On the Global Stability of Incompressible Elastic Bars in Uniaxial Extension

Jeyabal Sivaloganathan
Department of Mathematical Sciences
University of Bath
Bath BA2 7AY, U.K.

Scott J. Spector
Department of Mathematics
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901, U.S.A.

14th July 2009

Abstract

When a rectangular bar is subjected to uniaxial tension, the bar usually deforms (approximately) homogeneously and isoaxially until a critical load is reached. A bifurcation, such as the formation of shear bands or a neck, may then be observed. In this paper such an experiment is modelled as the in-plane extension of a two-dimensional, homogeneous, isotropic, incompressible, hyperelastic material in which the length of the bar is prescribed, the ends of the bar are assumed to be free of shear, and the sides are left completely free. It is shown that standard, additional constitutive hypotheses on the stored-energy function imply that no such bifurcation is possible in this model due to the fact that the homogeneous isoaxial deformation is the unique absolute minimizer of the elastic energy. Thus, in order for a bifurcation to occur either the material must cease to be elastic or the stored-energy function must violate the additional hypotheses. The fact that no local bifurcations can occur under the assumptions used herein was known previously, since these assumptions prohibit the load on the bar from reaching a maximum value. However, the fact that the homogeneous deformation is the absolute minimizer of the energy appears to be a new result.

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2010): 74B20, 35J50, 49K20, 74G65.

Key words: Incompressible, elastic, uniaxial tension, homogeneous absolute minimizer.

1 Introduction

Consider a homogeneous, isotropic, incompressible, hyperelastic material that occupies the rectangular region

$$\mathcal{R} := \{(x,y) \,:\, -R < x < R,\ 0 < y < L\}$$

in a fixed homogeneous reference configuration. A deformation $\mathbf{u} : \overline{\mathcal{R}} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ of the body is then a differentiable, one-to-one map that satisfies the constraint

$$\det \nabla\mathbf{u} \equiv 1 \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathcal{R}}. \tag{1.1}$$

The problem we herein consider is uniaxial extension. Specifically, we fix $\lambda \geq 1$ and restrict our attention to those deformations that satisfy the boundary conditions:

$$u_2(x,0) = 0, \quad u_2(x,L) = \lambda L \ \text{ for all } x \in [-R,R], \tag{1.2}$$

where we have written

$$\mathbf{u}(x,y) = \begin{bmatrix} u_1(x,y) \\ u_2(x,y) \end{bmatrix}.$$

With each such deformation we associate a corresponding elastic energy

$$E(\mathbf{u}) = \int_{\mathcal{R}} W(\nabla\mathbf{u}(x,y))\, dx\, dy, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\nabla\mathbf{u}$ denotes the 2×2 matrix of partial derivatives of $\mathbf{u}$, $W : \mathrm{M}_1^{2\times 2} \to [0,\infty)$ is the stored-energy density, and $\mathrm{M}_1^{2\times 2}$ denotes the set of 2×2 matrices with determinant equal to 1. If W is both isotropic and frame-indifferent, then standard representation theorems (see, e.g., [4, 9]) imply that there is a function $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies

$$W(\mathbf{F}) = \Phi(|\mathbf{F}|) \ \text{ for all } \mathbf{F} \in \mathrm{M}_1^{2\times 2}, \tag{1.4}$$

where $|\mathbf{F}|$ denotes the square-root of the sum of the squares of the elements of $\mathbf{F}$. Note that if a deformation $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies (1.1), (1.2) and minimizes (1.3), (1.4), then so does $\mathbf{g} \circ \mathbf{u}$ where $\mathbf{g}$ is any translation in the x-direction. In order to eliminate this trivial nonuniqueness we impose the additional constraint

$$\int_{\mathcal{R}} u_1(x,y)\, dx\, dy = 0. \tag{1.5}$$

Our main result shows that if the function Φ is both convex[1] and monotone increasing, then the homogeneous deformation

$$\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}(x,y) := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda}x \\ \lambda y \end{bmatrix} \tag{1.6}$$

is an absolute minimizer of E. Moreover, if in addition Φ is strictly increasing, then $\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$ is the only absolute minimizer of the elastic energy that satisfies (1.1), (1.2), and (1.5).

