Overall equilibrium in the coupling of peridynamics and classical continuum mechanics

Greta Ongaro^{a,b,*}, Pablo Seleson^c, Ugo Galvanetto^{a,b}, Tao Ni^{b,d,e}, Mirco Zaccariotto^{a,b}

^aCenter of Studies and Activities for Space (CISAS)-"G. Colombo", v. Venezia 15, Padova 35131, Italy
 ^bIndustrial Engineering Department, University of Padova, v. Venezia 1, Padova 35131, Italy

^c Computer Science and Mathematics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, One Bethel Valley Road, P.O. Box 2008, MS-6211, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6211, United States[†]

^dCollege of Civil and Transportation Engineering, Hohai University, 210098, Nanjing, China
^eKey Laboratory of Ministry of Education for Geomechanics and Embankment Engineering, Hohai University, Nanjing, China

Abstract

Coupling peridynamics based computational tools with those using classical continuum mechanics can be very beneficial, because it can provide a means to generate a computational method that combines the efficiency of classical continuum mechanics with the capability to simulate crack propagation, typical of peridynamics. This paper presents an overlooked issue in this type of coupled computational methods: the lack of overall equilibrium. This can be the case even if the coupling strategy satisfies the usual numerical tests involving rigid body motions as well as uniform and linear strain distributions. We focus our investigation on the lack of overall equilibrium in an approach to couple peridynamics and classical continuum mechanics recently proposed by the authors. In our examples, the magnitude of the out-of-balance forces is a fraction of a per cent of the applied forces, but it cannot be assumed to be a numerical round-off error. We show analytically and numerically that the main reason for the existence of out-of-balance forces is a lack of balance between the local and nonlocal tractions at the coupling interface. This usually results from the presence of high-order derivatives

Preprint submitted to Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering October 12, 2020

^{*}Corresponding author

Email address: greta.ongaro@phd.unipd.it (Greta Ongaro)

[†]This manuscript has been co-authored by UT-Battelle, LLC, under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the US Department of Energy (DOE). The US government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the US government retains a nonexclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for US government purposes. DOE will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan (http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan).

of displacements in the coupling zone.

Keywords: Peridynamics, classical continuum mechanics, CCM-PD coupling, overall static equilibrium, out-of-balance forces

1. Introduction

The unavoidable presence of small or large cracks in many aeronautical and aerospace structures still represents a major challenge for engineers who want to simulate a full structural life cycle [1, Chapter 16], [2–5]. Even though classical continuum mechan-

- ics (CCM) based numerical methods are extensively used for the simulation of different structural problems, their application for damage prediction introduces some challenges arising from the presence of spatial derivatives of displacements in the governing equations, which are undefined when the displacement fields are discontinuous [6], [7, Chapter 1]. Since cracks are, in fact, discontinuities in the domain where the problem
- is defined, they do not satisfy the basic underlying continuum hypothesis of classical continuum mechanics. In order to achieve an accurate description of large and complex structures, which can be affected by different levels of damage in their various parts or components, many scientists have tried to equip CCM based numerical methods, in particular the finite element method (FEM), with the capability to simulate crack
- ¹⁵ formation and propagation. The most popular approaches that have been developed in the last years are: extended finite element method [8, 9], element erosion [10, 11], phase field model [12, 13], interface elements with a cohesive zone model [14–16], and the partition of unity finite element method [17, 18]. Even if these different strategies have all been used so far, they all present some drawbacks [7, Chapter 10]. The issues
- related to the use of the extended finite element method to model propagating cracks are manifold. First, in dynamic brittle fracture problems, one may need to significantly modify the input fracture energy in the numerical method in order to match the values of the crack propagation speeds obtained from experimental investigations. Second, this method requires crack path tracking, phenomenological damage models, extra damage
- ²⁵ criteria regarding the angle of propagation and the stress state around the crack tip, and branching criteria, which are not reliable in practice. Third, the implementation of this

method may introduce some computational burdens related to the need to subdivide the cut elements to perform the numerical integration process. The inherent complexity and computational cost of this strategy prevent its application for problems involving

- an increasing number of cracks and branches as well as its implementation in threedimensional problems [7, Chapter 10], [19–21]. Although element erosion has been extensively used to simulate fracture in a number of application areas, this approach suffers from the problem of nonconvergence of the numerical solution under mesh refinement [7, Chapter 10]. The phase field model presents instead issues concerning
- spurious branching formation and inconsistency of branching patterns and angles with respect to the ones observed in experiments [22–24]. In addition, the relationship between quantitative phase field model predictions of dynamical branching instabilities and experimental observations is not yet clear and well understood [25]. Even though interface elements coupled with cohesive zone models have been successfully imple-
- ⁴⁰ mented, their application is limited due to the need of an a priori knowledge of the crack path, since cracks can only propagate along the element boundaries [16, 26, 27]. Furthermore, as in the case of the extended finite element method, cohesive zone models require extra damage criteria [20]. The computational burdens and complexity of the partition of unity finite element method prevent its implementation in three-dimensional
- ⁴⁵ problems as well as its application for the solution of problems involving dynamic crack branching and multiple crack growth and interaction in complex patterns. Moreover, another inherent drawback of this method is the unavoidable presence of a blending region in correspondence with the neighbouring elements of the tip element in which the crack tip is positioned. Since the partition of unity does not hold for those elements, the
- ⁵⁰ blending region is characterized by a lower solution accuracy [28].

In recent years, innovative computational methods based on peridynamics have been proposed and implemented in order to solve complex problems involving damage initiation and crack propagation. The peridynamic (PD) theory is a nonlocal reformulation of CCM based on integro-differential equations, which introduces a concept of dam-

⁵⁵ age for a material point, allowing to predict the evolution of cracks, including their nucleation, their propagation direction, and the points where they start and stop, with-

out having to define any criteria for triggering, bifurcation, and deviation phenomena. The PD theory was proposed in the year 2000. The original bond-based version of the theory was presented in [6] and then extended in the year 2007 to its final form called

- state-based PD theory in [29]. Related nonlocal models were proposed previously by other authors [30–32]. Despite the effectiveness of PD models in solving problems concerning crack propagation [33–46], PD models are computationally more expensive than CCM models due to their nonlocal nature. The computational expense issue is even more evident when implicit time integration is considered, since the number
- of nonzero elements in the PD tangent stiffness matrix is typically much bigger than that in the corresponding CCM model solved with the FEM [7, Chapter 14]. Therefore, the considerable computational cost of PD models hinders their application in large-scale, geometrically complex simulations [47]. Furthermore, PD numerical implementations may be affected by some additional difficulties related to the definition
- of nonlocal boundary conditions [6]. In nonlocal theories the boundaries are fuzzy, so that prescribed displacement or load conditions have to be imposed in finite volumetric regions rather than on boundary surfaces [48–50]. Most of the time, such extension of classical boundary conditions is not clearly defined [7, Chapter 14]. Hence, it would be convenient to couple PD and CCM models in order to take advantage of the benefits of
- ⁷⁵ both models while avoiding their aforementioned drawbacks.

In CCM-PD coupling, usually small areas of a domain, which might be affected by the presence of discontinuities, are described with a PD model, whereas the remaining parts of the domain are represented through a more efficient CCM model. In particular, it is common practice to couple PD models based on the meshfree discretization of [44]

- with CCM models discretized using the FEM. Even though PD models can be also discretized with the FEM [51], in this work FEM is used only to denote discretization of CCM models. Coupling FEM meshes with PD grids (or, more generally, coupling local and nonlocal models) is not as simple as sharing nodes between meshes, as is frequently done in FEM codes when different types of elements are connected to each
- ⁸⁵ other [52].

Local-to-nonlocal coupling has led to a great research effort (much of it concerning the

coupling of CCM and PD models) resulting in the development of a variety of techniques, including the optimization-based [53–55], partitioned [56, 57], Arlequin [58], morphing [59–62], quasi-nonlocal [63], blending [64, 65], splice [66], variable hori-

- 20 zon [66], and partial stress [66] methods, among others; a recent review of these methods can be found in [67]. In the context of the PD theory, the first paper to deal with this type of coupling was [68], in which bond-based PD grids and FEM meshes were coupled by embedding PD nodes within FEM elements. Other early works on the coupling of FEM meshes and PD grids can be found in [69–72]. CCM-PD coupling is still an
- area in which active research is carried out because most of the coupling methods proposed in the above listed papers are affected by some kind of arbitrariness or spurious effects that need to be overcome. In the present work, we are interested in the coupling technique proposed in a series of papers [73–77], which can be seen as an application of the splice method. For the first time, we address the problem of the overall equilibrium is CGULDE.
- in CCM-PD coupled models. This paper studies the origin of out-of-balance forces and discusses possible ways to reduce them.

The analysis presented in this paper shows that the absence of overall equilibrium in a CCM-PD coupled system results from the lack of balance between the local and non-local tractions at the coupling interface. The concept of lack of force reciprocity in

- CCM-PD coupled models and how it leads to failure of Newton's third law between two given objects was discussed in [64]. However, a thorough investigation of this effect and its manifestation in global structural equilibrium in CCM-PD coupled systems has not been presented. The closest studies in this regard from the literature concern patch-test consistency and the so-called "ghost" forces; these are non-physical forces
- that arise in the transition between local and nonlocal regions whenever a coupling method does not pass a patch test [67]. Unfortunately, such studies generally provide only a qualitative assessment of whether a CCM-PD coupled model passes or not a patch test and often limit the analysis to a simple constant strain solution (i.e., a linear patch test). Our work, in contrast, presents a detailed analysis of the balance between
- ¹¹⁵ local and nonlocal tractions at coupling interfaces along with a practical quantitative way to assess the resulting out-of-balance through computation of the reaction forces.

The contents of this paper are organized as follows. In Section 2, a short summary of the CCM-PD coupling strategy presented in [75, 76] and exploited in the present work is provided. In Section 3, the overall static equilibrium issue is presented, dis-

- ¹²⁰ cussing its theoretical background in one-dimensional and two-dimensional CCM-PD coupled models in Section 3.1 and Section 3.2, respectively. In Section 4, the theoretical analysis of the overall static equilibrium problem is confirmed numerically with examples involving one-dimensional models in Section 4.1 and two-dimensional models in Section 4.2. Section 5 extends the numerical studies to a two-dimensional and
- a fully three-dimensional crack propagation problem in Section 5.1 and Section 5.2, respectively. Section 6 closes the paper with some remarks and proposals for future research.

2. CCM-PD coupling strategy

140

The proposed coupling approach is based on the idea presented in [75], where the coupled stiffness matrix is defined and used to solve linear static bond-based PD problems, and then extended to the solution of dynamic problems in [76]. A further extension of this coupling approach to state-based PD models is presented in [77]. In order to better introduce the main features of the proposed CCM-PD coupling strategy, it is necessary to provide a brief outline of the PD theory. More details can be found in [6], where the

bond-based version of the PD theory is presented, and in [29], where the more general state-based PD theory is introduced.

In a domain $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with *n* the spatial dimension, described with a PD model, each material point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$ interacts with all the other material points located within a finite neighbourhood, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}$, of that material point. The state-based PD equation of motion for any material point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$ at time $t \ge 0$ is given by [29]:

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x},t) = \int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}} \left\{ \underline{\mathbf{T}}\left[\mathbf{x},t\right] \langle \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle - \underline{\mathbf{T}}\left[\mathbf{x}',t\right] \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}' \rangle \right\} d\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x},t), \tag{1}$$

where ρ is the mass density, $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}$ is the second derivative in time of the displacement field \mathbf{u} , $\underline{\mathbf{T}}[\mathbf{x}, t] \langle \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle$ is the force state defined at the material point \mathbf{x} at time *t* mapping the bond $\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}$ to force per unit volume squared, and \mathbf{b} is a prescribed body force density field. The neighbourhood, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}$, is defined by:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}} := \{ \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{B} : \| \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \| \leqslant \delta \}, \tag{2}$$

where $\delta > 0$ is the PD horizon. For material points in the bulk of the body, i.e., material points $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$ further than δ from the boundary of the body, $\partial \mathcal{B}$, the neighbourhood $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}$ represents a line segment in one dimension, a disk in two dimensions, and a ball in three dimensions centered at \mathbf{x} .

For convenience, we introduce the standard PD notation for a bond:

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} := \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x},\tag{3}$$

which represents the relative position vector of the two material points \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' in the reference configuration. In the deformed configuration at time t > 0, the two material points \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' would be displaced, respectively, by $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}', t)$. The corresponding relative displacement vector is denoted by:

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} := \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}', t) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t). \tag{4}$$

The relation between state-based PD models and bond-based PD models is given by [29]:

$$\underline{\mathbf{T}}[\mathbf{x},t] \langle \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}), \tag{5}$$

where **f** is the pairwise force function in the bond-based PD theory [6]. A linear isotropic bond-based PD model, provided a pairwise equilibrated reference configuration, is given by [6]:

$$\mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|)\boldsymbol{\xi} \otimes \boldsymbol{\xi}\boldsymbol{\eta},\tag{6}$$

where λ is a micromodulus function.

155

In the proposed CCM-PD coupling technique, the domain *B* is partially described with a CCM model discretized using the FEM. The remaining part of the domain is described with a PD model discretized with a meshfree method based on [44]. The two parts of the domain have to be coupled in a way that ensures an adequate transfer of force between the two regions. Figure 1 illustrates the CCM-PD coupled model in a one-dimensional

- system, where diamonds represent FEM nodes and circles represent PD nodes. Thick straight lines are FEM elements and curved thin lines are PD bonds. Nodes are either of FEM type or of PD type, and no overlapping region exists in the proposed approach in terms of the nature of the nodes. In this example, the horizon δ is taken as twice the grid spacing, i.e., $\delta = 2\Delta x$, where Δx is the uniform distance between adjacent nodes.
- In this case, each PD node is connected by PD bonds to four other nodes. For instance, nodes 5, 6, 8, and 9 interact with node 7 and are called its family nodes. FEM nodes are connected by FEM elements, whereas PD nodes are connected by PD bonds. At the transition between the CCM and PD regions, it is assumed that the last FEM node (i.e., node 4 in Fig. 1) is connected to the PD region by a single FEM element (i.e., element *d*
- in Fig. 1), whereas the first PD node (i.e., node 5 in Fig. 1) is nonlocally connected by PD bonds to all nodes, FEM or PD nodes, within its neighbourhood. In a similar way, all PD nodes, the neighbourhood of which contains FEM nodes, are nonlocally interacting through PD bonds with those FEM nodes.



Figure 1: Illustration of the CCM-PD coupled model in a one-dimensional system. Blue diamonds are FEM nodes and green circles are PD nodes. Blue thick straight lines represent FEM elements and green thin curved lines represent PD bonds. Adapted from [75].

- The proposed CCM-PD coupling technique assumes that internal forces acting on a node are of the same nature as the node itself: only internal forces evaluated using the FEM approach act on FEM nodes, whereas only internal forces computed through the PD formulation are applied on PD nodes. A coupling zone can be defined where forces are exchanged between the CCM and PD parts of the domain. In the example presented in Fig. 1, the coupling zone is composed of the FEM nodes 3 and 4; the PD nodes 5
- and 6; the PD bonds 3 5, 4 5, and 4 6; and the FEM element *d*. The coupling method assumes that the internal force exerted by the FEM element *d* acts only on the FEM node 4, whereas the internal forces exerted by the PD bonds 3 - 5 and 4 - 5 as well as 4 - 6 act only on the PD nodes 5 and 6, respectively. Consequently, the assembly

of the global stiffness matrix is performed by making sure that equilibrium equations of FEM nodes contain only terms coming from the FEM approach while equilibrium equations of PD nodes include only terms derived from the PD formulation.

The case of Fig. 1 produces the following system of equations:

	-										F 7		r -		
	l	-l	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	:	<i>u</i> ₁		F_1		
	-l	2 <i>l</i>	-l	0	0	0	0	0	0	:	<i>u</i> ₂		F_2		
	0	-l	21	-l	0	0	0	0	0	:	<i>u</i> ₃		F_3		
	0	0	-l	21	-l	0	0	0	0	:	<i>u</i> ₄		F_4		
	0	0	$-\frac{1}{4}p$	-p	$\frac{5}{2}p$	-p	$-\frac{1}{4}p$	0	0	:	<i>u</i> ₅	=	F_5	,	(7)
	0	0	0	$-\frac{1}{4}p$	-p	$\frac{5}{2}p$	-p	$-\frac{1}{4}p$	0	:	:		:		
	0	0	0	0	$-\frac{1}{4}p$	-p	$\frac{5}{2}p$	-p	$-\frac{1}{4}p$:	:		:		
	0	0	0	0				·.	:	:	:		:		
									·.	:	u_N		F_N		
1	_														

where $l := EA/\Delta x$ [52], $p := cA^2\Delta x$ [78], N is the total number of nodes (includ-

- ing FEM and PD nodes), $\{u_i\}_{i=1,...,N}$ are the nodal displacements, $\{F_i\}_{i=1,...,N}$ are the external nodal forces, *E* is Young's modulus, *c* is the micromodulus constant, and the cross-sectional area *A* is assumed to be A = 1; the same assumption applies hereafter. To obtain (7), we assumed a CCM model given by (8) and a PD model given by (15) with a micromodulus function $c(|\xi|) = c/|\xi|$. The meshfree PD discretization em-
- ployed in (7) uses a partial-volume correction [79], which applies a factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ to the contribution of second-nearest neighbors. The solution of a single equation satisfies node equilibrium. The overall equilibrium of the whole structure, however, requires the sum of the external nodal forces to be equal to zero.

In the numerical examples of Sections 4.1 and 4.2, a nodal displacement vector will be input into the system and the relevant external nodal forces (i.e., 'reactions', since the displacements are imposed) will be computed according to a system of the type of (7) in the one-dimensional case and a corresponding system in the two-dimensional case. In some cases of CCM-PD coupled systems, the force vector will have a non-zero resultant, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_i \neq 0$, and therefore overall equilibrium will not be satisfied, even if this type of CCM-PD coupling exactly satisfies all standard numerical tests for static coupling problems carried out by imposing rigid body motions as well as uniform and linear strain distributions [75–77].

3. Theoretical background: Out-of-balance analysis in CCM-PD coupling

Traditionally, the consistency between CCM and PD models is studied through the analysis of the corresponding governing equations, as reported in Appendix A. However,

- this analysis does not reveal the responsible for the existence of out-of-balance forces in CCM-PD coupled systems. For this reason, we present instead an analysis of the force balance in one-dimensional and two-dimensional CCM-PD coupled models in Section 3.1 and Section 3.2, respectively. For a detailed analysis of the consistency between CCM and PD models, please refer to Appendix A.1 for the one-dimensional case and Appendix A.2 for the two-dimensional case.
 - 3.1. One-dimensional case
 - 3.1.1. CCM model

215



Figure 2: One-dimensional domain $\mathcal{B} = (0, L)$.

