

# Non-entropic theory of rubber elasticity: flexible chains grafted on a rigid surface

A.D. Drozdov\*

Department of Chemical Engineering  
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev  
P.O. Box 653  
Beer-Sheva 84105, Israel

## Abstract

The elastic response is studied of (i) a single flexible chain grafted on a rigid plane and (ii) an ensemble of non-interacting tethered chains. It is demonstrated that the entropic theory of rubber elasticity leads to conclusions that disagree with experimental data. A modification of the conventional approach is proposed, where the end-to-end distribution function (treated as the governing parameter) is replaced by the average energy of a chain. It is revealed that this refinement ensures an adequate description of the mechanical behavior of flexible chains. Results of numerical simulation are compared with observations on uniaxial compression of a layer of grafted chains, and an acceptable agreement is shown between the model predictions and the experimental data. Based on the analysis of combined compression and shear, a novel micro-mechanism is proposed for the reduction of friction of polymer melts at rigid walls.

**Key-words:** Flexible chain, Grafted layer, Entropic elasticity, Free energy, Path integral

## 1 Introduction

This study is concerned with nonlinear elasticity of an individual flexible chain and of an ensemble of flexible chains grafted on a rigid surface. This subject has attracted substantial attention in the past decade, which may be explained by the importance of the mechanical responses of grafted polymer chains and their ensembles in a number of engineering applications, ranging from stick-slip transitions in polymer melts near rigid walls at extrusion [1, 2] to drag reduction in dilute polymer solutions (reflecting hydrodynamically induced transition from coiled to stretched conformations of chains [3]), stabilization of colloidal dispersions by polymers [4], enhancement of adhesion by polymer brushes [5], and manipulation on polymer membranes [6] and single DNA molecules tethered at surfaces [7, 8, 9].

We assume the surface to be sufficiently smooth in the sense that its radius of curvature substantially exceeds the mean square end-to-end distance of a chain  $b$ . Under this hypothesis, a tethered macromolecule is thought of as a chain whose end is fixed at some point on a rigid plane, whereas all other points are located in a half-space. For definiteness, we suppose that the chain lies in the half-space  $X_3 \geq 0$ , where a Cartesian coordinate frame  $\{X_m\}$  with base vectors  $\mathbf{e}_m$  ( $m = 1, 2, 3$ ) is chosen in such a way that the vectors  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  are located in the plane, and  $\mathbf{e}_3$  is orthogonal to the plane.

---

\*Phone: 972-86472146. E-mail: aleksey@bgumail.bgu.ac.il

Two models are conventionally employed to describe conformations of a polymer chain. According to the first, a chain is treated as a random walk with  $N \gg 1$  steps that starts at the origin. Assuming the length of a step  $b_0$  to be constant and small (in the sense that the contour length  $L = b_0 N$  is finite when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ), we treat the number of steps  $n$  as a continuous variable. For a flexible chain, the probability density  $P(n, \mathbf{r})$  that the  $n$ th step ends at a point  $\mathbf{r}$  is governed by the diffusion equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial n} = \frac{b^2}{6} \Delta P, \quad (1)$$

where  $\Delta$  stands for the Laplace operator, and  $b = \sqrt{b_0 L}$  [10]. For a Gaussian chain (no restrictions on the walk), the function  $P(n, \mathbf{r})$  obeys Eq. (1) with the initial condition

$$P(0, \mathbf{r}) = \delta(\mathbf{r}), \quad (2)$$

where  $\delta$  stands for the Dirac delta-function, and the normalization condition

$$\int P(n, \mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} = 1, \quad (3)$$

where integration is performed over the entire space. For a grafted chain, the function  $P(n, \mathbf{r})$  satisfies the additional adsorbing boundary condition [11]

$$P(n, \mathbf{r}) \Big|_{x_3=0} = 0. \quad (4)$$

The walk is entirely characterized by the distribution function  $p(\mathbf{Q}) = P(N, \mathbf{Q})$  of the end-to-end vector  $\mathbf{Q}$ . It follows from Eqs. (1) to (4) that  $p(\mathbf{Q})$  is given by

$$p_G(\mathbf{Q}) = \left( \frac{3}{2\pi b^2} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{3Q^2}{2b^2}\right) \quad (5)$$

for a Gaussian chain, and it reads

$$p(\mathbf{Q}) = \frac{9Q_3}{2\pi b^4} \exp\left(-\frac{3Q^2}{2b^2}\right) \quad (6)$$

for a chain confined to the half-space. Here  $Q_m$  is the  $m$ th Cartesian coordinate of the vector  $\mathbf{Q}$ ,  $Q = |\mathbf{Q}|$ , and the subscript index ‘‘G’’ stands for ‘‘Gaussian.’’

According to the other approach, a chain is treated as a curve (with ‘‘length’’  $L$ ) in a three-dimensional space. An arbitrary configuration of the chain is determined by the function  $\mathbf{r}(s)$ , where  $\mathbf{r}$  stands for the radius vector, and  $s \in [0, L]$ . For a chain that begins at the origin and finishes at a point  $\mathbf{Q}$ , the function  $\mathbf{r}(s)$  satisfies the boundary conditions

$$\mathbf{r}(0) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{r}(L) = \mathbf{Q}. \quad (7)$$

The energy of a chain is described by a Hamiltonian  $H(\mathbf{r})$ , which determines the Green function (propagator) for the chain

$$G(\mathbf{Q}) = \int_{\mathbf{r}(0)=\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{r}(L)=\mathbf{Q}} \exp\left[-\frac{H(\mathbf{r}(s))}{k_B T}\right] \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{r}(s)], \quad (8)$$

where  $k_B$  is Boltzmann’s constant,  $T$  is the absolute temperature, and the path integral with the measure  $\mathcal{D}[\mathbf{r}]$  is calculated over all curves  $\mathbf{r}(s)$  that obey Eq. (7). For a discussion of properties of

path integrals, the reader is referred to [12, 13]. As the functional integral is determined up to an arbitrary multiplier, an additional constraint is imposed on the function  $G(\mathbf{Q})$ ,

$$\int G(\mathbf{Q})d\mathbf{Q} = 1, \quad (9)$$

which allows the Green function  $G(\mathbf{Q})$  to be referred to as the distribution function of end-to-end vectors  $p(\mathbf{Q})$ .

