

# Why is the strength of a polymer network so low?

Shaswat Mohanty<sup>a</sup>, Jose Blanchet<sup>b</sup>, Zhigang Suo<sup>c</sup>, Wei Cai<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University, CA 94305-4040, USA*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Management Science and Engineering, Stanford University, CA 94305-4040, USA*

<sup>c</sup>*John A. Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Kavli Institute for Bionano Science and Technology, Harvard University, MA, 02138, USA*

---

## Abstract

Experiments have long shown that a polymer network of covalent bonds commonly ruptures at a stress that is orders of magnitude lower than the strength of the covalent bonds. Here we investigate this large reduction in strength by coarse-grained molecular dynamics simulations. We show that the network ruptures by sequentially breaking a small fraction of bonds, and that each broken bond lies on the minimum “shortest path”. The shortest path is the path of the fewest bonds that connect two monomers at the opposite ends of the network. As the network is stretched, the minimum shortest path straightens and bears high tension set by covalent bonds, while most strands off the path deform by entropic elasticity. After a bond on the minimum shortest path breaks, the process repeats for the next minimum shortest path. As the network is stretched and bonds are broken, the scatter in lengths of the shortest paths first narrows, causing stress to rise, and then broadens, causing stress to decline. This sequential breaking of a small fraction of bonds causes the network to rupture at a stress that is orders of magnitude below the strength of the covalent bonds.

*Keywords:* Polymer Network, Rupture Strength, Shortest Path

---

## 1. Introduction

Elastomers are highly stretchable polymer networks. Attention here is focused on an elastomer in which covalent bonds link monomers into polymer strands, and crosslink the polymer strands into a polymer network. Experiments have long shown that the strength of such an elastomer is orders of magnitude lower than the strength of the covalent bonds. A representative value of the strength of a covalent bond is on the order of 10 GPa [1], whereas a representative value of the experimentally measured strength of an elastomer is on the order of 10 MPa [2, 3]. What causes this three orders of magnitude reduction in strength?

This enormous reduction in strength is also commonly reported in other elastic materials, such as glass and ceramics [4, 5]. Since the work of Griffith [6], this reduction

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email address:* caiwei@stanford.edu (Wei Cai)

in strength in glass and ceramics has been attributed to crack-like flaws, which concentrate stress to atomic scale [1, 7]. Attempts have been made to apply the Griffith theory to account for the large reduction in strength in polymer networks [7, 8]. These attempts, however, have led to problems. In particular, experiments have shown that the strength of a polymer network, such as a polyacrylamide hydrogel, is insensitive to cracks of length up to about 1 mm [1].




Figure 1: A polymer network ruptures by breaking bonds on a sequence of minimum shortest paths. (a) For any two monomers at the opposite ends of the network, the shortest path is the path of the fewest bonds that connect them, e.g., the shortest path between A and A' (red), and the shortest path between B and B' (purple). Of all the shortest paths, the red path is the minimum. (b) When the network is stretched to  $\lambda_2$ , the minimum shortest path is stretched nearly straight, near the breaking point, while most other strands deform by entropic elasticity. (c) At a further stretch  $\lambda_3$ , a bond breaks on the minimum shortest path. Of all the new shortest paths, the minimum shortest path becomes the purple path connecting B and B', becomes nearly straight under subsequent loading and the process repeats itself.

We have previously established the shortest path (SP) between distant crosslinks as a key microstructural feature controlling the macroscopic behavior of the elastomers [9–11]. Here we hypothesize that the large reduction in strength in a polymer network is due to sequential breaking of a small fraction of bonds, which are not localized around a

crack but are distributed throughout the network. We test this hypothesis using coarse-grained molecular dynamics (CGMD) simulations. Our simulations confirm that the network ruptures by sequentially breaking a small fraction of bonds, and each broken bond lies on the minimum “shortest path” [12]. Connecting each pair of monomers at the opposite ends of the network is a shortest path defined as the path with the fewest bonds (Fig. 1a). The minimum shortest path is defined as the shortest path of the minimum number of bonds among all pairs of monomers. As the network is stretched, the minimum shortest path straightens and bears high tension set by the covalent bonds, while most strands off the path deform by entropic elasticity (Fig. 1b). After a bond on the minimum shortest path breaks, the process repeats for the next minimum shortest path (Fig. 1c). Because of the statistical scatter in the lengths of the paths, only an extremely small fraction of the paths bear the high tension approaching the covalent bond strength, while the vast majority of the paths bear low stress. These few high-tension paths contribute negligibly to overall load-bearing, while the majority of low-tension paths bear most of the load. It is this network “imbalance” that causes the polymer to rupture at a stress that is orders of magnitude below the strength of the covalent bonds.

