

## **INFLUENCE OF SURFACE STRESS ON ELASTIC CONSTANTS OF NANOHONEYCOMBS**

Qiang Chen<sup>1</sup>, Nicola Pugno<sup>2</sup>, Zhiyong Li<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Biomechanics Laboratory, School of Biological Science and Medical Engineering, Southeast University, 210096, Nanjing, P.R.China.*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Civil, Environmental and Mechanical Engineering, University of Trento, 38123 Trento, Italy.*

### **Corresponding Author:**

Dr. Zhiyong Li


Email: zylicam@gmail.com

Tel.: +862583792620

Fax: +862583792620

Manuscript Submitted to **PHYSICA E**

**Graphical Abstract:**



Summary: Comparison of shear modulus predicted by different considerations, i.e., without surface effect, only surface elasticity, both surface elasticity and surface residual stress.

**Abstract:** Surface effect on the four independent elastic constants of nanohoneycombs is investigated in this paper. The axial deformation of the horizontal cell wall is included, comparing to the Gibson's method, and the contributions of the two components of surface stress (*i.e.* surface residual stress and surface elasticity) are discussed. The result shows that the regular hexagonal honeycomb is not isotropic but orthotropic. An increase in the cell-wall thickness  $t$  leads to an increase in the discrepancy of the Young's moduli in both directions. Furthermore, the surface residual stress dominates the surface effect on the elastic constants when  $t < 15\text{nm}$  (or the relative density  $< 0.17$ ), which is in contrast to that the surface elasticity does when  $t > 15\text{nm}$  (or the relative density  $> 0.17$ ) for metal Al. The present structure and theory may be useful in the design of future nanodevices.

**Keywords:** Nanohoneycomb; Surface effect; Elastic constants.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Due to the existence of a surface, surface effect resulting in an excess free energy per area [1], produces an important influence on the mechanical properties of nanostructures when the structures' size comes down into nanoscale (less than 100nm) [2]. At present, a huge number of works focus on the mechanical behaviors of rod- or wire-like nanostructures for potential applications in micro- or nano-electromechanical systems by performing experiments [3] or popular method—molecular dynamics simulations [4], such as elasticity [5], fracture [6], buckling [7] and plasticity [8]. In theoretical aspect, models are often treated as structures with bulk core and surface shell, *i.e.*, so-called core-shell model [10], or composite model [11]. These works provide deep insights of the mechanisms of surface effect on the mechanical properties of the tiny structures.

Not confined by the nano-wire-structures, nanoporous structures have also drawn considerable attention for the future applications, *e.g.* catalysts, molecular sieves. Starting from fabricating technology, nanochannel [12] and mesoporous structures [13] were developed by chemical methods, and the mechanical properties of the nanoporous materials have also been investigated recently. Indeed, due to the high surface/volume ratio of nanoporous structures, the formula of macroporous materials lose their validity, and the surface effect has to be included. For example, by incorporating the surface effect into the continuum mechanics of the composite materials, the elastic constants of the nanoporous materials with uniformly distributed cycle channels and the Young's modulus of regular nano-foam were studied [14]. All of the results shows that the structures can be stiffer (positive surface effect) or softer (negative surface effect) than their parental materials, which are dependent of the crystal orientations. Zhang and Wang [17] presented a theory to study the surface energy on the yield strength of nanoporous materials, basing on the traditional micromechanics; in particular, for irregular nanoporous materials, the Hall-Petch relationship, which states that the materials strength is proportional to the reciprocal of the square root of the ligament size (*i.e.*, materials yield

strength increases as the ligament size decreases), is often employed to predict the effective materials' strength [18], and the classical power law to calculate the mechanical parameters is modified according to the effective mechanical strength, but it is worth mentioning that an inverse Hall-Petch relationship may appear in nanostructures because of sufficiently small grain size, and several reasons are considered to contribute to this phenomenon[20]; furthermore, the effect of surface stress on the plastic deformation of nanoporous or nanocomposite materials was also formulated by a micromechanical framework [21]. Recently, inspired by the hierarchical structures of natural materials, which span from nano- to macro-scale, a hierarchical foam or honeycomb taking the surface effect on nano-scale sub-structures into account was developed by the authors [22].

