Physical behavior of electrostrictive polymers. Part 1: Polarization forces

Gildas Diguët, Jean-Yves Cavaille, Gael Sebald, Toshiyuki Takagi, Hiroshi Yabu, Ai Suzuki, Ryuji Miura

► To cite this version:

Gildas Diguët, Jean-Yves Cavaille, Gael Sebald, Toshiyuki Takagi, Hiroshi Yabu, et al.. Physical behavior of electrostrictive polymers. Part 1: Polarization forces. Computational Materials Science, 2021, 190, pp.110294. 10.1016/j.commatsci.2021.110294 . hal-03265512

HAL Id: hal-03265512

<https://hal.science/hal-03265512>

Submitted on 21 Jun 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Physical behavior of electrostrictive polymers.

Part 1: Polarization forces

Gildas Diguët^{1,2,*}, Jean-Yves Cavaille¹, Gael Sebald¹, Toshiyuki Takagi^{1,2}, Hiroshi Yabu³, Ai Suzuki⁴, and Ryuji Miura⁴

¹ELyTMax, CNRS / Université de Lyon / Tohoku University, International Joint Unit UMI 3757, Room 502, 2-1-1 Katahira, Aoba-ku, Sendai 980-8577, Japan

²Institute of Fluid Science, Tohoku University, 2-1-1 Katahira, Aoba-ku, Sendai 980-8577, Japan

³WPI-Advanced Institute for Materials Research (AIMR), Tohoku University, 2-1-1 Katahira, Aoba-ku, Sendai 980-8577, Japan

⁴New Industry Creation Hatchery Center, Tohoku University, 6-6-10 Aoba, Aramaki, Aoba-ku, Sendai 980-8579, Japan

Abstract

The electrostrictive response of soft elastomers with the same stiffness, strongly depends on their chemical nature and their typically multiphase microstructure. Moreover, some elastomers exhibit a strongly time dependent electrostriction over tens of minutes, and up to now, no theoretical approach has been proposed to analyze experimental data on local parameters like the dielectric constants, conductivities and viscoelastic moduli of these composite-like materials. We consider the phenomenon where the deformation of a polymeric sample between two electrodes is proportional to the square of the applied field, which is known as electrostriction. The electrostatic attraction of charged electrodes is Maxwell electrostriction. In cases, such as block co-polymers with phase separation, the observed electrostriction reaches magnitudes more than 10 times higher than those achieved via the Maxwell process. Phenomenological analyses of experimental data are usually performed but few physical have been proposed to explain the difference. Therefore, we analyze the electric forces inside a composite-like polymer and estimate the corresponding deformation. Using data sets for polyurethane-based materials that exhibit phase separation during their processing, we propose a microstructural model corresponding to a composite where spherical particles randomly fill a matrix. The particles and matrix exhibit different values of physical parameters such as the (i) dielectric constant and electrical conductivity, which determine the local electric field and (ii) viscoelastic modulus, which determine the local stiffness. Because the phases are different, the electric field is not homogenous and the field gradient generates forces around the interfaces. Developing a 2D model, we compare simulation results to experimental literature and other modeling approaches, and discuss them in detail. The polarization forces are found to be responsible for 20% of the deformation in a material with 35% inhomogeneity. Though the time constants are consistent with experimental data, their contribution is smaller than the Maxwell contribution, and therefore other mechanisms are involved in the large electromechanical activity of polymers like polyurethanes.

*corresponding author: gildas.diguët.d4@tohoku.ac.jp

1. Introduction

When a soft material such as rubber is placed inside an applied electric field E between two electrodes, it also experiences to their electrostatic attraction. This leads in turn to a compressive strain, known as the Maxwell strain, given by [1]

$$S_m = -\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{Y}\right) E^2 = -M_m E^2 \quad (1)$$

where ε and Y are the dielectric constant and Young modulus of the material, and M_m the Maxwell electrostrictive coefficient.

However, some electro-active polymers (EAPs) exhibit much higher deformations, $S \gg S_m$ [2–6]. These high deformations are still quadratic at low applied electric field according to

$$S = -M E^2 \quad (2)$$

where $M > M_m$ is the electrostriction coefficient. Electrostriction occurs in ionic crystals [7] and is responsible for piezoelectricity in ferroelectrics that have spontaneous polarization [7-9]. Anderson calculated the strain of a homogenous polarizable material in a cubic lattice hence providing a correction to the Maxwell coefficient [10], which Shkel later generalized to the case of amorphous material [11] with corrections based on the dielectric (permittivities), mechanical (Young modulus and Poisson ratio) and structural (lattice) properties.

The electrostrictive response of soft elastomers with the same stiffness strongly depends on their chemical natures, and for multiphase polymers, on their microstructures (such as spherical domains dispersed in continuous matrixes and lamellar materials) [1-6].

Experimental tests of electrostriction can be tricky, and it is difficult to obtain relevant measurements. For example, the constraint induced by the electrodes limits the deformation, as shown by Guyomar et al. [12]. They measured the deformation of 70 μm polyurethane (PU) films (i) coated with a 50 nm-thick gold layer and (ii) uncoated. An interferometer was used to measure the electrostrictive coefficients of both coated and uncoated films. Without the gold layer the PU strain went up to 4%, whereas that of the coated film barely reached 1% for the same applied field of 10 MV/m. The resulting electrostriction coefficients for the coated and the uncoated films were $4.83 \times 10^{-16} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ and $1 \times 10^{-16} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$, respectively. Measurements of the low-field permittivity ($\varepsilon = 4\varepsilon_0$) and mechanical modulus ($Y = 32 \text{ MPa}$) lead to $M_m = \varepsilon/Y = 1.10 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$. To avoid any measurement artifacts, Zhenyi [13] evaluated the electrostriction coefficient of a PU material using three different experimental apparatuses; the first was an accelerometer, the second an interferometer and the third a capacitance sensor. All measured values were higher than the Maxwell coefficient ($1.7 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$), and the values corrected by removing the Maxwell effect were $M = 2.4 \times 10^{-17} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ (accelerometer), $3.3 \times 10^{-17} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ (interferometer), and $1 \times 63.10^{-17} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ (capacitance sensor). Diaconu et al. [6, 14–16] performed several experiments on a PU to study its strong behavior. For example [6], they used a liquid between the metallic electrodes and the polymer film to reduce friction in a Michaelson interferometer when measuring the electrostrictive properties of a 0.05 mm thick sample with low frequency dielectric constant of $\varepsilon = 7.2\varepsilon_0$ and elastic modulus of $Y = 13.1 \text{ MPa}$. Their measurements yielded $M = 7 \times 75.10^{-16} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$, which is much higher than the simple Maxwell response evaluated at $M_m = 4.86 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$. They also obtained similar results, with different film thicknesses [14]. All these data show that additional contribution to electrostriction must be taken into

68 account. A phenomenological way to account for this additional contribution is in splitting the deformation
 69 coefficient as $M = M_m + M_E$. If $M_m \ll M_E$, then $M \approx M_E$. We hereafter refer to M_E as the pure electrostriction
 70 coefficient.