[1] If Φ is convex, then W is polyconvex in the sense of Ball [1, 2].

The proof of our result uses the technique developed in [14] for energy minimization of thick spherical shells. The main idea is fairly simple. We first consider the stored-energy function $W(\mathbf{F}) = |\mathbf{F}|$. For this function we show that the constraint of incompressibility allows us to bound the elastic energy below by an integral of a convex function of the deformed length of line segments that were initially parallel to the loading axis. Moreover, this lower bound is an equality when the image curves are straight lines that are deformed uniformly and are parallel to the loading axis. Thus, energetically, the material *prefers* that each such straight line deform homogeneously into another parallel straight line. The general case then follows from Jensen's inequality applied to the convex, increasing function Φ.

We note that the final remark in this paper demonstrates that our constitutive assumptions include the Ogden [12] materials

$$W(\mathbf{F}) = \sum_{k=1}^{M} \frac{\mu_k}{\alpha_k} \Big[\lambda_1^{\alpha_k} + \lambda_2^{\alpha_k} \Big],$$

provided $\mu_k > 0$ and $\alpha_k \geq 2$. Here λ_1 and λ_2 are the principal stretches, i.e., the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{V} = \sqrt{\mathbf{F}\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{T}}}$. One of the simplest such examples is the neo-Hookean material:

$$W(\mathbf{F}) = \tfrac{\mu}{2} |\mathbf{F}|^2 = \tfrac{\mu}{2} \big[\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 \big],$$

which clearly satisfies our hypotheses.

The vast majority of prior results on elastic bars in uniaxial tension have analyzed the linearization stability of $\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$, that is, whether or not the system of partial differential equations that one obtains upon linearizing the equilibrium equations, (1.2), and (1.5), about $\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$, has a nontrivial solution. This technique was utilized by Wesołowski [17] to show that a neo-Hookean material is always stable in tension, while certain other constitutive relations do become unstable. Hill and Hutchinson [10] then employed this procedure to prove that an incompressible elastic material is linearization stable in tension as long as the linear-elasticity tensor remains elliptic and the force required to extend the rectangle is an increasing function of the extension ratio λ. For compressible elastic materials similar results have been obtained by Del Piero [6] and also in [16]. Recent results of Del Piero and Rizzoni [7] examine the stability of both compressible and incompressible materials. There is also an extensive literature on plastic and elastic/plastic materials, see, e.g., [8], [10], and the references therein.

We mention that linearization instability does not necessitate bifurcation. The additional technical details needed to establish the existence of a second solution branch can be found in [13]. Alternatively, another approach to this problem was proposed by Mielke [11, Chapter 10] who used the center-manifold theorem to prove that an infinite strip will bifurcate when the force required to extend the strip has a local maximum as a function of λ. When a bar is compressed rather than extended, $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, many authors have investigated this and many similar problems; see, e.g., Davies [5] and the references therein.

Finally, we note that it is unclear whether or not one can use techniques similar to those in [14, 15] and this paper to extend our results to compressible materials and also to three-dimensional circular-cylindrical bars and shells.