For a Gaussian chain, the Hamiltonian in Eq. (8) reads

$$H_G(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{3k_B T}{2b_0} \int_0^L \left( \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{ds}(s) \right)^2 ds, \quad (10)$$

and simple algebra implies that the normalized Green function  $G_G(\mathbf{Q})$  is given by Eq. (5). To account for the effect of rigid plane on chain conformations, a penalty functional is inserted into the Hamiltonian,

$$H(\mathbf{r}) = H_G(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{A}{L} \int_0^L \delta(r_3(s)) ds, \quad (11)$$

where  $A$  is a sufficiently large constant, and  $r_m(s)$  is the  $m$ th coordinate of the vector  $\mathbf{r}(s)$ . The physical meaning of the integral on the right-hand side of Eq. (11) is the “number” of times that the chain crosses the rigid plane in the configuration  $\mathbf{r}(s)$ . When  $A \gg 1$ , it is natural to expect that the configurations where the chain crosses the plane have a negligible weight in the path integral, and they are automatically excluded from the consideration. A rigorous analysis [14] demonstrates that this assertion is true: for an arbitrary  $A > 0$ , the non-normalized Green function reads

$$G(a, \mathbf{Q}) = 1 - 2 \int_0^1 \exp\left(-\frac{3Q_3^2 \tau^2}{2b^2(1-\tau^2)}\right) \varphi(a\tau) \frac{d\tau}{\tau\sqrt{1-\tau^2}} \quad (12)$$

with

$$a = \frac{A}{k_B T b} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad \varphi(x) = \frac{x}{\sqrt{\pi}} - x^2 \exp(x^2) \operatorname{erfc}(x), \quad (13)$$

where  $\operatorname{erfc}(x)$  is the complement error function. It is easy to show that after taking the limit  $A \rightarrow \infty$  and normalization, the Green function (12) coincides with the function  $p(\mathbf{Q})$  given by Eq. (6).

The classical theory of entropic elasticity has been formulated more than half a century ago, and its exposition can be found in a number of monographs, see, e.g., [15, 16]. This concept is grounded on the Boltzmann formula that expresses the probability density  $p(\mathbf{Q})$  in terms of the free energy of a chain  $\Psi(\mathbf{Q})$ ,

$$p(\mathbf{Q}) = \exp\left(-\frac{\Psi(\mathbf{Q})}{k_B T}\right). \quad (14)$$

According to the finite elasticity theory, two states of a chain are distinguished: (i) the reference (initial) state occupied before application of external loads, and (ii) the actual (deformed) state that the chain acquires after deformation. The end-to-end vector of a chain in the deformed state  $\mathbf{Q}'$  is expressed in terms of that in the reference state  $\mathbf{Q}$  by the formula

$$\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{Q}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathbf{F}$  is the deformation gradient, and the dot stands for inner product (for simplicity, we adopt the affinity hypothesis, according to which, the deformation gradient at the micro-level coincides with the deformation gradient for macro-deformation). It follows from Eqs. (14) and (15) that the increment of free energy  $\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{Q})$  driven by deformation of a chain reads

$$\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{Q}) = -k_B T \left[ \ln p(\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{Q}) - \ln p(\mathbf{Q}) \right].$$

The strain energy per chain  $W(\mathbf{F})$  is calculated by averaging the increment of free energy over the initial distribution of end-to-end vectors,

$$W(\mathbf{F}) = k_B T \int \left[ \ln p(\mathbf{Q}) - \ln p(\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{Q}) \right] p(\mathbf{Q}) d\mathbf{Q}, \quad (16)$$

where the integration is performed over the entire space. Given a strain energy  $W(\mathbf{F})$ , constitutive equations for a chain or an ensemble of chains (whose strain energy equals the sum of strain energies of individual chains) can be determined by conventional formulas. For example, for a Gaussian chain with the distribution function (5), Eq. (16) implies the classical formula

$$W = \frac{1}{2} k_B T (\mathcal{I}_1(\mathbf{C}) - 3),$$

where  $\mathcal{I}_m$  stands for the  $m$ th principal invariant of a tensor,  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{F}^\top \cdot \mathbf{F}$  is the right Cauchy-Green deformation tensor, and  $\top$  denotes transpose. For a chain grafted on a rigid plane, the natural restriction is imposed on the deformation gradient  $\mathbf{F}$ : the end-to-end vectors before and after deformation,  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}'$ , are located in the same half-space. Although this constraint complicates calculations in the general case, stress-strain relations can be easily developed in an explicit form for deformation programs traditionally studied in nonlinear mechanics.