71 This pure electrostriction is an intrinsic function of the material polarization P [17] and is expressed as $S = QP^2$. At
 72 low field, $S = Q(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0)^2 E^2$, yielding $M_E = Q(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0)^2$ [17–19]. The quantity Q is proportional to $1/\varepsilon Y$. Therefore [4, 17–
 73 21],

$$M_E \approx (\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0)/\varepsilon Y \quad (3)$$

74 However, polymers exhibiting $M_E \gg M_m$ have either been filled with conducting particles or have intrinsic
 75 heterogeneities [2, 21, 22–23]. Diblock-copolymers PU, have such intrinsic heterogeneities induced by a phase
 76 separation during the sample preparation resulting in a distribution of particles of one phase in a continuous matrix
 77 (second phase), for block compositions far from 50%–50%. In either case, added particles or a two-phase system,
 78 these materials can be viewed as composite materials (particles embedded in a matrix). The microstructural features
 79 of diblock-copolymer PUs have been characterized [22].

80 Some researchers have tried to increase the electrostriction coefficient M by increasing the dielectric constant, such
 81 as in the experiments performed by Putson and al. [24] on PU containing polyaniline (PANI). They succeeded in
 82 increasing the permittivity ε with an almost constant modulus as the PANI content increased. Additionally, M for the
 83 four tested PU materials was around $10^{-16} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ and M_m around $10^{-17} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$.

84 Although little work has been done at the theoretical level to describe macroscopic behavior using local parameters,
 85 it is interesting to note the work of Lefevre and Lopez-Pamies [25], or Stephen et al [26]. They have proposed very
 86 rigorous equations and simulations of composites made up of elastomeric matrices incorporating rigid spherical or
 87 ellipsoidal particles. In other works, Lefevre and Lopez-Pamies [27–28] have developed a framework devoted to non-
 88 linear elastic behaviour, which must be taken into account for deformations higher than about 1% for elastomeric
 89 polymers: this is the case for the best electroactive materials found in the literature. Such approaches have been
 90 developed using sophisticated and elegant homogenization techniques.

91 The main difference with this work is that they did not take into account electrical conductivity and only considered
 92 static conditions.

93 Diguët et al. [29] examined the idea that these composite-like materials have heterogeneous dielectric properties,
 94 which, in turn, locally modify the electric field and create forces. They calculated the force created by a single particle
 95 (with dielectric constant ε_2) embedded in a matrix (with $\varepsilon_1 \neq \varepsilon_2$) and estimated the resulting deformation.

96 Interestingly, these polymers also exhibit a time-dependent electrostriction $S(t)$, as seen in Figure 1. Possible reasons
 97 for this behavior are (i) their viscoelasticity and (ii) their dielectric relaxations. Previous works have studied both
 98 mechanical [5] and dielectric [30] behaviors for different PU types, and clearly found corresponding relaxation times
 99 at room temperature that were lower by more than five orders of magnitude than the typical electrostriction time.
 100 This means that, when a force is applied, the polymer deforms in less than a millisecond owing solely to mechanical
 101 and dielectric effects. Interestingly, the conductivity relaxation time is on the same order of magnitude observed for
 102 $S(t)$. This means that the driving forces are also time-dependent on the order of tens of seconds. In fact, the electric
 103 field is governed by two material electrical parameters: permittivity (ε) and conductivity (σ). The EAP polarization

state depends on the time scale because of charging effects at the electrodes arising from the effective conductivity [5] and dielectric constant. This time-dependent dielectric force or dielectrophoretic (DEP) force used in cell-separator devices or in concentrator devices [31, 32]. This force arises usually from the differences in electric properties (ϵ , σ) between biological cells and a medium, and depends on the field gradient as well as its frequency. The force experienced by cells is either positive or negative depending on these factors. Although the literature on this topic is abundant [31, 32], DEP forces have never been taken into account in elastic soft materials subjected to electric fields.

In this paper, we evaluate the effect of DEP forces as a physical mechanism for pure electrostriction in a composite-like structure. We then calculate the electric field and forces in a polymer with many particles, and obtain the resulting deformation. For diblock-copolymer PU, the phase separation (composition gradient) between domains might not be sharp, so we also evaluated how the profile might influence the macroscopic deformation.

115

116

117 2. Methods

118 2.1 Materials

The studied materials were PU materials, provided by Lubrizol Corporation. These PUs are block co-polymers with hard segments (HSs) and soft segments (SSs). HSs are composed of 4,4'-methylene bis (phenyl isocyanate) – (MDI) and 1,4-Butanediol (BD), and SSs consist of poly(teramethylene oxide) – (PTMO). Table 1 lists the weight fractions of the three samples studied. The molecular weight of the SSs (PTMO) were 1000 g/mol for PU60 and 88, and 2000 g/mol for PU75.

Film samples were made via solution casting. The first step was to dissolve each PU in N,N-dimethylformamide (DMF) at 350 K. The solutions were spread onto glass plates using the Doctor Blade applicator (Elcometer®), dried at 340 K for 1 day and 400 K for 3 h. The thickness of the dried films was $100 \pm 1 \mu\text{m}$.

Because HSs and SSs are thermodynamically incompatible, a phase separation occurs during their processing, specifically during solvent evaporation. This leads to a rich HS phase or "hard domain" (HD) and a rich SS phase or "soft domain" (SD). If the SS fraction predominates, the material topology is more likely a soft matrix with hard inclusion particles dispersed in it.

Au electrodes were sputtered onto a disk of radius 2 cm on and below the PU films with a thickness around 10–20 nm. Samples were then placed between the two electrodes and a voltage was applied. The lower electrode was fixed and the top electrode was free to move. The movement of the top electrode was recorded using a double-beam laser based interferometer. Figure 1 shows the strain obtained versus time as a step electric field $E_0 = 2 \text{ MVm}^{-1}$ was applied.

These polymers exhibit several relaxations times (Figure 2), which were characterized either with mechanical spectroscopy (using the homemade dynamic mechanical analyzer described in [5]) or through dielectric spectroscopy (Modulab Materials Test System; see [30]). Their relaxation times are compared with the characteristic times associated with electrostriction kinetics. The α -relaxation times result from polymer chain movements and impact the mechanical behavior of the PUs as well as their dielectric properties because the chains contain dipoles. The α -relaxation times were then determined via dielectric and mechanical measurements [30]; they are at least five orders of magnitude lower than the times associated with electrostriction at room temperature. For reference, we have also

142 provided the β relaxation times in Table 1, although they are slightly weaker than those for α . The small PU
 143 conductivity, which might originate in ionic diffusion and therefore thermally activated processes, introduces an
 144 additional characteristic time on the order of minutes for the three PUs [5]. These two characteristic times, α -
 145 relaxation (accounting for mechanical and dielectric time effects) and the characteristic time of the conductivity,
 146 highlight the importance of conductivity in the time dependence of electrostriction.
 147
 148

Figure 1. Electro-deformation of polyurethane. The electric field is switched on at time $t=0$.

