

Science Arts & Métiers (SAM) is an open access repository that collects the work of Arts et Métiers Institute of Technology researchers and makes it freely available over the web where possible.

> This is an author-deposited version published in: https://sam.ensam.eu Handle ID: .http://hdl.handle.net/10985/15215

To cite this version :

Soheil FIROOZ, George CHATZIGEORGIOU, Ali JAVILI, Fodil MERAGHNI - Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization accounting for general interfaces - Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics p.1-34 - 2019

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to the repository Administrator : scienceouverte@ensam.eu



Dear Author,

Here are the proofs of your article.

- You can submit your corrections online, via e-mail or by fax.
- For **online** submission please insert your corrections in the online correction form. Always indicate the line number to which the correction refers.
- You can also insert your corrections in the proof PDF and email the annotated PDF.
- For fax submission, please ensure that your corrections are clearly legible. Use a fine black pen and write the correction in the margin, not too close to the edge of the page.
- Remember to note the **journal title**, **article number**, and **your name** when sending your response via e-mail or fax.
- **Check** the metadata sheet to make sure that the header information, especially author names and the corresponding affiliations are correctly shown.
- **Check** the questions that may have arisen during copy editing and insert your answers/ corrections.
- **Check** that the text is complete and that all figures, tables and their legends are included. Also check the accuracy of special characters, equations, and electronic supplementary material if applicable. If necessary refer to the *Edited manuscript*.
- The publication of inaccurate data such as dosages and units can have serious consequences. Please take particular care that all such details are correct.
- Please **do not** make changes that involve only matters of style. We have generally introduced forms that follow the journal's style. Substantial changes in content, e.g., new results, corrected values, title and authorship are not allowed without the approval of the responsible editor. In such a case, please contact the Editorial Office and return his/her consent together with the proof.
- If we do not receive your corrections within 48 hours, we will send you a reminder.
- Your article will be published **Online First** approximately one week after receipt of your corrected proofs. This is the **official first publication** citable with the DOI. **Further changes are, therefore, not possible.**
- The **printed version** will follow in a forthcoming issue.

Please note

After online publication, subscribers (personal/institutional) to this journal will have access to the complete article via the DOI using the URL: http://dx.doi.org/[DOI].

If you would like to know when your article has been published online, take advantage of our free alert service. For registration and further information go to: <u>http://www.link.springer.com</u>.

Due to the electronic nature of the procedure, the manuscript and the original figures will only be returned to you on special request. When you return your corrections, please inform us if you would like to have these documents returned.

Metadata of the article that will be visualized in OnlineFirst

| ArticleTitle | Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization accounting for general interfaces | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
| Article Sub-Title | | | |
| Article CopyRight | Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature (This will be the copyright line in the final PDF) | | |
| Journal Name | Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics | | |
| Corresponding Author | Family Name | Javili | |
| | Particle | | |
| | Given Name | Ali | |
| | Suffix | | |
| | Division | Department of Mechanical Engineering | |
| | Organization | Bilkent University | |
| | Address | 06800, Ankara, Turkey | |
| | Phone | | |
| | Fax | | |
| | Email | ajavili@bilkent.edu.tr | |
| | URL | | |
| | ORCID | http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7965-7088 | |
| Author | Family Name | Firooz | |
| | Particle | | |
| | Given Name | Soheil | |
| | Suffix | | |
| | Division | Department of Mechanical Engineering | |
| | Organization | Bilkent University | |
| | Address | 06800, Ankara, Turkey | |
| | Phone | | |
| | Fax | | |
| | Email | nail soheil.firooz@bilkent.edu.tr | |
| | URL | | |
| | ORCID | | |
| Author | Family Name | Chatzigeorgiou | |
| | Particle | | |
| | Given Name | George | |
| | Suffix | | |
| | Division | | |
| | Organization | LEM3-UMR 7239 CNRS, Arts et Metiers ParisTech Metz | |
| | Address | 4 Rue Augustin Fresnel, 57078, Metz, France | |
| | Phone | | |
| | Fax | | |
| | Email | georges.chatzigeorgiou@ensam.eu | |
| | URL | | |

| | ORCID | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| Author | Family Name | Meraghni | |
| | Particle | | |
| | Given Name | Fodil | |
| | Suffix | | |
| | Division | | |
| | Organization | LEM3-UMR 7239 CNRS, Arts et Metiers ParisTech Metz | |
| | Address | 4 Rue Augustin Fresnel, 57078, Metz, France | |
| | Phone | | |
| | Fax | | |
| | Email | fodil.meraghni@ensam.eu | |
| | URL | | |
| | ORCID | | |
| | | | |
| | Received | 18 December 2018 | |
| Schedule | Revised | | |
| | Accepted | 25 May 2019 | |
| Abstract | This manuscript provides novel bounds and estimates, for the first time, on size-dependent properties of composites accounting for generalized interfaces in their microstructure, via analytical homogenization verified by computational analysis. We extend both the composite cylinder assemblage and Mori–Tanaka approaches to account for the general interface model. Our proposed strategy does not only determine the overall response of composites, but also it provides information about the local fields for each phase of the medium including the interface. We present a comprehensive study on a broad range of interface parameters, stiffness ratios and sizes. Our analytical solutions are in excellent agreement with the computational results using the finite element method. Based on the observations throughout our investigations, two notions of <i>size-dependent bounds</i> and <i>ultimate bounds</i> on the effective response of composites are introduced which yield a significant insight into the size effects, particularly important for the design of nano-composites. | | |
| Keywords (separated by '-') | General interface - Size effects - Ultimate bounds - Size-dependent bounds - Homogenization - Composites | | |
| Footnote Information | Communicated by Andreas Öchsner. | | |

ORIGINAL ARTICLE



- Soheil Firooz · George Chatzigeorgiou · Fodil Meraghni ·
- 2 Ali Javili

5

- Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization
 accounting for general interfaces
- 6 Received: 18 December 2018 / Accepted: 25 May 2019
- 7 © Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2019

Abstract This manuscript provides novel bounds and estimates, for the first time, on size-dependent properties 8 of composites accounting for generalized interfaces in their microstructure, via analytical homogenization 9 verified by computational analysis. We extend both the composite cylinder assemblage and Mori-Tanaka 10 approaches to account for the general interface model. Our proposed strategy does not only determine the 11 overall response of composites, but also it provides information about the local fields for each phase of the 12 medium including the interface. We present a comprehensive study on a broad range of interface parameters, 13 stiffness ratios and sizes. Our analytical solutions are in excellent agreement with the computational results 14 using the finite element method. Based on the observations throughout our investigations, two notions of *size*-15 dependent bounds and ultimate bounds on the effective response of composites are introduced which yield a 16 significant insight into the size effects, particularly important for the design of nano-composites. 17 Keywords General interface · Size effects · Ultimate bounds · Size-dependent bounds · Homogenization ·

18 Keywords G19 Composites

20 **1 Introduction**

Interphases between the constituents of heterogeneous materials play a crucial role on the overall material response and particularly at small scales, due to the large area-to-volume ratio. A common strategy to model the interphases is to replace them by a zero-thickness general interface [1] characterized by displacement and traction jumps. This idea was initially proposed by Sanchez-Palencia et al. [2,3] and followed by Hashin [4] for a thermal problem. Since the area-to-volume ratio is proportional to the inverse of the dimension, accounting for interfaces in homogenization results in size-dependent properties hence, capturing the size effects, unlike the classical homogenization [5–7] that lacks a length scale. In this contribution, we present two analytical

Communicated by Andreas Öchsner.

S. Firooz · A. Javili (⊠) Department of Mechanical Engineering, Bilkent University, 06800 Ankara, Turkey E-mail: ajavili@bilkent.edu.tr

S. Firooz E-mail: soheil.firooz@bilkent.edu.tr

G. Chatzigeorgiou · F. Meraghni

LEM3-UMR 7239 CNRS, Arts et Metiers ParisTech Metz, 4 Rue Augustin Fresnel, 57078 Metz, France E-mail: georges.chatzigeorgiou@ensam.eu

F. Meraghni E-mail: fodil.meraghni@ensam.eu



Fig. 1 Categorization of the interface models based on their kinetic or kinematic behavior. The perfect interface model does not allow for the displacement jump nor traction jump. The cohesive interface model has continuous traction field, whereas the displacement jump is allowed across the interface. In the elastic interface model, the displacement jump across the interface is zero, whereas the traction jump is permissible. All the models are unified in the general interface model in which both the displacement jump and traction jump across the interface are possible. Two interface properties of $\overline{\mu}$ and \overline{k} characterize the interface behavior. The interface stiffness against opening is denoted \overline{k} , and the interface resistance against stretch is denoted $\overline{\mu}$

solutions to determine the overall behavior of composites via a homogenization framework accounting for
 generalized interfaces. In addition, computational analysis is carried out to evaluate the performance of the
 analytical solutions.

features. The interface is referred to as perfect if the traction and displacement fields are continuous across the interface, and thus, the perfect interface model is coherent both kinetically and kinematically.

The elastic interface model is kinematically coherent but kinetically non-coherent and hence semi-perfect. 34 The main assumption of the interface elasticity theory [8-15] is that the interface is allowed to have its 35 own thermodynamic structure. This assumption could result in a traction jump across the interface due to 36 the Young–Laplace equation [16-18]. The subject of surface and interface elasticity has been extensively 37 studied in [19-35] among others. The cohesive interface model allows for the displacement jump but not for 38 the traction jump. This model is kinetically coherent and kinematically non-coherent. The cohesive interface 39 model emerges in a variety of studies dating from the seminal works [36-38] to its extensions and applications 40 in [39–57]. The general interface model is a unified version of all the aforementioned interface models where 41 both the displacement jump and traction jump are admissible. The general interface has been examined in a 42

⁴³ fundamental contribution by Hashin [58] and further studied in [59–68] among others.

In the past decade, scale-dependent macroscopic behavior due to the microscale elasticity has been com-44 prehensively studied from both analytical [69–79] and computational [80–84] perspectives. Comparisons with 45 atomistic simulations and experiments in [85–90] justify that the size effects due to interfaces are physically 46 meaningful. The underlying assumption in this contribution is that the size effects are only observed due to the 47 presence of the interface at the microstructure. While the surface/interface elasticity itself may be explained 48 by the tangential contributions of second-gradient continua on the boundary, the full contributions of second-49 gradient continua in the bulk are not taken into account. Obviously, one must eventually develop a complete 50 model in which both strain-gradient and surface/interface elasticity are present. Only then, one can claim 51 whether or not the size effect due to the interface is correlated with those associated with the strain-gradient 52 effects. See [23] for an excellent study on size-dependent effects in nano-materials. 53 The term "size" in this contribution refers to the physical size of a microstructure. Figure 2 illustrates

The term "size" in this contribution refers to the physical size of a microstructure. Figure 2 illustrates schematically the definition of the size. The volume fraction of the inclusion is denoted f. For a given volume fraction and size, the radii of the inclusion and the matrix can be calculated. Throughout this manuscript, the macroscopic quantities are distinct from their microscopic counterparts by a left superscript "M." For instance, ^M[•] is a macroscopic quantity with its counterpart being {•} at the microscale. Interface quantities are distinguished from the bulk quantities by a bar placed on top them. That is, {•} denotes an interface quantity with its bulk counterpart {•}. Moreover, the average and the jump operators across the interface are denoted by $\{\{\{\bullet\}\}\}\}$ and $[\{\{\bullet\}\}\}$.

The rest of this manuscript is organized as follows. Section 2 elaborates on the problem definition and provides the governing equations. In Sect. 3, the analytical approaches accounting for the general interface

Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization accounting



Fig. 2 Illustration of the term "size." Having the volume fraction, the radius of the inclusion and the matrix can be obtained for each specific size. As a result, size is proportional to the radius of the inclusion or that of the matrix



Fig. 3 Problem definition for homogenization including the general interface model. The macrostructure is shown as well as the microstructure which is in fact the RVE. It is assumed that the constitutive laws at the microscale are known and by prescribing a macroscopic strain M_{ε} on the microstructure, the macroscopic stress M_{σ} is obtained via averaging. A finite-thickness interphase is replaced with a zero-thickness interface model. The classical interface models cannot capture heterogeneous material layer, and thus, the general interface model is required

model are presented. Numerical examples are provided in Sect. 4 to compare the computational and analytical
 results. Section 5 concludes this work and provides further outlook for future contributions.

66 2 Governing equations

⁶⁷ In this section, the governing equations of continua embedding a general interface are given. For the sake of ⁶⁸ brevity, only the final form of the essential equations are stated. For more details on the derivations, the reader ⁶⁹ is referred to [1,65,91]. Consider a continuum body taking the configuration ^MB at the macroscale, as shown ⁷⁰ in Fig. 3, with its corresponding RVE at the microscale denoted as B. A general interface model is required to ⁷¹ replace the finite-thickness interphase between the constituents [92]. It is assumed that the constitutive behavior ⁷² of the material at the microscale is known and the macroscopic overall response of the medium is obtained ⁷³ via averaging over the RVE [see [93–98], among others]. In doing so, a macroscopic strain ^M ε is prescribed ⁷⁴ on the microstructure and the macroscopic stress ^M σ is obtained. Moreover, to establish a computational ⁷⁵ homogenization framework, an appropriate RVE must be chosen such that (i) it is small enough to guarantee ⁷⁶ scale separation and (ii) it is large enough to be representative of the microstructure. For more details on the ⁷⁷ definition of RVE, see [99–102]. Here, we significantly simplify the RVE to a circular microstructure in order ⁷⁸ to obtain in-plane isotropic effective behavior of the RVE suitable for comparison with the proposed analytical ⁷⁹ estimates.

The interface \mathcal{I} separates the microstructure into two subdomains \mathcal{B}^+ and \mathcal{B}^- . The outward unit normal to the external boundary is denoted as \mathbf{n} , whereas $\overline{\mathbf{n}}$ defines the interface unit normal vector pointing from the minus side of the interface to its plus side. The displacement field is denoted as \mathbf{u} , and the interface displacement $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ is defined by the average displacement across the interface conforming to the definition of the mid-surface. The displacement interface aread

⁸⁴ The displacement average and the displacement jump across the interface read

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{u}} := \{\!\{\boldsymbol{u}\}\!\} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{u}^+ + \boldsymbol{u}^- \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \llbracket \boldsymbol{u} \rrbracket = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{u}^+ - \boldsymbol{u}^- \end{bmatrix}, \tag{1}$$

respectively, where u^+ is the displacement of the plus side of the interface and u^- is the displacement of the minus side of the interface. The strain field in the bulk and on the interface read

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{i} \cdot \operatorname{grad} \boldsymbol{u} + [\operatorname{grad} \boldsymbol{u}]^{\mathsf{t}} \cdot \boldsymbol{i} \end{bmatrix} \text{ in } \mathcal{B} \text{ and } \overline{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\boldsymbol{i}} \cdot \overline{\operatorname{grad}} \, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}} + [\overline{\operatorname{grad}} \, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}]^{\mathsf{t}} \cdot \overline{\boldsymbol{i}} \end{bmatrix} \text{ on } \mathcal{I}, \quad (2)$$

where *i* is the identity tensor. The operator $\overline{\text{grad}}\{\bullet\}$ characterizes the projection of the gradient onto the interface as $\overline{\text{grad}}\{\bullet\} = \text{grad}\{\bullet\} \cdot \overline{i}$ with $\overline{i} = i - \overline{n} \otimes \overline{n}$. Note the contraction $\overline{i} \cdot \overline{\text{grad}} \overline{u}$ enforces the projection of the interface displacement gradient onto the interface.

The total energy density of the medium consists of the bulk free energy density ψ and the interface free energy density $\overline{\psi}$. The bulk free energy density is assumed to be only a function of the strain field $\psi = \psi(\varepsilon)$. The interface free energy density is assumed to be a function of both interface strain and interface displacement jump as $\overline{\psi} = \overline{\psi}(\overline{\varepsilon}, [[u]])$. That is, the contributions of higher gradients of the interface strain or interface curvature are not taken into account. Connecting the bulk and interface energy densities to their microscale energy conjugates, the constitutive equations read

100

$$\sigma = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varepsilon}$$
 in \mathcal{B} , $\overline{\sigma} = \frac{\partial \overline{\psi}}{\partial \overline{\varepsilon}}$ and $\overline{t} = \frac{\partial \overline{\psi}}{\partial [[u]]}$ on \mathcal{I} , (3)

⁹⁹ where \overline{t} is the interface traction as $\overline{t} := \{\{\sigma\}\} \cdot \overline{n}$. The balance equations in the absence of external forces read

div
$$\overline{\sigma} + [\sigma] \cdot \overline{n} = 0$$
 on \mathcal{I} (along the interface), $\{\sigma\} \cdot \overline{n} = \overline{t}$ on \mathcal{I} (across the interface),

with *t* being the traction on the boundary S. The interface divergence operator $\overline{\text{div}}\{\bullet\} = \text{grad}\{\bullet\} : \overline{i} \text{ embeds}$ the interface curvature operator. The constitutive material behavior for the bulk and interface reads

$$\sigma = 2 \mu \varepsilon + \lambda [\varepsilon; i] i \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B}, \qquad \overline{\sigma} = 2 \overline{\mu} \overline{\varepsilon} + \overline{\lambda} [\overline{\varepsilon}; \overline{i}] \overline{i} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{t} = \overline{k} [\![u]\!] \quad \text{on } \mathcal{I}, \quad (5)$$

¹⁰⁴ in which λ and μ are the bulk Lamé parameters and $\overline{\lambda}$ and $\overline{\mu}$ are the interface Lamé parameters. The interface ¹⁰⁵ Lamé parameters correspond to the interface in-plane resistance against stretches. The interface orthogonal ¹⁰⁶ resistance, \overline{k} , represents the interface resistance against opening. Without loss of generality, it can be shown ¹⁰⁷ that for the two-dimensional setting here $\overline{\lambda} = 0$ can be assumed since the resistance along an isotropic interface ¹⁰⁸ can be sufficiently captured with only one interface parameter.

