From coherent to incoherent mismatched interfaces: a generalized continuum formulation of surface stresses

Rémi Dingreville^{a,1}, Abdelmalek Hallil^b and Stéphane Berbenni^c

^a Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM 87185, USA

^b Laboratoire des Sciences de l'Ingénieur pour l'Environnement (LaSIE), Université de La Rochelle, Avenue Michel Crépeau, 17042 La Rochelle Cedex 1, France

^c Laboratoire d'Étude des Microstructures et de Mécanique des Matériaux, LEM3, UMR CNRS 7239, Université de Lorraine, Ile du Saulcy, 57045 Metz, France

Abstract

The equilibrium of coherent and incoherent mismatched interfaces is reformulated in the context of continuum mechanics based on the Gibbs dividing surface concept. Two surface stresses are introduced: a coherent surface stress and an incoherent surface stress, as well as a transverse excess strain. The coherent surface stress and the transverse excess strain represent the thermodynamic driving forces of stretching the interface while the incoherent surface stress represents the driving force of stretching one crystal while holding the other fixed and thereby altering the structure of the interface. These three quantities fully characterize the elastic behavior of coherent and incoherent interfaces as a function of the in-plane strain, the transverse stress and the mismatch strain. The isotropic case is developed in detail and particular attention is paid to the case of interfacial thermo-elasticity. This exercise provides an insight on the physical significance of the interfacial elastic constants introduced in the formulation and illustrates the obvious coupling between the interface structure and its associated thermodynamics quantities. Finally, an example based on

¹E-mail: rdingre@sandia.gov

atomistic simulations of Cu/Cu₂O interfaces is given to demonstrate the relevance of the generalized interfacial formulation and to emphasize the dependence of the interfacial thermodynamic quantities on the incoherency strain with an actual material system.

Keywords: Surface stresses, interface properties, mismatch, grain boundaries.

1. Introduction

The physical and chemical properties of materials are greatly influenced by the presence of surrounding surfaces and interfaces, whether interfaces are in the form of grain boundaries separating two grains or in the case of a bicrystal between two dissimilar materials (phase boundaries). Interfacial stress and interfacial energy are quantities that play key roles in the thermodynamics of solid surfaces by providing a continuum description of the underlying atomistic complexity of interfaces. Through various constitutive interfacial models, the thermodynamics of interfaces has proven to be an important factor governing the behavior of materials systems separated by an interface or for which the surface to volume ratio is significant (Povstenko, 1993; Cammarata, 1994; Nix and Gao, 1998; Miller and Shenoy, 2000; Sharma et al., 2003; Dingreville et al., 2005; Duan et al., 2005; Chen et al., 2007; Duan and Karihaloo, 2007).

Indeed, atoms near an interface experience a different local environment than atoms in the bulk of a material. In the direction normal to a surface or an interface, the periodicity of the atomic lattice loses its translational symmetry over several atomic layers as demonstrated for example by atomistic simulations (Dingreville and Qu, 2007, 2009; Mi et al., 2008). In the case of an interface between two dissimilar materials, at least one phase must be elastically stretched due to the lattice mismatch between both phases resulting in the formation of defects such as dislocations or

21 vacancies. Similarly, as a consequence, the equilibrium position and energy of atoms
22 located in the vicinity of an interface are, in general, somewhat different from their
23 bulk counterparts. Both the translational and in-plane atomic shuffling near the
24 interface contribute to a change in the total energy of the interfacial system. The
25 excess energy associated with atoms near an interface is called *interfacial excess*
26 *energy*.

27 For incoherent interfaces (e.g those between two adjacent phases), relaxation of
28 lattice mismatches may result in the formation of peculiar interfacial structures fur-
29 thering the “excess thermodynamic state” over the bulk configuration. The state
30 of interfacial coherency depends on the physical and chemical nature between both
31 phases but is also inherently dependent on external factors such as the tempera-
32 ture or stress field. Qualitatively, the contacting phases possess mismatching lattice
33 constants. For a coherent interface, the mismatch is completely accommodated by
34 straining both phases. In the case of a semi-coherent interface, localized misfit dis-
35 locations are assumed to be responsible for compensating uniform far-field elastic
36 fields, while an incoherent interface is the result of two rigid semi-infinite media in
37 rigid contact (Romanov et al., 1998; Romanov and Wagner, 2001).

38 There are commonly three approaches adopted to study the properties of inter-
39 faces: (i) the diffuse interface model, (ii) the interphase model and (iii) the dividing
40 interface/sharp interface model. In the case of the diffuse interface, interfacial proper-
41 ties are described by a smooth, but rapid transition of both fields (e.g., concentration
42 or elastic fields) describing the interfacial properties (Leo et al., 1998; Hu and Chen,
43 2002). The interphase approach treats the interface in a classical thermodynamic
44 fashion, namely, an arbitrarily defined finite volume is attributed to the interphase
45 region (hence treated as a three-dimensional material system) and is assigned ther-
46 modynamic properties in a classical manner (Lipinski et al., 2006; Duan et al., 2007;

47 Berbenni and Cherkaoui, 2010). Finally, the concepts of dividing surface, interfa-
 48 cial excess energy and interfacial stress are not new and were initially introduced
 49 by Gibbs (1928). In this paradigm, the surface contributions to the thermodynamic
 50 quantities are defined as the excesses over the values that would be obtained if the
 51 bulk phases retained their properties constant up to a two-dimensional imaginary
 52 dividing surface embedded in a three-dimensional continuum. In other words, the
 53 interface (not interphase) is a mathematical surface of zero thickness over which
 54 the thermodynamic properties change discontinuously from one bulk phase to the
 55 other. The excess amount is associated only with the dividing surface. This Gibb-
 56 sian conceptual approach has been widely studied in the fields of physics and chem-
 57 istry (Shuttleworth, 1950; Herring, 1951; Vermaak et al., 1968; Gurtin and Murdoch,
 58 1975; Cahn and Larché, 1982; Nozières and Wolf, 1988; Cammarata and Sieradzki,
 59 1994; Cammarata, 1994, 1997; Steigmann and Ogden, 1997; Gurtin et al., 1998; Nix
 60 and Gao, 1998; Cammarata et al., 2000; Sander, 2003; Müller and Saúl, 2004; Dingre-
 61 ville and Qu, 2008; Marichev, 2011; Mi and Kouris, 2012). Despite minor differences
 62 in the formulations, all interfacial models consist of the definition of an interfacial
 63 strain and the definition of an interfacial constitutive behavior linking the interfacial
 64 strain to the interface excess stress (also commonly called “*surface stress*”). Apart
 65 from a few exceptions, theories based on such two-dimensional framework cannot
 66 account for the flexural stiffness (Nozières and Wolf, 1988; Steigmann and Ogden,
 67 1997, 1999; Gao et al., 2014) nor can they describe the transverse behavior of real
 68 material interfaces or account for the interfacial mismatch. Fairly recently, for a
 69 coherent interface in an elastic solid, the so-called Shuttleworth or Shuttleworth-
 70 Herring relation (Shuttleworth, 1950; Herring, 1951) relating the interfacial excess
 71 energy Γ to the surface stress Σ^S has been generalized by Dingreville and Qu (2008)
 72 to account for the three-dimensional nature of the interface in a Gibbsian context

73 such that,

$$\Sigma^S = \left. \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \epsilon^S} \right|_{\sigma^\perp} + \sigma^\perp \cdot \underline{\mathbb{H}}, \quad (1)$$

74 where the surface stress Σ^S is not only a function of the interface in-plane strain
 75 ϵ^S (which is the case in the original Shuttleworth relation) but also a function of
 76 the transverse stress $\sigma^\perp$. The third-order interfacial tensor $\underline{\mathbb{H}}$ measures the inherent
 77 Poisson's effect in the transverse direction of the interface. However, in the case of a
 78 semi-coherent or incoherent interface, as discussed by Cahn and Larché (1982), it is
 79 necessary to define two strain and stress measures to describe the general deformation
 80 at the interface, rendering equation (1) inadequate since both phases can in principle
 81 be stretched independently along the interface.

82 The present work proposes the use of the Gibbs dividing surface thermodynamic
 83 framework to develop generalized expressions for interfacial excess stresses and inter-
 84 facial excess energy and to account for their variations with respect to the in-plane
 85 surface strain, the transverse stress and the interface mismatch strain. Our goal is
 86 to unambiguously define interface stresses and the interfacial excess strain in order
 87 to understand the connection between the interface thermodynamic quantities and
 88 the interface kinetic quantities to arrive at a generalized Shuttleworth relation for
 89 mismatched interfaces. In essence, our approach is close to that of Cahn and Larché
 90 (1982); in fact, we mostly render their formulation more general and systematic.

91 The manuscript is organized as follows. Section 2 starts with the definitions of
 92 the interfacial kinematics. In sections 3 and 4, we propose a generalized formula-
 93 tion of the Shuttleworth relationship when a structural mismatch is present at the
 94 interface. Explicit expressions of the interfacial tensors are derived in the special
 95 case of an incoherent interface between two dissimilar isotropic solids. The connec-
 96 tion between the structural mismatch and elastic properties of interfaces is revealed

in the singular case of isotropic thermo-elasticity. Finally, numerical examples are provided in section 5 for incoherent interfaces between Cu and its oxide Cu_2O to illustrate the physicality and insight provided by the proposed formulation in view of atomistic simulations. Note that in the following sections of this manuscript, the terms interface and surface are used interchangeably. A similar remark applies to the designation of the Shuttleworth or Shuttleworth-Herring relationship.

A list of notation and convention used throughout this manuscript is cataloged in Appendix A.

2. Interfacial kinematics

Let us consider an incoherent planar interface between two dissimilar elastic crystalline phases subjected to an anisotropic and nonuniform elastic deformation. The two half spaces are assumed to be mutually insoluble so that no diffusion occurs between them and can be ignored. In the interest of a concise analysis, we choose to consider only processes and equilibria at constant and uniform temperature (hence neglecting configurational and thermal entropies). Therefore, and although an explicit temperature dependence is admitted for all free energy functions and materials parameters, we do not display the temperature as a variable (lattice constants and materials properties may be a function of the temperature). It is also assumed that, if more than one interface is present in the the material system, these interfaces do not interact with one another. For thin slabs and small particles, it has been demonstrated that interfaces may interact with one another, altering interfacial properties and showing a finite size effect (Zhang et al., 2014). This size effect is more pronounced for ionic systems (long range electrostatic interaction forces) than it is for more classical metallic systems.