151 **Table 1.** PU properties, with hard domain (HD) average diameter $\langle D_{HD} \rangle \sim 10$ nm [22]. Characteristic times τ_{es} , τ_α and
 152 τ_β are for full electrostriction development, and the α - and β -mechanical relaxations, respectively; T_{gSD} is the glass
 153 transition temperature of the soft domains (SDs) of the PU; R.T. refers to room temperature.
 154

PU	Commercial references	wt% HS [5]	HD-HD distance (nm) [18]	T_{gSD} (K) [22]	Y (MPa) R.T, 0.2 Hz [32]	ϵ_r (-) R.T, 0.2 Hz [32]	τ_{es} (s) R.T. [5]	τ_α (s) R.T. [30]	τ_β (s) R.T. [30]	S/E^2 (10^{-14} m ² /V ²) [5]
75	Estane X-4977	26	17.5	205	12	6.6	9	10^{-15}	10^{-15}	1.6
88	Estane 58888 NAT021	45	14.3	234	29	7.2	15	10^{-12}	10^{-18}	1.2
60	Estane ETE60DT3 NAT022	65	11.8	259	201	7.0	25	-	10^{-17}	0.3

155

Figure 2. Experimental relaxation times in PUs. Data from [5,30].

156 **2.2 Simulation**

157 In this paper, the aim is to propose a physical analysis of the mechanisms of mechanical deformation due to the
 158 application of electrical forces on the material, and in particular the effect of conductivity (section 3). In this spirit, a
 159 material containing a random distribution of identical particles was considered, and the effect of their density and the
 160 gradient of their composition at the matrix-particle interface was tested. Several authors have calculated the electrical
 161 [34] and mechanical [35] macroscopic properties of similar composites. Such results from a 2D computation are of

course different from those obtained from a 3D computation, but the trends can be discussed: the influence of the parameters can be compared, and of course, the results are obtained faster than for a 3D computation.

The 2D force calculations were carried out using the “Electric Currents” module of the FEM software COMSOL 5.3. An electric potential was applied to the top electrode, while bottom electrode was grounded electrode, generating an electric field across the materials along the y-axis. The local electric field $\vec{E}$, electric polarization field $\vec{P}$, current density $\vec{J}$, and electric displacement field $\vec{D}$, were calculated directly ($\vec{E} = -\vec{\nabla}V$, $\vec{J} = \sigma\vec{E}$, $\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{J} = 0$ and $\vec{D} = \epsilon\vec{E} = \epsilon_0\vec{E} + \vec{P}$). From these electrical quantities, we derived both the body forces $\vec{f}_v$ in the volume and Maxwell stress $\vec{f}_s$ (see next section), which were then inputted to the “Solid Mechanics” module in COMSOL to obtain the mechanical stress tensor $\vec{T}$ ($\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{T} + \vec{f}_v = \vec{0}$ in the volume and $\vec{T} \cdot \vec{n} = \vec{f}_s$ at the electrodes) and the deformation. We also chose the displacement of the top electrode to be along the electric field direction (y-axis), keeping the bottom electrode fixed. The strain was estimated from the displacement of the top electrode. The geometry has been meshed by the COMSOL Solid Mechanics and is composed for a calculation that included 200 particles of 3771110 quadratic triangular elements for a number of degrees of freedom of 22628481.

3. Electric forces

3.1 Maxwell stress

Maxwell forces cause the attraction of two electrodes with opposite electrical charges. When a dielectric material is placed between the two charged plates, the force experienced depends on the dielectric constant of the medium. The electrode displacement is limited by the countering elastic force of the polymer. The potential ΔV applied to the electrodes induces a field E_0 given by $E_0 = \Delta V/h$ (with h the distance between the electrodes). From theory, the attractive stress acting on each electrode is $f_s = \epsilon E_0^2/2$, and the resulting strain is $S_m = -(\epsilon/Y)E_0^2 = -M_m E_0^2$. A typical value of M_m , for a polymer with $\epsilon \sim 10\epsilon_0$ and $Y \sim 1$ MPa would be $M_m \sim 10^{-17} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$, which is a thousand times weaker when compared than experimental values (Table 1), $M \sim 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$.

While the Maxwell effect originates as a stress f_s acting on the surface electrodes, we aim to evaluate the contribution of electric body forces (electric forces within the volume).

3.2 Body forces

For a polarizable material, the overall force is

$$\vec{F} = \int_V \vec{f}_v dV + \oint_S \vec{f}_s dS \quad (4)$$

where the electric force per unit volume of a material, with a polarization density $\vec{P}$ can be expressed as

$$\vec{f}_v = (\vec{P} \cdot \vec{\nabla})\vec{E} \quad (5)$$

An alternative is to calculate the internal forces in dielectric and magnetic materials. For example, we could use the equivalent charge density to obtain $\vec{f}_v = -(\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{P})\vec{E}$. First, the total force $\vec{F}$ is zero if the external field $\vec{E}$ is homogenous. Second, the difference between the two force expressions can be written as a gradient of a scalar

quantity, which does not change the deformation in an incompressible medium like a polymer well above its glass–rubber transition temperature; more details on this topic are in [36–38].

For the PUs studied here, we use the model of a composite material with a host matrix (SD) and filling particles (HD) having different sets of properties $(\varepsilon_1, \sigma_1, Y_1)$ and $(\varepsilon_2, \sigma_2, Y_2)$, respectively; we generally take $\varepsilon_2 \neq \varepsilon_1$, $\sigma_2 \neq \sigma_1$, and $Y_2 \neq Y_1$. Increasing the HS weight percentage slightly increases the SD glass transition temperature T_{gSD} when the phase separation between the SD and HD is not complete, implying that T_{gSD} is much lower than the HD glass transition temperature T_{gHD} . The result is that $T_{gSD} < 300 \text{ K} < T_{gHD}$, and $Y_2 \gg Y_1$ at room temperature. As discussed above, the conductivity of these polymers arises most probably from charge diffusion. This directly implies that, as $Y_2 \gg Y_1$, diffusion is much slower in the HD and the conductivities obey $\sigma_2 \ll \sigma_1$. Increasing the HS weight percentage decreases the conductivity of the composite, which is consistent with the data in Table 1. Finally, the HD has a higher dielectric constant than the SD because of their chemical structures, and therefore $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1$.

For the composite, we first calculate the forces exerted on the HD considered as a system of spherical particles, then the forces applied to the SD treated as the host matrix.

3.2.1 Body forces inside the HD. Equation (5) expresses the dielectric force density experienced by a polarized volume in an inhomogeneous electric field. A spherical particle in the HD with given electrical properties $(\varepsilon_2, \sigma_2)$ embedded in the SD medium, with electrical properties $(\varepsilon_1, \sigma_1)$ is polarized as a function of (i) the applied field $\mathbf{E}$, (ii) the particle radius R , and (iii) the set of $\varepsilon_2, \sigma_2, \varepsilon_1$, and σ_1 . The particle undergoes a DEP force from Eq. (5) as a function of time [39, 40]:

$$F_{DEP}(t) = 2\pi R^3 \varepsilon_1 [K_\sigma (1 - e^{-t/\tau}) + K_\varepsilon e^{-t/\tau}] \nabla E^2 \quad (6)$$

with

$$K_\sigma = \frac{\sigma_2 - \sigma_1}{\sigma_2 + 2\sigma_1} \quad (7)$$

$$K_\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon_2 + 2\varepsilon_1} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\tau = \frac{\varepsilon_2 + 2\varepsilon_1}{\sigma_2 + 2\sigma_1} \quad (9)$$

The conductivities are contrasted by K_σ and the permittivities by K_ε , and range values from -0.5 (for $\sigma_1 \gg \sigma_2$ and $\varepsilon_1 \gg \varepsilon_2$, respectively) to 1 (for $\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2$ and $\varepsilon_1 \ll \varepsilon_2$, respectively). As expected, when K_σ and K_ε are zero ($\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ and $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$), the polarization force tends towards zero as for homogeneous materials.