2 Isochoric Deformations.

Definition 2.1. We let $\lambda > 0$ and define the set of *admissible isochoric deformations* by

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda := \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{R}};\mathbb{R}^2) : \det \nabla\mathbf{u} \equiv 1, \ \mathbf{u} \text{ is one-to-one}, \ \mathbf{u} \text{ satisfies (1.2) and (1.5)} \right\}.$$

In particular, the *homogeneous* deformation (1.6) is an admissible deformation that satisfies

$$\nabla\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda} & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix}, \qquad |\nabla\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda|^2 \equiv \lambda^2 + \lambda^{-2}. \tag{2.1}$$

The unique shortest curve connecting two points is a straight line. We will need a slight variant of this well-known result. We provide a proof for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\lambda > 0$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$, and suppose that $\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda$ is given by* (1.6)*. Then, for each $x \in [-R, R]$,*

$$\text{length}\Big(\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{L}_x)\Big) \geq \text{length}\Big(\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda(\mathcal{L}_x)\Big),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_x$ is the line segment

$$\mathcal{L}_x := \{(x, y) : 0 \leq y \leq L\}.$$

Moreover, this inequality is strict unless $\mathbf{u}(x,\cdot) \equiv \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda(x,\cdot)$.

Proof. Let $\lambda > 0$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$, and $x \in [-R, R]$. Then

$$\text{length}\Big(\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{L}_x)\Big) = \int_0^L \left|\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right| dy \geq \left|\int_0^L \frac{\partial\mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\, dy\right| = |\mathbf{u}(x, L) - \mathbf{u}(x, 0)|.$$

However,

$$|\mathbf{u}(x, L) - \mathbf{u}(x, 0)| \geq |u_2(x, L) - u_2(x, 0)| = \lambda L = \text{length}\Big(\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda(\mathcal{L}_x)\Big),$$

where we have made use of $u_2(\cdot, L) \equiv \lambda L$, $u_2(\cdot, L) \equiv 0$, and (1.6).

To prove strictness when $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda$ we first observe that if $\mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{0}$, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies that $|\mathbf{a}||\mathbf{b}| \geq \mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{b}$, with equality if and only if $\mathbf{a} = k\mathbf{b}$ for some $k \geq 0$. Thus, for fixed $(x, y) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}$, the choice $\mathbf{a} = \partial\mathbf{u}/\partial y$ and $\mathbf{b} = \partial\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda/\partial y$ yields[2] (after some algebra)

$$\left|\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right| > \left|\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda}{\partial y}\right| + \frac{\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda}{\partial y}}{\left|\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda}{\partial y}\right|} \cdot \left[\frac{\partial\mathbf{u}}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{h}}_\lambda}{\partial y}\right] \tag{2.2}$$

[2] Equation (2.2) also follows from the strict convexity of the norm on lines that do not contain the origin.

unless $[\partial \mathbf{u}/\partial y] = k[\partial \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}/\partial y]$ for some $k = k(x, y) \geq 0$. If we then integrate (2.2) with respect to y over the interval $[0, L]$ and make use of (1.6) and the boundary conditions (1.2), we find that

$$\text{length}\Big(\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{L}_x)\Big) = \int_0^L \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right| dy > \int_0^L \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y}\, dy = \lambda L = \text{length}\Big(\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}(\mathcal{L}_x)\Big)$$

(This argument also provides an alternative proof of the first part of this lemma.)

Alternatively, if $[\partial \mathbf{u}/\partial y] = k[\partial \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}/\partial y]$, then $\partial u_1/\partial y = 0$, $\partial u_2/\partial y = \lambda k(x, y)$, and consequently

$$\mathbf{u}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} \rho(x) \\ \Lambda(x, y) \end{bmatrix}$$

for some functions $\rho : [-R, R] \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\Lambda : \overline{\mathcal{R}} \to \mathbb{R}$. However, since $\mathbf{u}$ is isochoric it follows that $\Lambda(x, y) = \widehat{\rho}(x) + y/\rho'(x)$ for some function $\widehat{\rho} : [-R, R] \to \mathbb{R}$. We next apply the boundary condition $\Lambda(\cdot, 0) \equiv 0$ to conclude that $\widehat{\rho} = 0$. The boundary condition $\Lambda(\cdot, L) \equiv \lambda L$ then yields $\rho' \equiv 1/\lambda$. Therefore

$$\mathbf{u}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda}x + a \\ \lambda y \end{bmatrix}$$

for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Finally the integral constraint (1.5) implies that $a = 0$ and so $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$. □

3 The Homogeneity of Isochoric Energy-Minimizing Deformations.

Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$. Our aim is to prove that the energy functional (1.3) satisfies

$$E(\mathbf{u}) \geq E(\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}})$$

for any polyconvex stored-energy function W of the form

$$W(\mathbf{F}) = \Phi(|\mathbf{F}|), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is convex and monotone increasing.