Next, we briefly elaborate on the micro- to macro-transition. The macroscopic strain and stress can be
 obtained through boundary integrals of the microscopic quantities as

$${}^{\mathsf{M}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{2} \left[\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{n} + \boldsymbol{n} \otimes \boldsymbol{u} \right] \, \mathrm{d}A \,, \qquad {}^{\mathsf{M}}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{t} \otimes \boldsymbol{x} \, \mathrm{d}A \,. \tag{6}$$

Exploiting the divergence theorem, the above relations simplify to the averages

¹¹³
$${}^{\mathsf{M}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int_{\mathcal{B}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \, \mathrm{d}V + \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{2} \left[\left[\boldsymbol{u} \right] \otimes \overline{\boldsymbol{n}} + \overline{\boldsymbol{n}} \otimes \left[\boldsymbol{u} \right] \right] \, \mathrm{d}A \,, \qquad {}^{\mathsf{M}}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int_{\mathcal{B}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \, \mathrm{d}V + \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}A \,.$$
(7)

85

8

Author Proof

Table 1 The relations between the interface and bulk properties for transversely isotropic composites in terms of the material parameters in Sect. 2 and the commonly accepted notation in analytical homogenization employed in Sect. 3. The parameters in the first row correspond to a generic case but in the second row correspond to a more specific (transversely isotropic) case of interest here

| Bulk | Interface | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| $\mu_{\rm ax}$ $\mu_{\rm tr}$ $\kappa_{\rm tr}$ l n | $\overline{\mu}_{ax}$ \overline{m} \overline{n} \overline{l} \overline{k}_r $\overline{k}_	heta$ \overline{k}_z | | |
| μ μ $\lambda + \mu$ λ $\lambda + 2\mu$ | $\overline{\mu}$ $2\overline{\mu}$ $2\overline{\mu}$ 0 \overline{k} \overline{k} \overline{k} | | |
| μ_{ax} : axial shear modulus | $\overline{\mu}_{ax}$: interface axial shear modulus | | |
| $\mu_{\rm tr}$: transverse shear modulus | m: interface transverse shear parameter | | |
| $k_{\rm tr}$: transverse bulk modulus | n: interface axial stiffness | | |
| <i>l</i> : stiffness in rz and θz directions | <i>l</i> : interface stiffness in θz direction | | |
| <i>n</i> : axial stiffness | \overline{k}_r : interface orthogonal resistance in r | | |
| μ : shear modulus | \overline{k}_{θ} : interface orthogonal resistance in θ | | |
| λ: first Lamé parameter | \overline{k}_z : interface orthogonal resistance in z | | |
| | $\overline{\mu}$: interface in-plane resistance | | |
| | \overline{k} : interface orthogonal resistance | | |
| | | | |

Finally, the Hill–Mandel condition must be employed to guarantee the energy equivalence between the two scales. The interface enhanced Hill–Mandel condition reads

$$\delta^{M}\psi \stackrel{!}{=} \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{B}} \delta\psi \, \mathrm{d}V + \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \delta\overline{\psi} \, \mathrm{d}A \,, \tag{8}$$

where \doteq shows the conditional equality. Utilizing the Hill's lemma, after some steps the Hill–Mandel condition (8) simplifies to the boundary integral

116

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\delta \boldsymbol{u} - \delta^{\mathsf{M}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \cdot \boldsymbol{x} \right] \cdot \left[\boldsymbol{t} - {}^{\mathsf{M}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \right] dA \stackrel{!}{=} 0, \qquad (9)$$

identifying appropriate boundary conditions on the RVE. Among various boundary conditions satisfying the
 Hill–Mandel condition, the canonical ones of interest here are the linear displacement boundary condition
 (DBC) and constant traction boundary condition (TBC). See Firooz et al. [103] for a comprehensive study on
 the influences of the boundary condition as well as the RVE type on the overall behavior of composites.

124 3 Analytical estimates

The aim of this section is to elaborate the analytical methods to determine the overall behavior of fiber 125 composites embedding general interfaces. First, the preliminaries of the RVE problem for fiber reinforced 126 composites is provided. Second, we extend the composite cylinder assemblage approach and the generalized 127 128 self-consistent method to account for general interfaces resulting in bounds and estimates on the macroscopic properties of composites. Finally, an interface enhanced Mori-Tanaka method is developed to incorporate 129 general interfaces which not only provides the overall properties but also determines the state of the stress and 130 strain in each phase of the medium including the interface. Table 1 gathers the relations between the material 131 parameters in Sect. 2 and the commonly accepted notation in analytical homogenization employed in this 132 section as well as the physical meaning of each modulus. 133

In passing, we shall add that the composite cylinders assemblage (CCA) framework has been designed to account for transversely isotropic constituents at most. Further anisotropy does not allow to identify analytical solutions in boundary value problems like those presented in this manuscript; at least this cannot be done in a straightforward manner. Cylindrical orthotropy of the fiber and the interface, however, has been addressed for similar type of boundary value problems in [104]. To the best of the authors knowledge, no further anisotropy has been studied so far using the composite cylinders assemblage approach. Considering Eshelby-based meanfield approaches, one could follow a strategy similar to the one described by Dinzart and Sabar [105] for general

141 anisotropy of the constituents.



Fig. 4 Heterogeneous medium and its corresponding appropriate RVE considered in our problem. The inner radius shows the radius of the fiber, whereas the outer one shows the radius of the matrix. The interface lies at $r = r_1$

142 3.1 Preliminaries of the RVE problem for fiber composites

Figure 4 demonstrates the heterogeneous medium and its underlying RVE consisting of two concentric cylinders corresponding to the fiber (phase 1) and matrix (phase 2) with the interface lying at $r = r_1$. The volume fraction of the fiber is $f = r_1^2/r_2^2$. Obviously, for the problem of interest here, it is more convenient to express the equilibrium equations and the constitutive law in cylindrical coordinate system with coordinates r, θ and z.

¹⁴⁷ For transversely isotropic materials, the constitutive material behavior in Voigt notation reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{rr} \\ \sigma_{\theta\theta} \\ \sigma_{zz} \\ \sigma_{r\theta} \\ \sigma_{rz} \\ \sigma_{\thetaz} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \kappa_{tr} + \mu_{tr} \kappa_{tr} - \mu_{tr} \mid 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ \kappa_{tr} - \mu_{tr} \kappa_{tr} + \mu_{tr} \mid 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ l \quad l \quad n \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \mu_{tr} \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \mu_{ax} \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \mu_{ax} \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \mu_{ax} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{rr} \\ \varepsilon_{\theta\theta} \\ \varepsilon_{zz} \\ 2\varepsilon_{r\theta} \\ 2\varepsilon_{rz} \\ 2\varepsilon_{\thetaz} \end{bmatrix}$$
 with
$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon_{rz} = \frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial z}, \\ & \varepsilon_{rz} = \frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u_{r}}{\partial z}, \\ & \varepsilon_{\theta\theta} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{u_{r}}{r}, \\ & \varepsilon_{zz} = \frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial z}, \\ & \varepsilon_{rz} = \frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u_{r}}{\partial z}, \\ & \varepsilon_{\theta\theta} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{u_{r}}{r}, \\ & \varepsilon_{zz} = \frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial r}, \\ & \varepsilon_{rz} = \frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u_{r}}{\partial z}, \\ & \varepsilon_{\theta\theta} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial z}, \\ & \varepsilon_{\theta\theta} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} - \frac{u_{\theta}}{r}, \end{aligned}$$

and the equilibrium equations in the bulk read

150

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \sigma_{rr}}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \sigma_{r\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{rz}}{\partial z} + \frac{\sigma_{rr} - \sigma_{\theta\theta}}{r} = 0, \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_{r\theta}}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \sigma_{\theta\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{\thetaz}}{\partial z} + \frac{2}{r} \sigma_{r\theta} = 0, \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_{rz}}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \sigma_{\thetaz}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{zz}}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{r} \sigma_{rz} = 0. \end{cases}$$
(11)

The constitutive relations for the general interface at $r = r_1$ are characterized by four parameters for the

traction jump $(\overline{m}, \overline{l}, \overline{n} \text{ and } \overline{\mu}_{ax})$ and three parameters for the displacement jump $(\overline{k}_r, \overline{k}_{\theta} \text{ and } \overline{k}_z)$ as

"161_2019_796_Article" — 2019/5/30 — 7:06 — page 6 — #6

$$\overline{\varepsilon}_{\theta\theta} = \frac{1}{r_1} \frac{\partial \overline{u}_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\overline{u}_r}{r_1}$$

$$\overline{\varepsilon}_{\thetaz} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{m} \ \overline{l} \ 0 \\ \overline{l} \ \overline{n} \ 0 \\ 0 \ 0 \ \overline{\mu}_{ax} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\varepsilon}_{\theta\theta} \\ \overline{\varepsilon}_{zz} \\ 2\overline{\varepsilon}_{\thetaz} \end{bmatrix} \text{ with } \overline{\varepsilon}_{zz} = \frac{\partial \overline{u}_z}{\partial z} \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} \overline{l}_r \\ \overline{l}_\theta \\ \overline{l}_z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{k}_r \ [\![u_r]\!] \\ \overline{k}_\theta \ [\![u_\theta]\!] \\ \overline{k}_z \ [\![u_z]\!] \end{bmatrix} \text{ (12)}$$

$$2\overline{\varepsilon}_{\thetaz} = \frac{1}{r_1} \frac{\partial \overline{u}_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \overline{u}_{\theta}}{\partial z}$$

¹⁵⁴ The equilibrium equations at the interface are

$$-\frac{\overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{r_{1}} + \llbracket \sigma_{rr} \rrbracket = 0,$$

$$\frac{1}{r_{1}} \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{\thetaz}}{\partial z} + \llbracket \sigma_{r\theta} \rrbracket = 0,$$

$$\frac{1}{r_{1}} \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{\thetaz}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{zz}}{\partial z} + \llbracket \sigma_{rz} \rrbracket = 0.$$
(13)

¹⁵⁶ The three normal vectors in cylindrical coordinates are

the average mechanical energy in the composite reads

$$\boldsymbol{n}_r = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta\\ \sin\theta\\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{n}_\theta = \begin{bmatrix} -\sin\theta\\ \cos\theta\\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{n}_z = \begin{bmatrix} 0\\ 0\\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

and therefore, the displacements and stresses can be represented in tensorial forms as

$$u = u_r n_r + u_\theta n_\theta + u_z n_z,$$

$$\sigma = \sigma_{rr} n_r \otimes n_r + \sigma_{\theta\theta} n_\theta \otimes n_\theta + \sigma_{zz} n_z \otimes n_z + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{r\theta} [n_r \otimes n_\theta + n_\theta \otimes n_r]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{rz} [n_r \otimes n_z + n_z \otimes n_r] + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\theta z} [n_\theta \otimes n_z + n_z \otimes n_\theta],$$

$$\overline{\sigma} = \overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta} n_\theta \otimes n_\theta + \overline{\sigma}_{zz} n_z \otimes n_z + \frac{1}{2} \overline{\sigma}_{\theta z} [n_\theta \otimes n_z + n_z \otimes n_\theta].$$
(15)

Using the equilibrium equations in the bulk and on the interface, the divergence theorem for our problem can be written as

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}} \operatorname{div}\{\bullet\} \, \mathrm{d}V + \int_{\mathcal{I}} \llbracket\{\bullet\}\rrbracket \cdot \overline{n} \, \mathrm{d}A = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \{\bullet\} \cdot n \, \mathrm{d}A \quad \text{and} \\ \int_{\mathcal{I}} \overline{\operatorname{div}}\{\bullet\} \, \mathrm{d}A - \int_{\mathcal{I}} \overline{\operatorname{div}}\overline{n} \, \{\bullet\} \cdot \overline{n} \, \mathrm{d}A = \int_{\partial \mathcal{I}} \{\bullet\} \cdot \widetilde{n} \, \mathrm{d}L \,, \tag{16}$$

.

where \tilde{n} is the normal at the boundary of the interface but along the interface itself. Using the above theorems,

166

164

165

$$U = \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{B}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \, \mathrm{d}V + \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} : \overline{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \, \mathrm{d}A$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \underbrace{\left[\int_{\mathcal{B}} \operatorname{div}(\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \, \mathrm{d}V + \int_{\mathcal{I}} \overline{\boldsymbol{u}} \cdot \left[\!\left[\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right]\!\right] \cdot \overline{\boldsymbol{n}} \, \mathrm{d}A \right]}_{\int_{\partial \mathcal{B}} \left[\!\left[\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}\right]\!\right] \cdot \boldsymbol{u} \, \mathrm{d}A} + \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \underbrace{\int_{\mathcal{I}} \overline{\operatorname{div}}(\overline{\boldsymbol{u}} \cdot \overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \, \mathrm{d}A}_{\int_{\partial \mathcal{I}} \left[\!\left[\overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \cdot \widetilde{\boldsymbol{n}}\right]\!\right] \cdot \overline{\boldsymbol{u}} \, \mathrm{d}L}, \tag{17}$$

The volume element in the cylindrical coordinates is $dv = r dr d\theta dz$, the (vertical) surface element at a constant radius r is $ds_r = r d\theta dz$, the (horizontal) surface element at a constant height z is $ds_z = r dr d\theta$ and

155

157

the line element at a constant radius *r* and height *z* is $dl = r d\theta$. Finally, the average mechanical energy in the RVE and in equivalent homogeneous medium read

$$U^{\text{RVE}} = \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{r_{2}} \left[\left[\sigma_{rz}u_{r} + \sigma_{\theta z}u_{\theta}\sigma_{zz}u_{z} \right]_{z=L} - \left[\sigma_{rz}u_{r} + \sigma_{\theta z}u_{\theta} + \sigma_{zz}u_{z} \right]_{z=-L} \right] r \, dr \, d\theta$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \int_{-L}^{L} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \left[\sigma_{rr}u_{r} + \sigma_{\theta r}u_{\theta} + \sigma_{zr}u_{z} \right]_{r=r_{2}} r_{2} \, d\theta \, dz$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \left[\left[\overline{\sigma}_{\theta z}\overline{u}_{\theta} + \overline{\sigma}_{zz}\overline{u}_{z} \right]_{z=L} - \left[\overline{\sigma}_{\theta z}\overline{u}_{\theta} + \overline{\sigma}_{zz}\overline{u}_{z} \right]_{z=-L} \right] r_{1} \, d\theta \,, \qquad (18)$$

$$U^{\text{eq}} = \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{r_{2}} \left[\left[\sigma_{rz}^{\text{eq}}u_{r}^{\text{eq}} + \sigma_{\theta z}^{\text{eq}}u_{\theta}^{\text{eq}} + \sigma_{zz}^{\text{eq}}u_{z}^{\text{eq}} \right]_{z=-L} - \left[\sigma_{rz}^{\text{eq}}u_{r}^{\text{eq}} + \sigma_{\theta z}^{\text{eq}}u_{\theta}^{\text{eq}} + \sigma_{zz}^{\text{eq}}u_{z}^{\text{eq}} \right]_{z=-L} \right] r \, dr \, d\theta$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \int_{-L}^{L} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \left[\sigma_{rr}^{\text{eq}}u_{r}^{\text{eq}} + \sigma_{\theta r}^{\text{eq}}u_{\theta}^{\text{eq}} + \sigma_{zr}^{\text{eq}}u_{z}^{\text{eq}} \right]_{r=r_{2}} r_{2} d\theta \, dz \,.$$

As we will see later, for the expansion and the in-plane shear boundary value problems, all the quantities with index z vanish and the above relations simplify to

$$U^{\text{RVE}} = \frac{1}{4\pi r_2^2 L} \int_{-L}^{L} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \left[\sigma_{rr}^{(2)} u_r^{(2)} + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)} u_{\theta}^{(2)} \right]_{r=r_2} r_2 \, d\theta \, dz \,,$$

$$U^{\text{eq}} = \frac{1}{4\pi r_2^2 L} \int_{-L}^{L} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \left[\sigma_{rr}^{\text{eq}} u_r^{\text{eq}} + \sigma_{r\theta}^{\text{eq}} u_{\theta}^{\text{eq}} \right]_{r=r_2} r_2 \, d\theta \, dz \,.$$
(19)