Because all materials have finite conductivities, it is important to compare the duration of the experiment with the characteristic time obtained from Eq. (6) [37]. Each of the two exponentially decreasing terms of Eq. (6) is

dominated by the term with either K_σ or K_ϵ . Hence, the force is dominated by the K_ϵ term for times much shorter than τ , and we have

$$F_{DEP}(t \ll \tau) = 2\pi R^3 \epsilon_1 K_\epsilon \nabla E^2 \quad (10)$$

226

In contrast, for times much longer than τ , the force is dominated by the K_σ term:

$$F_{DEP}(t \gg \tau) = 2\pi R^3 \epsilon_1 K_\sigma \nabla E^2. \quad (11)$$

228

The signs and strengths of the forces change depending on the experimental time, compared with τ . Steady states are dominated by the conductivities, which are limited because K_σ limits their difference.

3.2.2 *Body forces inside soft domains.* As pointed out by Diguët et al. [29], a particle with $\epsilon_2 > \epsilon_1$ ($K_\epsilon > 0$) generates a locally inhomogeneous electric field around itself. Similar to Eq. (5), this inhomogeneous electric field induces a body force inside a polarizable medium. The estimate was close to data obtained by extrapolating similar polymer blends, meaning $\epsilon_2 > \epsilon_1$. Some elastomeric polymers have relative permittivities of around 10 and are usually considered insulators but, in reality, have low conductivities. Thus, by including the difference in conductivities and permittivities via K_σ and K_ϵ , we can take time dependence into account for forces such as DEP. For example, following the previous case, where $\epsilon_2 > \epsilon_1$, $\sigma_2 < \sigma_1$, $K_\epsilon > 0$, and $K_\sigma < 0$, a representative elementary volume of the composite material is a spherical particle as in Fig. 3a, and the matrix experiences a body force depending on its position and time (Fig. 3b and c).

239

Figure 3. a) Heterogeneous polymer model. Maps of the body force (red) and electric field (blue) around a particle with properties (ϵ_2, σ_2) in a surrounding medium with properties (ϵ_1, σ_1) with $\epsilon_2 > \epsilon_1$ and $\sigma_2 < \sigma_1$ at b) $t = \tau/5$ and c) $t = 2\tau$.

240

Figure 3 presents map of the electric field and the resulting body force around a spherical particle calculated using Eq. (5) assuming 2D axisymmetry. The forces at a short time, $\tau/5$ in Fig. 3b, are towards the particle near its top surface and directed outwards at the equator. Moreover, the body forces are stronger near the poles than near the equator. At a longer time, $t=2\tau$ in fig. 3c, the opposite occurs: the forces are outwards near the top surface of the particle and directed inwards at the equator, and they are stronger near the equator than near the poles.

246

In the single-particle picture, the sign of the force experienced by the dipoles in both HD (particle-system) and SD (matrix) depends clearly on the properties of both the HD and SD. The analytical model of a DEP force acting on a sphere helps in understanding forces inside a composite composed of a spherical HD inside an SD: body forces at times $t < \tau$ are dominated by the permittivities, and those at $t > \tau$ are dominated by the conductivities. In the next section, we compute the effects of such time-dependent forces in steady state ($t \gg \tau$) with many particles inside the matrix.

4. Application to electroactive polymers and discussion

We next propose a 2D model in which all the above effects are taken into account, namely, (i) the Maxwell forces and (ii) the body forces calculated in the HD and SD. The calculation is performed assuming “linear” materials, meaning that the elastic constants, dielectric constants, and conductivities are independent of the electric field and mechanical strain. Because it is difficult to determine the permittivities of the parent polymers, a preliminary calculation of the electronic distribution of the PU was carried out using tight-binding-based accelerated quantum chemical molecular dynamics [41] at 300 K. This gives average dipole values of 1.18 Debye and 2.40 Debye for PTMO and MDI-BDO, respectively. There is also literature evidence of a larger dipole moment for MDI-BDO than for PTMO [42-44]. These calculations enable the HD and SD permittivities to be evaluated separately. More generally we choose simple parameters to roughly match the effective typical PU values with $\epsilon = 5 \epsilon_0$ to $10 \epsilon_0$ and $Y = 1$ MPa to 10 MPa. Parameters for each domain are provided in Table 2. The polymer matrix Poisson ratio is set as 0.49 (very close to typical value of 0.5) to avoid volumetric locking during numerical calculation of the mechanical response.

Table 2. Parameter values used for the calculation are typical of the PUs used.

	Matrix (1)	Particle (2)	Contrast
ϵ (ϵ_0 ; $\epsilon_0 = 8.85 \times 10^{-12}$ F/m)	5	20	$K_\epsilon = 0.5$
σ (S/m)	7×10^{-8}	1×10^{-8}	$K_\sigma = -0.4$
Y (Pa)	1×10^6	1×10^9	
Poisson ratio ν	0.49	0.3	

Lastly, because the contribution of body forces results from electric field gradients, it is important to test the effect of the chemical gradient, near the HD–SD interface. In block copolymers like the PUs used here, the phase separation does not lead to an abrupt change in chemical compositions and therefore of properties, but rather a smooth change in them [45]. This is hence a little different from standard particle–matrix composites and may change the profiles of both the permittivity and conductivity gradients. To account for this peculiar aspect and evaluate its contributions to the body forces, we modeled each particle as a core and boundary with different properties, with intermediate layers (to mimic the interphase) having properties that interpolate smoothly between the core and boundary. The chosen variation function is [46]

$$\rho_i(\vec{r}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \tanh \left(\frac{(r - r_i) - r_p}{\alpha} \right) \right] \quad (12)$$

where $\vec{r}$ is the position in the composite (with r the norm of $\vec{r}$), r_i is the center of the i -th HD-layer, $r_p=1.5 \mu\text{m}$ is the HD radius, and α is a coefficient setting the particle/matrix interphase size. A small value of α yields a smoother profile, whereas a large value yields a sharper profile. Hence, the Young modulus Y , conductivity σ , and permittivity ε are obtained as spatial functions of the forms

$$Y_{\text{composite}} = Y_{\text{matrix}} + (Y_{\text{particle}} - Y_{\text{matrix}}) \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_i(\vec{r})$$

$$\sigma_{\text{composite}} = \sigma_{\text{matrix}} + (\sigma_{\text{matrix}} - \sigma_{\text{particle}}) \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_i(\vec{r}) \quad (13)$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{composite}} = \varepsilon_{\text{matrix}} + (\varepsilon_{\text{particle}} - \varepsilon_{\text{matrix}}) \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_i(\vec{r})$$

where N is the number of HD- layers. The properties are plotted in Figure 4.

Figure 4. a). PU component and its microstructures. b) Properties along a cut line in the composite material. The two ends of the cut line lie in the matrix, and the line cuts diametrically through the particle.