A long tradition exists that attributes the large reduction in strength to the scatter of the lengths of polymer strands in a network [13, 14]. In an idealized model, a network is represented by parallel strands connecting two rigid and parallel plates [15]. As the two plates are pulled apart, the shortest strand reaches the covalent bond stretch and breaks, while the other strands still carry low stress. For such a model to reduce strength by orders of magnitude, the distribution of lengths of strands needs to be extremely wide. More significantly, this parallel strand model misses a significant aspect of a polymer network. Many strands in a network are extremely short but do not necessarily bear high tension or break early. In a network, strands are connected neither in parallel nor in series. Tension in a strand can be transmitted to the strands connected to it, so that tension usually does not build up to a level sufficient to break a strand. Our earlier work shows that the controlling microstructural parameter for strain-induced damage is the shortest path length connecting far-away monomers [9, 10]. The relevant shortest path is defined between two monomers separated by a large distance so that upon stretching, their distance vector deforms affinely with the applied stretch. The same cannot be said for the distance vector connecting the two ends of a typical polymer strand. Hence the concept of the shortest path provides a measure of the connectivity of the network that goes beyond the local measures such as the length of polymer strands, and does not suffer from the same limitations mentioned above.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 outlines the simulation and analysis methods employed to study the microstructural evolution of the elastomer under load. Section 3 presents the CGMD simulation results that capture the orders of mismatch between the ideal rupture stress of the cross-link and the peak stress carried by the polymer network. Section 4 presents the discussion on the microstructural evolution encoded by the SP distribution between distant cross-links, as the key indicators of material failure. We summarize our findings in Section 5.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. CGMD Model

In our CGMD simulations, the polymer network is represented by the commonly used bead-spring (Kremer-Grest) model [16]. We perform the CGMD simulations using LAMMPS [17]. The simulation cell is subjected to periodic boundary conditions in all three directions and contains 500 chains, each consisting of 500 beads. The chains are initialized as self-avoiding random walks. The covalent bonds along a polymer strand are represented by a quartic bond potential and the non-covalent interactions between strands are modeled by a Lennard-Jones (LJ) potential [9, 10]. The initial configuration is first equilibrated to form a polymer melt [18]. The crosslinks, also represented by quartic bonds, are then added between randomly chosen pairs of neighboring beads [11]. The CGMD simulation cell is a cube with a side length of  $\sim 55.4$  nm. We use a total of 8000 cross-links to have a cross-link density of  $\sim 9.66 \times 10^5$  mol/cm<sup>3</sup>. The effective diameter of the repeat unit of the natural rubber backbone is 4.89 Å [19]. The resulting polymer network is then further equilibrated under the NPT ensemble at  $T = 300$  K and at zero pressure for 10  $\mu$ s, followed by additional equilibration under the NVT ensemble at  $T = 300$  K for another 10  $\mu$ s.

The equilibrated polymer network is then stretched in one direction up to ten times its original length at a rate of  $8.7 \times 10^5$  s<sup>-1</sup> at  $T = 300$  K. The lateral directions contract to preserve the volume during stretching. A quartic bond is considered broken once the bonded pair of beads moves beyond a distance of 11.2 Å. In this stage of the simulation, covalent bonds can break but cannot form. The positions of all the beads and covalent bond connectivities are stored at an interval of 0.1 in stretch.

### 2.2. Shortest Path Analysis

We convert the polymer network from the CGMD representation into a graph where only the crosslinked beads are kept as nodes. An edge exists between two nodes if the corresponding beads are connected through either a crosslink or a polymer strand. The weight of the edge is the number of bonds on that polymer strand, or 1 when the two beads are connected by a cross-link. The shortest path is computed between every pair of nodes that are separated in the direction of stretch by the simulation cell size [10, 11], using Dijkstra’s algorithm [20].