Assume a one-dimensional domain $\mathcal{B} = (0, L)$ as in Fig. 2 and consider the CCM static equation

$$-E\frac{d^{2}u}{dx^{2}}(x) = b(x) \qquad x \in (0, L),$$
(8)

where E is Young's modulus. Integrating the equation over the domain \mathcal{B} , we obtain

$$-\int_{0}^{L} E \frac{d^{2}u}{dx^{2}}(x) dx = \int_{0}^{L} b(x) dx.$$
 (9)

Performing the integration on the left-hand side, we have

$$-E\frac{du}{dx}(L) + E\frac{du}{dx}(0) = \int_0^L b(x)dx.$$
 (10)

In this case, the stress at x_0 is given by:

$$\sigma(x_0) = E \frac{du}{dx}(x_0) \tag{11}$$

and the corresponding local traction is defined by:

$$\mathbf{t}(x_0, n) := \sigma(x_0)n,\tag{12}$$

where $n = \pm 1$ represents a normal in one dimension. Note that

$$t(x_0, -n) = -t(x_0, n).$$
(13)

We then obtain from (10) the force balance equation

$$t(L,+1) + t(0,-1) + \int_0^L b(x)dx = 0,$$
(14)

where t(L, +1) and t(0, -1) are boundary local tractions. The boundary local tractions balance the external forces.

3.1.2. PD model

240



Figure 3: One-dimensional domain $\mathcal{B} = (0, L)$ with nonlocal boundary $[-\delta, 0] \cup [L, L + \delta]$.

Assume a one-dimensional domain $\mathcal{B} = (0, L)$ as in Fig. 3, where $L \ge \delta > 0$, with nonlocal boundary $[-\delta, 0] \cup [L, L + \delta]$ and consider the bond-based PD static equation

$$-\int_{\mathcal{H}_x} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx' = b(x) \qquad x \in (0,L),$$
(15)

where $c(|\xi|)$ is a micromodulus function and $\mathcal{H}_x = [x - \delta, x + \delta]$. Note the relation $c(|\xi|) = \lambda(|\xi|)|\xi|^2$ in one dimension with $\lambda(|\xi|)$ from (6). Introducing the characteristic function

$$\chi_{\delta}(|\xi|) := \begin{cases} 1 & |\xi| \leq \delta, \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$
(16)

we can extend the domain of integration in (15) to the union of the domain \mathcal{B} and its nonlocal boundary (see Fig. 3):

$$-\int_{-\delta}^{L+\delta} \chi_{\delta}(|x'-x|)c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx' = b(x) \qquad x \in (0,L).$$
(17)

We now integrate the equation over the domain \mathcal{B} :

$$-\int_{0}^{L}\int_{-\delta}^{L+\delta}\chi_{\delta}(|x'-x|)c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx = \int_{0}^{L}b(x)dx.$$
 (18)

Due to the antisymmetry of the integrand on the left-hand side of (18),

$$-\int_{0}^{L}\int_{0}^{L}\chi_{\delta}(|x'-x|)c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx = 0,$$
(19)

meaning that internal forces are balanced in a bounded PD body. Consequently, we obtain

$$-\int_{0}^{L}\int_{-\delta}^{0}\chi_{\delta}(|x'-x|)c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx$$

$$-\int_{0}^{L}\int_{L}^{L+\delta}\chi_{\delta}(|x'-x|)c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx = \int_{0}^{L}b(x)dx, \quad (20)$$

which can now be written without the characteristic function (recall $L \ge \delta$) as

$$-\int_{0}^{\delta} \int_{x-\delta}^{0} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx$$

$$-\int_{L-\delta}^{L} \int_{L}^{x+\delta} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx = \int_{0}^{L} b(x)dx.$$
(21)

Following the concept of areal force density introduced in [6], we define the nonlocal traction at x_0 with normal $n = \pm 1$ in one dimension by:

$$\tau(x_0, n) := \begin{cases} \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \int_{x_0}^{x+\delta} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx & n=+1, \\ \int_{x_0}^{x_0+\delta} \int_{x-\delta}^{x_0} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx & n=-1. \end{cases}$$
(22)

Note that (see Remark B.1 in Appendix B.1)

$$\tau(x_0, -n) = -\tau(x_0, n).$$
(23)

We then obtain from (21) the force balance equation

$$\tau(L,+1) + \tau(0,-1) + \int_0^L b(x)dx = 0,$$
(24)

where $\tau(L, +1)$ and $\tau(0, -1)$ are boundary nonlocal tractions. The boundary nonlocal tractions balance the external forces.

3.1.3. CCM-PD coupled model

250



Figure 4: Decomposition of a one-dimensional domain $\mathcal{B} = (0, L)$ into a PD subdomain $\mathcal{B}_{PD} = (x_{IL}, x_{IR})$ embedded into a CCM subdomain $\mathcal{B}_{CCM} = \mathcal{B}_{CCM}^{L} \cup \mathcal{B}_{CCM}^{R} = (0, x_{IL}) \cup (x_{IR}, L)$. The transition between the PD and CCM subdomains occurs at the interfaces x_{IL} and x_{IR} .

Assume a one-dimensional domain $\mathcal{B} = (0, L)$ and consider a CCM-PD coupled configuration where a PD subdomain is embedded into a CCM subdomain, as illustrated in Fig. 4. This configuration enables the use of classical local boundary conditions. Consider two interfaces, x_{IL} and x_{IR} , such that $0 < x_{IL} < x_{IR} < L$. Assume points $x \in (x_{IL}, x_{IR})$ are described by the PD model (15), whereas points $x \in (0, x_{IL}) \cup (x_{IR}, L)$ are described by the CCM model (8). We assume the length of the PD subdomain is at least δ , so that $x_{IR} - x_{IL} \ge \delta$. We further assume the CCM subdomain is large enough, so that $x_{IL} - \delta \ge 0$ and $x_{IR} + \delta \le L$. The corresponding coupled system of equations can be written as:

$$-E\frac{d^{2}u}{dx^{2}}(x) = b(x) \qquad x \in (0, x_{IL}),$$
(25a)

$$-\int_{\mathcal{H}_x} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx' = b(x) \qquad x \in (x_{IL}, x_{IR}),$$
(25b)

$$-E\frac{d^2u}{dx^2}(x) = b(x)$$
 $x \in (x_{IR}, L).$ (25c)

Integrating the equations over their respective subdomains, we obtain

$$-\int_{0}^{x_{IL}} E \frac{d^2 u}{dx^2}(x) dx = \int_{0}^{x_{IL}} b(x) dx, \qquad (26a)$$

$$-\int_{x_{IL}}^{x_{IR}} \int_{\mathcal{H}_x} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx = \int_{x_{IL}}^{x_{IR}} b(x)dx,$$
(26b)

$$-\int_{x_{IR}}^{L} E \frac{d^2 u}{dx^2}(x) dx = \int_{x_{IR}}^{L} b(x) dx.$$
(26c)

Adding the equations in (26), we get

$$-\int_{0}^{x_{IL}} E \frac{d^{2}u}{dx^{2}}(x)dx - \int_{x_{IL}}^{x_{IR}} \int_{\mathcal{H}_{x}} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx$$
$$-\int_{x_{IR}}^{L} E \frac{d^{2}u}{dx^{2}}(x)dx = \int_{0}^{L} b(x)dx.$$
(27)

Performing the integration in the first and third terms on the left-hand side and using the characteristic function (16) for the second term on the left-hand side, we have

$$-E\frac{du}{dx}(x_{IL}) + E\frac{du}{dx}(0) - \int_{x_{IL}}^{x_{IR}} \int_{x_{IL}-\delta}^{x_{IR}+\delta} \chi_{\delta}(|x'-x|)c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx$$
$$-E\frac{du}{dx}(L) + E\frac{du}{dx}(x_{IR}) = \int_{0}^{L} b(x)dx.$$
(28)

Similar to (19),

$$-\int_{x_{IL}}^{x_{IR}}\int_{x_{IL}}^{x_{IR}}\chi_{\delta}(|x'-x|)c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx = 0.$$
 (29)

Therefore, we obtain

$$-E\frac{du}{dx}(x_{IL}) + E\frac{du}{dx}(0) - \int_{x_{IL}}^{x_{IR}} \int_{x_{IL-\delta}}^{x_{IL}} \chi_{\delta}(|x'-x|)c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx$$
$$-\int_{x_{IL}}^{x_{IR}} \int_{x_{IR}}^{x_{IR+\delta}} \chi_{\delta}(|x'-x|)c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx$$
$$-E\frac{du}{dx}(L) + E\frac{du}{dx}(x_{IR}) = \int_{0}^{L} b(x)dx.$$
(30)

Removing the characteristic function (recall $x_{IR} - x_{IL} \ge \delta$), we have

$$-E\frac{du}{dx}(x_{IL}) + E\frac{du}{dx}(0) - \int_{x_{IL}}^{x_{IL}+\delta} \int_{x-\delta}^{x_{IL}} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx$$
$$-\int_{x_{IR}-\delta}^{x_{IR}} \int_{x_{IR}}^{x+\delta} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx$$
$$-E\frac{du}{dx}(L) + E\frac{du}{dx}(x_{IR}) = \int_{0}^{L} b(x)dx.$$
(31)

Using the definitions for the local and nonlocal tractions in (12) and (22), respectively, we can express this equation as follows:

$$t(L,+1) + t(0,-1) + \int_0^L b(x)dx = -\left\{ \left[t(x_{IL},+1) + \tau(x_{IL},-1) \right] + \left[\tau(x_{IR},+1) + t(x_{IR},-1) \right] \right\}$$
(32)

The net force, \mathcal{F} , applied on the domain \mathcal{B} is given by (cf. (14)):

$$\mathcal{F} = t(L,+1) + t(0,-1) + \int_0^L b(x) dx.$$
(33)

We then conclude that overall equilibrium, i.e., $\mathcal{F} = 0$, requires the balance between the local and nonlocal tractions at the interfaces (see (32)):

$$\tau(x_{IL}, -1) = -t(x_{IL}, +1), \tag{34a}$$

$$\tau(x_{IR}, +1) = -t(x_{IR}, -1). \tag{34b}$$

In Section 3.1.4, we discuss the convergence of the nonlocal traction to the local traction and provide conditions under which (34) is satisfied.

3.1.4. Convergence of the nonlocal traction to the local traction in one dimension

This section presents for brevity only the main results derived from the analysis of the convergence of the nonlocal traction to the local traction in one-dimensional CCM-PD coupled models. For a comprehensive derivation, please refer to Appendix B.1.

Consider the nonlocal traction at $x_0 \in B$ in the bulk of the body with normal n = +1, i.e., $\tau(x_0, +1)$ in (22) and assume a micromodulus function of the form $c(|\xi|) = c/|\xi|^{\alpha}$ with *c* a constant and $\alpha < 2$. Assuming a smooth deformation and performing some Taylor expansions, we obtain

$$\tau(x_0, +1) = t(x_0, +1) + \frac{1}{12} \frac{3-\alpha}{5-\alpha} E \delta^2 \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3}(x_0) + \dots,$$
(35)

where the relation $c = \frac{3-\alpha}{\delta^{3-\alpha}}E$ has been employed (*cf.* (A.12)), t(x_0 , +1) is the local traction at x_0 with normal n = +1 (*cf.* (12)), and the dots indicate higher-order derivative terms. In the limit as $\delta \to 0$, we get

$$\tau(x_0, +1) = t(x_0, +1) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2), \tag{36}$$

i.e., the nonlocal traction converges to the local traction at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$. Furthermore, this result reveals that, even though the discrepancy between the PD and CCM models depends upon fourth-order and higher derivatives of displacements (see Appendix A.1), the discrepancy between the nonlocal and local tractions depends upon third-order and higher derivatives of displacements. Nevertheless, the leading terms in both the model and traction discrepancies are both of order $O(\delta^2)$ (see Appendix A.1).

The result in (35) implies that, if the deformation around the interfaces x_{IL} and x_{IR} in Fig. 4 is smooth and third-order and higher derivatives of displacements are negligible, we have (recall (13) and (23))

$$\tau(x_{IL}, -1) = -\tau(x_{IL}, +1) = -t(x_{IL}, +1),$$
(37a)

$$\tau(x_{IR}, +1) = t(x_{IR}, +1) = -t(x_{IR}, -1), \tag{37b}$$

so that (34) is satisfied and overall equilibrium is attained. However, whenever thirdorder or higher derivatives of displacements are not negligible around either of the interfaces, lack of overall equilibrium is in general expected. In this case, the net out-ofbalance force is given by (*cf.* (33) and (32)):

$$\mathcal{F} = -\left\{ \left[t(x_{IL}, +1) + \tau(x_{IL}, -1) \right] + \left[\tau(x_{IR}, +1) + t(x_{IR}, -1) \right] \right\}$$
$$= \frac{1}{12} \frac{3 - \alpha}{5 - \alpha} E \delta^2 \left(\frac{d^3 u}{dx^3} (x_{IL}) - \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3} (x_{IR}) \right) + \dots,$$
(38)

where we employed (35) in combination with (13) and (23) in the last equality. In the limit as $\delta \to 0$, the net out-of-balance force vanishes at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$.

3.2. Two-dimensional case

3.2.1. CCM model

Assume a two-dimensional domain \mathcal{B} with boundary $\partial \mathcal{B}$ as in Fig. 5 and consider the CCM static equation

$$-\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B},\tag{39}$$

where σ is a Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor field. Integrating the equation over the domain \mathcal{B} , we obtain

$$-\int_{\mathcal{B}} \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$
 (40)



Figure 5: Two-dimensional domain \mathcal{B} with boundary $\partial \mathcal{B}$.

Using Gauss's theorem for the left-hand side, we have

$$-\int_{\partial \mathcal{B}} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) dl = \int_{\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \tag{41}$$

where $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$ is the outward unit normal to the boundary $\partial \mathcal{B}$ at $\mathbf{x} \in \partial \mathcal{B}$ and the integral over $\partial \mathcal{B}$ is a line integral. The local traction is defined by:

$$\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{n}) := \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}). \tag{42}$$

Note that

$$\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}, -\mathbf{n}) = -\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}). \tag{43}$$

We then obtain from (41) the force balance equation

$$\int_{\partial B} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}) dl + \int_{B} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0},$$
(44)

where the boundary local tractions balance the external forces.

280 3.2.2. PD model

Assume a two-dimensional domain \mathcal{B} with a nonlocal boundary layer as in Fig. 6 and consider the PD static equation

$$-\int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}} f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B},$$
(45)

where (cf. (1))

$$f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) := \underline{\mathbf{T}} [\mathbf{x}, t] \langle \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x} \rangle - \underline{\mathbf{T}} [\mathbf{x}', t] \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}' \rangle$$
(46)



Figure 6: Two-dimensional domain \mathcal{B} with nonlocal boundary layer (in gray).

and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the neighbourhood of \mathbf{x} . Note that the following antisymmetric property holds:

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = -\boldsymbol{f}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}). \tag{47}$$

Introducing the characteristic function

$$\chi_{\delta}(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) := \begin{cases} 1 & \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \leq \delta, \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$
(48)

we can extend the domain of integration in (45) to the union of the domain \mathcal{B} and its nonlocal boundary, which we denote together by $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$:

$$-\int_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}} \chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}.$$
(49)

We now integrate the equation over the domain \mathcal{B} :

$$-\int_{\mathcal{B}}\int_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}}\chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}'-\mathbf{x}\|)f(\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}'d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}.$$
(50)

290 Due to the antisymmetric property (47), we have

$$-\int_{\mathcal{B}}\int_{\mathcal{B}}\chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}'-\mathbf{x}\|)f(\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}'d\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{0},$$
(51)

meaning that internal forces are balanced in a bounded PD body. Consequently, we obtain

$$-\int_{\mathcal{B}}\int_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}\setminus\mathcal{B}}\chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}'-\mathbf{x}\|)f(\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}'d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}.$$
 (52)

We now have the force balance equation

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{B}} \setminus \mathcal{B}} \chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}.$$
 (53)

Assume there exists a function $\tau(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n})$ satisfying

$$\int_{\partial B} \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}) dl = \int_{B} \int_{\overline{B} \setminus B} \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) \boldsymbol{f}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\mathbf{x},$$
(54)

where $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$ is the outward unit normal to the boundary $\partial \mathcal{B}$ at $\mathbf{x} \in \partial \mathcal{B}$. In this case, we refer to $\tau(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n})$ as the nonlocal traction at \mathbf{x} with normal $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$, and we can express (53) as

$$\int_{\partial B} \tau(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}) dl + \int_{\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0},$$
(55)

where the boundary nonlocal tractions balance the external forces.

3.2.3. CCM-PD coupled model



Figure 7: Decomposition of a two-dimensional domain B with boundary ∂B into a PD subdomain B_{PD} embedded into a CCM subdomain B_{CCM} . The interface between the PD and CCM subdomains is denoted by Γ .

Assume a two-dimensional domain \mathcal{B} with boundary $\partial \mathcal{B}$ and consider a CCM-PD coupled configuration where a PD subdomain, \mathcal{B}_{PD} , is embedded into a CCM subdomain, \mathcal{B}_{CCM} , as illustrated in Fig. 7, such that $\overline{\mathcal{B}} = \overline{\mathcal{B}_{PD}} \cup \overline{\mathcal{B}_{CCM}}$, $\mathcal{B}_{PD} \cap \mathcal{B}_{CCM} = \emptyset$, and $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{PD}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{B}_{CCM}} = \partial \mathcal{B}_{PD} =: \Gamma$. This configuration enables the use of classical local boundary conditions. We assume the CCM subdomain is large enough, so that $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{PD}} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{PD} \subset \overline{\mathcal{B}_{CCM}}$. The corresponding coupled system of equations can be written as:

$$-\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{CCM}},\tag{56a}$$

$$-\int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}.$$
 (56b)

Integrating the equations over their respective subdomains, we obtain

$$-\int_{\mathcal{B}_{\rm CCM}} \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\rm CCM}} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \tag{57a}$$

$$-\int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}}\int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}} f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$
 (57b)

Adding the equations in (57), we get

$$-\int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{CCM}}} \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}} \int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}} \boldsymbol{f}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$
 (58)

Using Gauss's theorem for the first term on the left-hand side and the characteristic function (48) for the second term on the left-hand side, we have

$$-\int_{\partial B_{\rm CCM}} \sigma(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) dl - \int_{B_{\rm PD}} \int_{\overline{B_{\rm PD}}} \chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\mathbf{x} = \int_{B} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$
 (59)

Note that $\partial \mathcal{B}_{CCM} = \partial \mathcal{B} \cup \Gamma$ (see Fig. 7). In addition, similar to (51),

$$-\int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}}\int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}}\chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}'-\mathbf{x}\|)f(\mathbf{x}',\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}'d\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{0}.$$
(60)

Therefore, we obtain

310

$$-\int_{\partial \mathcal{B}} \sigma(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) dl - \int_{\Gamma} \sigma(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) dl - \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}} \chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$
(61)

 $_{305}$ Using the definition for the local traction in (42), we can express this equation as follows:

$$\int_{\partial B} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}) dl + \int_{B} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = -\left[\int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}) dl + \int_{B_{\text{PD}}} \int_{B_{\text{CCM}}} \chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\mathbf{x} \right]$$
(62)

where we used the assumption $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{PD}} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{PD} \subset \overline{\mathcal{B}_{CCM}}$ to rewrite the inner domain of integration of the second term inside the square brackets on the right-hand side. We recall that the normal **n** on Γ in the first term inside the square brackets on the right-hand side points outwards relative to \mathcal{B}_{CCM} . The net force, \mathcal{F} , applied on the domain \mathcal{B} is given by (*cf.* (44)):

$$\mathcal{F} = \int_{\partial B} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}) dl + \int_{B} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$
 (63)

We then conclude that overall equilibrium, i.e., $\mathcal{F} = \mathbf{0}$, requires (see (62))

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}} \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{CCM}}} \chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\mathbf{x} = -\int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}) dl.$$
(64)

Similar to (54), assume there exists a nonlocal traction $\tau(\mathbf{x}, -\mathbf{n})$ satisfying

$$\int_{\Gamma} \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, -\mathbf{n}) dl = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{PD}}} \int_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{CCM}}} \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) \boldsymbol{f}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\mathbf{x}, \tag{65}$$

where, in this case, $-\mathbf{n}$ on Γ points outwards relative to \mathcal{B}_{PD} . Then, we can express (64) as

$$\int_{\Gamma} \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, -\mathbf{n}) dl = -\int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}) dl, \qquad (66)$$

i.e., overall equilibrium requires the balance between the local and nonlocal tractions at the interface Γ. In particular, overall equilibrium is attained if the following (stronger)
 ³¹⁵ condition is satisfied:

$$\tau(\mathbf{x}, -\mathbf{n}) = -\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}) \qquad \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma.$$
(67)

In Section 3.2.4, we discuss the convergence of the nonlocal traction to the local traction and provide conditions under which (67) is satisfied.