288 A 2D geometry was configured consisting of a rectangle (matrix) with a random distribution of N circular particle-
 289 like inclusions, with $N=200$ (Figure 5a). An electric potential was applied so that the field was directed from top to
 290 bottom with an average strength $|E_0| = 1$ MV/m (y-component) in the steady state (Figure 5a). The electric field y-
 291 component exhibits some local variation. In particular, the steady state field inside the particles is governed by the
 292 conductivity contrast; for example, the field inside a spherical particle is set as $|E_{int}| = 3|E_0|\sigma_1/(\sigma_2+2\sigma_1) \sim 1.5|E_0| \sim$
 293 1.5 MV/m if $\sigma_1 \gg \sigma_2$. The field is then weaker than E_0 around the particles
 294 The maximum particles fraction of 35% corresponds to about half of the percolation threshold, which is around 60%
 295 for 2D geometry (compared with 20% for 3D).
 296

Figure 5. a) Composite-like elastomer: with height $H=10^{-4}$ m (100 μ m) and length $L=2 \times 10^{-4}$ m randomly filled with 200 particles ($r_p=1.5$ μ m). The color scale represents the field strength along the direction perpendicular to the electrodes. The applied voltage (top and bottom) was such that the average electric field strength $|E_0| = 10^6$ V/m. b) Effect of the electric field on strain with both body forces and surface forces (red curve) or only surface forces (blue curve).

297

298 4.1 Electrostriction coefficients

299 Before analyzing the physical results in more details, it is important to check the influence of the parameters used in
 300 this FEM calculation, such as (i) the effect of the random draw of the position of the particles and (ii) their number
 301 (at constant volume fraction): in fact, if the results of the calculations depend on the number of particles, we should
 302 consider another approach, such as periodic boundary conditions that suppress the edge effect, in order to guarantee
 303 reliable results whatever the random draw of the particles dispersed in the matrix [47].

304 A random dispersion of particles in the matrix leads to many possible distributions which can affect the results,
 305 however, for $N=100$ particles with 16 different trials, an average strain $\langle S \rangle = -8.63 \times 10^{-6}$ was obtained with a small a
 306 standard deviation of 3×10^{-8} . A second test was performed with the fraction $\phi=7\%$ was performed varying the particle
 307 number N (and their radius) from 50 to 450. Results of this calculation are shown in Figure 6. Beside, for $N=75$, the
 308 calculation was done 15 times with 15 random distributions of particles. Results seems concentrate in the same range
 309 with an average value as $(S_i - \langle S(0.07) \rangle) / \langle S(0.07) \rangle \sim 5 \times 10^{-3}$, it is then verified that the result of the simulation is mainly

310 controlled by the filling fraction and not by the choice of distribution. This shows a consistency of the method to
 311 achieve repeatable results.

Figure 6. Test of the effect of the number of particles (at constant volume fraction of $\phi=7\%$) on the calculated value of S , and test of different random draw of the position of the particles (for $N=75$).

312

313 We calculated the deformation at different applied fields (i) induced by the surface stress only, and (ii) induced by
 314 all the forces, as seen in in Figure 5b. For $N=200$ particles; the deformation S_m obtained from the Maxwell stress is
 315 indicated by the blue dots and curve, while the deformation S obtained from the Maxwell stress and the body force
 316 together is indicated by the red dots and curve. As expected, both curves exhibit quadratic behavior with E_0 .
 317 Moreover, the deformations are such that $S = -ME_0^2$ and $S_m = -M_m E_0^2$ with $M_m \sim 7.84 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ and M
 318 $\sim 8.21 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$, showing that the body forces slightly reinforce the strain; the composite material is more
 319 compressed. This calculation with 200 particles represents a 2D filling factor of nearly 0.07. In this Figure 7, the
 320 effect of particle number, on the pure electrostriction coefficient is presented. At $N=0$, there is only the matrix, and
 321 the deformation reaches $S = -ME_0^2$ with $M = M_m \sim 9 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ and is less than expected from theory with ε/Y
 322 $= 5\varepsilon_0/10^6 \sim 45 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$. This might be an effect of the 2D geometry and/or of the clamping of the electrodes
 323 [12–13, 48]. The calculated values at $N=0$ are a reference for scaling the effect of particle number. When adding
 324 particles, we observe a divergence between M_m (Maxwell stress only) and M (Maxwell stress plus body forces),
 325 meaning that body forces increase in strength as particle number increases. As discussed above, the electrostriction
 326 coefficient M has two contributions: the Maxwell coefficient M_m and the pure coefficient M_E related to body forces:

$$S = ME_0^2 = (M_m + M_E)E_0^2 \quad (14)$$

327

Figure 7. Comparison between the effects of the electrostriction coefficients due to surface and body forces together (M), due to surface force alone (M_m), and due to body force alone (M_E)

We see in Figure 7 that for $N=1000$ particles, $M \sim 5.4 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$, $M_m \sim 4.2 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$, and $M_E \sim 1.2 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$. This means that the body forces are responsible for 22% of the total calculated deformation. The Maxwell stress is the dominant component. Comparing the value $M \sim 9.0 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ obtained with $N=0$ to $M \sim 5.4 \times 10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ obtained with $N=1000$ particles, the deformation is reduced by 50% and the percentage of M_E in M is increased by 22%.

4.2 Effective properties

Both coefficients M_m and M decrease with increasing particle number, probably because the composite material stiffens as the HD volume fraction increases. Filling the matrix with particles affects the properties of the material such as its dielectric constant, conductivity, and Young modulus. Hence, we extracted these effective values as the particles number increased:

$$\varepsilon_{eff} = \langle D \rangle / E_0 \quad (15)$$

$$\sigma_{eff} = \langle J \rangle / E_0, \quad (16)$$

where $\langle q \rangle$ denotes the average of quantity q . The effective mechanical modulus of the structure was obtained through numerical experiments by measuring the strain due to a relatively small pressure ($Y_{matrix}/100$) on the top electrode. Figure 8 shows the effective dielectric constant, conductivity, and Young modulus.

Figure 8. Effective composite properties versus particle number extracted from the 2D simulation. The values for $N=0$, are those of the matrix (see Table 2).

Clearly, the dielectric constant and Young modulus both increase with increasing N because the particles have higher ϵ and Y values than the matrix. In contrast, the effective conductivity decreases because particles have lower conductivities than the matrix. The increase in the Young modulus with particle fraction (HD) is larger than that for the dielectric constant which is experimentally measured in the PU [23]. Moreover, its behavior appears to be non-linear, whereas the electrical properties look almost linear, at least well below the percolation threshold of the particles.

The spatial distribution of spherical particles in a matrix is known for its electrical properties, which are usually modeled by the Maxwell–Garnett equation [49]:

$$\frac{\sigma_{eff} - \sigma_1}{\sigma_{eff} - (d-1)\sigma_1} = \varphi \frac{\sigma_2 - \sigma_1}{\sigma_2 + (d-1)\sigma_1} \quad (17)$$

With d is the dimension of the system, which is the Maxwell-Garnett in 3D ($d=3$) [50]. The dielectric constant and conductivity follow the Maxwell–Garnett equation. This is usually valid in the dilute regime. A linear behavior of permittivity and conductivity with the volume fraction of particles is then effectively obtained.

The Young modulus, however, follows the non-linear model [51],

$$\frac{Y_{eff}}{Y_{matrix}} = \frac{1}{1 - \varphi^2} \quad (18)$$

Being a non-linear equation with the filling factor, this explains the larger increase in the Young modulus as the particle number increases comparatively to the electric equations which are linear.