## 3. Results

Define stress  $S$  by the force in the current state divided by the cross-sectional area in the undeformed state. Define stretch  $\lambda$  by the current length of the simulation cell in the stretching direction divided by the length of the undeformed simulation cell. The stress-stretch curve predicted by the simulation goes up, peaks, and declines (Fig.2a). We identify the strength by the peak stress, which is  $\sim 21$  MPa. This strength is  $\sim 200$  times lower than the strength of our quartic bond, which is 4.4 GPa. This prediction of a large reduction in strength is consistent with numerous experimental

results. For example, a representative value of the experimentally measured strength of natural rubber is  $\sim 20$  MPa [3], which is  $\sim 500$  times lower than the strength of C-C covalent bond ( $\sim 10$  GPa) [1]. Throughout the stretching process, only a small fraction of strands and crosslinks break (Fig. 2(b)). Even at the peak stress, which is attained at a stretch of  $\lambda = 5$ , less than 5% of the strands and less than 2% of the crosslinks in the network break.




Figure 2: The network ruptures by breaking a small fraction of strands and crosslinks distributed in the network. (a) Stress-stretch curve. (b) The fraction of broken strands and the fraction of broken crosslinks as a function of stretch. (c) Snapshots of the sample at several stretches. The location of the broken bonds up to (d)  $\lambda = 5$  and (e)  $\lambda = 8$ , where they are color-coded according to the stretch at which a bond breaks.

At several stretches, we plot all beads, colored by the original chain to which they belong (Fig. 2(c)). Holes much larger than individual beads form at a large stretch of  $\lambda = 8$ . But no such holes form at the peak stress ( $\lambda = 5$ ). As the network is stretched, we record the stretch and location at which each individual bond breaks. We divide the coordinates of each broken bond by the dimensions of the simulation cell at the moment of bond breaking, and plot the scaled coordinates as points, color-coded by the stretch at which the bond breaks. Up to a stretch of  $\lambda = 5$ , when the stress peaks, the bonds break throughout the network, not in any localized region (Fig. 2(d)). Up to a stretch of  $\lambda = 8$ , when the stress has already declined significantly, there is still not a strong indication of bond breaking disproportionately in certain localized regions (Fig. 2(e)). A clearer indication of localized bond breaking is only observed at even larger stretches such as  $\lambda = 10$  (Supplementary Fig. S1). These observations support

the conclusion that the existence of a crack is not necessary for the large reduction in strength.




Figure 3: Snapshots of a network at  $\lambda = 5$ , the minimum shortest path is marked red, and strands connected to it are marked gray. The minimum shortest path is stretched nearly straight, near the breaking point, but the other strands deform by entropic elasticity unless they themselves lie on the shortest paths that are similar in length to the minimum shortest path.

We plot the shape of the minimum shortest path (in red) together with several other strands at the stretch  $\lambda = 5$ , where the stress peaks (Fig. 3). The minimum shortest path is nearly straight, while most of the strands in the network are not unless they happen to lie on a shortest path that is similar in length to the minimum shortest path. These relatively straighter paths and segments comprise a small fraction of the network and bear the high tension approaching the covalent bond strength, while a large fraction of the paths bear low stress. These limited high-tension paths contribute negligibly to overall load-bearing, while the majority of low-tension paths bear most of the load. This network “imbalance” causes the polymer to rupture at a stress that is orders of magnitude below the strength of the covalent bonds.

#### 4. Discussions

It has been hypothesized that bond breaks preferentially on short strands [13, 14, 21] but this hypothesis contradicts our simulation. We plot the distribution of lengths of all strands in the undeformed network, and the distribution of lengths of all broken strands in the network up to stretch  $\lambda = 11$  (Fig. 4). These two distributions nearly coincide, indicating that short strands are not more likely to break than long strands.




Figure 4: Distributions of the strand length of the undeformed configuration (red dashed curve) and of all the broken strands (blue solid curve). Here the length of a strand is measured by the number of bonds in the strand.

We next report the evidence that a network ruptures by breaking bonds on a sequence of minimum shortest paths. At each stretch  $\lambda$ , we count the number of bonds for each shortest path between every pair of nodes that are separated in the direction of stretch by the simulation cell size. Define the normalized path length,  $\xi$ , by the number of the bonds of a path divided by  $(L_0/b)$ , where  $L_0$  is the initial length of the simulation cell, and  $b$  is the bond length. For each stretch, we plot the distribution of the normalized shortest path length (Fig. 5(a)). Observe that the left edge of each distribution is the minimum shortest path, which coincides with the stretch when the stretch is sufficiently large,  $\lambda > 3$ .