174

171

¹⁷⁵ 3.2 Composite cylinder assemblage (CCA) approach and generalized self-consistent method (GSCM)

Recently, Chatzigeorgiou et al. [65] proposed an extension of the generalized self-consistent method 176 (GSCM) [106] and the composite cylinders assemblage (CCA) approach [107] to determine the effective 177 shear modulus and bulk modulus of fiber composites embedding general interfaces. Motivated by these obser-178 vations, here the original formalism of Hashin and Rosen [107] is extended to account for the general interface 179 to determine bounds on the overall shear modulus ${}^{M}\mu$. Note that the same methodology can be employed to 180 obtain bounds for the effective bulk modulus ${}^{M}\kappa$. However, the upper and lower bounds on the bulk modulus 181 coincide. Therefore, the bounds and estimates for the bulk modulus yield identical results. The derivations of 182 the effective bulk and shear modulus developed in [65] are briefly (and more explicitly) stated here for the 183 sake of completeness. 184

185 3.2.1 Effective bulk modulus

Assume that the RVE is subject to a radial expansion with its upper and lower surfaces fixed as depicted in
 Fig. 5 (left). The displacement field in cylindrical coordinates reads

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta r \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (20)

188

190

193

$$u_r^{(i)} = \beta \Xi_1^{(i)} r + \beta \Xi_2^{(i)} \frac{1}{r} \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\theta}^{(i)} = u_z^{(i)} = 0,$$
 (21)

for
$$i = 1, 2$$
 where $i = 1$ corresponds to the fiber and $i = 2$ corresponds to the matrix. The unknowns $\Xi_1^{(1)}$,
 $\Xi_1^{(2)}, \Xi_2^{(1)}$ and $\Xi_2^{(2)}$ can be calculated using the boundary and interface conditions

$$u_r^{(1)} \text{ finite at } r = 0 \rightarrow \Xi_2^{(1)} = 0, \qquad \text{(finite displacement at } r = 0)$$

$$\overline{t}_r = \overline{k}_r \llbracket u_r \rrbracket \rightarrow \frac{\sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_1) + \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_1)}{2} = \overline{k} \left[u_r^{(2)}(r_1) - u_r^{(1)}(r_1) \right], \text{ (traction average at } r = r_1)$$

$$\left[\overline{\text{div}} \overline{\sigma} \right]_r + \llbracket t_r \rrbracket = 0 \rightarrow -\frac{\overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{r_1} + \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_1) - \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_1) = 0, \qquad \text{(traction equilibrium at } r = r_1)$$

$$(22)$$

$$u_r^{(2)}(r_2) = \beta r_2,$$

(prescribed displacement at $r = r_2$)

"161_2019_796_Article" — 2019/5/30 — 7:06 — page 8 — #8

Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization accounting



Fig. 5 Boundary value problems for obtaining the macroscopic bulk modulus (left) and the macroscopic shear modulus (right) developed in [65]

leading to the system 194

195

Author Proof

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & \frac{1}{r_2^2} \\ -\lambda_1 - \mu_1 - \frac{\overline{\mu}}{2r_1} \lambda_2 + \mu_2 - \frac{\overline{\mu}}{2r_1} - \frac{2\mu_2 r_1 + \overline{\mu}}{2r_1^3} \\ \frac{\lambda_1 + \mu_1}{\overline{k}} + r_1 & \frac{\lambda_2 + \mu_2}{\overline{k}} - r_1 & -\frac{\mu_2 + \overline{k}r_1}{\overline{k}r_1^2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_1^{(1)} \\ \Xi_1^{(2)} \\ \Xi_2^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(23)

196

If the RVE is substituted by an equivalent homogeneous medium, applying the boundary condition (20) yields the displacement field $u_r^{eq} = \beta r$ and $u_{\theta}^{eq} = u_z^{eq} = 0$. Using Eq. (19), the overall energy in the RVE and in the equivalent homogeneous medium reads 197 198

2

$$U^{\text{RVE}} = 2\beta^2 \left[\Xi_1^{(2)} [\lambda_2 + \mu_2] - \frac{\Xi_2^{(2)} \mu_2}{r_2^2} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad U^{\text{eq}} = 2\beta^{2M} \kappa , \qquad (24)$$

where $\Xi_1^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_2^{(2)}$ are the solutions of the system (23). The above energies should be equal according to 200 Hill-Mandel condition. Therefore, we can obtain an explicit expression for the overall bulk modulus M_k of 201 fiber composites embedding general interfaces 202

$${}^{M_{\kappa}} = \lambda_{2} + \mu_{2} + \frac{f}{\frac{1}{\left[2r_{1}\lambda_{1} + 2r_{1}\mu_{1} + \overline{\mu}\right]\left[2\overline{k}r_{1}^{2} - \overline{\mu}\right]}{4r_{1}^{2}\left[2\lambda_{1} + 2\mu_{1} + \overline{k}r_{1}\right] + 2r_{1}\overline{\mu}} - \left[\lambda_{2} + \mu_{2}\right] + \frac{\overline{\mu}}{2r_{1}}} + \frac{1 - f}{\lambda_{2} + 2\mu_{2}}}.$$
(25)

3.2.2 Effective shear modulus 204

In order to determine the effective shear modulus of fiber composites, Christensen and Lo [106] proposed to 205 consider an infinite effective medium surrounding the matrix whose properties are indeed, the unknowns of the 206 problem. Therefore, the composite cylinder assemblage approach is transformed to generalized self-consistent 207 method (GSCM). To obtain the effective shear modulus, the deviatoric traction is applied to the RVE as depicted 208

in Fig. 5 (right). The traction field in cylindrical coordinates reads 209

$$\boldsymbol{t}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta \sin 2\theta \\ \beta \cos 2\theta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(26)

Considering the above boundary value problem and following the procedures in [106], the developed displace ment fields in the medium read

$$u_{r}^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^{4} a_{j}^{(i)} \Xi_{j}^{(i)} r^{n_{j}^{(i)}} \sin(2\theta) , \qquad u_{\theta}^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^{4} \Xi_{j}^{(i)} r^{n_{j}^{(i)}} \cos(2\theta) ,$$

$$u_{r}^{(\text{eff})} = \beta \frac{r_{2}}{4^{M}\mu} \left[\frac{2r}{r_{2}} + \Xi_{3}^{(\text{eff})} \frac{r_{2}^{3}}{r^{3}} + 2 \left[1 + \frac{M_{\mu}}{M_{\kappa}} \right] \Xi_{4}^{(\text{eff})} \frac{r_{2}}{r} \right] \sin(2\theta) , \qquad (27)$$

$$u_{\theta}^{(\text{eff})} = \beta \frac{r_{2}}{4^{M}\mu} \left[\frac{2r}{r_{2}} - \Xi_{3}^{(\text{eff})} \frac{r_{2}^{3}}{r^{3}} + 2 \frac{M_{\mu}}{M_{\kappa}} \Xi_{4}^{(\text{eff})} \frac{r_{2}}{r} \right] \cos(2\theta) ,$$

213

2

for
$$i = 1, 2$$
 where $i = 1$ corresponds to the fiber and $i = 2$ corresponds to the matrix. The constants $a_i^{(i)}$ read

$$a_{j}^{(i)} = \frac{2\lambda^{(i)} + 6\mu^{(i)} - 2n_{j}^{(i)}[\lambda^{(i)} + \mu^{(i)}]}{\lambda^{(i)} + 6\mu^{(i)} + [n_{j}^{(i)}]^{2}[\lambda^{(i)} + 2\mu^{(i)}]},$$
(28)

with $n_j^{(i)}$ being the solutions of the polynomial $n^4 - 10n^2 + 9 = 0$. The constants $n_1^{(i)}$ and $n_2^{(i)}$ are taken to be the positive solutions, and $n_3^{(i)}$ and $n_4^{(i)}$ are taken to be the negative solutions as $n_1^{(i)} = 3$, $n_2^{(i)} = 1$, $n_3^{(i)} = -3$ and $n_4^{(i)} = -1$. The ten unknowns $\Xi_1^{(1)}$, $\Xi_2^{(1)}$, $\Xi_3^{(1)}$, $\Xi_4^{(2)}$, $\Xi_2^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(2)}$, $\Xi_4^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(2)}$, $\Xi_4^{(2)}$, $\Xi_4^$

$$u_{r}^{(1)}, u_{\theta}^{(1)} \text{ finite at } r = 0 \rightarrow \Xi_{3}^{(1)} = \Xi_{4}^{(1)} = 0, \qquad \text{(finite displacement at } r = 0)$$

$$\bar{t}_{r} = \bar{k}_{r} \llbracket u_{r} \rrbracket \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\bar{k}_{r} \llbracket u_{r}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - u_{r}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \end{bmatrix}, \text{ (traction average at } r = r_{1})$$

$$\bar{t}_{\theta} = \bar{k}_{\theta} \llbracket u_{\theta} \rrbracket \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\bar{k}_{\theta} \llbracket u_{\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - u_{\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \end{bmatrix}, \text{ (traction average at } r = r_{1})$$

$$[\overline{\operatorname{div}} \overline{\sigma}]_{r} + \llbracket t_{r} \rrbracket = 0 \qquad \rightarrow \qquad -\frac{\overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{r_{1}} + \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0, \qquad \text{(traction equilibrium at } r = r_{1}) \qquad (29)$$

$$[\overline{\operatorname{div}} \overline{\sigma}]_{\theta} + \llbracket t_{\theta} \rrbracket = 0 \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \frac{1}{r_{1}} \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0, \qquad \text{(traction equilibrium at } r = r_{1})$$

$$\sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{2}) = \sigma_{rr}^{(\text{eff})}(r_{2}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{2}) = \sigma_{r\theta}^{(\text{eff})}(r_{2}). \qquad \text{(displacement continuity at } r = r_{2}).$$

In order to find the unknowns using the above system of equations, an additional energetic criterion expressed in [106] must be imposed which is deduced from the Eshelby's energy principle

$$\int_{0}^{2\pi} \left[\sigma_{rr}^{(\text{eff})} u_{r}^{\text{eq}} + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(\text{eff})} u_{\theta}^{\text{eq}} - \sigma_{rr}^{\text{eq}} u_{r}^{(\text{eff})} - \sigma_{r\theta}^{\text{eq}} u_{\theta}^{(\text{eff})} \right]_{r=r_{2}} \mathrm{d}\theta = 0 \,, \tag{30}$$

224

221

which yields $\Xi_4^{\text{(eff)}} = 0$. The remaining unknowns are calculated by solving the system (29). Further details regarding the solution of the system are available in Appendix A.1. Unlike the effective bulk modulus, it is not possible to furnish an explicit expression for the effective shear modulus. Nevertheless, a semi-explicit expression is attainable which reads

230

231

$$[a_6b_5 - a_5b_6]^{\mathsf{M}}\mu^2 - [b_5c_5 - b_6c_5 + a_5c_6 + a_6c_6]^{\mathsf{M}}\mu + 2c_5c_6 = 0.$$

Between the two roots obtained from the above relation, the positive one is the effective shear modulus. The parameters a_5 , a_6 , b_5 , b_6 , c_5 and c_6 are obtained from Eq. (A.5), see Apeendix A.1 for more details.

Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization accounting



Fig. 6 Boundary value problems for obtaining bounds on the macroscopic shear modulus of a fiber composite. Strain boundary condition (left) and stress boundary condition (right)

232 3.2.3 Strain bound on the shear modulus

To obtain the strain bound on the overall in-plane shear modulus, shear displacement is applied on the boundary of the RVE as shown in Fig. 6 (left) which reads

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta r \sin 2\theta \\ \beta r \cos 2\theta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(31)

236 Similar to the previous case, the developed displacement fields in the medium result in the analytical form

$$u_r^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^4 a_j^{(i)} \Xi_j^{(i)} r^{n_j^{(i)}} \sin(2\theta) , \ u_\theta^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^4 \Xi_j^{(i)} r^{n_j^{(i)}} \cos(2\theta) ,$$
(32)

where the superscripts i = 1, 2 correspond to the fiber and matrix, respectively. The constants $a_j^{(i)}$ are obtained similar to Eq. (28).

The eight unknowns $\Xi_1^{(1)}$, $\Xi_2^{(1)}$, $\Xi_3^{(1)}$, $\Xi_4^{(1)}$, $\Xi_1^{(2)}$, $\Xi_2^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(2)}$ can be determined via applying the boundary and interface conditions which read

$$u_{r}^{(1)}, u_{\theta}^{(1)} \text{ finite at } r = 0 \rightarrow \Xi_{3}^{(1)} = \Xi_{4}^{(1)} = 0, \qquad \text{(finite displacement at } r = 0)$$

$$\bar{t}_{r} = \bar{k}_{r} \llbracket u_{r} \rrbracket \rightarrow \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\bar{k}_{r} \left[u_{r}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - u_{r}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \right], \qquad \text{(traction average at } r = r_{1})$$

$$\bar{t}_{\theta} = \bar{k}_{\theta} \llbracket u_{\theta} \rrbracket \rightarrow \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\bar{k}_{\theta} \left[u_{\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - u_{\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \right], \qquad \text{(traction average at } r = r_{1})$$

$$[\overline{\operatorname{div}} \overline{\sigma}]_{r} + \llbracket t_{r} \rrbracket = 0 \rightarrow -\frac{\overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{r_{1}} + \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0, \qquad \text{(traction equilibrium at } r = r_{1})$$

$$[\overline{\operatorname{div}} \overline{\sigma}]_{\theta} + \llbracket t_{\theta} \rrbracket = 0 \rightarrow \frac{1}{r_{1}} \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0, \qquad \text{(traction equilibrium at } r = r_{1})$$

$$u_{r}^{(2)}(r_{2}) = \beta r_{2} \sin(2\theta) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\theta}^{(2)}(r_{2}) = \beta r_{2} \cos(2\theta). \qquad \text{(boundary condition at } r = r_{2}).$$

Further details regarding the construction of the system of equations are available in Appendix A.2. For an equivalent homogeneous medium with the same boundary conditions, the displacement field reads $u_r^{eq}(r) = \beta r \sin(2\theta)$ and $u_{\theta}^{eq}(r) = \beta r \cos(2\theta)$. Having the stress and displacement fields, using Eq. (19), one can

"161_2019_796_Article" — 2019/5/30 — 7:06 — page 11 — #11

237

calculate the average mechanical energy in the RVE and in the equivalent homogeneous medium 246

247

250

255

Author Proof

$$U^{\text{RVE}} = \frac{\beta^2}{2} \left[\frac{6\mu_2[\lambda_2 + \mu_2]r_2^2}{2\lambda_2 + 3\mu_2} \Xi_1^{(2)} + 4\mu_2\Xi_2^{(2)} - \frac{2[\lambda_2 + \mu_2]}{r_2^2}\Xi_4^{(2)} \right],$$
(34)
$$U^{\text{eq}} = 2\beta^{2M}\mu$$

Considering $U^{\text{RVE}} = U^{\text{eq}}$ results in a semi-explicit expression for the strain bound on the effective in-plane 248 shear modulus 249

$${}^{\mathrm{M}}\mu_{\mathrm{strain}} = \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{6\mu_2[\lambda_2 + \mu_2]r_2^2}{2\lambda_2 + 3\mu_2} \Xi_1^{(2)} + 4\mu_2\Xi_2^{(2)} - \frac{2[\lambda_2 + \mu_2]}{r_2^2}\Xi_4^{(2)} \right]. \tag{35}$$

where $\Xi_1^{(2)}$, $\Xi_2^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(2)}$ are the solution of the system of equations (A.6). 251

3.2.4 Stress bound on the shear modulus 252

Following the same methodology for the boundary value problem of Fig. 6 (right), the stress bound on the 253 macroscopic in-plane shear modulus can be obtained. Consider an RVE subject to the traction field 254

$$\boldsymbol{t}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta \sin 2\theta \\ \beta \cos 2\theta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(36)

The displacement fields in the constituents due to this boundary conditions are similar to Eq. (32). The eight unknowns $\Xi_1^{(1)}$, $\Xi_2^{(1)}$, $\Xi_3^{(1)}$, $\Xi_4^{(1)}$, $\Xi_2^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(2)}$ can be determined via applying the boundary and interface conditions are determined. 256 257 interface conditions which read 258

$$u_{r}^{(1)}, u_{\theta}^{(1)} \text{ finite at } r = 0 \rightarrow \Xi_{3}^{(1)} = \Xi_{4}^{(1)} = 0, \qquad \text{(finite displacement at } r = 0)$$

$$\overline{t}_{r} = \overline{k}_{r} \llbracket u_{r} \rrbracket \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\overline{k}_{r} \left[u_{r}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - u_{r}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \right], \qquad \text{(traction average at } r = r_{1})$$

$$\overline{t}_{\theta} = \overline{k}_{\theta} \llbracket u_{\theta} \rrbracket \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\overline{k}_{\theta} \left[u_{\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - u_{\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \right], \qquad \text{(traction average at } r = r_{1})$$

$$[\overline{\operatorname{div}} \overline{\sigma}]_{r} + \llbracket t_{r} \rrbracket = 0 \qquad \rightarrow \qquad -\frac{\overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{r_{1}} + \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0, \qquad \text{(traction equilibrium at } r = r_{1})$$

$$[\overline{\operatorname{div}} \overline{\sigma}]_{\theta} + \llbracket t_{\theta} \rrbracket = 0 \qquad \rightarrow \qquad -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{\partial a} + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0, \qquad \text{(traction equilibrium at } r = r_{1})$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \overline{\operatorname{div}}\,\overline{\sigma} \end{bmatrix}_{\theta} + \llbracket t_{\theta} \rrbracket = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{r_1} \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_1) - \sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_1) = 0, \qquad (\text{traction equilibrium at } r = r_1)$$

$$\sigma_{rr}(r_2) = \beta \sin(2\theta)$$
 and $\sigma_{r\theta}(r_2) = \beta \cos(2\theta)$. (boundary condition at $r = r_2$).

Further details regarding the construction of the system of equations are available in Appendix A.3. For an 260 equivalent homogeneous medium with the same boundary conditions, the displacement field reads 261

$$u_{r}^{\text{eq}}(r) = \frac{\beta}{2^{M}\mu} r \sin(2\theta), \qquad u_{\theta}^{\text{eq}}(r) = \frac{\beta}{2^{M}\mu} r \cos(2\theta), \qquad u_{z}^{\text{eq}}(r) = 0.$$
(38)

Using Eq. (19), the same strategy can be employed to define the energy stored in the RVE and the equivalent 263 homogeneous medium. 264

$$U^{\text{RVE}} = \frac{\beta^2}{2} \left[\frac{3[\lambda_2 + \mu_2]r_2^2}{2\lambda_2 + 3\mu_2} \Xi_1^{(2)} + 2\Xi_2^{(2)} + \frac{\lambda_2 + 3\mu_2}{\mu_2 r_2^2} \Xi_4^{(2)} \right],$$

$$U^{\text{eq}} = \frac{\beta^2}{2^{M_{\mu}}}.$$
(39)



Fig. 7 Illustration of inhomogeneity with general interface inside an infinite matrix (left) and RVE of fiber composite with general interface (right)

Considering $U^{\text{RVE}} = U^{\text{eq}}$ results in a semi-explicit expression for the stress bound on the effective in-plane shear modulus

$${}^{\mathrm{M}}\mu_{\mathrm{stress}} = \left[\frac{3[\lambda_2 + \mu_2]r_2^2}{2\lambda_2 + 3\mu_2}\Xi_1^{(2)} + 2\Xi_2^{(2)} + \frac{\lambda_2 + 3\mu_2}{\mu_2 r_2^2}\Xi_4^{(2)}\right]^{-1}.$$
(40)

where $\Xi_1^{(2)}$, $\Xi_2^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(2)}$ are the solution of the system of equations (A.7).

270 3.3 Modified Mori–Tanaka method

Analytical estimates for the effective properties of fiber composites with general interfaces have been developed 271 in [65]. Using energy principles, Duan et al. [108] proposed to substitute the fiber/interface system with 272 an equivalent fiber to predict the overall behavior of the medium. Both methodologies provide reasonable 273 estimates compared to full field homogenization strategies, like the periodic homogenization framework, but 274 they cannot provide information about the local fields that are developed in various phases of the medium, 275 including the interface. Our new methodology here not only obtains the effective properties, but also defines 276 the concentration tensors in each phase. The primary advantage of the concentration tensors is that they 277 link the macroscopic fields with the average fields in the matrix, fiber and interface hence, furnishing better 278 insights into the microstructural response of composites. For composites with interfaces, the main idea is to 279 identify the global interaction tensors for the fiber/interface system by solving the Eshelby's inhomogeneity 280 problem [109]. Such investigation is motivated by similar techniques in the literature for coated particles or 281 fibers [98,110–112]. Note the Mori–Tanaka estimates can lose major symmetry and thus results in physically 282 meaningless estimates. However, the loss of symmetry in the Mori-Tanaka estimates appears in composites 283 with different shapes of fibers, or fibers of the same shape but different orientation (non-uniform orientation 284 distribution function). For aligned long fiber composites, it has been shown analytically that Mori-Tanaka 285 continues to produce effective properties that respect the major symmetry [113]. This limitation of the Mori-286 Tanaka estimates holds regardless of interfaces. 287

288 3.3.1 General framework

Figure 7 (left) illustrates an inhomogeneity with general ellipsoidal shape occupying the space Ω_1 with elasticity modulus $L^{(1)}$ surrounded by a general interface \mathcal{I} . An infinite matrix occupying the space Ω_2 with elasticity tensor $L^{(2)}$ is embedding the inhomogeneity/interface system. The matrix is subjected to a far field linear displacement condition $u^0 = \varepsilon^0 \cdot x$. The equilibrium equations throughout the medium are given in Eq. (4) and further detailed in [65].

In this contribution, similar to [108] we propose to treat the fiber/interface system as a unique phase, but instead of identifying the response, we identify a strain interaction tensor T and a stress-strain interaction tensor H as

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_1}^+ = \boldsymbol{T} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^0 = \frac{1}{2|\Omega_1|} \int_{\mathcal{I}} [\boldsymbol{u}^+ \otimes \overline{\boldsymbol{n}} + \overline{\boldsymbol{n}} \otimes \boldsymbol{u}^+] \, \mathrm{d}A \quad \text{and}$$

S. Firooz et al.

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle_{\Omega_1}^+ = \boldsymbol{H} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^0 = \frac{1}{|\Omega_1|} \int_{\Omega_1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^- \mathrm{d}V + \frac{1}{|\Omega_1|} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}A \,.$$
 (41)

In addition, one can identify the pure fiber's concentration tensor as 299

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_1}^- = \boldsymbol{T}^{(1)} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^0 = \frac{1}{2|\Omega_1|} \int_{\mathcal{I}} [\boldsymbol{u}^- \otimes \overline{\boldsymbol{n}} + \overline{\boldsymbol{n}} \otimes \boldsymbol{u}^-] \, \mathrm{d}A \,.$$
 (42)

More precisely, $\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_1}^-$ corresponds to the strain field in the fiber itself, whereas $\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_1}^+$ corresponds to the strain field in the fiber/interface system. This case study is an extension of the Eshelby's inhomogeneity problem, 301 302 and the tensors T and H are extremely useful to develop the mean-field theories for composites [98]. Consider 303 a RVE of fiber composite with the volume of \mathscr{V} and the boundary of $\partial \mathcal{B}$ occupying the space \mathcal{B} shown in 304 Fig. 7 (right). The RVE is subjected to a macroscopic strain ${}^{M}\varepsilon$. The fiber with the volume of \mathscr{V}_{1} occupies 305 the space \mathcal{B}_1 , and the matrix with the volume of \mathcal{V}_2 occupies the space \mathcal{B}_2 . Obviously, $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$ and $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 + \mathcal{V}_2$. The fiber volume fraction is $f = \mathcal{V}_1/\mathcal{V}$, and accordingly, Eq. (7) can be rewritten as 306 307

$${}^{M}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{B}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \, \mathrm{d}V + \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \left[\left[\boldsymbol{u} \right] \otimes \boldsymbol{\overline{n}} + \boldsymbol{\overline{n}} \otimes \left[\boldsymbol{u} \right] \right] \mathrm{d}A = \left[1 - f \right] \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(2)} + f \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(1)} + \boldsymbol{\widehat{\varepsilon}},$$

$${}^{M}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{B}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \, \mathrm{d}V + \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \boldsymbol{\overline{\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}A = \left[1 - f \right] \boldsymbol{L}^{(2)} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(2)} + f \boldsymbol{L}^{(1)} : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(1)} + \boldsymbol{\widehat{\sigma}},$$

$$(43)$$

in which 309

308

312

314

316

319

321

323

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}_1} \int_{\mathcal{B}_1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \, \mathrm{d}V, \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}_2} \int_{\mathcal{B}_2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \, \mathrm{d}V \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\widehat{\varepsilon}} = \frac{1}{2\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \left[\llbracket \boldsymbol{u} \rrbracket \otimes \overline{\boldsymbol{n}} + \overline{\boldsymbol{n}} \otimes \llbracket \boldsymbol{u} \rrbracket \right] \mathrm{d}A, \quad (44)$$

are the average strains in the fiber, matrix and interface, respectively. The average stress on the interface reads 311

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \frac{1}{\mathscr{V}} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}A \,. \tag{45}$$

Exploiting the interaction tensors (41) and (42), the Mori–Tanaka scheme reads 313

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{T}^{(1)}:\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(2)}, \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{f}\boldsymbol{\widehat{\varepsilon}} = \boldsymbol{T}:\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(2)}, \quad \boldsymbol{L}^{(1)}:\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{f}\boldsymbol{\widehat{\sigma}} = \boldsymbol{H}:\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(2)}.$$
(46)

Thus, Eq. $(43)_1$ yields 315

$${}^{\mathbf{M}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \left[[1-f] \mathbb{I} + f\boldsymbol{T} \right] : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(2)} \quad \text{or} \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{A}^{(2)} : {}^{\mathbf{M}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} , \qquad (47)$$

where I is the fourth-order identity tensor and $A^{(2)} = [[1 - f]I + fT]^{-1}$. On the other hand, Eq. (43)₂ 317 yields 318

$${}^{\mathsf{M}}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \left[[1-f]\boldsymbol{L}^{(2)} + f\boldsymbol{H} \right] : \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(2)} = \left[[1-f]\boldsymbol{L}^{(2)} + f\boldsymbol{H} \right] : \boldsymbol{A}^{(2)} : {}^{\mathsf{M}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} .$$
(48)

Thus, the macroscopic stiffness tensor is given by the expression 320

ε

$${}^{\mathrm{M}}L = \left[[1 - f]L^{(2)} + fH \right] : A^{(2)}.$$
(49)

The properties of the equivalent fiber employed in [66] can be recovered according to 322

$$\boldsymbol{L}^{\mathrm{eq}} = \boldsymbol{H}: \boldsymbol{T}^{-1} \,. \tag{50}$$

The macroscopic elasticity tensors obtained by our proposed method are formally identical to those given 324 in [108]. The conceptual difference is that instead of seeking the properties of the equivalent fiber, the target 325 is to identify the global strain and stress tensors of the fiber/interface system. For a given macroscopic strain 326 ${}^{M}\varepsilon$, the average strain and stress in the fiber and matrix read 327

(1)

298

300

<u>Author Proof</u>

³²⁹ Using Eq. (46), the average strain and stress on the interface read

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = f\left[\boldsymbol{T} - \boldsymbol{T}^{(1)}\right] : \boldsymbol{A}^{(2)} : {}^{\mathsf{M}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} , \qquad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = f\left[\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{L}^{(1)} : \boldsymbol{T}^{(1)}\right] : \boldsymbol{A}^{(2)} : {}^{\mathsf{M}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} .$$
(52)

So far, the only missing parts to complete the homogenization framework are the interaction tensors T, H and $T^{(1)}$. To this end, the extended Eshelby's problem is solved analytically for three boundary value problems similar to those described by Hashin [114] in the composite cylinders assemblage approach. In fiber composites with isotropic or transversely isotropic phases, the strain and stress–strain interaction tensors present transverse isotropy. In Voigt notation, they take the forms

$$\boldsymbol{T} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{11} & T_{11} - T_{44} & T_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ T_{11} - T_{44} & T_{11} & T_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & T_{44} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & T_{55} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & T_{55} \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\boldsymbol{H} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{11} & H_{11} - 2H_{44} & H_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ H_{11} - 2H_{44} & H_{11} & H_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ H_{31} & H_{31} & H_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & H_{44} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & H_{55} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & H_{55} \end{bmatrix},$$
(53)

see [112] for more details on T. Note that $T^{(1)}$ has similar structure with T. Using this general representation,

the three boundary value problems to identify the interaction tensors will be introduced.

340 *3.3.1.1 Axial shear conditions*For this case, the far field displacement and strain fields applied to the RVE in 341 cylindrical coordinates read

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} 0\\0\\\beta r\cos\theta \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} 0&0&\frac{\beta}{2}\cos\theta\\0&0&-\frac{\beta}{2}\sin\theta\\\frac{\beta}{2}\cos\theta&-\frac{\beta}{2}\sin\theta&0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (54)

For these boundary conditions, the important displacements and stresses in the matrix, fiber and interface are given by

$$u_{z}^{(i)}(r,\theta) = \beta r U_{z}^{(i)}(r) \cos \theta \text{ with } U_{z}^{(i)}(r) = \Xi_{1}^{(i)} + \Xi_{2}^{(i)} \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{2}},$$

$$\sigma_{rz}^{(i)}(r,\theta) = \beta \Sigma_{rz}^{(i)}(r) \cos \theta \text{ with } \Sigma_{rz}^{(i)}(r) = \mu_{ax}^{(i)} \left[\Xi_{1}^{(i)} - \Xi_{2}^{(i)} \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{2}} \right],$$

$$\overline{\sigma}_{\theta z}(\theta) = \beta \overline{\Sigma}_{\theta z} \sin \theta \text{ with } \overline{\Sigma}_{\theta z} = -\frac{\overline{\mu}_{ax}}{2} \left[\Xi_{1}^{(1)} + \Xi_{1}^{(2)} + \Xi_{2}^{(1)} + \Xi_{2}^{(2)} \right],$$
(55)

345

349

342

for i = 1, 2 where i = 1 corresponds to the fiber and i = 2 corresponds to the matrix. The unknowns that need to be defined are $\Xi_1^{(1)}, \Xi_2^{(1)}, \Xi_1^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_2^{(2)}$. The boundary and interface conditions lead to the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} u_{z}^{(1)} \text{ finite at } r &= 0 &\to \Xi_{2}^{(1)} = 0, \\ \overline{t}_{z} &= \overline{k}_{z} \llbracket u_{z} \rrbracket &\to \Sigma_{rz}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \Sigma_{rz}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\overline{k}_{z}r_{1} \left[U_{z}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - U_{z}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \right], \\ \overline{t}_{z} &= \overline{k}_{z} \llbracket u_{z} \rrbracket &\to \Sigma_{rz}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \Sigma_{rz}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\overline{k}_{z}r_{1} \left[U_{z}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - U_{z}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \right], \\ \overline{t}_{z} &= \overline{t}_{z} \llbracket u_{z} \rrbracket = 0 &\to \frac{1}{r_{1}} \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{\theta z}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} + \sigma_{rz}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \sigma_{rz}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0 \to \frac{\overline{\Sigma}_{\theta z}}{r_{1}} + \Sigma_{rz}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \Sigma_{rz}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0, \\ u_{z}^{(2)}(r \to \infty) &= \beta r \cos \theta \to \Xi_{1}^{(2)} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

"161_2019_796_Article" — 2019/5/30 — 7:06 — page 15 — #15

330

336

³⁵⁰ Solving the above linear system, the average strain and stress in the fiber/interface system read

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_1}^- = U_z^{(1)}(r_1) \, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^0 \,, \qquad \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_1}^+ = U_z^{(2)}(r_1) \, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^0 \,, \qquad \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle_{\Omega_1}^+ = \Sigma_{rz}^{(2)}(r_1) \, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^0 \,. \tag{57}$$

Since *H* is a stress-type tensor and the applied shear angle is β , the term H_{55} must be equal to the generated stress on the fiber/interface system. Consequently, the axial shear interaction terms are

$$T_{55}^{(1)} = \Xi_1^{(1)}, \quad T_{55} = 1 + \Xi_2^{(2)}, \quad H_{55} = \mu_{ax}^{(2)} \left[1 - \Xi_2^{(2)} \right].$$
 (58)

355 *3.3.1.2 Transverse shear conditions*For this case, the far field displacement and strain fields applied to the RVE 356 in the cylindrical coordinates read

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta r \sin 2\theta \\ \beta r \cos 2\theta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta \sin 2\theta & \beta \cos 2\theta & 0 \\ \beta \cos 2\theta & -\beta \sin 2\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(59)

For these boundary conditions, the important displacements and stresses at each phase are given by the general expressions

$$\begin{split} u_{r}^{(i)}(r,\theta) &= \beta \ r \ U_{r}^{(i)}(r) \ \sin 2\theta & \text{with} \quad U_{r}^{(i)}(r) \ = \frac{\kappa_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} - \mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)}}{2\kappa_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} + \mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)}} [r/r_{1}]^{2} \Xi_{1}^{(i)} + \Xi_{2}^{(i)} \\ &- \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{4}} \Xi_{3}^{(i)} + \frac{\kappa_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} + \mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)}}{\mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)}} \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{2}} \Xi_{4}^{(i)} , \\ u_{\theta}^{(i)}(r,\theta) &= \beta \ r \ U_{\theta}^{(i)}(r) \ \cos 2\theta & \text{with} \quad U_{\theta}^{(i)}(r) \ = [r/r_{1}]^{2} \Xi_{1}^{(i)} + \Xi_{2}^{(i)} + \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{4}} \Xi_{3}^{(i)} + \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{2}} \Xi_{4}^{(i)} , \\ \sigma_{rr}^{(i)}(r,\theta) &= \beta \ \Sigma_{rr}^{(i)}(r) \ \sin 2\theta & \text{with} \quad \Sigma_{rr}^{(i)}(r) \ = 2\mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} \Xi_{2}^{(i)} + 6\mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{4}} \Xi_{3}^{(i)} - 4\kappa_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{2}} \Xi_{4}^{(i)} , \\ \end{array}$$

$$\sigma_{r\theta}^{(i)}(r,\theta) \ = \beta \ \Sigma_{r\theta}^{(i)}(r) \ \cos 2\theta & \text{with} \quad \Sigma_{r\theta}^{(i)}(r) \ = \frac{6\kappa_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} \mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)}}{2\kappa_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} + \mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)}} [r/r_{1}]^{2} \Xi_{1}^{(i)} + 2\mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} \Xi_{2}^{(i)} , \\ - 6\mu_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{4}} \Xi_{3}^{(i)} + 2\kappa_{\mathrm{tr}}^{(i)} \frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{2}} \Xi_{4}^{(i)} , \\ \overline{u}_{r}(\theta) \ = \beta \ r_{1} \ \overline{U}_{r} \ \sin 2\theta & \text{with} \quad \overline{U}_{r} \ = \frac{U_{r}^{(1)}(r_{1}) + U_{r}^{(2)}(r_{1})}{2} , \\ \overline{u}_{\theta}(\theta) \ = \beta \ \overline{\Sigma}_{\theta\theta} \ \sin 2\theta & \text{with} \quad \overline{\Sigma}_{\theta\theta} \ = \overline{m} \left[\overline{U}_{r} - 2\overline{U}_{\theta}\right] , \\ \end{array}$$

for i = 1, 2 where i = 1 corresponds to the fiber and i = 2 corresponds to the matrix. The unknowns that need to be defined are $\Xi_1^{(1)}, \Xi_2^{(1)}, \Xi_3^{(1)}, \Xi_4^{(1)}, \Xi_2^{(2)}, \Xi_3^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(2)}$. The boundary and interface conditions necessitate the following equations

$$u_{r}^{(1)}, u_{\theta}^{(1)} \text{ finite at } r = 0 \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \Xi_{3}^{(1)} = \Xi_{4}^{(1)} = 0,$$

$$\overline{\iota}_{r} = \overline{k}_{r} \llbracket u_{r} \rrbracket \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \Sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \Sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\overline{k}_{r}r_{1} \left[U_{r}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - U_{r}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \right],$$

$$\overline{\iota}_{\theta} = \overline{k}_{\theta} \llbracket u_{\theta} \rrbracket \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \Sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \Sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 2\overline{k}_{\theta}r_{1} \left[U_{\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - U_{\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \right],$$

$$^{364} \qquad \left[\overline{\operatorname{div}} \overline{\sigma} \right]_{r} + \llbracket t_{r} \rrbracket = 0 \qquad \rightarrow \qquad - \frac{\overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}(\theta)}{r_{1}} + \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0 \rightarrow - \frac{\overline{\Sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{r_{1}} + \Sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \Sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0,$$

$$\left[\overline{\operatorname{div}} \overline{\sigma} \right]_{\theta} + \llbracket t_{\theta} \rrbracket = 0 \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \frac{1}{r_{1}} \frac{\partial \overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} + \sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0 \rightarrow \frac{2 \overline{\Sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{r_{1}} + \Sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) - \Sigma_{r\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) = 0,$$

$$u_{r}^{(2)}(r \to \infty) = \beta r \sin 2\theta \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\theta}^{(2)}(r \to \infty) = \beta r \cos 2\theta \rightarrow \qquad \Xi_{1}^{(2)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_{2}^{(2)} = 1.$$

$$(61)$$

"161_2019_796_Article" — 2019/5/30 — 7:06 — page 16 — #16

351

354

(-)-

(;)

Solving the above linear system, the average strain and stress in the fiber/interface system are 366

368

371

372

375

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{-} = \frac{1}{2} \left[U_{r}^{(1)}(r_{1}) + U_{\theta}^{(1)}(r_{1}) \right] \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{0} , \quad \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = \frac{1}{2} \left[U_{r}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + U_{\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) \right] \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{0} ,$$

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\Sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) + \Sigma_{r\theta}^{(2)}(r_{1}) \right] \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{0} .$$

$$(62)$$

Again, since H is a stress-type tensor and the applied shear angle is 2β , the term H_{44} must be equal to the half 369 of the generated stress on the fiber/interface system. Consequently, the transverse shear interaction terms are 370

$$T_{44}^{(1)} = \frac{3\kappa_{tr}^{(1)}}{4\kappa_{tr}^{(1)} + 2\mu_{tr}^{(1)}} \Xi_1^{(1)} + \Xi_2^{(1)}, \qquad T_{44} = 1 + \frac{\kappa_{tr}^{(2)} + 2\mu_{tr}^{(2)}}{2\mu_{tr}^{(2)}} \Xi_4^{(2)},$$
$$H_{44} = \mu_{tr}^{(2)} - \frac{\kappa_{tr}^{(2)}}{2} \Xi_4^{(2)}.$$
(63)

Author Proof

3.3.1.3 Axisymmetric conditionsFor this case, the far field displacement and strain fields applied to the RVE in 373 the cylindrical coordinates read 374

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{T}r \\ 0 \\ e^{A}z \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{(r,\theta,z)}^{0} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{T} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{T} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{A} \end{bmatrix}.$$
(64)

For these boundary conditions, the important displacements and stresses in the matrix, fiber and the interface 376 are given by 377

$$u_{z}^{(i)}(z) = e^{A}z,$$

$$u_{r}^{(i)}(r) = e^{T}rU_{r}^{(i)}(r) \qquad \text{with } U_{r}^{(i)}(r) = \left[\Xi_{1}^{(i)} + \Xi_{2}^{(i)}\frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{2}}\right],$$

$$\sigma_{rr}^{(i)}(r) = e^{T}\Sigma_{rr}^{(i)}(r) + e^{A}l^{(i)} \text{ with } \Sigma_{rr}^{(i)}(r) = 2\kappa_{\text{tr}}^{(i)}\Xi_{1}^{(i)} - 2\mu_{\text{tr}}^{(i)}\Xi_{2}^{(i)}\frac{1}{[r/r_{1}]^{2}},$$

$$\sigma_{zz}^{(i)} = e^{T}\Sigma_{zz}^{(i)} + e^{A}n^{(i)} \qquad \text{with } \Sigma_{zz}^{(i)} = 2l^{(i)}\Xi_{1}^{(i)},$$

$$\overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta} = e^{T}\overline{\Sigma}_{\theta\theta} + e^{A}\overline{l} \qquad \text{with } \overline{\Sigma}_{\theta\theta} = \frac{\overline{m}}{2}\left[\Xi_{1}^{(1)} + \Xi_{1}^{(2)} + \Xi_{2}^{(1)} + \Xi_{2}^{(2)}\right],$$

$$\overline{\sigma}_{zz} = e^{T}\overline{\Sigma}_{zz} + e^{A}\overline{n} \qquad \text{with } \overline{\Sigma}_{zz} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\Xi_{1}^{(1)} + \Xi_{1}^{(2)} + \Xi_{2}^{(1)} + \Xi_{2}^{(2)}\right],$$
(65)

378

for i = 1, 2 where i = 1 corresponds to the fiber and i = 2 corresponds to the matrix. The unknowns that 379 need to be defined are $\Xi_1^{(1)}$, $\Xi_2^{(1)}$, $\Xi_1^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_2^{(2)}$. The boundary and interface conditions necessitate 380

Solving the above linear system, the average strain and stress in the fiber/interface system are

$$\begin{aligned} u_r^{(1)} \text{ finite at } r &= 0 &\to \quad \Xi_2^{(1)} = 0 \,, \\ \bar{t}_r &= \bar{k}_r \, \llbracket u_r \rrbracket &\to \quad \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_1) + \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_1) = 2\bar{k}_r \left[u_r^{(2)}(r_1) - u_r^{(1)}(r_1) \right] \,, \\ \left[\overline{\text{div}} \, \overline{\sigma} \right]_r + \llbracket t_r \rrbracket = 0 &\to \quad - \frac{\overline{\sigma}_{\theta\theta}}{r_1} + \sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_1) - \sigma_{rr}^{(1)}(r_1) = 0 \,, \\ u_r^{(2)}(r \to \infty) &= e^T r \quad \to \quad \Xi_1^{(2)} = 1 \,. \end{aligned}$$
(66)

382

383

381

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{-} = \begin{bmatrix} U_{r}^{(1)}(r_{1}) e^{T} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & U_{r}^{(1)}(r_{1}) e^{T} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{A} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = \begin{bmatrix} U_{r}^{(2)}(r_{1}) e^{T} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & U_{r}^{(2)}(r_{1}) e^{T} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{A} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{rr}^{(2)}(r_{1}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Sigma_{zz}^{(1)} + \frac{2\overline{\Sigma}_{zz}}{r_{1}} \end{bmatrix} e^{T} + \begin{bmatrix} l^{(2)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & l^{(2)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & n^{(1)} + \frac{2\overline{n}}{r_{1}} \end{bmatrix} e^{A}.$$

$$(67)$$

At this stage, two cases are examined: 384



Fig. 8 Mesh quality of the RVE for finite element analysis. The domain is discretized using biquadratic Lagrange elements

• $e^A = 0$ and $e^T = 1$: The constants from the solution of the linear system are denoted as $\Xi_{11}^{(1)}$ and $\Xi_{21}^{(2)}$. For this condition, the general forms of the dilute concentration tensors in Eq. (53) permit to write

$$\langle \varepsilon_{xx} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{-} = T_{11}^{(1)} + [T_{11}^{(1)} - T_{44}^{(1)}], \qquad \langle \varepsilon_{xx} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = T_{11} + [T_{11} - T_{44}], \langle \sigma_{xx} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = H_{11} + [H_{11} - 2H_{44}], \qquad \langle \sigma_{zz} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = 2H_{31}.$$

$$(68)$$

³⁸⁸ From (67), clearly we have

387

$$T_{11}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\Xi_{11}^{(1)} + T_{44}^{(1)} \right], \qquad T_{11} = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \Xi_{21}^{(2)} + T_{44} \right], H_{11} = \kappa_{tr}^{(2)} - \mu_{tr}^{(2)} \Xi_{21}^{(2)} + H_{44}, \qquad H_{31} = l^{(1)} \Xi_{11}^{(1)} + \frac{\bar{l}}{2r_1} \left[1 + \Xi_{11}^{(1)} + \Xi_{21}^{(2)} \right].$$
(69)

• $e^A = e^T = 1$: The constants from the solution of the linear system are denoted as $\Xi_{12}^{(1)}$ and $\Xi_{22}^{(2)}$. For this condition, the general forms of the dilute concentration tensors in Eq. (53) permit to write

$$\langle \varepsilon_{xx} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{-} = T_{11}^{(1)} + \left[T_{11}^{(1)} - T_{44}^{(1)} \right] + T_{13}^{(1)}, \qquad \langle \varepsilon_{xx} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = T_{11} + \left[T_{11} - T_{44} \right] + T_{13},$$

$$\langle \sigma_{xx} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = H_{11} + \left[H_{11} - 2H_{44} \right] + H_{13}, \qquad \langle \sigma_{zz} \rangle_{\Omega_{1}}^{+} = 2H_{31} + H_{33}.$$

$$(70)$$

392

$$T_{13}^{(1)} = \Xi_{12}^{(1)} + T_{44}^{(1)} - 2T_{11}^{(1)},$$

$$T_{13} = 1 + \Xi_{22}^{(2)} + T_{44} - 2T_{11},$$

$$H_{13} = 2\kappa_{tr}^{(2)} - 2\mu_{tr}^{(2)}\Xi_{22}^{(2)} + l^{(2)} + 2H_{44} - 2H_{11},$$

$$H_{33} = 2l^{(1)}\Xi_{12}^{(1)} + \frac{\bar{l}}{r_1} \left[1 + \Xi_{12}^{(1)} + \Xi_{22}^{(2)} \right] + n^{(1)} + \frac{2\bar{n}}{r_1} - 2H_{31}.$$
(71)

Expressions (58), (63), (69) and (71) provide all the required coefficients for the interaction tensors, which in turn can be implemented in the Mori–Tanaka scheme to identify the macroscopic elasticity tensor of fiber

³⁹⁷ composites. The components of ^ML are expressed as given in Eq. (10).

398 **4 Numerical results**

The goal of this section is to evaluate the performance of the proposed analytical solutions through a series 399 of numerical examples. In doing so, the influence of the general interfaces on the overall material response 400 is investigated and compared against computational simulations using the finite element method elaborated 401 in [91]. The computational analysis is carried out using our in-house finite element code applied to the RVE 402 discretized by biquadratic Lagrange elements as shown in Fig. 8. For all examples, the solution procedures 403 are robust and show asymptotically the quadratic rate of convergence associated with the Newton–Raphson 404 scheme. For all the cases, the volume fraction f = 30% is assumed. The RVE size varies from 0.001 to 1000, 405 and three different stiffness ratios of 0.1, 1 and 10 are studied. The stiffness ratio denoted as incl./matr. is the 406



Fig. 9 The effective bulk and shear moduli versus size for incl./matr. = 0.1. The lines correspond to the analytical solutions, and dots correspond to the numerical results using the finite element method. "CCA" and "GSCM" indicate the effective properties obtained via the solution proposed in Sects. 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. "Upper Bound" and "Lower Bound" refer to our proposed bounds in Sects. 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. "MT" corresponds to our proposed solution in Sect. 3.3

ratio of the inclusion to matrix Lamé parameters. The stiffness ratio 0.1 corresponds to a matrix 10 times stiffer 407 than the inclusion and in the limit of incl./matr. $\rightarrow 0$, the inclusion resembles a void. The stiffness ratio 10 408 corresponds to an inclusion 10 times stiffer than the matrix and in the limit of incl./matr. $\rightarrow \infty$, the inclusion 409 acts as being rigid. Clearly, the stiffness ratio 1 represents identical inclusion and matrix. Throughout the 410 numerical examples, the matrix Lamé parameters are $\lambda_2 = \mu_2 = 1$ and the inclusion Lamé parameters vary in 411 accordance with the prescribed stiffness ratios. The interface in-plane resistance $\overline{\mu}$ corresponds to the resistance 412 of the interface against stretch and is set to $\overline{\mu} = 1$ indicating a low in-plane resistance and $\overline{\mu} = 100$ indicating 413 a very high resistance. On the other hand, the two considered values for the orthogonal interface resistance 414 are $\overline{k} = 1$ indicating a low opening resistance and $\overline{k} = 100$ indicating a high opening resistance. In the limit 415 $\bar{k} \to \infty$, the interface remains coherent and does not allow for opening. On the contrary, $\bar{k} \to 0$ indicates 416 no orthogonal resistance and the fiber behaves entirely detached from the matrix. It shall be emphasized that 417 depending on the choice of the general interface parameters any of the perfect, elastic or cohesive interface 418 models could be recovered, as shown in Fig. 1. The conditions $\overline{\mu} \neq 0$ and $\overline{k} \rightarrow \infty$ recover the elastic interface 419 model. The cohesive interface is recovered when $\overline{\mu} = 0$ and $\overline{k} \to \infty$. Finally, the perfect interface model is 420 recovered when $\overline{\mu} = 0$ and $\overline{k} \to \infty$. 421

Figures 9, 10 and 11 illustrate the effective bulk modulus ${}^{M}\kappa$ and shear modulus ${}^{M}\mu$ versus size for different stiffness ratios. Each column corresponds to a specific in-plane resistance $\overline{\mu}$, and each row corresponds to a specific orthogonal resistance \overline{k} . The solid straight black line shows the effective response due to the perfect interface. Lines indicate the analytical solutions corresponding to the analytical approaches developed in Sects. 3.2.1 and 3.3. Red circular points and blue rectangular points correspond to computational results using the finite element method obtained via prescribing DBC and TBC, respectively.

A remarkable agreement between the analytical solutions and the computational results are consistently observed for all the examples. For all the cases, a size-dependent response is observed due to the presence of the general interface. For the bulk modulus, all the solutions render a consistent behavior with respect to the perfect interface solution. The results coincide with the perfect interface solution at small sizes. Increasing the size results in deviation from the perfect interface solution until a critical size at which an extremum is reached. Further increase in size yields asymptotic convergence of the results to the perfect interface solution which is due to the diminished interface effects at large sizes. For incl./matr. = 0.1, the results corresponding



Fig. 10 The effective bulk and shear moduli versus size for incl./matr. = 1. The lines correspond to the analytical solutions, and dots correspond to the numerical results using the finite element method. "CCA" and "GSCM" indicate the effective properties obtained via the solution proposed in Sects. 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. "Upper Bound" and "Lower Bound" refer to our proposed bounds in Sects. 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. "MT" corresponds to our proposed solution in Sect. 3.3.



Fig. 11 The effective bulk and shear moduli versus size for incl./matr. = 10. The lines correspond to the analytical solutions, and dots correspond to the numerical results using the finite element method. "CCA" and "GSCM" indicate the effective properties obtained via the solution proposed in Sects. 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. "Upper Bound" and "Lower Bound" refer to our proposed bounds in Sects. 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. "MT" corresponds to our proposed solution in Sect. 3.3

Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization accounting

to general interface always overestimate to those obtained from the perfect interface model. However, for the 435 other stiffness ratios, depending on the interface parameters, the results render either a weaker or a stronger 436 response compared to the perfect interface solution. Evidently, if the interface parameters are taken enough 437 large, the response due to the general interface is stiffer than those of the perfect interface. Overall, an important 438 observation and especially useful for computational material design is that in the presence of interfaces, even 439 if the inclusion is identical to the matrix, various combinations of parameters could result in substantially 440 different but also size-dependent overall material behavior. For the shear modulus, there is perfect agreement 441 between the upper bound and DBC and the lower bound and TBC. When incl./matr. = 0.1, the bounds 442 never coincide. When incl./matr. = 1 in Fig. 10, the upper and the lower bounds *converge* at larger sizes since 443 incl./matr. = 1 implies identical matrix and inclusion and hence, identical responses are seen when the interface 444 effects become negligible enough at large sizes. For incl./matr. = 10, the bounds tend to approach to each 445 other until they coincide at a specific sizes and then they distant from each other as size increases. A particular 446 significant observation is that the generalized self-consistent method and the modified Mori-Tanaka method 447 do not provide similar estimates for the effective shear modulus. For incl./matr. = 0.1 and incl./matr. = 1, the 448 response obtained from GSCM underestimates that of MT method. However, when incl./matr. = 10, the results 449 corresponding to GSCM underestimate the ones obtained from MT before the bounds coincide, whereas the 450 opposite story holds after the bounds coincidence. 451

Remark In view of the behavior of the effective bulk modulus ${}^{M}\kappa$, it is observed that the general interface 452 model at both limits of small and large sizes converges to the perfect interface model. The interface effect is 453 decreasing when increasing the size, and thus, its behavior at large sizes is fairly obvious. At small scales, 454 however, further discussion is required to justify the influence of the interface on the overall material response. 455 The effective behavior of the general interface model can be explained by the fact that it combines the two 456 opposing cohesive and elastic interface models, schematically illustrated in Fig. 1. The elastic interface model 457 results in a smaller-stronger effect in contrast to the smaller-weaker effect of the cohesive interface model. 458 At large sizes, neither of the interface effects is present. But at small sizes, both of the interface effects are 459 present and eventually cancel each other. Furthermore, we can elaborate on this observation from an analytical 460

⁴⁶¹ perspective. To do so, we re-express the effective bulk modulus (25) as

462

$${}^{M}\!\kappa = \lambda_{2} + \mu_{2} + \frac{f}{\frac{1}{\left[\lambda_{1} + \mu_{1}\right]\left[4\bar{k}r_{1}^{3} + 2\bar{\mu}r_{1}\right] + 4\bar{k}\bar{\mu}r_{1}^{2}}{4r_{1}^{2}\left[2\lambda_{1} + 2\mu_{1} + \bar{k}r_{1}\right] + 2\bar{\mu}r_{1}} - \left[\lambda_{2} + \mu_{2}\right]} + \frac{1 - f}{\lambda_{2} + 2\mu_{2}}$$

thereby gaining a better insight on ${}^{\rm M}\kappa$ in terms of r_1 . This relation in both limits simplifies to

$$r \to 0 \text{ or } r \to \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad {}^{M}\kappa = \lambda_2 + \mu_2 + \frac{f}{\frac{1}{[\lambda_1 + \mu_1] - [\lambda_2 + \mu_2]} + \frac{1 - f}{\lambda_2 + 2\mu_2}}$$
(72)

which corresponds exactly to the solution associated with the perfect interface model.

Inspired by the observations made throughout the numerical examples, it is possible to distinguish between 466 467 two dissimilar bounds on the overall behavior of the microstructure, namely size-dependent bounds and ultimate *bounds*. Size-dependent bounds are the bounds on the effective behavior of the microstructure at any given 468 size. The upper and lower size-dependent bounds correspond to the solution of the boundary value problem 469 associated with DBC and TBC, respectively. On the other hand, we also observe that the macroscopic response 470 is always bounded between two specific values regardless of the size of the microstructure and thus, we refer to 471 them as ultimate bounds. In the case of a stiff inclusion within a more compliant matrix such as incl./matr. = 10472 shown in Fig. 11, the ultimate bounds are reached at extreme sizes. However, the ultimate bounds may be 473 reached at critical sizes and not necessarily at the limits, see, for instance, Fig. 9. In fact, Fig. 12 elucidates the 474 notions of ultimate and size-dependent bounds schematically. Size-dependent bounds are local in the sense 475 that for a specific interface and material parameters, they vary with respect to size. In contrast, the ultimate 476 bounds are independent of size and they entirely depend on the interface and bulk material properties. As 477 pointed out earlier, the size-dependent bounds coincide in the case of the effective bulk modulus ${}^{M}\kappa$ and are 478 only distinct in the case of the effective shear modulus ${}^{M}\mu$. One can mention that this conclusion for general 470 interface is in agreement with that derived by Hashin and Rosen for the case of a perfect interface [107]. 480



Fig. 12 Schematic illustration of size-dependent and ultimate bounds. The size-dependent bounds are the bounds on the effective behavior of the microstructure at any given size. The ultimate bounds are independent of size, and they entirely depend on the interface and bulk material properties



Fig. 13 Effective moduli versus dimensionless interface parameters

To pinpoint the effects of the interface parameters on the overall material response of composites with 481 general interfaces, Fig. 13 illustrates the variation of the effective moduli versus interface parameters. Each 482 column corresponds to a specific stiffness ratio. The top row corresponds to effective bulk modulus ${}^{M}\kappa$, and the 483 bottom row corresponds to the effective shear modulus ${}^{M}\mu$. Note that the interface orthogonal resistance \overline{k} has 484 the inverse length dimension and thus multiplied to the size to become dimensionless. On the other hand, the 485 interface elastic parameter $\overline{\mu}$ has the length dimension and thus divided by the size to become dimensionless. 486 For the effective bulk modulus, increasing any of the interface parameters results in stiffer material response. 487 For two extreme cases of very strong and very weak interfaces, the associated overall response is similar for 488 all stiffness ratios. On the other hand, for the shear modulus, when incl./matr. = 0.1, increasing the interface 489 parameters stiffens the response. For incl./matr. = 1, the overall response shows no sensitivity to $\overline{\mu}$, whereas 490 increasing \overline{k} yields stronger response. An interesting observation arises for incl./matr. = 10 where increasing 491 \overline{k} results in stiffer response but increasing $\overline{\mu}$ might lead to either softer or stiffer response depending on the 492 size. 493

Figures 14 and 15 illustrate the stress distribution within the microstructure at different sizes and for different stiffness ratios. More precisely, the color patterns display $[\sigma_{xx} + \sigma_{yy}]/2$ in Fig. 14 and $[\sigma]_{xy}$ in Fig. 15. This choice is made to provide meaningful stress distributions for each case. In the case of Fig. 14, volumetric expansion is prescribed on the RVE to compute the effective bulk modulus ^M_k and thus, a pressure-



Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization accounting

Fig. 14 Illustration of the stress distribution within the microstructure due to isotropic expansion at different sizes and for different stiffness ratios. The upper row of stress distributions on each graph correspond to DBC and the lower row to TBC

like quantity $[\sigma_{xx} + \sigma_{yy}]/2$ is more relevant and informative. On the other hand, in the case of Fig. 15, a simple shear is prescribed on the RVE to compute the effective shear modulus ${}^{M}\mu$ in which case the shear component of the stress $[\sigma]_{xy}$ is a more appropriate quantity to look at. Obviously, for the sake of a better presentation, all the RVEs are scaled to the same size. On each graph, the upper row and lower row show the stress distributions corresponding to DBC and TBC, respectively. Both figures compare the cases with the interface parameters $\overline{k} = 100$ and $\overline{\mu} = 1$ from Figs. 9, 10 and 11. For the expansion case in Fig. 14, the stress patterns due to DBC

Author Proof



Fig. 15 Illustration of the stress distribution within the microstructure due to simple shear at different sizes and for different stiffness ratios. The upper row of stress distributions on each graph corresponds to DBC, and the lower row to TBC

and TBC are identical, and thus, the effective bulk modulus ${}^{M}k$ is same, at any given size. But that is not the case for the effective shear modulus. For the non-coinciding cases, the stress due to DBC always overestimates the stress due to TBC and hence stiffer overall response. For the coinciding cases, the stresses due to DBC and TBC are identical which justifies the same overall response. Moreover, for incl./matr. = 0.1, the stress in the fiber is less than the matrix at any size. For incl./matr. = 1, the same story holds at small sizes, whereas at large size, the stresses become similar since interface effects become negligible and the bulk materials are



Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization accounting

Fig. 16 Comparison of the analytical and numerical stress distributions within the RVE at different sizes for incl./matr. = 0.1. On each block, the top microstructures corresponds to the local stress distribution due to DBC and TBC. The analytical stress distribution is shown at the center. The bottom microstructures render the average of the computational stresses due to DBC and TBC

identical. Finally, when incl./matr. = 10, fiber undergoes less stress than the matrix at small sizes, whereas the
 opposite story holds at large sizes.

A significant feature of this contribution is that our novel formalism through the modified Mori-Tanaka 512 approach does not only determine the overall response of composites, but also it provides information about the 513 local fields for each phase of the medium. The purpose of the next set of examples is to evaluate the analytical 514 stress fields and compare them against the associated numerical solutions. Figures 16, 17 and 18 provide a 515 thorough comparison between the numerical and analytical stress distributions for different stiffness ratios at 516 different sizes. In each figure, the rows correspond to specific sizes, whereas the columns correspond to the 517 deformation type. Similar to Figs. 14 and 15, the stress component of the interest for the expansion and shear 518 deformations are $[\sigma_{xx} + \sigma_{yy}]/2$ and $[\sigma_{xy}]$, respectively. On each block, the top microstructures render the 519 computational stress distribution due to DBC and TBC obtained from the finite element method. The analytical 520 stress distribution is shown at the center of each block. Since our proposed analytical approach determines the 521 average stress in the constituents, the bottom microstructures render the computational average stresses due to 522 DBC and TBC suitable for comparison with analytical stresses. For the sake of clarity, the value of the average 523



Fig. 17 Comparison of the analytical and numerical stress distributions within the RVE at different sizes for incl./matr. = 1. On each block, the top microstructures correspond to the local stress distribution due to DBC and TBC. The analytical stress distribution is shown at the center. The bottom microstructures render the average of the computational stresses due to DBC and TBC

stresses in the inclusion and the matrix is shown at the bottom of each microstructure. For the expansion case, 524 the analytical stress is outstandingly precise and the stresses in the inclusion and matrix are exactly similar to 525 the computational stresses. However, this is not the case for the shear deformation where various conclusions 526 can be drawn. When incl./matr. = 0.1, the average stress due to DBC overestimates the analytical stress in the 527 matrix. On the other hand, the average stress due to TBC underestimates the analytical stress in the matrix. 528 For the stress in the inclusion, TBC results in the highest average stress and DBC renders the lowest average 529 stress with the analytical stress being in between. The same story holds for incl./matr. = 1 when size is small. 530 When size is large, both the analytical and computational stresses resemble which conforms to the coinciding 531 bounds at large sizes in Fig. 15. For incl./matr. = 10, when size = 0.01, the stress due to DBC is the highest in 532 the matrix and the lowest in the inclusion. TBC renders the highest inclusion average stress and lowest matrix 533 average stress. The analytical stress in both the inclusion and the matrix are between those obtained by DBC 534 and TBC. Finally, for incl./matr. = 10 and size = 100, both analytical and computational average stresses are 535 similar in the matrix. However, the average stress in the inclusion is highest for DBC and the lowest for TBC 536 with the analytical stress being in between. 537



Fig. 18 Comparison of the analytical and numerical stress distributions within the RVE at different sizes for incl./matr. = 10. On each block, the top microstructures correspond to the local stress distribution due to DBC and TBC. The analytical stress distribution is shown at the center. The bottom microstructures render the average of the computational stresses due to DBC and TBC

538 5 Conclusion and outlook

This contribution establishes novel bounds and estimates to determine the overall behavior of composites 539 through homogenization enhanced by general interfaces and hence the size effects. The bounds are obtained 540 via extension of the CCA approach to account for interfaces and by prescribing displacement-type and traction-541 type boundary conditions on the microstructure, respectively. Our proposed strategy to compute an estimate 542 for the effective material response, on the other hand, extends the Mori-Tanaka approach. Not only does our 543 methodology furnish accurate results for the effective properties, but also it provides additional information 544 about the local fields in the constituents including the interface. The proposed framework here is generic 545 and versatile, and thus, it can readily recover perfect, cohesive and elastic interface models. Throughout a 546 series of numerical examples, we have shown that our proposed analytical solutions are in excellent agreement 547 with the computational results obtained from the finite element method. Furthermore, the notions of *size*-548 dependent bounds and ultimate bounds were introduced which give a crucial insight into the problem from a 549 computational material design perspective. We believe this contribution provides a deeper understanding of the 550

interface effects and size-dependent behavior of continua with a variety of applications in nano-composites. 551

Our next immediate plan is to extend the current work to 3D and study the size effects in particulate composites 552

due to interfaces. 553

554

558

Appendix A: System of equations for the estimate and bounds on the shear modulus 555

In this section, we elaborate on the system of equations used to obtain the estimate and the bounds on the 556 macroscopic shear modulus explained in Sect. 3. 557

Appendix A.1: Effective shear modulus

For this problem, the displacement fields in the matrix, fiber and the effective medium are given in Eq. (27) resulting in ten unknowns $\Xi_1^{(1)}$, $\Xi_2^{(1)}$, $\Xi_3^{(1)}$, $\Xi_4^{(2)}$, $\Xi_2^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(2)}$, $\Xi_4^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(eff)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(eff)}$. We concluded that since the displacement at the center of the RVE must be finite, $\Xi_3^{(1)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(1)}$ must vanish. Applying the energetic criterion expressed in Eq. (30) yields $\Xi_4^{(eff)}$. The remaining seven unknowns are determined using the below mutual which is deduced from Eq. (20). 559 560 561 562 system which is deduced from Eq. (29) 563

$$\boldsymbol{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{1}^{(1)} \\ \Xi_{2}^{(1)} \\ \Xi_{1}^{(2)} \\ \Xi_{2}^{(2)} \\ \Xi_{3}^{(2)} \\ \Xi_{4}^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -\frac{3}{2} \\ \frac{3}{2} \end{bmatrix} \Xi_{3}^{(\text{eff})}, \quad (A.1)$$

with 565

564

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{Q}} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{3\overline{\mu}\zeta_{2}r_{1}}{\zeta_{3}} & \frac{\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} - 2\mu_{1} & \frac{3\overline{\mu}\zeta_{5}r_{1}}{\zeta_{6}} & \frac{\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} + 2\mu_{2} & \frac{3\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}^{5}} + \frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{1}^{4}} - \frac{4\zeta_{4}}{r_{1}^{2}} - \frac{\lambda_{2}\overline{\mu}}{\mu_{2}r_{1}^{3}} \\ -\frac{6[\overline{\mu}\zeta_{2} + \mu_{1}\zeta_{1}r_{1}]r_{1}}{\zeta_{3}} - \frac{2\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} - 2\mu_{1} - \frac{6[\overline{\mu}\zeta_{5} - \mu_{2}\zeta_{4}r_{1}]r_{1}}{\zeta_{6}} - \frac{2\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} + 2\mu_{2} - \frac{6\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}^{5}} - \frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{1}^{4}} - \frac{2\zeta_{4}}{r_{1}^{2}} + \frac{2\overline{\mu}\lambda_{2}}{\mu_{2}r_{1}^{3}} \\ \frac{\lambda_{1}r_{1}^{3}}{\zeta_{3}} & \frac{\mu_{1}}{\overline{k}} + r_{1} & -\frac{\lambda_{2}r_{1}^{3}}{\zeta_{6}} & \frac{\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}} - r_{1} & \frac{3\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{4}} + \frac{1}{r_{1}^{3}} - \frac{2\zeta_{4}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{2}} - \frac{\zeta_{5}}{\mu_{2}r_{1}} \\ \frac{3\mu_{1}\zeta_{1}r_{1}^{2}}{\overline{k}\zeta_{3}} + r_{1}^{3} & \frac{4\mu_{1}}{\overline{k}} + r_{1} & \frac{3\mu_{2}\zeta_{4}r_{1}^{2}}{\overline{k}\zeta_{6}} - r_{1}^{3} & \frac{\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}} - r_{1} & -\frac{3\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{4}} - \frac{1}{r_{1}^{3}} & \frac{\zeta_{4}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{2}} - \frac{1}{r_{1}} \\ 0 & 0 & 2\mu_{2} & \frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{2}^{4}} & -\frac{4\zeta_{4}}{r_{2}^{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{6\mu_{2}\zeta_{4}r_{2}^{2}}{\zeta_{6}} & 2\mu_{2} & -\frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{2}^{4}} & \frac{2\zeta_{4}}{r_{2}^{2}} \end{bmatrix} ,$$
 (A.2)

where 567

 $\xi_1 = \lambda_1 + \mu_1, \quad \xi_2 = \lambda_1 + 2\mu_1, \quad \xi_3 = 2\lambda_1 + 3\mu_1, \quad \xi_4 = \lambda_2 + \mu_2, \quad \xi_5 = \lambda_2 + 2\mu_2, \quad \xi_6 = 2\lambda_2 + 3\mu_2.$ 568

Note the above system of equations is nonlinear, and thus, special treatments must be applied. We express the 569

solution of the above system in the form 570

> $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_{1} \\ \mathbf{z}_{2}^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{z}_{1}^{(2)} \\ \mathbf{z}_{2}^{(2)} \\ \mathbf{z}_{3}^{(2)} \\ \mathbf{z}_{3}^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} g_{1} \\ g_{2} \\ a_{1} \\ a_{2} \\ a_{3} \\ a_{4} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} h_{1} \\ h_{2} \\ b_{1} \\ b_{2} \\ b_{3} \\ b_{4} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_{3}^{(\text{eff})} .$ (A.3)

The last two equations in Eq. (29) can be written as 572

$$a_5 + b_5 \Xi_3^{(\text{eff})} = \frac{c_5 + c_6 \Xi_3^{(\text{eff})}}{M_{\mu}}, \quad a_6 + b_6 \Xi_3^{(\text{eff})} = \frac{c_5 - c_6 \Xi_3^{(\text{eff})}}{M_{\mu}}.$$
 (A.4)

with 574

573

571

$$a_{5} = \frac{\lambda_{2}r_{2}^{3}}{2\lambda_{2} + 3\mu_{2}}a_{1} + r_{2}a_{2} - \frac{1}{r_{2}^{3}}a_{3} + \frac{\lambda_{2} + 2\mu_{2}}{\mu_{2}r_{2}}a_{4},$$

$$a_{6} = r_{2}^{3}a_{1} + r_{2}a_{2} + \frac{1}{r_{2}^{3}}a_{3} + \frac{1}{r_{2}}a_{4},$$

$$b_{5} = \frac{\lambda_{2}r_{2}^{3}}{2\lambda_{2} + 3\mu_{2}}b_{1} + r_{2}b_{2} - \frac{1}{r_{2}^{3}}b_{3} + \frac{\lambda_{2} + 2\mu_{2}}{\mu_{2}r_{2}}b_{4},$$

$$b_{6} = r_{2}^{3}b_{1} + r_{2}b_{2} + \frac{1}{r_{2}^{3}}b_{3} + \frac{1}{r_{2}}b_{4},$$

$$c_{5} = \frac{r_{2}}{2},$$

$$c_{6} = \frac{r_{2}}{4}.$$
(A.5)

575

Subtracting $(A.4)_1$ from $(A.4)_2$ gives 576

577
$$\Xi_3^{\text{(eff)}} = \frac{[a_5 - a_6]^{\text{M}} \mu}{2c_6 + [b_6 - b_5]^{\text{M}} \mu}.$$

Substituting the final result in $(A.4)_1$, after some algebra we obtain the below quadratic equation 578

$$[a_6b_5 - a_5b_6]^{M}\mu^2 - [b_5c_5 - b_6c_5 + a_5c_6 + a_6c_6]^{M}\mu + 2c_5c_6 = 0.$$

From the two possible solutions, the positive value is the macroscopic shear modulus. 580

- Appendix A.2: Strain bound on the shear modulus 581
- For this problem, the displacement fields in the matrix, fiber and the effective medium are given in Eq. (32) resulting in ten unknowns $\Xi_1^{(1)}$, $\Xi_2^{(1)}$, $\Xi_3^{(1)}$, $\Xi_4^{(2)}$, $\Xi_1^{(2)}$, $\Xi_2^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(2)}$. We concluded that since the 582

$$\Xi_3^{\text{(eff)}} = \frac{[a_5 - a_6]^{\text{M}}\mu}{2c_6 + [b_6 - b_5]^{\text{M}}\mu}$$

displacement at the center of the RVE must be finite, $\Xi_3^{(1)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(1)}$ must vanish. The remaining six unknowns are determined using the below system which is deduced from Eq. (33) 583 584

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{3\overline{\mu}\xi_{2}r_{1}}{\zeta_{3}} & \frac{\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} - 2\mu_{1} & \frac{3\overline{\mu}\xi_{5}r_{1}}{\zeta_{6}} & \frac{\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} + 2\mu_{2} & \frac{3\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}^{5}} + \frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{1}^{4}} - \frac{4\zeta_{4}}{r_{1}^{2}} - \frac{\lambda_{2}\overline{\mu}}{\mu_{2}r_{1}^{3}} \\ -\frac{6[\overline{\mu}\zeta_{2} + \mu_{1}\zeta_{1}r_{1}]r_{1}}{\zeta_{3}} - \frac{2\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} - 2\mu_{1} - \frac{6[\overline{\mu}\zeta_{5} - \mu_{2}\zeta_{4}r_{1}]r_{1}}{\zeta_{6}} - \frac{2\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} + 2\mu_{2} - \frac{6\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}^{5}} - \frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{1}^{4}} - \frac{2\zeta_{4}}{r_{1}^{2}} + \frac{2\overline{\mu}\lambda_{2}}{\mu_{2}r_{1}^{3}} \\ \frac{\lambda_{1}r_{1}^{3}}{\zeta_{3}} & \frac{\mu_{1}}{k} + r_{1} & -\frac{\lambda_{2}r_{1}^{3}}{\zeta_{6}} & \frac{\mu_{2}}{k} - r_{1} & \frac{3\mu_{2}}{k} + \frac{1}{r_{1}^{3}} - \frac{2\zeta_{4}}{k} - \frac{\zeta_{5}}{\mu_{2}r_{1}} - \frac{\zeta_{5}}{\omega_{2}r_{1}} \\ \frac{3\mu_{1}\zeta_{1}r_{1}^{2}}{\overline{k}\zeta_{3}} + r_{1}^{3} & \frac{\mu_{1}}{\overline{k}} + r_{1} & \frac{3\mu_{2}\zeta_{4}r_{1}^{2}}{\overline{k}\zeta_{6}} - r_{1}^{3} & \frac{\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}} - r_{1} & -\frac{3\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{4}} - \frac{1}{r_{1}^{3}} & \frac{\zeta_{4}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{2}} - \frac{1}{r_{1}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\lambda_{2}r_{2}^{3}}{\zeta_{6}} & r_{2} & -\frac{1}{r_{2}^{3}} & \frac{\zeta_{5}}{\mu_{2}r_{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & r_{2}^{3} & r_{2} & \frac{1}{r_{2}^{3}} & \frac{1}{r_{2}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ r_{2} \\ r_{2} \\ r_{2} \end{bmatrix},$$
(A.6)

587

586

585

where $\zeta_1 = \lambda_1 + \mu_1$, $\zeta_2 = \lambda_1 + 2\mu_1$, $\zeta_3 = 2\lambda_1 + 3\mu_1$, $\zeta_4 = \lambda_2 + \mu_2$, $\zeta_5 = \lambda_2 + 2\mu_2$, $\zeta_6 = 2\lambda_2 + 3\mu_2$. 588

Appendix A.3: Stress bound on the shear modulus 589

For this problem, the displacement fields in the matrix, fiber and the effective medium are given in Eq. (32) resulting in ten unknowns $\Xi_1^{(1)}$, $\Xi_2^{(1)}$, $\Xi_3^{(1)}$, $\Xi_4^{(1)}$, $\Xi_2^{(2)}$, $\Xi_2^{(2)}$, $\Xi_3^{(2)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(2)}$. We concluded that since the displacement at the center of the RVE must be finite, $\Xi_3^{(1)}$ and $\Xi_4^{(1)}$ must vanish. The remaining six unknowns are determined using the below system which is deduced from Eq. (37) 590 591 592 593

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{3\overline{\mu}\zeta_{2}r_{1}}{\zeta_{3}} & \frac{\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} - 2\mu_{1} & \frac{3\overline{\mu}\zeta_{5}r_{1}}{\zeta_{6}} & \frac{\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} + 2\mu_{2} & \frac{3\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}^{5}} + \frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{1}^{4}} - \frac{4\zeta_{4}}{r_{1}^{2}} - \frac{\lambda_{2}\overline{\mu}}{\mu_{2}r_{1}^{3}} \\
-\frac{6[\overline{\mu}\zeta_{2} + \mu_{1}\zeta_{1}r_{1}]r_{1}}{\zeta_{3}} - \frac{2\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} - 2\mu_{1} - \frac{6[\overline{\mu}\zeta_{5} - \mu_{2}\zeta_{4}r_{1}]r_{1}}{\zeta_{6}} - \frac{2\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}} + 2\mu_{2} - \frac{6\overline{\mu}}{r_{1}^{5}} - \frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{1}^{4}} - \frac{2\zeta_{4}}{r_{1}^{2}} + \frac{2\overline{\mu}\lambda_{2}}{\mu_{2}r_{1}^{3}} \\
\frac{\lambda_{1}r_{1}^{3}}{\zeta_{3}} & \frac{\mu_{1}}{\overline{k}} + r_{1} & -\frac{\lambda_{2}r_{1}^{3}}{\zeta_{6}} & \frac{\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}} - r_{1} & \frac{3\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{4}} + \frac{1}{r_{1}^{3}} - \frac{2\zeta_{4}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{2}} - \frac{\zeta_{5}}{\mu_{2}r_{1}} \\
\frac{3\mu_{1}\zeta_{1}r_{1}^{2}}{\overline{k}\zeta_{3}} + r_{1}^{3} & \frac{\mu_{1}}{\overline{k}} + r_{1} & \frac{3\mu_{2}\zeta_{4}r_{1}^{2}}{\overline{k}\zeta_{6}} - r_{1}^{3} & \frac{\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}} - r_{1} & -\frac{3\mu_{2}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{4}} - \frac{1}{r_{1}^{3}} & \frac{\zeta_{4}}{\overline{k}r_{1}^{2}} - \frac{1}{r_{1}} \\
0 & 0 & 2\mu_{2} & \frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{2}^{4}} & -\frac{4\zeta_{4}}{r_{2}^{2}} \\
0 & 0 & \frac{6\mu_{2}\zeta_{4}r_{2}^{2}}{\zeta_{6}} & 2\mu_{2} & -\frac{6\mu_{2}}{r_{2}^{4}} & \frac{2\zeta_{4}}{r_{2}^{2}}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(A.7)$$

59

59

where

597
$$\zeta_1 = \lambda_1 + \mu_1$$
, $\zeta_2 = \lambda_1 + 2\mu_1$, $\zeta_3 = 2\lambda_1 + 3\mu_1$, $\zeta_4 = \lambda_2 + \mu_2$, $\zeta_5 = \lambda_2 + 2\mu_2$, $\zeta_6 = 2\lambda_2 + 3\mu_2$.

References 598

1. Javili, A.: Variational formulation of generalized interfaces for finite deformation elasticity. Math. Mech. Solids 23, 303-322 599 (2017)600

"161_2019_796_Article" — 2019/5/30 — 7:06 — page 30 — #30

Bounds on size effects in composites via homogenization accounting

- Sanchez-Palencia, E.: Comportement limite d'un probleme de transmissiona travers une plaque faiblement conductrice.
 Comptes Rendus Mathematique Academie des Sciences 270, 1026–1028 (1970)
 - Pham Huy, H., Sanchez-Palencia, E.: Phénomènes de transmission à travers des couches minces de conductivitéélevée. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 47, 284–309 (1974)
 - 4. Hashin, Z.: Thin interphase/imperfect interface in conduction. J. Appl. Phys. 89, 2261–2267 (2001)
 - 5. Hill, R.: Elastic properties of reinforced solids: some theoretical principles. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 11, 357–372 (1963)
 - 6. Hill, R.: On constitutive macro-variables for heterogeneous solids at finite strain. Proc. R. Soc. A 326, 131-147 (1972)
 - 7. Ogden, R.W.: On the overall moduli of non-linear elastic composite materials. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 22, 541–553 (1974)
 - 8. Gurtin, M.E., Murdoch, A.I.: A continuum theory of elastic material surfaces. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 57, 291–323 (1975)
 - 9. Moeckel, G.P.: Thermodynamics of an interface. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 57, 255–280 (1975)
- 10. Murdoch, A.I.: A thermodynamical theory of elastic material interfaces. Q. J. Mech. Appl. Math. 29, 245–275 (1976)
- 11. Daher, N., Maugin, G.A.: The method of virtual power in continuum mechanics application to media presenting singular
 surfaces and interfaces. Acta Mechanica 60, 217–240 (1986)
- dell'Isola, F., Romano, A.: On the derivation of thermomechanical balance equations for continuous system with a nonmaterial interface. Int. J. Eng. Sci. 25, 1459–1468 (1987)
 - Fried, E., Gurtin, M.E.: Thermomechanics of the interface between a body and its environment. Contin. Mech. Thermodyn. 19, 253–271 (2007)
 - Klarbring, A.: Derivation of a model of adhesively bonded joints by the asymptotic expansion method. Int. J. Eng. Sci. 29, 493–512 (1991)
 - 15. Klarbring, A., Movchan, A.B.: Asymptotic modelling of adhesive joints. Mech. Mater. 28, 137–145 (1998)
 - Chen, T., Chiu, M.S., Weng, C.N.: Derivation of the generalized Young-Laplace equation of curved interfaces in nanoscaled solids. J. Appl. Phys. 100, 074308 (2006)
 - 17. Javili, A., McBride, A., Steinmann, P.: Thermomechanics of solids with lower-dimensional energetics: on the importance of surface, interface, and curve structures at the nanoscale. A unifying review. Appl. Mech. Rev. **65**, 010802 (2013a)
 - Javili, A.: A note on traction continuity across an interface in a geometrically non-linear framework. Math. Mech. Solids. https://doi.org/10.1177/1081286518766980
 - 19. Huang, Z.P., Sun, L.: Size-dependent effective properties of a heterogeneous material with interface energy effect: from finite deformation theory to infinitesimal strain analysis. Acta Mechanica **190**, 151–163 (2007)
- Huang, Z.P., Wang, J.: A theory of hyperelasticity of multi-phase media with surface/interface energy effect. Acta Mechanica
 182, 195–210 (2006)
- Altenbach, H., Eremeyev, V.A.: On the shell theory on the nanoscale with surface stresses. Int. J. Eng. Sci. 49, 1294–1301 (2011)
- Chhapadia, P., Mohammadi, P., Sharma, P.: Curvature-dependent surface energy and implications for nanostructures. J.
 Mech. Phys. Solids 59, 2103–2115 (2011)
- Cordero, N.M., Forest, S., Busso, E.P.: Second strain gradient elasticity of nano-objects. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 97, 92–124 (2016)
- Dingreville, R., Hallil, A., Berbenni, S.: From coherent to incoherent mismatched interfaces: a generalized continuum formulation of surface stresses. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 72, 40–60 (2014)
- Dingreville, R., Qu, J.: Interfacial excess energy, excess stress and excess strain in elastic solids: Planar interfaces. J. Mech.
 Phys. Solids 56, 1944–1954 (2008)
- 26. Duan, H.L., Wang, J., Karihaloo, B.L.: Theory of elasticity at the nanoscale. Adv. Appl. Mech. 42, 1–68 (2009)
- Fried, E., Todres, R.E.: Mind the gap: the shape of the free surface of a rubber-like material in proximity to a rigid contactor.
 J. Elast. 80, 97–151 (2005)
- Gurtin, M.E., Weissmüller, J., Larché, F.: A general theory of curved deformable interfaces in solids at equilibrium. Philos.
 Mag. A 78, 1093–1109 (1998)
- 29. Javili, A., Mcbride, A., Mergheim, J., Steinmann, P., Schmidt, U.: Micro-to-macro transitions for continua with surface
 structure at the microscale. Int. J. Solids Struct. 50, 2561–2572 (2013b)
- 30. Liu, L., Yu, M., Lin, H., Foty, R.: Deformation and relaxation of an incompressible viscoelastic body with surface vis coelasticity. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 98, 309–329 (2017)
- 31. Steigmann, D.J., Ogden, R.W.: Elastic surface-substrate interactions. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 455, 437-474 (1999)
- Wang, Z.Q., Zhao, Y.P., Huang, Z.P.: The effects of surface tension on the elastic properties of nano structures. Int. J. Eng.
 Sci. 48, 140–150 (2010)
- 33. Zhong, Z., Meguid, S.A.: On the elastic field of a spherical inhomogeneity with an imperfectly bonded interface. J. Elast.
 46, 91–113 (1997)
- Han, Z., Mogilevskaya, S.G., Schillinger, D.: Local fields and overall transverse properties of unidirectional composite
 materials with multiple nanofibers and SteigmannOgden interfaces. Int. J. Solids Struct. 147, 166–182 (2018)
- Fedotov, A.: Interface model of homogenization for analysing the influence of inclusion size on the elastic properties of
 composites. Compos. B Eng. 152, 241–247 (2018)
- 36. Barenblatt, G.I.: The formation of equilibrium cracks during brittle fracture. General ideas and hypotheses. Axiallysymmetric cracks. J. Appl. Math. Mech. **23**, 622–636 (1959)
- ⁶⁶² 37. Barenblatt, G.I.: The mathematical theory of equilibrium of crack in brittle fracture. Adv. Appl. Mech. **7**, 55–129 (1962)
- 38. Dugdale, D.S.: Yielding of steel sheets containing slits. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 8, 100–104 (1960)
- 39. Needleman, A.: A continuum model for void nucleation by inclusion debonding. J. Appl. Mech. 54, 525–531 (1987)
- 40. van den Bosch, M.J., Schreurs, P.J.G., Geers, M.G.D.: An improved description of the exponential Xu and Needleman cohesive zone law for mixed-mode decohesion. Eng. Fract. Mech. **73**, 1220–1234 (2006)
- 41. Wells, G.N., Sluys, L.J.: A new method for modelling cohesive cracks using finite elements. Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng.
 50, 2667–2682 (2001)

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

- 42. Remmers, J.J.C., de Borst, R., Needleman, A.: The simulation of dynamic crack propagation using the cohesive segments 669 method. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 56, 70-92 (2008) 670
- 43. Moës, N., Belytschko, T.: Extended finite element method for cohesive crack growth. Eng. Fract. Mech. 69, 813–833 (2002) 671 Alfano, G., Crisfield, M.A.: Finite element interface models for the delamination analysis of laminated composites: mechan-44. 672
- ical and computational issues. Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng. 50, 1701–1736 (2001) 673 45 Charlotte, M., Laverne, J., Marigo, J.J.: Initiation of cracks with cohesive force models: a variational approach. Eur. J. 674
 - Mech. A/Solids 25, 649-669 (2006)
 - Despringre, N., Chemisky, Y., Bonnay, K., Meraghni, F.: Micromechanical modeling of damage and load transfer in 46. particulate composites with partially debonded interface. Compos. Struct. 155, 77-88 (2016)
- Dimitri, R., Trullo, M., De Lorenzis, L., Zavarise, G.: Coupled cohesive zone models for mixed-mode fracture: a comparative 47 678 study. Eng. Fract. Mech. 148, 145-179 (2015)
 - 48 Fagerström, M., Larsson, R.: Theory and numerics for finite deformation fracture modelling using strong discontinuities. Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng. 66, 911–948 (2006)
 - 49 Gasser, T.C., Holzapfel, G.A.: Geometrically non-linear and consistently linearized embedded strong discontinuity models for 3D problems with an application to the dissection analysis of soft biological tissues. Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng. 192, 5059-5098 (2003)
 - 50. Ortiz, M., Pandolfi, A.: Finite-deformation irreversible cohesive elements for three-dimensional crack-propagation analysis. Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng. 1282, 1267-1282 (1999)
 - 51. Park, K., Paulino, G.H.: Cohesive zone models: a critical review of traction-separation relationships across fracture surfaces. Appl. Mech. Rev. 64, 060802 (2011)
 - 52 Park, K., Paulino, G.H., Roesler, J.R.: A unified potential-based cohesive model of mixed-mode fracture. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 57, 891-908 (2009)
 - 53. Tijssens, M.G.A., Sluys, B.L.J., Van der Giessen, E.: Numerical simulation of quasi-brittle fracture using damaging cohesive surfaces. Eur. J. Mech. A/Solids 19, 761-779 (2000)
- 54 Wu, C., Gowrishankar, S., Huang, R., Liechti, K.M.: On determining mixed-mode traction-separation relations for inter-603 faces. Int. J. Fract. 202, 1-19 (2016) 694
- Qian, J., Lin, J., Xu, G.K., Lin, Y., Gao, H.: Thermally assisted peeling of an elastic strip in adhesion with a substrate via 55. 695 molecular bonds. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 101, 197-208 (2017) 696
- 56 Wang, J., Duan, H.L., Zhang, Z., Huang, Z.P.: An anti-interpenetration model and connections between interphase and 697 interface models in particle-reinforced composites. Int. J. Mech. Sci. 47, 701-718 (2005) 698
- 57 Mosler, J., Scheider, I.: A thermodynamically and variationally consistent class of damage-type cohesive models. J. Mech. 699 Phys. Solids 59, 1647–1668 (2011) 700
- Hashin, Z.: Thin interphase/imperfect interface in elasticity with application to coated fiber composites. J. Mech. Phys. 701 58. Solids 50, 2509–2537 (2002) 702
- Benveniste, Y.: A general interface model for a three-dimensional curved thin anisotropic interphase between two anisotropic 59. 703 media. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 54, 708-734 (2006) 704
- Benveniste, Y.: Models of thin interphases with variable moduli in plane-strain elasticity. Math. Mech. Solids 18, 119-134 60 705 (2013)706
- Benveniste, Y., Miloh, T.: Imperfect soft and stiff interfaces in two-dimensional elasticity. Mech. Mater. 33, 309-323 (2001) 61 707
- 708 Gu, S.T., He, Q.C.: Interfacial discontinuity relations for coupled multifield phenomena and their application to the modeling of thin interphases as imperfect interfaces. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 59, 1413–1426 (2011) 709
- 710 63. Gu, S.T., Monteiro, E., He, Q.C.: Coordinate-free derivation and weak formulation of a general imperfect interface model for thermal conduction in composites. Compos. Sci. Technol. 71, 1209–1216 (2011) 711
- 64 Monchiet, V., Bonnet, G.: Interfacial models in viscoplastic composites materials. Int. J. Eng. Sci. 48, 1762–1768 (2010) 712
- Chatzigeorgiou, G., Meraghni, F., Javili, A.: Generalized interfacial energy and size effects in composites. J. Mech. Phys. 713 65. Solids 106, 257-282 (2017) 714
- Gu, S.T., Liu, J.T., He, Q.C.: Size-dependent effective elastic moduli of particulate composites with interfacial displacement 66 715 and traction discontinuities. Int. J. Solids Struct. 51, 2283-2296 (2014) 716
- Koutsawa, Y., Karatrantos, A., Yu, W., Ruch, D.: A micromechanics approach for the effective thermal conductivity of 67. 717 composite materials with general linear imperfect interfaces. Compos. Struct. 200, 747-756 (2018) 718
- 68 Firooz, S., Javili, A.: Understanding the role of general interfaces in the overall behavior of composites and size effects. 719 Comput. Mater. Sci. 162, 245–254 (2019) 720
- 69 Brisard, S., Dormieux, L., Kondo, D.: Hashin-Shtrikman bounds on the shear modulus of a nanocomposite with spherical 721 inclusions and interface effects. Comput. Mater. Sci. 50, 403-410 (2010) 722
- Chatzigeorgiou, G., Javili, A., Steinmann, P.: Multiscale modelling for composites with energetic interfaces at the micro-70. 723 or nanoscale. Math. Mech. Solids 20, 1130-1145 (2015) 724
- Duan, H.L., Karihaloo, B.L.: Effective thermal conductivities of heterogeneous media containing multiple imperfectly 71 725 bonded inclusions. Phys. Rev. B 75, 064206 (2007) 726
- Duan, H.L., Wang, J., Huang, Z.P., Karihaloo, B.L.: Size-dependent effective elastic constants of solids containing nano-72. 727 inhomogeneities with interface stress. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 53, 1574-1596 (2005) 728
- Lim, C.W., Li, Z.R., He, L.H.: Size dependent, non-uniform elastic field inside a nano-scale spherical inclusion due to 73. 729 interface stress. Int. J. Solids Struct. 43, 5055-5065 (2006) 730
- Mogilevskaya, S.G., Crouch, S.L., Stolarski, H.K.: Multiple interacting circular nano-inhomogeneities with sur-74. 731 732 face/interface effects. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 56, 2298-2327 (2008)
- Nazarenko, L., Bargmann, S., Stolarski, H.: Closed-form formulas for the effective properties of random particulate 75. 733 734 nanocomposites with complete Gurtin-Murdoch model of material surfaces. Contin. Mech. Thermodyn. 29, 77-96 (2017)
- 76. Sharma, P.: Size-dependent elastic fields of embedded inclusions in isotropic chiral solids. Int. J. Solids Struct. 41, 6317-735 736 6333 (2004)

675

676

677

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

- 77. Sharma, P., Ganti, S., Bhate, N.: Effect of surfaces on the size-dependent elastic state of nano-inhomogeneities. Appl. Phys. 737 Lett. 82, 535-537 (2003) 738 739
- 78. Sharma, P., Wheeler, L.T.: Size-dependent elastic state of ellipsoidal nano-inclusions incorporating surface/interface tension. J. Appl. Mech. 74, 447–454 (2007) 740 741
 - 79. Tian, L., Rajapakse, R.K.N.D.: Analytical solution for size-dependent elastic field of a nanoscale circular inhomogeneity. J. Appl. Mech. 74, 568–574 (2007)
 - 80. Fritzen, F., Leuschner, M.: Nonlinear reduced order homogenization of materials including cohesive interfaces. Comput. Mech. 56, 131-151 (2015)
 - Javili, A., dell'Isola, F., Steinmann, P.: Geometrically nonlinear higher-gradient elasticity with energetic boundaries. J. 81. Mech. Phys. Solids 61, 2381-2401 (2013c)
 - Monteiro, E., He, Q.C., Yvonnet, J.: Hyperelastic large deformations of two-phase composites with membrane-type inter-82 face. Int. J. Eng. Sci. 49, 985-1000 (2011)
 - Tu, W., Pindera, M.J.: Cohesive zone-based damage evolution in periodic materials via finite-volume homogenization. J. 83. Appl. Mech. 81, 101005 (2014)
 - Yvonnet, J., Quang, H.L., He, Q.C.: An XFEM/level set approach to modelling surface/interface effects and to computing 84. the size-dependent effective properties of nanocomposites. Comput. Mech. 42, 119–131 (2008)
- Davydov, D., Javili, A., Steinmann, P.: On molecular statics and surface-enhanced continuum modeling of nano-structures. 753 85. Comput. Mater. Sci. 69, 510-519 (2013) 754
 - Elsner, B.A.M., Müller, S., Bargmann, S., Weissmüller, J.: Surface excess elasticity of gold: Ab initio coefficients and 86 impact on the effective elastic response of nanowires. Acta Materialia 124, 468-477 (2017)
- He, J., Lilley, C.M.: Surface effect on the elastic behavior of static bending nanowires. Nano Lett. 8, 1798–1802 (2008) 87 757
- Levitas, V.I., Samani, K.: Size and mechanics effects in surface-induced melting of nanoparticles. Nature Commun. 2, 758 88. 284-286 (2011) 759 760
 - Olsson, P.A.T., Park, H.S.: On the importance of surface elastic contributions to the flexural rigidity of nanowires. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 60, 2064-2083 (2012)
- Park, H.S., Klein, P.A.: Surface stress effects on the resonant properties of metal nanowires: the importance of finite 90. deformation kinematics and the impact of the residual surface stress. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 56, 3144-3166 (2008) 763
- Javili, A., Steinmann, P., Mosler, J.: Micro-to-macro transition accounting for general imperfect interfaces. Comput. Methods 764 Appl. Mech. Eng. 317, 274–317 (2017) 765
- 92. McBride, A., Mergheim, J., Javili, A., Steinmann, P., Bargmann, S.: Micro-to-macro transitions for heterogeneous material 766 layers accounting for in-plane stretch. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 60, 1221–1239 (2012) 767
- Saeb, S., Steinmann, P., Javili, A.: Aspects of computational homogenization at finite deformations: a unifying review from 768 93. Reuss' to Voigt's Bound. Appl. Mech. Rev. 68, 050801 (2016) 769
- 94. Kanouté, P., Boso, D.P., Chaboche, J.L., Schrefler, B.A.: Multiscale methods for composites: a review. Arch. Comput. 770 Methods Eng. 16, 31-75 (2009) 771
- Charalambakis, N., Chatzigeorgiou, G., Chemisky, Y., Meraghni, F.: Mathematical homogenization of inelastic dissipative 95 772 materials: a survey and recent progress. Contin. Mech. Thermodyn. 30, 1-51 (2018) 773
- 774 96. Matouš, K., Geers, M.G.D., Kouznetsova, V.G., Gillman, A.: A review of predictive nonlinear theories for multiscale modeling of heterogeneous materials. J. Comput. Phys. 330, 192-220 (2017) 775
- 97. Chen, Q., Wang, G., Pindera, M.J.: Homogenization and localization of nanoporous composites-A critical review and 776 new developments. Compos. B Eng. 155, 329-368 (2018) 777
- 778 98. Pindera, M.J., Khatam, H., Drago, A.S., Bansal, Y.: Micromechanics of spatially uniform heterogeneous media: a critical review and emerging approaches. Compos. B Eng. 40, 349-378 (2009) 779
- 99 Khisaeva, Z.F., Ostoja-Starzewski, M.: On the size of RVE in finite elasticity of random composites. J. Elast. 85, 153-173 780 (2006)781
- 100. Temizer, I., Zohdi, T.I.: A numerical method for homogenization in non-linear elasticity. Comput. Mech. 40, 281-298 782 (2007)783
- 101. Gitman, I.M., Askes, H., Aifantis, E.C.: The representative volume size in static and dynamic micro-macro transitions. Int. 784 J. Fract. 135, 3-9 (2005) 785
- Kanit, T., Forest, S., Galliet, I., Mounoury, V., Jeulin, D.: Determination of the size of the representative volume element 102786 for random composites: statistical and numerical approach. Int. J. Solids Struct. 40, 3647–3679 (2003) 787
- 103. Firooz, S., Saeb, S., Chatzigeorgiou, G., Meraghni, F., Steinmann, P., Javili, A.: Systematic study of homogeniza-788 tion and the utility of circular simplified representative volume element. Math. Mech. Solids. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 789 1081286518823834 790
- 104. Chatzigeorgiou, G., Seidel, G.D., Lagoudas, D.C.: Effective mechanical properties of "fuzzy fiber" composites. Compos. 791 B 43, 2577–2593 (2012) 792
- 105. Dinzart, F., Sabar, H.: New micromechanical modeling of the elastic behavior of composite materials with ellipsoidal 793 reinforcements and imperfect interfaces. Int. J. Solids Struct. 108, 254-262 (2017) 794
- Christensen, R.M., Lo, K.H.: Solutions for effective shear properties in three phase sphere and cylinder models. J. Mech. 795 106Phys. Solids 27, 315-330 (1979) 796
- 107. Hashin, Z., Rosen, B.W.: The elastic moduli of fiber-reinforced materials. J. Appl. Mech. 31, 223–232 (1964) 797
- Duan, H.L., Yi, X., Huang, Z.P., Wang, J.: A unified scheme for prediction of effective moduli of multiphase composites 798 108. with interface effects. Part I: Theoretical framework. Mech. Mater. 39, 81-93 (2007) 799
- 800 109Eshelby, J.D.: The determination of the elastic field of an ellipsoidal inclusion, and related problems. Proc. R. Soc. A 241, 376-396 (1957) 801
- 802 110. Benveniste, Y., Dvorak, G.J., Chen, T.: Stress fields in composites with coated inclusions. Mech. Mater. 7, 305–317 (1989)
- Wang, Z., Oelkers, R.J., Lee, K.C., Fisher, F.T.: Annular coated inclusion model and applications for polymer 111. 803 804 nanocomposites-Part I: Spherical inclusions. Mech. Mater. 101, 170-184 (2016a)

742 743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

755

756

761

- ⁸⁰⁵ 112. Wang, Z., Oelkers, R.J., Lee, K.C., Fisher, F.T.: Annular coated inclusion model and applications for polymer ⁸⁰⁶ nanocomposites-Part II: Cylindrical inclusions. Mech. Mater. **101**, 50–60 (2016b)
- Benveniste, Y., Dvorak, G.J., Chen, T.: On diagonal and elastic symmetry of the approximate effective stiffness tensor of
 heterogeneous media. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 39(7), 927–946 (1991)
- 114. Hashin, Z.: Thermoelastic properties of fiber composites with imperfect interface. Mech. Mater. 8, 333–348 (1990)

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

| Journal: 161 | |
|--------------|--|
| Article: | |

Author Query Form

Please ensure you fill out your response to the queries raised below and return this form along with your corrections

Dear Author

During the process of typesetting your article, the following queries have arisen. Please check your typeset proof carefully against the queries listed below and mark the necessary changes either directly on the proof/online grid or in the 'Author's response' area provided below

| Query | Details required | Author's response |
|-------|---|-------------------|
| 1. | Please check that the terms 'micro-structure' and 'micro-scale' have been changed to 'microstruc- ture' and 'microscale' respectively in the article | |