The starting point of the present work is the difference between the two models for polymer chains. For a chain modeled as a random walk, the Boltzmann equation (14) provides the only way to introduce free energy. On the contrary, for a chain described as a curve with a Hamiltonian  $H$  ascribed to it, the free energy  $\Psi(\mathbf{Q})$  may be identified as the average value of the Hamiltonian  $\langle H \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}}$ ,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{Q}) = \frac{1}{G(\mathbf{Q})} \int_{\mathbf{r}(0)=\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{r}(L)=\mathbf{Q}} H(\mathbf{r}(s)) \exp \left[ -\frac{H(\mathbf{r}(s))}{k_B T} \right] \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{r}(s)], \quad (17)$$

where the pre-factor  $1/G(\mathbf{Q})$  plays the role of the partition function in the conventional formula for averaging. Given a free energy  $\Psi(\mathbf{Q})$ , we can define the non-normalized distribution function of end-to-end vectors  $p_\Psi(\mathbf{Q})$  by Eq. (14), and, after appropriate normalization of  $p_\Psi(\mathbf{Q})$  with the help of Eq. (3), calculate the strain energy per chain  $W(\mathbf{F})$  by the formula similar to Eq. (16),

$$W(\mathbf{F}) = \int \left[ \Psi(\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{Q}) - \Psi(\mathbf{Q}) \right] p_\Psi(\mathbf{Q}) d\mathbf{Q}. \quad (18)$$

Three questions arise naturally after the formulation of this “upside-down” (with respect to the entropic elasticity theory) approach to the derivation of constitutive equations: (i) does this technique lead to classical results for a Gaussian chain, (ii) is there any case of practical interest where the novel method implies physically plausible conclusions, whereas the traditional approach fails, and (iii) how difficult is it to calculate the path integral in Eq. (17) provided that the Green function  $G(\mathbf{Q})$  is known? The objective of this paper is to shed some light on these issues.

The exposition is organized as follows. In Section 2, a method is described that allows the average free energy  $\Psi(\mathbf{Q})$  to be found from Eq. (17) without calculation of the path integral. In particular, it is shown that for a Gaussian chain, constitutive equations (16) and (18) coincide. Force-stretch relations for an individual chain grafted on a rigid surface are developed in Section 3. It is demonstrated that two approaches lead to qualitatively similar conclusions for tension (compression) of a chain, although the results differ quantitatively. Stress-strain relations for an ensemble of noninteracting flexible chains grafted on a rigid surface are developed in Section 4. It is revealed that the conventional theory of rubber elasticity fails to adequately describe observations, whereas the non-entropic concept provides good agreement with experimental data. Combined

shear and compression of a layer of non-interacting grafted chains is studied in Section 5, where a novel mechanism is suggested for the reduction of friction of polymer melts near rigid surfaces (in addition to the standard entanglement–disentanglement process). Some concluding remarks are formulated in Section 6.

## 2 Calculation of the free energy

Our aim is to determine the function  $\Psi(\mathbf{Q})$  from Eq. (17) explicitly, provided that the Green function  $G(\mathbf{Q})$  for a flexible chain is known. To simplify transformations, it is convenient to consider a more general problem of averaging for an arbitrary Hamiltonian  $H$  of the form

$$H(\mathbf{r}) = H_G(\mathbf{r}) + A\Phi(\mathbf{r}), \quad (19)$$

where  $\Phi(\mathbf{r})$  is an arbitrary potential that describes intra-chain and inter-chain interactions. According to Eqs. (8) and (10), the Green function for the Hamiltonian (19) reads

$$G_H(A, b_0, \mathbf{Q}) = \int_{\mathbf{r}(0)=\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{r}(L)=\mathbf{Q}} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{k_B T} \left( \frac{3k_B T}{2b_0} \int_0^L \left( \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{ds}(s) \right)^2 ds + A\Phi(\mathbf{r}(s)) \right) \right] \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{r}(s)], \quad (20)$$

where the parameters  $b_0$  and  $A$  are included explicitly as arguments of the function  $G_H$ . Differentiating Eq. (20) with respect to  $b_0$  and using Eqs. (10) and (17), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial G_H}{\partial b_0} &= \frac{1}{k_B T b_0} \int_{\mathbf{r}(0)=\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{r}(L)=\mathbf{Q}} H_G(\mathbf{r}(s)) \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{k_B T} \left( \frac{3k_B T}{2b_0} \int_0^L \left( \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{ds}(s) \right)^2 ds + A\Phi(\mathbf{r}(s)) \right) \right] \mathcal{D}[\mathbf{r}(s)] \\ &= \frac{1}{k_B T b_0} \langle H_G \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}} G_H. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Similarly, differentiation of Eq. (20) with respect to  $A$  results in

$$\frac{\partial G_H}{\partial A} = -\frac{1}{k_B T} \langle \Phi \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}} G_H. \quad (22)$$

It follows from Eqs. (17), (21) and (22) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\mathbf{Q}) &= \langle H_G + A\Phi \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}} \\ &= \frac{k_B T}{G_H(A, b_0, \mathbf{Q})} \left[ b_0 \frac{\partial G_H}{\partial b_0}(A, b_0, \mathbf{Q}) - A \frac{\partial G_H}{\partial A}(A, b_0, \mathbf{Q}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Formula (23) provides an analytical expression for the average free energy of a flexible chain with an arbitrary potential  $\Phi$ . For example, for a Gaussian chain ( $A = 0$ ), Eqs. (5) and (23) imply that

$$\Psi_G(\mathbf{Q}) = \frac{3k_B T}{2} \left( \frac{Q^2}{b^2} - 1 \right). \quad (24)$$

Evidently, insertion of expression (24) into Eq. (14) and subsequent normalization results in the distribution function given by Eq. (5), which means that for a Gaussian chain, our approach coincides with the conventional one.

For a flexible chain confined to a half-space, we calculate the averages  $\langle H_G \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}}$  and  $\langle A\Phi \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}}$  separately and use the first equality in Eq. (23). Equation (21) results in

$$\langle H_G \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}} = \frac{k_B T b_0}{G_H} \frac{\partial G_H}{\partial b_0}.$$

As the differentiation with respect to  $b_0$  is independent of  $A$ , we can use Eq. (6) for the limit of the Green function when  $A \rightarrow \infty$ . Substitution of Eq. (6) into this equality implies that

$$\langle H_G \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}} = k_B T \left( \frac{3Q_3^2}{2b^2} - 2 \right). \quad (25)$$

Comparison of Eqs. (24) and (25) shows that the average Gaussian Hamiltonian is not affected by the presence of the constraint (additive constants in these relations do not influence the increment of free energy  $\Delta\Psi$ ).