The strains were estimated for the composites. As previously mentioned, $M_m = \epsilon_{eff}/Y_{eff}$ decreases as N increases because of the higher increase in the Young modulus with particle fraction than for the dielectric constant. A higher HD content induces a lower strain, which is confirmed by experiment [23]. Moreover, the pure coefficient M_E related

363 to the body forces increases as N increases (Figure 7). To analyze the effect of electrostrictive body forces on the
 364 resulting strain, we estimated the equivalent stress by multiplying the strain coefficient M_E by the effective Young's
 365 modulus and the square of the applied field: $M_E Y_{eff} E_0^2$. We used the effective Young modulus because we are looking
 366 at the displacement of the top surface of the composite material. The result, plotted in Figure 9, shows the equivalent
 367 electrostrictive stress exhibiting clearly linear behavior with particle number. Thus, each particle produces an
 368 effective stress of $2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ N/m}^2$.
 369

Figure 9. Equivalent electrostrictive stress as a function of the particle number in the matrix.

370

Figure 10. Experimental properties versus HS content of the 3 PUs (see Table 1).

371 This confirms that increasing the HD fraction reduces M for the reasons presented above. Figure 10 shows the
 372 experimental curves of M , Y , ε , and σ as functions of HS content, where the HS content (wt%) sets the HD fraction
 373 inside the material. The experimental properties (Figure 10) behave according to the calculation based on an HD
 374 particle in a matrix (Figs. 7–8). In [52–53], two PUs with different HS contents show different experimental
 375 deformations for the same applied field of 550V/mm: a measured deformation of 2.11×10^{-3} for HS fraction of 42.4
 376 wt%, and a deformation of 1.39×10^{-3} for an HS fraction of 55.2 % (wt). The corresponding mechanical moduli, and
 377 conductivities respectively increased and decreased with increasing HS, as in Fig.10. The effect for an SS molecule
 378 with different HS contents (wt%=20, 25, 30, and 35) has been tested previously [23]; the selected SS were:
 379 poly(tetramethylene glycol) (PTMG), poly(neopentyl glycol adipate) (PNAD), and poly(dimethyl siloxane) (PDMS).
 380 The effect was still as previously found: deformations decreased with increasing HS content independently of the
 381 type of SS molecule.

382 It is interesting to consider other heterogeneous materials, like composites obtained in dispersing conductive particles
 383 in a polymeric matrix, and to analyze the role of body forces. For example, a PU filled with particles such as carbon
 384 black [54] or carbon nanotube [55] has higher permittivity, conductivity, and mechanical modulus, than a pure PU.
 385 As discussed above, the higher permittivity of the particle limits DEP forces. The increase in Young modulus due to
 386 the stiff particles causes the deformation first to increase with increasing conductive particle fraction and then
 387 decrease when approaching the particle percolation threshold. This is due to the drastic increases in the effective
 388 mechanical modulus and electrical conductivity. Thus, the gain expected from the high electrical property values of
 389 the fillers disappears.

390 4.3 Particle/matrix interface profile effect

391 Keeping the properties of the matrix and particles constant (Table 2), we changed the value of α , which affects the
 392 profile of the HD–SD interface. Figure 11 shows various profiles of the relative permittivity gradients, obtained with
 393 Eqs. (12–13).

Figure 11. Effect of α on the permittivity along the same cut line as in Fig. 4.

394 The higher α is, the stronger the dielectric, stiffness, and conductivity gradients are, but in a more confined space.
 395 Because the body forces come from gradients of electrical properties (relative permittivity and conductivity) and the

mechanical response depends on the effective Young modulus, we calculated the deformation to estimate the resulting electrostriction coefficient for different values of α .

398

Figure 12 shows the effect of the interface thickness on the electrostriction coefficients M , M_m , and M_E along with the effective properties of a composite material with $N=200$ particles.

400

Figure 12. Electrostriction coefficients and effective composite properties as functions of α with $N=200$ particles.

The electrostriction coefficient M increases as α increases; the sharper the interface is, the higher M is. The Maxwell contribution M_m increases as α increases. Because M_m is proportional to the ratio of the effective permittivity to the effective Young modulus, these two parameters change as α changes. In fact, the effective permittivity increases while the Young modulus decreases, which globally explains the increase in the Maxwell coefficient (see Table 3).

Table 3. Effect of α on electrostriction coefficients.

405

α	$\epsilon (\epsilon_0)$	Y (MPa)	M_m ($10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$)	M_E ($10^{-19} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$)	M ($10^{-18} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$)
6	5.43	1.57	7.37	3.44	7.72
30	5.45	1.41	8.17	3.96	8.57
Relative change	0.3%	-9.9%	10.8%	15.1%	11.2%

406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443

In Table 3, the relative change in M_m with α is unsurprisingly about equal to the sum of the relative changes in the dielectrics constant and Young modulus. The relative change in M_E with α is the largest, but the values are still lower than those of M . For $\alpha=30$, M_E contributes 4.6% to M , while for $\alpha=6$, it is almost the same at 4.5%. The contribution of the electrostriction to the strain does not seem to depend on the property gradients, which is consistent with the fact that increasing α decreases the interphase thickness. The increase in ε and σ gradients is the origin of the body forces.

Conclusion

The experimental data for some polyurethanes show a typical electrostriction coefficient on the order of $10^{-14} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$ and Maxwell strain on the order of $10^{-17} \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2$. In this study, we calculated PU deformation with a polarization contribution from heterogeneities in the PU after a partial phase separation. The DEP forces, which are time-dependent body forces, contribute additionally to the deformation; the Maxwell contribution is a surface force acting on the electrodes. The deformation is complete a few tens of seconds after the voltage is applied because the electrical conductivity agrees with experimental data. The pure electrostriction coefficient of these body forces is responsible for up to 22% of the total deformation in the range of our calculation (up to a maximal 2D filling of 35%). Increasing the particle volume fraction above 35% (2D) is ineffective because a strong stiffening occurs in the composite material. The profile modifications of the electrical permittivity, electrical conductivity, and mechanical stiffness between stiff particles (HD) and the matrix (SD) also induce a change in the electrostriction coefficient, but this change remains on the same order of magnitude. Furthermore, the DEP magnitude is limited at short times by the permittivity contrast factor K_ε and at long times by the conductivity contrast factor K_σ . It is not possible to enhance the electrostriction coefficient by a factor higher than a few units just by changing the HD permittivity and/or conductivity in two-phase polymers such as a PU or by adding high permittivity/conductivity particles to that polymer.

Our numerical simulations were first performed in as simple a framework as possible, i.e. with a limited number of particles, no periodic boundary conditions, and considering only linear constitutive behaviors, and we obtained results much smaller than the experimental data, at equivalent particle volume fraction, but with a large variation in the number of particles. Consequently, we can assume that the contribution of the polarization body force is too low to explain the discrepancy between the deformation measurements and the Maxwell strain among the possible scenarios. More investigations are needed to understand the large electrostriction observed in various copolymer-like PUs. It is noteworthy that recent works are focused on time dependent phenomena at the origin of polymer electroactivity [56-57]. A very interesting approach by Gosh et al., consists in showing that the dielectric constant drastically increases at decreasing frequency, i.e. increases as a function of time when an electric field step is applied to the material [56]. On the other hand, the electrical conductivity observed in our materials indicates that electrical charges are free to diffuse inside elastomers, and therefore the space charges are to be taken into account as possible contributions to the deformation as shown by some recent works [58]. Following such consideration, we are currently investigating the electrostatic interactions of more or less mobile electrical charges responsible for the above conductivity, and will present it in Part 2 of this work.