3.2.4. Convergence of the nonlocal traction to the local traction in two dimensions

This section presents for brevity only the main results derived from the analysis of the convergence of the nonlocal traction to the local traction in two-dimensional CCM-PD coupled models. For a comprehensive derivation, please refer to Appendix B.2.

We consider the simplified case of two non-overlapping subdomains Ω_A and Ω_B with a straight interface Γ connecting them, i.e., $\Omega_A \cap \Omega_B = \emptyset$ and $\overline{\Omega_A} \cap \overline{\Omega_B} = \Gamma$. We assume the normal **n** to the interface Γ points outwards relative to Ω_A . In this case, following the concept of areal force density introduced in [6], we define the nonlocal traction at $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Gamma$ with normal **n** by:

$$\tau(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{n}) := \int_{\mathcal{L}} \int_{\Omega_B} \chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) f(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}' d\ell,$$
(68)

where

$$\mathcal{L} := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_A : \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_0 - s\mathbf{n}, 0 \leq s \leq \delta \right\}.$$
(69)

Given the linear isotropic bond-based PD model (6), we can express (68) as (recall (46) and (5)):

$$\tau(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{n}) = \int_{\mathcal{L}} \int_{\Omega_B} \chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) \lambda(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) (\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}) \otimes (\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}') - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}' d\ell$$
(70)

330 or, in component form,

$$\tau_i(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{n}) = \int_{\mathcal{L}} \int_{\Omega_B} \chi_{\delta}(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \xi_i \xi_j (u_j(\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) - u_j(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}' d\ell, \qquad i = 1, 2, \quad (71)$$

where we used the notation $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}$ for brevity and repeated indices imply a summation by 1 and 2. We consider below two cases, the first one given by a horizontal interface Γ with normal $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{e}_2$ (see Fig. B.26a) and the second one given by a vertical interface Γ with normal $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{e}_1$ (see Fig. B.26b); the normals $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2\}$ correspond to the steadard Casterian entropy here. In both second second points sutranged

the standard Cartesian orthonormal basis. In both cases, the normal points outwards relative to Ω_A . We assume the point \mathbf{x}_0 is in the bulk of the body. We further assume a micromodulus function of the form $\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||) = c/||\boldsymbol{\xi}||^{\alpha}$ with *c* a constant and $\alpha < 6$.

Horizontal Interface. Assuming a smooth deformation and performing some Taylor expansions, we obtain (see (B.30))

$$\tau_1(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) = \mathsf{t}_1(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x^2}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_0)\right) + \dots,$$
(72a)

$$\tau_2(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) = \mathbf{t}_2(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x^2}(\mathbf{x}_0)\right) + \dots,$$
(72b)

where the relation $c = \frac{3(6-\alpha)E}{\pi\delta^{6-\alpha}}$ has been employed (*cf.* (A.31)), $t_1(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2)$ and $t_2(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2)$ are the *x*- and *y*-components, respectively, of the local traction (*cf.* (42)) evaluated at $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Gamma$ in classical plane stress (*cf.* (A.18)) for v = 1/3, and the dots indicate higherorder derivative terms. In the limit as $\delta \to 0$, we get

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) = \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \tag{73}$$

i.e., the nonlocal traction converges to the local traction at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$. Equation (72) implies that, if the deformation around the interface Γ is smooth and second-order and higher derivatives of displacements are negligible, (67) is satisfied (note $\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) = -\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_0, -\mathbf{e}_2)$ by (43)) and overall equilibrium is attained. However, whenever second-order or higher derivatives of displacements are not negligible around the interface Γ , lack of overall equilibrium is in general expected. In this case, the components of the

net out-of-balance force are given by (see (62), (63), and (65)):

345

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \approx -\int_{\Gamma} \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x^2}(x, y_0) + \frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x \partial y}(x, y_0)\right) dx + \dots,$$
(74a)

$$\mathcal{F}_2 \approx -\int_{\Gamma} \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x \partial y}(x, y_0) + \frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x^2}(x, y_0)\right) dx + \dots,$$
(74b)

where all points along Γ have *y*-coordinate y_0 . Note that approximations and not equalities appear in (74). The reason for that is the fact that (72) holds for a point \mathbf{x}_0 in the bulk of the body; this assumption may not hold for all the points in Γ , which may then introduce a surface effect [80]. Nevertheless, this effect, if present, would normally vanish in the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$; in this limit, the net out-of-balance force thus vanishes at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$.

Vertical Interface. The treatment of the case with a vertical interface is identical to that of the horizontal interface, except that the limits of integration change. Assuming a smooth deformation and performing some Taylor expansions, we obtain (see (B.34))

$$\tau_1(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) = t_1(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial y^2}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_0)\right) + \dots,$$
(75a)

$$\pi_2(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) = \mathbf{t}_2(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial y^2}(\mathbf{x}_0)\right) + \dots,$$
(75b)

where the relation $c = \frac{3(6-\alpha)E}{\pi\delta^{6-\alpha}}$ has been employed (*cf.* (A.31)), $t_1(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)$ and $t_2(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)$ are the *x*- and *y*-components, respectively, of the local traction (*cf.* (42)) evaluated at $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Gamma$ in classical plane stress (*cf.* (A.18)) for v = 1/3, and the dots indicate higherorder derivative terms. In the limit as $\delta \to 0$, we get

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) = \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \tag{76}$$

i.e., the nonlocal traction converges to the local traction at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$. Equation (75) implies that, if the deformation around the interface Γ is smooth and second-order and higher derivatives of displacements are negligible, (67) is satisfied (note $\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) = -\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_0, -\mathbf{e}_1)$ by (43)) and overall equilibrium is attained. However, whenever second-order or higher derivatives of displacements are not negligible around the interface Γ , lack of overall equilibrium is in general expected. In this case, the components of the

net out-of-balance force are given by (see (62), (63), and (65)):

$$\mathcal{F}_{1} \approx -\int_{\Gamma} \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial y^{2}}(x_{0}, y) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x \partial y}(x_{0}, y)\right) dy + \dots,$$
(77a)

$$\mathcal{F}_2 \approx -\int_{\Gamma} \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x \partial y}(x_0, y) + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial y^2}(x_0, y)\right) dy + \dots,$$
(77b)

where all points along Γ have x-coordinate x_0 . Note that, similar to (74), approximations and not equalities appear in (77). In the limit as $\delta \to 0$, the net out-of-balance force vanishes at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$.

- We showed that, for a straight (horizontal or vertical) interface and a smooth deformation, the nonlocal traction converges to the local traction in the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$. The above derivations also reveal that, even though the discrepancy between the PD and CCM models depends upon fourth-order and higher derivatives of displacements (see Appendix A.2), the discrepancy between the nonlocal and local
- tractions depends upon second-order and higher derivatives of displacements. Furthermore, the leading term in the traction discrepancy turns out to be of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$, while the one in the model discrepancy is of order $O(\delta^2)$ (see Appendix A.2).

4. Numerical assessment of the out-of-balance forces in CCM-PD coupling

All numerical examples of the present section are linear in terms of material response and deformation [6].

4.1. One-dimensional case

In this section, an equilibrium check is carried out on one-dimensional cases adopting the CCM-PD coupling strategy described in Section 2. We consider a bar discretized with N = 31 nodes uniformly distributed with $\Delta x = 1$ as shown in Fig. 8. The PD portion of the domain is composed of nodes with coordinates in the interval [10 . . 20], while the remaining part of the domain is modelled with a CCM model discretized using two-node bar FEM elements with linear shape functions. The values of the main problem parameters are L = 30 (bar length), E = 1 (Young's modulus), and A = 1(bar cross-sectional area) in consistent units. We assume a CCM model given by (8)



Figure 8: CCM-PD coupled model for the one-dimensional case. Blue diamonds are FEM nodes, green circles are PD nodes, and blue solid lines represent FEM elements.



Figure 9: Imposed displacement field along the bar length.

and a PD model given by (15) with a micromodulus function $c(|\xi|) = c/|\xi|$. The PD horizon is taken as $\delta = 3$ (i.e., $m = \delta/\Delta x = 3$) and the micromodulus constant *c* has been evaluated through the following relation (see (A.12) with $\alpha = 1$):

$$c = \frac{2E}{\delta^2}.$$
(78)

The PD portion of the domain employs a meshfree discretization with a partial-volume correction [79].

- In the CCM-PD coupled model, a displacement is imposed on all the nodes and the reaction forces are computed using a system of the type of (7). The imposed displacement field is a piecewise polynomial function composed of three curves: two linear functions connected by a cubic function as shown in Fig. 9. The cubic function has been selected to ensure C^1 continuity of the displacement field along the bar length. The three curves
- used for the imposed displacement field are described in Table 1; the value of the coefficient *a* is set to a = 0.0001.

Table 1: Piecewise displ	lacement field for the	one-dimensional case.
--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Curve 1: linear $u(x) = ax$	$x\in \left(0,X_{1}\right)$
Curve 2: cubic $u(x) = \frac{a}{3X_1^2}x^3 + \frac{2a}{3}X_1$	$x \in \left(X_1, X_2\right)$
Curve 3: linear $u(x) = a \left(\frac{X_2}{X_1}\right)^2 \left(x - X_2\right) + \frac{a}{3X_1^2} \left(X_2^3 + 2X_1^3\right)^2$	$x \in (X_2, L)$

The following part of this section presents five different cases of displacement distributions imposed on the bar. For all the cases, we keep fixed the location of the PD portion of the domain and all the problem parameters, while only changing the position of the cubic displacement curve along the bar length. The resulting relative out-of-balance error is evaluated through the following quantity:

$$e_r := \frac{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_i\right|}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |F_i|},$$
(79)

where F_i is the reaction force generated at node *i* after the imposition of the displacement field. In the case of overall equilibrium of the whole structure, the sum of the reaction forces is equal to zero (see Section 2).

395

Table 2 lists the results in terms of relative out-of-balance error for the five different cases investigated (see Fig. 10). In the first three cases, i.e., configurations (a), (b), and (c) in Fig. 10, the cubic displacement curve is located away from the two coupling zones. In the configurations (a) and (c) the cubic displacement curve is placed within

- the CCM portion of the domain, whereas in the configuration (b) the cubic displacement curve is located in the PD region. As shown in Table 2, none of these cases exhibit out-of-balance, since the magnitude of the resulting relative out-of-balance errors is on the order of machine precision. In the last two cases, i.e., configurations (d) and (e) in Fig. 10, the cubic displacement curve is located over the left and right coupling zones,
- respectively. In these cases, the resulting relative out-of-balance errors are about twelve

Coupled model	e _r
Case (a)	9.04×10^{-16}
Case (b)	1.59×10^{-16}
Case (c)	3.02×10^{-16}
Case (d)	1.98×10^{-03}
Case (e)	5.78×10^{-04}

Table 2: Relative out-of-balance errors for the configurations described in Fig. 10.

orders of magnitude larger than the ones computed for the first three cases (see Table 2). These results confirm what was found in Section 3.1: if displacements across either of the interfaces between the PD and CCM portions of the domain are characterized by cubic or higher-order polynomial distributions, lack of overall equilibrium is experienced (*cf.* (38)).

410

We now present the outputs obtained by performing an *m*- and a δ -convergence study [78]. In the *m*-convergence study we keep δ fixed and increase the value of *m*, whereas in the δ -convergence study we keep the value of *m* fixed and decrease δ ; in both cases, the value of Δx decreases resulting in an increase in the total number of nodes, *N*. Both

- studies consider the configuration (e) in Fig. 10, where the cubic displacement curve is located over the right coupling zone. The resulting relative out-of-balance errors are listed in Table 3, where it is evident that the increase in *m* has no clear effect on the out-of-balance level of the CCM-PD coupled model (see cases (f) and (g)). On the contrary, when a δ -convergence study is performed, the out-of-balance level decreases with the horizon value (see cases (h) and (i)). To verify the δ -dependence of the out
 - of-balance, Table 3 also lists the sum of the reaction forces, $\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_i$, scaled by δ^2 . The results confirm the analysis presented in Section 3.1, where the leading term of the net out-of-balance force, \mathcal{F} , depends on δ^2 (see (38)).

In the last part of this section, we present a quantitative comparison between the nu-



Figure 10: Imposed displacement fields on the CCM-PD coupled model with a cubic displacement curve placed in different locations along the bar. The cubic displacement curve, represented by magenta lines, is located in (a) the left CCM region, (b) the central PD part, (c) the right CCM region, (d) the left coupling zone, and (e) the right coupling zone. Long dashed gray vertical lines indicate the interfaces between the PD and CCM portions of the domain, while short dashed-dotted red vertical lines define the coupling zones of the model. The values of the parameters X_1 and X_2 defining the curves in Table 1 are indicated for each case. For clarity reasons, the vertical axis scale changes from plot to plot.

Table 3: Relative out-of-balance errors and scaled sums of reaction forces for the *m*- and δ -convergence studies.

Coupled model	e _r	$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}F_{i}\right)/\delta^{2}$
Case (e), $\delta = 3, m = 3$	5.78×10^{-04}	-2.56×10^{-08}
Case (f), $\delta = 3, m = 6$	6.33×10^{-04}	-2.80×10^{-08}
Case (g), $\delta = 3, m = 12$	6.46×10^{-04}	-2.86×10^{-08}
Case (h), $\delta = 1.5, m = 3$	1.45×10^{-04}	-2.56×10^{-08}
Case (i), $\delta = 0.5, m = 3$	1.61×10^{-05}	-2.56×10^{-08}

merically computed sum of the reaction forces, $\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_i$, and the analytically calculated net out-of-balance force, \mathcal{F} , using (38). We consider the cases (e), (f), and (g) listed in Table 3. Additionally, we numerically compute the nonlocal and local tractions at the corresponding interface, $x_{IR} = 20 + \frac{\Delta x}{2}$, and report their sum. The nonlocal traction is computed by $\tau^{num}(x_{IR}, +1)$ in (B.15) and the local traction is computed by (*cf.* (7))

$$t^{\text{num}}(x_{IR}, -1) := -\frac{E}{\Delta x} \left(u_{x_{IR}}^{\text{FEM}} - u_{x_{IR}}^{\text{PD}} \right), \tag{80}$$

where $u_{x_{IR}}^{\text{FEM}}$ and $u_{x_{IR}}^{\text{PD}}$ are the displacements of the FEM node and PD node, respectively, closest to the interface x_{IR} . The results are presented in Table 4. Various observations are drawn from these results. First, the sum of the reaction forces has the same magnitude as, but opposite sign to the sum of the nonlocal and local tractions:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_i = -\left[\tau^{\text{num}}(x_{IR}, +1) + t^{\text{num}}(x_{IR}, -1)\right],$$
(81)

which confirms the force balance equation (32); note that, in this case, the corresponding nonlocal and local tractions at x_{IL} are equal in magnitude because the displacement field around that interface is linear (*cf.* (35)). Second, the sum of the reaction forces provides a suitable approximation to the net out-of-balance force:

$$\mathcal{F} \approx \sum_{i=1}^{N} F_i, \tag{82}$$

and the numerical values approach the analytical ones as *m* increases. Third, as shown in Appendix B.1.1, the numerical nonlocal traction, $\tau^{num}(x_{IR}, +1)$, accurately reproduces the analytical nonlocal traction, $\tau(x_{IR}, +1)$, for linear, quadratic, and cubic displacement fields (see Table B.12). Consequently, the discrepancy between the sum of the reaction forces and the net out-of-balance force in Table 4 originates from a numerical error in the approximation of the local traction. To show this, consider the numerical local traction in (80), and note that $u_{x_{IR}}^{\text{FEM}} = u(x_{IR} + \frac{\Delta x}{2})$ and $u_{x_{IR}}^{\text{PD}} = u(x_{IR} - \frac{\Delta x}{2})$. Performing Taylor expansions (recall the displacement field is cubic around x_{IR}), we obtain

$$t^{\text{num}}(x_{IR}, -1) = -\frac{E}{\Delta x} \left(u \left(x_{IR} + \frac{\Delta x}{2} \right) - u \left(x_{IR} - \frac{\Delta x}{2} \right) \right)$$
$$= -E \left(\frac{du}{dx}(x_{IR}) + \frac{1}{4!} \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3}(x_{IR})(\Delta x)^2 \right)$$
$$= -E \frac{du}{dx}(x_{IR}) + \mathcal{O} \left((\Delta x)^2 \right) = t(x_{IR}, -1) + \mathcal{O} \left((\Delta x)^2 \right).$$
(83)

The numerical local traction, $t^{num}(x_{IR}, -1)$, is thus an accurate estimator of the analytical local traction, $t(x_{IR}, -1)$, for constant, linear, and quadratic displacement fields, while it is an order $\mathcal{O}((\Delta x)^2)$ approximation of the analytical local traction for cubic or higher-order polynomial displacement fields. The error in this approximation vanishes in the limit as $\Delta x \rightarrow 0$, which coincides with the limit of $m \rightarrow \infty$ in the *m*-convergence study, explaining why the sum of the reaction forces approaches the net out-of-balance force in this limit (see Table 4).

Remark 1. The observation concerning the numerical error in the approximation of the local traction provides an explanation of why the scaled sums of the reaction forces in Table 3 possess a fixed value for m = 3, regardless of the value of δ , while varying when changing *m*. To explain this, consider a scaled sum of the numerical nonlocal and local tractions. Using the fact that, for the cases considered in Table 3, the numerical nonlocal traction accurately estimates the analytical nonlocal traction, and employing (35), (83), and (13), we have (recall the displacement field is cubic around x_{IR} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= 1, \text{ and } \delta = m\Delta x \\ \frac{1}{\delta^2} \left(\tau^{\text{num}}(x_{IR}, +1) + t^{\text{num}}(x_{IR}, -1) \right) &= \frac{1}{\delta^2} \left(\tau(x_{IR}, +1) + t^{\text{num}}(x_{IR}, -1) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta^2} \left(t(x_{IR}, +1) + \frac{1}{4!} E \delta^2 \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3}(x_{IR}) \right. \\ &\qquad + t(x_{IR}, -1) - \frac{1}{4!} E (\Delta x)^2 \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3}(x_{IR}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4!} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m^2} \right) E \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3}(x_{IR}). \end{aligned}$$
(84)

This expression is independent of δ for a fixed value of *m*, and it increases in magnitude with increasing *m*. Using (84) for the cases in Table 3 gives values with the same magnitude as, but opposite sign to the ones reported for the scaled sums of the reaction forces in that table.