As the network is stretched and bonds are broken, the scatter in normal lengths of the shortest paths first narrows, and then broadens (Fig. 5(a)). Statistically, the tension along each shortest path decreases with the number of bonds along the path. A narrow distribution of  $\xi$  means more shortest paths contribute significantly to the overall load. Conversely, a wide distribution means fewer paths contribute significantly to carry the load. This coincides with the initial rise of stress with stretch (up to  $\lambda = 5$ ) and the subsequent decrease of stress with stretch (Fig. 2(a)).




Figure 5: As a network is stretched, the distribution of the shortest path length evolves. (a) Distribution of the normalized shortest path length at several stretches. (b) The minimum among all shortest path length as a function of stretch (red solid line). The minimum path length among the broken shortest paths as a function of stretch (blue dots). A 45° line (gray) is shown to guide the eye.

We further plot the minimum among all  $\xi$  as a function of stretch (red curve) (Fig. 5(b)). Observe that this curve nearly coincides with the diagonal of the figure, indicating that the minimum or the shortest  $\xi$  coincides with the stretch (when  $\lambda > 3$ ). Also plotted is the minimum  $\xi$  among the broken shortest paths as a function of stretch (blue dots). Observe that these dots coincide with the red curve for most of the stretches, indicating that bonds almost always break on the minimum shortest path. This finding confirms what we have noted before: when the network is stretched, the length of the simulation cell increases, and approaches the length of the minimum shortest path, straightening it, and breaking a bond on the path. Furthermore, even out of the shortest paths, only a small fraction of the shortest paths are very close to being straight, and thus only a small fraction of these shortest paths carry a relatively high load. This is because these paths exhibit an inverse Langevin force response and thus, shortest paths with a straightness (defined as end-to-end distance over contour length) greater than 0.97 qualify as high load-carrying paths. This consolidates our reasoning behind the rupture of a polymer at a stress that is orders of magnitude below the strength of the covalent bonds.

## 5. Conclusions

The bead-spring model reproduces the experimental observation that the strength of a network is orders of magnitude lower than the strength of covalent bonds. The simulation shows that this enormous reduction in strength results from a simple fact: the network ruptures by a sequence of rare events breaking a small fraction of bonds. Each broken bond lies on the minimum shortest path, which straightens and bears high tension set by covalent bonds, while most strands off of the minimum shortest path



are more coiled and carry low tension (see Supplementary Fig. S2). After a bond on the minimum shortest path breaks, the process repeats for the next minimum shortest path. As the network is stretched and bonds are broken, the scatter in lengths of the shortest paths first narrows, causing stress to rise, and then broadens, causing stress to decline. This sequential breaking of a small fraction of bonds that lie on nearly straight shortest paths causes the network to rupture at a stress that is orders of magnitude below the strength of the covalent bonds. So long as a network is concerned, bonds do not break at a crack tip, but at wherever the sequence of minimum shortest paths is. The fundamental understanding obtained from this work can lead to rational strategies to improve the strength of polymer networks by engineering their microstructure.

### Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

### Data Access

All data can be obtained on request from the corresponding author. The code for the preparation of the polymer network and the subsequent stretching simulations is available as an open-source code and can be accessed from [https://gitlab.com/micronano\\_public/polymer\\_md](https://gitlab.com/micronano_public/polymer_md). The code for the analytic predictions of the shortest path is available as an open-source code and can be accessed from [https://gitlab.com/micronano\\_public/PolyBranchX](https://gitlab.com/micronano_public/PolyBranchX).

### Acknowledgements

S.M. and W.C. acknowledge support from the Precourt Pioneering Project of Stanford University. S.M., J.B., Z.S., and W.C. acknowledge support from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-20-1-0397.

### References

- [1] Canhui Yang, Tenghao Yin, and Zhigang Suo. Polyacrylamide hydrogels. i. network imperfection. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 131:43–55, 2019.
- [2] FM Helaly, SH El Sabbagh, OS El Kinawy, and SM El Sawy. Effect of synthesized zinc stearate on the properties of natural rubber vulcanizates in the absence and presence of some fillers. *Materials & Design*, 32(5):2835–2843, 2011.
- [3] Yueqiong Wang, Lusheng Liao, Rui Wang, Heping Yu, Tingting Zheng, Yujia Lian, Mingchao Luo, Shuangquan Liao, Hongchao Liu, and Zheng Peng. Research of strain induced crystallization and tensile properties of vulcanized natural rubber based on crosslink densities. *Industrial Crops and Products*, 202:117070, 2023.