As discussed before, the elastic constants of the nanoporous materials with uniformly distributed circular channels and regular nano-foam have already been studied based on a continuum mechanics, but the surface effect on the elastic properties of the hexagonal honeycomb (or nanoporous materials with uniformly distributed hexagonal channels, figure 1) has not been investigated. To this end, here we developed a relevant theory for the nanohoneycombs, and compared the results with different theories; moreover, the influences of the cell-wall thickness and the relative density on the four independent elastic constants of regular Al nanohoneycombs were studied. Besides, we have to point out that the hexagonal cell walls of the target structure is stable[25], and the curvature induced by the residual surface stress[26] is neglected, this is because the smallest size of the cell walls discussed in this work is 5nm, over which the mechanical properties of the cell walls are close to those of their bulk counterparts[5].

## 2 SURFACE STRESS

Surface effect was firstly introduced by [1] in the sense of thermodynamics of surfaces, and a keystone in the theory is about the surface free energy. The general expression on the surface stress  $\tau_{ij}$  is written as [2]:

$\tau_{ij} = \gamma \delta_{ij} + \partial \gamma / \partial \varepsilon_{ij}$ , where,  $\gamma$  is the surface excess free energy,  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker delta, and  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  is the strain tensor. For the elastic case,  $\tau_{ij}$  can be rewritten as [5]:  $\tau_{ij} = \tau_{ij}^0 + K_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl}$ , where,  $\tau_{ij}^0$  is the surface residual stress and  $K_{ijkl}$  is the stiffness matrix. Due to the structural deformation inducing the change of surface curvature, the surface stress will produce a distributed force perpendicular to the structural surface, and the distributed force is easily formulated by the general Young-Laplace equation [5]:  $\Delta \sigma_{ij} n_i n_j = \tau_{\alpha\beta} \kappa_{\alpha\beta}$  ( $i, j=1,2,3$  and  $\alpha, \beta=1, 2$ ),  $\Delta \sigma_{ij}$  is the stress difference across the structural surface,  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}$  and  $\kappa_{\alpha\beta}$  are surface stress tensor and surface curvature tensor, respectively. Then, for a one-dimensional nanostructure, the distributed force along its longitudinal axis can be expressed as:  $q(x) = \Delta \sigma(x) = H w''$ , where,  $H = 2\tau W$  for rectangular cross-sections,  $w''$  is the approximate curvature under small deformation, and  $W$  is the width of the cross-sections. Plus, because of the small displacement,  $H$  can be written as  $H^0 = 2\tau^0 W$  [27]. In the following sections, the distributed force  $q(x) = 2\tau^0 W w''$  will be employed to derive the elastic constants of nanohoneycombs.

It is worth mentioning that surface stress is composed of two parts from the expressions  $\tau_{ij}$ : the first is contributed by the intrinsic surface residual stress and the second by the structural deformation (or surface elasticity); interestingly, the surface elastic modulus in the second part can be positive or negative, this is due to the fact a surface cannot exist without the bulk, and the total energy (bulk and surface) that needs to satisfy the positive definiteness condition[28]. As for their contributions to the structural behavior, both the surface elasticity and surface residual stress have significant influences on the elastic behavior of macro- or nano-beams [29] and in particular, the surface residual stress (or residual strain) has a main influence on the plastic behavior of the nanoporous and nanocomposites materials [21] compared to the surface elasticity; and more, the theoretical frame based on strain gradient theory strongly supports that residual elastic strain gradient (or residual stress) effect is significant in elastic deformation of small-scale structures [30] and the residual stress field induced by the surface tension considerably affects the effective Young's modulus of Al nanowire [31]. Also, addressing their influences

on the Al nanohoneycomb, we will discuss this point in Section 5.