Table 4: Comparison between sums of reaction forces, net out-of-balance forces, and sums of numerical nonlocal and local tractions.

Coupled model	$\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_i$	\mathcal{F}	$\tau^{\text{num}}(x_{IR}, +1) + t^{\text{num}}(x_{IR}, -1)$
Case (e), $\delta = 3, m = 3$	-2.31×10^{-07}	-2.60×10^{-07}	2.31×10^{-07}
Case (f), $\delta = 3, m = 6$	-2.52×10^{-07}	-2.60×10^{-07}	2.52×10^{-07}
Case (g), $\delta = 3, m = 12$	-2.58×10^{-07}	-2.60×10^{-07}	2.58×10^{-07}

Remark 2. The analytical expression for the net out-of-balance force in (38) implies that imposing a cubic displacement field along the whole bar results in $\mathcal{F} = 0$, because the contributions of the nonlocal tractions at the interfaces cancel each other (note that the third derivative of the displacement, in this case, is constant). For this reason, the numerical results in this section were based on cases where a cubic displacement field occurs at most at one of the two interfaces. A similar reasoning is employed in Section 4.2 below in the choice of the imposed displacement fields for the two-dimensional case.



Figure 11: CCM-PD coupled model for the two-dimensional case. Green circles are PD nodes and blue (empty) squares are FEM elements. The dashed gray lines represent the interface between the PD and CCM regions, while the portion of the domain bounded by the dashed-dotted red lines is the coupling zone. For clarity reasons, in the figure, $\Delta x = \Delta y = 1$ and $m = \delta/\Delta x = 2$.

4.2. Two-dimensional case

In this section, equilibrium checks are carried out on two-dimensional plane stress cases adopting the CCM-PD coupling strategy described in Section 2. We consider a twodimensional rectangular plate with an internal PD region as shown in Fig. 11. The PD portion of the domain is a square of edge length $L_{PDx} = L_{PDy} = 10$, and its centre has coordinates (13, 19). The remaining part of the domain, the CCM region, is discretized using four-node square plane stress FEM elements for which the element stiffness matrix has been evaluated with exact integration [81]. The discretization of the domain employs a uniform grid with $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.25$, where Δx and Δy are the

- grid spacings in the x- and y-directions, respectively. The values of the main problem parameters are $L_x = 24$ and $L_y = 34$ (plate dimensions), E = 1 (Young's modulus), $v = \frac{1}{3}$ (Poisson's ratio), and h = 1 (plate thickness) in consistent units. We assume a CCM model given by the classical linear elasticity plane stress isotropic model (*cf.* (A.20)) and a PD model given by a linear bond-based isotropic model (*cf.* (A.16))
- with a micromodulus function $\lambda(\|\xi\|) = \frac{c}{\|\xi\|^3}$. The PD horizon is taken as $\delta = 0.75$ (i.e., $m = \delta/\Delta x = 3$) and the micromodulus constant *c* has been evaluated through the

following relation (see (A.31) with $\alpha = 3$):

470

$$c = \frac{9E}{\pi\delta^3}\gamma,\tag{85}$$

which corresponds to a plane stress condition, where γ is a correction factor (see Remark B.2 in Appendix B.2.1). The PD portion of the domain employs a meshfree discretization with a partial-volume correction [82].

In all the cases considered in this section, a displacement is imposed on all the nodes of the plate in such a way as to examine either a single straight interface between the PD and CCM portions of the domain (Case I in Section 4.2.1 and Case II in Section 4.2.2) or a single interface corner (Case III in Section 4.2.3). For all the cases, we keep fixed the location of the PD portion of the domain and all the problem parameters, while only changing the characteristics of the displacement distributions within the plate. The resulting relative out-of-balance error is evaluated both in the x- and y-directions through the following quantities:

$$e_{r_x} := \frac{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_{1i}\right|}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |F_{1i}|},$$
(86a)

$$e_{r_y} := \frac{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_{2i}\right|}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |F_{2i}|},$$
(86b)

where *N* is the total number of nodes and F_{1i} and F_{2i} are the *x*- and *y*-components, respectively, of the reaction force generated at node *i* after the imposition of the displacement field. In the case of overall equilibrium of the whole structure, the sum of the reaction forces for each component is equal to zero (see Section 2).

475 4.2.1. Case I: Bilinear displacement over a straight interface

In this section, an equilibrium check is carried out by imposing a piecewise displacement field composed of a bilinear function connected to a constant function. The imposed displacement field is described by the set of equations in Table 5, where u_1 and u_2 are the *x*- and *y*-components, respectively, of the displacement field $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)$, and the value of the coefficient *d* is set to d = 0.5. The bilinear portion of the displacement component u_2 is shown in Fig. 12, where the two subdomains B_1 and B_2 are defined as

Displacement type	Displacement field equation	Domain		
Constant	$u_1(x, y) = 0$	$(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}$		
Bilinear	$u_2(x, y) = d \frac{y - Y_1}{Y_B - Y_1}$	$(x, y) \in B_1$		
Diffical	$u_2(x, y) = d\left(1 - \frac{y - Y_B}{Y_2 - Y_B}\right)$	$(x, y) \in B_2$		
Constant	$u_2(x, y) = 0$	$(x, y) \in \mathcal{B} \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)$		

Table 5: Piecewise displacement field for the two-dimensional Case I.

follows:

$$B_1 := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathcal{B} : x \in (X_1, X_2) \land y \in (Y_1, Y_B) \right\},\tag{87a}$$

$$B_2 := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathcal{B} : x \in \left(X_1, X_2\right) \land y \in \left(Y_B, Y_2\right) \right\},\tag{87b}$$

where X_1 , X_2 , Y_1 , Y_2 , and Y_B are the bounds of the two subdomains, as shown in Fig. 12c. The bilinear displacement portion is located over the lower horizontal interface (see Fig. 12a and Fig. 12b). The values of the bounds of the subdomains B_1 and B_2 are set to $X_1 = 9.25$, $X_2 = 13.75$, $Y_1 = 12.75$, $Y_2 = 17.25$, and $Y_B = (Y_1 + Y_2)/2 = 15$.

- Table 6 lists the results in terms of relative out-of-balance error along the x- and ydirections. In this case, the force equilibrium is verified along both the x- and ydirections. We performed a similar study by imposing instead the bilinear distribution described in Table 5 on the displacement component u_1 over a vertical interface. Also, in this case, no appreciable out-of-balance error was found. These results confirm what
- was found in Section 3.2: if displacements across a straight (horizontal or vertical) interface are characterized by linear or constant distributions, overall equilibrium is attained (*cf.* (74) and (77)).



Figure 12: Imposed displacement field on the plate for Case I: (a) top view, (b) 3D view, and (c) characteristic parameters of the bilinear displacement portion. The square part of the domain bounded by thick straight white lines represents the PD region, while the remaining part of the domain is the CCM region.

Table 6: Relative out-of-balance error along the *x*- and *y*-directions for Case I in Fig. 12.

Coupled model	e_{r_x}	e _{ry}
Case I	3.28×10^{-16}	5.64×10^{-17}

Displacement type	Displacement field equation	Domain
Constant	$u_1(x, y) = 0$	$(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}$
Quadratic	$u_{2}(x, y) = \frac{-(x - X_{Q})^{2} - (y - Y_{Q})^{2} + R^{2}}{q^{2}}$	$(x, y) \in Q$
Constant	$u_2(x, y) = 0$	$(x,y)\in \mathcal{B}\setminus Q$

Table 7: Piecewise displacement field for the two-dimensional Case II.

4.2.2. Case II: Quadratic displacement over a straight interface

In this section, an equilibrium check is carried out by imposing a piecewise displacement field composed of a quadratic function connected to a constant function. The imposed displacement field is described by the set of equations in Table 7, where the value of the coefficient q is set to q = 15. The quadratic portion of the displacement component u_2 is shown in Fig. 13, and it is applied to a circular subdomain, Q, defined as follows:

$$Q := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathcal{B} : \left(x - X_Q \right)^2 + \left(y - Y_Q \right)^2 \leqslant R^2 \right\},$$
(88)

where X_Q and Y_Q are the x- and y-coordinates, respectively, of the centre of the subdomain and R indicates its radius (see Fig. 13c). The quadratic displacement portion is located over the lower horizontal interface (see Fig. 13a and Fig. 13b). The centre of Q has coordinates $X_Q = 11.5$ and $Y_Q = 15$, and its radius is set to R = 2.25. Table 8 lists the results obtained in terms of relative out-of-balance error along the x- and y-directions. In this case, the force equilibrium is verified only along the x-direction. This result is consistent with the net out-of-balance force in (74); specifically, in this case, \mathcal{F}_1 is expected to vanish, while \mathcal{F}_2 is expected to be non-zero due to the contribution of the second derivative of the displacement component u_2 with respect to x. We performed a similar study by imposing instead the quadratic distribution described in Table 7 on the displacement component u_1 over a vertical interface. In this case, the


Figure 13: Imposed displacement field on the plate for Case II: (a) top view, (b) 3D view, and (c) characteristic parameters of the quadratic displacement portion. The square part of the domain bounded by thick straight white lines represents the PD region, while the remaining part of the domain is the CCM region.

force equilibrium is verified only along the *y*-direction. This result is consistent with the net out-of-balance force in (77); specifically, in this case, \mathcal{F}_2 is expected to vanish, while \mathcal{F}_1 is expected to be non-zero due to the contribution of the second derivative of the displacement component u_1 with respect to *y*. These results confirm what was

⁵¹⁰ found in Section 3.2: if displacements across a straight (horizontal or vertical) interface are characterized by quadratic or higher-order polynomial distributions, lack of overall equilibrium is experienced (*cf.* (74) and (77)).

In the remaining part of this section, the outputs obtained by performing a δ -convergence study are presented. We consider the case where the quadratic displacement distribu-

tion described in Table 7, which is applied to the displacement component u_2 , is located

Table 8: Relative out-of-balance error along the x- and y-directions for Case II in Fig. 13.

Coupled model	e_{r_x}	e_{r_y}	
Case II	1.40×10^{-16}	5.00×10^{-04}	

over the lower horizontal interface (see Fig. 13). As demonstrated in Appendix B.2.1, large values of m are required to obtain accurate computations of nonlocal tractions (see Table B.14). For this reason, we perform the δ -convergence study using a larger value of m, chosen as m = 8; this value has been selected as a compromise between computational cost and numerical accuracy in two-dimensional simulations. The re-520 sulting relative out-of-balance errors are listed in Table 9, where, as expected, the force equilibrium is verified only along the x-direction. The results for e_{r_y} demonstrate that the out-of-balance level decreases with the horizon. To verify the δ -dependence of the out-of-balance, Table 9 also lists the sum of the y-component of the reaction forces, $\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_{2i}$, scaled by δ . The results do not exactly give a linear dependence on δ , which 525 is the theoretically predicted behavior in (74). The potential reasons for this discrepancy are twofold. First, it is possible that the value of m is not large enough to provide the required numerical accuracy (cf. Table B.14). Second, the configuration presented in Fig. 13 cannot satisfy one of the hypotheses on which the analytical derivations leading to (74) rely, i.e., the assumption that, for each PD node, the entire neighbourhood on 530 the CCM side is subjected to a uniform, non-piecewise displacement field.

The reason for the choice of the piecewise displacement fields in Fig. 12 and Fig. 13 was to consider a displacement variation around a single straight (horizontal or vertical) interface, for consistency with the analysis presented in Section 3.2.4. In particular,

that choice was aimed at isolating the effect of corners, i.e., non-straight interfaces; this effect is investigated in Section 4.2.3 below.

4.2.3. Case III: Bilinear displacement over an interface corner

The theoretical results for the net out-of-balance forces presented in Section 3.2.4 hold for a straight (horizontal or vertical) interface and may not hold for an interface of ar-

Table 9: Relative out-of-balance errors and scaled sums of reaction forces for the δ -convergence study.

Coupled model	e _{rx}	e _{ry}	$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} F_{2i}\right)/\delta$
Case II, $\delta = 0.75, m = 8$	1.03×10^{-16}	1.86×10^{-03}	-8.08×10^{-04}
Case II, $\delta = 0.375, m = 8$	5.23×10^{-17}	7.23×10^{-04}	-7.05×10^{-04}
Case II, $\delta = 0.1875, m = 8$	1.05×10^{-15}	1.60×10^{-04}	-3.33×10^{-04}

Table 10: Relative out-of-balance error along the x- and y-directions for Case III in Fig. 14.

Coupled model	e_{r_x}	e _{ry}	
Case III	4.31×10^{-03}	3.09×10^{-16}	

- ⁵⁴⁰ bitrary shape (e.g., a corner). In this section, we consider a non-straight interface. An equilibrium check is carried out by imposing the displacement field described in Table 5 in Section 4.2.1, with the bilinear displacement portion located over the lower right interface corner of the CCM-PD coupled model. In this case, the values of the bounds of the subdomains B_1 and B_2 are set to $X_1 = 14.75$, $X_2 = 19.25$, $Y_1 = 12.75$, $Y_2 = 17.25$, and $Y_B = 15$. Fig 14 shows the configuration under investigation. Table 10 lists the results obtained in terms of relative out-of-balance error along the *x*- and *y*-directions. In this case, the resulting relative out-of-balance error e_{r_x} is not negligible. This result demonstrates that, in contrast to the results reported in Section 4.2.1, if displacements across a non-straight interface are characterized by linear distributions, lack of overall
- ⁵⁵⁰ equilibrium may be experienced.

The results of this section suggest that, for a two-dimensional CCM-PD coupled model, the overall static equilibrium is affected not only by the location of the coupling interface but also by its shape. Consequently, a future extension of the out-of-balance analysis in CCM-PD coupled models could be focused on controlling the relative out-of-balance

error by optimizing the shape of the interface between the PD and CCM portions of the domain. In Section 5, we study the effect of the location of the coupling interface in the context of crack propagation problems.



Figure 14: Imposed displacement field on the plate for Case III (top view). The square part of the domain bounded by thick straight white lines represents the PD region, while the remaining part of the domain is the CCM region.

5. Simulation of crack propagation using the CCM-PD coupled model

In this section, we present quasi-static crack propagation problems. Initially, the entire domain with an initial crack is discretized with the FEM; then, a PD region is introduced, which adaptively follows an advancing crack [76, 77]. We show that the position of the coupling interface of the CCM-PD coupled model affects the values of the outof-balance forces. The main idea is that, in crack propagation problems, high spatial strains normally appear in the region near the crack tip. Therefore, the coupling inter-

face of the CCM-PD coupled model should not be too close to the crack tip. The CCM region is linear in terms of material response and deformation, and it is described by a classical linear elasticity model given by the plane stress isotropic model (*cf.* (A.20)) in two dimensions and the Navier equation in three dimensions. The PD region is described by the linearized state-based PD model from [83, 84]. The values given to the parameters of the problems are associated to the usual units.

5.1. Two-dimensional case: three-point bending test

In Fig. 15, we present the geometric parameters and boundary conditions of a threepoint bending test carried out in this section. The domain is discretized using a uniform grid with $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.05$ [m], resulting in a total of 64,561 nodes. The material



Figure 15: Geometric parameters and boundary conditions of the three-point bending test.

parameters are: E = 2.4 [GPa] (Young's modulus), v = 0.25 (Poisson's ratio), and 575 $G_0 = 500 \,[\text{J/m}^2]$ (fracture energy) [85]. The CCM region is discretized using four-node FEM elements with bilinear shape functions and four integration points. For the PD portion of the domain, we employ the same PD discretization used in Section 4.2. The horizon is taken as $\delta = 0.15$ [m] (i.e., $m = \delta/\Delta x = 3$), and the micromodulus function and influence function described in [77] are used. A downward vertical displacement 580 of $u_y = 0.001$ [m] is imposed on the central point of the top edge of the plate. The imposed displacement is divided into 1000 steps. A crack at the bottom, the initial length of which is 1 [m], propagates in the vertical direction as the imposed vertical displacement increases. Using the algorithm in [85], we solve the structural problem and compute the three vertical reaction forces of the system: F_{y_A} , F_{y_B} , and F_{y_C} , the first 585 two at the supports A and B, and the third one at C where the vertical displacement is imposed (see Fig. 15). The relative out-of-balance error is given by:

$$e_r := \frac{|F_{y_A} + F_{y_B} + F_{y_C}|}{|F_{y_A}| + |F_{y_B}| + |F_{y_C}|}.$$
(89)

The second-order derivatives of the displacement field, $\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x^2}$, $\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial y^2}$, $\frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x^2}$, $\frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x^2}$, $\frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial y^2}$, and $\frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x \partial y}$, are calculated using the PD differential operators [86, 87]. An indicator for



Figure 16: Distribution of $D^2(\mathbf{u})$ based on the CCM model for the three-point bending test in Fig. 15 with an applied vertical displacement of $u_y = 1 \times 10^{-06}$ [m]. The colour plot is displayed in logarithmic scale.

the distribution of the overall second-order derivatives is defined as:

$$D^{2}(\mathbf{u}) := \left| \frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x^{2}} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial y^{2}} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial y^{2}} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x \partial y} \right|.$$
(90)

Given the configuration in Fig. 15, the distribution of $D^2(\mathbf{u})$ for the CCM model with a displacement of $u_y = 1 \times 10^{-06}$ [m] is shown in Fig. 16. It is obvious that the values of $D^2(\mathbf{u})$ around the crack tip as well as around the point *C* where the displacement is imposed and around the supports *A* and *B* are greater than in other zones, and this feature is preserved during the crack propagation. When the crack propagates, we adopt two switching schemes to convert FEM nodes to PD nodes [76, 77]:

Switching scheme 1: FEM nodes within one horizon radius from PD nodes with broken bonds are transformed into PD nodes, as shown in Fig. 17a.

595

600

Switching scheme 2: FEM nodes within a distance of twice the horizon radius from PD nodes with broken bonds are transformed into PD nodes, as shown in Fig. 17b.

In order to ensure that the solutions of the two switching schemes are comparable, we perform the simulation using the switching scheme 1, and then post-process the solution using both switching schemes to study the behaviour of the relative out-of-balance error.

Figure 18 shows the distribution of $D^2(\mathbf{u})$ around the crack tip for different load step numbers (*step* = 200, 400, 600, 800, 1000). The relative out-of-balance error computed with (89) is plotted in Fig. 19. We observe that the relative out-of-balance error is larger



Figure 17: Schemes for switching nodes around the crack tip. Blue diamonds are FEM nodes and green circles are PD nodes. The black line represents the crack.

when the interface between the CCM and PD regions falls into an area with larger values of $D^2(\mathbf{u})$ (switching scheme 1) compared to the case where that interface falls into an area with smaller values of $D^2(\mathbf{u})$ (switching scheme 2).

