Crack Street: The Cycloidal Wake of a Cylinder Tearing through a Thin Sheet
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When a cylindrical tool cuts through a thin sheet of a relatively brittle material, it leaves behind a visually arresting crack street in its wake, reminiscent of a vortex street in the wake of a cylinder moving through a fluid. We show that simple geometrical arguments based on the interplay of in-plane stretching and out-of-plane bending suffice to explain the cycloidal morphology of the curved crack. The coupling between geometry and dynamics also allows us to explain the “stick-slip”-like behavior of tearing and suggests that these oscillations should occur generically in the brittle fracture of thin solid films.
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Despite enormous recent efforts to understand the stability and motion of cracks [1], there is no general theory capable of predicting the path of a crack as it moves through a three-dimensional solid. Thus one might imagine that if one considers the motion of a crack in a thin sheet capable of geometrically large deformations, the problem becomes essentially untractable. In fact, the vast separation of length scales actually simplifies the problem by clearly separating the statics and dynamics of the different modes of deformation. Therefore crack propagation in thin films offers a very different window into the mechanics and dynamics of fracture, both in the context of fundamentals and in processes involving thin films in materials science [2,3], impact engineering [4], and geophysics [5,6]. Here we address the unsteady dynamics and oscillatory morphology of a crack that forms in the wake of a relatively blunt tool used to cut through a thin brittle film, motivated by observations of the everyday chore of opening an envelope. If a knifelike letter opener is used, the result is a cleanly opened envelope. If a knifelike letter opener is used, the result is a cleanly opened envelope. If one uses a finger instead, the result is usually a rather raggedly torn envelope. This suggests that there is an instability that is controlled by the ratio of the tool (finger) diameter \(d\) to the sheet thickness \(h\).

To investigate this phenomenon using a controlled experiment, we attach a thin sheet (\(h = 40–50 \mu m\)) made of a relatively brittle material such as polypropylene with a low tearing strength (wrappers used to package audio and video tapes, compact disks, etc., all work very well because of their layered structure which makes them stiff out-of-plane shear) by clamping it to a long rigid rectangular frame (length \(l\), width \(w\), \(h \ll w < l\)) along its length, as shown in Fig. 1(a). A sharp notch centered along one of the free lateral edges is used as a nucleating site from where tearing is initiated by the tool, a rigid rod (\(d \sim 0.25–25 \text{ mm}\)) of circular cross section with its axis perpendicular to the plane of the frame. The tool is attached to a motorized stage that can move parallel to the long axis of the frame at a uniform speed (\(v_t \sim 0.25–25 \text{ mm/s}\). When the aspect ratio \(d/h \ll (d/h)_c\), a critical threshold, the crack in the wake of the tool is straight. However, when \((d/h) > (d/h)_c\), the straight crack loses stability to a spatiotemporal oscillatory mode of propagation, leaving behind a torn edge which suffers no permanent out-of-plane deformation [7] but is highly regular [Figs. 1(b)–1(e)]. The form of the torn edge is independent of the cross-sectional shape of the tool [8]; square, rectangular, and hexagonal cross-sectional tools all lead to similar shapes. More complex tear morphologies are also seen when the sheet is initially nonplanar and/or slack leading to interesting dynamical transitions shown in Fig. 1(f); we will not consider these any further, and instead focus on the quantitative description of the periodic states in Figs. 1(b)–1(e). The mechanism for the instability can be understood by considering the deformation of the sheet in response to the forces that the tool exerts on it. When the diameter of the tool is smaller than or comparable to the thickness of the sheet, the primarily planar sheet deformation leads to a stress profile that yields a maximum hoop stress just ahead of the tool so that the sheet tears linearly just ahead of the tool. At the other extreme, if the tool diameter is much larger than the thickness of the sheet with \(h \ll d < w < l\), so that all the scales are relatively well separated, the motion of the tool causes the sheet to bend out of the plane as shown in Fig. 2(a). In this situation, the maximum stress that leads to rupture is no longer directly ahead of the tool but is instead at an angle to the direction of tool motion. If the maximum deflection of the sheet in the vicinity of the tool is denoted by \(\xi\), the typical curvature induced in the sheet by the tool scales as \(\xi/d^2\), so that the bending energy density \(U_B \sim Eh^3 \xi^2/d^4\), where \(E\) is the Young’s modulus of the material. The stretching strain due to bending scales as \(\xi^2/d^2\), so that the stretching energy density \(U_S \sim Eh\xi^4/d^4\). Therefore, the ratio of the energy release rate in bending to that in stretching \(G_B/G_S \sim U_B/U_S \sim \xi^2/d^2\) [3]. Thus if the deflection of the sheet is larger than its thickness, the sheet prefers to tear by...
out-of-plane bending, while if the deflection is of the order of the thickness, the sheet ruptures via in-plane stretching.

