

⁶We let $\text{Sym}(n)$ and $\text{Sym}^+(n)$ denote the symmetric and positive definite symmetric tensors, respectively. We adopt the usual abbreviations of Lie-group theory, i.e., $\text{GL}(n) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid \det(X) \neq 0\}$ the general linear group $\text{SO}(n) = \{X \in \text{GL}(n) \mid X^T X = \mathbb{1}_n, \det(X) = 1\}$ with corresponding Lie-algebras $\mathfrak{so}(n) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid X^T = -X\}$ of skew symmetric tensors and $\mathfrak{sl}(n) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid \text{tr}(X) = 0\}$ of traceless tensors. For all $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ we set $\text{sym } X = \frac{1}{2}(X^T + X) \in \text{Sym}(n)$, skew $X = \frac{1}{2}(X - X^T) \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$ and the deviatoric part $\text{dev } X = X - \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(X) \cdot \mathbb{1}_n \in \mathfrak{sl}(n)$ and we have the orthogonal Cartan-decomposition of the Lie-algebra $\mathfrak{gl}(n) = \{\mathfrak{sl}(n) \cap \text{Sym}(n)\} \oplus \mathfrak{so}(n) \oplus \mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbb{1}_n$, $X = \text{dev sym } X + \text{skew } X + \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(X) \cdot \mathbb{1}_n$.

⁷For an open domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$, the usual Lebesgue spaces of square integrable functions, vector or tensor fields on Ω with values in \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}^3 , $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ or $\text{SO}(3)$, respectively will be denoted by $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3})$ and $L^2(\Omega; \text{SO}(3))$, respectively. Moreover, we use the standard Sobolev spaces $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ [2, 29, 34] of functions u . For vector fields $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)^T$ with $u_i \in H^1(\Omega)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, we define $\nabla u := (\nabla u_1 \mid \nabla u_2 \mid \nabla u_3)^T$. The corresponding Sobolev-space will be denoted by $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$. A tensor $Q : \Omega \rightarrow \text{SO}(3)$ having the components in $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ belongs to $H^1(\Omega; \text{SO}(3))$.

The dimensional descent in [25] is done by assuming that the elastic microrotation is constant through the thickness, i.e. $\overline{Q}_{e,s}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \overline{Q}_{e,s}(x_1, x_2)$, and by considering an *8-parameter quadratic ansatz* in the thickness direction for the reconstructed total deformation $\varphi_s : \Omega_h \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ of the shell-like body, i.e.,

$$\varphi_s(x_1, x_2, x_3) = m(x_1, x_2) + \left(x_3 \varrho_m(x_1, x_2) + \frac{x_3^2}{2} \varrho_b(x_1, x_2) \right) \overline{Q}_{e,s}(x_1, x_2) \nabla \Theta \cdot e_3. \quad (2.2)$$

Here $m : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ represents the total deformation of the midsurface, $\varrho_m, \varrho_b : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ allow in principal for symmetric thickness stretch ($\varrho_m \neq 1$) and asymmetric thickness stretch ($\varrho_b \neq 0$) about the midsurface and they are given analytically by

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_m &= 1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + 2\mu} [\langle \overline{Q}_{e,s}^T (\nabla m | 0) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, \mathbf{1}_3 \rangle - 2], \\ \varrho_b &= -\frac{\lambda}{\lambda + 2\mu} \langle \overline{Q}_{e,s}^T (\nabla (\overline{Q}_{e,s} \nabla \Theta \cdot e_3) | 0) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, \mathbf{1}_3 \rangle + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + 2\mu} \langle \overline{Q}_{e,s}^T (\nabla m | 0) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} (\nabla n_0 | 0) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, \mathbf{1}_3 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

2.2 Shell strain tensors in Koiter type models

The classical *change of metric* tensor in the Koiter model [59, 60, 17] is given by the difference between the first fundamental form of the unknown midsurface parametrized by m and the first fundamental form of the referential midsurface configuration parametrized by y_0

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}} := \frac{1}{2} [(\nabla m)^T \nabla m - \mathbf{I}_{y_0}] = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{I}_{y_0}) \in \text{Sym}(2), \quad (2.4)$$

with $\mathbf{I}_m := (\nabla m)^T (\nabla m) \in \text{Sym}^+(2)$, while the classical *bending strain tensor* in the Koiter model is defined by the difference between the second fundamental form of the unknown midsurface parametrized by m and the second fundamental form of the referential midsurface configuration parametrized by y_0

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}} := -(\nabla m)^T \nabla n - (-(\nabla y_0)^T \nabla n_0) = \mathbf{II}_m - \mathbf{II}_{y_0} \in \text{Sym}(2). \quad (2.5)$$

In the linearised model, the total midsurface deformation is written as

$$m(x_1, x_2) = y_0(x_1, x_2) + v(x_1, x_2), \quad (2.6)$$

with $v : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ the infinitesimal midsurface displacement, and the strain measures [17] of the linearised Koiter model are given by

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{I}_{y_0}]^{\text{lin}} = \frac{1}{2} [(\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v) + (\nabla v)^T (\nabla y_0)] = \text{sym}[(\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v)] \in \text{Sym}(2) \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} := [\mathbf{II}_m - \mathbf{II}_{y_0}]^{\text{lin}} = \left(\langle n_0, \partial_{x_\alpha x_\beta} v - \sum_{\gamma=1,2} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma \partial_{x_\gamma} v \rangle_{\alpha\beta} \right) \in \text{Sym}(2). \quad (2.8)$$

The expression of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ involves the Christoffel symbols $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma$ on the surface parametrized by y_0 given by

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma = \langle a^\gamma, \partial_{x_\alpha} a_\beta \rangle = -\langle \partial_{x_\alpha} a^\gamma, a_\beta \rangle = \Gamma_{\beta\alpha}^\gamma. \quad (2.9)$$

Here, and in the rest of the paper, a_1, a_2, a_3 denote the columns of $\nabla \Theta$, while a^1, a^2, a^3 denote the rows of $[\nabla \Theta]^{-1}$, i.e. $\nabla \Theta = (\nabla y_0 | n_0) = (a_1 | a_2 | a_3)$, $[\nabla \Theta]^{-1} = (a^1 | a^2 | a^3)^T$. In fact, a_1, a_2 are the covariant base vectors and a^1, a^2 are the contravariant base vectors in the tangent plane given by $a_\alpha := \partial_{x_\alpha} y_0$, $\langle a^\beta, a_\alpha \rangle = \delta_\alpha^\beta$, $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$, and $a_3 = a^3 = n_0$. The following relations hold [17, page 95]: $\|a_1 \times a_2\| = \sqrt{\det \mathbf{I}_{y_0}}$, $a_3 \times a_1 = \sqrt{\det \mathbf{I}_{y_0}} a^2$, $a_2 \times a_3 = \sqrt{\det \mathbf{I}_{y_0}} a^1$.

Other alternative (equivalent) forms of the change of metric tensor and the change of curvature tensor [17, Page 181] are

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = \left(\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\beta v_\alpha + \partial_\alpha v_\beta) - \sum_{\gamma=1,2} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma v_\gamma - b_{\alpha\beta} v_3 \right)_{\alpha\beta} \in \text{Sym}(2), \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = & \left(\partial_{x_\alpha x_\beta} v_3 - \sum_{\gamma=1,2} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma \partial_{x_\gamma} v_3 - \sum_{\gamma=1,2} b_\alpha^\gamma b_{\gamma\beta} v_3 + \sum_{\gamma=1,2} b_\alpha^\gamma (\partial_{x_\beta} v_\gamma - \sum_{\tau=1,2} \Gamma_{\beta\gamma}^\tau v_\tau) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{\gamma=1,2} b_\beta^\gamma (\partial_{x_\alpha} v_\gamma - \sum_{\tau=1,2} \Gamma_{\alpha\tau}^\gamma v_\tau) + \sum_{\tau=1,2} (\partial_{x_\alpha} b_\beta^\tau + \sum_{\gamma=1,2} \Gamma_{\alpha\gamma}^\tau b_\beta^\gamma - \sum_{\gamma=1,2} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma b_\gamma^\tau) v_\tau \right)_{\alpha\beta} \in \text{Sym}(2), \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

respectively, where $b_{\alpha\beta}(m)$ are the components of the second fundamental form corresponding to the map m , $b_\alpha^\beta(m)$ are the components of the matrix associated to the Weingarten map (shape operator).

2.3 Kinematics in the Cosserat shell model

2.3.1 Strain tensors in the nonlinear Cosserat shell model

In the resulting fully two-dimensional minimization problem, the reduced energy density is formulated using the following tensor fields which are also discussed in [36, 15, 21, 10], and [11], although with different contexts and reasons for their significance, all defined on the surface denoted as ω . The tensor fields are⁸

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{m,s} & := \bar{Q}_{e,s}^T (\nabla m | \bar{Q}_{e,s} \nabla \Theta . e_3) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} - \mathbb{1}_3 \notin \text{Sym}(3), & \text{elastic shell strain tensor}, \\ \mathcal{K}_{e,s} & := \left(\text{axl}(\bar{Q}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_1} \bar{Q}_{e,s}) | \text{axl}(\bar{Q}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_2} \bar{Q}_{e,s}) | 0 \right) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} \notin \text{Sym}(3) & \text{elastic shell bending-curvature tensor}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Beside these two strain tensors, in the expression of the internal energy two other tensors are present (with different physical meaning, in comparison with the elastic shell strain tensor and the elastic shell bending-curvature tensor), namely $C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}$ and $\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}$. In order to see what each of these four tensors measures, we observe that we can express the strain tensors as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{m,s} & = [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{(\bar{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0} | \mathbf{0}}{(\bar{Q}_{e,s} n_0)^T \nabla m} \middle| \mathbf{0} \right) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} = [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{G} | \mathbf{0}}{\mathcal{T} | \mathbf{0}} \right) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, \\ C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s} & = [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{(\bar{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla (\bar{Q}_{e,s} n_0) + \mathbb{I}_{y_0} | \mathbf{0}}{0} \middle| \mathbf{0} \right) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} = -[\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R} | \mathbf{0}}{0 | \mathbf{0}} \right) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{m,s} B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s} & = -[\nabla_x \Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{G} L_{y_0} | \mathbf{0}}{\mathcal{T} L_{y_0}} \middle| \mathbf{0} \right) [\nabla_x \Theta]^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} & := (\bar{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2) & \text{the change of metric tensor}, \\ \mathcal{T} & := (\bar{Q}_{e,s} n_0)^T \nabla m = \langle \bar{Q}_{e,s} n_0, \partial_{x_1} m \rangle, \langle \bar{Q}_{e,s} n_0, \partial_{x_2} m \rangle & \text{the transverse shear deformation (row) vector}, \\ \mathcal{R} & := -(\bar{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla (\bar{Q}_{e,s} n_0) - \mathbb{I}_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2) & \text{the bending strain tensor}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

The non-symmetric quantity $\mathcal{R} - \mathbb{1} \mathcal{G} L_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2)$ serves as a representation of what we refer to as the *change of curvature* tensor. The rationale behind this nomenclature will become evident as this paper progresses. For now, it is important to note that the definition of \mathcal{G} is associated with the classical *change of metric* tensor in the Koiter model [59, 60, 17], denoted as $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}$.

Our bending strain tensor \mathcal{R} generalises the bending strain tensor in the Naghdi-type shell model [37, p. 11] with one independent director field $d : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ given by

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Naghdi}} := -[\text{sym}((\nabla m)^T \nabla d) - (\nabla y_0)^T \nabla n_0] = -(\text{sym}((\nabla m)^T \nabla d) - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}) \in \text{Sym}(2).$$

Identifying $d = \bar{Q}_{e,s} n_0$, our transverse shear deformation row vector \mathcal{T} may be seen in relation to the transverse shear deformation row vector in the Naghdi-type shell models, see [37, Section 6] and [24], which is

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{Naghdi}} := d^T \nabla m = \langle d, \partial_{x_1} m \rangle, \langle d, \partial_{x_2} m \rangle. \quad (2.15)$$

⁸A matrix having the three column vectors A_1, A_2, A_3 will be written as $(A_1 | A_2 | A_3)$. We make use of the operator $\text{axl} : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ associating with a matrix $A \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ the vector $\text{axl}(A) := (-A_{23}, A_{13}, -A_{12})^T$. The inverse operator will be denoted by $\text{Anti} : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$.

The presence of our additional strain tensor

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C} &:= \mathcal{R} - \mathcal{G} \mathbf{L}_{y_0} = -(\overline{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla (\overline{Q}_{e,s} n_0) - \mathbb{I}_{y_0} - (\overline{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla m \mathbf{L}_{y_0} + \mathbf{I}_{y_0} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}, \\ &= -(\overline{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla (\overline{Q}_{e,s} n_0) - (\overline{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla m \mathbf{L}_{y_0}\end{aligned}\quad (2.16)$$

named by us *change of curvature* is surprising at first. Our change of curvature tensor \mathcal{C} replaces the strain tensor

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{Naghdi}} = (\nabla d)^T (\nabla d) - \mathbb{I} \mathbf{I}_{y_0} \quad (2.17)$$

considered in some Naghdi-type models, see [37, Section 6], but its expression is fundamentally different, primarily because it involves the deformation gradient ∇m and not only the gradient of the director d .

It is possible to express the tensor $\mathcal{K}_{e,s}$ in terms of the tensor $\mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}$ and the vector $\mathcal{K}_{e,s}^T n_0$ as

$$\mathcal{K}_{e,s} = \mathbf{A}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s} + (0|0|n_0) (0|0|n_0)^T \mathcal{K}_{e,s} = \mathbf{C}_{y_0} (-\mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}) + (0|0|n_0) (0|0|\mathcal{K}_{e,s}^T n_0)^T. \quad (2.18)$$

We have already seen that $\mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}$ from the above decomposition can be expressed in terms of the *bending strain tensor* \mathcal{R} , while the remaining vector $\mathcal{K}_{e,s}^T n_0$ from (2.18) is completely characterized by the row vector

$$\mathcal{N} := n_0^T (\text{axl}(\overline{Q}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_1} \overline{Q}_{e,s}) | \text{axl}(\overline{Q}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_2} \overline{Q}_{e,s})), \quad (2.19)$$

which is called the row vector of *drilling bendings*.