### 3 ELEASTIC CONSTANTS

#### 3.1 Young's modulus in 1 direction and Poisson's ratio $\nu_{12}$

The total deformation in 1-direction includes two components: the bending deflection of inclined cell walls (*B* & *C*) and the axial deformation of horizontal cell wall *A* (figure 2a). On the one hand, according to the classical Euler formula for pure-bending structures, the modified result by surface effect of the cell wall is expressed as [27]:

$D^e w'''' = H^0 w''$ , where  $w(x)$  is the cell wall deflection, and  $D^e = D(1+6l_{in}/t)$  [5], where  $D^e$  is effective flexural rigidity of cell walls,  $D = EWt^3/12$  is flexural rigidity without surface effect, and  $l_{in} = E^{sur}/E$  with surface Young's modulus  $E^{sur}$  is the materials intrinsic length[22]. Then, the solution is derived by an integration, *i.e.*  $w(x) = A_1 e^{-kx}/k^2 + A_2 e^{kx}/k^2 + A_3 x + A_4$ , with boundary conditions  $w(0) = w'(0) = w'(L) = 0$ ,  $w''(L) = -P_1/D^e$ , in which  $k = \sqrt{H^0/D^e}$  and  $P_1 = \sigma_1 WL \cos^2 \theta$ . Substituting the boundary conditions into  $w(x)$ , we immediately obtained the four integral constants:

$$A_1 = \frac{P_1}{2D^e k} \left( \tanh \frac{kL}{2} + 1 \right); A_2 = \frac{P_1}{2D^e k} \left( \tanh \frac{kL}{2} - 1 \right); A_3 = \frac{P_1}{D^e k^2}; A_4 = \frac{-P_1}{D^e k^3} \tanh \frac{kL}{2}$$

and the bending deflection  $w(x)$  of the cell walls (*B* & *C*) is expressed as:

$$w(x) = \frac{P_1}{H^0} \left[ x + \frac{1}{k} \tanh \frac{kL}{2} (\cosh(kx) - 1) - \frac{1}{k} \sinh(kx) \right] \quad (1)$$

the maximum displacement located at  $x=L$ , and it is formulated as:

$$\delta_1^b = \frac{P_1 L}{H^0} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \tanh \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot (\cosh \beta - 1) - \sinh \beta \right) \right] \quad \text{with } \beta = kL \quad (2)$$

On the other hand, the axial displacement of the cell wall *A* is:

$$\delta_1^a = \frac{2P_1 h}{d^e} \quad (3)$$

where,  $d^e = d(1+2l_{in}/t)$  [5] is tensile stiffness of cell walls,  $d = EA$  is tensile stiffness without surface effect,

finally, the total displacement  $\Delta_1$  is obtained as:

$$\Delta_1 = \delta_1^b \cos \theta + \delta_1^a = \frac{P_1 L \cos \theta}{H^0} f_1(\beta) \quad (4)$$

where,

$$f_1(\beta) = \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \tanh \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot (\cosh \beta - 1) - \sinh \beta \right) + \frac{4}{E \cos \theta} \left( \frac{h}{L} \right) \left( \frac{\tau^0}{t} \right) \frac{1}{(1 + 2l_m/t)} \right]$$

Immediately, the strain in the 1-direction is calculated:

$$\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\Delta_1}{h + L \sin \theta} = \frac{\sigma_1 W L \cos^3 \theta}{H^0 (h/L + \sin \theta)} f_1(\beta) \quad (5)$$

and, the Young's modulus in the 1-direction is derived:

$$E_1 = \frac{\sigma_1}{\varepsilon_1} = \frac{h/L + \sin \theta}{\cos^3 \theta} \cdot 2 \left( \frac{\tau^0}{t} \right) \left( \frac{t}{L} \right) f_1(\beta)^{-1} \quad (6)$$