Acknowledgments

This work was partly supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Core-to-Core Program, A. Advanced Research Networks, “International research core on smart layered materials and structures for energy saving”. We thank Mark Kurban, from Edanz Group (www.edanzediting.com/ac) for editing a draft of this manuscript.

References

- [1] R.E. Pelrine, R.D. Kornbluh, Electrostriction of polymer dielectrics with compliant electrodes as a means of actuation, *Sensors and Actuators A: Physical* 64 (1998) 1 77–85.
- [2] D. Jaaoh, C. Putson, N. Muensit, Contribution of Electrostriction in polyurethane/polyaniline blends, *Advanced Materials Research*, 1025-1026 (2014) 697-702.
- [3] J.Su, Q.M. Zhang, C.H. Kim, R. Capps, Effects of transitional phenomena on the electric field induced strain–electrostrictive response of a segmented polyurethane elastomer, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.* 65 (1997) 1363–1370.
- [4] F.M. Guillot, E. Balizer, Electrostrictive effect in polyurethanes, *Applied Polymer* 89 (2003) 399–404.
- [5] M.H. Jomaa, L. Seveyrat, V. Perrin, L. Lebrun, K. Masenelli-Varlot, G. Diguët, J.Y. Cavaille, Difference between electrostriction kinetics, and mechanical response of segmented polyurethane-based EAP, *Smart Mater. Struct.* 26 (2017) 035049.
- [6] I. Diaconu, D.O. Dorohoi, F. Topoliceanu, Electrostriction of a polyurethane elastomer-based polyester, *IEEE Sensors Journal* 6 (2006) 876-880.
- [7] F. Li, L. Jin, S. Zhang, Electrostrictive effect in ferroelectrics: An alternative approach to improve piezoelectricity. *Appl. Phys. Rev.* 1 (2014) 011103.
- [8] I. Katsouras, K. Asadi, M. Li, T.B. van Driel, K.S. Kjær, D. Zhao, T. Lenz, Y. Gu, P.W.M. Blom, D. Damjanovic, M.M. Nielsen, D.M. de Leeuw, The negative piezoelectric effect of the ferroelectric polymer poly(vinylidene fluoride), *Nature Materials*, 15 (2016) 78-84.
- [9] T. Fukukawa, N. Seo, Electrostriction as the origin of piezoelectricity in ferroelectric polymers, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* 29 (1990) 675.
- [10] R. A. Anderson, Mechanical stress in a dielectric solid from a uniform electric field, *Phys. Rev. B* 33 (1986) 1302.
- [11] Y.M. Shkel, D.J. Klingenberg, Electrostriction of polarizable materials: Comparison of models with experimental data, *Journal of Applied Physics* 80 (1996) 4566.
- [12] D. Guyomar, K. Yuse, P.J. Cottinet, M. Kanda, L. Lebrun, Focus on the electrical field-induced strain of electroactive polymers and the observed saturation, *J. of Applied Physics* 108 (2010) 114910.
- [13] M. Zhenyi, J.I. Scheinbeim, J.W. Lee, B.A. Newman, High field electrostrictive response of polymers, *J. Polymer Science: Part B: Polymer Physics* 32 (1994) 2721–2731.
- [14] I. Diaconu, D.O. Dorohoi, C. Ciobanu, Electromechanical response of polyurethane films with different thickness, *Rom. Journ. Phys.* 53 (2008) 91–97.

480 [15] I. Diaconu, D.O. Dorohoi, Properties of polyurethane thin films, *J. of Optoelectronics and Advanced Materials*
481 7 (2005) 921 – 924.

482 [16] I. Diaconu, D.O. Dorohoi, An experimental investigation of electroactive polyurethane, *Journal of*
483 *Optoelectronics and Advanced Materials* 7 (2005) 2797 – 2801.

484 [17] B. Guiffard, L. Seveyrat, G. Sebald, D. Guyomar, Enhanced electric field-induced strain in non-percolative
485 carbon nanopowder/polyurethane composites, *J. Applied Physics D: Applied Physics* 39 (2006) 3053–3057.

486 [18] K. Wongtimnoi, J.Y. Cavaille, J.M. Chenal, B. Guiffard, A. Bogner, L. Seveyrat, Thickness-dependent
487 microstructural and electromechanical properties in polyurethane films obtained by polymer solution casting, *J.*
488 *of Applied Polymer Science* 135 (2018) 46981–46989.

489 [19] D. Guyomar, P.J. Cottinet, L. Lebrun, C. Putson, K. Yuse, M. Kanda, Y. Nishi, The compressive electrical field
490 electrostrictive coefficient M_{33} of electroactive polymer composites and its saturation versus electrical field,
491 polymer thickness, frequency, and fillers, *Polym. Adv. Tech.* 23 (2012) 946–950.

492 [20] L. Lebrun, D. Guyomar, B. Guiffard, P.J. Cottinet, C. Putson, The characterization of the harvesting capabilities
493 of an electrostrictive polymer composite, *Sensors and Actuators A* 153 (2009) 251–257.

494 [21] M. Roussel, C. Malhaire, A.L. Deman, J.F. Chateaux, L. Petit, L. Seveyrat, J. Galineau, B. Guiffard, C.
495 Segueineau, J.M. Desmarres, J. Martegoutte, Electromechanical study of polyurethane films with carbon black
496 nanoparticles for MEMS actuators, *J. Micromech. Microeng.* 24 (2014) 055011.

497 [22] M.H. Jomaa, K. Masenelli-Varlot, G. Diguët, L. Seveyrat, L. Lebrun, K. Wongtimnoi, C. Vechambre, J.M.
498 Chenal, J.Y. Cavaille, Modeling of segmented pure polyurethane electrostriction behaviors based on their
499 nanostructural properties *Polymer* 62 (2015) 139–147.

500 [23] N.J. Jo, D.H. Lim, G.M. Bark, H.H. Chun, I.W. Lee, H. Park, Polyurethane-based actuators with various polyols,
501 *J. Mater. Sci. Technol.*, 26 (2010) 763-768.

502 [24] C. Putson, D. Jaaoh, N. Muensit, Large electromechanical strain at low electric field of modified polyurethane
503 composites for flexible actuators, *Materials Letters* 172 (2016) 27–31.

504 [25] V. Lefèvre, O. Lopez-Pamies, The overall elastic dielectric properties of a suspension of spherical particles in
505 rubber: An exact explicit solution in the small-deformation limit, *Journal of Applied Physics* 116, 134106
506 (2014).

507 [26] S. A. Spinelli, V. Lefèvre, O. Lopez-Pamies, Dielectric elastomer composites: A general closed-form solution
508 in the small-deformation limit, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 83 (2015) 263–284.

509 [27] V. Lefèvre, O. Lopez-Pamies, Nonlinear electro-elastic deformations of dielectric elastomer composites: I -
510 Ideal elastic dielectrics, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 99 (2017) 409-437.