It follows from Eqs. (12), (13) and (22) that for any  $A > 0$ ,

$$\langle A\Phi \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}} = -\frac{k_B T A}{G_H} \frac{\partial G_H}{\partial A} = -\frac{k_B T a}{G(a, \mathbf{Q})} \frac{\partial G}{\partial a}(a, \mathbf{Q}), \quad (26)$$

where  $G(a, \mathbf{Q})$  is given by Eq. (12). Differentiation of Eq. (12) with respect to  $a$  results in

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial a}(a, \mathbf{Q}) = -2 \int_0^1 \exp\left(-\frac{3Q_3^2 \tau^2}{2b^2(1-\tau^2)}\right) \varphi'(a\tau) \frac{d\tau}{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}},$$

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to the argument. Bearing in mind that

$$\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \tau}(a\tau) = a\varphi'(a\tau)$$

and integrating by parts, we present this equality in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial G}{\partial a}(a, \mathbf{Q}) &= -\frac{2}{a} \left[ \exp\left(-\frac{3Q_3^2 \tau^2}{2b^2(1-\tau^2)}\right) \frac{\varphi(a\tau)}{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}} \right]_{\tau=0}^{\tau=1} \\ &+ \frac{2}{a} \int_0^1 \varphi(a\tau) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left[ \exp\left(-\frac{3Q_3^2 \tau^2}{2b^2(1-\tau^2)}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}} \right] d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The out-of-integral term vanishes (because of the property of the exponent at  $\tau = 1$  and due to Eq. (13) for the function  $\varphi(x)$  at  $\tau = 0$ ). Insertion of expression (27) into Eq. (26) yields

$$\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \langle A\Phi \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}} = -2k_B T \frac{\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 a\varphi(a\tau) \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left[ \exp\left(-\frac{3Q_3^2 \tau^2}{2b^2(1-\tau^2)}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}} \right] d\tau}{\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} aG(a, \mathbf{Q})}.$$

The limit of the function  $aG(a, \mathbf{Q})$  was calculated in [14],

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} aG(a, \mathbf{Q}) = \frac{Q_3}{b} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Taking into account that

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a\varphi(a\tau) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}\tau}$$

and performing differentiation with respect to  $\tau$ , we arrive at the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \langle A\Phi \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}} &= \frac{k_B T b}{Q_3} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3\pi}} \int_0^1 \exp\left(-\frac{3Q_3^2 \tau^2}{2b^2(1-\tau^2)}\right) \left( \frac{3Q_3^2}{b^2(1-\tau^2)} - 1 \right) \frac{d\tau}{(1-\tau^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{k_B T b}{Q_3} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3\pi}} \int_0^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{3Q_3^2 t^2}{2b^2}\right) \left( \frac{3Q_3^2}{b^2}(1+t^2) - 1 \right) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where  $t = \tau/\sqrt{1 - \tau^2}$ . Calculation of the Gaussian integral results in

$$\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \langle A\Phi \rangle_{\mathbf{Q}} = k_B T \left( \frac{b^2}{3Q_3^2} + 1 \right),$$

which, together with Eqs. (23) and (25), implies that

$$\Psi(\mathbf{Q}) = k_B T \left( \frac{3Q^2}{2b^2} + \frac{b^2}{3Q_3^2} - 1 \right). \quad (28)$$

Formula (28) provides an explicit expression for the average free energy of a flexible chain grafted on a rigid surface.

### 3 Uniaxial tension of an individual chain

Our aim now is to compare the mechanical response of an individual flexible chain grafted on a rigid plane when its free energy is (i) determined by the entropic elasticity theory, Eq. (14), and (ii) given by Eq. (28).

We begin with the conventional approach, substitute expression (6) into Eq. (14), and find that

$$\Psi_e(\mathbf{Q}) = k_B T \left( \frac{3Q^2}{2b^2} - \ln \frac{9Q_3}{2\pi b^4} \right), \quad (29)$$

where the subscript index “e” stands for “entropic.” To determine the natural state of the chain, that is the state (described by an end-to-end vector  $\mathbf{Q}^0$ ) in which the free energy has its extremum, we differentiate Eq. (29) with respect to  $Q_m$ , equate the derivatives to zero, and obtain

$$Q_1^0 = 0, \quad Q_2^0 = 0, \quad Q_3^0 = \frac{b}{\sqrt{3}}. \quad (30)$$

It follows from Eqs. (29) and (30) that for a fixed  $Q_3$  (shear), the response of a tethered flexible chain coincides with that of a Gaussian chain. Thus, we concentrate on tension (compression) perpendicular to the rigid plane. Denote by  $z$  the displacement (from the natural state) of the free end of the chain along the  $\mathbf{e}_3$  vector when a force  $\mathbf{f} = f\mathbf{e}_3$  is applied to this end. Given an elastic energy  $\Psi$ , the force  $f$  is expressed in terms of the displacement  $z$  by the formula

$$f = \left. \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial Q_3} \right|_{Q_3=Q_3^0+z}. \quad (31)$$

Combination of Eqs. (29) to (31) implies that

$$f_e(z) = \frac{3k_B T}{b} \left[ \frac{z}{b} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left( 1 - \left( 1 + \frac{z}{b} \sqrt{3} \right)^{-1} \right) \right]. \quad (32)$$

The first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (32) describes the mechanical response of a Gaussian chain, whereas the last term characterizes the influence of the constraint on the force–stretch relation. The expression in the parentheses approaches zero as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ , which means that at large extensions, the effect of surface becomes insignificant. This expression is important at compression ( $z < 0$ ), because it tends to infinity when  $z \rightarrow -Q_3^0$  (the total compression of the chain requires an infinite force). The stiffness (an equivalent spring constant) of the chain  $\mu$  is determined as

$$\mu = \left. \frac{df}{dz} \right|_{z=0}. \quad (33)$$

Equations (32) and (33) imply that

$$\mu_e = 6k_B T b^{-2}, \quad (34)$$

which means that the presence of a rigid surface increases the stiffness of a Gaussian chain  $\mu_G = 3k_B T b^{-2}$  [17] by twice.