correspondingly, the Poisson's ratio  $\nu_{12}$  is also obtained:

$$\nu_{12} = -\frac{\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_1} = \frac{\delta_1^b \sin \theta / L \cos \theta}{(\delta_1^b \cos \theta + \delta_1^a) / (h + L \sin \theta)} = \frac{(h/L + \sin \theta) \sin \theta}{\cos^2 \theta} \cdot \frac{f_2(\beta)}{f_1(\beta)} \quad (7)$$

where,

$$f_2(\beta) = \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \tanh \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot (\cosh \beta - 1) - \sinh \beta \right) \right]$$

Apparently,  $f_1(\beta) > f_2(\beta)$ , the Poisson's ratio  $\nu_{12}$  is less than 1 for regular hexagonal honeycombs, of which  $\nu_{12}$  is a constant in [33]. This is because the axial deformation is neglected due to its smallness compared with the bending deflection, when the cell-wall thickness is small; however, the difference between these two methods tends to larger as  $t/L$  (or relative density) increases, which will be shown later.

### 3.2 Young's modulus in 2 direction and Poisson's ratio $\nu_{21}$

Likewise, we find that the displacement of the cell walls under the 2-direction stress is only contributed by the bending deflection of the inclined cell walls ( $B$  &  $C$ ), and the boundary conditions of the cell walls is identical with that of the 1-direction. Then, the displacement  $\delta_2^b$  is similar as equation (2) but with different load  $P_2$ , *i.e.*,

$$\delta_2^b = \frac{P_2 L}{H^0} f_2(\beta) \quad (8)$$

where,  $P_2 = \sigma_2 W (h + L \sin \theta) \sin \theta$ .

and the displacement  $\Delta_2$  is expressed as:

$$\Delta_2 = \delta_2^b \sin \theta = \frac{P_2 L \sin \theta}{H^0} f_2(\beta) \quad (9)$$

furthermore, the strain in the 2-direction is calculated:

$$\varepsilon_2 = \frac{\Delta_2}{L \cos \theta} = \frac{\sigma_2 W L (h/L + \sin \theta) \sin^2 \theta}{H^0 \cos \theta} f_2(\beta) \quad (10)$$

Thus, the Young's modulus in the 2-direction is derived:

$$E_2 = \frac{\sigma_2}{\varepsilon_2} = \frac{\cos \theta}{(h/L + \sin \theta) \sin^2 \theta} \cdot 2 \left( \frac{t^0}{t} \right) \left( \frac{t}{L} \right) f_2(\beta)^{-1} \quad (11)$$

and the corresponding Poisson's ratio  $\nu_{21}$  is expressed as:

$$\nu_{21} = -\frac{\varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon_2} = \frac{\delta_2^b \cos \theta / (h + L \sin \theta)}{\delta_2^b \sin \theta / L \cos \theta} = \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{(h/L + \sin \theta) \sin \theta} \quad (12)$$

Different from equation (7), equation (12) is the same as that reported in[33], and this is due to no axial displacement of cell walls in the 2-direction. Thus, the regular hexagonal honeycomb is not an isotropic structure any more, but the reciprocal relationship  $E_1 \nu_{21} = E_2 \nu_{12}$  still holds, that is to say, the structure is orthotropic.

### 3.3 Shear modulus

Deformation of cell walls under shear load in honeycomb is more complex than those under normal stresses in the two directions discussed above. The deformation includes the rotation angle  $\phi_{ABC}$  of the joint of cell walls A, B, C, and the vertical translation  $\delta_A$  of the point a, see figure 3. In figure 3a, a, b, c denote the middle points of the cell walls A, B, C, respectively. At point a, there is a vertical displacement and rotation, whereas, at points b, c, only rotation exists, because of the structural anti-symmetry; therefore, the structure could be simplified as figure 3b and the total displacement at point a is[33]:

$$\Delta_{12} = \phi_{ABC} h / 2 + \delta_A \quad (13)$$

On the one hand, for the rotational angle  $\phi_{ABC}$ , reconsidering the expression of  $w(x)$  but with the different boundary conditions of the cell wall  $B$  according to figure 3b, *i.e.*,  $w(0) = w(L/2) = w''(0) = 0$ ,  $w'''(L/2) = M/D^e$ , where  $M = Sh/4$  and  $S = 2\sigma_{12}WL\cos\theta$ , we find the four integral constants:

$$A_1 = -\frac{M}{2D^e} \left( \sinh \frac{kL}{2} \right)^{-1}; A_2 = \frac{M}{2D^e} \left( \sinh \frac{kL}{2} \right)^{-1}; A_3 = -\frac{M}{D^e k} \cdot \frac{2}{kL}; A_4 = 0$$

thus,  $w(x)$  is expressed as:

$$w(x) = \frac{Sh}{4H^0} \left[ \frac{\sinh(kx)}{\sinh(kL/2)} - \frac{2}{L} x \right] \quad (14)$$

furthermore, the rotation angle  $\phi_{ABC} = w'(L/2)$  is derived:

$$\phi_{ABC} = \frac{S}{2H^0} \left( \frac{h}{L} \right) \left[ \frac{\beta}{2} \coth \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \right) - 1 \right] \quad (15)$$

On the other hand, the vertical translation  $\delta_A$  is calculated from the existing formula of the cantilever structure[27]:

$$\delta_A = \frac{Sh}{2H^0} \cosh \beta' \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\beta'} \tanh \beta' \right) \quad \text{with } \beta' = \frac{h}{2L} \beta \quad (16)$$

then, substituting equations (15) and (16) into equation (13), the shear displacement is obtained:

$$\Delta_{12} = \frac{Sh}{2H^0} \left[ \frac{h}{2L} \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \coth \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \right) - 1 \right) + \cosh \beta' \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\beta'} \tanh \beta' \right) \right] \quad (17)$$

thus, the shear strain is calculated:

$$\gamma = \frac{\Delta_{12}}{(h + L \sin \theta) / 2} = \sigma_{12} \left( \frac{\frac{h}{L} \cdot \cos \theta}{\frac{h}{L} + \sin \theta} \right) \left( \frac{t}{t^0} \right) \left( \frac{L}{t} \right) g(\beta) \quad (18)$$

where,

$$g(\beta) = \left[ \frac{h}{2L} \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \coth \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \right) - 1 \right) + \cosh \beta' \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\beta'} \tanh \beta' \right) \right]$$

Finally, the shear modulus is obtained:

$$G_{12} = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\gamma} = \left( \frac{\frac{h}{L} + \sin \theta}{\frac{h}{L} \cdot \cos \theta} \right) \left( \frac{\tau^0}{t} \right) \left( \frac{t}{L} \right) g(\beta)^{-1} \quad (19)$$

## 4 EXAMPLE and DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Comparison of shear modulus of nanohoneycombs with different channel shapes:

In this part, we compare our prediction on shear modulus of the present structure (figure4a;  $\theta = 30^\circ$  and  $h/L=1$ ) with that of the other similar structure (figure4b) presented in the literature [14] with identical constant porosity 0.2 (or relative density 0.8), side length  $L$  and out-of-plane depth of unit cell (figure 4). Besides, other parameters are set as below: firstly, according to the considered porosity 0.2 and the geometry in figure 4a, we obtain the relationship between the side length  $L$  and cell-wall thickness  $t$ , *i.e.*,  $L = 1.045t$ ; likewise, for the structure in figure 4b, we find  $L = 2.459R$ ; if pore radius  $R$  varies from 1nm to 30nm and then  $t$  from 2.353 nm to 70.593nm; secondly, we also use the data of Al presented by Miller and Shenoy [5], namely, the Young's modulus of the bulk material  $E$  is 89.392GPa, the Young's modulus of the surface  $E^{sur}$  on surfaces of [111] and [100] crystal orientations for plates are 5.1811N/m and -7.9146N/m, respectively, and the surface residual stress  $\tau^0$  on the two surfaces are 0.9096N/m and 0.5682N/m, respectively.

