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We analyse the statistical distribution function for the height fluctuations of brittle fracture surfaces using extensive experimental data sampled on widely different materials and geometries. We compare a direct measurement of the distribution to an analysis based on the structure functions. For length scales $\delta$ larger than a characteristic scale $\Lambda$ that corresponds to a material heterogeneity size, we find that the distribution of the height increments $\Delta h = h(x + \delta) - h(x)$ is Gaussian and mono-affine, i.e. the scaling of the standard deviation $\sigma$ is proportional to $\delta^\alpha$ with a unique roughness exponent. Below the scale $\Lambda$ we observe a deviation from a Gaussian distribution and a mono-affine behavior. We discuss for the latter, the relevance of a multi-affine analysis and the influences of the discreteness resulting from material micro-structures or experimental sampling.

PACS numbers: 83.80.Ab, 62.20.Mk, 81.40.Np

It is difficult to believe that there may be anything in common between the morphology of fractures in, say, concrete and aluminium, except for the qualitative statement that they both are “rough”. The roughness seems very different when comparing the two materials. Studies [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] have shown that the scaling properties of this roughness are the same to within the measuring accuracy for not only these two materials, but for most brittle or weakly ductile materials that have been tested. The scaling properties of the roughness alluded to above, the scaling of the standard deviation $\sigma$ is proportional to $\delta^\alpha$ for length scales $\delta$ larger than a characteristic scale $\Lambda$ that corresponds to a material heterogeneity, the scanned surface comes from a high-resolution silicon mold (RTV 1570) of the granite fracture surface is obtained from the failure of a granite block obtained from various experiments on different materials. The materials have been broken in different modes and more directions.

The materials have been broken in different modes and geometries and the surfaces have been analyzed along one or more directions. First we sampled a (2+1)D fracture surface in a 3D medium. The roughness measurement of the fracture surface is obtained from the failure of a granite block from Lanhlin (France) in mode I (4 bending point failure) after an initiation notch has been machined on one side of the block. The scanned area of 10cm×10cm covers the complete section of the block with a grid mesh of $(\delta_\alpha)^2 = 48 \mu m \times 48 \mu m$. Accordingly the grid size is: 2062×2063, i.e. more than 4 million data points. The profiler is optical with a laser beam of 30$\mu$m in diameter. To reduce possible optical artifacts due to mineral heterogeneity, the scanned surface comes from a high-resolution silicon mold (RTV 1570) of the granite frac-
ture. The replica technique in a perfectly homogeneous material removes fluctuations of local optical properties and significantly improves the quality of the roughness measurement.

Second, we analyzed the morphology of (1+1)D fracture fronts propagating in a 3D transparent medium. Dimension of the fracture fronts is reduced because we consider interfacial fractures where fronts propagate (in mode I) into the annealing plane between two sand-blasted plexiglas (PMMA) plates [11, 12, 13, 14]. We have analyzed 6 long front lines (obtained by assembling high resolution optical images of the fronts for a crack at rest [1]) containing 17000 pixels each, with a pixel size \( \delta_o = 2.6 \) \( \mu m \).

Finally, we studied (1+1)D fracture fronts in a quasi-2D medium. Indeed, we considered the fracture of fax paper sheets loaded in mode I at a constant force [6, 7, 8, 9]. High resolution optical scans were performed on post-mortem samples. We analyzed 5 fronts with around 10000 pixels each, the pixel size is \( \delta_o = 16 \) \( \mu m \).

We aim at characterizing the statistical distribution function of the height fluctuations of a fracture surface \( P(h(x+\delta) - h(x)) \) and comparing it with a Gaussian distribution. However, a direct measurement of the distribution function is not always accessible due to limited statistics. Only the data set on granite experiments is large enough to perform such a direct estimate. For the others, we propose a method [10] introduced in connection with the study of directed polymers [15] that is based on the structure functions defined as the \( k \)th root of the \( k \)th moment of the increment \( |\Delta h| = |h(x+\delta) - h(x)| \) on a scale \( \delta \):

\[
C_k(\delta) = \langle |h(x+\delta) - h(x)|^k \rangle^{1/k}.
\]

The average is taken over the spatial coordinate \( x \). Now, forming the ratio between the \( k \)th structure function and the second structure function, we define the function

\[
R_k(\delta) = \frac{\langle |h(x+\delta) - h(x)|^k \rangle^{1/k}}{\langle |h(x+\delta) - h(x)|^2 \rangle^{1/2}}.
\]

In the case of fluctuations \( \Delta h \) that are Gaussian (with a zero mean and a variance \( \sigma^2 \)),

\[
P(\Delta h) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-(\Delta h)^2/2\sigma^2},
\]

and with a variance of the distribution that scales like \( \sigma^2 \propto \delta^2 \) where \( \zeta \) is the roughness exponent, i.e. a mono-affine scaling, Eq. (1) is easily calculated:

\[
C_k^G(\delta) = \left(2^k \zeta^k \right)^{1/2} \Gamma((k+1)/2)/\sqrt{\pi}^{1/k}.
\]

In this case the ratios \( R_k^G \) of the structure functions become

\[
R_k^G = \sqrt{2} \left( \frac{\Gamma(k+1)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right)^{1/k}.
\]

Note that these Gaussian ratios have prescribed values with no adjustable parameters. In particular, they are independent of \( \sigma^2 \), hence independent of \( \delta \) and \( \zeta \). This property is constrained by the assumption of an underlying Gaussian distribution. A different underlying distribution will give rise to a different set of ratios \( R_k \).

