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We investigate dynamic fracture of heterogeneous materials experimentally by measuring displacement fields as a rupture propagates through a periodic array of obstacles of controlled fracture energy. Our measurements demonstrate the applicability of the classical equation of motion of cracks at a discontinuity of fracture energy: the crack speed jumps at the entrance and exit of an obstacle, as predicted by the crack-tip energy balance within the brittle fracture framework. The speed jump amplitude is governed by the fracture energy contrast and by the combination of rate-dependency of fracture energy and inertia of the medium, which allows the crack to cross a fracture energy discontinuity at constant energy release rate. This discontinuous dynamics and the rate-dependence cause higher effective toughness, which governs the coarse-grained behavior of these cracks.

Many biological materials, such as bone, nacre and tooth, have intricate microstructures which are responsible for remarkable macroscopic mechanical properties [1, 2]. Carefully designed microstructures combined with advances in micro-fabrication techniques allow for the development of new materials with unprecedented properties [3–8]. Understanding how to harness small-scale heterogeneities is, however, necessary to achieve the desired macroscopic properties. For fracture properties, recent research focused either on disordered microstructures, where randomly placed obstacles distort the crack front and cause toughening by collective pinning [9–12], or on elastic heterogeneities, where compliant inclusions provide toughening by effectively reducing the energy flow into the crack tip [13, 14]. However, a complete and fundamental theory for effective material resistance against fracture remains missing, and experimental observations, which are key for establishing such theoretical knowledge, are scarce.

Theoretical fracture mechanics, based on the seminal work of Griffith [15, 16] states that a crack will propagate as soon as the released elastic energy per unit increment of crack length \( G^S = -\partial l \Omega \), where \( \Omega \) is the elastic energy in the medium and \( l \) the crack length, balances the local fracture energy \( \Gamma \) (i.e., the energy necessary for creating two unit surfaces). During dynamic crack propagation, the energy balance further includes inertia of the surrounding medium and possible rate-dependence of the fracture energy \( \Gamma(v) \), where \( v = \dot{l} \) is the crack speed. Using Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics (LEFM) theory [17], one can derive the equation of motion of a crack from this energy balance by assuming steady state crack propagation in an unbounded homogeneous domain. Under these circumstances the crack has no inertia (there is no term involving \( \dot{l} \) in the equation of motion) and its speed adapts abruptly to accommodate changes in fracture energy. However, it remains unclear if these idealized conditions are valid at discontinuities within heterogeneous materials and how they affect the coarse-grained behavior of the crack during dynamic propagation.

In this Letter, we analyze these questions in depth through the experimental investigation of crack propagation in heterogeneous media with fracture energy discontinuities. Usually, fracture mechanics experiments are based on global measurements, thus, only capture averaged quantities. In contrast, our experimental setup and simplified 2D geometry with periodic heterogeneities allows local measurements of the near-crack-tip fields, which support the uncovering of fundamental mechanisms. While the elastic energy release rate is constant as the crack faces a fracture energy discontinuity, the speed at which the crack propagates is observed to vary discontinuously. We study the amplitude of the speed jumps as the crack crosses the interface between regions of different fracture energy and show that it stems from the combination of rate-dependency of fracture energy and inertia of the medium. Rate-dependent effects result from the non-equilibrium nature of fracture problems and are prevailing in materials. Thus, rate-dependent fracture energy applies to a wide range of materials and has been observed, for instance, on rock [18, 19], glassy polymers [20–26] and metals [27]. The discontinuous dynamics and the rate-dependent effects significantly affect the effective toughness of heterogeneous materials, as we will show with our experimental observations.

Our experimental setup (see FIG. 1a) consists of a tapered double cantilever beam, made of multi-material 3D-printed polymers (Stratasys Objet260 Connex3), a high-speed camera (Phantom v2511) and an electromechanical testing machine (Shimadzu AG-X Plus). The matrix material is VeroClear with static fracture energy \( \Gamma^O \approx 80 \text{ J/m}^2 \) and Young’s modulus \( E^M \approx 2.8 \pm 0.2 \text{ GPa} \). The obstacle material is VeroWhite-DurusWhite (\( \Gamma^O \approx 106 \text{ J/m}^2, E^O \approx 1.9 \pm 0.2 \text{ GPa} \),
FIG. 1. (a) Model heterogeneous material made of multi-material 3D-printed polymers in a tapered double cantilever beam geometry with applied forces $F$. The displacement field $u = (u_x, u_y)$ is measured in the area within the blue box by digital image correlation. (b) Closeup view shows two different materials in a periodic stripe geometry. The transparent material constitutes the matrix with width $w^M$ and the opaque (darker) areas are obstacles of higher fracture energy $\Gamma^O/\Gamma^M \approx 1.3$ with width $w^O$. (c) Closeup of crack tip at $l \approx 35$ mm and $v \approx 50$ m/s. The crack interface is slightly visible running from left to center. A random speckle pattern is applied onto the surface, which is compared to its reference pre-cracked configuration to find $u$. (d) Infinitesimal strain $\varepsilon_{yy} = \partial_y u_y$ found by differentiating $u$. Approaching the crack tip, $\varepsilon_{yy}$ diverges. (e) $\varepsilon_{yy}$ assuming the Williams eigenfunctions as basis for $u$.