We now repeat the same calculations for a tethered flexible chain with free energy (28). Differentiating Eq. (28) with respect to  $Q_m$  and equating the derivatives to zero, we find the end-to-end vector in equilibrium

$$Q_1^0 = 0, \quad Q_2^0 = 0, \quad Q_3^0 = b\sqrt[4]{\frac{2}{9}}. \quad (35)$$

Substitution of expressions (28) and (35) into Eq. (31) implies the force–stretch relation

$$f_{\text{ne}}(z) = \frac{3k_B T}{b} \left[ \frac{z}{b} + \sqrt[4]{\frac{2}{9}} \left( 1 - \left( 1 + \frac{z}{b} \sqrt[4]{\frac{2}{9}} \right)^{-3} \right) \right], \quad (36)$$

where the subscript index “ne” stands for “non-entropic.” Equations (33) and (36) result in

$$\mu_{\text{ne}} = 12k_B T b^{-2}, \quad (37)$$

which means that the stiffness of a flexible chain grafted on a rigid surface exceeds that of a Gaussian chain by a factor of four.

Equations (32), (34) and (36), (37) show that, although the force–extension relations derived within these approaches are quantitatively different, they are quite similar qualitatively. To reveal a qualitative difference between the two concepts, we study the elastic behavior of an ensemble of grafted chains.

## 4 Uniaxial tension of an ensemble of chains

We now consider the response of an ensemble of non-interacting flexible chains grafted on a rigid plane. In the rubber elasticity theory, inter-chain interactions are conventionally accounted for in terms of the incompressibility condition [10], which means that the neglect of interactions between chains is tantamount to the assumption about compressibility of the ensemble. The difference between the analysis of an individual chain and that of an ensemble of macromolecules is that we do not assume end-to-end vectors of chains in an ensemble to be in their natural states, but suppose that the distribution of end-to-end vectors  $\mathbf{Q}$  is governed by an appropriate probability density.

At uniaxial tension in the direction orthogonal to the plane, the deformation gradient  $\mathbf{F}$  reads

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2 \mathbf{e}_2 + \lambda \mathbf{e}_3 \mathbf{e}_3, \quad (38)$$

where  $\lambda$  stands for the elongation ratio. It follows from Eqs. (6), (14) and (38) that within the entropic elasticity theory, the increment of free energy per chain is given by

$$\Delta\Psi_e(\lambda, \mathbf{Q}) = k_B T \left( \frac{3Q_3^2}{2b^2} (\lambda^2 - 1) - \ln \lambda \right).$$

Inserting this expression and Eq. (6) into Eq. (16) and calculating the integral, we find the strain energy of an individual chain,

$$W_e(\lambda) = k_B T (\lambda^2 - \ln \lambda - 1). \quad (39)$$

Denote by  $\zeta$  concentration of grafted chains (the number of chains per unit area of the surface). Multiplying the strain energy of a chain  $W$  by the number of chains per unit area, we determine the strain energy per unit area of a layer,

$$\tilde{W} = \zeta W. \quad (40)$$



At uniaxial extension, the work of external forces (per unit area and per unit time) reads

$$\Pi = \Sigma h \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{d\lambda}{dt},$$

where  $\Sigma$  is the tensile stress,  $\lambda^{-1}d\lambda/dt$  is the rate of longitudinal strain, and  $h$  is the initial height of the layer. According to the first law of thermodynamics,

$$\frac{d\tilde{W}}{dt} = \Pi. \quad (41)$$

Combining these relations, we arrive at the formula

$$\Sigma = \lambda \frac{\zeta}{h} \frac{dW}{d\lambda}. \quad (42)$$

Equation (42) is similar to the well-known formula that expresses the principal Cauchy stresses  $\Sigma_m$  in terms of the principal elongation ratios  $\lambda_m$ ,

$$\Sigma_m = \lambda_m \frac{dW}{d\lambda_m},$$

where  $W$  is the strain energy per unit volume in the reference state and  $m = 1, 2, 3$ . Inserting expression (39) into Eq. (42), we find that

$$\Sigma_e(\lambda) = \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} (2\lambda^2 - 1). \quad (43)$$

Before discussing the physical meaning of Eq. (43), we find a stress-strain relation for a layer of grafted chain with the average free energy given by Eq. (28). It follows from Eqs. (28) and (38) that the increment of free energy  $\Delta\Psi_{\text{ne}}$  reads

$$\Delta\Psi_{\text{ne}}(\lambda, \mathbf{Q}) = k_B T \left[ \frac{3Q_3^2}{2b^2} (\lambda^2 - 1) + \frac{b^2}{3Q_3^2} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda^2} - 1 \right) \right].$$