121 We begin with the definitions of interfacial strains and incoherency. The interface
 122 $\mathcal{S}$ is considered as an imaginary, two-dimensional surface with its location chosen
 123 arbitrarily following the Gibbs dividing surface concept. For convenience, let the
 124 interface be located at $z = 0$ in a Cartesian coordinate system as shown in Fig 1. In
 125 this work we consider that the bicrystal is subjected to a homogeneous traction and
 126 displacement boundary condition at infinity, such that far away from the interface
 127 the deformation can be assumed homogeneous, and the transverse (second Piola-
 128 Kirchhoff) stress and the in-plane (Lagrangian) strain tensors in the upper ($z > 0$)
 129 and lower ($z < 0$) materials are given by $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\pm}^{\perp}$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\pm}^S$ respectively. It has been shown
 130 that such homogeneous deformation can be easily constructed in a bimaterial (Qu
 131 and Bassani, 1993) by the so-called “T-decomposition”. Although the deformation
 132 far away from the interface is homogeneous, the stress and strain fields near the
 133 interface are disrupted by the presence of the interface and the associated disturbance
 134 of the atomic lattice periodicity in its vicinity. The deformation of the interfacial
 135 system manifests itself by displacements of the atoms i which can be described by
 136 individual displacement vectors $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$. In general, the deformation field gives rise to
 137 local stresses in the interfacial system, which can be related by balance laws to the
 138 stress in the interface surroundings and external forces acting on the atoms near the
 139 interface. If we assume that the displacement varies smoothly at the atomic scale,
 140 the equations of balance can be derived based on a description of the interfacial
 141 system as a continuum, where the displacement field is represented by $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})$, with
 142 the vector $\mathbf{x}$ being a continuous position variable. The treatment of the displacement
 143 fields and strain fields is measured from a reference state (Lagrangian measure) of
 144 one of the two half crystals chosen arbitrarily. The reference states for medium “+”
 145 ($z > 0$) and for medium “-” ($z < 0$) can be chosen as states of uniform composition.
 146 As mentioned by Cahn and Larché (1982), two measures of the Lagrangian in-

147 terfacial in-plane strain tensors, ϵ^S and $\epsilon^{*,S}$ respectively, are necessary since each
 148 crystal has its own reference state. The displacement fields $\mathbf{u}_+(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{u}_-(\mathbf{x})$ can be
 149 used for the standard definition of the elastic in-plane surface strain tensor in small
 150 deformation ϵ_+^S and ϵ_-^S in medium “+” and medium “−” respectively such that,

$$\epsilon_{\pm}^S = \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla^S \mathbf{u}_{\pm} + \nabla^S \mathbf{u}_{\pm}^T \right) , \quad (2)$$

151 where ∇^S is the surface gradient. The surface nabla operator ∇^S is simply defined
 152 by the projection of the nabla operator ∇ on the tangential plane of the interface
 153 such that,

$$\nabla^S = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}^S) \otimes \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}^S)) \nabla , \quad (3)$$

154 where $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}^S)$ is the interface unit normal upward pointing from the reference phase
 155 (in this case the “+” half space), $\mathbf{x}^S$ is the interfacial position vector, and $\mathbf{I}$ is the
 156 second-order identity tensor. Having the medium “+” chosen as our reference phase
 157 and assuming continuity of displacement along the interface leads to $\epsilon^S = \epsilon_+^S = \epsilon_-^S$.
 158 Because medium “+” is chosen as our reference, ϵ^S is independent of $\mathbf{u}_-(\mathbf{x})$. The
 159 in-plane strain tensor ϵ^S represents the interface strain measure associated with
 160 deforming both phases by the same amount. Another assumption stemming for the
 161 “T- decomposition” (see Appendix B for more details) leads to an interfacial normal
 162 stress continuity condition (i.e. $\sigma^\perp = \sigma_+^\perp = \sigma_-^\perp$).

163 The second strain measure $\epsilon^{*,S}$ associated with the interface represents the inter-
 164 face components of the strain of medium “−” relative to medium “+”. As illustrated
 165 in Fig. 2, following Romanov and Wagner (2001) and Cahn and Larché (1982), the
 166 strain tensor $\epsilon^{*,S}$ is only defined in medium “−” such that it can be expressed and
 167 decomposed into two components such that,

$$\epsilon^{*,S}(\mathbf{x}) = \epsilon_-^{*,S}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[(\nabla^S \mathbf{u}_- - \nabla^S \mathbf{u}_+) + (\nabla^S \mathbf{u}_- - \nabla^S \mathbf{u}_+)^T \right] = \epsilon^{0,S} + \epsilon^{m,S} g(\mathbf{x}) . \quad (4)$$

168 The strain tensor $\epsilon^{0,S}$ is an eigenstrain related to stress free configuration corre-
 169 sponding to the change in molar volume between medium “+” and medium “-”.
 170 For cubic systems, the molar volume V_-^0 of stress free medium “-” is given in terms
 171 of the molar volume V_+^0 of medium “+” in its reference state such that,

$$V_-^0 = \left[1 + \epsilon_{kk}^{0,S}\right]^3 V_+^0 \approx \left[1 + 3\epsilon_{kk}^{0,S}\right] V_+^0 . \quad (5)$$

172 The strain tensor $\epsilon^{m,S}$ represents the in-plane structural mismatch or deviation
 173 from the coherency at the interface (i.e. $z = 0$). The spatial function $g(\mathbf{x})$ defined in
 174 equation (4) corresponds to the variation of this structural mismatch over few atomic
 175 layers and vanishes far from the interface. As such, $g(0) = 1$ by definition of the
 176 in-plane structural mismatch $\epsilon^{m,S}$, and $g(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, $\forall \mathbf{x} \leq -h$, where h is an arbitrary
 177 distance far away from the interface (see illustrations in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). In the
 178 present manuscript (semi-infinite media), the function $g(\mathbf{x})$ does not vary with the
 179 interfacial material system size (as it would be the case for thin films, for example)
 180 since we are not accounting for interfaces interactions. The structural mismatch at
 181 the interface is usually defined as (Romanov et al., 1998; Sayle et al., 2002):

$$\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{m,S} = 2 \frac{\ell_+ - \ell_-}{\ell_+ + \ell_-} \delta_{\alpha\beta} , \quad (6)$$

182 where ℓ_+ and ℓ_- are the crystal lattice parameters in phase “+” and “-” respectively
 183 and $\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ is the Kronecker delta symbol.

184 In light of the definitions of $\epsilon^{0,S}$ and $\epsilon^{m,S}$, the strain tensor $\epsilon^{*,S}$ corresponds to
 185 an in-plane eigenstrain related to the change of the interface structure. For example,
 186 if we consider the interface between a crystal of finite thickness and a flat thick
 187 substrate, changing the in-plane lattice spacing of the crystal while keeping the lattice
 188 spacing of the substrate constant requires the introduction of misfit dislocations at
 189 the interface to relax the interfacial system (Romanov et al., 1998).

3. Thermodynamic framework for an incoherent interface

3.1. Interfacial thermodynamic framework

We now use the Gibbs dividing surface thermodynamic framework to define the interfacial excess free energy, interfacial excess stress and interfacial excess strain for a coherent and incoherent interface. In this continuum representation, the total free energy $\mathcal{F}$ of the interfacial system (i.e. both semi-infinite crystal Ω_+ and Ω_- and the dividing interface $\mathcal{S}$) is given by

$$\mathcal{F} = \int_{\Omega_+} \Psi_+(\mathbf{x}) dV + \int_{\Omega_-} \Psi_-(\mathbf{x}) dV + \int_{\mathcal{S}} \Gamma(\mathbf{x}) dA , \quad (7)$$

where $\Psi_{\pm}(\mathbf{x})$ is the bulk free-energy density per unit volume in medium “+” and “−” respectively, while $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ is the interfacial excess free energy.

Both bulk phases are being strained by the same amount in the plane of the interface and loaded transversely to the interface along its normal direction (“T-decomposition”). Additionally each solid half space is subjected to eigenstrains $\epsilon_{\pm}^*(\mathbf{x})$ ($\epsilon_+^*(\mathbf{x}) = 0$) in medium “+” or medium “−” respectively and the bulk constitutive behavior is treated in a classical manner such that,

$$\Psi_{\pm} = \hat{\Psi}_{\pm}(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \epsilon^*, \mathbf{x}) \text{ in } \Omega_{\pm} , \quad (8)$$

$$d\Psi_{\pm} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\pm} : d\epsilon_{\pm} = \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_{\pm} : (\epsilon_{\pm} - \epsilon_{\pm}^*) d\epsilon_{\pm} , \quad (9)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\pm}$ is the second Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor in medium “+” or medium “−” respectively, $\underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_{\pm}$ is the corresponding elastic stiffness tensor and the elastic strain tensor in small deformation $\epsilon_{\pm}$ is defined in a standard fashion. The bulk description is augmented by the constitutive behavior of the interface in the form,

$$\Gamma = \hat{\Gamma}(\epsilon^S, \epsilon^{m,S}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\perp}, \mathbf{x}^S) , \quad (10)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S$ is the surface strain defined in equation (2), $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp$ denotes the transverse stress tensor normal to the interface (based on the “T-decomposition”) and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S}$ is the in-plane structural mismatch strain tensor defined in equation (4).

The variables $(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S})$ being defined, the next task is to identify their appropriate interfacial conjugate variables through the generalized thermodynamic framework for the interface free energy density for which the interfacial power density of internal forces takes the form in the most general case,

$$p^S = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^S : \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^S + \mathbb{D}^\perp \cdot \dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^\perp + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^S : \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^{m,S} . \quad (11)$$

In this context, the surface tensor $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^S$ can be identified as the interfacial stress, thermodynamic conjugate of the in-plane strain field $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S$, the surface tensor $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^S$ can be identified as the incoherent interfacial stress, thermodynamic conjugate of the interfacial mismatch strain $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S}$, and the tensor $\mathbb{D}^\perp$ can be associated with the interfacial excess strain, thermodynamic conjugate of the transverse stress field $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp$. For coherent interfaces the last term is missing since $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S} = 0$. The term in $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^S : \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^{m,S}$ can be viewed as a correction to the interfacial energy due to deviation from coherency. Expressions for tensor $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^S$, $\mathbb{D}^\perp$ and $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^S$ stated as a function of the interfacial excess energy and its derivatives with respect to the state variables $(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S})$ constitute the generalized Shuttleworth relationship (see section 3.5).