which is tougher and more compliant. We prescribe a constant crack mouth displacement rate $\dot{\delta} \approx 25$ mm/s. Hence, the elastic energy in the system is gradually increased, until a planar crack initiates from a pre-existing notch. The elastic energy release rate at initiation is proportional to the bluntness of the notch, which we can tune to explore a range of initial crack speeds from moderate up to $350$ m/s $\approx 0.4c_R$, where $c_R \approx 800$ m/s is the Rayleigh wave speed. The crack propagates then dynamically through a series of periodic obstacles (see FIG. 1b). During crack propagation no additional energy is added to the system ($\dot{\delta}$ is constant) and the tapered geometry causes exponentially decaying released elastic energy $G^S \approx \dot{\delta}^2 e^{-l/t_{sys}}$, where $t_{sys} \approx 17.5$ mm is a structural length scale directly related to the sample size [28]. Thus, the crack speed gradually decreases on average. All properties are constant through the sample thickness and the overall behavior is quasi-2D. We analyze the crack dynamics by measuring the near-tip displacement field $u$ using Digital Image Correlation. We apply a random speckle pattern (see FIG. 1c) onto the surface of the specimen using aerosol paint. The temporal evolution of the speckle is tracked using high speed photography at 250,000 fps. The auto-correlation length of the pattern corresponds to 4-6 pixels, where the pixel size is $\approx 45$ µm. $u$ (see color in FIG. 1c) is found by minimizing the difference between the pattern at a given time $t$ mapped back to its pre-crack configuration [29]. The resulting infinitesimal strain field $\varepsilon_{yy}$ is depicted in FIG. 1d. An alternative approach (see FIG. 1e) is the Integrated Digital Image Correlation (IDIC) [28, 30], which assumes the analytical solution for a singular crack in an infinite elastic medium – the Williams eigenfunctions expansion [31] – as basis for $u$ [29]. The first term of the series has singular strains at the crack tip $\varepsilon_{ij} \approx 1/\sqrt{t}$, where $r$ is the distance from the tip and its amplitude is related to the stress intensity factor $K$. Note that for both methods the amplitude of $\varepsilon$ is similar. IDIC has the advantages of precisely determining the crack tip position $l$ and directly computing $K$, from which, one can find the dynamic energy release rate $G = K^2/E A(v)$ that provides a measure of the fracture energy $\Gamma$ at the crack tip [17, 29, 32]. The effects of elastic heterogeneity are minor in our setup, but give rise to an interaction between the size of the $K$-dominant region ($r \lesssim 5$ mm) with the size of the heterogeneity and are discussed in [29].

Typical experiments are illustrated in FIG. 2a&b. The crack first propagates through the matrix material with
propagation speed \( v \) being maximum immediately after initiation, then \( v \) gradually decreases as crack length increases. \( v \) undergoes abrupt deceleration (acceleration) as the front enters (leaves) an obstacle. Simultaneously, \( \Gamma \) also abruptly increases (decreases). However, the relative jumps of the dissipation rate are significantly smaller than the ones observed on crack speed. We calculate the speed in the obstacle \( v^O \) and matrix \( v^M \) by selecting the mean speed over 12\( \mu \)s before and after the obstacle boundaries. All speed jumps at material discontinuities were studied for a collection of 30 experiments with different period \( \Delta l = w^O + w^M \) and constant obstacle density \( \beta = \frac{w^O}{w^O + w^M} = 1/2 \). Jumps as the crack enters (trapping) and leaves (untrapping) an obstacle are shown in FIG. 2c&d, respectively. Results show that the crack dynamics at the matrix/obstacle interface is independent of obstacle width and is symmetric with respect to the direction of propagation, i.e., the jumps are the same for trapping and untrapping. This implies that the crack dynamics only depends on local fracture properties.

In order to understand the jumps and their effect on effective material properties, we analyze the fracture propagation with a crack-tip energy balance. In our experiments, failure mechanisms occur at time scales 4 orders of magnitude smaller than the viscous relaxation time typical of the polymers used in this study [29] so that an elastic response of the sample can be safely assumed. Moreover, the failure mechanisms are too fast for a craze to develop [33], making the fracture process essentially brittle. Thus, we develop a theoretical model based on LEFM to interpret the experimental observations.

As the crack advances, elastic energy \( G^S \) is released from the specimen and is in part dissipated as fracture energy \( \Gamma \) to create new surfaces and in part radiated away as elastic waves. Analyzing the near-tip fields of a steady-state dynamic crack, Freund [17] showed that the energy release rate of a dynamic crack \( G(l, v) \) is related to the energy release rate for a corresponding static crack \( G^S(l) \) by \( g(v) \), a universal function of \( v \). The crack-tip energy balance provides the equation of motion for a crack [29]

\[
\Gamma(v) = G^S(l)g(v) \approx G^S(l)(1 - v/c_R), \tag{1}
\]

which implies that within the framework of LEFM, a sub-Rayleigh crack in an infinite medium has no inertia and \( v \) adjusts instantaneously to fluctuations in \( \Gamma \) or \( G^S \) [29]. Note that for rate-dependent materials, the fracture energy \( \Gamma(v) \) is not constant.

We analyze the rate-dependence of the matrix and obstacle material by independently plotting \( \Gamma \) vs. \( v \) (see averaged data as dashed line in FIG. 3 or full data in FIG. S3 of [29]). We observe that our measurements are in good agreement with a model [25] (solid line in FIG. 3) that considers the actual dissipative mechanism taking place within the process zone. Within the matrix or obstacle material, the fracture energy follows this kinetic law. At the material boundaries, however, the rupture needs to jump from one kinetic law to the other. The jump amplitude is governed by the equation of motion (1). The jump trajectory in the \( \Gamma-v \) space corresponds to the right-hand side of (1), which, since \( G^S(l) \) is constant across the boundary, corresponds to a diagonal line \( G^Sg(v) \) (arrows in FIG. 3).

Thus, at a discontinuity in material property the equation of motion of a crack becomes

\[
G^S = \Gamma^M(v^M)/g(v^M) = \Gamma^O(v^O)/g(v^O), \tag{2}
\]

which captures the experimentally observed velocity discontinuity at trapping and untrapping with no fitting parameter (see FIG. 2c&d). Eq. (2) cannot be solved explicitly. However, assuming a linear rate-dependent fracture energy \( \Gamma(v) \approx \Gamma_0 + \gamma v \), for the purpose of discussion, the velocity jump becomes

\[
v^M - v^O \approx \Delta \Gamma_0 \frac{1 - v^M/c_R}{\gamma + \Gamma^M_0/c_R}, \tag{3}
\]

where \( \Delta \Gamma_0 = \Gamma^O_0 - \Gamma^M_0 \) is the jump in fracture energy. This simple result highlights that (i) the jump amplitude is the same for trapping and untrapping (FIG. 2c&d) and (ii) during trapping the velocity right after the interference is zero if \( v^M \) is smaller than a critical incident velocity \( v_c \) below which the obstacle causes crack arrest

\[
v_c \approx \Delta \Gamma_0/(\gamma + \Gamma^O_0/c_R). \tag{4}
\]

All these features are discernible from our experimental data and are captured fairly well by the model. Eq. (3) as well as a parameter study of (2) (see FIG. S3 of [29]).
in [29]) reveal that the speed jump and \( v_c \) are proportional to the toughness discontinuity \( \Delta \Gamma_0 \). The latter is particularly noisy because of variations of fracture properties of both matrix and obstacle material, \( \text{i.e.}, \text{Var}[\Delta \Gamma_0] = \text{Var}[\Gamma^M_0] + \text{Var}[\Gamma^O_0] \), assuming \( \Gamma^O_0 \) and \( \Gamma^M_0 \) are uncorrelated. In the limit of small rate-dependency \( \gamma \ll \Gamma_0/c_R \), inertia controls the speed jumps, which are then given by \( \bar{v}^M = \bar{v}^O \approx (\Delta \Gamma_0/\Gamma_0^M)(c_R - \bar{v}^M) \) and the corresponding condition for crack arrest becomes \( \bar{v} < v_c \approx (\Delta \Gamma_0/\Gamma_0^O)c_R \). Conversely, in the limit of large rate-dependency \( \gamma \gg \Gamma_0/c_R \) and quasi-static propagation \( \bar{v} \ll c_R \), inertia can be neglected and the speed jumps become constant \( \bar{v}^M - \bar{v}^O \approx \Delta \Gamma_0/\gamma \equiv v_c \).

How does such a trapping/untrapping dynamics impact the effective fracture properties \( \bar{\Gamma} \) of heterogeneous materials? We compute the homogenized fracture energy \( \bar{\Gamma} \) by integrating over an interval \( \Delta l \) of uninterrupted crack propagation starting at \( l_i \), the beginning of each matrix/obstacle period,

\[
\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{v}) = \frac{1}{\Delta l} \int_{l_i}^{l_i + \Delta l} \Gamma(\bar{v}(l)) \, dl. \tag{5}
\]

As \( \bar{\Gamma} \) in each phase depends on crack speed, \( \bar{\Gamma} \) depends on it too. Thus, we report \( \bar{\Gamma} \) as a function of the apparent crack velocity \( \bar{v} = \Delta l/ \int_{l_i}^{l_i + \Delta l} \bar{v}^{-1} \, dl \).

First, we assume \( \Delta l \ll l_{sys} \), \text{i.e.}, a clear separation between the micro-structural scale and the specimen scale. Hence, it is possible to define intrinsic homogenized fracture properties, decoupled from the specimen size and the details of applied boundary conditions. Under this assumption, \( \bar{\Gamma}^O \) remains constant during the entire crack propagation. Thus, \( v \) and \( \Gamma \) are constant within each material phase (insets in FIG. 4a), which allows us to calculate the dissipation rate from (5)

\[
\lim_{\Delta l/l_{sys} \to 0} \bar{\Gamma} = \beta \Gamma^O(v^O) + (1 - \beta) \Gamma^M(v^M) \tag{6}
\]

and the apparent crack speed

\[
\lim_{\Delta l/l_{sys} \to 0} \bar{v} = \left( \frac{\beta}{v^O} + \frac{1 - \beta}{v^M} \right)^{-1}, \tag{7}
\]

with \( \beta = 1/2 \). Note that (7) is a weighted harmonic mean, which is dominated by its lower argument, \( v^O \), so \( \bar{v} \) is effectively lower than the arithmetic mean \( \bar{v}(v) = \beta v^O + (1 - \beta)v^M \). As a result, the apparent kinetic law \( \bar{\Gamma}(\bar{v}) \) is shifted "horizontally" towards lower speeds in comparison to \( \bar{\Gamma}(\bar{v}) \). This leads, in practice, to a resistance to failure \( \bar{\Gamma} \) larger than the toughness spatial average \( \bar{\Gamma} = \beta \Gamma^O + (1 - \beta) \Gamma^M(\bar{v}) \), but lower than the obstacle toughness \( \Gamma^O_0 \) predicted by rate-independent theory (see FIG. 4).

However, when comparing the infinite system size prediction (6) and (7) to our experimental measurements we observe higher effective toughness (see FIG. 4b). The interplay between the size of the heterogeneity \( \Delta l \) and the structural length scale \( l_{sys} \) makes homogenization of fracture properties particularly challenging. The emerging effective toughness depends on the ratio \( \Delta l/l_{sys} \), and (6) and (7) only represent a lower bound of \( \bar{\Gamma}(\bar{v}) \). The larger \( \Delta l/l_{sys} \), the higher \( \bar{\Gamma}(\bar{v}) \), which can even exceed \( \Gamma^O_0(v^O) \) of the obstacle material. This additional toughening, related to the structural problem with \( \Delta l \approx l_{sys} \), is quantitatively captured by the theoretical solutions for \( \bar{\Gamma}(\bar{v}) \), which we derive from (5) and (1), assuming \( G^S \approx e^{-l/l_{sys}} \). Note that as we approach \( \Delta l \approx l_{sys} \), the experimental toughness converges towards the theoretical one; and for \( \Delta l \gg l_{sys} \) the rupture arrests before reaching \( \Delta l \) required for homogenization of fracture properties.

How do these observations translate to macroscopic measurements? While measurements from total elastic energy input (see FIG. S5 in [29]) present increased toughness compared to the matrix material, they do not exceed the obstacle material. This is because the additional toughening observed at the small scale is a "horizontal shift" of the kinetic law. However, we observe that the macroscopic fracture energy is independent of \( \Delta l \) and corresponds to the average of matrix and obstacle material, which validates (6). Furthermore, crack arrest, as described by (4), may play an important role in further
increasing the macroscopic toughness. Even very thin obstacles may cause the crack to arrest, which raises interesting questions of practical importance for material design. How to design flaw insensitive materials, whose resistance to crack propagation – or ability to prevent a crack to grow indefinitely – is directly proportional to the obstacle toughness but independent of its size? What are the strategies to translate this local toughening to the macro-scale and improve the mechanical integrity of structures through the use of damage-tolerant composites?

In summary, our study shows that the classical LEFM equation of motion of cracks quantitatively predicts crack dynamics at toughness discontinuities. The crack arrests if it is slower than a threshold speed that is primarily dependent on the toughness contrast and independent of the characteristic size of the microstructure (i.e., obstacle thickness), i.e., (3). Finally, the heterogeneous material presents an increased effective (homogenized) toughness because of high fluctuations in crack speed between obstacles and matrix, and the rate-dependent nature of the fracture energy. Direct experimental validation of (3) and (4) is challenging due to limited temporal resolution and fluctuations in $\Gamma$, but increased toughness contrast and focus on a single interface could provide a path to overcome these limitations.
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