One aim of the present paper is to argue the following new names of the involved strain tensors

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{E}_{m,s} & \textit{the change of metric-transverse shear deformation strain tensor,} \\ \mathcal{K}_{e,s} & \textit{the bending-drilling strain tensor,} \\ \mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s} & \textit{the bending strain tensor,} \\ \mathcal{E}_{m,s} \mathbf{B}_{y_0} + \mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s} & \textit{the change of curvature-transverse shear deformation strain tensor.} \end{array} \quad (2.20)$$

2.3.2 Strain tensors in the linearised Cosserat shell model

In the linearised model, as usual, the total midsurface deformation is written $m(x_1, x_2) = y_0(x_1, x_2) + v(x_1, x_2)$, with $v : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ the infinitesimal shell-midsurface displacement, while the elastic rotation tensor $\overline{Q}_{e,s} \in \text{SO}(3)$ is approximated by $\overline{Q}_{e,s} = \mathbb{1}_3 + \overline{A}_\vartheta + \text{h.o.t.}$, where the skew-symmetric matrix $\overline{A}_\vartheta \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ is the infinitesimal elastic microrotation $\overline{A}_\vartheta := \text{Anti}(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\vartheta_3 & \vartheta_2 \\ \vartheta_3 & 0 & -\vartheta_1 \\ -\vartheta_2 & \vartheta_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ and $\vartheta = \text{axl}(\overline{A}_\vartheta)$ denotes the corresponding axial vector of \overline{A}_ϑ . Then, we linearise all the previous strain tensors and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{m,s}^{\text{lin}} &= [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} | \mathbf{0}}{\mathcal{T}^{\text{lin}} | 0} \right) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, \\ \mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}^{\text{lin}} &= -[\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} | \mathbf{0}}{0 | 0} \right) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{m,s}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{B}_{y_0} + \mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}^{\text{lin}} &= -[\nabla_x \Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} - \mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0} | \mathbf{0}}{\mathcal{T}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0} | 0} \right) [\nabla_x \Theta]^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

and

$$\mathcal{K}_{e,s}^{\text{lin}} = (\nabla \vartheta | 0) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, \quad (2.22)$$

where⁹

$$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} = (\nabla y_0)^T \nabla v + (\vartheta \times \nabla y_0)^T \nabla y_0, \quad \mathcal{T}^{\text{lin}} = n_0^T \nabla v + (\vartheta \times n_0)^T \nabla y_0, \quad \mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} = -(n_0 \times \nabla y_0)^T \nabla \vartheta$$

⁹For any column vector $q \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and any matrix $M = (M_1|M_2|M_3) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ we define the cross-product $q \times M := (q \times M_1 | q \times M_2 | q \times M_3)$ (operates on columns) and $M^T \times q^T := -(q \times M)^T$ (operates on rows). Note that M can also be a 3×2 matrix, the definition remains the same.

are the linearisation of \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{R} , respectively.

Since the strain tensors from the Cosserat shell model are correlated to strain tensors from the Naghdi-type models, we give the linearised form of the tensors considered in these models [37, Section 7]

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Naghdi}}^{\text{lin}} := -[\text{sym}((\nabla y_0)^T \nabla d) + \text{sym}((\nabla v)^T \nabla n_0)] \in \text{Sym}(2) \quad (2.23)$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{Naghdi}}^{\text{lin}} := n_0^T \nabla v + \zeta^T \nabla y_0 = (\langle n_0, \partial_{x_1} v \rangle, \langle n_0, \partial_{x_2} v \rangle) + (\langle \zeta, \partial_{x_1} y_0 \rangle, \langle \zeta, \partial_{x_2} y_0 \rangle), \quad (2.24)$$

where $d = n_0 + \zeta$. The linearisation of the Naghdi-type candidate for the change of curvature $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Naghdi}}$ is

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{Naghdi}}^{\text{lin}} = \frac{1}{2}[(\nabla n_0)^T (\nabla d) + (\nabla d)^T (\nabla n_0)] = \text{sym}[(\nabla n_0)^T (\nabla d)]. \quad (2.25)$$

To obtain a comparison with the classical linear Koiter-shell model, let us first present an alternative form of \mathcal{G}^{lin} , i.e., we can express \mathcal{G}^{lin} also as

$$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} = (\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v) + \langle \vartheta, n_0 \rangle \sqrt{\det \mathbb{I}_{y_0}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.26)$$

From (2.26) we note the relation

$$\text{sym } \mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} = \text{sym}[(\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v)] = \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}, \quad (2.27)$$

therefore $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ corresponds to the symmetric part of our \mathcal{G}^{lin} but it does not coincide with \mathcal{G}^{lin} .

It is not possible to establish an equivalence between the linear bending strain tensor in the Koiter model and the bending strain tensor addressed in our linear Cosserat-shell model. This difference arises because, whereas $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ relies solely on infinitesimal displacements, \mathcal{R}^{lin} is contingent on both infinitesimal displacements and infinitesimal elastic microrotations.

2.4 Kinematics in the constrained Cosserat shell model

2.4.1 Strain tensors in the constrained modified nonlinear Cosserat shell model

In the constrained Cosserat model, the microrotation is not any more an independent unknown [27, 44] and [46] of the model, it now depends on the deformation of the total midsurface through

$$\bar{Q}_{e,s} \equiv \bar{Q}_\infty := \text{polar}((\nabla m|n)[\nabla \Theta]^{-1}) = (\nabla m|n)[\nabla \Theta]^{-1} \sqrt{[\nabla \Theta] \hat{\mathbb{I}}_m^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^T}, \quad (2.28)$$

with the lifted quantity $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ given by $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_m := (\nabla m|n)^T (\nabla m|n)$, $n = \frac{\partial_{x_1} m \times \partial_{x_2} m}{\|\partial_{x_1} m \times \partial_{x_2} m\|}$.

Thus, the strain tensors of the unconstrained nonlinear Cosserat shell model become the following strain tensors of the constrained nonlinear Cosserat shell model

- the symmetric elastic shell strain tensor $\mathcal{E}_\infty \in \text{Sym}(3)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\infty &:= \bar{Q}_\infty^T (\nabla m| \bar{Q}_\infty \nabla \Theta \cdot e_3) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} - \mathbb{1}_3 = [\text{polar}((\nabla m|n)[\nabla \Theta]^{-1})]^T (\nabla m|n)[\nabla \Theta]^{-1} - \mathbb{1}_3 \\ &= \sqrt{[\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \hat{\mathbb{I}}_m \mathbb{1}_2^b [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}} - \sqrt{[\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \hat{\mathbb{I}}_{y_0} \mathbb{1}_2^b [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}}; \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

- the (still non-symmetric) elastic shell bending-curvature tensor $\mathcal{K}_\infty \notin \text{Sym}(3)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_\infty &:= \left(\text{axl}(\bar{Q}_\infty^T \partial_{x_1} \bar{Q}_\infty) \mid \text{axl}(\bar{Q}_\infty^T \partial_{x_2} \bar{Q}_\infty) \mid 0 \right) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} \\ &= \left(\text{axl} \left(\sqrt{[\nabla \Theta] \hat{\mathbb{I}}_m^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^T} [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} (\nabla m|n)^T \partial_{x_1} \left((\nabla m|n)[\nabla \Theta]^{-1} \sqrt{[\nabla \Theta] \hat{\mathbb{I}}_m^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^T} \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mid \text{axl} \left(\sqrt{[\nabla \Theta] \hat{\mathbb{I}}_m^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^T} [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} (\nabla m|n)^T \partial_{x_2} \left((\nabla m|n)[\nabla \Theta]^{-1} \sqrt{[\nabla \Theta] \hat{\mathbb{I}}_m^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^T} \right) \right) \mid 0 \right) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

Let us recall that in the constrained parental 3D Cosserat model, the microrotation is chosen to be

$$Q_{3D} = \text{polar}(\nabla\varphi_{3D}), \quad (2.31)$$

where φ_{3D} is the 3D-deformation, and the 3D strain measure becomes the symmetric Biot-strain $\mathcal{E}_{3D} = \sqrt{(\nabla\varphi_{3D})^T(\nabla\varphi_{3D})} - \mathbb{1}_3 \in \text{Sym}(3)$. Therefore, in the constrained Cosserat shell model, the reconstructed strain measure given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{3D} = & 1 \left[\underbrace{\mathcal{E}_\infty}_{\in \text{Sym}(3)} - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + 2\mu} \text{tr}(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \underbrace{(0|0|n_0)(0|0|n_0)^T}_{\in \text{Sym}(3)} \right] \\ & + x_3 \left[(\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty) - \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda + 2\mu)} \text{tr}(\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty) \underbrace{(0|0|n_0)(0|0|n_0)^T}_{\in \text{Sym}(3)} \right] \\ & + x_3^2 \left[(\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty) B_{y_0} \right] + O(x_3^3) \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

should be symmetric! Since $\{1, x_3, x_3^2\}$ are linear independent, from the last relation we see that the symmetry of the reconstructed 3D strain measures \mathcal{E}_{3D} in (2.36) leads to the idea to use only the symmetric parts of the tensors in the reconstruction, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}_\infty = [\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{G}_\infty | \mathbf{0}}{0 | 0} \right) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}, \quad (2.33)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty = -[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_\infty - \mathcal{G}_\infty L_{y_0} | \mathbf{0}}{0 | 0} \right) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1},$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_\infty := (\overline{Q}_\infty \nabla y_0)^T \nabla m - I_{y_0} \in \text{Sym}(2), \quad \mathcal{R}_\infty := -(\overline{Q}_\infty \nabla y_0)^T \nabla (\overline{Q}_\infty n_0) - \Pi_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2). \quad (2.34)$$

Following this idea, in the modified constrained Cosserat-shell model we consider the symmetrized strain measures

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym } \mathcal{E}_\infty = \mathcal{E}_\infty &= [\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{G}_\infty | \mathbf{0}}{0 | 0} \right) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}, \\ \text{sym}(\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty) &= -[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_\infty - \mathcal{G}_\infty L_{y_0}) | \mathbf{0}}{0 | 0} \right) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}, \\ \text{sym}(\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0}^2 + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty B_{y_0}) &= -[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\text{sym}[(\mathcal{R}_\infty - \mathcal{G}_\infty L_{y_0}) L_{y_0}] | \mathbf{0}}{0 | 0} \right) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

where we used that $\text{sym}(X^T Y X) = X^T \text{sym}(Y) X$, and the reconstructed symmetric 3D strain measure is then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{3D} = & 1 \left[\mathcal{E}_\infty - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + 2\mu} \text{tr}(\mathcal{E}_\infty) (0|0|n_0)(0|0|n_0)^T \right] \\ & + x_3 \left[\text{sym}(\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty) - \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda + 2\mu)} \text{tr}(\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty) (0|0|n_0)(0|0|n_0)^T \right] \\ & + x_3^2 \left[\text{sym}[(\mathcal{E}_{m,s} B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}) B_{y_0}] \right] + O(x_3^3). \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

Note that the symmetry of \mathcal{G}_∞ follows from the symmetry of \mathcal{E}_∞ . The constrained Cosserat-shell model is not able to reflect the effect of the transverse shear vector $\mathcal{T}_\infty := (\overline{Q}_\infty n_0)^T (\nabla m)$, since from the constraint for the expression of \overline{Q}_∞ it follows that the transverse shear vector vanishes.

We also notice that, in the constrained model, too, we use the decomposition of \mathcal{K}_∞ in terms of the tensor $C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty$ and the vector $\mathcal{K}_\infty^T n_0$ as

$$\mathcal{K}_\infty = A_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty + (0|0|n_0)(0|0|n_0)^T \mathcal{K}_\infty = C_{y_0} (-C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty) + (0|0|n_0)(0|0|\mathcal{K}_\infty^T n_0)^T, \quad (2.37)$$

and that $C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty$ from the above decomposition can be expressed in terms of the *bending strain* tensor \mathcal{R}_∞ by

$$C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty = -[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}_\infty | \mathbf{0}}{0 | 0} \right) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}, \quad (2.38)$$

while the remaining vector $\mathcal{K}_\infty^T n_0$ from (2.37) is completely characterized by the row vector (*drilling bendings*)

$$\mathcal{N}_\infty := n_0^T (\text{axl}(\overline{Q}_\infty^T \partial_{x_1} \overline{Q}_\infty) | \text{axl}(\overline{Q}_\infty^T \partial_{x_2} \overline{Q}_\infty)). \quad (2.39)$$

As we will explain in Subsection 3.3, we do not identify a modelling reason for considering only the symmetric part of \mathcal{R}_∞ as kinematic strain measure. In the constrained Cosserat shell model, the still non-symmetric bending strain tensor \mathcal{R}_∞ has the following mixed expression in terms of the first and second fundamental form

$$\mathcal{R}_\infty^b = [\nabla\Theta]^T \left(\sqrt{[\nabla\Theta] \widehat{I}_m^{-1} [\nabla\Theta]^T} [\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \Pi_m^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1} - \sqrt{[\nabla\Theta] \widehat{I}_{y_0}^{-1} [\nabla\Theta]^T} [\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \Pi_{y_0}^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1} \right) \nabla\Theta. \quad (2.40)$$

Moreover, for in-extensional deformations $I_m = I_{y_0}$ (pure flexure), the bending strain tensor turns into

$$\mathcal{R}_\infty^b = [\nabla\Theta]^T \sqrt{[\nabla\Theta] \widehat{I}_{y_0}^{-1} [\nabla\Theta]^T} [\nabla\Theta]^{-T} (\Pi_m^b - \Pi_{y_0}^b) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1} \nabla\Theta = \Pi_m^b - \Pi_{y_0}^b = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^b \in \text{Sym}(3).$$

Hence, in the pure flexure case \mathcal{R}_∞^b coincides with the classical Koiter bending tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^b$.

However, when it comes to coupled membrane bending or a change in membrane curvature (flexure), there is no immediate indication as to why the classical Koiter bending tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^b$ should serve as a suitable measure for bending or curvature change. In fact, as we will explore, alternate variations of the classical Koiter tensor, some of which Koiter himself has acknowledged, or others supported by clear arguments presented by Šilhavý [57], can be contemplated within a coupled membrane bending or curvature alteration (flexural) model.

2.4.2 Strain tensors in the linearised constrained Cosserat shell model

In the linearised constrained Cosserat shell model, as reminiscent of the conditions imposed by the constrained Cosserat shell model, the infinitesimal microrotation and the infinitesimal displacement are not independent any more and

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{A}_\vartheta_\infty &\equiv \text{Anti}\vartheta_\infty = -\text{skew}([\nabla v | \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \langle n_0, \partial_{x_\alpha} v \rangle a^\alpha] [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}) \in \mathfrak{so}(3), \\ \vartheta_\infty &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\text{skew} [(\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v)] C^{-1}) n_0 - \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \langle n_0, \partial_{x_\alpha} v \rangle a^\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3, \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

where

$$C = \sqrt{\det I_{y_0}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.42)$$

Using these dependences, the linearisation of the strain tensors are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\infty^{\text{lin}} &= [\nabla\Theta]^{-T} (\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}})^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}, \\ C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}} &= -[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} (\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0})^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1} \\ \text{sym}(\mathcal{E}_\infty^{\text{lin}} B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}}) &= -[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} [\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0})]^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}, \\ \mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}} &= (\nabla\vartheta_\infty | 0) [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

In the above relations we have already used that the linearisation of \mathcal{G}_∞ and \mathcal{R}_∞ are given by

$$\mathcal{G}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}, \quad \mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}. \quad (2.44)$$

At this point, it is important to note a significant distinction between the interpretation of the bending tensor in the constrained Cosserat shell model and the bending tensor employed in the Koiter model. As we will see in the following $\text{sym} \mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0})$ measures the bending and $\text{sym} \mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} - \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0})$ measures the change of curvature, while the "bending tensor" employed in the Koiter model does not measure none of them. If $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = 0$ (infinitesimal pure flexure) or for a plate (flat shell), $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ and no difference between bending and change of curvature occurs.