511 [28] V. Lefèvre, O. Lopez-Pamies, Nonlinear electro-elastic deformations of dielectric elastomer composites: II
512 Non-Gaussian elastic dielectrics. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 99 (2017) 438-470.

513 [29] G. Diguët, A. Bogner, J.M. Chenal, J.Y. Cavaille, Physical modeling of the electromechanical behavior of polar
514 heterogenous polymers, *J. Applied Physics* 112 (2012) 114905.

515 [30] M.H. Jomaa, L. Seveyrat, L. Lebrun, K. Masenelli-Varlot, J.Y. Cavaille, Dielectric properties of segmented
516 polyurethanes for electromechanical applications *Polymer* 63 (2015) 214–221.

517 [31] C. Zhang, K. Khoshmanesh, A. Mitchell, K. Kalantar-zadeh, Dielectrophoresis for manipulation of micro/nano
518 particles in microfluidic systems, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 396 (2010) 401–420.

519 [32] B. Simmons, G. McGraw, R. Davalos, G. Fiechtner, Y. Fintschenko, E. Cummings, The Development of
520 Polymeric Devices as Dielectrophoretic Separators and Concentrators, *MRS Bulletin* 31 (2006) 120–124.

521 [33] K. Wongtimnoi, Polyurethane electrostrictifs et nanocomposites : caracterisation et analyse des mecanismes de
522 couplages electromecaniques, (2011) Thesis.

523 [34] K.Y. Huang, L.S. Schadler, Understanding the strain dependent dielectric behavior of carbon black reinforced
524 natural rubber- An interfacial or bulk phenomenon. *Composites Science and Technology* 142 (2017) 91-97.

525 [35] Z. Wang, D.R. Schmitt, R. Wang, Modeling of viscoelastic properties of nonpermeable porous rocks saturated
526 with high viscous fluid at seismic frequencies at the core scale. *Journal of Geophysical Research : Solid Earth*
527 122 (2017) 6067-6086.

528 [36] H.S. Choi, S.H. Lee, I.H. Park, General formulation of equivalent magnetic charge method for force density
529 distribution on interface of different materials, *IEEE: Transactions on Magnetics* 41 (2005) 1420-1423.

530 [37] M. Zahn, Derivation of the Korteweg-Helmholtz electric and magnetic force densities including electrostriction
531 and magnetostriction from the quasistatic Poynting's theorem, 2006 IEEE Conference on Electrical Insulation
532 and Dielectric Phenomena, (2006) 186-189.

533 [38] M. Petit, A. Kedous-Lebouc, Y. Avenas, M. Tawk, E. Artega, Calculation and analysis of local magnetic forces
534 in ferrofluids, *Przeglad Elektrotechniczny (Electrical Review)*, 87 (2011) 115-119.

535 [39] L. Benguigui, I.J. Li, More about the dielectrophoric force, *J. Appl. Phys.* 53 (1982) 1141-1143.

536 [40] T.B. Jones, Dielectrophoretic force calculation, *J. Electrostatics*, 6 (1979) 69-82.

537 [41] F. Ahmed, R. Nagumo, R. Miura, A. Suzuki, H. Tsuboi, N. Hatakeyama, H. Takaba, A. Miyamoto, CO
538 Oxidation and NO Reduction on a MgO(100) Supported Pd Cluster: A Quantum Chemical Molecular Dynamics
539 Study, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 115 (2011) 24123–24132.

540 [42] R.V. Law, Y. Sasanuma, Conformational Characteristics of Poly (tetramethylene oxide), *Macromolecules* 31
541 (1998) 2335–2342.

542 [43] C. Zhang, J. Hu, S. Chen, F. Ji, Theoretical study of hydrogen bonding interactions on MDI-based
543 polyurethane, *J. Molecular Modeling* 16 (2010) 1391–1399.

544 [44] M. Ramirez, J. Vargas, M. Springborg, Energetic, Structural, and Vibrational Properties of 4,4'-
545 Methylenediphenyl Diisocyanate with Relevance for Adhesion, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 120 (2016) 4256–4266.

546 [45] C.G. Seefried, J.V. Koleske, F.E. Critchfield, Thermoplastic urethane elastomers. II. Effects of variations in
547 hard-segment concentration, *J. Applied Polymer Science* 19 (1975) 2503–2513.

548 [46] J. Merlin, J.F.L. Duval, Electrodynamics of soft multilayered particles dispersions: dielectric permittivity and
549 dynamic mobility, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 16 (2014) 15173-15188.

550 [47] A.A. Gusev, Representative volume element size for elastic composites: a numerical study, *J. of the Mech. and*
551 *Phys. of Solids* 45 (1997) 1449-1459.

552 [48] H. Wang, Q.M. Zhang, L.E. Cross, A.O. Sykes, Clamping effect on the piezoelectric properties of
553 poly(vinylidene fluoride-trifluoroethylene) copolymer, *Ferroelectrics* 150 (1993) 255–266.

- [49] S. Torquato, Random Heterogeneous Materials: Microstructure and Macroscopic Properties Appl. Mech. Rev. 55 (2002), B62-B63.
- [50] R. Ruppin, Evaluation of extended Maxwell-Garnett theories, Optics Communications 182 (2000) 273–279.
- [51] O. Lopez-Pamies, An exact result for the macroscopic response of particle-reinforced Neo-Hookean solids. Journal of Applied Mechanics 77 (2010) 021016.
- [52] K. Petcharoen, A. Sirivat, Electrostrictive properties of thermoplastic polyurethane elastomer: Effects of urethane type and soft–hard segment composition, Current Applied Physics 13 (2013) 1119-1127.
- [53] H.O. Lim, G.M. Bark, H. Park, H.H. Chun, N.J. Jo, High-Field Maxwell Stress Effect of Dielectric Actuator Based on Segmented Polyurethane, Adv. Mat. Research 26 (2007) 753-756.
- [54] K. Wongtimnoi, B. Guiffard, A. Bogner-Van de Moortèle, L. Seveyrat, C. Gauthier, J.Y. Cavaillé, Improvement of electrostrictive properties of a polyether-based polyurethane elastomer filled with conductive carbon black, Composites Science and Technology 71 (2011) 885–892.
- [55] K. Wongtimnoi, B. Guiffard, A. Bogner-Van de Moortèle, L. Seveyrat, J.Y. Cavaillé, Electrostrictive thermoplastic polyurethane-based nanocomposites filled with carboxyl-functionalized multi-walled carbon nanotubes (MWCNT-COOH): Properties and improvement of electromechanical activity, Composites Science and Technology 85 (2013) 23–28.
- [56] Chatchai Putson, Darika Jaaoh, and Nantakan Muensit, Interface Polarization Effect on Dielectric and Electrical properties of Polyurethane (PU)/Polyaniline (PANI) Polymer Composites, Advanced Materials Research Online: ISSN: 1662-8985, Vol. 770, pp 275-278, doi:10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.770.275
- [57] Kamalendu Ghosh, Jinlong Guo, Oscar Lopez-Pamies, Homogenization of time-dependent dielectric composites containing space charges, with applications to polymer nanoparticulate composites, International Journal of Non-Linear Mechanics 116 (2019) 155–166
- [58] V. Lefèvre, O. Lopez-Pamies, Homogenization of elastic dielectric composites with rapidly oscillating passive and active source terms. SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics 77 (2017) 1962-1988.