In [14], the surface elasticity is only considered, therefore, the influence of surface residual stress can be evaluated thanks to the inclusion of both surface elasticity and surface residual stress by comparing the two cases.

The results are reported in figure 5.

Figure 5 shows that surface effect on the shear modulus decreases as the cell-wall thickness  $t$  increases. The

present method agrees very well with the result from [14], and this explains that the influence of surface residual stress is very weak in the elastic deformation of nanohoneycombs when the relative density is 0.8. Moreover, the prediction is comparable with the result from [14], even though our result shows a slightly greater influence with [111] orientation surface; this is induced by their different geometries and other effects (such as the shear effect in the bending of cell walls). Moreover, it is noted that the negative surface Young's modulus softens the shear behavior of the nanohoneycomb.

#### 4.2 Competition between surface elasticity and surface residual stress:

Let us continue the previous example, but the cell-wall thickness  $t$  varies from 5nm to 29nm and the side length  $L$  is maintained as a constant (100nm); thus, the corresponding relative density ranges from 0.06 to 0.31. Like the comparison of the shear modulus, two cases are considered: one is only considering surface elasticity and the other both surface elasticity and surface residual stress, the results are reported in figure 6, in which  $E_G$  and  $G_G$  are Young's modulus and shear modulus calculated by Gibson's method, respectively[33].

In figure 6, an increase in cell-wall thickness similarly results in a decrease in the surface effect on the four independent elastic constants. Moreover, if surface elasticity is only considered, the normalized Young's moduli and shear modulus are enhanced for positive  $E^{sur}$  and reduced for negative  $E^{sur}$  as cell-wall thickness decreases, which again softens the mechanical behavior of the nanohoneycomb;  $E_1/E_G$  of the two surfaces approach a value less than one due to the inclusion of axial deformation of horizontal cell walls (black and red lines in figure 6a). Whereas,  $E_2/E_G$  or  $G_{12}/G_G$  approach unity, which is the result by the Gibson's method (black and red lines in figure 6b,d). However, the effective Young's modulus  $E^e$  does not influence the Poisson's ratio  $\nu_{12}$  (black and red lines in figure 6c).

On the other hand, if surface elasticity and surface residual stress are both included, surface residual stress

plays much more important roles when the cell-wall thickness is less than 15nm (or relative density $<0.17$ ); this is because the cell walls *B&C* in figure 3 are similar as one-end clamped and one-end guided structures, and in this case, the distributed force induced by the surface residual stress, produces an opposite deflection to that by the external normal load, thus,  $\delta_i^b$  ( $i=1,2$ ) decreases and  $\tau^0$  strengthens nanohoneycombs; furthermore, the two Young's moduli are improved and greater  $\tau^0$  results in greater Young's modulus (green and blue lines in figure 6a,b); for the Poisson's ratio  $\nu_{12}$ , smaller  $\delta_i^b$  results in smaller  $\nu_{12}$  thanks to equation (7), and different from the surface effect on the other constants, the effect on the Poisson's ratio is much weaker (green and blue lines in figure 6c); for the shear modulus, different from the cell walls *B&C*, the boundary conditions of cell wall *A* are same as a cantilever structure, so the distributed force produces a consistent deflection to that by the shear load, therefore,  $\delta_A$  increases and  $\tau^0$  softens nanohoneycombs (green and blue lines in figure 6d). In the end, the elastic constants influenced by both surface elasticity and surface residual stress on the same crystal surface tend to those influenced only by surface elasticity when cell-wall thickness increases after 15nm.