3 Concise description of the family of Cosserat-shell models

3.1 Variational problem for nonlinear and linear Koiter models

The variational problem for the Koiter energy is to find

$$\begin{cases} \text{a deformation of the midsurface} & m : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \text{in the nonlinear Koiter model} \\ \text{a midsurface displacement vector field} & v : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \text{in the linear Koiter model} \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

minimizing on the planar domain $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$

$$\int_{\omega} \left\{ h \left(\mu \|\mathcal{E}\|^2 + \frac{\lambda \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} [\text{tr}(\mathcal{E})]^2 \right) + \frac{h^3}{12} \left(\mu \|\mathcal{F}\|^2 + \frac{\lambda \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} [\text{tr}(\mathcal{F})]^2 \right) \right\} \det \nabla \Theta \, da, \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\mathcal{E} = \begin{cases} [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} (\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}})^{\flat} [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, & \text{in the nonlinear Koiter model,} \\ [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} (\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}})^{\flat} [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, & \text{in the linear Koiter model,} \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\mathcal{F} = \begin{cases} [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} (\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}})^{\flat} [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, & \text{in the nonlinear Koiter model} \\ [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} (\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}})^{\flat} [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}, & \text{in the linear Koiter model.} \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

The main feature of the classical Koiter model is that it is just the sum of the correctly identified membrane term and flexural terms (but only under inextensional deformation).¹⁰

3.2 Variational problem for geometrically nonlinear and linear Cosserat-shell models

The total internal energy of the models given in [25, 9], is written with the help of the following quadratic/bilinear forms in terms of some second order tensors $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\text{shell}}(X) &= \mu \|\text{sym } X\|^2 + \mu_c \|\text{skew } X\|^2 + \frac{\lambda \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} [\text{tr}(X)]^2, \\ W_{\text{shell}}(X, Y) &= \mu \langle \text{sym } X, \text{sym } Y \rangle + \mu_c \langle \text{skew } X, \text{skew } Y \rangle + \frac{\lambda \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} \text{tr}(X) \text{tr}(Y), \\ W_{\text{mp}}(X) &= \mu \|\text{sym } X\|^2 + \mu_c \|\text{skew } X\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} [\text{tr}(X)]^2 = \mathcal{W}_{\text{shell}}(X) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2(\lambda + 2\mu)} [\text{tr}(X)]^2, \\ W_{\text{curv}}(X) &= \mu L_c^2 (b_1 \|\text{dev sym } X\|^2 + b_2 \|\text{skew } X\|^2 + b_3 [\text{tr}(X)]^2), \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

The parameters μ and λ are the *Lamé constants* of classical isotropic elasticity, $\kappa = \frac{2\mu+3\lambda}{3}$ is the *infinitesimal bulk modulus*, b_1, b_2, b_3 are *non-dimensional constitutive curvature coefficients (weights)*, $\mu_c \geq 0$ is called the *Cosserat couple modulus* and $L_c > 0$ introduces an *internal length* which is characteristic for the material, e.g., related to the grain size in a polycrystal. The internal length $L_c > 0$ is responsible for *size effects* in the sense that smaller samples are relatively stiffer than larger samples. If not stated otherwise, we assume that $\mu > 0$, $\kappa > 0$, $\mu_c > 0$, $b_1 > 0$, $b_2 > 0$, $b_3 > 0$. All the constitutive coefficients are coming from the three-dimensional Cosserat formulation, without using any a posteriori fitting of some two-dimensional constitutive coefficients.

It is important to note that there is no counterpart of W_{curv} in classical shell theories since W_{curv} is coming exclusively from the 3D independent Cosserat curvature.

¹⁰We are not delving here into a discussion whether the membrane energy needs an additional quasiconvexification step [20].

The two-dimensional minimization problem in the nonlinear and linear Cosserat-shell model is to find

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{lll} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{a deformation of the midsurface} & m : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and} \\ \text{an elastic microrotation} & \bar{Q}_{e,s} : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \text{SO}(3) \end{array} \right. & \begin{array}{l} \text{in the nonlinear} \\ \text{Cosserat-shell model} \end{array} \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{a midsurface displacement vector field} & v : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and} \\ \text{an elastic microrotation vector} & \vartheta : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \end{array} \right. & \begin{array}{l} \text{in the linear} \\ \text{Cosserat-shell model} \end{array} \end{array} \right. \quad (3.6)$$

minimizing on $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ the functional

$$\begin{aligned} I = \int_{\omega} & \left[\left(h + K \frac{h^3}{12} \right) W_{\text{shell}}(\mathcal{E}) + \left(\frac{h^3}{12} - K \frac{h^5}{80} \right) W_{\text{shell}}(\mathcal{E}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K}) \right. \\ & - \frac{h^3}{3} H \mathcal{W}_{\text{shell}}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K}) + \frac{h^3}{6} \mathcal{W}_{\text{shell}}(\mathcal{E}, (\mathcal{E}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K})B_{y_0}) \\ & + \frac{h^5}{80} W_{\text{mp}}((\mathcal{E}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K})B_{y_0}), \\ & \left. + \left(h - K \frac{h^3}{12} \right) W_{\text{curv}}(\mathcal{K}) + \left(\frac{h^3}{12} - K \frac{h^5}{80} \right) W_{\text{curv}}(\mathcal{K}B_{y_0}) + \frac{h^5}{80} W_{\text{curv}}(\mathcal{K}B_{y_0}^2) \right] \det \nabla \Theta \, da, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$\mathcal{E} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_{m,s}, & \text{in the nonlinear Cosserat-shell model,} \\ \mathcal{E}_{m,s}^{\text{lin}}, & \text{in the linear Cosserat-shell model,} \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\mathcal{K} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}, & \text{in the nonlinear Cosserat-shell model} \\ \mathcal{K}_{e,s}^{\text{lin}}, & \text{in the linear Cosserat-shell model.} \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

3.3 Variational problem for the modified nonlinear and modified linear constrained Cosserat shell model

Instead of requiring directly the symmetry of the tensors $\mathcal{E}_{m,s}$, $\mathcal{E}_{m,s}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K}_{e,s}$ and $(\mathcal{E}_{m,s}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K}_{e,s})B_{y_0}$ (the coefficients of $\{1, x_3, x_3^2\}$ of the decomposition of the symmetric 3D strain tensor) in the variational problem of the constrained Cosserat shell model, in the modified constrained Cosserat shell model the admissible space remains untouched, but instead only the symmetric parts of the above tensors are considered in the energy.

Therefore, the variational problem for the modified constrained Cosserat $O(h^5)$ -shell model [27] is to find

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{lll} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{a deformation of the midsurface} & m : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and} \\ \text{an elastic microrotation} & \bar{Q}_{\infty} : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \text{SO}(3) \end{array} \right. & \begin{array}{l} \text{in the modified constrained nonlinear} \\ \text{Cosserat-shell model} \end{array} \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{a midsurface displacement vector field} & v : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and} \\ \text{an elastic microrotation vector} & \vartheta_{\infty} : \omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \end{array} \right. & \begin{array}{l} \text{in the modified constrained linear} \\ \text{Cosserat-shell model} \end{array} \end{array} \right. \quad (3.10)$$

minimizing on $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ the functional

$$\begin{aligned} I = \int_{\omega} & \left[\left(h + K \frac{h^3}{12} \right) W_{\text{shell}}^{\infty}(\mathcal{E}) + \left(\frac{h^3}{12} - K \frac{h^5}{80} \right) W_{\text{shell}}^{\infty}(\mathcal{E}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K}) \right. \\ & - \frac{h^3}{3} H \mathcal{W}_{\text{shell}}^{\infty}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K}) + \frac{h^3}{6} \mathcal{W}_{\text{shell}}^{\infty}(\mathcal{E}, (\mathcal{E}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K})B_{y_0}) \\ & \left. + \frac{h^5}{80} W_{\text{mp}}^{\infty}((\mathcal{E}B_{y_0} + C_{y_0}\mathcal{K})B_{y_0}), \right. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

$$+ \left(h - \mathbb{K} \frac{h^3}{12} \right) W_{\text{curv}}(\mathcal{K}) + \left(\frac{h^3}{12} - \mathbb{K} \frac{h^5}{80} \right) W_{\text{curv}}(\mathcal{K}B_{y_0}) + \frac{h^5}{80} W_{\text{curv}}(\mathcal{K}B_{y_0}^2) \Big] \det \nabla \Theta \, da,$$

where

$$\mathcal{E} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_\infty, & \text{in the nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat-shell model,} \\ \mathcal{E}_\infty^{\text{lin}}, & \text{in the linear modified constrained Cosserat-shell model,} \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$\mathcal{K} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{K}_\infty, & \text{in the nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat-shell model,} \\ \mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}}, & \text{in the linear modified constrained Cosserat-shell model,} \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\text{shell}}^\infty(X) &= \mu \|\text{sym} X\|^2 + \frac{\lambda \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} [\text{tr}(X)]^2, & W_{\text{shell}}^\infty(X, Y) &= \mu \langle \text{sym} X, \text{sym} Y \rangle + \frac{\lambda \mu}{\lambda + 2\mu} \text{tr}(\text{sym} X) \text{tr}(\text{sym} Y), \\ W_{\text{mp}}^\infty(X) &= \mu \|\text{sym} X\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} [\text{tr}(\text{sym} X)]^2 & \forall X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, & \\ W_{\text{curv}}(X) &= \mu L_c^2 (b_1 \|\text{dev} \text{sym} X\|^2 + b_2 \|\text{skew} X\|^2 + b_3 [\text{tr}(X)]^2) & \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}. & \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

In the dimensional reduction procedure, we do not identify a modelling reason for considering only the symmetric part of \mathcal{K} in the reduced Cosserat-curvature energy¹¹ W_{curv} . Therefore, since skew $\mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$ and skew \mathcal{K}_∞ , respectively are present, the tensors

$$\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_\infty = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}} - \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}} L_{y_0} \quad (3.15)$$

are the bending tensors candidates in our linear and nonlinear modified constrained models, respectively, instead of

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}} := \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{sym}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}) \quad (3.16)$$

considered by Budiansky and Sanders [13] and by Koiter [31]. It is easy to remark that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathbf{sym} \mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}, \quad (3.17)$$

but our bending tensor $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$ does not coincide with the Koiter-Sander-Budiansky bending tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}}$. Moreover, we also propose the bending tensor \mathcal{R}_∞ in the nonlinear model, while $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}}$ is the linearisation of the second bending tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}} = \mathbf{sym} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}} \in \text{Sym}(3)$ introduced by Acharya [1], where $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}} = -\sqrt{[\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \hat{\Gamma}_m [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \mathcal{R}_\infty^b [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}}$. The linearisation of the first bending tensor $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}$ considered by Acharya is our linear bending tensor $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$. Considering only its symmetric part was made according to the Budiansky-Sanders-Koiter [13, 14, 31] demand to consider symmetrised measures “to effect a reduction in the number of stress-couple resultant components that enter the theory”, see [1, Page 5521]. However, in a couple-stress theory the couple stress may be non-symmetric, at least in the constrained Cosserat 3D theory. Thus, the remarks about the symmetry of the bending strain measure is suitable only in a couple stress model with a symmetric couple stress. We continue this discussion and comparisons in the next section.

Contrary to what we have described in the above paragraph regarding the non-symmetry of our bending measure, the curvature measure considered by us, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{sym}(\mathcal{E}_\infty^{\text{lin}} B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}}) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}} := \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} \mathbf{sym}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}) \quad (3.18)$$

in the linear modified model and

$$\mathbf{sym}(\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty) := \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}} - \mathbf{2} \mathbf{sym}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}} L_{y_0}) \quad (3.19)$$

in the nonlinear modified model, are both symmetric, through the construction of the model, and requested by the symmetry of the reconstructed 3D strain measure.

¹¹It is also not clear whether setting $b_2 = 0$ would still lead to a well-posed problem.

4 The change of metric tensor

In the linear elastic models (which do not include Cosserat effects) the same measure was used for the change of metric tensor, i.e. the tensor $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ given by (2.7). However, in the nonlinear models which do not include Cosserat effects there is a difference between our choice for the measure of the change of metric and other models, see Table 4.

There is a unanimous consensus regarding the choice of strain tensor for measuring metric changes in linearised models. However, in nonlinear models, there are still diverging opinions. For example, when using the derivation approach [43, 25] or the expression of the Gamma-limit [45, 51] based on the Biot-type quadratic parental 3D energy, the strain tensor $\sqrt{[\nabla\Theta]^{-T}\widehat{\mathbb{I}}_m\mathbb{1}_2^b[\nabla\Theta]^{-1}} - \sqrt{[\nabla\Theta]^{-T}\widehat{\mathbb{I}}_{y_0}\mathbb{1}_2^b[\nabla\Theta]^{-1}}$ appears naturally in the formulation of the 2D variational problem. On the other hand, models derived from the Saint-Venant-Kirchhoff energy yield a metric change represented as the difference between the first fundamental form of the current midsurface and that of the reference midsurface configuration. It is worth noting that sometimes this difference, $\mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}$, is directly incorporated into the model construction without further elaboration. In essence, while the linearised versions of these two strain measures for metric changes are equivalent, they differ in the nonlinear case.

Comparing to the general 6-parameter shell model [21], we have considered the same change of metric tensor in the Cosserat linear and in the nonlinear shell models. However, in our model there are mixed energetic terms present depending on the change of metric tensor which are not occurring in the general 6-parameter shell model.

5 What does bending mean? Scaling invariance of bending tensors

5.1 Idealized invariance requirements for a bending strain tensor

What is the appropriate approach to modeling the physical concept of bending? A thorough grasp of bending measures must provide a precise definition of its complementary work counterpart when establishing equilibrium equations. Simultaneously, it is beneficial to develop a suitable formulation for traction boundary conditions when they are necessary. With this mindset, Acharya, as described in [1, page 5519], has presented a series of modeling criteria for a bending strain tensor in any first-order nonlinear shell theory:

AR1 “Being a strain measure, it should be a tensor that vanishes in rigid deformations”.

AR2 “It should be based on a proper tensorial comparison of the deformed and underformed curvature fields $[\mathbb{I}_m$ and $\mathbb{I}_{y_0}]$ ”.

AR3 “A vanishing bending strain at a point should be associated with any deformation that leaves the orientation of the unit normal field locally unaltered around that point.”

The first two criteria, **AR1** and **AR2**, are met by the nonlinear bending tensors discussed in this paper, namely, \mathcal{R} and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}$. These two requirements are intuitively sound from a physical perspective. However, the third requirement, **AR3**, implies that a non-zero bending tensor should only be associated with a change in the orientation of tangent planes. For example, in the case of a radial expansion of a cylinder, this should result in a zero bending strain measure, as it **does not induce additional bending deformation of the shell (though it alters the curvature)**. In [27] we have shown that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}} = \mathbb{I}_m - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}$ satisfies **AR1** and **AR2**, since rigid deformations keep the second fundamental form invariant, but $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}$ does not satisfy **AR3**.

