Strain-Dependent Solid Surface Stress and the Stiffness of Soft Contacts
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Surface stresses have recently emerged as a key player in the mechanics of highly compliant solids. The classic theories of contact mechanics describe adhesion with a compliant substrate as a competition between surface energies driving deformation to establish contact and bulk elasticity resisting this. However, it has recently been shown that surface stresses provide an additional restoring force that can compete with and even dominate over elasticity in highly compliant materials, especially when length scales are small compared to the ratio of the surface stress to the elastic modulus, $\gamma/E$. Here, we investigate experimentally the contribution of surface stresses to the total force of adhesion. We find that the elastic and capillary contributions to the adhesive force are of similar magnitude and that both are required to account for measured adhesive forces between rigid silica spheres and compliant, silicone gels. Notably, the strain dependence of the solid surface stress contributes to the stiffness of soft solid contacts at leading order.
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Soft solids can make excellent adhesives because they can conform to establish intimate contact, even on very rough surfaces [1,2]. Applications of soft or “pressure-sensitive” adhesives range from the ubiquitous sticky note to large-scale building construction [2], from everyday adhesive bandages to new developments toward improved surgical techniques [3]. The true test of any adhesive material is how it responds to an externally applied force. Does it stick and stay stuck, and how much force can it sustain before unsticking? Even though soft adhesives are widely used, answering these seemingly simple questions remains an area of active research [4–14].

When a soft solid conforms into adhesive contact with an uneven surface, it is well understood that bulk elasticity opposes this deformation [15–17]. However, a number of recent experiments have demonstrated that for highly compliant solids, elasticity is not always enough to describe the mechanical response [6,18–31]. Rather, an additional restoring force can arise from the solid surface tension $\gamma$, which opposes the stretching of the surface required to conform into contact. This solid surface stress can compete with or even dominate over the elastic modulus $E$ in determining the mechanics of soft materials, at least on length scales that are small compared to an elastocapillary length, $L_c = \gamma/E$.

Meanwhile, surface stresses are still ignored in the standard theories of adhesive contact mechanics [15–17]. Recent insights into elastocapillary phenomena suggest that a new approach is needed to interpret contact measurements on soft materials, from characterizing cancer cells using atomic force microscopy to soft-adhesives developments [32–34]. Theoretical studies have begun to investigate the contributions of surface stresses to adhesion with applied forces [10,35], but there are still only very limited experimental data [36].

In this paper, we investigate the roles of surface tension and elasticity in adhesion with applied force. We directly measure the adhesive forces and contact geometry between compliant solid substrates and small rigid spheres during quasistatic separation. We find that classic theories of contact mechanics fail to account for either the forces or the shape of the contact zone. On the other hand, the measured forces are reasonably described when a simple estimate of the contribution of surface stress is added to the standard elastic predictions. We find that the strain dependence of the solid surface stress plays an essential role in these phenomena.

We study the pull-off of small glass spheres from compliant, silicone gel substrates. The gels are prepared by mixing liquid (1 Pa s) divinyl-terminated polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) (Gelest, DMS-V31) with a chemical cross-linker (Gelest, HMS-301) and catalyst (Gelest, SIP6831.2) (as in Refs. [11,26]). We degas the mixture in vacuum and then deposit a layer along the millimeter-wide edge of a standard microscope slide. After curing at 68°C overnight, the resulting solid silicone substrate is about 300 $\mu$m thick, flat parallel to the long edge of the microscope slide, and very slightly curved (radius of curvature about 700 $\mu$m) in the orthogonal direction [11]. The cured PDMS substrate has a Young modulus
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of $E = 5.6$ kPa, and the Poisson ratio of the gel’s elastic network is $\nu = 0.48$ [11,37]. Bulk tensile tests show that the gel is linear elastic to about 10% true strain and moderately strain stiffening thereafter [38].

For rigid, spherical indenters, we use untreated silica spheres ranging in radius from 7.9 to 32.0 µm (Polysciences, 07668). We rigidly attach the spheres to the ends of either rigid, tapered glass rods or solid-state capacitive force probes (FemtoTools, FTS 100) using two-part 5-minute epoxy (Elmer’s), waiting at least 6 minutes after mixing to ensure that the glue does not flow over the sphere surface. For the spheres attached to tapered glass rods, we control the position manually with submicrometer precision using a 3-axis micromanipulator stage (Narishige MMO-023). For the spheres attached to the force probes, we control the position using a 3-axis piezo stage with 1-nm accuracy (FemtoTools). Either indentation system is mounted on a standard inverted microscope, and the contact zone is imaged from the side with a 40× (N.A. 0.60) objective, as described previously [11,38].