Therefore, the surface residual stress dominates the surface effect when  $t<15\text{nm}$  (or relative density $<0.17$ ), while the surface elasticity dominates when  $t>15\text{nm}$  (or relative density $>0.17$ ). At this point, it is different from the conclusion reported by Feng *et al.*[16], which reported that surface residual stress has a weaker influence on the effective elastic constants than surface elasticity; this is because in that work they considered a large constant relative density 0.35 ( $>0.17$  [16]), and the weaker influence of the surface residual stress is also observed in figure 5 with the larger constant relative density 0.8 ( $>0.17$ ).

#### **4.3 Elastic modulus of Al nanohoneycombs:**

Here, we again use the above set of surface properties, the variable  $t$ , constant  $L$ , and addressing the four independent elastic constants, the comparison between the results of nanohoneycombs with both surface elasticity

and surface residual stress and macrohoneycombs (Gibson's method) are reported in figure 7 *versus* relative density.

For the two Young's moduli and shear modulus in figure 7a,b,d, the normalized values can be referred to those in figure 6a,b,d. In figure 7c, the results of the Poisson's ratio predicted by different methods are compared, and the present method considering the axial deformation of horizontal cell walls is between the FEM [34] (Timoshenko beam theory) result and unity, which is formulated by the Gibson's method (Euler beam theory).

## 5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have calculated the elastic constants of nanohoneycombs influenced by the surface effect (surface residual stress and surface elasticity), and different from Gibson's method, the axial deformation of the horizontal cell wall is included. The result shows that the regular hexagonal honeycomb is not isotropic but orthotropic, and as the cell-wall thickness  $t$  increases, the discrepancy of the Young's moduli in two directions increases. Meanwhile, the surface effect plays a vital role when  $t$  is a few nanometers; when  $t < 15\text{nm}$ , the surface residual stress dominates the surface effect on the elastic constants of metal Al nanohoneycombs, otherwise (*i.e.*  $t > 15\text{nm}$ ), surface elasticity does. Finally, the nanohoneycomb and present theory could be important and useful in the design of nanosieves or other nanodevices.

### Acknowledgements:

This study was partially supported by the National 973 Basic Research Program of China [No. 2013CB733800] and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) (No. 11272091) to ZL. The research related to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013)/ERC Grant agreement nu [279985] (ERC StG Ideas 2011 BIHSNAM on "Bio-inspired hierarchical super nanomaterials") to NP.

## **References**

- [1] J.W. Gibbs, *The Scientific Papers of J. W. Gibbs*, Longmans-Green, London, Vol. I, p. 55, 1906.
- [2] R.C. Cammarata, *Prog. Surf. Sci.* 46(1994)1-38.
- [3] S. Cuenot, C. Frétiigny, S. Demoustier-Champagne, and B. Nysten, *Phys. Rev. B* 69(2004)165410.
- [4] K. Kang and W. Cai, *Int. J. Plasticity* 26(2010)1387-1401.
- [5] R.E. Miller and V.B. Shenoy, *Nanotechnology* 11(2000)139-147.
- [6] H. Mehrez and S. Ciraci, *Phys. Rev. B* 56(1997)12632-12642.
- [7] G. Wang and X. Feng, *Appl. Phys.Lett.* 94(2009)141913.
- [8] G. Huang and B. Svendsen, *Int. J.Fract.*166(2010)173-178.
- [9] X. Zheng, Y. Cao, B. Li, X. Feng, and G. Wang, *Nanotechnology* 21 (2010)205702.
- [10] G. Ouyang, X.L. Li, X. Tan, and G.W. Yang, *Phys. Rev. B* 76(2007)193406.
- [11] B. Gong, Q. Chen, and D. Wang, *Mater. Lett.* 67(2012)165-168.
- [12] H. Masuda and K. Fukuda, *Science* 268(1995)1466-1468.
- [13] D. Li, H. Zhou, and I. Honma, *Nat. Mater.* 3(2004)65-72.
- [14] H.L. Duan, J. Wang, B.L. Karihaloo, and Z.P. Huang, *Acta Mater.*54(2006)2983-2990.
- [15] G. Ouyang, G. Yang, C. Sun, and W. Zhu, *Small* 4(2008)1359-1362.
- [16] X. Feng, R. Xia, X. Li, and B. Li, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 94(2009)011916.
- [17] W. X. Zhang and T. J. Wang, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 90(2007)063104.
- [18] A.M. Hodge, J. Biener, J.R. Hayes, P.M. Bythrow, C.A. Volkert, and A.V. Hamza, *Acta Mater.* 55(2007) 1343-1349.
- [19] M. Hakamada and M. Mabuchi, *Scripta Mater.* 56(2007) 1003-1006.
- [20] J.R. Greer and J.Th.M. De Hosson, *Prog. Mater. Sci.* 56(2011) 654-724.