Let us consider $\omega_\xi = y_0(\omega)$ the deformation of a planar surface $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ through the mapping y_0 , then **AR3** asserts that a deformation measure qualifies as a pure measure of bending if the bending tensor remains invariant under a C^2 -mapping $m : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ that changes the surface $\omega_\xi = y_0(\omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, see Figure 2, into another surface by having the relative (elastic) reconstructed “gradient”

$$F_e := (\nabla m(\xi) | n(\xi))(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} = R_e(\xi) U_e(\xi), \quad (5.1)$$

where $U_e(\xi) \in \text{Sym}^+(3)$ is a linear mapping of the tangent plane to the initial surface at $\xi = y_0(x)$ into itself and

$$R_e(\xi) = R_0 R_{n_0}(\xi), \quad (5.2)$$




Figure 2: Kinematics of the 2D-constrained Cosserat shell model. Here, Q_e is the elastic rotation field, Q_0 is the initial rotation from the fictitious planar Cartesian reference ω configuration to the initial configuration ω_ξ .

with $R_0 \in \text{SO}(3)$ a uniform rotation, i.e., independent of position, and $R_{n_0}(\xi) \in \text{SO}(3)$ belongs to the group of rotations about the unit normal $n_0(\xi)$ to the surface at $\xi = y_0(x)$ (pure drill). In other words, **AR3** considers mappings m which produce a local stretching, described by U_e , a twist about n_0 (a drill about n_0), described by R_{n_0} , and an overall rotation given by R_0 .

While condition **AR3** holds strong physical appeal, it may, in practice, prove to be too stringent for general application. Therefore, already in [27], we introduced and explored a less restrictive suitable invariance requirement. To facilitate this discussion, let us revisit the following definition from [27]:

Definition 5.1. *Let m induce a deformation of the midsurface y_0 . Denoting by n and n_0 normal fields on the surface m and y_0 , respectively, we say that the midsurface deformation m is obtained from a **pure elastic stretch** provided that $U_e = F_e := (\nabla m | n) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} = (\nabla m | n) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}$ is already symmetric and positive-definite, i.e., belongs to $\text{Sym}^+(3)$.*

In particular, the relation (5.1) is satisfied for a pure elastic stretch of the surface $\omega_\xi = m(\omega)$ as in Definition 5.1 that in addition leave the unit normal field unaltered in a point¹², i.e., $n = n_0$ and $U_e = (\nabla m | n) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}$ is symmetric and positive definite. In other words, when $F_e := (\nabla m(\xi) | n(\xi)) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} = U_e(\xi)$, a case already considered by Swabowicz [61].¹³ Another particular case in (5.1) is a pure drill deformation, i.e., $F_e := (\nabla m(\xi) | n(\xi)) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} = R_e(\xi)$, considered by Saem, Lewintan and Neff¹⁴ in [52].

¹²We have already shown in [27] that for pure elastic stretch that in addition leave the unit normal field unaltered it holds $U_e n_0 = n_0$ and $U_e^{-1} n_0 = n_0$.

¹³In fact, Swabowicz has shown more, namely

- pure strain maps of surfaces preserve the third fundamental form of a surface.
- pure strain maps of non-umbilical surfaces preserve the lines of principal curvature.
- under a pure strain map the principal directions of stretch and second fundamental forms of the original surface and of its image all coincide.
- a map between two non-umbilical surfaces is a pure strain map if and only if it preserves the third fundamental form and the lines of principal curvature.

¹⁴Regarding pure drill, Saem, Lewintan and Neff [52, Proposition 5.2.] have shown the following rigidity result: Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Assume that $m, y_0 \in C^2(\bar{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ are regular surfaces, $Q \in C^1(\bar{\omega}, \text{SO}(3))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla m(x) &= Q(x) \nabla y_0(x), & x \in \bar{\omega} & \Leftrightarrow & (\nabla m(x) | n(x)) (\nabla y_0(x) | n_0(x))^{-1} = Q(x), & x \in \bar{\omega} \\ Q(x) n_0(x) &= n_0(x), & x \in \bar{\omega} & & Q(x) n_0(x) &= n_0(x), & x \in \bar{\omega} \\ m|_{\gamma_d} &= y_0|_{\gamma_d} & & & m|_{\gamma_d} &= y_0|_{\gamma_d}, & \end{aligned}$$

where $n_0 = \frac{\partial_1 y_0 \times \partial_2 y_0}{\|\partial_1 y_0 \times \partial_2 y_0\|}$ denotes the normal field on $y_0(\omega)$ and γ_d a relatively open, non-empty subset of the boundary $\partial\omega$. Then $m \equiv y_0$.

In [1, Eq. (8) and (10)], Acharya introduced two nonlinear bending strain tensors for a first-order nonlinear elastic shell theory, expressed in our notation as follows:

$$\text{the first proposal: } \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}} = - \left([\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \Pi_m^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1} - \sqrt{[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \mathbf{I}_m^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1} [\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \Pi_{y_0}^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}} \right) \notin \text{Sym}(3),$$

$$\text{the second proposal: } \mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}} = \text{sym}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}) \in \text{Sym}(3). \quad (5.3)$$

According to Acharya [1], the nonlinear bending strain tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}}$ would satisfy all three requirements **AR1 - AR3** “if locally pure stretch deformations are the only ones that leave the orientation of tangent planes unaltered locally under deformation.”¹⁵

Incidentally, the second tensor (5.3)₂ introduced by Acharya reduces after linearization as well to the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky “best” bending measure [13, 14, 31]

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2), \quad (5.4)$$

while the first tensor introduced by Acharya reduces after linearisation to our bending measure

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - [\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] \notin \text{Sym}(2). \quad (5.5)$$

It is then interesting to note that our tensor \mathcal{R}_{∞}^b has the same properties as $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}$, since Acharya’s bending tensors are similar to but do not coincide with the bending tensor appearing naturally in our nonlinear constrained Cosserat-shell model, i.e., we can express

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}} = - \underbrace{\sqrt{[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \hat{\mathbf{I}}_m [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}}}_{\text{invertible}} [\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \mathcal{R}_{\infty}^b [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}. \quad (5.6)$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}} = 0 \quad \iff \quad \mathcal{R}_{\infty}^b = 0. \quad (5.7)$$

Acharya demonstrated that his nonlinear bending strain measure is zero in cases of pure stretch deformations that maintain the normal direction unaltered. In contrast, classical bending strain measures do not exhibit this behavior. However, it is important to note again that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}}$ may not necessarily vanish for deformations characterized by a “pure drill” rotation (a rotation about the normal leaving the tangent plane fixed) in their rotation tensor. According to Acharya, his nonlinear bending measure should only be seen as a mathematical “better alternative” for modelling the physical bending process since “the set of deformations that leave the orientation of tangent planes unaltered locally can be divided into two classes- deformations that have a pure stretch deformation gradient locally, and those that have their local rotation tensor field consisting of either [in-plane] *drill* rotations or the identity tensor.” Acharya has shown that his nonlinear bending strain measure vanishes in pure stretch deformations that leave the normal unaltered, while the other classical bending strain measures fail to do so, but $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}}$ does not necessarily vanish for deformations whose rotation tensor is a “drill” rotation. Consequently, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}}$ does not consistently conform to **AR3**.

Taking into account that pure in-plane drill does not leave the \mathcal{R} tensor invariant, but that pure in-plane drill is absent once Dirichlet boundary conditions are prescribed [52] (see also footnote 14), motivates that Acharya’s essential invariance requirement may be modified to

AR3* *A vanishing bending strain at a point should be associated with any deformation obtained from a pure elastic stretch that leaves the orientation of the unit normal field locally unaltered around that point, i.e.,*

$$\mathbf{U}_e = \mathbf{F}_e := (\nabla m | \mathbf{n}) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} \stackrel{!}{=} (\nabla m | \mathbf{n}_0) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} \text{ is symmetric and positive-definite.}$$

We have shown in [27] that both tensors $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}}$ and \mathcal{R}_{∞}^b satisfy the three requirements **AR1**, **AR2** and **AR3***, while $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}} = \Pi_m - \Pi_{y_0}$ satisfies **AR1**, **AR2** but it does not satisfy **AR3*** either.

Let us notice that the minimal requirement for a bending tensor (for shells and plates) is that it should be invariant under the simple scaling of the midsurface $m \rightarrow \alpha m$, $\alpha > 0$. Since the normal is preserved under such a scaling of the midsurface the first fundamental form, the second fundamental and the Weingarten maps are

$$\mathbf{I}_{\alpha m} := \alpha^2 [\nabla m]^T \nabla m = \alpha^2 \mathbf{I}_m, \quad \mathbf{II}_{\alpha m} := -\alpha [\nabla m]^T \nabla n = \alpha \mathbf{II}_m, \quad (5.8)$$

¹⁵However, this is not true as the case of pure drill deformation shows [52].

$$\mathbf{L}_{\alpha m} := \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbf{I}_m^{-1} \mathbf{I}_m = \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbf{L}_m, \quad \mathbf{III}_{\alpha m} := [\nabla n]^T \nabla n = \mathbf{III}_m.$$

Hence, the Koiter bending tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}(\alpha m) = \alpha \mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{I}_{y_0} \neq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}(m)$ is **not preserved under scaling**. The situation is different when we look at our bending tensor, since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\infty}^b(\alpha m) &= [\nabla \Theta]^T \left(\sqrt{[\nabla \Theta] \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \widehat{\mathbf{I}}_m^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^T [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \alpha \mathbf{I}_m^b [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}} - \sqrt{[\nabla \Theta] \widehat{\mathbf{I}}_{y_0}^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^T [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \mathbf{I}_{y_0}^b [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}} \right) \nabla \Theta \\ &= \mathcal{R}_{\infty}^b(m). \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Thus, **our bending tensor \mathcal{R}_{∞}^b is invariant under this scaling**. The invariance under scaling is not satisfied by Acharya's bending tensors, since

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}(\alpha m) &= -\sqrt{[\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \alpha^2 \widehat{\mathbf{I}}_m [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \mathcal{R}_{\infty}^b(\alpha m) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}} \\ &= -\alpha \sqrt{[\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \widehat{\mathbf{I}}_m [\nabla \Theta]^{-1} [\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \mathcal{R}_{\infty}^b(m) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}} = \alpha \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}(m) \neq \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}(\alpha m). \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

In the context of flat shell models, Virga [62] has proposed a measure of bending

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Virga}}^{\text{plate}} = (\nabla n)^T \nabla n. \quad (5.11)$$

The tensor $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Virga}}^{\text{plate}}$ satisfies the condition **AR2**, since for a rigid deformation $y_0 \rightarrow m = \widehat{Q} y_0$, $\widehat{Q} \in \text{SO}(3)$ the fundamental forms coincide, $\mathbf{I}_m = \mathbf{I}_{y_0}$ and $\mathbf{II}_m = \mathbf{II}_{y_0}$, due to the identities $\nabla m = \widehat{Q} \nabla y_0$, $\nabla n_0 = \nabla(\widehat{Q} n) = \widehat{Q} \nabla n_0$. From here, it is also clear that the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Virga}}^{\text{plate}}$ satisfies **AR1**, too. We observe that the measure of bending considered by Virga is the *third fundamental form* (denoted by us \mathbf{III}_m) of the surface parametrized by m . Hence, since $\nabla m \mathbf{L}_m = -\nabla n$, the measure of bending $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Virga}}^{\text{plate}}$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Virga}}^{\text{plate}} &= (\nabla m \mathbf{L}_m)^T (\nabla m \mathbf{L}_m) = \mathbf{L}_m^T (\nabla m)^T (\nabla m) \mathbf{L}_m = \mathbf{L}_m^T \mathbf{I}_m \mathbf{L}_m = (\mathbf{I}_m^{-1} \mathbf{II}_m)^T \mathbf{I}_m \mathbf{L}_m (\mathbf{I}_m^{-1} \mathbf{II}_m) \\ &= \mathbf{II}_m^T \mathbf{I}_m^{-1} \mathbf{I}_m (\mathbf{I}_m^{-1} \mathbf{II}_m) = \mathbf{II}_m^T \mathbf{I}_m^{-1} \mathbf{II}_m = \mathbf{I}_m \mathbf{L}_m^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Let us strengthen further the additional invariance requirements on the bending tensor by postulating

AR3*_{plate} For a planar reference geometry ($\mathbf{II}_{y_0} \equiv \mathbf{0}_2$) the bending tensor should be invariant under the scaling of the midsurface $m \rightarrow \alpha m$, $\alpha > 0$.

It is evident that a straightforward scaling transformation, such as $m \rightarrow \alpha m$ with $\alpha > 0$, represents an additional in-plane stretching without introducing any additional bending. Therefore, **AR3*_{plate}** should be considered as the appropriate requirement for a genuine expression of a bending tensor. Moreover, this new condition, **AR3*_{plate}**, allows to distinguish between Acharya's ad hoc bending tensors, denoted as $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}}$, and our derived bending tensor \mathcal{R}_{∞}^b . In fact, in [27], it has been demonstrated that our bending tensor \mathcal{R}_{∞}^b satisfies **AR3*_{plate}** for pure elastic stretch which do not change the normal, while $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}}$ lack this particular invariance property. For plates (flat shells), $y_0 = \text{id}$, Definition 5.1 becomes

Definition 5.2. Let m be a deformation of the flat reference domain. Denoting by n and e_3 normal fields on the surface m and on the referential configuration, respectively, we say that the midsurface deformation m is obtained from a **pure elastic stretch** provided that $\mathbf{U}_e = \mathbf{F}_e := (\nabla m | n)$ is symmetric and positive-definite, i.e., belongs to $\text{Sym}^+(3)$.

Since the normal is preserved under scaling, **Virga's bending tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Virga}}^{\text{plate}}$ is also preserved** under the scaling $m \mapsto \alpha m$. As proven in [62], **Virga's bending tensor $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Virga}}^{\text{plate}}$ also satisfies AR3**.

For flat shells ($y_0 = \text{id}$) we have

$$n = \frac{\partial_{x_1} m \times \partial_{x_2} m}{\sqrt{\det((\nabla m)^T \nabla m)}} = e_3 + (\partial_{x_1} y_0 \times \partial_{x_2} v + \partial_{x_1} v \times \partial_{x_2} y_0 + \text{h.o.t}) - \text{tr}((\text{sym}((\nabla y_0)^T \nabla v)) e_3. \quad (5.13)$$

Therefore the linearisation of $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Virga}}^{\text{plate}}$ is $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Virga}}^{\text{plate,lin}} = \mathbf{O}_2 \neq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{plate,lin}}$. Here, we have used that for flat shells ($y_0 = \text{id}$) the Christoffel symbols $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma$ vanishes and

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{plate,lin}} := \left(\langle e_3, \partial_{x_\alpha x_\beta} v - \sum_{\gamma=1,2} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma \partial_{x_\gamma} v \rangle \right)_{\alpha\beta} = \left(\langle e_3, \partial_{x_\alpha x_\beta} v \rangle \right)_{\alpha\beta} \in \text{Sym}(2), \quad (5.14)$$

which does not vanish for every v .