The expression for the distribution function of end-to-end vectors is found from Eqs. (14) and (28),

$$p_{\text{ne}}(\mathbf{Q}) = C \exp \left[ - \left( \frac{3Q^2}{2b^2} + \frac{b^2}{3Q_3^2} \right) \right], \quad (44)$$

where the pre-factor  $C$  is determined by the normalization condition (3). Calculation of the integrals over  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  in this relation implies that

$$C = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \frac{3}{b^2} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} C_0, \quad C_0 = \left[ \int_0^\infty \exp \left( - \left( \frac{1}{2} z^2 + \frac{1}{z^2} \right) \right) dz \right]^{-1}, \quad (45)$$

where  $z = Q_3 \sqrt{3}/b$ . Substitution of these expressions into Eq. (18) results in

$$W_{\text{ne}}(\lambda) = k_B T \left[ C_1 (\lambda^2 - 1) + C_2 \left( \frac{1}{\lambda^2} - 1 \right) \right], \quad (46)$$

where

$$C_1 = C_0 \int_0^\infty \exp \left( - \left( \frac{1}{2} z^2 + \frac{1}{z^2} \right) \right) \frac{z^2}{2} dz, \quad C_2 = C_0 \int_0^\infty \exp \left( - \left( \frac{1}{2} z^2 + \frac{1}{z^2} \right) \right) \frac{dz}{z^2}. \quad (47)$$

It follows from Eqs. (42) and (46) that

$$\Sigma_{\text{ne}}(\lambda) = 2 \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} (C_1 \lambda^2 - C_2 \lambda^{-2}). \quad (48)$$

To find the coefficients  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  explicitly, we transform the second equality in Eq. (45) by integration by parts

$$\frac{1}{C_0} = 2 \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\left(\frac{1}{2}z^2 + \frac{1}{z^2}\right)\right) \left(\frac{z^2}{2} - \frac{1}{z^2}\right) dz.$$

Combining this relation with Eq. (47), we conclude that

$$C_1 - C_2 = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (49)$$

We now set  $y = \sqrt{2}/z$  in the second equality in Eq. (45) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{C_0} = \sqrt{2} \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\left(\frac{1}{2}y^2 + \frac{1}{y^2}\right)\right) \frac{1}{y^2} dy.$$

It follows from this formula and Eq. (47) that

$$C_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (50)$$

Equations (48) to (50) yield

$$\Sigma_{\text{ne}}(\lambda) = \sqrt{2} \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} \left[ \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \lambda^2 - \lambda^{-2} \right]. \quad (51)$$

According to Eqs. (43) and (51), the tensile stress  $\Sigma_0 = \zeta k_B T/h$  should be applied to an ensemble of grafted chains in order to maintain its initial (undeformed) state. Splitting the longitudinal stress  $\Sigma$  into the sum of the residual stress  $\Sigma_0$  and the extra-stress  $\sigma$ , we find that

$$\sigma_e(\lambda) = 2 \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} (\lambda^2 - 1), \quad (52)$$

$$\sigma_{\text{ne}}(\lambda) = \sqrt{2} \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} \left[ \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) (\lambda^2 - 1) - (\lambda^{-2} - 1) \right]. \quad (53)$$

At strong extension of a layer of chains ( $\lambda \gg 1$ ), Eqs. (52) and (53) show a monotonic increase in tensile stresses with  $\lambda$ , but the non-entropic model implies a higher (by a factor of  $\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{2} + 1)$ ) rate of growth of the extra-stress  $\sigma$ .

Formulas (52) and (53) demonstrate the principal difference between the two approaches at compression. According to the entropic elasticity theory, Eq. (52), a finite compressive stress  $\sigma_e = -2\Sigma_0$  leads to the total compression of a layer of flexible chains ( $\lambda = 0$ ). As this conclusion contradicts basic hypotheses of continuum mechanics, the corresponding strain energy density, Eq. (39), should be excluded from the consideration. On the contrary, Eq. (53) reveals that an infinite compressive stress is required for the total compression of a layer of grafted chains, in accord with the axioms of the nonlinear theory of elasticity.

It is worth recalling that Eqs. (52) and (53) are derived for a compressible layer of grafted chains, which implies that they differ from conventional relations describing uniaxial extension of an incompressible medium (where the engineering stress is proportional to  $\lambda$ , not to  $\lambda^2$ ). This discrepancy is driven by the fact that the area of a compressible layer with the normal vector  $\mathbf{e}_3$  does not change, while at uniaxial tension of an incompressible material, this area decreases as  $\lambda^{-1}$ .

It is of interest to compare predictions of the non-entropic model with experimental data. For this purpose, we use observations at compression of red cell membranes by a micro-sphere tip (the bio-membrane force probe). A red cell ghost after a preliminary treatment was put on a glass substrate and was compressed by a glass bead with a micron-size radius. The compressive force  $f_c$  was measured simultaneously with the distance from the bead to the substrate  $z$ . The red cell membrane on the substrate is modeled as a rigid layer, to which a compressible spectrin network (treated as a layer of non-interacting flexible chains) is linked by junctional complexes of short actin filaments and other proteins. For a description of the material, the experimental procedure, and the method of analysis of measurements, the reader is referred to the original publication [6]. In numerical simulation, the force  $f_c$  is found from Eq. (53) where the stress  $\sigma_{ne}$  is multiplied by the contact area  $S$  (following [6], the latter is assumed to be independent of  $z$ ). The elongation ratio  $\lambda$  is connected with the distance  $z$  by the formula  $\lambda = z/Z$ , where  $Z = 205$  nm is the initial distance (determined from the measurements as the smallest distance at which the force  $f_c$  vanishes). The compressive force  $f_c$  is plotted versus distance from the substrate  $z$  in Figure 1 together with the curve  $f_c(z)$  calculated at  $\sqrt{2}\zeta k_B T S/h = 30$  pN. Figure 1 demonstrates an acceptable agreement between the observations and the results of numerical analysis. We do not treat this agreement as a confirmation of the model (the experimental data were obtained based on a number of simplifications that may be questioned), but rather as a demonstration of failure of the entropic theory of rubber elasticity.

## 5 Superposition of uniaxial tension and shear

Our purpose now is to consider the influence of uniaxial tension (compression) on shear deformation of a layer of grafted flexible chains. An exposition of motivation for the study of this problem is postponed to the discussion at the end of this section. The analysis is focused on the non-entropic model with the average free energy (28), whose results are compared with those of the entropic elasticity theory.