3.2. Interfacial excess energy

The interfacial excess energy Γ of a mismatched interface is defined using the standard Gibbs definition of the interfacial excess energy per unit of undeformed area combined with the “T-decomposition” (see Appendix B) such that,

$$\Gamma = \int_0^\infty (\Psi(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi_+) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{-\infty}^0 (\Psi(\mathbf{x}) - \Psi_-) d\mathbf{x} , \quad (12)$$

229 where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \hat{\Psi}_0 + \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^S(\mathbf{x}) : [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*,S}(\mathbf{x})] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*,S}(\mathbf{x})] : \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^S(\mathbf{x}) : [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*,S}(\mathbf{x})] + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \cdot \mathbb{M}^\perp(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

230 and

$$\Psi_+ = \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S : \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_+^S : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_+^\perp \cdot \mathbb{M}_+^\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_+^\perp, \quad (14)$$

$$\Psi_- = \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{0,S}) : \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_-^S : (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{0,S}) + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \cdot \mathbb{M}_-^\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp. \quad (15)$$

231 Keep in mind that equations (14) and (15) are the result of having medium “+” as
 232 the reference medium. As such, the eigenstrain $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{0,S}$ appears only in medium “−” and
 233 not in medium “+”. Making use of equations (13), (14) and (15) in equation (12),
 234 it follows that the interfacial excess energy Γ can be expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= \Gamma_0 + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S : \underline{\underline{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}}^{(2)} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(2)} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \\ &+ \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^{(1)} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S} + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S} : \underline{\underline{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}}^{(2)} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S} - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S} : \underline{\underline{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

235 where,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_0 &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\Psi}_0(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \int_0^{\infty} \hat{\tau}^S(\mathbf{x}) \epsilon^{0,S} d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^0 \epsilon^{0,S} : [\underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^S(\mathbf{x}) - \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_-^S] : \epsilon^{0,S} d\mathbf{x} ,\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\tau}^S(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \int_{-\infty}^0 \epsilon^{0,S} : [\underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^S(\mathbf{x}) - \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_-^S] d\mathbf{x} , \quad (18)$$

$$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{\Gamma}}}^{(2)} = \int_0^{\infty} [\underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^S(\mathbf{x}) - \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_+^S] d\mathbf{x} + \int_{-\infty}^0 [\underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^S(\mathbf{x}) - \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_-^S] d\mathbf{x} , \quad (19)$$

$$\mathbf{\Upsilon}^{(1)} = - \int_{-\infty}^0 \hat{\tau}^S(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{-\infty}^0 \epsilon^{0,S} : \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^S(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} , \quad (20)$$

$$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{\Upsilon}}}^{(2)} = \int_{-\infty}^0 \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^S(\mathbf{x}) g^2(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} , \quad (21)$$

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(2)} = \int_0^{\infty} [\mathbb{M}^\perp(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{M}_+^\perp] d\mathbf{x} + \int_0^{\infty} [\mathbb{M}^\perp(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{M}_-^\perp] d\mathbf{x} , \quad (22)$$

$$\underline{\underline{\Phi}} = \int_{-\infty}^0 \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^S(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} . \quad (23)$$

236 Note that, even though the range of the integrals defined in equations (17)–(23)
 237 is infinite, the convergence of these integrals is satisfied. Indeed $\hat{\tau}^S(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{x})$
 238 both vanish far away from the interface so that the integrals only need to be car-
 239 ried out over a finite thickness in the interphase region (see Fig. 1(b) and Fig. 2).
 240 Equation (16) expresses the interfacial excess energy as a function of the in-plane
 241 strain ϵ^S , the transverse stress $\sigma^\perp$ and the interfacial mismatch $\epsilon^{m,S}$. As illustrated
 242 in equation (24), note the explicit dependence and correction of the residual inter-
 243 facial excess energy Γ_0 and some of the interfacial elastic tensors due to the state of
 244 coherency of the interface through the eigenstrain $\epsilon^{0,S}$ and the short range function
 245 $g(\mathbf{x})$:

$$\Gamma|_{\epsilon^S=0, \sigma^\perp=0} = \Gamma^* = \Gamma_0 + \mathbf{\Upsilon}^{(1)} : \epsilon^{m,S} + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{m,S} : \underline{\underline{\mathbf{\Upsilon}}}^{(2)} : \epsilon^{m,S} . \quad (24)$$

246 3.3. In-plane interfacial excess stress

247 We now define the in-plane interfacial excess stress by decomposing the second
 248 Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor in its in-plane component and transverse component
 249 (see equation (B.9) in Appendix B), so that we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^S(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^S(\mathbf{x}) + \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^S(\mathbf{x}) : [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*,S}(\mathbf{x})] + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \cdot \underline{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbf{x}) . \quad (25)$$

250 Furthermore in the bulk of medium “+” and medium “−”,

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_+^S = \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_+^S : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_+^S + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \cdot \underline{\underline{\gamma}}_+ , \quad (26)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_-^S = \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}_-^S : (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_-^S - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{0,S}) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \cdot \underline{\underline{\gamma}}_- . \quad (27)$$

251 Again equations (26) and (27) are the result of having medium “+” as the reference
 252 medium. Following Dingreville and Qu (2008), we can define the (second Piola-
 253 Kirchhoff) interfacial excess stress by,

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^S = \int_0^\infty (\boldsymbol{\sigma}^S(\mathbf{x}) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_+^S) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{-\infty}^0 (\boldsymbol{\sigma}^S(\mathbf{x}) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_-^S) d\mathbf{x} . \quad (28)$$

254 It results from strain compatibility ($\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_+^S = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_-^S$), traction continuity ($\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_+^\perp =$
 255 $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_-^\perp$) and equations (25)–(27) that,

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^S = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)} - \underline{\underline{\Phi}} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S} + \underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^{(2)} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \cdot \underline{\underline{\mathbb{H}}} , \quad (29)$$

256 where $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$, $\underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}^{(2)}$, $\underline{\underline{\Phi}}$ are given by equations (18)–(23) and $\underline{\underline{\mathbb{H}}}$ reads

$$\underline{\underline{\mathbb{H}}} = \int_0^\infty [\underline{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbf{x}) - \underline{\underline{\gamma}}_+] d\mathbf{x} + \int_{-\infty}^0 [\underline{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbf{x}) - \underline{\underline{\gamma}}_-] d\mathbf{x} . \quad (30)$$

257 The first term $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ represents the internal residual excess stress of the interface. This
 258 component of the surface stress exists even when a remote interfacial deformation
 259 is absent. Note that two factors contribute to this residual surface stress (see equa-
 260 tion (18)). One can be attributed to the pure elastic behavior of the interface (see

term in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^S$ in equation (18)). This contribution has been discussed and derived in a similar fashion by others (Cammarata, 1994; Nix and Gao, 1998). The second contribution can be ascribed to the coupling between the state of coherency, the change in molar volume between the two media and the elastic stiffness of the interface (see term in $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{0,S}$ in equation (18)). The term $\underline{\underline{\Phi}}$ describes the intrinsic coupling between the surface stress and the structural interfacial mismatch. The third term $\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}^{(2)}$ represents the interface in-plane elastic stiffness tensor, while the tensor $\underline{\underline{\mathbb{H}}}$ measures the Poisson's effect of the interface in the direction normal to the interface. Note that the interface coherency does not affect the surface stiffness (surface elastic tensors $\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}^{(2)}$ and $\underline{\underline{\mathbb{H}}}$), but does have an effect on the residual surface stress $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ and the coupling with the structural mismatch $\underline{\underline{\Phi}}$. As such the first two terms of equation (29) could be viewed as a correction to the coherent residual surface stress due to the mismatch at the interface, while the last two terms are solely due to the elastic stiffness and compliance of the interface.

3.4. Transverse interfacial excess strain

Similarly, if we consider the transverse interfacial excess strain by decomposing the transverse Lagrangian strain according to the ‘‘T-decomposition’’ (see equation (B.7) in Appendix B), we get,

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^\perp(\mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\perp,*}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{M}^\perp(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}^\perp(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbb{M}^\perp(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp - \underline{\underline{\gamma}}(\mathbf{x}) : [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*,S}(\mathbf{x})] . \quad (31)$$

with the transverse strain in the bulk of each medium given by,

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_+^\perp = \mathbb{M}_+^\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp - \underline{\underline{\gamma}}_+ : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S , \quad (32)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_-^\perp = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\perp,0} + \mathbb{M}_-^\perp \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp - \underline{\underline{\gamma}}_- : (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{0,S}) . \quad (33)$$

Here again equations (32) and (33) are the result of having medium ‘‘+’’ as the reference medium.

282 The excess transverse interfacial strain is defined by,

$$\Delta^\perp = \int_0^\infty (\epsilon^\perp(\mathbf{x}) - \epsilon_+^\perp) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{-\infty}^0 (\epsilon^\perp(\mathbf{x}) - \epsilon_-^\perp) d\mathbf{x} , \quad (34)$$

283 which becomes,

$$\Delta^\perp = \Lambda^{(1)} + \underline{\mathbb{K}} : \epsilon^{m,S} + \Lambda^{(2)} \cdot \sigma^\perp - \underline{\mathbb{H}} : \epsilon^S , \quad (35)$$

284 with the tensors $\Lambda^{(1)}$ and $\underline{\mathbb{K}}$ defined by,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^{(1)} &= \int_{-\infty}^0 (\epsilon^{\perp,*}(\mathbf{x}) - \epsilon^{\perp,0}) + (\underline{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) - \underline{\gamma}_-) : \epsilon^{0,S} d\mathbf{x} \\ &- \int_{-\infty}^\infty \mathbb{M}^\perp(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \tau^\perp(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} , \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\underline{\mathbb{K}} = \int_{-\infty}^0 \underline{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} . \quad (37)$$

285 The transverse interfacial excess strain tensor $\Delta^\perp$ measures the interfacial excess
 286 deformation in the direction transverse to the interface. The first term $\Lambda^{(1)}$ repre-
 287 sents the part of transverse interfacial deformation that exists even when a remote
 288 interfacial deformation is absent. Its physical interpretation could be viewed as an
 289 “intrinsic relaxed thickness” of the interface as compared with an interface which
 290 would retain a perfect bulk lattice arrangement up to the dividing surface. Similarly
 291 to the residual surface stress, two elements compose the “intrinsic relaxed thickness”
 292 of the interface. One comes from the elastic transverse compliance across the in-
 293 terface (see term in $\mathbb{M}^\perp$ in equation (36)) and the other stems from the coupling
 294 between the interface elastic behavior and the interface state of coherency (see term
 295 in $\epsilon^{0,S}$ in equation (36)). The tensor $\Lambda^{(2)}$ describes the transverse compliance of the
 296 interface, while the tensor $\underline{\mathbb{K}}$ represents the coupling between the transverse loading
 297 and the structural mismatch at the interface. Analogously to the remarks made for
 298 the in-plane interfacial excess stress, note that the first two terms of equation (35)
 299 could be viewed as a correction to the “intrinsic relaxed thickness” for a coherent

300 interface due to the mismatch at the interface, while the surface coherency does not
 301 affect the interface elastic compliance (tensor $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(2)}$).