The bending tensor considered by Virga is consistent with the tensor

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{Naghdi}} = (\nabla d)^T (\nabla d) - \text{III}_{y_0}, \quad (5.15)$$

considered in the Naghdi-type models, see [37, Section 6], since upon constraining $d \rightarrow n$ we have

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{Naghdi}}^\infty = (\nabla n)^T (\nabla n) - \text{III}_{y_0} = \text{III}_m - \text{III}_{y_0}. \quad (5.16)$$

After linearisation, this tensor becomes

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{Naghdi}}^{\text{lin}} = ((\nabla n_0)^T (\nabla \zeta) + (\nabla \zeta)^T (\nabla n_0)), \quad (5.17)$$

where $m = y_0 + u$ and $d = n_0 + \zeta$.

5.2 The bending measures of the first-order linear shell theory

While there appears to be a general consensus, particularly in linearised models, regarding the choice of a measure for the change in the metric tensor, the same cannot be said for the measurement of bending, as evidenced in Table 3. It is crucial to distinguish between the measures of bending and those of the change in curvature. The distinctions, as well as the tensors discussed in the existing literature, will be explored in the following two subsections.

It is worth noting that the bending tensor utilized in our model is the same as that in the comprehensive 6-parameter theory. However, our Cosserat shell model incorporates additional energetic terms and couplings.

In the ensuing discussion, our attention is directed towards both the constrained and linearised constrained models, where we compare the measures used for bending with those employed in classical models that do not incorporate Cosserat effects. It is important to emphasize that even in the modified constrained Cosserat shell model, not only the symmetric part of the bending strain tensor \mathcal{R}_∞ impacts the overall internal energy but the entire \mathcal{R}_∞ (due to the additional independent Cosserat curvature term).

The second proposal of Acharya, the tensor $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}$, reduces after linearization to the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky “best” bending measure [32, 54, 13, 14]

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Acharya}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2) \quad (5.18)$$

of the first-order linear shell theory, while the first proposal of Acharya $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Acharya}}$ and our bending tensor \mathcal{R}_∞ reduce after linearization to

$$\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2). \quad (5.19)$$

The tensor $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$ is not symmetric as long as no additional a priori constraint, e.g., $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0} \in \text{Sym}(2)$, is imposed. However, it is clear that the symmetric part of $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$ is present in our linearised constrained Cosserat shell model and that

$$\text{sym} \mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] = \mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2). \quad (5.20)$$

There are several compelling reasons for favoring the use of the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}} = \text{sym} \mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$ over the simpler tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$. Our argument begins by noting that Naghdi and Green [41] regarded the straightforward application of differences in the first and second fundamental forms between two states of shells, derived from the works of Sanders [55] and Leonard [35], as merely based on a “heuristic argument.” Simultaneously, Koiter [32] independently arrived at nearly the same conclusion as Sanders and Leonard.

our models	Koiter-type models	Anicic-Léger	Budiansky-Sanders	Acharya	6-parameter	generalized Naghdi-type
nonlinear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{R} = -(\bar{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla (\bar{Q}_{e,s} n_0) - \Pi_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2)$	\times	\times	\times	\mathcal{R}	
linear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} = (\nabla y_0)^T (n_0 \times \nabla \theta)$	\times	\times	\times	\mathcal{R}^{lin}	
nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{R}^b_{\text{Koiter}} = [\nabla \theta]^T \left(\sqrt{ \nabla \theta } \bar{\Gamma}_m^{-1} \nabla \theta ^T \nabla \theta ^{-T} \Pi_m^b \nabla \theta ^{-1} - \sqrt{ \nabla \theta } \bar{\Gamma}_{y_0}^{-1} \nabla \theta ^T \nabla \theta ^{-T} \Pi_{y_0}^b \nabla \theta ^{-1} \right) \nabla \theta \notin \text{Sym}(3)$	\times	\times	\times	\mathcal{R}^b_{∞}	
linear modified constrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{KSB}} = \mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}} - [\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}} L_{y_0}] \notin \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{AL}} = \mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}} - 2 \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}} L_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}}_{\infty} = \mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}} L_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{KSB}}$	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{KSB}}$	

Table 3: The bending measures in various models.

our models	Koiter-type models	Anicic-Léger	Budiansky-Sanders	Acharya	6-parameter	generalized Naghdi-type
nonlinear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{G} = (\bar{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla m - \mathbf{1}_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2)$	\times	\times	\times	\mathcal{G}	\times
linear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} = (\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v - \bar{A}_\theta \nabla y_0) \notin \text{Sym}(2)$	\times	\times	\times	\mathcal{G}^{lin}	\times
nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{G}^b = [\nabla \theta]^T \left(\sqrt{ \nabla \theta }^{-T} \bar{\Gamma}_m^{-1} \nabla \theta ^{-1} - \sqrt{ \nabla \theta }^{-T} \bar{\Gamma}_{y_0}^{-1} \nabla \theta ^{-1} \right) [\nabla \theta]^{-1} \in \text{Sym}(3)$	$\mathcal{G}^b_{\text{Koiter}} = \frac{1}{2} [\nabla \theta]^T [\mathbb{I}_m^b - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}^b] [\nabla \theta]^{-1} \in \text{Sym}(3)$	\times	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{Koiter}}$	\mathcal{G}_∞	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{Koiter}}$
linear modified constrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}} = [[\nabla \theta]^T \left(\sqrt{ \nabla \theta }^{-T} \bar{\Gamma}_m^{-1} \nabla \theta ^{-1} - \sqrt{ \nabla \theta }^{-T} \bar{\Gamma}_{y_0}^{-1} \nabla \theta ^{-1} \right) [\nabla \theta]^{-1}]^{\text{lin}} = \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}})$	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}} = \frac{1}{2} [[\nabla \theta]^T [\mathbb{I}_m^b - \mathbb{I}_{y_0}^b] [\nabla \theta]^{-1}]^{\text{lin}} = \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}})$	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}}$	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}}$	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}}$	$\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}}_{\text{Koiter}}$

Table 4: The change of metric measures in various models.

The rationale behind why Koiter, Sanders, Leonard, and other subsequent authors initially favored the simpler strain measures, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}$, in the finite strain regime is evident [35, 54, 31]. This preference is rooted in the fact that, within this regime, knowledge of the first and second fundamental forms, subject to the Gauß and Codazzi integrability conditions, suffices to determine the deformed middle surface of the shell, barring any infinitesimal rigid body motion. Additionally, it is worth noting that Naghdi himself considered alternative expressions for the bending strain measure, which differ by the difference between the second fundamental forms, in the nonlinear modeling of isotropic elastic shells. These alternative expressions coincide with $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ in the linearised model, as shown in [40] and [57, Eq. (7.22)].

It is noteworthy that Sanders [54, 55, 56] was among the first to employ the same bending tensor found in our linear constrained Cosserat shell model, namely, our tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}$. He was the first to anticipate the significance of using the strain measure $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}$ instead of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$, as observed in [55, Eq. 48 and Eqs. 23, 24]. This choice was made because \mathcal{R}^{lin} and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ are present as a work conjugate pair of some stress tensors, a result of the derivation of the equations for the displacement, which are used to write the equilibrium equations for the deformed middle surface, as described in [30] and [23]. In the context considered in [54, 55, 56] $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}$ is a work conjugate pair to a symmetric tensor, which means that it can be replaced by $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}]$, considering that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ is already symmetric. To accommodate this unexpected strain measure, Sanders made certain choices regarding the membrane stress tensor and the bending moment tensor, considering modified versions $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}}$ of these tensors that were assumed to be symmetric from the outset. These new membrane stress and bending moment tensors were designed to be the work conjugate pair for the difference between the first fundamental forms and the difference between the second fundamental forms between the two states of the shells, respectively (both symmetric). Sanders acknowledged that the introduction of these modified stresses might appear somewhat unusual, but he argued that these quantities could be adopted as the stress components in the theory instead of those typically used in the three-dimensional formulation of the deformation of the middle surface [30]. Sanders noted that this indicated that the equilibrium equations containing the usual membrane stress tensor and the usual bending moment tensor were slightly more general than necessary for a theory constrained by Kirchhoff's normality hypotheses. Additionally, Sanders mentioned that there are an equal number of stress quantities as strain quantities, and for both a principle of minimum potential energy and a principle of minimum complementary energy to be applicable in the theory, the constitutive relations needed to be invertible. This was only feasible if there were an equal number of stress quantities and strain quantities, therefore the introduction of the symmetrical variants.

Building on insights from [54, 55] and [32], later researchers, including Budiansky and Sanders [13, 14], and Koiter and Simmonds [31], reevaluated the use of the strain measures $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$. They recognized that the choice of the membrane stress tensor and the new bending moment tensor was not unique, but had to be selected as a work conjugate term of a “good” measure for bending.

Budiansky and Sanders, in their work, emphasized that “Koiter himself [32] prefers the expression $[\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}]]$.” They also pointed out that Koiter demonstrated that errors in Love's uncoupled strain energy expression (consistent with uncoupled stress-strain relations) were essentially the same, regardless of which alternative, such as a linear combination of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ from a given list, was used, as detailed in [13, Eqs. 18-20]. In their concluding remarks, Budiansky and Sanders, based on the features presented, referred to their theory as the “best” linear first-order theory of elastic shells. This nomenclature was subsequently adopted by Koiter and Simmonds [31, page 152] when they expressed their equations in terms of the “modified tensor of changes of curvature,” which essentially equates to $\text{sym} \mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2)$.

The term known as the “modified tensor of changes of curvature” $\text{sym} \mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2)$, employed by Koiter [32], Koiter and Simmonds [31] (while Sanders [54, 55] and Budiansky and Sanders [13, 14] named it bending), possesses certain exceptional properties not shared by the classical bending strain tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$. However, it is worth clarifying that the term “modified tensor of changes of curvature” is not appropriate for this particular concept of a bending strain tensor.

From a purely kinematical perspective, whether we use $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ or any other linear combinations of these two tensors may not be of paramount importance. This is because physically reasonable constitutive variables can always be reformulated in a manner suitable for different strain measures. Nevertheless, it is crucial to comprehend the relationship between the physical concept of bending and the mathematical measures of bending. As of now, a clear articulation of this aspect remains elusive. Referring again to Koiter and Simmonds

[31, page 173], “In the approximations, it is essential to bear in mind the physical interpretation of intermediate results at every stage in the analysis, and to apply appropriate corrections to the initial assumptions where this is required by the physics of the problem. It is indeed quite dangerous to derive a physical theory by a systematic and rigorous mathematical development of initial (approximate) assumptions unless due account is taken of the physical consequences at every step in the analysis. To physicists and engineers, these remarks will look like the forcing of an open door, but experience with quite a few papers on shell theory published in the last five years [1973] shows the need for a repetition of such cautionary remarks.”¹⁶

In conclusion, the bending measure utilized in our linearised constrained Cosserat-shell model aligns perfectly with the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}}$, which is often considered the “best” possible choice. Meanwhile, \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}_∞ represent nonlinear generalizations of the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure in the unconstrained and constrained Cosserat-shell models, respectively. The Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure is a component in the expression of our bending-curvature energy density through $\text{sym } \mathcal{R}$, but the bending-curvature energy density also depends on skew \mathcal{R} .

In light of our discussion on the bending strain measure, all the above arguments substantiate that we have used appropriate and meaningful terminology for the bending measures that we employed in the Cosserat family.

6 What does the change of curvature tensor describe?

Let us remark that in the final variational problem of the modified linear constrained Cosserat shell model the energy terms, excepting the bending energy derived from the 3D curvature energy (called bending-curvature energy in [25]), are not written in terms of the bending strain measure $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - [\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]$, but rather in terms of the tensor $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} - \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_\infty^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}] = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - 2 \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]$. It is clear that we may always rewrite our internal energy as a quadratic form in terms of $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ or even in terms of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$, without any difficulty, since, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}\|^2 &= \|\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - [\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}\|^2 - 2 \langle \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0} \rangle + \|\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

However, we believe that such a rewriting of the energy is not necessary, since all the involved strain tensors have clear meanings:

- $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ measures the change of metric;
- $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]$ measures the bending;
- $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - 2 \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]$ measures the change of curvature (this aspect is discussed in the rest of this subsection).

Acharya has shown that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ does not vanish in (infinitesimal) pure stretch deformation of a quadrant of a cylindrical surface, while the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$ does. Nothing is said by Acharya about the relation between the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure and the variations of the Gauss curvature K and of the mean curvature H .

Thus, in the spirit of the definition by Acharya [1], we may impose **reasonable requirements for a change of curvature tensor**, i.e

- C1.** it should be a tensor that vanishes in rigid deformations,
- C2.** it should be based on \mathbf{II}_m and \mathbf{II}_{y_0} , and its norm should be invariant when m and y_0 interchange the roles (the inverse mapping produces the same energy),
- C3.** a vanishing **curvature tensor** should lead to zero variations of the **Gauss curvature** K and of the **mean curvature** H of the midsurface.