We begin each experiment by bringing a sphere into initial adhesive contact with the solid silicone gel substrate at a vertical position $D = 0$, where $D$ is defined as the distance between the initial, undeformed surface and the bottom of the sphere, as shown in Fig. 1(a). We approach the substrate slowly until the bottom of the sphere just touches an initially flat region of substrate that has not been contacted previously. We identify contact either as the first position where we register a measurable force on the sphere or where we visually observe the compliant substrate suddenly deforming into contact with the sphere. High-speed imaging indicates that the initial contact deformation is complete in less than a second [39]. The rigid attachment of the sphere prevents it from spontaneously indentering into the substrate [6,11], so at the start of the experiment, an initial tensile force $F_0$ is already required to hold the sphere at $D = 0$.

We wait about 10 minutes after initial contact in order to ensure the system is in equilibrium before beginning each experiment. We then quasistatically withdraw the sphere from the surface ($D > 0$) at a slow, controlled rate of 0.1 µm/s. A series of example images from a typical experiment on a 10.0-µm-radius sphere are shown in Fig. 1(b)–1(e). At initial contact [Fig. 1(b)], we already observe significant local deformation of the substrate. As we subsequently pull the sphere away from initial contact, the contact area stays nearly constant, decreasing only slightly as we approach the last stable position [Fig. 1(e)]. After this position, the contact line begins to slide rapidly toward a point at the bottom of the sphere where it finally
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integral of the surface stresses, we calculate the capillary force contribution as the force from solid surface stresses. We improve the elastic calculation by accounting for nonlinear elasticity or large deformations using finite elements. In the absence of a complete elastocapillary adhesion theory, we plot these predictions with no free parameters as blue lines on the left side of Fig. 2(a). For all deformations, we find that the elastic theory works well in the far field but fails to describe the shape of the surface close to the contact line. Fitting with the Maugis theory by allowing the contact radius or sphere position to vary only does a marginally better job in describing the substrate deformation.

Even though the silicone meniscus below the sphere is solid, it bears a remarkable resemblance to a liquid capillary bridge. Inspired by this similarity, we test how well a purely capillary theory describes this shape by fitting it with a surface of constant total curvature \( \kappa \) starting from the contact line \([11]\). We plot these fits as red lines on the right side of Fig. 2(a), extending the curves beyond the fit region to make it clear where they begin to deviate from the data. Note that the measured total curvatures are typically nonzero, and that they change with sphere displacement. Unlike a liquid, an elastic solid can sustain internal pressure gradients, so it does not need to have the same curvature everywhere. In control experiments with un-cross-linked PDMS fluid in the same experimental geometry, we find that the pure capillary solution works everywhere with a total curvature of zero, independent of sphere position, as expected for a liquid meniscus equilibrated with a flat far field in the absence of gravity.

The pure capillary solution fits the measured surface profile of the soft solid extremely well close to the contact...
line, precisely where the elastic solution fails, but it deviates from the measured profile in the far field, where the elastic solution works well. We quantify the size of this domain of constant curvature, $\Delta S$, by measuring the path length along the profile from the contact line to the end of where the capillary solution fits well. We plot $\Delta S$ and $-\kappa$ vs sphere displacement $D$ over the entire stable contact regime in Figs. 2(b) and 2(c) for the same experiment as in Fig. 2(a) (black circles), as well as for an 18.8-µm-radius sphere (blue triangles) and a 32.0-µm-radius sphere (red squares). The domain of constant curvature expands roughly exponentially with displacement; simultaneously, the magnitude of the curvature drops roughly exponentially.

We plot the sphere-size dependence of the domain size, $\Delta S$, and the magnitude of the curvature, $-\kappa$, at $D = 0$ in Figs. 2(d) and 2(e). Over a factor of 3 in particle radius, the initial inverse curvature (red squares) remains unchanged, while the domain of constant curvature (blue triangles) increases slightly. The initial size of the capillary-dominated domain is $\Delta S_0 = 5.5 \pm 0.6$ µm, while the initial inverse curvature at $D = 0$ is $-1/\kappa_0 = 3.5 \pm 0.4$ µm. These values are both comparable to the expected zero-force elastocapillary length: $\Gamma_0/E = 3.6$ µm.

We plot fitted values of length scales associated with the exponential growth or decay of the domain size (blue triangles) and curvature magnitude (red squares) vs sphere displacement $R$: $\Delta S_0$ (blue triangles, mean ± std dev = 5.5 ± 0.6 µm) and $-1/\kappa_0$ (red squares, mean ± std dev = 3.5 ± 0.4 µm). (e) Log-log plot of fit exponential length scales $L_{\Delta S}$ (blue triangles) and $L_\kappa$ (red squares) vs $R$. Lines of slope 1 (dot-dashed line) and slope 1/2 (dashed line) are shown as guides to the eye.

The contact profiles demonstrate a crossover from a capillary-dominated near field to an elastically-dominated far field, typical of elastocapillary behavior in soft materials. The transition between these domains is determined by the elastocapillary length, which is usually assumed to be a material constant [30]. Here, the dramatic increase of $\Delta S$ with sphere displacement suggests a concomitant increase in the elastocapillary length with deformation. There are two ways that the elastocapillary length can grow with strain: Either the elastic modulus drops, or the surface stress increases. Bulk tensile tests rule out the former, showing instead moderate strain stiffening at large strains. Therefore, a growing elastocapillary length can only arise from a strain-dependent surface stress that increases with substrate surface deformation.
Inspired by these observations, we recently completed a complementary study directly measuring the strain-dependent surface stress of similar silicone gels and found that it is indeed very sensitive to the surface strain of the material [38]. In that case, we found that the strain dependence is described by a surface modulus $\Lambda$ such that $\Upsilon(\varepsilon) = \Upsilon_0 + \varepsilon \Lambda$, where $\Lambda \approx 6 \Upsilon_0$. The surface modulus also introduces a new length scale $\Lambda/E$, which, for the silicone gels used in that study, is about 6 times the zero-strain elastocapillary length.

Armed with these insights into the strain dependence of the surface stress, we revisit our estimate of capillary contributions to adhesive forces. The complex strain state of these adhesion experiments makes a direct measurement of the surface stress very difficult. We therefore estimate contributions to adhesive forces. The elastic and strain-dependent capillary contributions to the total adhesive force over this range of particle sizes, plotted as red dashed lines in Figs. 3(a) and 3(b). As implemented, the strain dependence of the surface stress has no impact on the force at initial contact [Fig. 3(a)]. However, it significantly impacts the magnitude and scaling of both adhesive force and contact stiffness over this range of particle sizes.

This approach does remarkably well even at large deformations. We plot the measured force-displacement data for a single example experiment as black circles in Fig. 3(c). For comparison, we calculate all of the variants of the force predictions, using the contact radius and growth of the constant curvature domain as measured from the images for this experiment: the elastic prediction $F_{EL}$ [17] (blue dot-dashed line); the capillary predictions $F_{CL}$, with both a fixed value of surface stress $\Upsilon = \Upsilon_0$ (red dot-dashed line) and a strain-dependent surface stress $\Upsilon \approx \Upsilon_0 \exp(D/L_{AS})$ (red dashed line); and the sum total forces, using both the fixed value of surface stress (gray dot-dashed line) and the strain-dependent surface stress (gray solid line). The estimate with a fixed $\Upsilon = \Upsilon_0$ increasingly fails to describe the data as $D$ becomes large. However, the total force combining elastic and strain-dependent capillary contributions is in remarkable agreement with the measurements again, despite the simplicity of our approach.

We have seen that theories of contact mechanics accounting only for bulk elasticity capture neither adhesive forces nor contact geometry in soft adhesion. Rather, capillary forces arising from the surface stress of the compliant solid can contribute significantly to the total force. However, simply including a fixed surface tension is not enough. Strain-dependent surface stresses are required to account for the structure and stiffness of soft adhesive contacts. While our simple estimate of contact forces does a surprisingly good job, a complete elastocapillary theory of adhesion including strain-dependent surface stress needs to be developed. In particular, contributions from the interfacial curvature through the generalized Laplace-Young relation may need to be considered [30].

We thank Dominic Vella, Desiree Plata, Anand Jagota, and Herbert Hui for useful discussions. We acknowledge funding from the National Science Foundation (CBET-1236086).

FIG. 3. Predicting adhesive forces. (a,b) Initial force $F_0$ and initial contact stiffness $k_0$, respectively, vs sphere radius $R$. Plotted are measured data (black symbols), predictions of elastic theory (blue dot-dashed lines) [17], and capillary force predictions accounting for a strain-dependent surface stress (red dashed lines). Solid gray lines show the sum of the capillary and elastic predictions. (c) Measured force vs sphere displacement for an example experiment using an 18.9-µm-radius sphere (black points). Theoretical predictions are overlaid as follows: elastic theory (blue dot-dashed line), capillary prediction with constant or strain-dependent surface stress (red dot-dashed line and red dashed line, respectively), and total estimated force with constant or strain-dependent surface stress (gray dot-dashed line and solid gray line, respectively).
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