To present the main ideas in our proof we present our results first for the energy $W(\mathbf{F}) = |\mathbf{F}|$. The more general result will then be a consequence of Jensen's inequality. To simplify the technical details we will assume that $\mathbf{u} \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{R}}; \mathbb{R}^2)$, however, the proofs easily generalize to wider classes of deformations in an appropriate Sobolev space.

3.1 The case $W(\mathbf{F}) = |\mathbf{F}|$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\lambda > 0$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$. Then, for $(x, y) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}$,*

$$|\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 \geq \frac{1}{\left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right|^2} + \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right|^2. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. We first observe that

$$|\nabla \mathbf{u}(x,y)|^2 = \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial x}\right|^2 + \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right|^2. \tag{3.3}$$

Next, since $\mathbf{u}$ is isochoric the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies

$$1 = \det \nabla \mathbf{u} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial x} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial y} \le \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial x}\right| \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right| \tag{3.4}$$

since the above matrix is orthogonal. The desired result now follows from (3.3) and (3.4). □

A straightforward computation then gives us the following result.

Lemma 3.2. *Let*

$$g(t) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{t^2} + t^2} \quad \textit{for} \quad t \in (0,\infty).$$

Then g is convex on $(0,\infty)$ and monotone increasing for $t \ge 1$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\lambda > 0$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$. Then, for each $x \in [-R,R]$,*

$$⨍_0^L |\nabla \mathbf{u}|\, dy \ge ⨍_0^L g\left(\left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right|\right) dy \ge g\left(⨍_0^L \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right| dy\right), \tag{3.5}$$

where $⨍_0^L \phi\, dy$ denotes the average value of ϕ over $[0,L]$, i.e.,

$$⨍_0^L \phi(x,y)\, dy := \frac{1}{L}\int_0^L \phi(x,y)\, dy.$$

Proof. If we take the square-root of (3.2) and then integrate the result over $[0,L]$ and divide by L, the result will follow from Jensen's inequality since g is convex by Lemma 3.2. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\lambda > 0$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$. Then, for each $x \in [-R,R]$,*

$$⨍_0^L \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial y}\right| dy \ge ⨍_0^L \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}}{\partial y}\right| dy = \lambda$$

with equality if and only if $\mathbf{u} \equiv \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$.

Proof. This result is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.2 since

$$\int_0^L \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial y}\right| dy = \mathrm{length}\Big(\mathbf{v}\big(x \times [0,L]\big)\Big)$$

for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ and $x \in [-R,R]$. □

If we now combine Lemmas 3.2–3.4 and make use of the identity (see $(2.1)_2$)

$$g\left(\fint_0^L \left|\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}}{\partial y}\right| dy\right) = g(\lambda) \equiv |\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}(x,y)|,$$

we arrive at the following result.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\lambda \geq 1$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$, and $x \in [-R, R]$. Then*

$$\fint_0^L |\nabla \mathbf{u}(x,y)|\, dy \geq \fint_0^L |\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}(x,y)|\, dy. \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover, this inequality is strict when $\mathbf{u}(x,\cdot) \not\equiv \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}(x,\cdot)$.