¹⁶The situation has not changed much 50 years later.

	our models	Koiter-type models	Anicic-Léger	Budiansky-Sanders	Acharya	6-parameter	generalized Naghdi-type
nonlinear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{T} := (\overline{Q}_{e,s} n_0)^T \nabla m$ $= \langle (\overline{Q}_{e,s} n_0, \partial_{x_1} m), \langle \overline{Q}_{e,s} n_0, \partial_{x_2} m \rangle \rangle$	×	×	×	×	\mathcal{T}	$\mathcal{T}_{\text{Naghdi}} = \langle (d, \partial_{x_1} m), (d, \partial_{x_1} m) \rangle$
linear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{T}^{\text{lin}} = n_0^T (\nabla v - \vartheta \times \nabla y_0)$	×	×	×	×	\mathcal{T}^{lin}	$\mathcal{T}_{\text{Naghdi}}^{\text{lin}} = \langle (n_0, \partial_{x_1} v), (n_0, \partial_{x_1} v) \rangle + \langle (\zeta, \partial_{x_1} y_0), (\zeta, \partial_{x_1} y_0) \rangle$
nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat	0	×	×	×	×	0	0
linear modified constrained Cosserat	0	×	×	×	×	0	0

Table 5: The transverse shear deformation measures.

	our models	Koiter-type models	Anicic-Léger	Budiansky-Sanders	Acharya	6-parameter	generalized Naghdi-type
nonlinear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{G} L_{y_0}^*$ $\mathcal{G} = (\overline{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla m - L_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2)$, $\mathcal{R} = -(\overline{Q}_{e,s} \nabla y_0)^T \nabla (\overline{Q}_{e,s} n_0) - \Pi_{y_0} \notin \text{Sym}(2)$	×	×	×	×	×	
linear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} - \mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}^*$ $\mathcal{G}^{\text{lin}} = (\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v - \overline{A}_\vartheta \nabla y_0) \notin \text{Sym}(2)$, $\mathcal{R}^{\text{lin}} = (\nabla y_0)^T (n_0 \times \nabla v)$	×	×	×	×	×	
nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^b - \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^b L_{y_0})$, $\mathcal{G}_{\infty}^b = \nabla \vartheta ^T \left(\sqrt{ \nabla \vartheta }^{-T} \Gamma_m \nabla \vartheta ^{-1} - \sqrt{ \nabla \vartheta }^{-T} \Gamma_m \nabla \vartheta ^{-1} \right) \nabla \vartheta ^{-1} \in \text{Sym}(3)$, $\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^b = \nabla \vartheta ^T \left(\sqrt{ \nabla \vartheta }^{-1} \nabla \vartheta ^T \nabla \vartheta ^{-T} \Pi_m^b \nabla \vartheta ^{-1} - \sqrt{ \nabla \vartheta }^{-1} \Gamma_m^b \nabla \vartheta ^T \nabla \vartheta ^{-T} \Pi_m^b \nabla \vartheta ^{-1} \right) \nabla \vartheta$ $\notin \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^b = \nabla \vartheta ^T \left[\Pi_m^b - \Pi_{y_0}^b \right] \nabla \vartheta ^{-1} \in \text{Sym}(3)$	×	×	×	\mathcal{R}_{∞}^b	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Naghdi}}^b = -\text{sym}[\nabla m]^T \nabla d - \Pi_{y_0}$
linear modified constrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - 2 \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = [\nabla \vartheta ^T \left[\Pi_m^{\text{lin}} - \Pi_{y_0}^{\text{lin}} \right] \nabla \vartheta ^{-1}]^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(3)$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - 2 \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2)$	×	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \in \text{Sym}(2)$

Table 6: The change of curvature in various models.

Anicic and Léger [6, 4, 5], have provided a linear change of curvature tensor, in the sense of the above definition. They also derived a linear Kirchhoff-Love shell model which is in close connection to our linear constraint Cosserat-shell model. They proved that considering a family of deformations $\{y_0 + \eta v \mid \eta \in \mathbb{R}, v \in C^2(\omega) \text{ such that } y_0 + \eta v \text{ defines a regular surface}\}$ of the middle surface the following change of incremental curvature tensor

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}(v) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - 2 \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}] \in \text{Sym}(2), \quad (6.2)$$

with $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} := \frac{1}{2} [(\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v) + (\nabla v)^T (\nabla y_0)] = \text{sym}[(\nabla y_0)^T (\nabla v)] \in \text{Sym}(2)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} := \left(\langle n_0, \partial_{x_\alpha x_\beta} v - \sum_{\gamma=1,2} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma \partial_{x_\gamma} v \rangle_{\alpha\beta} \right) \in \text{Sym}(2)$, has the alternative expression

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}(v) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{I}_{y_0} \frac{d\mathbf{L}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0} + \frac{d\mathbf{L}_{y_0+\eta v}^T}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0} \mathbf{I}_{y_0} \right) = \text{sym} \left(\mathbf{I}_{y_0} \frac{d\mathbf{L}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0} \right) \in \text{Sym}(2). \quad (6.3)$$

The proof is based on the formulae established by Blouza and Le Dret [12], see also [4],

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = \frac{d\mathbf{\Pi}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0}. \quad (6.4)$$

Indeed, an interesting fact is that the local variations of the Weingarten map along the family of surfaces $y_0 + \eta v$, with respect to η is

$$\frac{d\mathbf{L}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0} = \mathbf{I}_{y_0}^{-1} (\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - 2[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]) = \mathbf{I}_{y_0}^{-1} \mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}. \quad (6.5)$$

Indeed, from $\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v} = \mathbf{1}_2$ follows

$$\frac{d\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1}}{d\eta} \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v} = -\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \frac{d\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta}. \quad (6.6)$$

Thus, we have

$$\frac{d\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1}}{d\eta} = -\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \frac{d\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1}, \quad (6.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbf{L}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} &= \frac{d}{d\eta} [\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi}_{y_0+\eta v}] = \frac{d}{d\eta} \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi}_{y_0+\eta v} + \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \frac{d}{d\eta} \mathbf{\Pi}_{y_0+\eta v} \\ &= -\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \frac{d\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi}_{y_0+\eta v} + \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \frac{d}{d\eta} \mathbf{\Pi}_{y_0+\eta v} \\ &= -\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \frac{d\mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \mathbf{L}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} + \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \frac{d}{d\eta} \mathbf{\Pi}_{y_0+\eta v}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Thus

$$\frac{d\mathbf{L}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0} = \mathbf{I}_{y_0}^{-1} \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{I}_{y_0}^{-1} 2 \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^{-1} \quad (6.9)$$

and

$$\mathbf{I}_{y_0} \frac{d\mathbf{L}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - 2 \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^{-1}, \quad (6.10)$$

which leads to

$$\text{sym} \left(\mathbf{I}_{y_0} \frac{d\mathbf{L}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \Big|_{\eta=0} \right) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - 2 \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^{-1} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}, \quad (6.11)$$

and (6.3) is proven.

Next, we show that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}(v) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \left. \frac{d\text{H}}{d\eta}(y_0 + \eta v) \right|_{\eta=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \frac{d\text{K}}{d\eta}(y_0 + \eta v) \right|_{\eta=0} = 0. \quad (6.12)$$

The components of the first and second fundamental form of the surface are defined by $a_{\alpha\beta}(y_0 + \eta v) = \langle a_\alpha(y_0 + \eta v), a_\beta(y_0 + \eta v) \rangle$ and $b_{\alpha\beta}(y_0 + \eta v) = \langle \partial_\alpha a_\beta(y_0 + \eta v), a_3(y_0 + \eta v) \rangle$, respectively. The mixed components of the second fundamental form read $b_\alpha^\beta(y_0 + \eta v) = b_{\alpha\rho}(y_0 + \eta v) a^{\rho\beta}(y_0 + \eta v)$, where $(a^{\alpha\beta}(y_0 + \eta v))$ is the matrix inverse of $(a_{\alpha\beta}(y_0 + \eta v))$. Thus, the mean curvature H and Gaussian curvature K, read in terms of the coefficients of the fundamental forms,

$$2\text{H}(y_0 + \eta v) = \text{tr}(b_\alpha^\beta(y_0 + \eta v)) = b_1^1(y_0 + \eta v) + b_2^2(y_0 + \eta v), \quad (6.13)$$

and

$$\text{K} = \det(b_\alpha^\beta(y_0 + \eta v)) = b_1^1(y_0 + \eta v) b_2^2(y_0 + \eta v) - b_2^1(y_0 + \eta v) b_1^2(y_0 + \eta v). \quad (6.14)$$

The condition from the left hand side of (6.3), i.e., $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}(v) = 0$ (6.3), see [6, Eq. 9], reads

$$\left. \frac{db_\alpha^\rho(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{\rho\beta}(y_0) + \left. \frac{db_\beta^\rho(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{\rho\alpha}(y_0) = 0, \quad (6.15)$$

which explicit into

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha = \beta = 1 : \quad & 0 = \left. \frac{db_1^1(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{11}(y_0) + \left. \frac{db_1^2}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{21}(y_0) \\ \alpha = \beta = 2 : \quad & 0 = \left. \frac{db_2^1(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{12}(y_0) + \left. \frac{db_2^2(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{22}(y_0) \\ \alpha = 1, 2; \beta = 2, 1 : \quad & 0 = \left. \frac{db_1^1(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{12}(y_0) + \left. \frac{db_1^2(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{22}(y_0) \\ & + \left. \frac{db_2^1(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{11}(y_0) + \left. \frac{db_2^2(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{21}(y_0). \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

Using the symmetry $a_{\alpha\beta} = a_{\beta\alpha}$ we can rewrite the last system of equations using matrices in the following way:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{11}(y_0) & a_{12}(y_0) \\ a_{12}(y_0) & a_{22}(y_0) \end{pmatrix} \left[\left. \frac{d}{d\eta} \begin{pmatrix} b_1^1(y_0 + \eta v) & b_2^1(y_0 + \eta v) \\ b_1^2(y_0 + \eta v) & b_2^2(y_0 + \eta v) \end{pmatrix} \right] \right|_{\eta=0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & k \\ -k & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.17)$$

where we have set $k = \left. \frac{db_2^1(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{11}(y_0) + \left. \frac{db_2^2(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} a_{21}(y_0)$. Multiplying both sides with the inverse matrix $(a^{\alpha\beta}(y_0))$ we arrive at

$$\left[\left. \frac{d}{d\eta} \begin{pmatrix} b_1^1(y_0 + \eta v) & b_2^1(y_0 + \eta v) \\ b_1^2(y_0 + \eta v) & b_2^2(y_0 + \eta v) \end{pmatrix} \right] \right|_{\eta=0} = \begin{pmatrix} -k a^{12}(y_0) & k a^{11}(y_0) \\ -k a^{22}(y_0) & k a^{12}(y_0) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6.18)$$

Thus

$$\left. \frac{d\text{H}(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta}(0) = \frac{d}{d\eta}(b_1^1(y_0 + \eta v) + b_2^2(y_0 + \eta v)) \right|_{\eta=0} = -k a^{12}(y_0) + k a^{12}(y_0) = 0 \quad (6.19)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d\text{K}(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} &= \left[\left. \frac{db_1^1(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} b_2^2(y_0) + b_1^1(y_0) \frac{db_2^2(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{db_2^1(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} b_1^2(y_0) - b_2^1(y_0) \frac{db_1^2(y_0 + \eta v)}{d\eta} \right] \right|_{\eta=0} \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

$$= k [-a^{12}(y_0) b_2^2(y_0) + a^{12}(y_0) b_1^1(y_0) - a^{11} b_1^2(y_0) + a^{22}(y_0) b_2^1(y_0)] = 0,$$

where the last step follows from the expression of the mixed components together with the symmetry $b_{\alpha\beta} = b_{\beta\alpha}$.

It is an interesting issue to understand a nonlinear version of the foregoing results. The minimal requirement for a nonlinear change of curvature tensor is that its linearisation should characterise the local variations of the mean curvature and the Gauß curvature. This is automatically satisfied if the linearisation coincides with $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} \text{sym}[\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]$.

We observe the surprising fact that in our constrained Cosserat shell model the membrane-change of curvature energy is actually written in terms of the Anicic-Léger's change of curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$ and not in terms of the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure $\mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\text{lin}}$, although everything can be rearranged to be expressed in the Koiter strain measure $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$. Another coincidence is that quadratic coupling energies in terms of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ are present both in Anicic-Léger's linear shell model and in our linear constrained Cosserat shell model. Anicic and Léger have also obtained explicit forms of the constitutive coefficients of the shell model in terms of the initial curvatures and the three-dimensional constitutive coefficients.

Just for completeness of the discussion, we can do similar calculations for the third fundamental form $\text{III}_m = \text{II}_m \mathbf{I}_m^{-1} \text{II}_m$ and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d \text{III}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} &= \frac{d}{d\eta} [\text{II}_{y_0+\eta v} \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \text{II}_{y_0+\eta v}] \\ &= \frac{d}{d\eta} \text{II}_{y_0+\eta v} \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \text{II}_{y_0+\eta v} + \text{II}_{y_0+\eta v} \frac{d}{d\eta} \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \text{II}_{y_0+\eta v} + \text{II}_{y_0+\eta v} \mathbf{I}_{y_0+\eta v}^{-1} \frac{d}{d\eta} \text{II}_{y_0+\eta v} \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

which, after using (6.4), and (6.7) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d \text{III}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} &= \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{I}_{y_0}^{-1} \text{II}_{y_0} - \text{II}_{y_0} \mathbf{I}_{y_0}^{-1} \left. \frac{d \text{II}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} \mathbf{I}_{y_0}^{-1} \text{II}_{y_0} + \text{II}_{y_0} \mathbf{I}_{y_0}^{-1} \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \\ &= \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0} - \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T \mathbf{2} \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0} + \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = 2 \text{sym}(\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0} - \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}) \\ &= 2 \text{sym}(\mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}) = 2 \text{sym}(\mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T [\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]). \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

When we have constructed the constrained Cosserat shell model we have seen that we must impose the symmetry of \mathcal{E}_{∞} , $\mathcal{E}_{\infty} \mathbf{B}_{y_0} + \mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{\infty}$ and $(\mathcal{E}_{\infty} \mathbf{B}_{y_0} + \mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{\infty}) \mathbf{B}_{y_0}$. In the modified constrained Cosserat shell model we have avoided this issue by considering only their symmetric parts in the variational problem. However, in the original constrained Cosserat shell model these symmetries remain as constraint in the variational problems, and using (2.35), we know that the symmetry of \mathcal{E}_{∞} , $\mathcal{E}_{\infty} \mathbf{B}_{y_0} + \mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{\infty}$ and $(\mathcal{E}_{\infty} \mathbf{B}_{y_0} + \mathbf{C}_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{\infty}) \mathbf{B}_{y_0}$ are equivalent to the symmetry of \mathcal{G}_{∞} and $(\mathcal{R}_{\infty} - \mathcal{G}_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{y_0})$ and $(\mathcal{R}_{\infty} - \mathcal{G}_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}) \mathbf{L}_{y_0}$. Then, we should have

$$\mathcal{G}_{\infty} = \mathcal{G}_{\infty}^T, \quad (\mathcal{R}_{\infty} - \mathcal{G}_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}) = (\mathcal{R}_{\infty} - \mathcal{G}_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{y_0})^T, \quad (\mathcal{R}_{\infty} - \mathcal{G}_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}) \mathbf{L}_{y_0} = [(\mathcal{R}_{\infty} - \mathcal{G}_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}) \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]^T. \quad (6.23)$$

Let us look at the last condition (6.23)₃. Using (6.23)_{1,2} we see that (6.23)₃ is equivalent to

$$(\mathcal{R}_{\infty} - \mathcal{G}_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}) \mathbf{L}_{y_0} = \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T (\mathcal{R}_{\infty} - \mathcal{G}_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}). \quad (6.24)$$

In the linearised constrained Cosserat shell model, the constraint (6.23)₁ is automatically satisfied, since $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ is symmetric, while (6.23)_{2,3} turn into

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} [\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]) &= (\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} [\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}])^T, \\ (\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} [\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}]) \mathbf{L}_{y_0} &= \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T (\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} [\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}])^T. \end{aligned} \quad (6.25)$$

Due to the symmetry of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ the relations (6.25) are equivalent to

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0} = \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0} = \mathbf{L}_{y_0}^T \mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}. \quad (6.26)$$

Hence, from (6.22), we have that in the constrained linear Cosserat shell model (not modified) we get

$$\left. \frac{d \text{III}_{y_0+\eta v}}{d\eta} \right|_{\eta=0} = 2 \text{sym}([\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} \mathbf{L}_{y_0}] \mathbf{L}_{y_0}),$$

which attributes a clear geometrical meaning of the energy terms containing the strain tensor $(\mathcal{E} B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}) B_{y_0}$, beside the geometrical meaning which we have given to $(\mathcal{E} B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K})$.