Subsequent imposition of uniaxial tension with an elongation ratio  $\lambda$  and the deformation gradient  $\mathbf{F}_1$  given by Eq. (38) and simple shear with the deformation gradient

$$\mathbf{F}_2 = \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2 \mathbf{e}_2 + \mathbf{e}_3 \mathbf{e}_3 + \kappa \mathbf{e}_2 \mathbf{e}_3,$$

where  $\kappa$  stands for shear, induces deformation with the deformation gradient

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_2 \cdot \mathbf{F}_1 = \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2 \mathbf{e}_2 + \lambda \mathbf{e}_3 \mathbf{e}_3 + \lambda \kappa \mathbf{e}_2 \mathbf{e}_3. \quad (54)$$

It follows from Eqs. (28) and (54) that

$$\Delta \Psi_{ne}(\lambda, \kappa, \mathbf{Q}) = k_B T \left\{ \frac{3}{2b^2} \left[ \left( (Q_2 + \lambda \kappa Q_3)^2 - Q_2^2 \right) + (\lambda^2 - 1) Q_3^2 \right] + \frac{b^2}{3Q_3^2} (\lambda^{-2} - 1) \right\}. \quad (55)$$

Inserting expressions (44) and (55) into Eq. (18) and calculating the integral, we find that

$$W(\lambda, \kappa) = k_B T \left[ C_1 \left( \lambda^2 (1 + \kappa^2) - 1 \right) + C_2 \left( \frac{1}{\lambda^2} - 1 \right) \right], \quad (56)$$

where the coefficients  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are given by Eq. (47). At combined uniaxial tension and shear, the work of external forces (per unit area of the layer of grafted chains and unit time) reads

$$\Pi = \left( \Sigma \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{d\lambda}{dt} + \Sigma_1 \frac{d\kappa}{dt} \right) h,$$

where  $\Sigma_1$  denotes the (Cauchy) shear stress. The remark that  $\Sigma_1$  is defined per unit area in the deformed state is important: at uniaxial tension  $\Sigma_1$  is less than the engineering shear stress by a factor of  $\lambda^{-1}$ , while the shear displacement of the upper boundary of the layer increases by a factor of  $\lambda$ , which means that no additional multiplier appears in the expression for the work of shear forces. Substitution of this expression and Eq. (40) into Eq. (41) results in

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \left( \Sigma - \lambda \frac{\zeta}{h} \frac{\partial W}{\partial \lambda} \right) \frac{d\lambda}{dt} + \left( \Sigma_1 - \frac{\zeta}{h} \frac{\partial W}{\partial \kappa} \right) \frac{d\kappa}{dt} = 0.$$

Bearing in mind that this equality is satisfied for arbitrary functions  $\lambda(t)$  and  $\kappa(t)$ , we conclude that the expressions in parentheses vanish. Equating the first expression to zero, we arrive at Eq. (42), whereas equating the other expression to zero, we obtain

$$\Sigma_1 = \frac{\zeta}{h} \frac{\partial W}{\partial \kappa}. \quad (57)$$

It follows from Eqs. (42), (56) and (57) that

$$\Sigma = 2 \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} \left[ C_1 (1 + \kappa^2) \lambda^2 - C_2 \lambda^{-2} \right], \quad \Sigma_1 = 2 \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} C_1 \kappa \lambda^2.$$

Inserting expressions (49) and (50) into these relations and splitting the longitudinal stress  $\Sigma$  into the sum of  $\Sigma_0$  and the extra-stress  $\sigma$ , we find that

$$\sigma = \sqrt{2} \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} \left[ \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) (1 + \kappa^2) \lambda^2 - \lambda^{-2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right], \quad \Sigma_1 = (1 + \sqrt{2}) \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} \kappa \lambda^2. \quad (58)$$

Introducing the notation

$$\bar{\sigma} = \frac{\sigma h}{\zeta k_B T}, \quad \bar{\tau} = \frac{\Sigma_1 h}{\zeta k_B T},$$

and excluding  $\lambda^2$  from Eqs. (58), we obtain

$$\bar{\sigma} = \bar{\tau} \frac{1 + \kappa^2}{\kappa} - \frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\kappa}{\bar{\tau}} - 1.$$

Resolving this equation with respect to  $\bar{\tau}$ , we find that

$$\bar{\tau} = \frac{\kappa^2}{2(1 + \kappa^2)} \left\{ (1 + \bar{\sigma}) + \left[ (1 + \bar{\sigma})^2 + 2\sqrt{2}(1 + \sqrt{2}) \frac{1 + \kappa^2}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}. \quad (59)$$

The dependence of the dimensionless shear stress  $\bar{\tau}$  on shear  $\kappa$  is plotted in Figure 2 at various values of the dimensionless tensile stress  $\bar{\sigma}$ . This figure demonstrates that given  $\bar{\sigma}$ , the shear stress monotonically increases with shear. Given  $\kappa$ , the stress  $\bar{\tau}$  pronouncedly grows with  $\bar{\sigma}$ . At a relatively large compression ( $\bar{\sigma} = -5.0$  to  $-20.0$ ), the function  $\bar{\tau}(\kappa)$  is practically linear, and the tangent shear modulus is rather small. When  $\bar{\sigma}$  is positive (tension), the function  $\bar{\tau}(\kappa)$  becomes strongly nonlinear: it rapidly grows at relatively small  $\kappa$  and increases as  $\sqrt{\kappa}$  at large  $\kappa$ .