302 3.5. Generalized Shuttleworth relationship

303 Based on the thermodynamic derivations presented above, the generalized form
 304 of the Shuttleworth relationship for a mismatched interface can be obtained. By
 305 combining equations (11) with equations (16) and (29), the relation between the
 306 coherent surface stress Σ^S and the interfacial energy Γ is given by,

$$\Sigma^S = \left. \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \epsilon^S} \right|_{\epsilon^{m,S}, \sigma^\perp} + \sigma^\perp \cdot \underline{\mathbb{H}}, \quad (38)$$

307 while the relation between the interfacial strain $\Delta^\perp$ and the interfacial energy Γ is
 308 simply obtained by combining equations (11) with equations (16) and (35) such that,

$$\mathbb{D}^\perp = \Delta^\perp - \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)} = \left. \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \sigma^\perp} \right|_{\epsilon^S, \epsilon^{m,S}} - \underline{\mathbb{H}} : \epsilon^S + \underline{\mathbb{K}} : \epsilon^{m,S}. \quad (39)$$

309 Note that equations (38) and (39) are consistent with that of Dingreville and Qu
 310 (2008) in the above equation (1) and reduce to the original formulation of Shuttleworth-
 311 Herring when $\sigma^\perp = 0$ and $\epsilon^{m,S} = 0$. The term $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)} + \underline{\mathbb{K}} : \epsilon^{m,S}$ corresponds to a
 312 correction due to the structure of the interface (through the mismatch strain) to the
 313 intrinsic “relaxation width” of the interface accounting for the relative movement be-
 314 tween the top and bottom “surfaces” of the interfacial region, even when $\sigma^\perp = 0$ and
 315 $\epsilon^S = 0$ (i.e., when the remote traction the in-plane strain vanishes). Additionally,
 316 the coherent residual surface stress comprises a correction due to (i) the change in
 317 molar volume between medium “+” and medium “-” through the eigenstrain $\epsilon^{0,S}$
 318 in the two-dimensional tensor $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ and (ii) the intrinsic misfit structural coupling
 319 through the tensor $\underline{\Phi}$.

320 Finally, by integrating the interfacial power density of internal forces in equa-
 321 tion (11) in conjunction with equation (16) and equations (38) and (39) such that,

$$\Gamma = \int [\Sigma^S : d\epsilon^S + (\Delta^\perp - \Lambda^{(1)}) \cdot d\sigma^\perp + \Upsilon^S : d\epsilon^{m,S}] , \quad (40)$$

322 we obtain a complementary Shuttleworth equation relating the incoherent surface
 323 stress Υ^S to the interfacial excess energy Γ such that,

$$\Upsilon^S = \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \epsilon^{m,S}} \Big|_{\epsilon^S, \sigma^\perp} - \sigma^\perp \cdot \underline{\mathbb{K}} + \underline{\underline{\Phi}} : \epsilon^S . \quad (41)$$

324 All together, equations (38), (39) and (41) constitute the generalized Shuttleworth
 325 relationship for incoherent interfaces. The coherent surface stress Σ^S and the trans-
 326 verse excess strain $\Delta^\perp$ represent the thermodynamic driving forces deforming the
 327 interface while the incoherent surface stress Υ^S represents the driving force of stretch-
 328 ing one crystal while holding the other fixed and therefore altering the structure of the
 329 interface. This generalized formulation not only accounts for the three-dimensional
 330 nature of the interface in a Gibbsian sense (2D mathematical object as opposed to
 331 an interphase model) but also explicitly considers its interfacial structure. The three
 332 thermodynamics quantities described above fully characterize the elastic behavior of
 333 coherent and incoherent interfaces under general loading conditions. The extension
 334 to curved interfaces will be briefly discussed in section 3.6.

335 Several differences between the present formulation and that of Cahn and Larché
 336 (1982) are observed. Equation (41) is consistent with the incoherent stress introduced
 337 in Cahn and Larché when $\sigma^\perp = 0$ and $\epsilon^S = 0$. The absence of the in-plane strain
 338 in their formulation is essentially due to the fact that they expanded the excess free
 339 energy Γ in terms of ϵ^S and $\epsilon^{m,S}$ only to the first order (no surface elasticity).

340 From a surface stress point of view, three major differences need to be noted.
 341 First, the coherent and incoherent surface stresses derived in equations (29), (38)

and (41) reduce in the case of Cahn and Larché (1982) to the residual surface stresses such that,

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{CL}^S = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{CL}^S = \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^{(1)} , \quad (42)$$

where the subscript “CL” denotes the Cahn and Larché formulation. Second, the expression for the two-dimensional tensor $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$ in Cahn and Larché does not account for the contribution attributed to the coupling between the state of coherency, the change in molar volume between the two media and the elastic stiffness of the interface (see second integral in equation (18)). Finally neither the intrinsic coupling between the surface stress and the structural interfacial mismatch (tensor $\underline{\underline{\Phi}}$) nor the transverse interfacial behavior (tensors $\mathbb{D}^\perp$, $\mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{K}$) are accounted for.

From an interfacial energy point of view, the interfacial power density derived in equation (11) simplifies in the case of Cahn and Larché to,

$$p_{CL}^S = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)} : \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^S + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^{(1)} : \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^{m,S} , \quad (43)$$

in which neither the surface elasticity ($\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}^{(2)}$) nor the couplings both in terms of structural mismatch and transverse behavior are accounted for (see equation (29)). This simplification makes the interfacial excess energy Γ_{CL} simply quadratic in terms of the in-plane surface strain $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S$ and mismatch strain $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S}$, while it is shown in equation (16) that the evolution of the interfacial excess energy as a function of the loading path $(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp)$ and the structural mismatch strain $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S}$ is not that straightforward.

3.6. Discussion on the equilibrium condition of incoherent curved interfaces

We have intentionally limited ourselves to planar interfaces between two semi-infinite media when dealing with surface excess stresses and surface excess strain in the formulation described above. However, in quite a few practical engineering applications (e.g. composites reinforced with nanoparticles), interfaces can be curved

surfaces, not planar. In that case, and in the limit where the interface characteristic length scale is much smaller than the interface radius of curvature, the constitutive relationships describing the interface behavior not only need to account for the in-plane and transverse behavior (i.e. interfacial Poisson’s effect) as well as the interface structural mismatch (as it is described in this manuscript), but also the intrinsic flexural resistance. As mentioned in section 1, few models have been presented in the literature to account for the flexural stiffness (Nozières and Wolf, 1988; Steigmann and Ogden, 1997, 1999; Gao et al., 2014). In this context, the interfacial excess energy is a function of the local in-plane deformation and also comprises a dependence on the curvature introducing an intrinsic flexural resistance of the interface. As described very recently in Gao et al. (2014), the interfacial power density of internal forces for curved interfaces takes the form,

$$p^S = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^S : \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^S + \boldsymbol{M}^S : \dot{\boldsymbol{\kappa}} , \quad (44)$$

where $\boldsymbol{M}^S$ is the interface bending moment conjugate of the relative curvature $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$. While accounting for the curvature dependence, these interfacial flexural formulations do not account for the interfacial mismatch or the interfacial transverse behavior (see equation (11)). For curved interfaces, the present formulation would need to include the last term of equation (44) and the interfacial kinematics presented in section 2 would need to be revisited in order to account for the curvature dependence (see for example section 2.2 in Gao et al. (2014)). Additionally, as discussed elsewhere (see equation (5.76) in Dingreville (2007)), due to the “T-decomposition” used in the present formulation, supplemental conditions for the displacement jump across the curved mismatched interface would need to be considered. In other words, an additional incoherent thermodynamic driving force (which could be called the incoherent interfacial bending moment) corresponding to flexural deformation of the

388 interface would need to be introduced for curved interfaces. Such an extension of
 389 the formulation is beyond the scope of the present manuscript but will be presented
 390 in a subsequent study by the authors.

391 Besides the constitutive relationships describing the interface behavior, the equi-
 392 librium condition of curved coherent interfaces is expressed by the generalized Young-
 393 Laplace equation and describes the equilibrium relationship between the interface
 394 (coherent) stress and the stress in the bulk. For incoherent mismatched curved
 395 interfaces, the principle of minimum potential energy can be used to derive the gen-
 396 eralized Young-Laplace equation by accounting for (i) the interfacial excess energy,
 397 which would depend not only on the interface strains (coherent and incoherent) but
 398 also on the interface curvature; (ii) the elastic strain energy of the bulk, which would
 399 include the residual elastic field induced by the interfacial excess energy and eigen-
 400 strains due to the mismatch across the interface; and (iii) the potential of the external
 401 loads. The generalized Young-Laplace equation will also be complemented by the
 402 displacement jump condition described in the above paragraph. Again, such an ex-
 403 tension of the formulation is beyond the scope of the present manuscript but will be
 404 presented in the aforementioned study by the authors. Such a paradigm could be
 405 used to fully describe heterogeneous solids containing incoherent curved interfaces
 406 and inhomogeneities.