Since the coercivity inequality

$$W^\infty(\mathcal{E}_\infty, \mathcal{K}_\infty) \geq \frac{h}{12} a_1^+ \|\mathcal{E}_\infty\|^2 + \frac{h^3}{12} a_2^+ \|\text{sym}(\mathcal{E}_\infty B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_\infty)\|^2 + a_3^+ \frac{h^3}{6} \|\mathcal{K}_\infty\|^2, \quad a_i^+ > 0, \quad (6.27)$$

from the nonlinear case turns, upon linearization, into

$$\begin{aligned} W^\infty(\mathcal{E}_\infty^{\text{lin}}, \mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}}) &\geq \frac{h}{12} a_1^+ \|[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} (\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}})^\flat [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{h^3}{12} a_2^+ \|[\nabla\Theta]^{-T} \underbrace{[\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} - \mathbf{2} \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} L_{y_0})]^\flat}_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}} [\nabla\Theta]^{-1}\|^2 + a_3^+ \frac{h^3}{6} \|\mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}}\|^2, \quad a_i^+ > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

using the Anicic and Léger's result (6.12), it is clear that vanishing elastic energy implies $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = 0$, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}} = 0$ and $\mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = 0$, i.e. no changes of the metric, no variations of the Gauss curvature K and of the mean curvature H and zero bending, too.

We note that $\mathcal{K}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = 0$ implies that $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = 0$ (no bending) and $\mathcal{N}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = 0$ (no drill).

Therefore, with regard to Table 6, we can claim that

1. the linearised modified constrained Cosserat shell model represents a generalization of Anicic and Léger's model by including the effect of the curvature energy and incorporating also the bending effects, the transverse shear effect and drilling effect,
2. the nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat shell model represents a nonlinear generalization of the Anicic and Léger's shell model, but starting from a 3D-Biot type energy,
3. the nonlinear unconstrained Cosserat shell model represents a nonlinear generalization of the Anicic and Léger's shell model by considering additional degrees of freedom and transverse shear deformations, as well as in-plane drill.
4. the change of curvature tensors $\mathcal{R}_\infty - \mathcal{G}_\infty L_{y_0}$ and $\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{G} L_{y_0}$ represent generalizations of the Anicic and Léger's change of curvature tensor, in the nonlinear constrained and unconstrained Cosserat shell models, respectively.

It is worth noting that, based on different arguments, Šilhavý [57] recently arrived at the conclusion that Anicic-Léger's change of curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$ is more suitable for use as a curvature measure in a linear Kirchhoff-Love shell theory than the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure. Šilhavý's approach involves determining the three-dimensional strain tensor of a shear deformation of a shell-like body and then linearizing it with respect to the displacement and the distance of a point from the middle surface.

However, it is important to note that Anicic-Léger's change of curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$ does not vanish in pure stretch deformations, whereas the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure $\mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$ does not possess a similar property as $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$ concerning the variations of the curvatures H and K, as seen in (6.12).¹⁷

In summary, all the tensors in question, including the Koiter bending measure $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}} = [\Pi_m - \Pi_{y_0}]^{\text{lin}}$, the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{Koiter}} - \mathbf{1} \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}_\infty^{\text{Koiter}} L_{y_0})$, and the change of curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}} = \mathcal{R}_\infty^{\text{Koiter}} - \mathbf{2} \text{sym}(\mathcal{G}_\infty^{\text{Koiter}} L_{y_0})$, can each be accepted with their distinct and proper physical meanings. To the best of our knowledge, there is no existing statement in the literature asserting that the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure has the same properties as Anicic-Léger's change of curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$, or vice versa, i.e., if a vanishing Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky tensor lead to a vanishing variations of the mean curvature and Gauß curvature and if the Anicic-Léger's satisfies the axioms put forward for a bending measure.

¹⁷Shell theory is not a wish concert! It seems one would think that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{AL}}^{\text{lin}}$ should coincide in an ideal world but they simply do not, since $1 \neq 2$.

7 Transverse shear in Cosserat, Reissner-Mindlin and Naghdi shell models

By (2.33) we observe that the elastic shell strain tensor $\mathcal{E}_{m,s}$ is capable of measuring the change of metric but the transverse shear deformation, too.

To the contrary, in classical elastic theories, i.e., when Cosserat effects are ignored, the transverse shear deformation is missing, see Table 5. The Cosserat shell theory, as well as the 6-parameter shells, is able to show how the transverse shear deformation influences the energy density, through the transverse shear deformation vector (a row)

$$\mathcal{T} = (\overline{Q}_{e,s} n_0)^T \nabla m = (\langle \overline{Q}_{e,s} n_0, \partial_{x_1} m \rangle, \langle \overline{Q}_{e,s} n_0, \partial_{x_2} m \rangle) \quad (7.1)$$

in the nonlinear unconstrained Cosserat shell theory, while in the linear unconstrained Cosserat shell theory by

$$\mathcal{T}^{\text{lin}} = n_0^T (\nabla v - \vartheta \times \nabla y_0). \quad (7.2)$$

In the constrained nonlinear Cosserat shell model, hence also in the constrained linear Cosserat shell model, as a consequence of the constraint, the transverse shear deformation vector vanishes $\mathcal{T}_\infty = 0$ and $\mathcal{T}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = 0$.

The transverse shear deformation row vector is also present in the Naghdi-type models, see [37, Section 6] and [24, 58] or Reissner-Mindlin 5-parameter model given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{Naghdi}} := d^T \nabla m = \langle d, \partial_{x_1} m \rangle, \langle d, \partial_{x_2} m \rangle, \quad (7.3)$$

with its linearisation

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{Naghdi}}^{\text{lin}} := n_0^T \nabla v + \zeta^T \nabla y_0 = (\langle n_0, \partial_{x_1} v \rangle, \langle n_0, \partial_{x_2} v \rangle) + (\langle \zeta, \partial_{x_1} y_0 \rangle, \langle \zeta, \partial_{x_2} y_0 \rangle), \quad (7.4)$$

where $d = n_0 + \zeta$.

8 Drilling appears only in Cosserat shell models

The Cosserat shell theory, as well as the 6-parameter shells, is able to describe the effect of drilling bending in shells [52]. These effects are absent in 5-parameter Reissner-Mindlin and Naghdi-type shell models. As already mentioned, the drilling bending effect is incorporated in the bending-curvature tensor $\mathcal{K}_{e,s}$, through the vector (row) of drilling bendings

$$\mathcal{N} = n_0^T (\text{axl}(\overline{Q}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_1} \overline{Q}_{e,s}) | \text{axl}(\overline{Q}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_2} \overline{Q}_{e,s})) \quad (8.1)$$

in the nonlinear theory and by its linearisation

$$\mathcal{N}^{\text{lin}} = n_0^T (\partial_{x_1} \vartheta | \partial_{x_2} \vartheta) = n_0^T (\nabla \vartheta) \quad (8.2)$$

in the linear model. The capture of the drilling bending is absent in the other theories, see Table 7, excepting 6-parameter shells model, presented in this comparison.

9 Conclusions of this paper

In this paper, we have highlighted that in the constrained Cosserat shell model, the change of metric tensor simplifies to $\sqrt{[\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \mathbb{I}_m^b [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}} - \sqrt{[\nabla \Theta]^{-T} \mathbb{I}_{y_0}^b [\nabla \Theta]^{-1}}$. Upon linearization of the constrained model, this change of metric tensor further reduces to the change of metric tensor $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$, whose geometric interpretation is provided in [17, 37, 38, 19, 18]. The correspondence between the metric tensor in our Cosserat shell model and the change of metric tensor $\mathcal{G}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ employed in the linear Koiter model is clear and to be expected. It is important to note that such a direct equivalence does not exist between the bending strain tensor \mathcal{R} considered by us in the constrained Cosserat framework and the bending tensor or the change of curvature tensor in other theories. This disparity is not surprising because the tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ in the Koiter linear theory cannot be simply

	our models	Koiter-type models	Anicic-Léger	Budiansky-Sanders	Acharya	6-parameter	generalized Naghdi-type
nonlinear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{N} = n_0^T (\text{axl}(\overline{Q}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_1} \overline{Q}_{e,s}) \text{axl}(\overline{Q}_{e,s}^T \partial_{x_2} \overline{Q}_{e,s}))$	×	×	×	×	\mathcal{N}	×
linear unconstrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{N}^{\text{lin}} = n_0^T (\partial_{x_1} \vartheta \partial_{x_2} \vartheta) = n_0^T (\nabla \vartheta)$	×	×	×	×	\mathcal{N}^{lin}	×
nonlinear modified constrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{N}_\infty := n_0^T (\text{axl}(Q_\infty^T \partial_{x_1} Q_\infty) \text{axl}(Q_\infty^T \partial_{x_2} Q_\infty))$	×	×	×	×	\mathcal{N}_∞	×
linear constrained Cosserat	$\mathcal{N}_\infty^{\text{lin}} = n_0^T (\partial_{x_1} \vartheta \partial_{x_2} \vartheta_\infty) = n_0^T (\nabla \vartheta_\infty)$ $\vartheta_\infty = \text{axl}(A_{\vartheta_\infty})$ $A_{\vartheta_\infty} = -\text{skew}((\nabla v \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \langle n_0, \partial_{x_\alpha} v \rangle a^\alpha) [\nabla \Theta]^{-1})$	×	×	×	×	$\mathcal{N}_\infty^{\text{lin}}$	×

Table 7: The drilling bending measures.

labeled as "bending" or "change of curvature." Our bending strain tensor \mathcal{R} extends and generalizes the linear Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending measure $\mathcal{R}_{\text{KSB}}^{\text{lin}}$ [14, 31], which vanishes during infinitesimal pure stretch deformations of a quadrant of a cylindrical surface [1]. This property is not shared by the classical "bending strain tensor" $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Koiter}}^{\text{lin}}$ in the Koiter model.

In our modelling framework we find that the bending strain tensor \mathcal{R} plays a role through the elastic shell bending-curvature tensor $\mathcal{K}_{e,s}$. This tensor, $\mathcal{K}_{e,s}$, exerts influence on both the membrane-bending energy density and the bending-curvature energy density. In the context of the membrane-bending energy, its impact is incorporated along with the influence of the elastic shell tensor, resulting in the expression $\mathcal{E}_{m,s} B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}$. More specifically, it encompasses the effects of transverse shear deformations (represented by \mathcal{T}) and the changes in curvature (expressed by $\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{G} L_{y_0}$). The term "the change of curvature" is used to describe the nonsymmetric quantity \mathcal{R} , combined with $\mathcal{G} L_{y_0}$, and its justification is provided within the framework of the linearised constrained theory.

We posit that the influence of the tensor $\mathcal{E}_{m,s} B_{y_0} + C_{y_0} \mathcal{K}_{e,s}$, denoted as "the change of curvature" tensor \mathcal{R} , is not accounted for in other models. This assertion is further detailed in [25, Section 6] by a comprehensive comparison with the general 6-parameter shell model. The natural inclusion of this tensor in the model, particularly after dimension reduction, and its intriguing geometric interpretation in its linearised form has been explored in this paper.

From the alternative formulations presented for both unconstrained and constrained models, we have seen that $\mathcal{K}_{e,s}$ influences the bending-curvature energy and that the *elastic shell bending-curvature tensor* $\mathcal{K}_{e,s}$ incorporates at the same time *bending effects* and *drilling bendings*.

We have to notice that by the names we have used for \mathcal{R} and $\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{G} L_{y_0}$, it is indicated that \mathcal{R} measures rather bending while $\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{G} L_{y_0}$ measures the changes of the curvature.

This line of thought, beside some other arguments presented in the linearised framework by Anicic and Léger [6], see also [3], and more recently by Šilhavý [57], suggest that the triple \mathcal{G}_∞ , $\mathcal{R}_\infty - 2\mathcal{G}_\infty L_{y_0}$ and \mathcal{K}_∞ are appropriate measures to express the change of metric and of the curvatures \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{K} , while the bending and drilling effects are both additionally incorporated in the bending-curvature energy through the elastic shell bending-curvature tensor \mathcal{K}_∞ .

In the linearised version of our Cosserat shell model we obtain all the linear strain measures of the theory of 6-parameter shells, due to the fact that the kinematical structure is equivalent, since there is an explicit dependence of the internal energy density on the change of curvature measure and on the bending measure. In order to make connections with existing works in the literature on 6-parameter shell models [21, 15, 16], see also [25, Section 6], we conclude that the influence of the change of curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}_\infty - 2\mathcal{G}_\infty L_{y_0}$, is omitted if a constrained Cosserat shell model would be derived from other available simpler 6-parameter shell models [21, 15, 16, 47, 48], even if the bending strain tensor \mathcal{R}_∞ is present (through the presence of the curvature energy).

Acknowledgements: Patrizio Neff is grateful for discussions with Sylvia Anicic, Université de Haute-Alsace, Mulhouse, France. This research has been funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project no. 415894848: NE 902/8-1.

