

Mid-surface scaling invariance of some bending strain measures

Amit Acharya*

Abstract

The mid-surface scaling invariance of bending strain measures proposed in [1] is discussed in light of the work of [3].

1 Introduction

This brief note discusses the mid-surface scaling invariance of three nonlinear measures of pure bending strain, as introduced in [1] and physically motivated therein more than 20 years ago, in light of the recent work of [3] where the said invariance is introduced.

It is shown that one of the strain measures introduced in [1] possesses scaling invariance, and the other two are easily modified to have the invariance as well. There has been a recent surge of interest in such matters, as can be seen from the works of [3, 5, 6].

We use the notation of [1]: a shell mid-surface is thought of as a 2D surface in ambient 3D space (the qualification ‘mid-surface’ will not be used in all instances; it is hoped that the meaning will be clear from the context). Both the reference and deformed shells are parametrized by the same coordinate system $((\xi^\alpha, \alpha = 1, 2)$ (convected coordinates). Points on the reference geometry are denoted generically by \mathbf{X} and on the deformed geometry by \mathbf{x} . The reference unit normal is denoted by \mathbf{N} and the unit normal on the deformed geometry by \mathbf{n} . A subscript comma refers to partial differentiation, e.g. $\frac{\partial(\cdot)}{\partial \xi^\alpha} = (\cdot)_{,\alpha}$. Summation over repeated indices will be assumed. The convected coordinate basis vectors in the reference geometry will be referred to by the symbols (\mathbf{E}_α) and those in the deformed geometry by (\mathbf{e}_α) , $\alpha = 1, 2$, with corresponding dual bases (\mathbf{E}^α) , (\mathbf{e}^α) , respectively. A suitable number of dots placed between two tensors represent the operation of contraction, while the symbol \otimes will represent a tensor product. The deformation gradient will be denoted by $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{e}_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{E}^\alpha$ and admits the right polar decomposition $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{U}$, where $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{X}) : T_{\mathbf{X}} \rightarrow T_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{X}) : T_{\mathbf{X}} \rightarrow T_{\mathbf{x}}$, where $T_{\mathbf{c}}$ represents the tangent space of the shell at the point \mathbf{c} .

2 Some measures of pure bending and their invariance under mid-surface scaling

In [1] three measures of bending strain were proposed, given by

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{K}} = (\mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{r}^T \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\beta} - \mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\beta}) \mathbf{E}^\alpha \otimes \mathbf{E}^\beta \quad (1a)$$

$$\check{\mathbf{K}} = \left(\mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{r}^T \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\beta} - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\beta} + \mathbf{E}_\beta \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\alpha}) \right) \mathbf{E}^\alpha \otimes \mathbf{E}^\beta \quad (1b)$$

$$\overline{\mathbf{K}} = (\mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{r}^T \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\beta} - \mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\beta}) \mathbf{E}^\alpha \otimes \mathbf{E}^\beta. \quad (1c)$$

*Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, and Center for Nonlinear Analysis, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, email: acharyaamit@cmu.edu.

Equation (1c) was unnumbered in that work, as the main emphasis was to obtain a nonlinear generalization of the Koiter-Sanders-Budiansky bending strain measure [4, 2]; $\widetilde{\mathbf{K}}$ is introduced as Equation (8) and $\check{\mathbf{K}}$ as Equation (10) in [1].

In [3] a physically natural requirement of invariance of bending strain measure under simple scalings of the form

$$\mathbf{x} \rightarrow a\mathbf{x}, \quad 0 < a \in \mathbb{R}$$

is introduced (for plates, but the requirement is natural for shells as well) and it is shown that the measures $\widetilde{\mathbf{K}}, \check{\mathbf{K}}$ are not invariant under such a scaling. The measure $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$ is not discussed in [3].

It is straightforward to see that under the said scaling, the deformation gradient scales as

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{f} \quad \rightarrow \quad a\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{r} \cdot (a\mathbf{U}) = a \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{X}},$$

resulting in the bending measures scaling as

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{K}} \rightarrow a\widetilde{\mathbf{K}}; \quad \check{\mathbf{K}} \rightarrow a\check{\mathbf{K}}; \quad \overline{\mathbf{K}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{K}}.$$

Thus, the bending strain measure $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$ from [1], not discussed by [3], is actually *invariant under scaling deformations of the deformed shell mid-surface*. Furthermore, the simple modifications of the measures $\widetilde{\mathbf{K}}, \check{\mathbf{K}}$ to

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{K}}_{mod} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{U}|} (\mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{r}^T \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\beta} - \mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\beta}) \mathbf{E}^\alpha \otimes \mathbf{E}^\beta \quad (2a)$$

$$= (\text{tr}(\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{f}))^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{x}_{,\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\beta} - \mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\beta}) \mathbf{E}^\alpha \otimes \mathbf{E}^\beta$$

$$\check{\mathbf{K}}_{mod} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{U}|} \left(\mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{r}^T \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\beta} - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\beta} + \mathbf{E}_\beta \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\alpha}) \right) \mathbf{E}^\alpha \otimes \mathbf{E}^\beta \quad (2b)$$

$$= (\text{tr}(\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{f}))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbf{x}_{,\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\beta} - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{E}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\beta} + \mathbf{E}_\beta \cdot \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{,\alpha}) \right) \mathbf{E}^\alpha \otimes \mathbf{E}^\beta,$$

where

$$|\mathbf{U}| = \sqrt{\mathbf{U} : \mathbf{U}} = \sqrt{\text{tr}(\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{f})},$$

make them mid-surface scaling invariant.

References

- [1] Amit Acharya. “A nonlinear generalization of the Koiter–Sanders–Budiansky bending strain measure”. In: *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 37.39 (2000), pp. 5517–5528.
- [2] B. Budiansky and J. L. Sanders. “On the ‘Best’ first-order linear shell theory”. In: *Progress in Applied Mechanics (The Prager Anniversary Volume)*. 1963, pp. 129–140.
- [3] I. D. Ghiba, M. Bîrsan, P. Lewintan, and Patrizio Neff. “A constrained Cosserat shell model up to order $O(h^5)$: modelling, existence of minimizers, relations to classical shell models and scaling invariance of the bending tensor”. In: *Journal of Elasticity* 146.1 (2021), pp. 83–141.
- [4] W. T. Koiter. “A consistent first approximation in the general theory of thin elastic shells”. In: *Proceedings of the IUTAM Symposium on the Theory of Thin Shells*. North-Holland Amsterdam, 1960, pp. 12–33.
- [5] Epifanio G. Virga. “Pure measures of bending for soft plates”. In: *Soft Matter* 20.1 (2024), pp. 144–151.

- [6] E. Vitral and J. A. Hanna. “Dilation-invariant bending of elastic plates, and broken symmetry in shells”. In: *Journal of Elasticity* 153.4-5 (2023), pp. 571–579.