407 **4. Interfacial isotropic elasticity formulation**

408 As an illustration of the general formulation presented above, we consider in
 409 this section a special case in which both semi-infinite crystals are isotropic elastic
 410 materials with the following bulk elastic moduli,

$$\mathbb{C}_{ijkl,\pm} = \lambda_{\pm} \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + \mu_{\pm} (\delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{il} \delta_{jk}) . \quad (45)$$

Using the “T-decomposition” derived in Appendix B through equations (B.8) and (B.10) along with equation (45), we obtain the following expressions for the elastic tensors characterizing the behavior of the bulk phases in the case of elastic isotropic materials,

$$\mathbb{C}_{3k3j,\pm} = (\lambda_{\pm} + \mu_{\pm}) \delta_{3k} \delta_{3j} + \mu_{\pm} \delta_{kj} , \quad (46)$$

$$\mathbb{M}_{kj,\pm} = -\frac{\lambda_{\pm} + \mu_{\pm}}{(\lambda_{\pm} + 2\mu_{\pm}) \mu_{\pm}} \delta_{3k} \delta_{3j} + \frac{1}{\mu_{\pm}} \delta_{kj} , \quad (47)$$

$$\gamma_{i\alpha\beta,\pm} = \frac{\lambda_{\pm}}{\lambda_{\pm} + 2\mu_{\pm}} \delta_{3i} \delta_{\alpha\beta} , \quad (48)$$

$$\mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda,\pm}^S = \frac{2\lambda_{\pm}\mu_{\pm}}{\lambda_{\pm} + 2\mu_{\pm}} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\kappa\lambda} + \mu_{\pm} (\delta_{\alpha\kappa} \delta_{\beta\lambda} + \delta_{\alpha\lambda} \delta_{\beta\kappa}) , \quad (49)$$

$$\hat{\tau}_{\alpha\beta,\pm}^S = \tau_{\alpha\beta}^S - \tau_3^{\perp} \frac{\lambda_{\pm}}{\lambda_{\pm} + 2\mu_{\pm}} \delta_{\alpha\beta} . \quad (50)$$

4.1. In-plane interfacial excess stress

Regarding the in-plane interfacial excess stress Σ^S , by using equations (28) and (46)–(50), we immediately find

$$\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S = \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} - \Phi_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda} \epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^{m,S} + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda}^{(2)} \epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^S + \sigma_i^{\perp} \mathbb{H}_{i\alpha\beta} , \quad (51)$$

with the elastic surface tensors defined by,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\tau_{\alpha\beta}^S(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\tau_3^{\perp}(\mathbf{x}) \lambda(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \right] d\mathbf{x} \\ &- \int_{-\infty}^0 \left[\left(\frac{2\lambda(\mathbf{x}) \mu(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{2\lambda_- \mu_-}{\lambda_- + 2\mu_-} \right) \delta_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{0,S} + 2(\mu(\mathbf{x}) - \mu_-) \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{0,S} \right] d\mathbf{x} \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda}^{(2)} = \lambda^S \delta_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\kappa\lambda} + \mu^S (\delta_{\alpha\kappa} \delta_{\beta\lambda} + \delta_{\alpha\lambda} \delta_{\beta\kappa}) , \quad (53)$$

$$\mathbb{H}_{i\alpha\beta} = \frac{2K^S \nu^S}{E^{\perp}} \delta_{3i} \delta_{\alpha\beta} , \quad (54)$$

$$\Phi_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda} = \int_{-\infty}^0 \left[\frac{2\lambda(\mathbf{x}) \mu(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\kappa\lambda} + \mu(\mathbf{x}) (\delta_{\alpha\kappa} \delta_{\beta\lambda} + \delta_{\alpha\lambda} \delta_{\beta\kappa}) \right] g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} . \quad (55)$$

419 Taking equations (52)–(55) together with equation (51) gives the in-plane inter-
 420 facial excess stress as follows

$$\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S = \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} - \lambda^{*,S} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{m,S} - 2\mu^{*,S} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{m,S} + \lambda^S \delta_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^S + 2\mu^S \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^S + \frac{2K^S \nu^S}{E^\perp} \sigma_3^\perp \delta_{\alpha\beta} , \quad (56)$$

421 where the two new terms compared to Dingreville and Qu (2008) are the ones contain-
 422 ing the in-plane structural mismatch embodied by $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{m,S}$. In the case of coherent in-
 423 terfaces, i.e. $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{m,S} = 0$, following Cahn and Larché (1982), the formulation developed
 424 by Dingreville and Qu (2008) would be sufficient only if both materials have same
 425 stress-free molar volumes for which $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{0,S}$ vanishes. In equation (54), $K^S = \lambda^S + \mu^S$
 426 and the surface elastic constants are defined by,

$$\mu^S = \int_0^\infty (\mu(\mathbf{x}) - \mu_+) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{-\infty}^0 (\mu(\mathbf{x}) - \mu_-) d\mathbf{x} , \quad (57)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^S &= \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{2\lambda(\mathbf{x})\mu(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{2\lambda_+\mu_+}{\lambda_+ + 2\mu_+} \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(\frac{2\lambda(\mathbf{x})\mu(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{2\lambda_-\mu_-}{\lambda_- + 2\mu_-} \right) d\mathbf{x} , \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

$$\mu^{*,S} = \int_{-\infty}^0 \mu(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} , \quad (59)$$

$$\lambda^{*,S} = \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{2\lambda(\mathbf{x})\mu(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} , \quad (60)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2K^S \nu^S}{E^\perp} &= \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{\lambda(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{\lambda_+}{\lambda_+ + 2\mu_+} \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(\frac{\lambda(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{\lambda_-}{\lambda_- + 2\mu_-} \right) d\mathbf{x} . \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

427 Through this exercise several points are noteworthy:

- 428 • In equation (56), λ^S and μ^S , which could be defined as the surface Lamé
 429 constants, are consistent (in terms of their definition and analytical expressions)
 430 with other classical formulations derived by many authors for surface stress in

solids (Gurtin and Murdoch, 1975; Gurtin et al., 1998; Sharma et al., 2003; Duan et al., 2005; Chen et al., 2007; Duan et al., 2007).

- The effective transverse surface “Poisson’s ratio” $2K^S\nu^S/E^\perp$ in equation (61) is consistent with the formulation for an interface containing no mismatch and stress-free strains (Dingreville and Qu, 2008).
- The present formulation introduces two new surface constants $\mu^{*,S}$ and $\lambda^{*,S}$ defined in equations (59)–(60). These constants are solely related to the interfacial incoherency and the in-plane structural mismatch strain $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{m,S}$ and correspond to a correction to the interfacial residual stress $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}$. To our knowledge, their expressions and physical origins are presented for the first time in the literature.

With this in mind, the in-plane interfacial excess stress components yield

$$\Sigma_{11}^S = \Gamma_{11}^{(1)} - \lambda^{*,S}\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{m,S} - 2\mu^{*,S}\epsilon_{11}^{m,S} + \lambda^S\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^S + 2\mu^S\epsilon_{11}^S + \frac{2K^S\nu^S}{E^\perp}\sigma_3^\perp, \quad (62)$$

$$\Sigma_{22}^S = \Gamma_{22}^{(1)} - \lambda^{*,S}\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{m,S} - 2\mu^{*,S}\epsilon_{22}^{m,S} + \lambda^S\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^S + 2\mu^S\epsilon_{22}^S + \frac{2K^S\nu^S}{E^\perp}\sigma_3^\perp, \quad (63)$$

$$\Sigma_{12}^S = \Gamma_{12}^{(1)} - 2\mu^{*,S}\epsilon_{12}^{m,S} + 2\mu^S\epsilon_{12}^S. \quad (64)$$

Thus, from equations (62)–(64), μ^S and $\mu^{*,S}$ are in-plane interfacial shear moduli associated with in-plane interfacial shear strain ϵ_{12}^S and in-plane incoherent mismatched shear strain $\epsilon_{12}^{m,S}$ respectively. The surface elastic moduli λ^S and $\lambda^{*,S}$ are in-plane interfacial Lamé constants. Furthermore, the in-plane biaxial hydrostatic stress is given by $\Sigma_{\alpha\alpha}^S/2$ where

$$\Sigma_{\alpha\alpha}^S = \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha}^{(1)} - 2K^{*,S}\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{m,S} + 2K^S\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^S + \frac{4K^S\nu^S}{E^\perp}\sigma_3^\perp, \quad (65)$$

where $K^{S*} = \mu^{*,S} + \lambda^{*,S}$ can be interpreted as the in-plane bi-axial surface modulus of

the incoherent interface associated with the structural mismatch (or deviation from coherency) $\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{m,S}$.

4.2. Transverse interfacial excess strain

Regarding the transverse interfacial excess strain, using equations (35) along with (46)–(50), we find the interfacial excess strain,

$$\Delta_i^\perp = \Lambda_i^{(1)} + \mathbb{K}_{i\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{m,S} + \Lambda_{ij}^{(2)} \sigma_j^\perp - \mathbb{H}_{i\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^S, \quad (66)$$

with the transverse surface tensors defined by,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_i^{(1)} &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + \mu(\mathbf{x})}{(\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x}))\mu(\mathbf{x})} \delta_{3i} \tau_3^\perp(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{\mu(\mathbf{x})} \tau_i^\perp(\mathbf{x}) \right] d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \left[\left(\frac{\lambda(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{\lambda_-}{\lambda_- + 2\mu_-} \right) \delta_{3i} \epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{0,S} \right] d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \int_{-\infty}^0 [\epsilon_i^{\perp*}(\mathbf{x}) - \epsilon_i^{\perp 0}] d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

$$\Lambda_{ij}^{(2)} = \left(\frac{1}{E^\perp} - \frac{1}{\mu^\perp} - \frac{4K^S \nu^{S^2}}{E^{\perp 2}} \right) \delta_{3i} \delta_{3j} + \frac{1}{\mu^\perp} \delta_{ij}, \quad (68)$$

$$\mathbb{K}_{i\alpha\beta} = \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{\lambda(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} g(\mathbf{x}) \delta_{3i} \delta_{\alpha\beta} d\mathbf{x}. \quad (69)$$

Similarly to the formulation for the surface stress, taking equation (66) together with the expressions for the transverse surface tensors yields

$$\Delta_i^\perp = \Lambda_i^{(1)} + \frac{2K^{*,S} \nu^{*,S}}{E^{*,\perp}} \delta_{3i} \epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{m,S} + \left(\frac{1}{E^\perp} - \frac{1}{\mu^\perp} - \frac{4K^S \nu^{S^2}}{E^{\perp 2}} \right) \delta_{3i} \sigma_3^\perp + \frac{1}{\mu^\perp} \sigma_i^\perp - \frac{2K^S \nu^S}{E^\perp} \delta_{3i} \epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^S, \quad (70)$$

where the transverse elastic constant associated with the structural mismatch can be defined as,

$$\frac{2K^{*,S} \nu^{*,S}}{E^{*,\perp}} = \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{\lambda(\mathbf{x})}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \quad (71)$$

459 and,

$$\frac{1}{\mu^\perp} = \int_0^\infty \left[\frac{1}{\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{1}{\mu_+} \right] d\mathbf{x} + \int_{-\infty}^0 \left[\frac{1}{\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{1}{\mu_-} \right] d\mathbf{x} , \quad (72)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{E^\perp} - \frac{4K^S \nu^{S^2}}{E^{\perp^2}} &= \int_0^\infty \left[\frac{1}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{1}{\lambda_+ + 2\mu_+} \right] d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \left[\frac{1}{\lambda(\mathbf{x}) + 2\mu(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{1}{\lambda_- + 2\mu_-} \right] d\mathbf{x} . \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

460 It follows that the components of the interfacial transverse excess strain can be
461 expressed as,

$$\Delta_1^\perp = \Lambda_1^{(1)} + \frac{1}{\mu^\perp} \sigma_1^\perp , \quad (74)$$

$$\Delta_2^\perp = \Lambda_2^{(1)} + \frac{1}{\mu^\perp} \sigma_2^\perp , \quad (75)$$

$$\Delta_3^\perp = \Lambda_3^{(1)} + 2K^{*,S} \left(\frac{\nu^{*,S}}{E^{*,\perp}} - \frac{\nu^S}{E^\perp} \right) \epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{m,S} + \frac{1}{E^\perp} (\sigma_3^\perp - \nu^S (\Sigma_{\alpha\alpha}^S - \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha}^{(1)})) . \quad (76)$$

462 It is again noteworthy to point out that $\Lambda_i^{(1)}$ and the second term in $\Delta_3^\perp$ are
463 new when compared to Dingreville and Qu (2008). Their origin stems from the
464 (stress-free) eigenstrains and structural mismatch for incoherent interfaces, i.e. for
465 $\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^{m,S} \neq 0$.