We computed the moment ratios normalized by the Gaussian values, \( R_k(\delta)/R_k^G \) for different values of \( k \) and different fracture profiles we have studied, as a function of the scale ratio \( \delta/\delta_o \) where \( \delta_o \) is the pixel size (see Fig. 1). Above a characteristic length scale \( \Lambda \), i.e. the cross-over length scale, the ratios \( R_k(\delta)/R_k^G \) converge towards a constant value equal to one, which is the signature of a Gaussian distribution. Note that a deviation from a constant value happen for the largest values of \( \delta/\delta_o \) which might be related to finite size effects. At small scales, i.e. lower than \( \Lambda \), a fanning of the ratios indicates a non-Gaussian distribution.

It is of interest to note that the cross-over length scale \( \Lambda \) that separates the small scale and large scale behavior of the structure functions is significantly larger than the pixel size \( \delta_o \) but similar to material micro-structure length scales. Indeed, the paper fibers have a length of the order of 800 \( \mu m \) (their diameter being of the order of 10 \( \mu m \)). For the PMMA experiments, the sand-blasting procedure leads to a random topography from indentation impacts at a length scale of 50 \( \mu m \) corresponding to the sand grain size. Minerals in granite provide also length scales. Typically their size is of the order of 1 mm. Therefore the fanning of the structure functions at small scales, most likely, reflects the micro-structures of the material.

Second, we examined the scaling behavior of the struc-

FIG. 1: (Color online) Convergence of the moment ratios \( R_k \) as function of \( \delta/\delta_o \) towards the Gaussian ratios \( R_k^G \) for the different order \( k = 1, 2, ..., 6 \) (\( \delta_o \) is the pixel size). For each set, the individual lines visible for the small scales, represents from below to above increasing \( k \) values. The various ratios \( R_k \) are averaged over a) 6 interfacial fronts in PMMA, b) 5 fracture fronts in Paper and 100 profiles c) perpendicular to the fracture propagation in a granite block. The cross-over length scale is labelled \( \Lambda \) and estimated as the scale at which \( |1 - R_k/R_k^G| < 5\% \), for \( k = 1, 3 \).
Note that we subtract the averaged height fluctuations in order to center the various distributions around a zero mean. The structure functions (Eq. (1)) are defined by the Gaussian ratios, normalized by the Gaussian ratios, the fact that the rescaling by Gaussian ratios leads to a data collapse above the cross-over length scales Λ, when δh is sampled from a grid of 2000 lines in the direction perpendicular to the fracture propagation in a 3D granite block. We show the distribution for logarithmically increasing length scales δ. Note that in addition, we have shifted the various distributions logarithmically for visual clarity. We plot on a semilog scale $P(\Delta h)/\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}$ versus $(\Delta h)/\sqrt{2\sigma^2}$ and observe at large scales a typical parabolic shape of a Gaussian distribution. The solid lines represent the curve $y = e^{-x^2}$ and fit the experimental distributions above a characteristic length scale $\Lambda \sim 20h_0 \sim 1 mm$. Inset: The scaling behavior of the standard deviation of the distributions $P(\Delta h(\delta))$ allows us to extract the roughness of the fracture surface: $\sigma \propto \delta^{\zeta_{sd}}$ with $\zeta_{sd} \approx 0.75$.

![FIG. 2: Data collapse of the structure function normalized by the Gaussian ratios $C_k(\delta)/R_k^2$ for the values $k = 1, 2, ... , 6$ (bottom to top curves for each material). The various data set are displaced vertically to improve the visual clarity. The dashed lines are eye guidance line based on previous extended estimated of the roughness exponent (typically based on to the second order structure functions $C_2(\delta)/R_2^2$)): for PMMA $\zeta \approx 0.6$, for paper $\zeta_{sd} \approx 0.6$ and for granite $\zeta_{sd} \approx 0.8$.]](image)

![FIG. 3: (Color online) Statistical distributions of the height fluctuations $P(\Delta h)$ sampled from a grid of 2000 lines in the direction perpendicular to the fracture propagation in a 3D granite block. We show the distribution for logarithmically increasing length scales $\delta$. The various data set consisted of 2000 profiles $h(x)$ each containing 2000 points. We clearly see that above the characteristic length scale $\Lambda \sim 1 mm$ (i.e., 20 $\delta_0$), the shape of the distributions become Gaussian. Interestingly, a similar cross over has been observed in the width distribution of contact lines measured recently [13]. We emphasize that the self-affine behavior of the fracture front enters through the scaling of the standard deviation $\sigma \propto \delta^{\zeta_{sd}}$. We obtained from a direct estimate (see the inset in Fig. 3), $\zeta_{sd} \approx 0.75$. This estimate is typically a low side estimate of the roughness exponent [20].

At small scales (see Fig. 3), we observe a fanning of the structure functions together with a deviation from a gaussian distribution in particular for the tails of the distribution (see Fig. 3). Several authors have reported similar findings [3, 32]. If one assumes that the scaling of the structure functions can be fitted by power laws, a multi-scaling analysis can be performed. This has already been recently reported for the paper data [3]. Fig. 3a shows the fits of the structure function in this framework with a linear law for the scaling exponents: $\zeta_{sd} = H - \alpha \delta$ with $H = 0.64$ and $\alpha = 0.026 \pm 0.002$ [3] (In ref. [3, 22], the definition of the structure function is different leading to a quadratic framework for the scaling exponent).
fits are consistent for a short range of scales around the cross-over length scale $\Lambda$ but not at very small scales. We clearly see that corrections to scaling are significant for scales smaller than $\Lambda$.

We argue that the multi affine-like behavior at the smallest scales is possibly a result of jump discontinuities in the fracture front sampling. Such discontinuities are likely to arise from the material properties or from lack of sufficient resolution in measurement processes. Fig. 3a shows a typical picture of a fracture in paper sheet. The line that defines the fracture front has been superimposed. Clearly the front is strongly influenced by the non broken fibers along the fracture. Numerous front fluctuations are related to an arbitrary definition of the front along the fiber. Accordingly, the front includes a set of vertical jumps. One important question is: what is the influence of these jumps on the scaling of the fracture front? Possibly it may have a significant contribution. Indeed, in KPZ models on kinetic surface of the fracture front? Possibly it may have a significant contribution. Indeed, in KPZ models on kinetic surface roughening, a broadly distributed noise gives rise to rare but large perturbations of the surface and hence a multiscale of the structure functions at small scales [21].

To illuminate the origin of such multi affine behavior, consider a piecewise continuous fracture surface with a number of vertical jumps of size $\epsilon_i$, e.g. due to overhangs, microscopical defects or the grain size in granite and the fibre size in paper. On sufficiently small length scales $\delta$, the height variations in the surface will be negligible relative to the jump size $\epsilon_i$. The structure function will therefore collect from each jump a contribution roughly proportional to $\delta \epsilon_i^k$. Overall, the contribution to Eq. (1) will be $C_k(\delta) \sim \delta^{1/k} \left( \sum_i \epsilon_i^k \right)^{1/k}$ where the sum is taken over all the jumps. We see that the structure function now scales with a $k$-dependent Hurst exponent $\zeta_k = 1/k$. Actually this behavior is observed for paper data, for values of $k$ close to or larger than unity (see Fig. 3b) at small scales. For small values of $k$ the effect of the vertical jumps will diminish relative to the ordinary surface roughening and therefore $\zeta_k \approx \zeta$ for $k \ll 1$.

On the contrary, the influence of the jumps is rather limited for PMMA and Granite data. Fig. 3a shows a picture of the fracture for PMMA. No fiber emerges from the front. The crack front is more easily and precisely defined. Only limited flaws interact with the main crack front and subsequently limited jumps are present. Hence, the $1/k$ behavior is not observed for the scaling exponents of the structure functions (see Fig. 3c). The Granite crack surface is similar to the PMMA crack experiment in the sense that the interface is clearly defined and profiles along it contain very limited jumps. In this case, the $1/k$ behavior is also not observed (see Fig. 3d).

A related aspect might strongly influences the structure functions at small scales. Indeed, it is important to have in mind that the experimental scan of the surface at small scales might be spurious due to limitations of the profilometers or scanners leading for instance to artificial jumps in the measured profiles. The discretization (coarse graining) of the data also plays a crucial role, see [21].
FIG. 4: Details at small scales of the structure functions $C_k$ normalized by the Gaussian ratio $R_k^G$ for different $k = 1, 2, ..., 6$ (from bottom to top curves): a) Paper data with power law fits based on a quadratic function of the exponent $[6]$ (each plot has been shifted for readability); b) Same paper data but with power law fits based on a $1/k$ function of the exponent; c) PMMA data with power law fits ($1/k$ fits are not consistent with the data.); d) Granite data with power law fits ($1/k$ fits are not consistent with the data). $\delta_0$ is the pixel size.

FIG. 5: (Color online) Zoom of crack front images: a) paper sheet; b) PMMA
FIG. 6: Influence of the sampling resolution on the structure functions \( C_k(\delta)/R_k \) (for \( k=2,3,4 \) from bottom to top curves of each resolution). A synthetic self-affine front of 16384 points with a roughness exponent \( \zeta = 0.6 \), has been coarse-grained using different resolutions. Each resolution is defined by the number of bins (in bits: 3, 5, 7 or 9) required to cover two rms of \( h \). Note that the fanning of the structure functions on the small scales diminishes as the resolution is increased.
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