- [4] DR Clarke and KT Faber. Fracture of ceramics and glasses. *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids*, 48(11):1115–1157, 1987.
- [5] Errol B Shand. Strength of glass the griffith method revised. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society*, 48(1):43–49, 1965.
- [6] CH Cáceres, CJ Davidson, and JR Griffiths. The deformation and fracture behaviour of an al si mg casting alloy. *Materials Science and Engineering: A*, 197(2):171–179, 1995.
- [7] JP Berry. Fracture processes in polymeric materials. ii. the tensile strength of polystyrene. *Journal of Polymer Science*, 50(154):313–321, 1961.
- [8] K Kendall, AJ Howard, and James Derek Birchall. The relation between porosity, microstructure and strength, and the approach to advanced cement-based materials. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 310(1511):139–153, 1983.
- [9] Yikai Yin, Nicolas Bertin, Yanming Wang, Zhenan Bao, and Wei Cai. Topological origin of strain induced damage of multi-network elastomers by bond breaking. *Extreme Mechanics Letters*, 40:100883, 2020.
- [10] Yikai Yin, Shaswat Mohanty, Christopher B Cooper, Zhenan Bao, and Wei Cai. Network evolution controlling strain-induced damage and self-healing of elastomers with dynamic bonds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11087*, 2024.
- [11] Zhenyuan Zhang, Shaswat Mohanty, Jose Blanchet, and Wei Cai. Modeling shortest paths in polymeric networks using spatial branching processes. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 187:105636, 2024.
- [12] Shaswat Mohanty. *Understanding the Microstructural and Macroscopic Evolution of Dynamic Polymer Networks through Coarse-grained Molecular Dynamics*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2024. URL <https://purl.stanford.edu/vv258vb0486>.
- [13] Mohammad Tehrani and Alireza Sarvestani. Effect of chain length distribution on mechanical behavior of polymeric networks. *European Polymer Journal*, 87:136–146, 2017.
- [14] Brian D Edgecombe, Jason A Stein, Jean MJ Fréchet, Zhihua Xu, and Edward J Kramer. The role of polymer architecture in strengthening polymer- polymer interfaces: a comparison of graft, block, and random copolymers containing hydrogen-bonding moieties. *Macromolecules*, 31(4):1292–1304, 1998.
- [15] Manyuan Tao, Shawn Lavoie, Zhigang Suo, and Maria K Cameron. The effect of scatter of polymer chain length on strength. *Extreme Mechanics Letters*, 61:102024, 2023.

- [16] Kurt Kremer and Gary S Grest. Dynamics of entangled linear polymer melts: A molecular-dynamics simulation. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 92(8):5057–5086, 1990.
- [17] A. P. Thompson, H. M. Aktulga, R. Berger, D. S. Bolintineanu, W. M. Brown, P. S. Crozier, P. J. in 't Veld, A. Kohlmeyer, S. G. Moore, T. D. Nguyen, R. Shan, M. J. Stevens, J. Tranchida, C. Trott, and S. J. Plimpton. LAMMPS - a flexible simulation tool for particle-based materials modeling at the atomic, meso, and continuum scales. *Comp. Phys. Comm.*, 271:108171, 2022.
- [18] Yelena R Sliozberg and Jan W Andzelm. Fast protocol for equilibration of entangled and branched polymer chains. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 523:139–143, 2012.
- [19] Md Salah Uddin and Jaehyung Ju. Multiscale modeling of a natural rubber: Bridging a coarse-grained molecular model to the rubber network theory. *Polymer*, 101:34–47, 2016.
- [20] Edsger W Dijkstra. A note on two problems in connexion with graphs. In *Edsger Wybe Dijkstra: His Life, Work, and Legacy*, pages 287–290. 2022.
- [21] Aoife Hill and William Ronan. Relationship between failure strain, molecular weight, and chain extensibility in biodegradable polymers. *Journal of the Mechanical Behavior of Biomedical Materials*, 139:105663, 2023.