466 4.3. Interfacial thermo-elastic properties

467 Of particular interest (see for example the Levin's formula and Hill's connections
468 problems in Duan and Karihaloo (2007)) is the case for which we assume that the
469 interfacial incoherency is due to thermal strains associated with an isotropic in-plane
470 interfacial coefficient of thermal expansion (CTE) denoted α^S , i.e.

$$\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{m,S} = \alpha^S \delta_{\alpha\beta} \Delta T , \quad (77)$$

where ΔT is the temperature difference. In the bulk of both media, assuming an isotropic CTE, the eigenstrain $\epsilon^{0,S}$ can simply be expressed by,

$$\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{0,S} = (\alpha_- - \alpha_+) \delta_{\alpha\beta} \Delta T , \quad (78)$$

where α_- and α_+ are the bulk CTEs for media “−” and “+” respectively while the reference medium is assumed to be the medium “+”.

Thus, the expression for the isotropic surface stress in equation (56) reduces to

$$\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S = \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} - d_0^* \delta_{\alpha\beta} \Delta T + \lambda^S \delta_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^S + 2\mu^S \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^S + \frac{2K^S \nu^S}{E^\perp} \sigma_3^\perp \delta_{\alpha\beta} , \quad (79)$$

and,

$$d_0^* = 2 (\lambda^{*,S} + \mu^{*,S}) \alpha^S = 2K^{*,S} \alpha^S . \quad (80)$$

The present formulation sheds light on the in-plane thermal-mechanical connection of the interface and its elastic origin assuming a resulting incoherent interface due to temperature difference. This thermal-mechanical relationship is however different from that of Murdoch (1976, 2005) and Duan and Karihaloo (2007). For instance, Duan and Karihaloo (2007) reported the following equation (see equation (3) in their paper):

$$\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S = \lambda^S \delta_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^S + 2\mu^S \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^S - d_0 \delta_{\alpha\beta} \Delta T , \quad (81)$$

where d_0 is assumed by the authors to be $d_0 = 2 (\lambda^S + \mu^S) \alpha^S$. Several differences are observed. First, the contribution of the residual surface stress $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}$ and the contribution of the transverse stress are not taken into account in Duan and Karihaloo. This is due to the choice of the interfacial constitutive behavior used in their paper. Second, the contribution due to the interfacial mismatch through the term $(\lambda^{*,S} + \mu^{*,S})$ (as defined by our equations (59) and (60)) is arbitrarily taken as $(\lambda^S + \mu^S)$ in Duan and Karihaloo. In the present formulation, the interpretation

of the thermal-mechanical connection d_0^* is unambiguously and explicitly associated with the structural mismatch at the interface coming from temperature change. In turn, this can ultimately be related to interfacial defects and associated deformation fields. This is not the case for d_0 in the formulation of Duan and Karihaloo which appears to be empirically introduced. Note here that the thermo-elastic coupling is spatially defined at every vector position starting from $\mathbf{x} = 0$ to a few atomic distance close to the interface in medium “–”.

Additionally, to complete the description of the thermo-elasticity of the interface, the interfacial constitutive behavior is also accompanied by equation (70) which reduces to:

$$\Delta_i^\perp = \Lambda_i^{(1)} + \frac{2d_0^*\nu^{*,S}}{E^{*,\perp}}\delta_{3i}\Delta T + \left(\frac{1}{E^\perp} - \frac{1}{\mu^\perp} - \frac{4K^S\nu^{S^2}}{E^{\perp 2}} \right) \delta_{3i}\sigma_3^\perp + \frac{1}{\mu^\perp}\sigma_i^\perp - \frac{2K^S\nu^S}{E^\perp}\delta_{3i}\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^S. \quad (82)$$

In particular, the transverse excess strain along the normal to the interface is given by,

$$\Delta_3^\perp = \Lambda_3^{(1)} + \frac{2d_0^*\nu^{*,S}}{E^{*,\perp}}\Delta T + \frac{1}{E^\perp} \left(1 - \frac{4K^S\nu^{S^2}}{E^{\perp 2}} \right) \sigma_3^\perp - \frac{2K^S\nu^S}{E^\perp}\epsilon_{\kappa\kappa}^S. \quad (83)$$

Equations (82) and (83) are extensions of Dingreville and Qu (2008) to thermo-elastic interfaces and were not considered in the works of Murdoch (1976, 2005) and Duan and Karihaloo (2007).

4.4. *Insight on interfacial elasticity*

An important point is raised in the sections above: deforming a coherent or incoherent interface does not always increase its interfacial excess energy. Indeed, the interfacial excess energy decreases if a deformation path reduces the interface coherent surface, the interfacial excess strain, or the interface incoherent stress. This assertion can have important consequences for problems in which the incorporation

of interfacial properties play an important role (Cammarata, 1994; Chen et al., 2007; Duan and Karihaloo, 2007). Indeed, the in-plane strain, transverse stress and mismatch strain can be considered as three process control variables (with the first two being associated with the deformation path and the latter one being associated with the interface structure) that can accentuate or minimize the role of interfacial elasticity.

For instance, in the case of thermo-elasticity provided in section 4.3, the loading space for which the coherent surface stress Σ^S and the interfacial excess strain $\Delta^\perp$ vanish is of particular interest. Using equation (79) for the biaxial surface stress ($\epsilon_{11}^S = \epsilon_{22}^S = \epsilon^S$) and equation (83) for the transverse interfacial excess strain, this configuration would correspond to the loading path $(\epsilon^S, \sigma^\perp)$ satisfying the following equation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\Gamma_{11}^{(1)}}{2} \\ \Lambda_3^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 2K^S & \frac{2K^S\nu^S}{E^\perp} & -d_0^* \\ -\frac{4K^S\nu^S}{E^\perp} & \frac{1}{E^\perp} \left(1 - \frac{4K^S\nu^{S2}}{E^{\perp 2}}\right) & \frac{2d_0^*\nu^{*,S}}{E^{*,\perp}} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon^S \\ \sigma^\perp \\ \Delta T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (84)$$

Equation (84) can be parametrized to obtain the loading path line in the $(\epsilon^S, \sigma^\perp)$ space as a function of the interfacial elastic constants $(K^S, \nu^S, E^\perp, \nu^{*,S}, E^{*,\perp}, d_0^*)$ and the temperature difference ΔT . Clearly, this illustrates the concept that one can construct a loading path that would minimize the impact of the interface on the behavior of a material system separated by it or construct a loading path for which the surface to volume ratio is significant.

5. Illustration from atomistic simulations of Cu/Cu₂O interfaces

As discussed in the previous sections, the interfacial excess energy is a function of the in-plane surface strain, the transverse stress and the interface mismatch strain.

532 In this section we illustrate the formulation developed above with examples based
 533 on atomistic simulations for incoherent interfaces between Cu and its oxide Cu_2O
 534 under various loading configurations.

535 *5.1. Atomistic model for $\text{Cu}(111)/\text{Cu}_2\text{O}(111)$ interface and simulation methodology*

536 To demonstrate the generalized formulation of a mismatched interface from a
 537 discrete medium point of view, we consider as an example a flat incoherent interface
 538 between Cu and its oxide Cu_2O . As shown in Fig. 3, the crystallographic orientation
 539 used for the present atomistic simulations is chosen as the most probable observed
 540 interface between Cu and its oxide Cu_2O (Dubois, 1982; Jensen et al., 1991; Werner
 541 et al., 1997; Schedel-Niedrig et al., 2000; Pierson et al., 2005; Soon et al., 2006).
 542 As such, we consider Cu and Cu_2O blocks oriented in the (111) direction when
 543 the interface is created. Note that these surfaces are isotropic in the plane of the
 544 interface.

545 The interatomic potential based on pairwise interactions proposed by Hallil et al.
 546 (2014) is used to describe the Cu_2O properties while the embedded-atom method
 547 (EAM) potential developed by Cleri and Rosato (1993) is employed for the Cu metal-
 548 lic phase. The cross atomic interactions between Cu and Cu_2O is modeled through
 549 (i) a 9–6 Lennard-Jones (LJ) potential for the interaction between copper metallic
 550 atoms and copper atoms from the oxide, and (ii) a Morse potential linking copper
 551 metallic atoms with the oxygen atoms. Note that there are two types of metallic
 552 bonds in this model: the Cu-Cu non-bond interaction in the copper oxide which is
 553 modeled by the 9–6 LJ potential and the Cu-Cu metallic bond modeled by EAM
 554 potential. The bond interaction between the oxygen and copper species defined by
 555 the Morse potential remains the same whether the Cu atoms belong either to the
 556 pure copper phase or the copper oxide compounds (Hallil et al., 2014).

Various interfacial structural mismatches are considered by varying the overlap between the surface lattice vectors of each material during the matching process between both phases. Matching Cu and Cu₂O blocks presents some issues in terms of coherency since the Cu₂O (111) unit cell ($\ell_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}} = 6.04825 \text{ \AA}$) is larger than the Cu (111) unit cell ($\ell_{\text{Cu}} = 2.5542 \text{ \AA}$). Following equation (6), in this atomistic context, the structural mismatch is simply defined as,

$$\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{m,S} = 2 \frac{n\ell_{\text{Cu}} - m\ell_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}}{n\ell_{\text{Cu}} + m\ell_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}} \delta_{\alpha\beta} , \quad (85)$$

where ℓ_{Cu} and $\ell_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}$ are the lattice constants of Cu and Cu₂O respectively and (n, m) are scaling factors (taken as integers) used to obtain various mismatch strains. To minimize the structural mismatch, several sets of couple (m, n) have been chosen such that the overall strain is small when the interface is formed.