3.2 The general case: $W(\mathbf{F}) = \Phi(|\mathbf{F}|)$.

We now suppose that $W(\mathbf{F}) = \Phi(|\mathbf{F}|)$ to obtain the following result.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $\lambda \geq 1$ and*

$$W(\mathbf{F}) = \Phi(|\mathbf{F}|),$$

where $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is convex and monotone increasing. Then, for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$,

$$E(\mathbf{u}) = \int_{\mathcal{R}} W(\nabla \mathbf{u})\, dx\, dy \geq \int_{\mathcal{R}} W(\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}})\, dx\, dy = E(\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}).$$

Moreover, if in addition Φ is strictly increasing, then the inequality is strict when $\mathbf{u} \not\equiv \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$.

Proof. By Jensen's inequality, the monotonicity of Φ, Proposition 3.5, and $(2.1)_2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathcal{R}} W(\nabla \mathbf{u})\, dx\, dy &= L \int_{-R}^{R} \left(\fint_0^L \Phi(|\nabla \mathbf{u}|)\, dy\right) dx \\
&\geq L \int_{-R}^{R} \Phi\left(\fint_0^L |\nabla \mathbf{u}|\, dy\right) dx \\
&\geq L \int_{-R}^{R} \Phi\left(\fint_0^L |\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}|\, dy\right) dx \\
&= L \int_{-R}^{R} \Phi\left(|\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}|\right) dx = \int_{\mathcal{R}} W(\nabla \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}})\, dx\, dy.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to see that the inequality is strict when $\mathbf{u} \not\equiv \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$ we observe that Proposition 3.5 and the strict monotonicity of Φ imply that the second of the above inequalities is a strict inequality when $\mathbf{u} \not\equiv \mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$. □

Remark 3.7. Under appropriate growth conditions on W (see [1, 2, 3, 4]), $\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$ is also the (strict) minimizer of the energy E over the larger sets:

$$\{\mathbf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{R};\mathbb{R}^2) : \det \nabla \mathbf{u} = 1 \ a.e.,\ \mathbf{u} \text{ is one-to-one } a.e.,\ \mathbf{u} \text{ satisfies (1.2) and (1.5)}\},$$

$p \in [1, \infty]$. The details are similar to those used in [14, Section 5].

Remark 3.8. The (Piola-Kirchhoff) stress for the constitutive model used in this paper is given by

$$\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{F}) := \frac{dW}{d\mathbf{F}} - \pi[\operatorname{adj}\mathbf{F}]^{\mathrm{T}} = \Phi'(|\mathbf{F}|)\frac{\mathbf{F}}{|\mathbf{F}|} - \pi[\operatorname{adj}\mathbf{F}]^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{F} \in \mathrm{M}_1^{2\times 2},$$

where $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$ is a pressure. In particular when $\mathbf{F} = \nabla\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$ it follows that the force (per unit undeformed length) on the sides of the rectangle is

$$S_{11} = \frac{1}{\lambda}\frac{\Phi'(\sqrt{\lambda^{-2}+\lambda^2})}{\sqrt{\lambda^{-2}+\lambda^2}} - \lambda\pi = 0,$$

while the force (per unit undeformed length) on the top and bottom is

$$S_{22} = \lambda\frac{\Phi'(\sqrt{\lambda^{-2}+\lambda^2})}{\sqrt{\lambda^{-2}+\lambda^2}} - \frac{1}{\lambda}\pi.$$

If we combine these two equations we conclude that

$$S_{22}(\lambda) = \Phi'\left(\sqrt{\lambda^{-2}+\lambda^2}\right)\frac{\lambda-\lambda^{-3}}{\sqrt{\lambda^{-2}+\lambda^2}}$$

and hence

$$\frac{dS_{22}}{d\lambda} = \frac{2\lambda^{-6}+6\lambda^{-2}}{\left(\lambda^2+\lambda^{-2}\right)^{3/2}}\Phi'\left(\sqrt{\lambda^{-2}+\lambda^2}\right) + \frac{\left(\lambda-\lambda^{-3}\right)^2}{\lambda^{-2}+\lambda^2}\Phi''\left(\sqrt{\lambda^{-2}+\lambda^2}\right),$$

which is nonnegative if Φ is convex and monotone increasing. Thus the force increases with increasing extension, which has been shown by Hill and Hutchinson [10] (see, also, [6, 7, 16]) to be a sufficient condition to prohibit bifurcation of an incompressible elastic material that has an elasticity tensor that is elliptic.