5.2. Three-dimensional case: Brokenshire torsion experiment

605

This section is only intended to demonstrate that the study presented in Section 5.1 can be extended to a three-dimensional case. We consider a crack propagation problem given by the Brokenshire torsion experiment, which is comprehensively described in [88]. The geometric parameters of the prismatic specimen and the boundary conditions are presented in Fig. 20. The CCM region is discretized using eight-node FEM elements with trilinear shape functions and eight integration points. The initial FEM mesh used in the simulation is shown in Fig. 21. In the central part of the specimen a uniform hexahedral mesh with mesh size $\Delta x = \Delta y = \Delta z = 0.0025$ [m] is adopted, whereas the

- remaining parts of the domain are discretized using non-uniform hexahedral meshes to reduce the computational cost of the simulation. The FEM mesh has a total of 173,082 nodes and 161,824 elements. The material parameters are: E = 35 [GPa] (Young's modulus), v = 0.2 (Poisson's ratio), and $G_0 = 80$ [J/m²] (fracture energy) [77]. For the
- ⁶²⁰ PD portion of the domain, the standard meshfree PD discretization presented in [44] is employed. The horizon is taken as $\delta = 0.0075$ [m] (i.e., $m = \delta/\Delta x = 3$), and the



Figure 18: Distribution of $D^2(\mathbf{u})$ around the crack tip for different load step numbers, based on the CCM-PD coupled model with the switching scheme 1, for the three-point bending test in Fig. 15. The colour plot is displayed in logarithmic scale. The black solid line is the crack. The inner dotted piecewise linear red curve represents the interface between the CCM and PD regions generated by the switching scheme 1. The outer dashed-dotted piecewise linear red curve represents the corresponding interface generated by the switching scheme 2, which is used only for post-processing pufets.



Figure 19: Relative out-of-balance error in the CCM-PD coupled model for different load step numbers for the three-point bending test in Fig. 15 with the two switching schemes.

micromodulus function and influence function described in [77] are used. A downward vertical displacement of $u_z = 0.001$ [m] is divided into 7000 steps and applied as shown in Fig. 20. As the imposed vertical displacement increases, a non-planar crack propagates in the notched prismatic specimen. Using the algorithm in [85], we solve the fracture problem and compute the four vertical reaction forces of the system: F_{z_A} , F_{z_B} , F_{z_C} , and F_{z_D} , the first one at *A* where the vertical displacement u_z is imposed, and the other three at the supports B, C, and D (see Fig. 20). The relative out-of-balance error is given by:

$$e_r := \frac{|F_{z_A} + F_{z_B} + F_{z_C} + F_{z_D}|}{|F_{z_A}| + |F_{z_B}| + |F_{z_C}| + |F_{z_D}|}.$$
(91)

Similar to Section 5.1, when the non-planar crack propagates, we employ a switching scheme to convert FEM nodes to PD nodes and adaptively follow the advancing crack [76, 77]. Following the same procedure adopted in Section 5.1, we perform the simulation using the switching scheme 1, and then post-process the solution using both switching schemes, i.e., the switching scheme 1 and the switching scheme 2, to study
the behaviour of the relative out-of-balance error.



Figure 20: Geometric parameters and boundary conditions of the Brokenshire torsion experiment. Adapted from [77].



Figure 21: Initial FEM mesh used for the Brokenshire torsion experiment.

Figure 22 shows the shape of the propagating crack for different load step numbers (step = 1000, 2000, 3000, 4000, 5000, 6000, 7000). The corresponding relative out-of-balance error computed with (91) is plotted in Fig. 23. This latter result is consistent with the output of the study carried out in Section 5.1 and plotted in Fig. 19, since the

- switching scheme 2 again demonstrates to generally perform better than the switching scheme 1 in terms of relative out-of-balance error. As in the two-dimensional case in Section 5.1, we observe that the relative out-of-balance error is affected by the location of the coupling interface of the CCM-PD coupled model, since its magnitude is generally smaller when the interface between the CCM and PD regions is further from the
- crack tip (switching scheme 2), i.e., further from the area with larger values of highorder derivatives of displacements, compared to the case where the interface is closer to the crack tip (switching scheme 1).







(d) step = 4000



E





(e) step = 5000



(g) step = 7000

Figure 22: Shapes of the non-planar crack for different load step numbers, based on the CCM-PD coupled model with the switching scheme 1, for the Brokenshire torsion experiment in Fig. 20. The colours indicate damage [44].



Figure 23: Relative out-of-balance error in the CCM-PD coupled model for the different load step numbers shown in Fig. 22 for the Brokenshire torsion experiment in Fig. 20 with the two switching schemes.

6. Conclusions

This work concerned the coupling of peridynamics and classical continuum mechanics, focusing on an error given by the lack of overall equilibrium in static problems. This coupling error has been overlooked in the literature. We provided a theoretical analysis describing the reason for the appearance of this spurious effect, and we supported the analysis with numerical simulations. While this paper considered a particular strategy to couple peridynamics and classical continuum mechanics, proposed by

- the authors [75, 76], this issue most probably affects other coupling approaches. We observed that a lack of overall equilibrium may occur even if the coupling method satisfies the usual numerical tests for static problems, given by rigid body motions as well as uniform and linear strain distributions. The theoretical analysis and the supporting numerical simulations allow us to conclude:
- 660

665

670

- The out-of-balance forces are related to the order of the derivatives of displacements in the coupling zone.
- It is easy to evaluate the magnitude of the out-of-balance error by computing the reaction forces.
- In the numerical examples investigated in this paper, the relative out-of-balance error is a fraction of a per cent and reduces as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.
- It is usually possible to reduce the out-of-balance error by moving the coupling interface away from regions of high gradients of displacements.
- The two-dimensional numerical examples suggest that the shape of the coupling interface may have a significant impact on the overall out-of-balance error: corners in the coupling interface can introduce additional out-of-balance contributions.

The impacts of these findings on coupled simulations are twofold. First, the tolerance used in an implicit solution of a coupled computational problem should be carefully chosen: if the tolerance is smaller than the out-of-balance forces, then the computation

will not converge. Second, the proper location and shape of the coupling interface in a computational problem can be defined by using an adaptive approach to convert FEM

nodes into peridynamic nodes. The use of adaptivity, focused on controlling the outof-balance error, can reduce the computational effort considerably with respect to that required by a fully peridynamic simulation and will pave the way to future applications of the coupling of peridynamics and classical continuum mechanics to the solution of

680 Of

many practical problems.

Acknowledgements

Research sponsored by the Laboratory Directed Research and Development Program of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, managed by UT-Battelle, LLC, for the U. S. De-

- partment of Energy. U. Galvanetto and M. Zaccariotto would like to acknowledge the support they received from MIUR under the research project PRIN2017-DEVISU, and from University of Padua under the research projects BIRD2018 NR.183703/18 and BIRD2017 NR.175705/17. Tao Ni would like to acknowledge the support he received from the Fundamental Research Funds for Central Universities (2017B704X14), the
- Postgraduate Research & Practice Innovation Program of Jiangsu Province (Grant No. KYCX17_0479), and the Chinese Scholarship Council (No. 201706710018).

Appendices

A. Consistency between linear bond-based PD and CCM models

A.1. One-dimensional case

Assume a domain $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and let a one-dimensional linear bond-based PD model be given by (*cf.* (6)):

$$\rho(x)\ddot{u}(x,t) = \int_{\mathcal{H}_x} c(|x'-x|)(u(x',t)-u(x,t))dx' + b(x,t), \tag{A.1}$$

where ρ is the mass density, ü is the second derivative in time of the displacement field u,
c(|ξ|) is a micromodulus function with ξ = x' - x a PD bond, H_x is the neighbourhood of the material point x, and b is a prescribed body force density field. The relation
c(|ξ|) = λ(|ξ|)|ξ|² (cf. (6)) holds in one dimension. For points in the bulk of the body,

the neighbourhood is $\mathcal{H}_x = [x-\delta, x+\delta]$ and we can use the change of variable $\xi = x'-x$ to express (A.1) as

$$\rho(x)\ddot{u}(x,t) = \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} c(|\xi|)(u(x+\xi,t) - u(x,t))d\xi + b(x,t).$$
(A.2)

To establish a connection between (A.2) and the corresponding CCM model, given by the classical wave equation

$$\rho(x)\ddot{u}(x,t) = E\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x,t) + b(x,t)$$
(A.3)

with *E* Young's modulus, we assume the displacement field is smooth and perform a Taylor expansion of $u(x + \xi, t)$ about *x*:

$$u(x+\xi,t) = u(x,t) + \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(x,t)\xi + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x,t)\xi^2 + \frac{1}{3!}\frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x^3}(x,t)\xi^3 + \frac{1}{4!}\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^4}(x,t)\xi^4 + \dots$$
(A.4)

Substituting (A.4) in (A.2), we obtain

$$\rho(x)\ddot{u}(x,t) = \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} c(|\xi|) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(x,t)\xi + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x,t)\xi^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x^3}(x,t)\xi^3 + \frac{1}{4!} \frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^4}(x,t)\xi^4 + \dots \right) d\xi$$
$$+ b(x,t). \tag{A.5}$$

We observe that terms with an odd power of ξ vanish due to their antisymmetry and the symmetry of the integration domain. Then, we have

$$\rho(x)\ddot{u}(x,t) = \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\delta}^{\delta} c(|\xi|)\xi^2 d\xi\right] \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x,t) + \left[\frac{1}{4!}\int_{-\delta}^{\delta} c(|\xi|)\xi^4 d\xi\right] \frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^4}(x,t) + \dots + b(x,t).$$
(A.6)

Assuming fourth-order and higher derivatives of displacements are negligible, we obtain

$$\rho(x)\ddot{u}(x,t) = \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\delta}^{\delta} c(|\xi|)\xi^2 d\xi\right] \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x,t) + b(x,t).$$
(A.7)

This allows us to relate the micromodulus function $c(|\xi|)$ in (A.2) to Young's modulus *E* in (A.3):

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} c(|\xi|) \xi^2 d\xi = E, \qquad (A.8)$$

so that the PD model (A.2) reduces to the CCM model (A.3).

- We conclude that for a smooth displacement field, if fourth-order and higher derivatives of displacements can be neglected, the one-dimensional linear bond-based PD equation (A.2) reduces to the CCM equation (A.3), assuming relation (A.8) holds. In particular, this implies that, given the same body force density field and consistent boundary conditions, the PD and CCM models possess the same static solution for problems with
- ⁷¹⁵ constant, linear, quadratic, or cubic solutions. To characterize the model discrepancy between the PD and CCM models, in Section A.1.1 below we assume a particular form for the micromodulus function.

A.1.1. Model discrepancy between PD and CCM models in one dimension

Assume a micromodulus function of the following form:

$$c(|\xi|) = \frac{c}{|\xi|^{\alpha}} \tag{A.9}$$

with *c* a constant and $\alpha < 3$ (see below). Then, we can compute the following integrals appearing in (A.6):

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} c(|\xi|) \xi^2 d\xi = \int_{0}^{\delta} c \, \xi^{2-\alpha} d\xi = \frac{\delta^{3-\alpha}}{3-\alpha} c, \tag{A.10}$$

$$\frac{1}{4!} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} c(|\xi|) \xi^4 d\xi = \frac{2}{4!} \int_{0}^{\delta} c \,\xi^{4-\alpha} d\xi = \frac{2}{4!} \frac{\delta^{5-\alpha}}{5-\alpha} c. \tag{A.11}$$

Figure Equating (A.8) and (A.10), we obtain

$$c = \frac{(3-\alpha)E}{\delta^{3-\alpha}}.$$
 (A.12)

Note that the case $\alpha = 1$ recovers the micromodulus definition reported in [78] for a one-dimensional bar with unit cross-sectional area. Using (A.10)–(A.12) in (A.6), we get

$$\rho(x)\ddot{u}(x,t) = E\left[\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x,t) + \frac{1}{12}\left(\frac{3-\alpha}{5-\alpha}\right)\delta^2\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^4}(x,t) + \dots\right] + b(x,t).$$
(A.13)

In the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\rho(x)\ddot{u}(x,t) = E\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x,t) + O(\delta^2) + b(x,t), \qquad (A.14)$$

so that the PD model (A.2) converges to the CCM model (A.3) at a rate of $O(\delta^2)$. The leading term in the model discrepancy is of order $O(\delta^2)$.

A.2. Two-dimensional case

Assume a domain $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and let a two-dimensional linear bond-based PD model be given by (*cf.* (6)):

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x},t) = \int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}} \lambda(\|\mathbf{x}'-\mathbf{x}\|)(\mathbf{x}'-\mathbf{x}) \otimes (\mathbf{x}'-\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}',t)-\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x},t))d\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x},t), \quad (A.15)$$

where ρ is the mass density, $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}$ is the second derivative in time of the displacement field \mathbf{u} , $\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)$ is a micromodulus function with $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}$ a PD bond, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the neighbourhood of the material point \mathbf{x} , and \mathbf{b} is a prescribed body force density field. For points in the bulk of the body, we can use the change of variable $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}$ to express (A.15) as

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x},t) = \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|)\boldsymbol{\xi} \otimes \boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\xi},t)-\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x},t))d\boldsymbol{\xi} + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x},t), \quad (A.16)$$

730 where

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \leq \delta \right\}.$$
(A.17)

We would like to establish a connection between the PD model (A.16) and the twodimensional classical linear elasticity plane stress model given by:²

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_1(\mathbf{x},t) = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x^2}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial y^2}(\mathbf{x},t) \right] + b_1(\mathbf{x},t), \quad (A.20a)$$

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_{2}(\mathbf{x},t) = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) \right] + b_{2}(\mathbf{x},t), \quad (A.20b)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{E}{1 - v^2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & v & 0 \\ v & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 - v \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{11} \\ \varepsilon_{22} \\ \varepsilon_{12} \end{bmatrix},$$
(A.18)

where *E* is Young's modulus, v is Poisson's ratio, σ_{ij} are the components of the stress tensor, and ϵ_{ij} are the components of the infinitesimal strain tensor, $\epsilon_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} \right)$; both σ and ϵ are symmetric tensors. The equation of motion is given, in component form, by

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_i(\mathbf{x},t) = \frac{\partial\sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j}(\mathbf{x},t) + b_i(\mathbf{x},t), \quad i = 1, 2,$$
(A.19)

where repeated indices imply summation by 1 and 2.

²In classical linear elasticity, the stress-strain relation for isotropic materials under plane stress is given by:

where *E* is Young's modulus and we assumed a Poisson's ratio of v = 1/3 [89, 90]. For this purpose, we assume the displacement field is smooth and perform a Taylor expansion of $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\xi}, t)$ about **x**:

$$u_{j}(\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\xi}, t) = u_{j}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(\mathbf{x}, t)\xi_{k} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(\mathbf{x}, t)\xi_{k}\xi_{l} + \frac{1}{3!}\frac{\partial^{3}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}\partial x_{m}}(\mathbf{x}, t)\xi_{k}\xi_{l}\xi_{m}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{4!}\frac{\partial^{4}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}\partial x_{m}\partial x_{n}}(\mathbf{x}, t)\xi_{k}\xi_{l}\xi_{m}\xi_{n} + \dots, \quad j = 1, 2, \qquad (A.21)$$

where repeated indices imply a summation by 1 and 2. Employing (A.21) for the *i*th component of (A.16), we obtain

$$\begin{split} \rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_{i}(\mathbf{x},t) &= \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|)\xi_{i}\xi_{j}(u_{j}(\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\xi},t)-u_{j}(\mathbf{x},t))d\boldsymbol{\xi} + b_{i}(\mathbf{x},t) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|)\xi_{i}\xi_{j}\left(\frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(\mathbf{x},t)\xi_{k} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(\mathbf{x},t)\xi_{k}\xi_{l} + \frac{1}{3!}\frac{\partial^{3}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}\partial x_{m}}(\mathbf{x},t)\xi_{k}\xi_{l}\xi_{m} \\ &+ \frac{1}{4!}\frac{\partial^{4}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}\partial x_{m}\partial x_{n}}(\mathbf{x},t)\xi_{k}\xi_{l}\xi_{m}\xi_{n} + \dots\right)d\boldsymbol{\xi} + b_{i}(\mathbf{x},t). \end{split}$$
(A.22)

We observe that terms with an odd number of components of ξ vanish due to their antisymmetry and the symmetry of the integration domain. Then, we have

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_{i}(\mathbf{x},t) = \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|)\xi_{i}\xi_{j}\xi_{k}\xi_{l}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \left[\frac{1}{4!}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|)\xi_{i}\xi_{j}\xi_{k}\xi_{l}\xi_{m}\xi_{n}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{4}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}\partial x_{m}\partial x_{n}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \dots + b_{i}(\mathbf{x},t).$$
(A.23)

Assuming fourth-order and higher derivatives of displacements are negligible, we obtain

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_{i}(\mathbf{x},t) = \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|)\xi_{i}\xi_{j}\xi_{k}\xi_{l}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(\mathbf{x},t) + b_{i}(\mathbf{x},t).$$
(A.24)

Employing polar coordinates, $\xi_1 = r \cos(\theta)$ and $\xi_2 = r \sin(\theta)$, we can compute the

following integrals:

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \boldsymbol{\xi}_{1}^{4} d\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{\delta} \lambda(r) (r\cos(\theta))^{4} r dr d\theta$$
$$= \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^{5} dr\right) \int_{0}^{2\pi} \cos^{4}(\theta) d\theta = \Lambda, \tag{A.25a}$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \xi_1^2 \xi_2^2 d\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\delta} \lambda(r) (r\cos(\theta))^2 (r\sin(\theta))^2 r dr d\theta$$
$$= \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^5 dr\right) \int_0^{2\pi} \cos^2(\theta) \sin^2(\theta) d\theta = \frac{\Lambda}{3}, \quad (A.25b)$$
$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \xi_2^4 d\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\delta} \lambda(r) (r\sin(\theta))^4 r dr d\theta$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^\delta \lambda(r)r^5 dr\right)\int_0^{2\pi} \sin^4(\theta)d\theta = \Lambda,$$
(A.25c)

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \xi_1^3 \xi_2 d\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \xi_1 \xi_2^3 d\boldsymbol{\xi} = 0,$$
(A.25d)

where

$$\Lambda := \frac{3\pi}{4} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^\delta \lambda(r) r^5 dr \right).$$
(A.26)

Substituting (A.25) in (A.24), we get

$$\begin{split} \rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_{1}(\mathbf{x},t) &= \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{1}\xi_{j}\xi_{k}\xi_{l}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(\mathbf{x},t) + b_{1}(\mathbf{x},t) \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{1}^{4}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{1}^{2}\xi_{2}^{2}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) \\ &+ 2\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{1}^{2}\xi_{2}^{2}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial x\partial y}(\mathbf{x},t) + b_{1}(\mathbf{x},t) \\ &= \Lambda\left[\frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{2}{3}\frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial x\partial y}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{1}{3}\frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t)\right] + b_{1}(\mathbf{x},t), \quad (A.27a) \\ \rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_{2}(\mathbf{x},t) &= \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{2}\xi_{j}\xi_{k}\xi_{l}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) + b_{2}(\mathbf{x},t) \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{2}^{4}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{1}^{2}\xi_{2}^{2}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) \\ &+ 2\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{H}}\lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{1}^{2}\xi_{2}^{2}d\boldsymbol{\xi}\right]\frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial x\partial y}(\mathbf{x},t) + b_{2}(\mathbf{x},t) \\ &= \Lambda\left[\frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{2}{3}\frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial x\partial y}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{1}{3}\frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t)\right] + b_{2}(\mathbf{x},t). \quad (A.27b) \end{split}$$

Equating (A.27a) and (A.20a) or (A.27b) and (A.20b), we obtain

$$\Lambda = \frac{9E}{8}.\tag{A.28}$$

- As in the one-dimensional case in Section A.1, we conclude that for a smooth displacement field, if fourth-order and higher derivatives of displacements can be neglected, the two-dimensional linear bond-based PD equation (A.16) reduces to the CCM equation (A.20), assuming relation (A.28) holds (*cf.* (A.26)). In particular, this implies that given the same body force density field and consistent boundary conditions, the PD
- and CCM models possess the same static solution for problems with constant, linear, quadratic, or cubic solutions. To characterize the model discrepancy between the PD and CCM models, in Section A.2.1 below we assume a particular form for the micro-modulus function.