When \( d \ll h \), the geometry of interaction between the tool and the sheet leads naturally to a periodic transition from stretching to bending and back. At the beginning of a cycle, the crack tip is at its maximum lateral amplitude relative to the direction of the motion of the tool, so that the sheet is deformed primarily in the plane [Fig. 2(a)], causing it to stretch, until it eventually ruptures forming a crack that propagates at a speed that is much larger than the tool speed. Since the stress field far ahead of the tool is larger than that giving way to multiteeth patterns and eventually leads to the creation of periodic patterns, starting with a single tooth pattern (mode I) and harks the beginning of the second half of a cycle. Evidence of the stretching and bending modes of failure can be seen by examining the tearing front under an optical microscope. In Fig. 2(b), we see that close to the crest of the wavy pattern, i.e., from A to B the edge of the crack is nearly perpendicular to the sheet, indicating failure under in-plane stretching, while the edge of the crack is slanted from B to C indicating failure due to out-of-plane bending/shear.

The shape of the torn edge is particularly easy to understand in the extreme case when all the lengths in the problem are asymptotically far apart, and the crack is assumed to propagate quasistatically (realizable using a feedback control loop to prevent the crack from accelerating as it first starts in the stretching mode). Then the crack tip will trace out the path of a point on the circumference of the tool which moves at constant velocity in a

![FIG. 1. Experimental setup and tear morphology. (a) Schematic of the experiment in which a rigid rod is driven transversely through a thin sheet of plastic (length \( l = 230 \text{ mm} \) and the width \( w = 30 \text{ mm} \)) attached laterally to a rigid frame. The sheet is stretched slightly so that it does not sag between the edges of the frame. (b)–(e) Typical tearing patterns as a function of the sheet thickness \( h \) and tool diameter \( d \). (b) \( h = 40 \mu\text{m}, d = 0.25 \text{ mm} \); (c) \( h = 50 \mu\text{m}, d = 3 \text{ mm} \); (d) \( h = 40 \mu\text{m}, d = 8 \text{ mm} \). (e) If the film has some lateral slack induced by bringing the lateral edges closer (so that \( \Delta w = 2.5 \text{ mm} \)), and a rigid rod of diameter \( d = 3 \text{ mm} \) is driven through the sheet at a speed \( v_t = 5.3 \text{ mm/s} \), we see the evolution of periodic patterns, starting with a single tooth pattern that gives way to multiteeth patterns and eventually leads to the continuous cycloidal patterns that are seen when there is no slack in the sheet. The scale bar corresponds to 1 cm.]

![FIG. 2. Geometry and mechanics of tearing. (a) The sheet tears by two different mechanisms: in-plane-stretching and out-of-plane bending. The first mechanism is operative at the beginning of each cycle, while the second takes over during the rest of the cycle. (b) The edge of the crack close to the crest is perpendicular to the sheet, signifying ripping of sheet by in-plane-stretching. Away from the crest it is slanted, signifying out-of-plane shearing due to bending of sheet. (c) The crack wake left behind the tool (solid line) showing the region corresponding to in-plane stretching (A to B) and out-of-plane bending (B to C). The tearing path is reasonably well described by a series of cycloidal arcs \([x = R(\theta - \sin \theta); y = R(1 - \cos \theta); R = 1.15d/2 = 0.575d; \theta \in [-42^\circ, 42^\circ]]\) which would correspond to the ideal situation when the crack tip hugs the tool, tracing out a point on its circumference. Here the sheet thickness, \( h = 50 \mu\text{m} \), the tool diameter \( d = 3 \text{ mm} \), and the tool speed \( v_t = 5.3 \text{ mm/s} \).]
the crack moves in two stages; very rapidly at first and immediately after, reminiscent of frictional stick-slip behavior. This is clearly seen in Fig. 4(b), where we show the crack tip velocity \( v \) as a function of time. The curve of two vastly different velocities, the tool speed \( v_t \) and the maximum crack speed \( v_c \) is a function of the material properties and the geometry of the experiment. However, the maximum speed of the crack, \( v_c \approx 1 \text{ m/s} \) is much smaller than the inertial wave speeds in the medium \( v_i \sim (E/\rho)^{1/2} \sim 3 \times 10^3 \text{ m/s} \) (and also much less than the Rayleigh wave speed), suggesting that local dissipation mechanisms lead to the slowing down of the crack. In terms of a simple viscous model for the dissipation close to the crack tip during in-plane tearing, the rate of dissipation scales as \( \mu (v_s/h)h^3 \) where \( \mu \) is the effective “viscosity” of the medium [10]. The driving power due the elastic stresses which scales as \( E\epsilon^2 dh/v_t \), where \( \epsilon \) is the typical strain in the neighborhood of the tool. Balancing the driving power with the dissipation rate yields

\[
v_c \sim E\epsilon^2 d/\mu.
\]

Substituting in typical values for the experimental parameters with \( E \approx 10^{10} \text{ Pa} \), \( d = 10^{-2} \text{ m} \), \( \epsilon = 10^{-1} \),

\[
\frac{d}{2} (\theta - \sin \theta), \quad y = \frac{d}{2} (1 - \cos \theta),
\]

where \( \theta \) is the angular position of the crack tip relative to the direction of tool motion. Thus, we might expect that the crack tip follows an arc of a cycloid over each half-cycle of tearing. Figure 2(c) shows that this is a good approximation and the small deviations from the cycloidal path that arise due to finite size and dynamical effects. Quantitatively, the experimentally fitted cycloid is characterized by a circle of radius \( r/d = 0.025 \), and dynamical effects. The alternation between stretching and bending deformations also has dynamical implications, which we study by tracking the crack tip using high-speed photography (500–5000 fps). In Fig. 4(a), we show the position of the crack tip as a function of time and see that in each cycle the crack moves in two stages; very rapidly at first and then very slowly, reminiscent of frictional stick-slip behavior. This is clearly seen in Fig. 4(b), where we show the crack tip velocity \( v \) as a function of time. The filled and open symbols correspond to the \( x \) and \( y \) coordinates of the tip, respectively. Here \( d = 12 \text{ mm} \), \( h = 50 \mu \text{m} \), and \( v = 12.5 \text{ mm/s} \). (b) Velocity of the tip \( v_t \) as a function of time. Two different times scales of crack propagation \( T_t \) and \( T_c \) can be identified in this figure. \( T_t = d/v_t \), is the slow time scale associated with the tool speed, while \( T_c = d/v_c \) is the fast time scale associated with the maximum intrinsic crack speed in the sheet \( v_c \).

FIG. 3. Wavelength and amplitude of the wake. (a) Below a critical value of the aspect ratio of the tool, \( (d/h)_c \approx 30 \), the crack is straight and stable, while above it, the crack is unsteady and curved. The scaled wavelength \( \lambda/h \) varies linearly with the scaled tool diameter \( d/h \). The closed and open symbols represent data for sheets of thickness 40 and 50 \( \mu \text{m} \), respectively. The solid line is given by \( \lambda/h = (1.22 \pm 0.01)d/h \). (b) The dimensionless amplitude \( A/h \) of the pattern also varies linearly with \( d/h \). Closed and open symbols represent films of thickness 40 and 50 \( \mu \text{m} \), respectively, and the solid line is given by \( A/h = (0.9 \pm 0.03)d/h \). For the 40 \( \mu \text{m} \) film, the dotted line indicates a transition region, in which tearing can be both stable and unstable.

FIG. 4. Stick-slip dynamics of tearing. (a) Position of the crack tip as a function of time. The filled and open symbols correspond to the \( x \) and \( y \) coordinates of the tip, respectively. Here \( d = 12 \text{ mm} \), \( h = 50 \mu \text{m} \), and \( v = 12.5 \text{ mm/s} \). (b) Velocity of the tip \( v_t \) as a function of time. Two different times scales of crack propagation \( T_t \) and \( T_c \) can be identified in this figure. \( T_t = d/v_t \), is the slow time scale associated with the tool speed, while \( T_c = d/v_c \) is the fast time scale associated with the maximum intrinsic crack speed in the sheet \( v_c \).
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The finite horizontal intercept suggests that if the diameter of the tool is below a critical value, the stick-slip behavior will give way to steady tearing, qualitatively consistent with observations.
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Although the essence of our qualitative geometrical argument for the morphology of the crack does not change, the cycloid equation (1) in our Letter is only an idealization. A thorough stress analysis of the problem is clearly required to determine the actual crack morphology. This erratum corrects an equation in the caption of Fig. 2 in our Letter. The tearing tip oscillates between $-\beta \pi/2$ to $\beta \pi/2$ and not between $-\pi/2$ to $\pi/2$, where $\beta < 1$. Furthermore, the radius of the circle that the tearing tip traverses is not $d/2$ but $\alpha d/2$, where $\alpha > 1$ reflects the fact that the crack tip does not hug the tool perfectly. Thus, the best fit of our data, shown in Fig. 2(c), is given by prolate-cycloidal arcs that are written as

$$x = (d/2)\left(\theta - \alpha \sin\theta\right), \quad y = (d/2)(1 - \alpha \cos\theta).$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Note that this is different from the equation in the caption to Fig. 2(c), where a factor $\alpha$ was inadvertently left out. Each time the tip changes direction, it jumps an angle of $(1 - \beta)\pi$. This is a dynamic event, as shown in Fig. 4 of the original Letter, and leads to a jump in angular position then resulting in a shift along the $x$ axis of a distance $(d/2)(1 - \beta)\pi$. Each subsequent theoretical arc is therefore shifted by this distance. For the same reason, the very first arc gets shifted by a distance $(d/4)(1 - \beta)\pi$. The curves should be accompanied by the caption: The tearing path is reasonably well described by a series of prolate-cycloidal arcs ($\alpha = 1.15$ and $\beta = 0.467$) represented by Eq. (1) of this erratum.

B. Audoly is acknowledged for bringing this error to our attention.
Comment on “Crack Street: The Cycloidal Wake of a Cylinder Tearing through a Thin Sheet”

A new mode of oscillatory fracture in brittle thin films has recently been reported in two independent experiments [1,2]. When an object is driven through a thin film clamped along its lateral boundaries, the film tears following a striking sawtooth pattern, as the crack tip propagates in an oscillatory manner.

In their Letter, Ghatak and Mahadevan [1,3] make an analogy with the classical construction of a cycloid and claim that the crack path consists of series of arcs of prolate cycloids (APC). This approach is based on the assumptions that (i) the crack tip moves along an arc of circle in the cutting tool’s frame of reference and (ii) it does so with an angular velocity that is constant with an alternating sign. Whereas these assumptions roughly mimic the oscillatory behavior, they bear some important limitations. First, they lack a physical justification, making their construction an ad hoc description of the experiments. For instance, this construction is justified by the fact that the crack tip moves “on the circumference of the tool” but a heuristic fitting parameter, \( \alpha > 1 \), is later introduced in the model, implying that the crack is ahead of the tool. Second, these assumptions are inconsistent with some of the experimental observations. In particular, (i) in our own experiments [2], we have measured fluctuations of the distance of the crack tip to the center of the cutting tool by as much as 40% of the tool radius and (ii) the velocity of the crack tip presented in their Fig. 4(b) is far from constant, even within the quasistatic regime (stick phase).

In the absence of a solid physical basis, the claim that the morphology of fracture paths is cycloidal is supported solely by a superposition of an experimental path with an APC curve, shown in their Fig. 2(c). Although visually satisfactory, the similarity of the curves mostly reflects the ingredients that have been included in the construction by hand, namely, the periodicity, existence of angular points, and invariance under axial symmetry combined with translation by a half-period.

With the aim of testing the APC construction on a more quantitative ground, we have performed an error analysis of this model: we compared its predictions to those of two reference models which were purposely chosen to be unphysical. To avoid any bias, the comparison was based on the experimental crack path presented by the authors in Fig. 2(c), and the reference models were chosen with the same number of adjustable parameters, two, as in the APC construction. The first reference model is a plain sinusoid \( y(x) = \alpha \sin(\beta x) \), with adjustable amplitude \( \alpha \) and wave number \( \beta \). Note that experimental patterns are far from sinusoidal [1]; hence, as intended, this model should provide a poor fit and establish an upper bound on the error estimation. The other reference model is based on repli-

![FIG. 1. The experimental crack path used in Ref. [1] (solid curve) is fitted by our two reference models (dashed curves). Both fits are significantly better than the one obtained by the authors with their cycloidal construction, as revealed by comparison with Fig. 2(c) of the original Letter [1].](image)

cated arches of parabolas (RAP): every half-period follows the equation \( y(x) = \alpha x^2 \) for \( 0 \leq x \leq \beta \), where \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are adjustable, and is replicated as in the APC construction.

The error of the fit provided by all three models was measured using the rms of the transverse deviation: \( E = (2/d)[(y_{\text{model}} - y_{\text{exp}})^2]^{1/2} \), where \( x \) and \( y \) are the axial and transverse coordinates, the brackets denote average with respect to \( x \), and the prefactor (inverse radius of the cylinder) makes the error dimensionless. The reference models fit the experimental crack path of Fig. 2(c) with an error \( E_{\text{sinusoid}} = 7.8\% \) and \( E_{\text{RAP}} = 6.4\% \); see Fig. 1 above. In comparison, the fit intended to support the APC construction in their Fig. 2(c) yields a much larger error, \( E_{\text{APC}} = 18.7\% \). We conclude that the two reference models, even though just as unphysical, provide a more effective description of the experiments than the APC construction. In this sense, the statement that the crack morphology is cycloidal appears arbitrary and the construction proposed in [1] seems to be an unnatural starting point in understanding oscillatory fracture paths in the tearing of thin sheets.

B. Audoly,1 B. Roman,2 and P. M. Reis3
1LMM, UMR 7607
CNRS/UPMC
4 place Jussieu
case 162 75252 Paris cedex 5, France
2PMMH, UMR 7636
CNRS/ESPCI
10 rue Vauquelin
75231 Paris cedex 5, France
3MCND
University of Manchester
Manchester, M13 9PL, United Kingdom

Received 10 December 2003; published 1 April 2005
DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.94.129601
PACS numbers: 62.20.Mk, 46.50.+a, 47.54.+r, 92.10.Rw

Ghatak and Mahadevan Reply: In our Letter [1], we describe a new mode of oscillatory fracture in thin films (independently observed by Roman et al. [2]), and quantify the morphology and dynamics of these cracks. We also propose a simple physical mechanism that is able to approximately describe the morphology of the crack (in the simplest case only) as a series of prolate cycloids (see Erratum [3]), and give a simple scaling argument for the maximum velocity of the crack that propagates jerkily.

The authors of the preceding Comment [4] take issue with our fit of the cracks using prolate cycloids and argue that since some arbitrarily chosen curves are able to better fit our data, our model is also unphysical. We wish to emphasize that our model was an idealization, and thus only a first step at an attempt to explain what was happening at a purely geometric level using only the barest of physical ingredients—the large aspect ratio of the system leading to the disparity between bending and stretching the sheet, and an idealization of the crack motion. We are well aware of the assumptions inherent in this as well as the limitations of this picture—indeed our own Letter shows that other more complex patterns are possible (see Fig. 1) and that there are large variations in the velocity of the crack in the two modes of fracture [see Fig. 4(b)]. Clearly a more quantitative physical picture is required; we hope that our geometrical picture is just the first step in moving towards a more complete explanation of the dynamics of oscillating cracks in thin sheets.
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