The interface model dimensions and mismatch strains simulated are summarized in Table 1. A typical computation cell contains on average 20,000 atoms composed of N_{Cu} atoms in the Cu phase and $N_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}$ atoms in the Cu₂O phase. Periodic boundary conditions are used in all directions. Note that the use of periodic boundary conditions in the transverse direction implicitly introduces a second interface at the edge of the calculation box with an identical structure as the interface located at the center of atomic assembly. Dimensions of the simulation box (W, D, L) have been chosen such that atoms far away from the interface have energy levels corresponding to the perfect bulk configuration. In other words, the two interfaces present in the atomistic system do not interact, therefore avoiding the size effect mentioned in section 2.

Once the initial interfacial assembly is created, a molecular statics calculation, which employs a nonlinear conjugate gradient method, is used to determine the minimum energy interface configuration (i.e., relaxed positions of the atoms) and

581 to find the self equilibrium state of the interface. Due to the in-plane periodicity,
582 relaxation of the structure occurs only in the direction perpendicular to the bound-
583 ary plane. The transverse stress in the relaxed configuration is therefore null. A
584 detailed discussion of interface atomistic structural rearrangement throughout the
585 entire simulation process and resulting interfacial point defects is beyond the scope
586 of the present manuscript.

587 After the minimum interfacial energy configuration is obtained, the interfacial
588 assembly is elastically deformed either by applying a transverse tensile stress $\sigma_3^\perp$ or
589 by applying biaxial strains $\epsilon_{11}^S = \epsilon_{22}^S = \epsilon^S$ of a couple percents in the interfacial plane.
590 Each of these stresses and biaxial strains is less than the critical load required for
591 defect nucleation (dislocation notably) for the interfaces considered in this work, so
592 that we remain in the elastic domain. In the configuration when the tensile stress
593 is applied, the x - and y -direction boundaries are specified as stress-free throughout
594 deformation.

595 For each deformation process described in the above, MS simulations are per-
596 formed to compute the interfacial excess energy at the equilibrium state of the sys-
597 tem. In the case of the discrete atomistic systems used in this work, the integral of
598 the energy profile defined in equation (12) is discretized into a summation over a set
599 of atoms within each region, rigorously separating the energy profile normal to the
600 interface into two regions (Dingreville and Qu, 2009) such that,

$$\Gamma = \frac{1}{2A_0} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{Cu}}} \left(e^{(i)}(z) - e_{\text{Cu}}^{(0)} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}} \left(e^{(i)}(z) - e_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}^{(0)} \right) \right], \quad (86)$$

601 where $e^{(i)}$ is the total energy of atom i enclosed by the area A_0 on the interface, N_{Cu}
602 and $N_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}$ are the number of atoms in the copper region and its oxide respectively,
603 and $e_{\text{Cu}}^{(0)}$ and $e_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}^{(0)}$ are the total energies of an atom in a perfect lattice (bulk config-

uration) far away from the surface in medium Cu and medium Cu₂O, respectively. The bulk energies, $e_{\text{Cu}}^{(0)}$ and $e_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}^{(0)}$, are determined by averaging the total energy $e^{(i)}$ of a group of atoms positioned sufficiently far away from the interface such that the presence of the boundary can be ignored. Using $e_{\text{Cu}}^{(0)}$ and $e_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}^{(0)}$, an excess energy is computed for every atom within the interface model; the sum of these excess energies is defined as the total interface energy. Note that the factor 2 in the denominator of equation (86) accounts for the presence of the two actual interfaces within the atomic assembly due to the periodic boundary conditions.

5.2. Comparisons between the discrete atomistic simulations and the generalized Shuttleworth relationships

The above procedure has been used to calculate the variation of the interfacial excess energy under biaxial straining or transverse loading. The interfacial elastic properties used for the comparison between the atomistic simulations and the theoretical model presented in the above are listed in Table 2. These interfacial elastic properties have been obtained numerically using a least-square method accounting for the various loading paths used the atomistic system based on equations (87)–(89), thus limiting the number of interfacial elastic constants that can be calculated through this method. Note that the semi-analytical methodology developed by Dingreville and Qu (2009) in the case of the EAM potential could be used as an alternative to derive the interfacial properties. However this formulation would need to be modified to account for the complexity of the two interatomic potentials and cross atomic interactions used in this manuscript for the Cu/Cu₂O interfacial system. Such modifications of the methodology are beyond the scope of the present manuscript.

Looking first at the interfacial excess energy as a function of the mismatch strain

629 $\epsilon^{m,S}$ when no load is applied ($\epsilon^S = 0$ and $\sigma^\perp = 0$ MPa), equation (16) reduces to

$$\Gamma|_{\epsilon^S=0, \sigma^\perp=0} = \Gamma^* = \Gamma_0 + \Upsilon_{\alpha\alpha}^{(1)} \epsilon_{\alpha\alpha}^{m,S} + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\alpha\alpha}^{m,S} \Upsilon_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}^{(2)} \epsilon_{\beta\beta}^{m,S} . \quad (87)$$

630 The MS simulation results for the variation of the interfacial excess energy as a
 631 function of the mismatch strain are shown in Fig. 4 together with the results from
 632 the present continuum model. It is seen that these results agree very well with those
 633 obtained by the generalized interfacial formulation and show a quadratic behavior.

634 Considering now the variation of interfacial excess energy as a function of the
 635 transverse stress $\sigma^\perp$ for various mismatch strains (no in-plane strain applied), the
 636 interfacial excess energy Γ in equation (16) reduces to

$$\Gamma|_{\epsilon^S=0} = \Gamma^* + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_3^\perp \Lambda_{33}^{(2)} \sigma_3^\perp . \quad (88)$$

637 We again observe a very good agreement between the atomistic simulation results
 638 and the present theoretical formulation as it is plotted in Fig. 5.

639 Similarly, in the case of the variation of interfacial excess energy as a function of
 640 the biaxial strain ϵ^S (no transverse stress applied), equation (16) reduces to

$$\Gamma|_{\sigma^\perp=0} = \Gamma^* + \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha}^{(1)} \epsilon_{\alpha\alpha}^S + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\alpha\alpha}^S \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta}^{(2)} \epsilon_{\beta\beta}^S - \epsilon_{\alpha\alpha}^{m,S} \Phi_{\alpha\alpha\beta\beta} \epsilon_{\beta\beta}^S . \quad (89)$$

641 Comparison between the atomistic simulations and the theoretical models are pre-
 642 sented in Fig. 6. The results of the present model are in good agreement with those
 643 obtained by full-blown atomistic simulations.

644 6. Conclusion

645 The main contribution of this manuscript is the derivation of a generalized contin-
 646 uum framework describing the elastic behavior of coherent and incoherent interfaces

under general loading conditions based on the Gibbs dividing surface concept combined with the so-called “T-decomposition”. This generalized Shuttleworth-Herring formulation considers the equilibrium of mismatched interfaces as a function of the in-plane strain $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S$, the transverse stress $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp$ and the structural mismatch strain $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S}$. This formulation not only accounts for the three-dimensional nature of the interface in a Gibbsian sense (2D mathematical object as opposed to an interphase model) but also explicitly considers its interfacial structure. Two surface stresses are thus introduced: a coherent surface stress $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^S$ and an incoherent surface stress $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^S$, along with a transverse excess strain $\boldsymbol{\Delta}^\perp$. The coherent surface stress $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^S$ and the transverse excess strain $\boldsymbol{\Delta}^\perp$ represent the thermodynamic driving forces of stretching the interface while the incoherent surface stress $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^S$ represents the driving force of altering the structure of the interface by stretching one crystal while holding the other fixed. These three quantities fully characterize the elastic behavior of coherent and incoherent interfaces and read:

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^S &= \left. \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S} \right|_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \cdot \underline{\mathbb{H}} , \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta}^\perp - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(1)} &= \left. \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp} \right|_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S}} - \underline{\mathbb{H}} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S + \underline{\mathbb{K}} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S} , \\ \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^S &= \left. \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{m,S}} \right|_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp \cdot \underline{\mathbb{K}} + \underline{\underline{\Phi}} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^S .\end{aligned}$$

This formulation naturally introduces interfacial elastic tensors, as well as an implicit coupling between the interfacial structure and interfacial stresses. Three surface tensors ($\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}^{(2)}$, $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(2)}$, $\underline{\mathbb{H}}$) describe the pure elastic behavior of the interface (i.e., independent of the structural mismatch) while four surface tensors ($\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{(1)}$, $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{(1)}$, $\underline{\underline{\Phi}}$, $\underline{\mathbb{K}}$) describe and/or account for the coupling between the interface and the state of coherency (i.e. dependent on the structural mismatch).

The isotropic case is developed in detail and particular attention is paid to the

668 case of interfacial thermo-elasticity resulting from the mismatch of coefficient of
669 thermal expansions between two dissimilar materials. This exercise provides some
670 insight on the physical significance of the interfacial elastic constants introduced in
671 the formulation and illustrates the obvious coupling between the interface structure
672 and its associated thermodynamics quantities.

673 Comparisons between discrete atomistic simulations for incoherent interfaces be-
674 tween Cu and its oxide Cu_2O and the present continuum formulation demonstrate
675 that this generalized framework for mismatched interfaces successfully characterizes
676 the elastic behavior of such interfaces.

677 **Acknowledgments**

678 A.H. would like to thank the UMI GTL/CNRS (UMI 2958) and Pr. M. Cherkaoui
679 for their valuable support for part of this work along with the support from the Euro-
680 pean Commission for partial funding of this work under the “NanoInterface” project
681 (NMP-2008-214371). S.B. would also like to thank the support of the French govern-
682 ment through the National Research Agency (ANR) under the program “Investment
683 in the future” (Labex DAMAS referenced as ANR-11-LABX-0008-01).

684 Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed
685 Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy, under Contract No.
686 DE-AC04-94AL85000.

687 **References**

- 688 Berbenni, S., Cherkaoui, M., 2010. Homogenization of multicoated inclusion-
689 reinforced linear elastic composites with eigenstrains: Application to thermoelastic
690 behavior. *Philosophical Magazine* 90 (22), 3003–3026.
- 691 Cahn, J. W., Larché, F., 1982. Surface stress and the chemical equilibrium of small
692 crystals—II. Solid particles embedded in a solid matrix. *Acta Metallurgica* 30 (1),
693 51–56.
- 694 Cammarata, R. C., 1994. Surface and interface stress effects in thin films. *Progress*
695 *in Surface Science* 46 (1), 1–38.
- 696 Cammarata, R. C., 1997. Surface and interface stress effects on interfacial and nanos-
697 tructured materials. *Materials Science and Engineering: A* 237 (2), 180–184.
- 698 Cammarata, R. C., Sieradzki, K., 1994. Surface and interface stresses. *Annual Review*
699 *of Materials Science* 24 (1), 215–234.
- 700 Cammarata, R. C., Sieradzki, K., Spaepen, F., 2000. Simple model for interface
701 stresses with application to misfit dislocation generation in epitaxial thin films.
702 *Journal of Applied Physics* 87 (3), 1227–1234.
- 703 Chen, T., Dvorak, G. J., Yu, C. C., 2007. Solids containing spherical nano-inclusions
704 with interface stresses: effective properties and thermal-mechanical connections.
705 *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 44 (3–4), 941–955.
- 706 Cleri, F., Rosato, V., 1993. Tight-binding potentials for transition metals and alloys.
707 *Physical Review B* 48 (1), 22–33.