References

- [1] A. Acharya. A nonlinear generalization of the Koiter–Sanders–Budiansky bending strain measure. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 37(39):5517–5528, 2000.
- [2] R. A. Adams. *Sobolev Spaces.*, volume 65 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, London, 1. edition, 1975.
- [3] S. Anicic. *Du modèle de Kirchhoff-Love exact à un modèle de coque mince et à un modèle de coque pliée.* PhD thesis, Université Joseph Fourier (Grenoble 1), 2001.
- [4] S. Anicic. Mesure des variations infinitésimales des courbures principales d’une surface. *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences - Series I - Mathematics*, 335(3):301–306, 2002.
- [5] S. Anicic. A shell model allowing folds. In *Numerical Mathematics and Advanced Applications*, pages 317–326. Springer, 2003.
- [6] S. Anicic and A. Léger. Formulation bidimensionnelle exacte du modèle de coque 3D de Kirchhoff-Love. *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences - Series I - Mathematics*, 329(8):741–746, 1999.
- [7] M. Biršan. Derivation of a refined 6-parameter shell model: Descent from the three-dimensional Cosserat elasticity using a method of classical shell theory. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, 25(6):1318–1339, 2020.
- [8] M. Biršan. Alternative derivation of the higher-order constitutive model for six-parameter elastic shells. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik*, 72:1–29, 2021.
- [9] M. Biršan, I.D. Ghiba, and P. Neff. A linear Cosserat-shell model including terms up to $O(h^5)$. *Journal of Elasticity*, pages 1–27, 2023.
- [10] M. Biršan and P. Neff. Existence of minimizers in the geometrically non-linear 6-parameter resultant shell theory with drilling rotations. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, 19(4):376–397, 2014.
- [11] M. Biršan and P. Neff. Shells without drilling rotations: A representation theorem in the framework of the geometrically nonlinear 6-parameter resultant shell theory. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 80:32–42, 2014.
- [12] A. Blouza and H. Le Dret. Sur le lemme du mouvement rigide. *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences - Series I - Mathematics*, 319(9):1015–1020, 1994.
- [13] B. Budiansky and J.L. Sanders. *On the “best” first-order linear shell theory.* Technical Report No. 14, Contract No. 1886(02). Division of Engineering and Applied Physics, Harvard University, 1962.
- [14] B. Budiansky and J.L. Sanders. On the “best” first-order linear shell theory. *Progress in Applied Mechanics, The Prager Anniversary Volume*, 1963.
- [15] J. Chróścielewski, J. Makowski, and W. Pietraszkiewicz. *Statics and Dynamics of Multifold Shells: Nonlinear Theory and Finite Element Method (in Polish).* Wydawnictwo IPPT PAN, Warsaw, 2004.
- [16] J. Chróścielewski, W. Pietraszkiewicz, and W. Witkowski. On shear correction factors in the non-linear theory of elastic shells. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 47:3537–3545, 2010.
- [17] Ph.G. Ciarlet. *Mathematical Elasticity, Vol. III: Theory of Shells.* North-Holland, Amsterdam, first edition, 2000.
- [18] Ph.G. Ciarlet, M. Mălin, and C. Mardare. New estimates of the distance between two surfaces in terms of the distance between their fundamental forms. *Analysis and Applications*, 17(03):363–392, 2019.
- [19] Ph.G. Ciarlet and C. Mardare. An existence theorem for a two-dimensional nonlinear shell model of Koiter’s type. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 28(14):2833–2861, 2018.
- [20] H. Le Dret and A. Raoult. The quasiconvex envelope of the Saint Venant-Kirchhoff stored energy function. In Ph.G. Ciarlet, L. Trabucho, and J.M. Viano, editors, *Asymptotic Methods for Elastic Structures*, Proceedings of the International Conference. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1995.
- [21] V.A. Eremeyev and W. Pietraszkiewicz. Local symmetry group in the general theory of elastic shells. *Journal of Elasticity*, 85:125–152, 2006.
- [22] V.A. Eremeyev and L.M. Zubov. *Mechanics of Elastic Shells (in Russian).* Nauka, Moscow, 2008.
- [23] J.L. Ericksen and C. Truesdell. Exact theory of stress and strain in rods and shells. *Archive of Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 1:295–323, 1958.
- [24] A. Gastel and P. Neff. Regularity for a geometrically nonlinear flat Cosserat micropolar membrane shell with curvature. *to appear in Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 2022.
- [25] I.D. Ghiba, M. Biršan, P. Lewintan, and P. Neff. The isotropic Cosserat shell model including terms up to $O(h^5)$. Part I: Derivation in matrix notation. *Journal of Elasticity*, 142:201–262, 2020.
- [26] I.D. Ghiba, M. Biršan, P. Lewintan, and P. Neff. The isotropic elastic Cosserat shell model including terms up to order $O(h^5)$ in the shell thickness. Part II: Existence of minimizers. *Journal of Elasticity*, 142:263–290, 2020.
- [27] I.D. Ghiba, M. Biršan, P. Lewintan, and P. Neff. A constrained Cosserat-shell model including terms up to $O(h^5)$. *Journal of Elasticity*, 146(1):83–141, 2021.
- [28] I.D. Ghiba and P. Neff. Linear constrained Cosserat-shell models including terms up to $O(h^5)$. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik*, 74(2):47, 2023.
- [29] V. Girault and P.-A. Raviart. *Finite Element Approximation of the Navier-Stokes Equations.*, volume 749 of *Lect. Notes Math.* Springer, Heidelberg, 1979.

- [30] A.E. Green and W. Zerna. *Theoretical Elasticity*. Oxford University Press, 1961.
- [31] W. T. Koiter and J.G. Simmonds. Foundations of shell theory. In *Theoretical and Applied Mechanics*, pages 150–176. Springer, 1973.
- [32] W.T. Koiter. A consistent first approximation in the general theory of thin elastic shells. In W.T. Koiter, editor, *The Theory of Thin Elastic Shells*, IUTAM Symposium Delft 1960, pages 12–33. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1960.
- [33] L.P. Lebedev, M.J. Cloud, and V.A. Eremeyev. *Tensor Analysis with Applications in Mechanics*. World Scientific, New Jersey, 2010.
- [34] R. Leis. *Initial Boundary Value Problems in Mathematical Physics*. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1986.
- [35] R.W. Leonard. *Nonlinear First Approximation Thin Shell Membrane Theory*. PhD thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1961.
- [36] A. Libai and J.G. Simmonds. *The Nonlinear Theory of Elastic Shells*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2nd edition, 1998.
- [37] C. Mardare. On the derivation of nonlinear shell models from three-dimensional elasticity. *Revue Roumaine de Mathématique Pures et Appliquées*, 53:499–522, 2008.
- [38] C. Mardare. Nonlinear shell models of Kirchhoff-Love type: existence theorem and comparison with Koiter’s model. *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica, English Series*, 35(1):3–27, 2019.
- [39] P.M. Naghdi. A new derivation of the general equations of elastic shells. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 1:509–522, 1963.
- [40] P.M. Naghdi. The theory of shells and plates. In S. Flügge, editor, *Handbuch der Physik, Mechanics of Solids.*, volume VI a/2, pages 425–640. Springer, Berlin, 1972.
- [41] P.M. Naghdi and R.P. Nordgren. On the nonlinear theory of elastic shells under the Kirchhoff hypothesis. *Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics*, 21(1):49–59, 1963.
- [42] L.J. Nebel, O. Sander, M. Birsan, and P. Neff. A geometrically nonlinear Cosserat shell model for orientable and non-orientable surfaces: Discretization with geometric finite elements. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 416 (6):116309, 2023.
- [43] P. Neff. A geometrically exact Cosserat-shell model including size effects, avoiding degeneracy in the thin shell limit. Part I: Formal dimensional reduction for elastic plates and existence of minimizers for positive Cosserat couple modulus. *Continuum Mechanics Thermodynamics*, 16:577–628, 2004.
- [44] P. Neff. A geometrically exact Cosserat shell-model including size effects, avoiding degeneracy in the thin shell limit. Part I: Formal dimensional reduction for elastic plates and existence of minimizers for positive Cosserat couple modulus. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, 16(6):577–628, 2004.
- [45] P. Neff. A geometrically exact planar Cosserat shell-model with microstructure: Existence of minimizers for zero Cosserat couple modulus. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 17(03):363–392, 2007.
- [46] P. Neff, J. Lankeit, and A. Madeo. On Grioli’s minimum property and its relation to Cauchy’s polar decomposition. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 80:207–217, 2014.
- [47] W. Pietraszkiewicz. On exact expressions of the bending tensor in the nonlinear theory of thin shells. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 36(4):1821–1824, 2012.
- [48] W. Pietraszkiewicz. Thin elastic shells, linear theory. In *Encyclopedia of Continuum Mechanics*, pages 2518–2533. Springer, 2020.
- [49] W. Pietraszkiewicz and V.A. Eremeyev. On natural strain measures of the non-linear micropolar continuum. *International Journal of Solids and Structure*, 46:774–787, 2009.
- [50] M.M. Saem, E. Bulgariu, I.D. Ghiba, and P. Neff. Explicit formula for the Gamma-convergence homogenized quadratic curvature energy in isotropic Cosserat shell models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06032*, 2023.
- [51] M.M. Saem, I.D. Ghiba, and P. Neff. A geometrically nonlinear Cosserat (micropolar) curvy shell model via Gamma convergence. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 33(5):70, 2023.
- [52] M.M. Saem, P. Lewintan, and P. Neff. On in-plane drill rotations for cosserat surfaces. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 477(2252):20210158, 2021.
- [53] O. Sander, P. Neff, and M. Birsan. Numerical treatment of a geometrically nonlinear planar Cosserat shell model. *Computational Mechanics*, 57(5):817–841, 2016.
- [54] J.L. Sanders. An improved first-approximation theory for thin shells. *NASA Technical Report R-24*, 1959.
- [55] J.L. Sanders. *Nonlinear theories of thin shells*. Tech. Rept. No. 10, Contract No. 1866(02). Division of Engineering and Applied Physics, Harvard University, 1961.
- [56] J.L. Sanders. Nonlinear theories for thin shells. *Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics*, 21(1):21–36, 1963.
- [57] M. Šilhavý. A new approach to curvature measures in linear shell theories. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids*, 26(9):1241–1263, 2021.
- [58] A. Sky, M. Neunteufel, J.S. Hale, and A. Zilian. A Reissner-Mindlin plate formulation using symmetric Hu-Zhang elements via polytopal transformations. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 416:116291, 2023.

- [59] D.J. Steigmann. Extension of Koiter's linear shell theory to materials exhibiting arbitrary symmetry. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 51:216–232, 2012.
- [60] D.J. Steigmann. Koiter's shell theory from the perspective of three-dimensional nonlinear elasticity. *Journal of Elasticity*, 111:91–107, 2013.
- [61] M.L. Szwabowicz. Pure strain deformations of surfaces. *Journal of Elasticity*, 92(3):255–275, 2008.
- [62] E.G. Virga. Pure measure of bending for soft plates. *Soft Matter*, page online 10.1039/D3SM01123B, 2023.
- [63] P.A. Zhilin. *Applied Mechanics – Foundations of Shell Theory (in Russian)*. State Polytechnical University Publisher, Sankt Petersburg, 2006.

A Appendix

A.1 Acharya's blog-entry on iMechanica from 2007

<https://imechanica.org/node/1408>: “We know from strength of materials that non-uniform stretching of fibers along the cross section of a beam produces bending moments. But does this situation necessarily correspond to a 'bending' deformation? For that matter, what do we exactly mean kinematically when we talk about a bending deformation? To make the question more concrete, consider a cylinder that expands uniformly along all radial rays. Does this deformation of the cylinder correspond to bending? I think it is fair to say that most would say that this is purely a stretching deformation with no bending. But then, what is precisely a bending deformation? The most classical definition relates the change in the second fundamental form as a bending strain. By this is meant the following. Calculate the gradient of the unit normal fields (i.e. curvature tensors) on the deformed and undeformed shells. The difference of these curvatures, suitably adjusted for the fact that at each material point they are tensors on different tangent spaces that can be oriented very differently, is assigned to be the bending strain. But you see, a stretching of the shell changes the curvature and therefore the radially expanding cylinder would be described as undergoing a bending deformation, according to this classical measure. So, something isn't quite right here. Starting with KOITER and then followed by SANDERS and BUDIANSKY, a bending strain measure was introduced for linear kinematics that does not have this shortcoming, up to the accuracy of the linear theory. Koiter and Budiansky later proposed nonlinear strain measures that predict vanishing bending strain in biaxial stretching of cylinders, up to second order in the radial and axial displacements. In my opinion, the Koiter, Sanders, Budiansky developments were pioneering works towards clarifying what one might mean kinematically by bending. However, a clear physical definition leading to an exact mathematical statement of what constitutes bending deformation of a shell was lacking. For one thing, if such a measure was available then it would associate, without approximation, no bending strain to a biaxial stretching of a cylinder. In [1], I tried to address this question of physical definition and corresponding mathematical form in the nonlinear setting with its connections to the linear KSB [Koiter-Sander-Budiansky] measure. The seemingly innocuous question became surprisingly subtle - at least for me - with things like the drill rotation spoiling the show to exact success. The physical definition naturally involves things like the polar decomposition of the deformation gradient on a manifold with almost the whole story revolving around being careful about the domain and range of the stretch and rotation tensors. For those of you who read it, I hope you enjoy it as much as I did working on the problem.”

A.2 The stretch U_e that leaves tangent planes invariant

In this appendix we consider the specific form that a stretch U_e must have, such that the stretch derives from a mapping m that leaves normals invariant. Hence, the question: is every stretch U_e for a mapping m that leaves normals invariant of the form $U_e = \sqrt{F_e^T F_e}$ with $F_e = (\nabla m | n_0)(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}$?

The answer is yes: First let us see which is such an U_e for a mapping m that leaves normals invariant is of the form $U_e = \sqrt{F_e^T F_e}$ with $F_e = (\nabla m | n_0)(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}$. We compute

$$U_e = \sqrt{F_e^T F_e} = \sqrt{(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} (\nabla m | n_0)^T (\nabla m | n_0) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}}$$

$$\stackrel{n \equiv n_0}{=} \sqrt{(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} (\nabla m | n)^T (\nabla m | n) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}} = \sqrt{(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We check that if a mapping m leaves normals invariant then U_e given by (A.1) satisfies $U_e n_0 = n_0$. We recall that a^1, a^2, a^3 denote the rows of $[\nabla \Theta]^{-1}$, i.e. $\nabla \Theta = (\nabla y_0 | n_0) = (a_1 | a_2 | a_3)$, $[\nabla \Theta]^{-1} = (a^1 | a^2 | a^3)^T$, and $a^3 = n_0$, $\langle a^1, a^3 \rangle = 0$, $\langle a^2, a^3 \rangle = 0$. We compute

$$U_e^2 n_0 = (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} n_0 = (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (a^1 | a^2 | n_0)^T n_0 \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$= (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} e_3 = (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} e_3 = (a^1 | a^2 | n_0) e_3 = n_0.$$

The positive definite square root of U_e^2 satisfies also $U_e n_0 = n_0$. This follows from the spectral decomposition of matrices and the uniqueness of the square root of a symmetric and positive definite matrix.

So, the remaining question is: is every stretch U_e for a mapping m that leaves normals invariant necessarily of the above form

$$U_e = \sqrt{(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}} ? \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Consider a map m such that the corresponding stretch leaves normals invariant. Then for this deformation m we can consider the polar decomposition [46]

$$(\nabla m | n)(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} = R_e U_e, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $U_e n_0 = n_0$ and $U_e(\xi) \in \text{Sym}^+(3)$ is a linear mapping of the tangent plane to the initial surface at $\xi = y_0(x)$ into itself and $R_e(\xi) = R_0 R_{n_0}(\xi)$, with $R_0 \in \text{SO}(3)$ a uniform rotation, i.e., independent of position, and $R_{n_0}(\xi) \in \text{SO}(3)$ belongs to the group of rotations about the unit normal $n_0(\xi)$ to the surface at $\xi = y_0(x)$ (pure drill).

Question: is $U_e = U_e := \sqrt{(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}} \in \text{Sym}^+(3)$? Indeed, since

$$\begin{aligned} U_e^2 &= U_e U_e = U_e^T U_e = (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} (\nabla m | n)^T R_e R_e^T (\nabla m | n) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} \\ &= (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} (\nabla m | n)^T (\nabla m | n) (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1} = (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

the answer is yes.

Altogether, we have shown that every stretch U_e for a mapping m that leaves normals invariant is of the form

$$U_e = \sqrt{(\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-T} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\nabla y_0 | n_0)^{-1}}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$