Remark 3.9. Among the many papers in the literature that develop constitutive relations for rubber-like materials, one of the most influential is that of Ogden [12]. The energies developed there are of the form:

$$W(\mathbf{F}) = \phi(\lambda_1) + \phi(\lambda_2),$$

where λ_i are the principal stretches, i.e., the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{V} = \sqrt{\mathbf{F}\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{T}}}$ and $\phi : (0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$. If ϕ is convex and monotone increasing, then such energies are polyconvex (see [1, pp. 363–367]). In order to compare restrictions on ϕ and Φ we note that the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{V}$ satisfy the characteristic equation (recall $\det\mathbf{V} = 1$)

$$\lambda^2 - \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{V})\lambda + 1 = 0,$$

where $\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{V}) = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ denotes the trace of $\mathbf{V}$. The identity $[\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{V})]^2 = |\mathbf{F}|^2 + 2$ together with the quadratic formula then yield

$$\lambda_{\mathrm{L}}(t) = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[\sqrt{t^2+2}+\sqrt{t^2-2}\right], \qquad \lambda_{\mathrm{S}}(t) = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[\sqrt{t^2+2}-\sqrt{t^2-2}\right] \tag{3.7}$$

for t:=$|\mathbf{F}| \geq \sqrt{2}$. Consequently, if we differentiate (3.7) with respect to t we find that

$$\dot{\lambda}_{\rm L}(t) = \frac{t}{\sqrt{t^4-4}}\lambda_{\rm L}(t), \qquad \dot{\lambda}_{\rm S}(t) = -\frac{t}{\sqrt{t^4-4}}\lambda_{\rm S}(t), \tag{3.8}$$

and hence

$$\ddot{\lambda}_{\rm L}(t) = \left[\frac{t^2}{t^4-4} - \frac{t^4+4}{(t^4-4)^{3/2}}\right]\lambda_{\rm L}(t), \qquad \ddot{\lambda}_{\rm S}(t) = \left[\frac{t^2}{t^4-4} + \frac{t^4+4}{(t^4-4)^{3/2}}\right]\lambda_{\rm S}(t). \tag{3.9}$$

Thus $t \mapsto \lambda_{\rm L}(t)$ is monotone increasing and concave while $t \mapsto \lambda_{\rm S}(t)$ is monotone decreasing and convex.

We observe that our constitutive relation can be written

$$W(\mathbf{F}) = \Phi(|\mathbf{F}|), \qquad \Phi(t) := \phi\big(\lambda_{\rm L}(t)\big) + \phi\big(\lambda_{\rm S}(t)\big). \tag{3.10}$$

Differentiating the last equation with respect to t yields

$$\dot{\Phi}(t) = \phi'\big(\lambda_{\rm L}(t)\big)\dot{\lambda}_{\rm L}(t) + \phi'\big(\lambda_{\rm S}(t)\big)\dot{\lambda}_{\rm S}(t), \tag{3.11}$$

which together with (3.7) and (3.8) implies that

$$\dot{\Phi}(t) = \frac{t}{2\sqrt{t^2+2}}\Big[\phi'(\lambda_{\rm L}) + \phi'(\lambda_{\rm S})\Big] + \frac{t}{2\sqrt{t^2-2}}\Big[\phi'(\lambda_{\rm L}) - \phi'(\lambda_{\rm S})\Big]. \tag{3.12}$$