It is of interest to compare the solution (59) with that found by using the entropic elasticity theory. In the latter case, an analog of Eqs. (58) is given by

$$\sigma = 2 \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} \left[ (1 + \kappa^2) \lambda^2 - 1 \right], \quad \Sigma_1 = 2 \frac{\zeta k_B T}{h} \kappa \lambda^2.$$

Introducing the dimensionless variables  $\bar{\sigma}$  and  $\bar{\tau}$  and excluding  $\lambda^2$  from these relations, we arrive at the formula

$$\bar{\tau} = \frac{(2 + \bar{\sigma}) \kappa}{1 + \kappa^2}. \quad (60)$$

Equation (60) contradicts the physical intuition: it shows that given a tensile stress  $\sigma$ , the shear stress  $\Sigma_1$  depends on shear  $\kappa$  non-monotonically:  $\Sigma_1$  increases with  $\kappa$  at small strains, reaches its maximum, and decays to zero at large deformations.

It is necessary to provide some explanations for our choice of shear deformation with a fixed normal stress for the analysis. This problem naturally arises in the study of laminar flows of polymer melts near a rigid surface. Experiments reveal that some chains from the melt are grafted on the surface. At low flow velocities and, as a consequence, small pressures in the melt (in the model, the pressure  $p$  is equivalent to the compressive stress  $\sigma$ ), a strong friction is observed between the melt and the rigid wall which suppresses slippage of the melt entirely. At higher flow velocities, measurements demonstrate a significant reduction in friction and noticeable slippage of the melt with respect to the surface [1, 17], in particular, when the grafted chains do not overlap (an ensemble of non-interacting tethered chains). Two reasons for this decrease in friction may be mentioned: (i) disentanglement of polymer chains in the bulk from grafted chains [1, 2], and (ii) a decay in the tangent shear modulus of the layer of grafted chains driven by the growth of pressure. Although the entanglement–disentanglement mechanism may be dominant, the above analysis demonstrates that an increase in pressure  $p$  may provide substantial contribution into the decrease of friction as well.

## 6 Concluding remarks

The nonlinear elastic behavior has been analyzed of an individual flexible chain and an ensemble of non-interacting chains grafted on a rigid surface. It is demonstrated that the conventional entropic elasticity theory leads to the conclusions that contradict our physical intuition, which implies that its applicability in the mechanics of polymers is questionable. A modification of this theory is proposed, where the average energy of a flexible chain is treated as the governing parameter instead of the distribution function of end-to-end vectors. It is shown that this refinement leads to physically plausible conclusions for an ensemble of tethered flexible chains under uniaxial tension (compression) and under superposition of uniaxial tension and shear. The results of numerical simulation for the former problem demonstrate fair agreement with observations on compression of red cell membranes. Our results for the latter problem reveal a novel micro-mechanism for the decrease in friction (with the growth of flow velocity) of polymer melts moving near solid walls.

## References

- [1] F. Brochard, P.G. de Gennes, Shear-dependent slippage at a polymer/solid interface. *Langmuir* 8 (1992) 3033–3037.
- [2] J.L.A. Dubbeldum, J. Molenaar, Self-consistent dynamics of wall slip. *Phys. Rev. E* 67 (2003) 011803.
- [3] R. Rzehak, W. Zimmermann, Static dynamics approach to relaxation modes and times for deformed polymers. *Phys. Rev. E* 68 (2003) 021804.
- [4] W.B. Russell, D.A. Saville, W.R. Schowalter, *Colloidal Dispersions*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (1989).
- [5] S.W. Sides, G.S. Grest, M.J. Stevens, Surface-tethered chains entangled in a polymer melt: Effects on adhesion dynamics. *Phys. Rev. E.* 64 (2001) 050802(R).
- [6] V. Heinrich, K. Ritchie, N. Monandas, E. Evans, Elastic thickness compressibility of the red cell membranes. *Biophys. J.* 81 (2001) 1452–1463.
- [7] D. Stigter, C. Bustamante, Theory for the hydrodynamic and electrophoretic stretch of tethered B-DNA. *Biophys. J.* 75 (1998) 1197–1210.
- [8] S. Ferree, H.W. Blanch, Electrokinetic stretching of tethered DNA. *Biophys. J.* 85 (2003) 2539–2546.
- [9] A. Crut, D. Lasne, J.-F. Allemand, M. Dahan, P. Desbiolles, Transverse fluctuations of single DNA molecules attached at both extremities to a surface. *Phys. Rev. E.* 67 (2003) 051910.
- [10] M. Doi, S.F. Edwards, *The Theory of Polymer Dynamics*. Clarendon Press, Oxford (1986).
- [11] E.A. DiMarzio, Proper accounting of conformations of a polymer near a surface. *J. Chem. Phys.* 42 (1965) 2101–2106.
- [12] R.P. Feynman, A.R. Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals*. McGraw-Hill, New York (1965).
- [13] H. Kleinert, *Path Integrals in Quantum Mechanics, Statistics, and Polymer Physics*. World Scientific, Singapore (1995).
- [14] M. Slutsky, Diffusion in a half-space: from Lord Kelvin to path integrals. Preprint cond-mat/0406613 (2004).
- [15] L.R.G. Treloar, *The Physics of Rubber Elasticity*. Clarendon Press, Oxford (1975).
- [16] J.D. Ferry, *Viscoelastic Properties of Polymers*. Wiley, New York (1980).
- [17] P.G. de Gennes, *Simple Views on Condensed Matter*. World Scientific, London (1992).

## List of figures

**Figure 1:** The compressive force  $f_c$  versus the distance from the substrate  $z$  for a red cell membrane. Circles: experimental data [6]. Solid line: results of numerical simulation.

**Figure 2:** The dimensionless shear stress  $\bar{\tau}$  versus shear  $\kappa$  for  $\bar{\sigma} = -20.0, -10.0, -5.0, -2.0, -1.0, 0.0, 2.0$  and  $5.0$ , from bottom to top, respectively.




Figure 1:




Figure 2: