

## Variational models for peeling problems

FRANCESCO MADDALENA<sup>†</sup>

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Bari, via Re David 200, 70125 Bari, Italy*

DANILO PERCIVALE<sup>‡</sup>

*Dipartimento di Ingegneria della Produzione Termoenergetica e Modelli Matematici,  
Università di Genova, Piazzale Kennedy, Fiera del Mare, Padiglione D, 16129 Genova, Italy*

[Received 18 April 2007 and in revised form 20 February 2008]

We study variational models for flexural beams and plates interacting with a rigid substrate through an adhesive layer. The general structure of the minimizers is investigated and some properties characterizing the system's dependence on the load and the material stiffnesses are discussed.

### Introduction

Adhesion phenomena constitute a very challenging area of research from both the theoretical and applied points of view. The physics underlying the adhesion crucially depends on the properties at the microscale level of the material constituting the adhesive (usually polymers in the case of artificial adhesives) and the properties of the surfaces of the jointed bodies. In recent years the problems posed by the miniaturization technology, as in the case of microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) (see the review [22]) or, more generally by nanotechnology, as well as the understanding of the role played by adhesion and elasticity in biophysics (see [8], [12], [6]) have pointed out the need of rational accurate models capturing the essentials of the complex phenomena involved in the adhesion problems. At the macroscopic level the energy of peeling off a deformable material body from a rigid substrate (i.e. another material body assumed to be rigid) incorporates an *adhesion* energy and an *elastic* energy. Indeed, starting from the essential analysis of J. Eriksen carried out in [4, Chapter 7.3], the problem of peeling off a thin (extensible or inextensible) tape has been investigated in the context of continuum mechanics by using a variational formulation (see [16], [5], [2], [7], [17], [18]), and more recently also the dynamics of these phenomena has been investigated (see [13]). Much of these works assume a membrane-like behavior for the elastic body and consider the adhesion energy as a linear function of the measure of the detached zone.

In this paper we study, in the classical setting of calculus of variations, the peeling problem for flexural elastic beams and plates. In particular, we consider a linear elastic behavior of the Bernoulli–Navier beam and the Kirchhoff–Love plate and we assume the adhesion energy is modeled by a continuous monotone function of the measure of the detached zone. In the case of elastic beams we get a detailed characterization of the structure of the minimizers which allows us to study the quasistatic evolution of the system when an increasing load is supposed to act. In the case of elastic plates we get two key estimates which characterize the regimes of the system in which the plate is completely detached or completely bonded, in dependence on the value of the load. In both the

<sup>†</sup>E-mail: f.maddalena@poliba.it

<sup>‡</sup>E-mail: percivale@diptem.unige.it

problems it is seen that a crucial role is played by the growth exponent affecting the constitutive assumption characterizing the adhesive material, which can be thought of as synthesizing the macroscopic counterpart of the peculiarities at the microscale. Indeed, different choices of the exponent lead to different behaviors of the system.

### 1. Preliminaries and notation

In this paper  $H^2(\Omega)$  will denote the Sobolev space of functions  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  whose weak second partial derivatives are in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . Moreover, let  $BV(\Omega)$  be the space of functions with bounded variation, i.e.  $u \in L^1(\Omega)$  whose partial derivatives in the sense of distributions are measures with finite total variation in  $\Omega$  (see [1], [11]). Now we recall that the perimeter  $P_\Omega(E)$  of a set  $E$  relative to  $\Omega$  is defined as the total variation of the measure  $D\mathbf{1}_{E \cap \Omega}$ , where  $\mathbf{1}_{E \cap \Omega}$  denotes the characteristic function of the set  $E \cap \Omega$ . Finally, we introduce the perimeter of  $E$  relative to the closed set  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega$ , namely

$$P_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega}(E) = \inf\{P_G(E) \mid G \text{ open}, (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega) \subset G\}.$$

### 2. Peeling off elastic beams

In the following we shall consider the case of a linearly elastic flexural beam, under the Bernoulli–Navier hypothesis, interacting with a rigid foundation which occupies the lower half space  $y \leq 0$  through a thin adhesion layer. Let the beam occupy the interval  $[0, L]$  in its reference configuration and let  $u : [0, L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the displacement function measuring the vertical deflection of the beam. The elastic potential energy is given by

$$W_e(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L k_b |u''|^2 dx, \quad (1)$$

where  $k_b = EI$  denotes the flexural rigidity of the beam,  $E$  is the Young modulus and  $I$  is the inertia moment of the cross section. In order to model the energy released by detachment between the beam and the rigid substrate let us introduce the set

$$\Sigma_u = \{x \in [0, L] \mid u(x) > 0\}$$

and let  $|\Sigma_u|$  be the Lebesgue measure of  $\Sigma_u$ . We define the adhesion potential as

$$W_a(u) = \vartheta(L^{-1}|\Sigma_u|), \quad (2)$$

where  $\vartheta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is assumed to be continuous and strictly increasing with  $\vartheta(0) = 0$ . Let us assume the beam is subjected to a given load  $f$  applied at the right end  $x = L$ . Then the load potential takes the form

$$W_l(u) = -fu(L). \quad (3)$$

Therefore the total potential energy is given by

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = W_e(u) + W_a(u) + W_l(u)$$

and so, according to the Gibbs Principle, stable equilibrium configurations of the beam are minimizers of the functional

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L k_b |u''|^2 dx + \vartheta(L^{-1}|\Sigma_u|) - fu(L) \quad (4)$$

among the functions  $u \in \mathcal{A} = \{u \in H^2(0, L) \mid u(0) = 0, u(x) \geq 0\}$ . It is worth noticing that if  $f \leq 0$  then  $u \equiv 0$  is the only trivial minimizer and therefore we will assume without loss of generality that  $f > 0$ .

We are going to apply the direct methods of the calculus of variations to establish the existence of solutions for this minimization problem.

**LEMMA 2.1** (Lower semicontinuity of  $W_a$ ) The functional  $W_a$  defined in (2) is sequentially weakly lower semicontinuous in  $H^2(0, L)$ , i.e. if  $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to  $u$  in  $H^2(0, L)$ , then

$$W_a(u) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} W_a(u_k).$$

*Proof.* Let  $u_k \rightharpoonup u$  in  $H^2(0, L)$ , with  $u_k \geq 0$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $u \geq 0$  and  $u_k \rightarrow u$  uniformly in  $[0, L]$ . Therefore we have

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\Sigma_{u_k}| \geq |\Sigma_u|.$$

Then by virtue of the monotonicity and continuity properties of  $\vartheta$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \vartheta(L^{-1}|\Sigma_{u_k}|) &= \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{k \geq j} \vartheta(L^{-1}|\Sigma_{u_k}|) \geq \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \vartheta(\inf_{k \geq j} L^{-1}|\Sigma_{u_k}|) \\ &= \vartheta(\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} L^{-1}|\Sigma_{u_k}|) \geq \vartheta(L^{-1}|\Sigma_u|). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**THEOREM 2.2** (Existence of minimizers)  $\mathcal{F}$  admits a minimum in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof.* Let us observe that  $W_e$  and  $W_l$  are trivially l.s.c. Then by Lemma 2.1 we deduce the lower semicontinuity of  $\mathcal{F}$ , and a standard compactness argument yields the result.  $\square$

### 2.1 Structure of the minimizers

In this section we focus on the essential properties of the solutions of the problem of minimizing the functional  $\mathcal{F}$  given by (4) in the class  $\mathcal{A}$ , for a given value of the load  $f$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.3** Let  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{F}$ . Then there exists  $\xi \in [0, L]$  such that  $\Sigma_u = [\xi, L]$ . In particular,  $u'(\xi) = 0$  and  $u(x) = 0$  in  $[0, \xi]$ .

*Proof.* Let us observe that, since  $u$  is continuous,  $\Sigma_u$  is open in  $[0, L]$ . Moreover we claim that there is no interval  $]\alpha, \beta[$  with  $0 < \alpha < \beta < L$  such that  $]\alpha, \beta[ \supset \Sigma_u$ . Indeed, if this were not true, we could take  $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{A}$  defined as follows:

$$\tilde{u}(x) = \begin{cases} u(x) & \text{if } x \in [0, L] \setminus (\alpha, \beta), \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in (\alpha, \beta), \end{cases}$$

to obtain the inequality  $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{u}) < \mathcal{F}(u)$ , which yields a contradiction since  $u$  is a minimizer. Finally,  $u'(\xi) = 0$  since  $u \in H^2(0, L)$ .  $\square$

The previous results allow us to state that if  $u \in \mathcal{A}$  minimizes  $\mathcal{F}$  then it can be completely characterized in a form which depends on the detachment variable  $\xi$ , as we are going to prove in the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.4 Let  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{F}$ . Then

$$u(x) = \frac{f}{k_b}(x - \bar{\xi})^2 \left( -\frac{x}{6} + \frac{L}{2} - \frac{\bar{\xi}}{3} \right) \mathbf{1}_{[\bar{\xi}, L]}(x) \quad (5)$$

where  $\bar{\xi}$  is a global minimizer of

$$F(\xi) = \vartheta \left( 1 - \frac{\xi}{L} \right) - \frac{f^2 L^3}{6k_b} \left( 1 - \frac{\xi}{L} \right)^3 \quad (6)$$

in  $[0, L]$ .

*Proof.* If  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{F}$  then by Proposition 2.3, for some  $0 < \xi < L$  the total energy takes the form

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\xi}^L k_b |u''|^2 dx + \vartheta \left( 1 - \frac{\xi}{L} \right) - fu(L). \quad (7)$$

Then  $u$  minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\xi}^L k_b |v''|^2 dx - fv(L) \quad (8)$$

among all  $v \in H^2(\xi, L)$  such that  $v \geq 0$  and  $v(\xi) = v'(\xi) = 0$ . By taking into account that  $f > 0$ , it is readily seen that any minimizer of (7) among all such  $v$  is nonnegative, and therefore standard first variation of (7) shows that

$$\begin{cases} v''''(x) = 0 & \forall x \in (\xi, L), \\ v(\xi) = v'(\xi) = 0, \\ v''(L) = 0, v'''(L) = -f/k_b. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

It is easy to check that the unique solution  $u$  of (9) is given by

$$u(x) = \frac{f}{k_b}(x - \xi)^2 \left( -\frac{x}{6} + \frac{L}{2} - \frac{\xi}{3} \right), \quad x > \xi. \quad (10)$$

By substituting (10) in (7) we obtain the minimum energy in dependence on the free boundary point  $\xi \in [0, L]$ , that is,

$$F(\xi) = \mathcal{F}(u) = \vartheta \left( 1 - \frac{\xi}{L} \right) - \frac{f^2 L^3}{6k_b} \left( 1 - \frac{\xi}{L} \right)^3, \quad (11)$$

hence

$$\min \mathcal{F} = \min \{ F(\xi) \mid \xi \in [0, L] \}, \quad (12)$$

thus completing the proof.  $\square$

Then a complete understanding of the analytical properties of the energy minimizers leads to study the minimization problem

$$\min \{ F(\xi) \mid \xi \in [0, L] \}, \quad (13)$$

and the value of  $\xi$  minimizing  $F$  fully characterizes the detachment region  $\Sigma_u = [\xi, L]$ , for a given value of the load  $f$ .

For the sake of convenience and to simplify notations, we introduce the normalized variable  $\zeta = 1 - \xi/L$ , and so, after changing variable, (6) becomes

$$G(\zeta) = \vartheta(\zeta) - \frac{f^2 L^3}{6k_b} \zeta^3 \quad (14)$$

with  $\zeta \in [0, 1]$ .

Since the uniqueness of  $\zeta$  minimizing  $G$  given by (14) depends on the constitutive choice of the adhesion potential  $\vartheta$ , we wish to say a few words about this uniqueness question. Obviously, strict convexity of  $G$  leads to uniqueness of the minimum  $\zeta$ . Otherwise, different choices of  $\vartheta$  may lead to multiple minima. Indeed, if for instance we take

$$\vartheta(\zeta) = \frac{f^2 L^3}{6k_b} \left( \zeta^3 + \zeta^2 \left( \zeta - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right),$$

which satisfies the assumptions of monotonicity and vanishing at zero, it is easy to see that the function  $G$  in (14) has two different minima, at  $\zeta = 0$  and  $\zeta = 1/2$ . Therefore, to study stable equilibrium configurations one has to choose a suitable form of the adhesion potential. In particular, we shall assume a power law for  $\vartheta$  and, in the next section, we will focus on suitable growth of  $\vartheta$  with the aim of distinguishing between stable and metastable configurations.

## 2.2 Growth conditions and stability analysis

We claim that different growth assumptions on  $\vartheta$  give rise to different constitutive properties of the peeling model. In particular, we can characterize the stability of the equilibrium configurations in dependence on the growth properties of  $\vartheta$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.5** Let  $\alpha \in (0, 3]$ , and assume that for every  $\zeta \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\vartheta(\zeta) = c|\zeta|^\alpha$$

for some constant  $c > 0$ . Set  $f_{\text{cr}} = \sqrt{6ck_b/L^3}$ . Then, for  $0 \leq f < f_{\text{cr}}$ ,  $G(\zeta)$  achieves its minimum at  $\zeta = 0$ , and for  $f > f_{\text{cr}}$  it achieves its minimum at  $\zeta = 1$ .

*Proof.* We see that, for  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ ,

$$G''(\zeta) = c\alpha(\alpha - 1)\zeta^{\alpha-2} - \frac{f^2 L^3}{k_b} \zeta \leq 0 \quad \forall \zeta \in [0, 1].$$

Hence  $G(\zeta)$  is concave and for  $0 \leq f < f_{\text{cr}}$  we have  $G(1) > 0$ , and so the minimum point is  $\zeta = 0$ , since  $G(0) = 0$ . If  $f > f_{\text{cr}}$ , then  $G(1) < 0$ , and so the minimum point is  $\zeta = 1$ . If  $1 < \alpha < 3$ , then  $G(\zeta)$  has two critical points, namely  $\zeta = 0$  and  $\zeta = \bar{\zeta}$  with

$$\bar{\zeta} = \left( \frac{2\alpha ck_b}{f^2 L^3} \right)^{1/(3-\alpha)}, \quad G'(\bar{\zeta}) = 0, \quad G''(\bar{\zeta}) < 0.$$

For  $0 < f < f_{\text{cr}}$  we have  $G(1) > 0$  and the minimum is at  $\zeta = 0$ , while for  $f > f_{\text{cr}}$ ,  $G(1) < 0$ , and so the minimum is at  $\zeta = 1$ . Finally, if  $\alpha = 3$  then  $G''(\zeta) = \zeta(6c - f^2 L^3/k_b)$ , and thus, by a convexity argument, we obtain the result.  $\square$

PROPOSITION 2.6 Let  $\alpha > 3$  and assume that for every  $\zeta \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\vartheta(\zeta) = c|\zeta|^\alpha$$

for some constant  $c > 0$ . Set  $f_{\text{cr}}^\alpha = \sqrt{2\alpha ck_b/L^3}$ . Then for every  $0 < f < f_{\text{cr}}^\alpha$  there exists a unique  $\bar{\zeta} \in (0, 1)$  such that  $G(\zeta)$  achieves its minimum at  $\bar{\zeta}$ . For every  $f \geq f_{\text{cr}}^\alpha$ ,  $G(\zeta)$  achieves its minimum at  $\zeta = 1$ .

*Proof.* We see that

$$G'(\zeta) = \zeta^2 \left( \alpha c \zeta^{\alpha-3} - \frac{f^2 L^3}{2k_b} \right)$$

and so  $G'(\zeta) = 0$  for  $\zeta = 0$  and for  $\zeta = \bar{\zeta}$  with

$$\bar{\zeta} = \left( \frac{f^2 L^3}{2\alpha ck_b} \right)^{1/(\alpha-3)}. \quad (15)$$

Clearly, it is easy to verify that  $\bar{\zeta} \in (0, 1)$  for  $0 < f < f_{\text{cr}}^\alpha$ . Moreover,  $G''(\bar{\zeta}) > 0$  and  $G(\bar{\zeta}) < 0$ , and therefore  $\bar{\zeta} \in (0, 1)$  is the absolute minimizer of  $G$ . Finally, for  $f \geq f_{\text{cr}}^\alpha$ ,  $G(\zeta)$  is decreasing in  $[0, 1]$ , and so the minimum is at  $\zeta = 1$ .  $\square$

REMARK 2.7 It is easy to check that a slight generalization of Proposition 2.5 leads to stating that for  $1 < \alpha < 3$ , if the adhesive has any constitutive function  $\vartheta$  such that  $c_1 \zeta^\alpha < \vartheta(\zeta) < c_2 \zeta^\alpha$  for some positive  $0 < c_1 < c_2$ , then for  $0 \leq f < \sqrt{6c_1 k_b/L^3}$  the minimum of  $G$  is attained at  $\zeta = 0$ .

The above results allow us to single out two different regimes of behavior of the mechanical system, according to the constitutive assumptions on the adhesive material. In the case of slow growth condition, by Proposition 2.5 the system exhibits a *catastrophe-like* behavior depending on the critical value  $f_{\text{cr}}$ . Indeed, when  $f = f_{\text{cr}}$ , the beam can be completely attached to or completely detached from the rigid support, the two configurations being energetically equivalent. In other words, we have a bifurcation of the equilibrium and no partial detachment is allowed. In the case of fast growth condition, Proposition 2.6 tells us that, for every value of the force  $f$ , the minimizer  $u$  of (4) is a stable equilibrium configuration of the beam and the free boundary  $\xi$  is a continuous and increasing function of  $f$ . Furthermore, by looking at (15) we notice that  $\bar{\zeta} = O(f^{2/(\alpha-3)})$ , while a simple computation gives, for the maximum elastic displacement, the relation

$$u_{\text{max}} = \frac{f(L - \xi)^3}{3k_b} = O(f).$$

Therefore, for  $\alpha$  sufficiently large, if an equilibrium configuration has  $u \neq 0$  and  $\xi \neq 1$  and we let  $f$  increase quasistatically, then the elastic maximum displacement  $u_{\text{max}}$  becomes very large, before the variation of  $\xi$  becomes appreciable. Since beyond certain values of the maximum displacement the material fails to behave elastically, we are led to study constitutive models which take into account phenomena beyond the elastic range; this will be the subject of [10] where we will consider an elastic-plastic energetic model for the beam (see [14], [15]). Finally, we remark that a more complex behavior of the system, regarding the mechanical stability, can be captured by assuming for  $\vartheta$  varying growth law like, for instance, those of hardening or softening type.

### 2.3 General load conditions

In this section we assume the beam is loaded with a vertical force and an end moment. Before studying the combined effect, we now assume that the beam is subjected to a moment  $M$  acting at the end  $x = L$ . Then

$$W_l(u) = -Mu'(L).$$

We set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = W_e + W_a - Mu'(L).$$

Analogously to the previous section, we can prove the following result.

**THEOREM 2.8** Let  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ . Then

$$u(x) = \frac{M}{2k_b}(x - \bar{\xi})^2, \quad (16)$$

where  $\bar{\xi}$  is a global minimizer of

$$F(u) = \vartheta \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{L}\right) - \frac{M^2 L}{2k_b} \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{L}\right). \quad (17)$$

*Proof.* If  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ , then

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\xi}^L k_b |u''|^2 dx + \vartheta \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{L}\right) - Mu'(L).$$

Therefore, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2.4, we can say that  $u$  satisfies the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} u''''(x) = 0 & \forall x \in (\xi, L), \\ u(\xi) = u'(\xi) = 0, \\ u''(L) = M/k_b, \\ u'''(L) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

The solution of (18) is

$$u(x) = \frac{M}{2k_b}(x - \xi)^2, \quad (19)$$

and so the minimum of the energy in dependence on the free boundary  $\xi \in [0, L]$  is given by

$$F(\xi) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(u) = \vartheta \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{L}\right) - \frac{M^2 L}{2k_b} \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{L}\right).$$

Finally, minimizing with respect to  $\xi$  we obtain the result.  $\square$

The same analysis carried out in Section 2.2 leads to study the function  $G : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$G(\zeta) = \vartheta(\zeta) - \frac{M^2 L}{2k_b} \zeta \quad (20)$$

obtained as (14). As in Section 2.2 we assume that  $\vartheta(\zeta) = c|\zeta|^\alpha$  for some  $c > 0$  and we discuss the stability conditions by varying  $\alpha$ . In this case, for  $\alpha \in ]0, 1]$  the minimum of  $G$  is achieved at  $\zeta = 0$  or  $\zeta = 1$  and so the system exhibits a catastrophe-like behavior. Specifically for  $0 < \alpha < 1$ ,  $G$  has the minimum at  $\zeta = 0$ , while for  $\alpha = 1$  the minimum point is  $\zeta = 0$  if  $M \leq M_{cr} = \sqrt{2ck_b/L}$ , and  $\zeta = 1$  if  $M \geq M_{cr}$ . Obviously for  $M = M_{cr}$  we have a bifurcation point. If  $\alpha > 1$  then the minimum point of  $G$  is  $\zeta = 0$  for every value of  $M$ .

Finally, when the load condition is given by assigning both the force and the moment at  $x = L$ , the previous results allow us to conclude that the stability analysis falls in the range of Section 2.2, and so if the adhesive is modeled by the constitutive law  $\vartheta(\zeta) = |\zeta|^\alpha$ , the critical threshold is  $\alpha = 3$ . Indeed, roughly speaking, the moment offers a low order contribution, as we have just observed.

2.4 Local minimizers

The stability analysis carried out in the previous section involves only global minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}$ . However, a careful analysis of a quasistatic evolution of the mechanical system requires detecting the presence of local minimizers, which we are going to study in this section.

DEFINITION 2.9 We say that  $u \in \mathcal{A}$  is a local minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}$  if there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $v \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\|v - u\|_{H^2} < \delta$  we have  $\mathcal{F}(u) \leq \mathcal{F}(v)$ .

The main result of this section is the following

THEOREM 2.10 A function  $u \in \mathcal{A}$  is a local minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}$  if either  $u \equiv 0$  or

$$u(x) = \frac{f}{6k_b}(3L - 2\bar{\xi} - x)(x - \bar{\xi})^2 \mathbf{1}_{(\bar{\xi}, L]} \tag{21}$$

where  $\bar{\xi} \in [0, L)$  is a local minimizer of the function

$$\xi \mapsto \vartheta\left(1 - \frac{\xi}{L}\right) - \frac{f^2 L^3}{6k_b} \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{L}\right)^3. \tag{22}$$

The proof of the above theorem requires some preliminary lemmas.

LEMMA 2.11 Assume that  $u \in \mathcal{A}$  is a local minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $u \not\equiv 0$ . Then there exists a unique  $\xi \in [0, L)$  such that  $\Sigma_u = (\xi, L)$ .

Proof. Since  $u \in H^2(0, L)$  we have  $u' \equiv 0$  on the set  $\partial \Sigma_u$ ; moreover continuity of  $u$  implies that  $\Sigma_u$  is a countable union of pairwise disjoint open intervals,

$$\Sigma_u = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} (a_j, b_j) \tag{23}$$

and  $u(a_j) = u(b_j) = u'(a_j) = u'(b_j) = 0$ . Suppose now that  $b_j \neq L$  for some  $j$  and choose  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\varepsilon \|u\|_{H^2} \leq \delta$ . Then by taking  $v = u - \varepsilon u \mathbf{1}_{(a_j, b_j)}$  we have  $\|v - u\|_{H^2} \leq \delta$  and  $\mathcal{F}(v) < \mathcal{F}(u)$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

LEMMA 2.12 Assume that  $u \in \mathcal{A}$  is a local minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then either  $u \equiv 0$  or  $u(L) > 0$ .



*Proof.* If  $u$  is a local minimizer then

$$0 \leq \mathcal{F}(u + \varepsilon u) - \mathcal{F}(u) = \left( \varepsilon k_b + \varepsilon^2 \frac{k_b}{2} \right) \int_0^L |u''|^2 - \varepsilon f u(L) \tag{24}$$

and arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon$  yields

$$k_b \int_0^L |u''|^2 = f u(L). \tag{25}$$

If  $u(L) = 0$  then  $u'' \equiv 0$  and by recalling the definition of  $\mathcal{A}$  we get  $u \equiv 0$ . □

LEMMA 2.13 Assume that  $u \in \mathcal{A}$  is a local minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}$  and that  $u \not\equiv 0$ . Then

$$u(x) = \frac{f}{6k_b} (3L - 2\xi - x)(x - \xi)^2 \mathbf{1}_{(\xi, L)} \tag{26}$$

for a suitable  $\xi \in [0, L)$ .

*Proof.* If  $u$  is a local minimizer and  $u \not\equiv 0$  then by Lemma 2.11 there exists a unique  $\xi \in [0, L)$  such that  $\Sigma_u = (\xi, L)$ . Let now  $(a, b) \subset\subset (\xi, L)$  and  $\psi \in C_0^2(a, b)$ . Then  $u + \varepsilon\psi > 0$  in  $(a, b)$  for  $|\varepsilon|$  small enough and  $|\Sigma_{u+\varepsilon\psi}| = |\Sigma_u|$ . Since  $u$  is a local minimizer we have

$$\mathcal{F}(u + \varepsilon\psi) - \mathcal{F}(u) = \frac{k_b}{2} \int_a^b (2\varepsilon\psi''u'' + \varepsilon^2|\psi''|^2) \geq 0, \tag{27}$$

and the arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon$  yields

$$\int_a^b \psi''u'' = 0, \tag{28}$$

hence  $u'''' = 0$  in  $(a, b)$ , and again as  $(a, b)$  was arbitrarily chosen in  $(\xi, L)$  we have  $u'''' = 0$  in the whole  $(\xi, L)$ . Since  $u \in H^2(0, L)$  and  $u \equiv 0$  in  $[0, \xi]$  it follows that  $u(x) = (x - \xi)^2(\alpha x + \beta)$ . By taking into account Lemma 2.12 we see that  $u(L) > 0$  and then for every  $a > \xi$  and for every  $\psi \in C^2([a, L])$  such that  $\psi(a) = \psi'(a) = 0$  we have  $u + \varepsilon\psi > 0$  when  $|\varepsilon|$  is small enough. This implies that

$$\int_a^L \psi''u'' - f\psi(L) = 0, \tag{29}$$

that is,  $u''(L) = 0$  and  $u'''(L) = -f/k_b$ . Therefore

$$u(x) = \frac{f}{6k_b} (3L - 2\xi - x)(x - \xi)^2. \tag{30}$$

□

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 2.10. Indeed, by using formula (30) it is readily seen that when  $\varepsilon$  is suitably chosen then  $\|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{H^2} < \delta$ , where we have set

$$u_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{f}{6k_b} (3L - 2\bar{\xi} - 2\varepsilon - x)(x - \bar{\xi} - \varepsilon)^2. \tag{31}$$

Hence  $u$  will be a local minimizer if and only if  $\bar{\xi}$  is a local minimizer of the function

$$\xi \mapsto \vartheta \left( 1 - \frac{\xi}{L} \right) - \frac{f^2 L^3}{6k_b} \left( 1 - \frac{\xi}{L} \right)^3. \tag{32}$$

### 3. Peeling off elastic plates

In this section we shall consider the case of an elastic plate interacting with a rigid substrate through a thin adhesive layer. So let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be an open bounded set, representing the reference configuration of a Kirchhoff–Love plate. Assume that  $|\Omega| = 1$ ,  $\partial\Omega \in \text{Lip}$  and  $\Gamma_i \subset \partial\Omega$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are two measurable subsets of  $\partial\Omega$  such that  $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 = \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma_i), \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_i) > 0$ . The elastic energy of the plate is

$$J_e(u) = \int_{\Omega} k_p (|\Delta u|^2 - 2(1 - \nu) \det D^2 u) \, dx,$$

where  $k_p$  is the flexural rigidity and  $\nu$  is the Poisson ratio. We assume the plate is loaded by a force distribution  $f \in L^\infty(\Gamma_2)$  acting perpendicular to the plane of the plate. Then the load potential is

$$J_l(u) = - \int_{\Gamma_2} f u \, d\mathcal{H}^1.$$

Let  $\vartheta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous and increasing function with  $\vartheta(0) = 0$ . The adhesion potential is

$$J_a(u) = \vartheta(|\Sigma_u|).$$

We denote by  $\nu$  the unit outer normal vector to  $\partial\Omega$  and we introduce the function space

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ v \in H^2(\Omega) \mid v \geq 0, v = \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ in } \Gamma_1 \right\} \tag{33}$$

and the energy functional  $\mathcal{F}(u) = J_e(u) + J_a(u) + J_l(u)$ .

We consider here a more general formulation of the problem, so let  $\text{Sym}$  be the space of real symmetric  $2 \times 2$  matrices and consider a quadratic form  $W : \text{Sym} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  such that for a suitable  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$W(A) \geq \delta \|A\|^2 \quad \forall A \in \text{Sym}. \tag{34}$$

We define for every  $v \in H^2(\Omega)$  the functional

$$\mathcal{F}(v) = \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} W(D^2 v) \, dx - \int_{\Gamma_2} f v \, d\mathcal{H}^1 + \vartheta(|\Sigma_v|) & \text{if } v \in \mathcal{A}, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise in } H^2(\Omega). \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

Then we are interested in the minimization of the functional  $\mathcal{F}$ . As in Lemma 2.1 we can prove that  $\mathcal{F}$  is lower semicontinuous with respect to the weak topology of  $H^2$ , and by using (34) it is readily seen that a minimizer of  $\mathcal{F}$  always exists. In this section we want to investigate qualitative properties of such minimizers, in particular we are interested, as in the case of the elastic beam, in establishing stability-like conditions involving thresholds of the load  $f$  characterizing equilibrium states in which the plate is completely bonded to the substrate or completely detached; this will be obtained in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 below. The role played by the exponent  $\alpha = 2$  is worth noticing, whereas in the case of the beam the critical value was  $\alpha = 3$ . As in the case of the elastic beam, this analysis depends on the constitutive behavior of the adhesive layer through the growth assumptions on  $\vartheta$ .

We proceed by proving some preliminary results. The next lemma establishes the so called *compliance identity* enjoyed by the minimizers of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

LEMMA 3.1 Let  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{F}$ . Then

$$2 \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx = \int_{\Gamma_2} f u \, d\mathcal{H}^1. \quad (36)$$

*Proof.* Let  $0 < |t| < 1$ . Then  $(1+t)u \in \mathcal{A}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathcal{F}((1+t)u) - \mathcal{F}(u) = (1+t)^2 \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx - t \int_{\Gamma_2} f u \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \\ &= 2t \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx + t^2 \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx - t \int_{\Gamma_2} f u \, d\mathcal{H}^1. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Hence

$$\frac{t}{|t|} \left( 2 \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx - \int_{\Gamma_2} f u \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \right) \geq -|t| \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx, \quad (38)$$

that is,

$$\left| 2 \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx - \int_{\Gamma_2} f u \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \right| \leq |t| \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx, \quad (39)$$

and the conclusion follows by letting  $t \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

For every  $s \in [0, \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega))$  we define

$$\rho(s) = \sup \left\{ \frac{P_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega}(E)}{P_{\Omega}(E)} \mid E \subset \Omega, P_{\Omega}(E) > 0, P_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega}(E) \leq s \right\} \quad (40)$$

and we recall the following result whose proof can be found in [11].

PROPOSITION 3.2 Let  $w \in BV(\Omega)$  with  $\mathcal{H}^1(\{x \in \partial\Omega \mid w(x) \neq 0\}) \leq s$ . Then

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} |w| \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq \rho(s) \int_{\Omega} |Dw|. \quad (41)$$

Moreover, the constant  $\rho(s)$  is best possible.

Based on the previous results we are going to prove the following statement.

LEMMA 3.3 Let  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{F}$  and let

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\pi}} \rho(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_1))(1 + \rho(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_1))). \quad (42)$$

Then

$$\|D^2u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\delta} |\Sigma_u| \|f\|_{\infty}. \quad (43)$$

*Proof.* By (34) and Lemma 3.1 we get via the Hölder inequality

$$\int_{\Omega} |D^2u|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{1}{2\delta} \|f\|_{\infty} \int_{\partial\Omega} |u| \, d\mathcal{H}^1, \quad (44)$$

and since  $u \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\{x \in \partial\Omega \mid u(x) \neq 0\}) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_1) < \mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega).$$

Hence, by applying Proposition 3.2 and (44) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |D^2u|^2 \, dx &\leq \frac{1}{2\delta} \|f\|_{\infty} \rho(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_1)) \int_{\Sigma_u} |\nabla u| \, dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\delta} |\Sigma_u|^{1/2} \|f\|_{\infty} \rho(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_1)) \left( \int_{\Sigma_u} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

A well known result about best constants in Sobolev inequalities (see again [11, p. 189]) yields

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} (\|D^2u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^1(\partial\Omega)}), \tag{46}$$

and applying again Proposition 3.2 and the Hölder inequality we deduce from (45) and (46) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |D^2u|^2 \, dx &\leq \frac{1}{2\delta} |\Sigma_u|^{1/2} \|f\|_{\infty} \rho(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_1)) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4\delta\sqrt{\pi}} |\Sigma_u|^{1/2} \|f\|_{\infty} \rho(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_1)) (\|D^2u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^1(\partial\Omega)}) \\ &\leq \frac{\Lambda}{\delta} |\Sigma_u|^{1/2} \|f\|_{\infty} \|D^2u\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \frac{\Lambda}{\delta} |\Sigma_u|^{1/2} \|f\|_{\infty} \|D^2u\|_{L^1(\Sigma_u)} \\ &\leq \frac{\Lambda}{\delta} |\Sigma_u| \|f\|_{\infty} \|D^2u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (42), this yields

$$\|D^2u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\delta} |\Sigma_u| \|f\|_{\infty}. \quad \square$$

We are now in a position to state and prove the main results of this section. More precisely, in the following two theorems we shall obtain precise estimates on the force  $f$  and on the growth exponent  $\alpha$  characterizing stable equilibrium configurations of the plate.

**THEOREM 3.4** Assume that  $\vartheta(\tau) \geq \lambda\tau^2$  for some  $\lambda > 0$ . Then there exists  $K > 0$  such that if

$$\|f\|_{\infty} < K$$

then  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{F}$  if and only if  $u \equiv 0$  a.e.

*Proof.* Assume  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{F}$ . Since  $W$  is a quadratic form there exists a suitable  $\gamma > 0$  such that  $W(A) \leq \gamma \|A\|^2$  for every  $A \in \operatorname{Sym}$ . Then by Lemma 3.1 and minimality, we get

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = - \int_{\Omega} W(D^2u) \, dx + \vartheta(|\Sigma_u|) \geq -\gamma \int_{\Omega} |D^2u|^2 \, dx + \vartheta(|\Sigma_u|). \tag{47}$$

Let

$$\|f\|_{\infty} < K = \frac{\delta}{\Lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\gamma}}.$$

Then, by Lemma 3.3, we obtain

$$0 = \mathcal{F}(0) \geq \mathcal{F}(u) \geq |\Sigma_u|^2 \left( -\gamma \frac{\Lambda^2}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{\infty}^2 + \lambda \right),$$

which easily implies  $|\Sigma_u| = 0$  and so  $u \equiv 0$  a.e. □

**THEOREM 3.5** Assume that  $\vartheta(\tau) \geq \lambda\tau^\alpha$  with  $0 < \alpha < 2$ . Let  $u \in \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{F}$  and let  $K = (\delta/\Lambda)\sqrt{\lambda/\gamma}$ . Then the following implications hold true:

- (i) If  $\|f\|_\infty < K$  then  $|\Sigma_u| = 0$ .
- (ii) If  $\|f\|_\infty = K$  then either  $|\Sigma_u| = 0$  or  $|\Sigma_u| = 1$ .
- (iii) If  $|\Sigma_u| = 1$  then  $\|f\|_\infty \geq K$ .

*Proof.* By the same argument of the previous proof we deduce

$$\lambda|\Sigma_u|^2 \left( -\frac{1}{K^2} \|f\|_\infty^2 + |\Sigma_u|^{\alpha-2} \right) \leq 0. \quad (48)$$

To prove the first assertion note that if  $|\Sigma_u| \neq 0$ , then since  $0 < \alpha < 2$ , (48) implies  $|\Sigma_u| \leq 1$  and  $\|f\|_\infty \geq K$ . The second assertion follows by observing that if  $\|f\|_\infty = K$ , then (48) becomes

$$\lambda|\Sigma_u|^2 (-1 + |\Sigma_u|^{\alpha-2}) \leq 0,$$

from which we get the result. Finally, by substituting  $|\Sigma_u| = 1$  in (48), we get

$$\lambda \left( -\frac{1}{K^2} \|f\|_\infty^2 + 1 \right) \leq 0,$$

which proves the last statement. □

We point out that the condition  $\|f\|_\infty = K$  defines a bifurcation point for which the material system exhibits a catastrophe-like behavior. For this value of the load, both the states of plate: bonded and completely detached, are admissible. Therefore, by increasing the load starting from the value  $K$ , we can expect two possible scenarios. If  $|\Sigma_u| = 0$  the system will expend energy on deforming the plate and breaking the adhesive, whereas if  $|\Sigma_u| = 1$  the only further energy will be expended on the elastic deformation of the plate.

Finally, notice that  $K = (\delta/\Lambda)\sqrt{\lambda/\gamma}$  plays the role of a threshold on the force  $f$ . As in the case of elastic beam studied in Section 2, where the analogous parameter is denoted by  $f_{cr}$ ,  $K$  depends on the elastic stiffness of the plate through the ratio  $\delta/\sqrt{\gamma}$ , on the stiffness of the adhesive layer through  $\sqrt{\lambda}$ , and on a geometric parameter  $\Lambda$ .

#### REFERENCES

1. AMBROSIO, L., FUSCO, N., & PALLARA, D. *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems*. Clarendon Press, Oxford (2000). Zbl 0957.49001 MR 1857292
2. ANDREWS, K. T., CHAPMAN, L., FERNÁNDEZ, J. R., FISACKERLY, M., SHILLOR, M., VANERIAN, L., & VANHOUTEN, T. A membrane in adhesive contact. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **64** (2003), 152–169. Zbl 1081.74034 MR 2029129
3. BURRIDGE, R., & KELLER, J.-B. Peeling, slipping and cracking—Some one dimensional free-boundary problems in mechanics. *SIAM Rev.* **20** (1978), 31–61. Zbl 0394.73093 MR 0464828
4. ERICKSEN, J. L. *Introduction to the Thermodynamics of Solids*. Chapman & Hall (1991). Zbl 0744.73011 MR 1121016
5. FRÉMOND, M. Contact with adhesion. Chapter IV of *Topics in Nonsmooth Mechanics*, Birkhäuser (1988). Zbl 0656.73051 MR 0957090

6. GHATAK, A., MAHADEVAN, L., CHUNG, J. Y., CHAUDHURY, M. K., & SHENOY, V. Peeling from a biomimetically patterned thin elastic film. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **460** (2004), 2725–2735. Zbl 1081.74031
7. HAN, W., KUTTLER, K. L., SHILLOR, M., & SOFONEA, M. Elastic beam in adhesive contact. *Int. J. Solids Structures* **39** (2002), 1145–1164. Zbl 1012.74050 MR 1893897
8. ISRAELACHVILI, N. *Intramolecular and Surface Forces*. Academic Press, New York (1992).
9. JOHNSON, K. L. Adhesion and friction between a smooth elastic spherical asperity and a smooth surface. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **453** (1997), 163–179.
10. MADDALENA, F., & PERCIVALE, D. Forthcoming.
11. MAZ'JA, V. G. *Sobolev Spaces*. Springer (1985). Zbl 0692.46023 MR 0817985
12. OYHARCABAL, X., & FRISCH, T. Peeling off an elastica from a smooth attractive substrate. *Phys. Rev. E* **71** (2005), 036611–6.
13. PEDE, N., PODIO-GUIDUGLI, P., & TOMASSETTI, G. Balancing the force that drives the peeling of an adhesive tape. Preprint.
14. PERCIVALE, D., & TOMARELLI, F. Smooth and creased equilibria for elastic-plastic plates and beams. *Variational Problems in Material Science* (Trieste, 2004), Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. 68, Birkhäuser, Basel (2006), 127–136. Zbl 1097.74040 MR 2223367
15. PERCIVALE, D., & TOMARELLI, F. A variational principle for plastic hinges in a beam. Preprint.
16. PODIO-GUIDUGLI, P. Peeling tapes. *Mechanics of Material Forces*, P. Steinmann and G. Maugin (eds.), Springer (2005).
17. SHILLOR, M., SOFONEA, M., & TELEGA, J. J. *Models and Analysis of Quasistatic Contact*. Lecture Notes in Phys. 655, Springer, Berlin (2004). Zbl 1069.74001
18. SOFONEA, M., HAN, W., & SHILLOR, M. *Analysis and Approximations of Contact Problems with Adhesion or Damage*. Pure Appl. Math. 276, Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL (2006). Zbl 1089.74004 MR 2183435
19. VILLAGGIO, P. *Qualitative Methods in Elasticity*. Noordhoff (1977). Zbl 0374.73001 MR 0502510
20. VILLAGGIO, P. Problemi variazionali plebei. *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. Sez. A* **10** (2007), 1–20.
21. WEI, Y., & HUTCHINSON, J. W. Interface strength, work of adhesion and plasticity in the peel test. *Int. J. Fracture* **93** (1998), 315–333.
22. ZHAO, Y.-P., WANG, L. S., & YU, T. X. Mechanics of adhesion in MEMS—a review. *J. Adhesion Sci. Technol.* **17** (2003), 519–546.