Thus if ϕ is convex and increasing, then Φ will be monotone increasing on $[\sqrt{2}, \infty)$. In particular this is true when (cf. Ogden [12, p. 570–571])

$$\phi(\lambda) := \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{\mu_i}{\alpha_i}\,\lambda^{\alpha_i}, \tag{3.13}$$

with $\mu_i > 0$ and $\alpha_i \geq 1$. Moreover, if we differentiate (3.11) with respect to t we arrive at

$$\ddot{\Phi}(t) = \phi''(\lambda_{\rm L})\,\big[\dot{\lambda}_{\rm L}\big]^2 + \phi''(\lambda_{\rm S})\,\big[\dot{\lambda}_{\rm S}\big]^2 + \phi'(\lambda_{\rm L})\ddot{\lambda}_{\rm L} + \phi'(\lambda_{\rm S})\ddot{\lambda}_{\rm S}.$$

Thus if ϕ is given by (3.13) it follows from (3.8) and (3.9) that $\ddot{\Phi}(t)$ will be the sum of terms of the form

$$\frac{N(t)}{\left(t^4-4\right)^{3/2}}, \tag{3.14}$$

$$N(t) := \alpha t^2\sqrt{t^4-4}\,\Big(\big[\lambda_{\rm L}(t)\big]^\alpha + \big[\lambda_{\rm S}(t)\big]^\alpha\Big) + \big(t^4+4\big)\Big(\big[\lambda_{\rm S}(t)\big]^\alpha - \big[\lambda_{\rm L}(t)\big]^\alpha\Big).$$

We observe that the denominator of (3.14) is strictly positive on $(\sqrt{2}, \infty)$, $N(\sqrt{2}) = 0$, and

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = 3\alpha t\sqrt{t^4-4}\,\Big(\big[\lambda_{\rm L}(t)\big]^\alpha + \big[\lambda_{\rm S}(t)\big]^\alpha\Big) + t^3\big(\alpha^2-4\big)\Big(\big[\lambda_{\rm L}(t)\big]^\alpha - \big[\lambda_{\rm S}(t)\big]^\alpha\Big), \tag{3.15}$$

which is strictly positive on $(\sqrt{2}, \infty)$ when $\alpha \geq 2$. The numerator of (3.14) is therefore also strictly positive on $(\sqrt{2}, \infty)$ for $\alpha \geq 2$.

Finally, we note that our hypotheses require that Φ have an extension to all of $\mathbb{R}^+$ that is monotone increasing and convex. To see that such an extension exists when ϕ is given by (3.13) we observe that (3.7), (3.8), (3.12), and (3.13) yield, with the aid of l'Hôpital's rule,

$$\lim_{t \searrow \sqrt{2}} \dot{\Phi}(t) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\left[\phi'(1) + \phi''(1)\right] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{M} \mu_i\alpha_i > 0$$

for $\mu_i\alpha_i > 0$. Similarly, (3.7), (3.8), (3.13), (3.14), (3.15) together with two applications of l'Hôpital's rule yield, for $\mu_i\alpha_i > 0$ and $\alpha_i \geq 2$,

$$\lim_{t \searrow \sqrt{2}} \ddot{\Phi}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{M}\left[\mu_i\alpha_i\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha_i^2 - 4}{12}\right)\right] > 0.$$

We therefore conclude that *the constitutive relation given by* (3.7)*,* (3.10)*, and* (3.13)*, with* $\mu_i > 0$ *and* $\alpha_i \geq 2$*, satisfies* $(3.10)_1$*, where* Φ *is convex and strictly monotone increasing. It therefore follows from Theorem 3.6 that* $\mathbf{u}_\lambda^{\mathrm{h}}$*, given by* (1.6)*, is the unique absolute minimizer of these energies for every* $\lambda \geq 1$*.*

Finally, we remark that given any stored-energy $\Psi = \Psi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, expressed as a function of the principal stretches, different extensions of Ψ off the curve $\lambda_1\lambda_2 = 1$ will in general yield different representations for $\Phi(|\mathbf{F}|) = \Psi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. The resulting Φ may or may not be convex and increasing on $\mathbb{R}^+$ depending on the extension. For example, although the previous remark demonstrates that the Ogden material $\Psi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \lambda_1^6 + \lambda_2^6$ does satisfy our conditions, a direct computation using $\lambda_1\lambda_2 = 1$ shows that

$$\Psi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) := \lambda_1^6 + \lambda_2^6 = \left(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2\right)^3 - 3\left(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2\right) = |\mathbf{F}|^6 - 3|\mathbf{F}|^2 =: \Phi(|\mathbf{F}|),$$

which is neither convex nor monotone increasing on all of $\mathbb{R}^+$. However, the constraint $\det \mathbf{F} = 1$ implies that $|\mathbf{F}| \geq \sqrt{2}$ and so all one need show is that Φ restricted to $[\sqrt{2}, \infty)$ has an extension to $\mathbb{R}^+$ that is convex and increasing, which is straightforward.

Acknowledgement. We thank Stuart Antman for his valuable comments and suggestions.

References

[1] J. M. Ball, Convexity conditions and existence theorems in nonlinear elasticity, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **63** (1977), 337–403.

[2] J. M. Ball, *Constitutive inequalities and existence theorems in nonlinear elastostatics* in Nonlinear Analysis and Mechanics: Heriot-Watt Symposium, Vol. 1, R. J. Knops ed., Pitman, 1977, 187–241.

[3] P. G. Ciarlet and J. Nečas, Injectivity and self-contact in non-linear elasticity, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **97** (1987), 171–188.

[4] P. G. Ciarlet, *Mathematical Elasticity, vol. 1*, Elsevier, 1988.

[5] P. J. Davies, Buckling and barrelling instabilities in finite elasticity, *J. Elasticity* **21** (1989), 147–192.

[6] G. Del Piero, Lower bounds for the critical loads of elastic bodies, *J. Elasticity* **10** (1980), 135–143.

[7] G. Del Piero and R. Rizzoni, Weak local minimizers in finite elasticity, *J. Elasticity* **93** (2008), 203–244.

[8] P. R. Guduru and L. B. Freund, The dynamics of multiple neck formation and fragmentation in high rate extension of ductile materials, *Int. J. Solids Structures* **39** (2002), 5615–5632.

[9] M. E. Gurtin, *An Introduction to Continuum Mechanics*, Academic Press, 1981.

[10] R. Hill and J. W. Hutchinson, Bifurcation phenomena in the plane tension test, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **23** (1975), 239–264.

[11] A. Mielke, *Hamiltonian and Lagrangian Flows on Center Manifolds*, Springer, 1991.

[12] R. W. Ogden, Large deformation isotropic elasticity - On the correlation of theory and experiment for incompressible rubberlike solids, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* A **326** (1972), 565–584.

[13] H. C. Simpson and S. J. Spector, On bifurcation in finite elasticity: Buckling of a rectangular rod, *J. Elasticity* **92** (2008), 277–326.

[14] J. Sivaloganathan and S. J. Spector, On the Symmetry of Energy Minimising Deformations in Nonlinear Elasticity I: Incompressible Materials. To appear: *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* Preprint, 2008: Http://www.math.siu.edu/spector/incompressible.pdf

[15] J. Sivaloganathan and S. J. Spector, On the Symmetry of Energy Minimising Deformations in Nonlinear Elasticity II: Compressible Materials. To appear: *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* Preprint, 2008: Http://www.math.siu.edu/spector/compressible.pdf

[16] S. J. Spector, On the absence of bifurcation for elastic bars in uniaxial tension, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **85** (1984), 171–199.

[17] Z. Wesołowski, Stability in some cases of tension in the light of the theory of finite strain, *Arch. Mech. Stos.* **14** (1962), 875–900.