A.2.1. Model discrepancy between PD and CCM models in two dimensions

Assume a micromodulus function of the following form:

$$\lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) = \frac{c}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^{\alpha}} \tag{A.29}$$

with *c* a constant and $\alpha < 6$ (see below). Then, we can compute Λ in (A.26):

$$\Lambda = \frac{3\pi}{4} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\delta} c r^{5-\alpha} dr \right) = c \frac{3\pi}{8} \frac{\delta^{6-\alpha}}{6-\alpha}.$$
 (A.30)

By equating (A.30) and (A.28), we get

$$c = \frac{3(6-\alpha)E}{\pi\delta^{6-\alpha}}.$$
 (A.31)

Note that the case $\alpha = 3$ recovers the micromodulus definition reported in [89] for a plane stress structure with unit thickness. Employing polar coordinates as in (A.25), we can express the coefficients of the fourth-order derivatives in (A.23) as

$$\frac{1}{4!} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \xi_{k} \xi_{l} \xi_{m} \xi_{n} d\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{4!} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{\delta} \lambda(r) (r\cos(\theta))^{a} (r\sin(\theta))^{6-a} r dr d\theta$$
$$= \frac{1}{4!} \left(\int_{0}^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^{7} dr \right) \int_{0}^{2\pi} (\cos(\theta))^{a} (\sin(\theta))^{6-a} d\theta,$$
(A.32)

where a is the number of 1s in $\{i, j, k, l, m, n\}$. We now have (cf. (A.29) and (A.31)),

$$\int_0^\delta \lambda(r) r^7 dr = \int_0^\delta c r^{7-\alpha} dr = c \frac{\delta^{8-\alpha}}{8-\alpha} = \frac{3}{\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{8-\alpha} E \delta^2.$$
(A.33)

In the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, (A.23) gives (*cf.* (A.27) and (A.28))

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_{1}(\mathbf{x},t) = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) \right] + O(\delta^{2}) + b_{1}(\mathbf{x},t),$$
(A.34a)

$$\rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{u}_{2}(\mathbf{x},t) = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial^{2}u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial^{2}u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x},t) \right] + O(\delta^{2}) + b_{2}(\mathbf{x},t),$$
(A.34b)

so that the PD model (A.16) converges to the CCM model (A.20) at a rate of $O(\delta^2)$. The leading term in the model discrepancy is of order $O(\delta^2)$, similar to the result obtained in Section A.1.1.

B. Convergence of the nonlocal traction to the local traction

B.1. One-dimensional case

Assume a domain $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and consider the nonlocal traction at $x_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ in the bulk of the body with normal n = +1 (*cf.* (22)):

$$\tau(x_0, +1) = \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \int_{x_0}^{x+\delta} c(|x'-x|)(u(x')-u(x))dx'dx.$$
(B.1)

Assuming a smooth deformation, we begin by employing a first Taylor expansion of u(x') about x (cf. (A.4)):

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x_0,+1) &= \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \int_{x_0}^{x+\delta} c(|x'-x|) \left(\frac{du}{dx}(x)(x'-x) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2u}{dx^2}(x)(x'-x)^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \frac{d^3u}{dx^3}(x)(x'-x)^3 + \dots \right) dx' dx \\ &= \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \int_{x_0-x}^{\delta} c(|\xi|) \left(\frac{du}{dx}(x)\xi + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2u}{dx^2}(x)\xi^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \frac{d^3u}{dx^3}(x)\xi^3 + \dots \right) d\xi dx, \end{aligned}$$
(B.2)

where we used the change of variable $\xi = x' - x$ in the last equality. Note that due to the limits of integration, x' > x and thus $\xi > 0$. Assume the micromodulus function (A.9)

with $\alpha < 2$ (see below). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x_0,+1) &= \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \int_{x_0-x}^{\delta} \frac{c}{|\xi|^{\alpha}} \left(\frac{du}{dx}(x)\xi + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2u}{dx^2}(x)\xi^2 + \frac{1}{3!}\frac{d^3u}{dx^3}(x)\xi^3 + \dots \right) d\xi dx \\ &= c \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \int_{x_0-x}^{\delta} \left(\frac{du}{dx}(x)\xi^{1-\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2u}{dx^2}(x)\xi^{2-\alpha} + \frac{1}{3!}\frac{d^3u}{dx^3}(x)\xi^{3-\alpha} + \dots \right) d\xi dx \\ &= c \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \left(\frac{du}{dx}(x)\frac{1}{2-\alpha} \left[\delta^{2-\alpha} - (x_0-x)^{2-\alpha} \right] + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2u}{dx^2}(x)\frac{1}{3-\alpha} \left[\delta^{3-\alpha} - (x_0-x)^{3-\alpha} \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{3!}\frac{d^3u}{dx^3}(x)\frac{1}{4-\alpha} \left[\delta^{4-\alpha} - (x_0-x)^{4-\alpha} \right] + \dots \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$
 (B.3)

We now perform a second Taylor expansion, this time for the derivatives evaluated at x about x_0 . Explicitly writing terms up to third derivatives, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x_0,+1) &= c \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \left(\frac{1}{2-\alpha} \left\{ \frac{du}{dx} (x_0) + \frac{d^2u}{dx^2} (x_0) (x-x_0) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^3u}{dx^3} (x_0) (x-x_0)^2 + \dots \right\} \left[\delta^{2-\alpha} - (x_0-x)^{2-\alpha} \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{3-\alpha} \left\{ \frac{d^2u}{dx^2} (x_0) + \frac{d^3u}{dx^3} (x_0) (x-x_0) + \dots \right\} \left[\delta^{3-\alpha} - (x_0-x)^{3-\alpha} \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{3!} \frac{1}{4-\alpha} \left\{ \frac{d^3u}{dx^3} (x_0) + \dots \right\} \left[\delta^{4-\alpha} - (x_0-x)^{4-\alpha} \right] \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$
(B.4)

Collecting the contributions to each derivative, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x_{0},+1) &= c \left(\left\{ \int_{x_{0}-\delta}^{x_{0}} \frac{1}{2-\alpha} \left[\delta^{2-\alpha} - (x_{0}-x)^{2-\alpha} \right] dx \right\} \frac{du}{dx} (x_{0}) \\ &+ \left\{ \int_{x_{0}-\delta}^{x_{0}} \frac{1}{2-\alpha} (x-x_{0}) \left[\delta^{2-\alpha} - (x_{0}-x)^{2-\alpha} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{3-\alpha} \left[\delta^{3-\alpha} - (x_{0}-x)^{3-\alpha} \right] dx \right\} \frac{d^{2}u}{dx^{2}} (x_{0}) \\ &+ \left\{ \int_{x_{0}-\delta}^{x_{0}} \frac{1}{2-\alpha} \frac{(x-x_{0})^{2}}{2} \left[\delta^{2-\alpha} - (x_{0}-x)^{2-\alpha} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{3-\alpha} (x-x_{0}) \left[\delta^{3-\alpha} - (x_{0}-x)^{3-\alpha} \right] \right. \\ &+ \frac{1}{3!} \frac{1}{4-\alpha} \left[\delta^{4-\alpha} - (x_{0}-x)^{4-\alpha} \right] dx \right\} \frac{d^{3}u}{dx^{3}} (x_{0}) + \dots \right). \end{aligned}$$

$$(B.5)$$

We compute the following integral (for $n \ge 0$ and m > 1):

$$\begin{split} &\int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \frac{1}{m-\alpha} \frac{(x-x_0)^n}{n!} \left[\delta^{m-\alpha} - (x_0-x)^{m-\alpha} \right] dx \\ &= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \frac{1}{m-\alpha} \frac{1}{n!} (-1)^n \left[-\delta^{m-\alpha} \frac{1}{n+1} (x_0-x)^{n+1} + \frac{1}{n+m+1-\alpha} (x_0-x)^{n+m+1-\alpha} \right] \Big|_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0} \\ &= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \frac{(-1)^n}{(n+1)!} \frac{\delta^{n+m+1-\alpha}}{n+m+1-\alpha}. \end{split}$$
(B.6)

Using (B.6) to compute the integrals in (B.5), we obtain

$$\tau(x_0, +1) = c \left(\frac{\delta^{3-\alpha}}{3-\alpha} \frac{du}{dx}(x_0) + \frac{1}{12} \frac{\delta^{5-\alpha}}{5-\alpha} \frac{d^3u}{dx^3}(x_0) + \dots \right).$$
(B.7)

Employing the relation in (A.12), we finally obtain

$$\tau(x_0, +1) = E \frac{du}{dx}(x_0) + \frac{1}{12} \frac{3-\alpha}{5-\alpha} E \delta^2 \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3}(x_0) + \dots$$

= $t(x_0, +1) + \frac{1}{12} \frac{3-\alpha}{5-\alpha} E \delta^2 \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3}(x_0) + \dots,$ (B.8)

where $t(x_0, +1)$ is the local traction at x_0 with normal n = +1 (*cf.* (12) and (11)). In the limit as $\delta \to 0$, we have

$$\tau(x_0, +1) = t(x_0, +1) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2), \tag{B.9}$$

i.e., the nonlocal traction converges to the local traction at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$.



Figure B.24: Domain of integration (shaded region) for the one-dimensional nonlocal traction in (B.10). *Remark B.1.* Consider the nonlocal traction at x_0 with normal n = -1 (*cf.* (22)):

$$\tau(x_0, -1) = \int_{x_0}^{x_0 + \delta} \int_{x - \delta}^{x_0} c(|x' - x|)(u(x') - u(x))dx'dx.$$
(B.10)

The two-dimensional region of integration is illustrated in Fig. B.24. Changing the order of integration, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x_0, -1) &= \int_{x_0 - \delta}^{x_0} \int_{x_0}^{x' + \delta} c(|x' - x|)(u(x') - u(x))dxdx' \\ &= -\int_{x_0 - \delta}^{x_0} \int_{x_0}^{x' + \delta} c(|x - x'|)(u(x) - u(x'))dxdx' \\ &= -\int_{x_0 - \delta}^{x_0} \int_{x_0}^{\hat{x} + \delta} c(|\hat{x}' - \hat{x}|)(u(\hat{x}') - u(\hat{x}))d\hat{x}'d\hat{x} = -\tau(x_0, +1), \quad (B.11) \end{aligned}$$

where we used the change of variables $\hat{x} = x'$ and $\hat{x}' = x$ as well as (22) in the second to last and last equalities, respectively. Using (B.8) and (13), we have

$$\tau(x_0, -1) = -\tau(x_0, +1) = -t(x_0, +1) - \frac{1}{12} \frac{3-\alpha}{5-\alpha} E \delta^2 \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3}(x_0) + \dots$$
$$= t(x_0, -1) - \frac{1}{12} \frac{3-\alpha}{5-\alpha} E \delta^2 \frac{d^3 u}{dx^3}(x_0) + \dots,$$
(B.12)

where $t(x_0, -1)$ is the local traction at x_0 with normal n = -1 (cf. (12) and (11)).

B.1.1. Numerical examples for the nonlocal traction in one dimension



Figure B.25: Interface between the PD and CCM regions for the nonlocal traction computation in a onedimensional CCM-PD coupled model. Blue diamonds are FEM nodes and green circles are PD nodes. The dashed gray vertical line indicates the interface at x_0 . A uniform discretization with grid spacing $\Delta x = 1$ is employed, and the PD horizon is taken as $\delta = 3$.

We present some numerical examples to confirm the result in (B.8). To put these examples within the context of a CCM-PD coupled model, we consider a one-dimensional system with an interface at x_0 in the bulk of the body between a PD region and a CCM region. We assume points $x < x_0$ belong to the PD region, whereas points $x > x_0$

correspond to the CCM region. To numerically compute the nonlocal traction in (B.1),

760

we employ a uniform discretization with grid spacing Δx and define a set of N_{PD} PD nodes with positions given by

$$S_{\rm PD} = \left\{ x_0 - \delta + \frac{\Delta x}{2}, \dots, x_0 - \frac{\Delta x}{2} \right\}$$
(B.13)

and a set of N_{FEM} FEM nodes with positions given by

775

$$S_{\text{FEM}} = \left\{ x_0 + \frac{\Delta x}{2}, \dots, x_0 + \delta - \frac{\Delta x}{2} \right\}.$$
 (B.14)

To relate the examples in this section to the numerical results in Section 4.1, we choose $\delta = 3$ and $\Delta x = 1$ (i.e., $m = \delta/\Delta x = 3$), and we consider the case of an interface at $x_0 = 20.5$ (i.e., $x_0 = 20 + \frac{\Delta x}{2}$), which corresponds to the configuration (e) in Fig. 10; an illustration is presented in Fig. B.25. We denote by $x_i^{\text{PD}} \in S_{\text{PD}}$, $i = 1, ..., N_{\text{PD}}$, and $x_j^{\text{FEM}} \in S_{\text{FEM}}$, $j = 1, ..., N_{\text{FEM}}$, the reference positions of the PD and FEM nodes, respectively. Define the displacements of the PD and FEM nodes, respectively, by $u_i^{\text{PD}} := u(x_i^{\text{PD}})$, $i = 1, ..., N_{\text{PD}}$, and $u_j^{\text{FEM}} := u(x_j^{\text{FEM}})$, $j = 1, ..., N_{\text{FEM}}$. Then, we can compute the nonlocal traction in (B.1) by

$$\tau^{\text{num}}(x_0, +1) := \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{PD}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{FEM}}} \chi_{\delta} \left(\left| x_j^{\text{CE}} - x_i^{\text{PD}} \right| \right) c \left(\left| x_j^{\text{CE}} - x_i^{\text{PD}} \right| \right) \left(u_j^{\text{FEM}} - u_i^{\text{PD}} \right) \Delta x_j^{(i)} \Delta x,$$
(B.15)

where χ_{δ} is the characteristic function in (16) and a partial-volume correction [79] is used for *m*th neighbors, so that $\Delta x_j^{(i)} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta x$ if $|x_j^{\text{CE}} - x_i^{\text{PD}}| = \delta$ and $\Delta x_j^{(i)} = \Delta x$ otherwise. We consider the micromodulus function (A.9) with $\alpha = 1$.

We compare the numerical computation of the nonlocal traction given by (B.15) with the analytical calculation using (B.8) for the case of linear, quadratic, and cubic displacement fields, described in Table B.11; the values of the coefficients are a = 0.0001and $X_1 = 17$. As a comparison, we analytically calculate the local traction using (12)

- with (11). The results are reported in Table B.12. In addition to reporting the values for the nonlocal and local tractions, we present the error of the nonlocal traction computation given by the absolute value of the difference between the numerical and analytical values. We observe that the values of the numerical nonlocal traction obtained by (B.15), which is a discretization of (B.1), accurately match the values given
- ⁷⁸⁵ by the analytical nonlocal traction in (B.8) for all the cases, linear, quadratic, and cubic

Displacement type	Displacement field equation
Linear	u(x) = ax
Quadratic	$u(x) = \frac{a}{2X_1}x^2$
Cubic	$u(x) = \frac{a}{3X_1^2}x^3$

Table B.11: Displacement fields for the nonlocal traction computation in one dimension.

Table B.12: Comparison between numerical and analytical tractions in one dimension.

Displacement type	Nonlocal traction			Local traction
	$\tau^{\text{num}}(x_0,+1)$	$\tau(x_0,+1)$	$ \tau^{\rm num}(x_0,+1) - \tau(x_0,+1) $	$t(x_0, +1)$
Linear	1.00×10^{-04}	1.00×10^{-04}	9.49×10^{-20}	1.00×10^{-04}
Quadratic	1.21×10^{-04}	1.21×10^{-04}	4.07×10^{-20}	1.21×10^{-04}
Cubic	1.46×10^{-04}	1.46×10^{-04}	2.71×10^{-20}	1.45×10^{-04}

displacements. Moreover, for the linear and quadratic displacements, the values of the nonlocal and local tractions coincide, as predicted by (B.8). These two observations confirm the result in (B.8).

B.2. Two-dimensional case

Assume a domain $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and consider two non-overlapping subdomains Ω_A and Ω_B with a straight interface Γ connecting them (see, e.g., Fig. B.26), i.e., $\Omega_A \cap \Omega_B = \emptyset$ and $\overline{\Omega_A} \cap \overline{\Omega_B} = \Gamma$. We assume the normal **n** to the interface Γ points outwards relative to Ω_A . Given the linear isotropic bond-based PD model (6), consider the nonlocal traction at $\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \Gamma$ in the bulk of the body with normal **n** (*cf.* (70)):

$$\tau(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{n}) = \int_{\mathcal{L}} \int_{\Omega_B} \chi_{\delta}(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) \lambda(\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|) (\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}) \otimes (\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}') - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}' d\ell, \quad (B.16)$$

where \mathcal{L} is defined in (69). In component form, we have

$$\tau_i(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{n}) = \int_{\mathcal{L}} \int_{\Omega_B} \chi_\delta(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \xi_i \xi_j (u_j(\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) - u_j(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}' d\ell, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ (B.17)$$



Figure B.26: Illustration of two adjacent subdomains Ω_A and Ω_B separated by a straight interface Γ for the calculation of the nonlocal traction.

where the notation $\xi = \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}$ is used for brevity and repeated indices imply a summation by 1 and 2. Assuming a smooth deformation, we begin by employing a first Taylor expansion of $u_i(\mathbf{x} + \xi)$ about \mathbf{x} (*cf.* (A.21)) for the *i*th component of (B.17):

$$\tau_{i}(\mathbf{x}_{0},\mathbf{n}) = \int_{\mathcal{L}} \int_{\Omega_{B}} \chi_{\delta}(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|) \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \left(\frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(\mathbf{x}) \xi_{k} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial x_{k} \partial x_{l}}(\mathbf{x}) \xi_{k} \xi_{l} + \dots \right) d\mathbf{x}' d\ell.$$
(B.18)

We consider below two cases, the first one given by a horizontal interface Γ with normal $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{e}_2$ (see Fig. B.26a) and the second one given by a vertical interface Γ with normal $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{e}_1$ (see Fig. B.26b); the normals $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2\}$ correspond to the standard Cartesian orthonormal basis. We assume the micromodulus function (A.29).

Horizontal Interface. For the case of a horizontal interface with normal $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{e}_2$, we can compute (B.18) using polar coordinates, $\xi_1 = r \sin(\theta)$ and $\xi_2 = r \cos(\theta)$, as follows

(see Fig. B.26a for the limits of integration):

$$\begin{split} \tau_{i}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) &= \int_{y_{0}-\delta}^{y_{0}} \int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}\cap\Omega_{B}} \lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{i}\xi_{j} \left(\frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(x_{0}, y)\xi_{k} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(x_{0}, y)\xi_{k}\xi_{l} + \dots\right) d\mathbf{x}' dy \\ &= \int_{y_{0}-\delta}^{y_{0}} \left[\int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}\cap\Omega_{B}} \lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{i}\xi_{j}\xi_{k}d\mathbf{x}'\right] \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(x_{0}, y)dy \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int_{y_{0}-\delta}^{y_{0}} \left[\int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}\cap\Omega_{B}} \lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{i}\xi_{j}\xi_{k}\xi_{l}d\mathbf{x}'\right] \frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(x_{0}, y)dy + \dots \\ &= \int_{y_{0}-\delta}^{y_{0}} \left[\int_{y_{0}-y}^{\delta} \int_{-\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{y_{0}-y}{r}\right)}^{\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{y_{0}-y}{r}\right)} \lambda(r)(r\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}}(r\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}}rd\theta dr\right] \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(x_{0}, y)dy \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int_{y_{0}-\delta}^{y_{0}} \left[\int_{y_{0}-y}^{\delta} \int_{-\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{y_{0}-y}{r}\right)}^{\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{y_{0}-y}{r}\right)} \lambda(r)(r\cos(\theta))^{a_{2}}(r\sin(\theta))^{4-a_{2}}rd\theta dr\right] \frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(x_{0}, y)dy + \dots, \\ (B.19) \end{split}$$

where a_1 is the number of 2s in $\{i, j, k\}$ in the coefficients of the first-order derivatives and a_2 is the number of 2s in $\{i, j, k, l\}$ in the coefficients of the second-order derivatives. Employing the change of variable $s = y_0 - y$, we obtain

$$\tau_{i}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) = \int_{0}^{\delta} \left[\int_{s}^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^{4} \int_{-\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)}^{\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta dr \right] \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}} (x_{0}, y_{0} - s) ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\delta} \left[\int_{s}^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^{5} \int_{-\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)}^{\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{2}} (\sin(\theta))^{4-a_{2}} d\theta dr \right] \frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial x_{k} \partial x_{l}} (x_{0}, y_{0} - s) ds + \dots$$
(B.20)

Changing the order of integration between r and s according to Fig. B.27, and then



Figure B.27: Domain of integration (shaded region) in the variables s and r in (B.20) and corresponding limits for the change in the order of integration.

using the change of variable $\kappa = s/r$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{i}(\mathbf{x}_{0},\mathbf{e}_{2}) &= \int_{0}^{\delta} \int_{0}^{r} \lambda(r) r^{4} \int_{-\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)}^{\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}} (x_{0}, y_{0} - s) ds dr \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\delta} \int_{0}^{r} \lambda(r) r^{5} \int_{-\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)}^{\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{2}} (\sin(\theta))^{4-a_{2}} d\theta \frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial x_{k} \partial x_{l}} (x_{0}, y_{0} - s) ds dr + \dots \\ &= \int_{0}^{\delta} \int_{0}^{1} \lambda(r) r^{4} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}} (x_{0}, y_{0} - r\kappa) r d\kappa dr \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\delta} \int_{0}^{1} \lambda(r) r^{5} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{2}} (\sin(\theta))^{4-a_{2}} d\theta \frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial x_{k} \partial x_{l}} (x_{0}, y_{0} - r\kappa) r d\kappa dr + \dots \end{aligned}$$
(B.21)

Using a second Taylor expansion for each term:

$$\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k}(x_0, y_0 - r\kappa) = \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k}(x_0, y_0) - \frac{\partial^2 u_j}{\partial y \partial x_k}(x_0, y_0)r\kappa + \dots,$$
(B.22a)

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_j}{\partial x_k \partial x_l} (x_0, y_0 - r\kappa) = \frac{\partial^2 u_j}{\partial x_k \partial x_l} (x_0, y_0) + \dots,$$
(B.22b)

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{i}(\mathbf{x}_{0},\mathbf{e}_{2}) &= \int_{0}^{\delta} \int_{0}^{1} \lambda(r) r^{4} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta \left[\frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(x_{0},y_{0}) - \frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial y \partial x_{k}}(x_{0},y_{0}) r \kappa + \ldots \right] r d\kappa dr \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\delta} \int_{0}^{1} \lambda(r) r^{5} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{2}} (\sin(\theta))^{4-a_{2}} d\theta \left[\frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial x_{k} \partial x_{l}}(x_{0},y_{0}) + \ldots \right] r d\kappa dr + \ldots \\ &= \left(\int_{0}^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^{5} dr \right) \left[\int_{0}^{1} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta d\kappa \right] \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(x_{0},y_{0}) \\ &- \left(\int_{0}^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^{6} dr \right) \left[\int_{0}^{1} \kappa \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta d\kappa \right] \frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial y \partial x_{k}}(x_{0},y_{0}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{0}^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^{6} dr \right) \left[\int_{0}^{1} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{2}} (\sin(\theta))^{4-a_{2}} d\theta d\kappa \right] \frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial x_{k} \partial x_{l}}(x_{0},y_{0}) + \ldots \right] \end{aligned}$$
(B.23)

We now have (recall (A.29) and (A.31)):

$$\int_{0}^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^{5} dr = c \int_{0}^{\delta} r^{5-\alpha} dr = \frac{3(6-\alpha)E}{\pi\delta^{6-\alpha}} \frac{\delta^{6-\alpha}}{6-\alpha} = \frac{3E}{\pi},$$
(B.24)
$$\int_{0}^{\delta} \lambda(r) r^{6} dr = c \int_{0}^{\delta} r^{6-\alpha} dr = \frac{3(6-\alpha)E}{\pi\delta^{6-\alpha}} \frac{\delta^{7-\alpha}}{7-\alpha} = \frac{3E}{\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta.$$
(B.25)

Consequently, we can write (B.23) as (recall $\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_0, y_0)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{i}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) &= \frac{3E}{\pi} \left[\int_{0}^{1} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta d\kappa \right] \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}} (\mathbf{x}_{0}) \\ &- \frac{3E}{\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta \left[\int_{0}^{1} \kappa \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta d\kappa \right] \frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial y \partial x_{k}} (\mathbf{x}_{0}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{3E}{\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta \left[\int_{0}^{1} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{2}} (\sin(\theta))^{4-a_{2}} d\theta d\kappa \right] \frac{\partial^{2} u_{j}}{\partial x_{k} \partial x_{l}} (\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \dots \end{aligned}$$
(B.26)

Computing with Mathematica [91], we have

$$\int_{0}^{1} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta d\kappa = \begin{cases} \frac{3\pi}{8} & a_{1} = 3, \\ 0 & a_{1} = 2, \\ \frac{\pi}{8} & a_{1} = 1, \\ 0 & a_{1} = 0, \end{cases}$$
(B.27a)
$$\int_{0}^{1} \kappa \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}} (\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}} d\theta d\kappa = \begin{cases} \frac{8}{15} & a_{1} = 3, \\ 0 & a_{1} = 2, \\ \frac{2}{15} & a_{1} = 1, \\ 0 & a_{1} = 0, \end{cases}$$
(B.27b)
$$\int_{0}^{1} \int_{-\cos^{-1}(\kappa)}^{\cos^{-1}(\kappa)} (\cos(\theta))^{a_{2}} (\sin(\theta))^{4-a_{2}} d\theta d\kappa = \begin{cases} \frac{16}{15} & a_{2} = 4, \\ 0 & a_{2} = 3, \\ \frac{4}{15} & a_{2} = 2, \\ 0 & a_{2} = 1, \\ \frac{2}{5} & a_{2} = 0. \end{cases}$$
(B.27c)

Employing (B.27) to compute the coefficients in (B.26) and collecting the contributions from each derivative term, we finally obtain

$$\tau_{1}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial u_{2}}{\partial x}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) \right) + \frac{16}{45\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta \left(\frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) \right) + \dots \right],$$
(B.28a)
$$\tau_{2}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial x}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial u_{2}}{\partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{16}{45\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta \left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) \right) + \dots \right],$$
(B.28b)

where the dots indicate higher-order derivative terms.

Consider a classical linear elasticity plane stress isotropic model (see (A.18)). Given a Young's modulus *E* and a Poisson's ratio v = 1/3 [89, 90], the components of the

stress tensor are given by:

$$\sigma_{11} = \frac{E}{1 - v^2} \left[\varepsilon_{11} + v \varepsilon_{22} \right] = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} \right], \quad (B.29a)$$

$$\sigma_{22} = \frac{E}{1 - v^2} \left[v \varepsilon_{11} + \varepsilon_{22} \right] = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} \right], \quad (B.29b)$$

$$\sigma_{12} = \frac{E}{1 - v^2} (1 - v) \varepsilon_{12} = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} \right) \right].$$
(B.29c)

We can then express (B.28a) and (B.28b), respectively, as (recall (42))

$$\tau_{1}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) = \sigma_{12}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0})\right) + \dots$$
$$= t_{1}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0})\right) + \dots, \quad (B.30a)$$
$$\tau_{2}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) = \sigma_{22}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0})\right) + \dots$$

$$\begin{aligned} z_{2}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) &= \sigma_{22}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{\delta - \alpha}{7 - \alpha} \delta \left(\frac{\delta \cdot u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\delta \cdot u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) \right) + \dots \\ &= t_{2}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{\delta - \alpha}{7 - \alpha} \delta \left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) \right) + \dots \end{aligned}$$
(B.30b)

In the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) = \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \tag{B.31}$$

i.e., the nonlocal traction converges to the local traction at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$.

Vertical Interface. The treatment of the case with a vertical interface is identical to that of the horizontal interface, except that the limits of integration change. For the case of a vertical interface with normal $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{e}_1$, we can compute (B.18) using polar coordinates, $\xi_1 = r \cos(\theta)$ and $\xi_2 = r \sin(\theta)$, as follows (see Fig. B.26b for the limits of

integration):

$$\begin{split} \tau_{i}(\mathbf{x}_{0},\mathbf{e}_{1}) &= \int_{x_{0}-\delta}^{x_{0}} \int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}\cap\Omega_{B}} \lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{i}\xi_{j} \left(\frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(x,y_{0})\xi_{k} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(x,y_{0})\xi_{k}\xi_{l} + \dots\right) d\mathbf{x}'dx \\ &= \int_{x_{0}-\delta}^{x_{0}} \left[\int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}\cap\Omega_{B}} \lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{i}\xi_{j}\xi_{k}d\mathbf{x}' \right] \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(x,y_{0})dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int_{x_{0}-\delta}^{x_{0}} \left[\int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}}\cap\Omega_{B}} \lambda(||\boldsymbol{\xi}||)\xi_{i}\xi_{j}\xi_{k}\xi_{l}d\mathbf{x}' \right] \frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(x,y_{0})dx + \dots \\ &= \int_{x_{0}-\delta}^{x_{0}} \left[\int_{x_{0}-x}^{\delta} \int_{-\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{x_{0}-x}{r}\right)}^{\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{x_{0}-x}{r}\right)} \lambda(r)(r\cos(\theta))^{a_{1}}(r\sin(\theta))^{3-a_{1}}rd\theta dr \right] \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}}(x,y_{0})dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int_{x_{0}-\delta}^{x_{0}} \left[\int_{x_{0}-x}^{\delta} \int_{-\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{x_{0}-x}{r}\right)}^{\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{x_{0}-x}{r}\right)} \lambda(r)(r\cos(\theta))^{a_{2}}(r\sin(\theta))^{4-a_{2}}rd\theta dr \right] \frac{\partial^{2}u_{j}}{\partial x_{k}\partial x_{l}}(x,y_{0})dx + \dots, \end{split}$$
(B.32)

where, in this case, a_1 is the number of 1s in $\{i, j, k\}$ in the coefficients of the first-order derivatives and a_2 is the number of 1s in $\{i, j, k, l\}$ in the coefficients of the second-order derivatives. Employing a similar procedure to the one used from (B.19) to (B.28), we obtain

$$\tau_{1}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{1}) = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial x}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial u_{2}}{\partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{16}{45\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta \left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) \right) + \dots \right],$$

$$(B.33a)$$

$$\tau_{2}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{1}) = \frac{9E}{8} \left[\frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial u_{2}}{\partial x}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) \right) + \frac{16}{45\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta \left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) \right) + \dots \right],$$

$$(B.33b)$$

where the dots indicate higher-order derivative terms. Employing (B.29), we can express (B.33a) and (B.33b), respectively, as (recall (42))

$$\tau_{1}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{1}) = \sigma_{11}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0})\right) + \dots$$

$$= t_{1}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{1}) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0})\right) + \dots, \quad (B.34a)$$

$$\tau_{2}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{1}) = \sigma_{12}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0})\right) + \dots$$

$$= t_{2}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{1}) + \frac{2E}{5\pi} \frac{6-\alpha}{7-\alpha} \delta\left(\frac{\partial^{2} u_{1}}{\partial x \partial y}(\mathbf{x}_{0}) + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} u_{2}}{\partial y^{2}}(\mathbf{x}_{0})\right) + \dots \quad (B.34b)$$



Figure B.28: Interface Γ between the PD and CCM regions for the nonlocal traction computation in a twodimensional CCM-PD coupled model. Blue diamonds are FEM nodes and green circles are PD nodes; only PD nodes located along the line \mathcal{L} (*cf.* (69)) are indicated. The dashed gray line indicates the interface Γ . The point \mathbf{x}_0 where \mathcal{L} intersects Γ is the point where the nonlocal traction is computed. A uniform discretization with grid spacing $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.25$ is employed, and the PD horizon is taken as $\delta = 0.75$. For illustration, the red dotted curve represents the part of the boundary of the neigborhood of the PD node closest to Γ located in the CCM region; for clarity, the dotted black lines represent the radius of that neighborhood.

In the limit as $\delta \to 0$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) = \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \tag{B.35}$$

i.e., the nonlocal traction converges to the local traction at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$.

B.2.1. Numerical examples for the nonlocal traction in two dimensions

We present some numerical examples to confirm the results in (B.30) and (B.34). To put these examples within the context of a CCM-PD coupled model, we consider a twodimensional system with an interface Γ between a PD region, given by Ω_A , and a CCM region, given by Ω_B (see Fig. B.26). We consider the case of a horizontal interface Γ with normal $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{e}_2$ (see Fig. B.26a) and the nonlocal traction at $\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \Gamma$ in the bulk of the body. To numerically compute the nonlocal traction in (B.16), we employ a uniform discretization with grid spacing $\Delta x = \Delta y$ and define a set of N_{PD} PD nodes with positions given by

$$S_{\rm PD} = \left\{ \left(x_0, y_0 - \delta + \frac{\Delta y}{2} \right), \dots, \left(x_0, y_0 - \frac{\Delta y}{2} \right) \right\}$$
(B.36)

and a set of N_{FEM} FEM nodes with positions given by

$$S_{\text{FEM}} = \left\{ x_0 - \delta, \dots, x_0 + \delta \right\} \times \left\{ y_0 + \frac{\Delta y}{2}, \dots, y_0 + \delta - \frac{\Delta y}{2} \right\}, \tag{B.37}$$

which is built as a Cartesian product. To relate the examples in this section to the numerical results in Section 4.2, we choose $\delta = 0.75$ and $\Delta x = 0.25$ (i.e., $m = \delta/\Delta x = 3$), and we consider the case of an interface vertically located at $y_0 = 24.125$ (i.e., $y_0 = 24 + \frac{\Delta y}{2}$); an illustration is presented in Fig. B.28a. We compute the nonlocal traction

at $\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_0, y_0)$ with $x_0 = 11.5$. We denote by $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{PD}} \in S_{\text{PD}}$, $i = 1, ..., N_{\text{PD}}$, and $\mathbf{x}_j^{\text{FEM}} \in S_{\text{FEM}}$, $j = 1, ..., N_{\text{FEM}}$, the reference positions of the PD and FEM nodes, respectively. Define the displacements of the PD and FEM nodes, respectively, by $\mathbf{u}_i^{\text{PD}} := \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{PD}})$, $i = 1, ..., N_{\text{PD}}$, and $\mathbf{u}_j^{\text{FEM}} := \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}_j^{\text{FEM}})$, $j = 1, ..., N_{\text{FEM}}$. Then, we can compute the nonlocal traction in (B.16) by

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\text{num}}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{e}_{2}) := \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{PD}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{FEM}}} \chi_{\delta}(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{ji}\|) \lambda(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{ji}\|) \boldsymbol{\xi}_{ji} \otimes \boldsymbol{\xi}_{ji} \left(\mathbf{u}_{j}^{\text{FEM}} - \mathbf{u}_{i}^{\text{PD}}\right) A_{j}^{(i)} \Delta x, \quad (B.38)$$

where $\xi_{ji} := \mathbf{x}_j^{\text{FEM}} - \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{PD}}$ and $A_j^{(i)}$ is a partial area ("partial volume" in two dimensions) given by the area of the intersection between the neighborhood of PD node *i* and the cell of FEM node *j*, which is calculated analytically [82]; the cell of FEM node *j* is a square of edge length Δx centered at that node. We consider the micromodulus function (A.29)

with $\alpha = 3$.

830

820

We compare the numerical computation of the nonlocal traction given by (B.38) with the analytical calculation using (B.30) for the case of linear and quadratic displacement fields, imposed on the displacement component u_2 , described in Table B.13. For the linear displacement field, the values of the coefficients are d = 0.5, $Y_1 = 12.75$, and $Y_B = 15$. For the quadratic displacement field, the values of the coefficients are q = 15, $X_Q = 11.5$, $Y_Q = 23$, and R = 2.25. As a comparison, we analytically calculate the local traction using (42) with (B.29). The results are reported in Table B.14. In addition to reporting the values for the *x*- and *y*-components of the nonlocal and local tractions,

we present the error of the nonlocal traction computation, for each component, given by the absolute value of the difference between the numerical and analytical values. To study the improvement in accuracy gained by using an increased value of *m*, we also re-
port the calculations for m = 8 and the same δ . Both values of *m* reported in Table B.14 are used in Section 4.2. We observe that the values of the numerical nonlocal traction

- obtained by (B.38), which is a discretization of (B.16), approximately recover the values given by the analytical nonlocal traction in (B.30) for both cases, linear and quadratic displacements. For the linear displacement, the values of the analytical nonlocal and local tractions coincide, as expected from (B.30). We note that the *x*-component of the tractions is zero, while the *y*-component of the tractions is non-zero. We performed a
- similar study by imposing instead the linear and quadratic distributions described in Table B.13 on the displacement component u_1 over a vertical interface (see Fig. B.28b). In this case, similar results were obtained, where instead the *x*-component of the tractions is non-zero, while the *y*-component of the tractions is zero. These findings confirm the results in (B.30) and (B.34).
- *Remark B.2.* In the numerical studies in Section 4.2, we investigate the overall equilibrium in two-dimensional CCM-PD coupled systems, which requires the balance between the local and nonlocal tractions at the coupling interface. The results in (B.30) and (B.34) imply that, for linear deformations, the nonlocal and local tractions should be balanced at the coupling interface. However, the results in Table B.14 show that the numerical computation of the nonlocal traction only approximately recovers the ana-
- lytical nonlocal traction. To allow a numerical verification of the force equilibrium for linear deformations in Section 4.2, we introduce a correction factor given by

$$\gamma := \frac{\tau_2(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2)}{\tau_2^{\text{num}}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2)},\tag{B.39}$$

which is computed with the values reported in Table B.14 for the linear displacement case. For m = 3, $\gamma = 0.9784710341$, whereas for m = 8, $\gamma = 0.9974762599$.

Table B.13: Displacement fields for the nonlocal traction computation in two dimensions.

Displacement type	Displacement field equation
Linear	$u_1(x, y) = 0$ $u_2(x, y) = d \frac{y - Y_1}{Y_B - Y_1}$
Quadratic	$u_1(x, y) = 0$ $u_2(x, y) = \frac{-(x - X_Q)^2 - (y - Y_Q)^2 + R^2}{q^2}$

Table B.14:	Comparison	between	numerical	and	analytical	tractions	in two	dimensions.
	1				2			

Displacement type		Local traction (<i>x</i> -component)				
	$\tau_1^{\text{num}}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2)$	$\tau_1(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2)$	$ \tau_1^{\text{num}}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) - \tau_1(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) $	$t_1(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2)$		
Linear, $\delta = 0.75, m = 3$	-5.83×10^{-19}	0.00	5.83×10^{-19}	0.00		
Linear, $\delta = 0.75, m = 8$	-4.86×10^{-18}	0.00	4.86×10^{-18}	0.00		
Quadratic, $\delta = 0.75, m = 3$	2.62×10^{-19}	0.00	2.62×10^{-19}	0.00		
Quadratic, $\delta = 0.75, m = 8$	-4.40×10^{-17}	0.00	4.40×10^{-17}	0.00		
Displacement type		Nonlocal traction (y-component)				
	$\tau_2^{\text{num}}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2)$	$\tau_2(\mathbf{x}_0,\mathbf{e}_2)$	$ \tau_2^{\text{num}}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) - \tau_2(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2) $	$t_2(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{e}_2)$		
Linear, $\delta = 0.75, m = 3$	2.56×10^{-01}	2.50×10^{-01}	5.50×10^{-03}	2.50×10^{-01}		
Linear, $\delta = 0.75, m = 8$	2.51×10^{-01}	2.50×10^{-01}	6.33×10^{-04}	2.50×10^{-01}		
Quadratic, $\delta = 0.75, m = 3$	-1.22×10^{-02}	-1.19×10^{-02}	2.69×10^{-04}	-1.12×10^{-02}		
Quadratic, $\delta = 0.75, m = 8$	-1.19×10^{-02}	-1.19×10^{-02}	3.18×10^{-05}	-1.12×10^{-02}		

865 References

875

880

- N. E. Prasad, R. Wanhill, Aerospace Materials and Material Technologies: Volume 2: Aerospace Material Technologies, Springer, 2016.
- [2] T. L. Anderson, Fracture Mechanics: Fundamentals and Applications, CRC Press, 2017.
- [3] J.-W. Simon, D. Höwer, B. Stier, S. Reese, J. Fish, A regularized orthotropic continuum damage model for layered composites: intralaminar damage progression and delamination, Computational Mechanics 60 (3) (2017) 445–463.
 - [4] V. P. Nguyen, C. T. Nguyen, S. Bordas, A. Heidarpour, Modelling interfacial cracking with non-matching cohesive interface elements, Computational Mechanics 58 (5) (2016) 731–746.
 - [5] I. Kaleel, M. Petrolo, A. M. Waas, E. Carrera, Micromechanical progressive failure analysis of fiber-reinforced composite using refined beam models, Journal of Applied Mechanics 85 (2) (2018) 021004.
 - [6] S. A. Silling, Reformulation of elasticity theory for discontinuities and long-range forces, Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids 48 (1) (2000) 175–209.
 - [7] F. Bobaru, J. T. Foster, P. H. Geubelle, S. A. Silling (Eds.), Handbook of Peridynamic Modeling, CRC Press, 2016.
 - [8] N. Moës, J. Dolbow, T. Belytschko, A finite element method for crack growth without remeshing, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 46 (1) (1999) 131–150.
 - [9] T. Belytschko, T. Black, Elastic crack growth in finite elements with minimal remeshing, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 45 (5) (1999) 601–620.
- [10] G. R. Johnson, R. A. Stryk, Eroding interface and improved tetrahedral element
 algorithms for high-velocity impact computations in three dimensions, International Journal of Impact Engineering 5 (1-4) (1987) 411–421.
 - 75

- [11] T. Belytschko, J. I. Lin, A three-dimensional impact-penetration algorithm with erosion, International Journal of Impact Engineering 5 (1-4) (1987) 111–127.
- [12] C. Kuhn, R. Müller, A phase field model for fracture, in: PAMM: Proceedings in
 Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, Vol. 8, Wiley Online Library, 2008, 10223– 10224.
 - [13] H. Amor, J.-J. Marigo, C. Maurini, Regularized formulation of the variational brittle fracture with unilateral contact: Numerical experiments, Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids 57 (8) (2009) 1209–1229.
- 900 [14] M. Ortiz, Y. Leroy, A. Needleman, A finite element method for localized failure analysis, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 61 (2) (1987) 189–214.
 - [15] X.-P. Xu, A. Needleman, Void nucleation by inclusion debonding in a crystal matrix, Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering 1 (2) (1993)
 111.

- [16] X.-P. Xu, A. Needleman, Numerical simulations of fast crack growth in brittle solids, Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids 42 (9) (1994) 1397–1434.
- [17] J. M. Melenk, I. Babuška, The partition of unity finite element method: Basic theory and applications, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 139 (1-4) (1996) 289–314.
- [18] I. Babuška, J. M. Melenk, The partition of unity method, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 40 (4) (1997) 727–758.
- [19] J.-H. Song, H. Wang, T. Belytschko, A comparative study on finite element methods for dynamic fracture, Computational Mechanics 42 (2) (2008) 239–250.
- [20] T. Rabczuk, Computational methods for fracture in brittle and quasi-brittle solids: state-of-the-art review and future perspectives, ISRN Applied Mathematics 2013 (2013).

[21] F. Bobaru, G. Zhang, Why do cracks branch? A peridynamic investigation of dynamic brittle fracture, International Journal of Fracture 196 (1-2) (2015) 59– 98.

920 98

- [22] B. Bourdin, C. J. Larsen, C. L. Richardson, A time-discrete model for dynamic fracture based on crack regularization, International Journal of Fracture 168 (2) (2011) 133–143.
- [23] M. J. Borden, C. V. Verhoosel, M. A. Scott, T. J. Hughes, C. M. Landis, A phasefield description of dynamic brittle fracture, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 217 (2012) 77–95.
- [24] M. Hofacker, C. Miehe, A phase field model of dynamic fracture: Robust field updates for the analysis of complex crack patterns, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 93 (3) (2013) 276–301.
- 930 [25] R. Spatschek, E. Brener, A. Karma, Phase field modeling of crack propagation, Philosophical Magazine 91 (1) (2011) 75–95.
 - [26] G. T. Camacho, M. Ortiz, Computational modelling of impact damage in brittle materials, International Journal of Solids and Structures 33 (20-22) (1996) 2899– 2938.
- 935 [27] M. Ortiz, A. Pandolfi, Finite-deformation irreversible cohesive elements for three-dimensional crack-propagation analysis, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 44 (9) (1999) 1267–1282.
 - [28] G. Zi, T. Rabczuk, W. Wall, Extended meshfree methods without branch enrichment for cohesive cracks, Computational Mechanics 40 (2) (2007) 367–382.
- 940 [29] S. A. Silling, M. Epton, O. Weckner, J. Xu, E. Askari, Peridynamic states and constitutive modeling, Journal of Elasticity 88 (2) (2007) 151–184.
 - [30] A. C. Eringen, D. G. B. Edelen, On nonlocal elasticity, International Journal of Engineering Science 10 (3) (1972) 233–248.

[31] I. A. Kunin, Elastic Media with Microstructure I: One-Dimensional Models,

Vol. 26, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1982.

- [32] I. A. Kunin, Elastic Media with Microstructure II: Three-Dimensional Models, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1983.
- [33] P. Diehl, S. Prudhomme, M. Lévesque, A review of benchmark experiments for the validation of peridynamics models, Journal of Peridynamics and Nonlocal Modeling 1 (1) (2019) 14–35.
- [34] S. A. Silling, O. Weckner, E. Askari, F. Bobaru, Crack nucleation in a peridynamic solid, International Journal of Fracture 162 (1-2) (2010) 219–227.
- [35] B. Kilic, E. Madenci, An adaptive dynamic relaxation method for quasi-static simulations using the peridynamic theory, Theoretical and Applied Fracture Mechanics 53 (3) (2010) 194–204.
- 955

950

- [36] Y. D. Ha, F. Bobaru, Characteristics of dynamic brittle fracture captured with peridynamics, Engineering Fracture Mechanics 78 (6) (2011) 1156–1168.
- [37] A. Agwai, I. Guven, E. Madenci, Predicting crack propagation with peridynamics: a comparative study, International Journal of Fracture 171 (1) (2011) 65.
- [38] W. Hu, Y. D. Ha, F. Bobaru, Peridynamic model for dynamic fracture in unidirectional fiber-reinforced composites, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 217 (2012) 247–261.
 - [39] M. Zaccariotto, U. Galvanetto, Peridynamic and cohesive zone model approaches for crack propagation modelling, 21st AIDAA Congress (2011).
- 965 [40] F. Luongo, M. Zaccariotto, U. Galvanetto, Static implementation of peridynamics for the simulation of crack propagation, The 19th ICCM (2013).
 - [41] D. Dipasquale, M. Zaccariotto, U. Galvanetto, Crack propagation with adaptive grid refinement in 2D peridynamics, International Journal of Fracture 190 (1-2) (2014) 1–22.

- 970 [42] A. Shojaei, F. Mossaiby, M. Zaccariotto, U. Galvanetto, An adaptive multi-grid peridynamic method for dynamic fracture analysis, International Journal of Mechanical Sciences 144 (2018) 600–617.
 - [43] M. Zaccariotto, F. Luongo, G. Sarego, U. Galvanetto, Examples of applications of the peridynamic theory to the solution of static equilibrium problems, The Aeronautical Journal 119 (1216) (2015) 677–700.
 - [44] S. A. Silling, E. Askari, A meshfree method based on the peridynamic model of solid mechanics, Computers & Structures 83 (17-18) (2005) 1526–1535.
 - [45] Y. D. Ha, F. Bobaru, Studies of dynamic crack propagation and crack branching with peridynamics, International Journal of Fracture 162 (1-2) (2010) 229–244.
- [46] B. Ren, C. T. Wu, P. Seleson, D. Zeng, D. Lyu, A peridynamic failure analysis of fiber-reinforced composite laminates using finite element discontinuous Galerkin approximations, International Journal of Fracture 214 (1) (2018) 49–68.
 - [47] A. Shojaei, A. Hermann, P. Seleson, C. J. Cyron, Dirichlet absorbing boundary conditions for classical and peridynamic diffusion-type models, Computational Mechanics 66 (2020) 773–793.
 - [48] B. Aksoylu, M. L. Parks, Variational theory and domain decomposition for nonlocal problems, Applied Mathematics and Computation 217 (14) (2011) 6498–6515.
 - [49] Q. Du, M. Gunzburger, R. B. Lehoucq, K. Zhou, A nonlocal vector calculus, nonlocal volume-constrained problems, and nonlocal balance laws, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences 23 (03) (2013) 493–540.

995

985

- [50] P. Seleson, M. Gunzburger, M. L. Parks, Interface problems in nonlocal diffusion and sharp transitions between local and nonlocal domains, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 266 (2013) 185–204.
- [51] X. Chen, M. Gunzburger, Continuous and discontinuous finite element methods for a peridynamics model of mechanics, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 200 (9-12) (2011) 1237–1250.

- [52] O. C. Zienkiewicz, R. L. Taylor, D. D. Fox, The Finite Element Method for Solid and Structural Mechanics, Butterworth-Heinemann, 2014.
- [53] M. D'Elia, P. B. Bochev, Optimization-based coupling of nonlocal and local dif fusion models, in: R. Lipton (Ed.), Proceedings of the Fall 2014 Materials Research Society Meeting, MRS Symposium Proceedings, Cambridge University Press, Boston, MA, 2014.
 - [54] M. D'Elia, P. Bochev, Formulation, analysis and computation of an optimizationbased local-to-nonlocal coupling method, arXiv preprint arXiv.1910.11214 (2019). arXiv:1910.11214.

1010

- [55] M. D'Elia, M. Perego, P. Bochev, D. Littlewood, A coupling strategy for nonlocal and local diffusion models with mixed volume constraints and boundary conditions, Computers & Mathematics with Applications 71 (11) (2016) 2218–2230.
- [56] Y. Yu, F. F. Bargos, H. You, M. L. Parks, M. L. Bittencourt, G. E. Karniadakis, A partitioned coupling framework for peridynamics and classical theory: Analysis and simulations, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 340 (2018) 905–931.
 - [57] H. You, Y. Yu, D. Kamensky, An asymptotically compatible formulation for localto-nonlocal coupling problems without overlapping regions, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 366 (2020) 113038.
 - [58] F. Han, G. Lubineau, Coupling of nonlocal and local continuum models by the Arlequin approach, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 89 (6) (2012) 671–685.
- [59] G. Lubineau, Y. Azdoud, F. Han, C. Rey, A. Askari, A morphing strategy to couple
 non-local to local continuum mechanics, Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of
 Solids 60 (6) (2012) 1088–1102.
 - [60] Y. Azdoud, F. Han, G. Lubineau, A morphing framework to couple non-local and local anisotropic continua, International Journal of Solids and Structures 50 (9) (2013) 1332–1341.
 - 80

- 1025 [61] Y. Azdoud, F. Han, G. Lubineau, The morphing method as a flexible tool for adaptive local/non-local simulation of static fracture, Computational Mechanics 54 (3) (2014) 711–722.
 - [62] F. Han, G. Lubineau, Y. Azdoud, A. Askari, A morphing approach to couple statebased peridynamics with classical continuum mechanics, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 301 (2016) 336–358.

1035

- [63] Q. Du, X. H. Li, J. Lu, X. Tian, A quasi-nonlocal coupling method for nonlocal and local diffusion models, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis 56 (2018) 1386– 1404.
- [64] P. Seleson, S. Beneddine, S. Prudhomme, A force-based coupling scheme for peridynamics and classical elasticity, Computational Materials Science 66 (2013) 34– 49.
- [65] P. Seleson, Y. D. Ha, S. Beneddine, Concurrent coupling of bond-based peridynamics and the Navier equation of classical elasticity by blending, International Journal for Multiscale Computational Engineering 13 (2) (2015) 91–113.
- [66] S. A. Silling, D. J. Littlewood, P. Seleson, Variable horizon in a peridynamic medium, Journal of Mechanics of Materials and Structures 10 (5) (2015) 591–612.
 - [67] M. D'Elia, X. Li, P. Seleson, X. Tian, Y. Yu, A review of Local-to-Nonlocal coupling methods in nonlocal diffusion and nonlocal mechanics, arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06668 (2019).
 - [68] R. W. Macek, S. A. Silling, Peridynamics via finite element analysis, Finite Elements in Analysis and Design 43 (15) (2007) 1169–1178.
 - [69] B. Kilic, E. Madenci, Coupling of peridynamic theory and the finite element method, Journal of Mechanics of Materials and Structures 5 (5) (2010) 707–733.
- [70] W. Liu, J.-W. Hong, A coupling approach of discretized peridynamics with finite element method, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 245– 246 (2012) 163–175.

[71] E. Oterkus, E. Madenci, O. Weckner, S. Silling, P. Bogert, A. Tessler, Combined finite element and peridynamic analyses for predicting failure in a stiffened composite curved panel with a central slot, Composite Structures 94 (3) (2012) 839– 850.

1055

- [72] A. Agwai, I. Guven, E. Madenci, Drop-shock failure prediction in electronic packages by using peridynamic theory, IEEE Transactions on Components, Packaging and Manufacturing Technology 2 (3) (2012) 439–447.
- [73] A. Shojaei, M. Zaccariotto, U. Galvanetto, Coupling of 2D discretized Peridynamics with a meshless method based on classical elasticity using switching of nodal behaviour, Engineering Computations 34 (5) (2017) 1334–1366.
 - [74] A. Shojaei, T. Mudric, M. Zaccariotto, U. Galvanetto, A coupled meshless finite point/Peridynamic method for 2D dynamic fracture analysis, International Journal of Mechanical Sciences 119 (2016) 419–431.
 - [75] U. Galvanetto, T. Mudric, A. Shojaei, M. Zaccariotto, An effective way to couple FEM meshes and Peridynamics grids for the solution of static equilibrium problems, Mechanics Research Communications 76 (2016) 41–47.
- [76] M. Zaccariotto, T. Mudric, D. Tomasi, A. Shojaei, U. Galvanetto, Coupling of
 FEM meshes with Peridynamic grids, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 330 (2018) 471–497.
 - [77] T. Ni, M. Zaccariotto, Q.-Z. Zhu, U. Galvanetto, Coupling of FEM and ordinary state-based peridynamics for brittle failure analysis in 3D, Mechanics of Advanced Materials and Structures (2019) 1–16.
- [78] F. Bobaru, M. Yang, L. F. Alves, S. A. Silling, E. Askari, J. Xu, Convergence, adaptive refinement, and scaling in 1D peridynamics, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 77 (6) (2009) 852–877.
 - [79] P. Seleson, D. J. Littlewood, Convergence studies in meshfree peridynamic simulations, Computers & Mathematics with Applications 71 (11) (2016) 2432–2448.

- [80] Q. V. Le, F. Bobaru, Surface corrections for peridynamic models in elasticity and fracture, Computational Mechanics 61 (2018) 499–518.
 - [81] O. C. Zienkiewicz, R. L. Taylor, P. Nithiarasu, J. Zhu, The Finite Element Method, Vol. 3, McGraw-Hill London, 1977.
 - [82] P. Seleson, Improved one-point quadrature algorithms for two-dimensional peri-
- 1085

dynamic models based on analytical calculations, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 282 (2014) 184–217.

- [83] G. Sarego, Q. V. Le, F. Bobaru, M. Zaccariotto, U. Galvanetto, Linearized statebased peridynamics for 2-D problems, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 108 (10) (2016) 1174–1197.
- [84] S. A. Silling, Linearized theory of peridynamic states, Journal of Elasticity 99 (1) (2010) 85–111.
 - [85] T. Ni, M. Zaccariotto, Q.-Z. Zhu, U. Galvanetto, Static solution of crack propagation problems in peridynamics, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 346 (2019) 126–151.
- [86] E. Madenci, A. Barut, M. Futch, Peridynamic differential operator and its applications, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 304 (2016) 408–451.
 - [87] A. Shojaei, U. Galvanetto, T. Rabczuk, A. Jenabi, M. Zaccariotto, A generalized finite difference method based on the peridynamic differential operator for the solution of problems in bounded and unbounded domains, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 343 (2019) 100–126.
 - [88] D. Brokenshire, A study of torsional fracture tests, Ph.D. thesis, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wells (1996).
 - [89] W. Gerstle, N. Sau, S. Silling, Peridynamic modeling of plain and reinforced concrete structures, SMiRT 18 (2005) 54–68.

1100

- [90] J. Trageser, P. Seleson, Bond-based peridynamics: a tale of two Poisson's ratios, Journal of Peridynamics and Nonlocal Modeling 2 (2020) 278–288.
- [91] Wolfram Research, Inc., Mathematica, Version 12.1, Champaign, IL, 2020. URL https://www.wolfram.com/mathematica