- [21] W.X. Zhang, T.J. Wang, and X. Chen, *Int. J. Plasticity* 26(2010)957-975.
- [22] Q. Chen and N. Pugno, *EPL* 97(2012a)26002.
- [23] Q. Chen and N. Pugno, *EPL* 98(2012b)16005.
- [24] Q. Chen and N. Pugno, *Eur. J. Mech. A/Solids* 37(2013)248-255.
- [25] A. Garcia, D. Sen and M.J. Buehler, *Metall. Mater. Trans. A* 42(2011) 3889-3897.
- [26] J.-L. Zang and Y.-P. Zhao, *Int. J. Eng. Sci.* 61(2012)156-170.
- [27] J. He and C.M. Lilley, *Nano Lett.* 8(2008)1798-1802.
- [28] V.B. Shenoy, *Phys. Rev. B* 71(2005)094104.
- [29] G-F. Wang and X.Q. Feng, *Appl.Phys.Lett.* 90(2007)231904.
- [30] D.C.C. Lam, F. Yang, A.C.M. Chong, J. Wang, and P. Tong, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* 51(2003)1477-1508.
- [31] Z-Q. Wang, Y-P. Zhao, and Z-P. Huang, *Int. J. Eng. Sci.* 48(2010)140-150.
- [32] Z. Wang and Y. Zhao, *Acta Mech. Solida Sin.* 22(2009)630-643.
- [33] L.J. Gibson and M.F. Ashby. *Cellular Solids: Structure and Properties*, second ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [34] F. Wang, S. Zhuang, and J. Yu, *Acta Mech. Sinica* 34(2002)914-923(In Chinese).

**Figure Captions:**

**Figure 1** Regular hexagonal nanohoneycomb

**Figure 2** Unit-cell deformations in (a) 1-direction and (b) 2-direction of nanohoneycombs.

**Figure 3** Deformation of cell wall under shear load. (a) Representative element deformation; (b) Simplified structure.


**Figure 4** Unit cell of nanohoneycombs with (a) cylindrical nano-channel and (b) hexagonal nano-channel.

**Figure 5** Comparison of shear moduli predicted by different methods. Note: the shear moduli of the nanohoneycombs are normalized by those of the honeycombs without surface effect.


**Figure 6** Comparisons of four elastic constants on the surfaces of [111] and [100] orientations, influenced by only surface elasticity (the black and red curves) or both surface elasticity & surface residual stress (the green and blue curves). (a) Young's moduli in the 1-direction; (b) Young's moduli in the 2-direction; (c) Poisson's ratio  $\nu_{12}$ ; (c) Shear moduli.

**Figure 7** Young's moduli of nanohoneycombs in the (a) 1-direction and (b) 2-direction on the surfaces of [111] and [100] orientations; (c) Comparison of Poisson's ratio by different methods, note that FEM (TB) denotes Timoshenko-beam element in finite element method; (d) Shear moduli of nanohoneycombs on the surfaces of [111] and [100] orientations.


**Figure 1**



**Figure 2**



**Figure 3**



**Figure 4**






Figure 5



**Figure 6**



**Figure 7**