- 708 Dingreville, R., 2007. Modeling and characterization of the elastic behavior of inter-
709 faces in nanostructured materials: from an atomistic description to a continuum
710 approach. Ph.D. thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology.
- 711 Dingreville, R., Qu, J., 2007. A semi-analytical method to compute surface elastic
712 properties. *Acta Materialia* 55 (1), 141–147.
- 713 Dingreville, R., Qu, J., 2008. Interfacial excess energy, excess stress and excess strain
714 in elastic solids: Planar interfaces. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*
715 56 (5), 1944–1954.
- 716 Dingreville, R., Qu, J., 2009. A semi-analytical method to estimate interface elastic
717 properties. *Computational Materials Science* 46 (1), 83–91.
- 718 Dingreville, R., Qu, J., Cherkaoui, M., 2005. Surface free energy and its effect on the
719 elastic behavior of nano-sized particles, wires and films. *Journal of the Mechanics*
720 *and Physics of Solids* 53 (8), 1827–1854.
- 721 Duan, H. L., Karihaloo, B. L., 2007. Thermo-elastic properties of heterogeneous
722 materials with imperfect interfaces: Generalized Levin’s formula and Hill’s con-
723 nections. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 55 (5), 1036–1052.
- 724 Duan, H. L., Wang, J., Huang, Z. P., Karihaloo, B. L., 2005. Size-dependent effective
725 elastic constants of solids containing nano-inhomogeneities with interface stress.
726 *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 53 (7), 1574–1596.
- 727 Duan, H. L., Yi, X., Huang, Z. P., Wang, J., 2007. A unified scheme for prediction of
728 effective moduli of multiphase composites with interface effects. Part I: Theoretical
729 framework. *Mechanics of Materials* 39 (1), 81–93.

- 730 Dubois, L. H., 1982. Oxygen chemisorption and cuprous oxide formation on Cu(111):
731 A high resolution EELS study. *Surface Science* 119 (2–3), 399–410.
- 732 Gao, X., Huang, Z., Qu, J., Fang, D., 2014. A curvature-dependent interfacial energy-
733 based interface stress theory and its applications to nano-structured materials:(I)
734 General theory. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 66, 59–77.
- 735 Gibbs, J. W., 1928. The collected works of J. Willard Gibbs, Volume I: Thermody-
736 namics. Longmans, Green and Company, New York, 228.
- 737 Gurtin, M. E., Murdoch, A. I., 1975. A continuum theory of elastic material surfaces.
738 *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 57 (4), 291–323.
- 739 Gurtin, M. E., Weissmüller, J., Larché, F., 1998. A general theory of curved de-
740 formable interfaces in solids at equilibrium. *Philosophical Magazine A* 78 (5),
741 1093–1109.
- 742 Hallil, A., Raulot, J.-M., Cherkaoui, M., 2014. Atomistic simulations of Cu₂O bulk
743 and Cu/Cu₂O interface properties by using a new interatomic potential. *Compu-
744 tational Materials Science* 81, 366–373.
- 745 Herring, C., 1951. Some theorems on the free energies of crystal surfaces. *Physical
746 Review* 82 (1), 87–93.
- 747 Hu, S. Y., Chen, L.-Q., 2002. Diffuse-interface modeling of composition evolution in
748 the presence of structural defects. *Computational Materials Science* 23 (1), 270–
749 282.
- 750 Jensen, F., Besenbacher, F., Lægsgaard, E., Stensgaard, I., 1991. Oxidation of
751 Cu(111): two new oxygen induced reconstructions. *Surface Science* 259 (3), L774–
752 L780.

- 753 Leo, P. H., Lowengrub, J. S., Jou, H.-J., 1998. A diffuse interface model for mi-
 754 crostructural evolution in elastically stressed solids. *Acta Materialia* 46 (6), 2113–
 755 2130.
- 756 Lipinski, P., Barhdadi, E. H., Cherkaoui, M., 2006. Micromechanical modelling of
 757 an arbitrary ellipsoidal multi-coated inclusion. *Philosophical Magazine* 86 (10),
 758 1305–1326.
- 759 Marichev, V. A., 2011. The Shuttleworth equation: Its modifications and current
 760 state. *Protection of Metals and Physical Chemistry of Surfaces* 47 (1), 25–30.
- 761 Mi, C., Jun, S., Kouris, D. A., Kim, S. Y., 2008. Atomistic calculations of inter-
 762 face elastic properties in noncoherent metallic bilayers. *Physical Review B* 77 (7),
 763 075425.
- 764 Mi, C., Kouris, D., 2012. On the significance of coherent interface ef-
 765 fects for embedded nanoparticles. *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids* (doi:
 766 10.1177/1081286512465426).
- 767 Miller, R. E., Shenoy, V. B., 2000. Size-dependent elastic properties of nanosized
 768 structural elements. *Nanotechnology* 11 (3), 139.
- 769 Müller, P., Saúl, A., 2004. Elastic effects on surface physics. *Surface Science Reports*
 770 54 (5), 157–258.
- 771 Murdoch, A. I., 1976. A thermodynamical theory of elastic material interfaces. *The*
 772 *Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied* 29 (3), 245–275.
- 773 Murdoch, A. I., 2005. Some fundamental aspects of surface modelling. *Journal of*
 774 *Elasticity* 80 (1–3), 33–52.

- 775 Nix, W., Gao, H., 1998. An atomistic interpretation of interface stress. *Scripta Mat-*
776 *aterialia* 39 (12), 1653–1661.
- 777 Nozières, P., Wolf, D. E., 1988. Interfacial properties of elastically strained materials.
778 *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter* 70 (3), 399–407.
- 779 Pierson, J. F., Wiederkehr, D., Billard, A., 2005. Reactive magnetron sputtering of
780 copper, silver, and gold. *Thin Solid Films* 478 (1–2), 196–205.
- 781 Povstenko, Y. Z., 1993. Theoretical investigation of phenomena caused by hetero-
782 geneous surface tension in solids. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*
783 41 (9), 1499–1514.
- 784 Qu, J., Bassani, J. L., 1993. Interfacial fracture mechanics for anisotropic bimaterials.
785 *Journal of Applied Mechanics* 60 (2), 422–431.
- 786 Romanov, A. E., Wagner, T., 2001. On the universal misfit parameter at mismatched
787 interfaces. *Scripta Materialia* 45 (3), 325–331.
- 788 Romanov, A. E., Wagner, T., Rühle, M., 1998. Coherent to incoherent transition in
789 mismatched interfaces. *Scripta Materialia* 38 (6), 869–875.
- 790 Sander, D., 2003. Surface stress: implications and measurements. *Current Opinion*
791 *in Solid State and Materials Science* 7 (1), 51–57.
- 792 Sayle, D. C., Catlow, C. R. A., Dulamita, N., Healy, M. J. F., Maicaneanu, S. A.,
793 Slater, B., Watson, G. W., 2002. Modelling oxide thin films. *Molecular Simulation*
794 28 (6–7), 683–725.
- 795 Schedel-Niedrig, T., Hävecker, M., Knop-Gericke, A., Schlögl, R., 2000. Partial

methanol oxidation over copper: Active sites observed by means of in situ X-ray
absorption spectroscopy. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* 2 (15), 3473–3481.

Sharma, P., Ganti, S., Bhate, N., 2003. Effect of surfaces on the size-dependent
elastic state of nano-inhomogeneities. *Applied Physics Letters* 82 (4), 535–537.

Shuttleworth, R., 1950. The surface tension of solids. *Proceedings of the Physical
Society. Section A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 63 (5), 444.

Soon, A., Todorova, M., Delley, B., Stampfl, C., 2006. Oxygen adsorption and stabil-
ity of surface oxides on Cu(111): A first-principles investigation. *Physical Review
B* 73 (16), 165424.

Steigmann, D. J., Ogden, R. W., 1997. Plane deformations of elastic solids with
intrinsic boundary elasticity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series
A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 453 (1959), 853–877.

Steigmann, D. J., Ogden, R. W., 1999. Elastic surface–substrate interactions. *Pro-
ceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and
Engineering Sciences* 455 (1982), 437–474.

Vermaak, J. S., Mays, C. W., Kuhlmann-Wilsdorf, D., 1968. On surface stress and
surface tension: I. Theoretical considerations. *Surface Science* 12 (2), 128–133.

Werner, H., Herein, D., Schulz, G., Wild, U., Schlögl, R., 1997. Reaction pathways
in methanol oxidation: kinetic oscillations in the copper/oxygen system. *Catalysis
Letters* 49 (1–2), 109–119.

Zhang, C., Yao, Y., Chen, S., 2014. Size-dependent surface energy density of typically
fcc metallic nanomaterials. *Computational Materials Science* 82, 372–377.

Table 1: Geometric parameters used to set up the atomistic simulations.

Interface	$\epsilon^{m,S}$ (%)	n	m	L (Å)	D (Å)	$N_{\text{Cu}} + N_{\text{Cu}_2\text{O}}$
1	-1.476	14	6	218.628	35.923	19696
2	1.34	12	5	217.391	30.479	14088
3	5.42	15	6	215.181	37.645	21204
4	2.524	17	7	216.757	43.017	27964

Table 2: Interfacial elastic properties for an incoherent Cu/Cu₂O interface.

Property		Value
Γ_0	$[\text{J.m}^{-2}]$	1.102
$\Gamma_{11}^{(1)}$	$[\text{J.m}^{-2}]$	3.00
$\Gamma_{1111}^{(2)} + \Gamma_{1122}^{(2)}$	$[\text{J.m}^{-2}]$	2455.51
$\Lambda_{33}^{(2)}$	$[\text{nm.GPa}^{-1}]$	0.0210
$\Upsilon_{11}^{(1)}$	$[\text{J.m}^{-2}]$	0.213
$\Upsilon_{1111}^{(2)} + \Upsilon_{1122}^{(2)}$	$[\text{J.m}^{-2}]$	526.71
$\Phi_{1111} + \Phi_{1122}$	$[\text{J.m}^{-2}]$	-9.24

Figure 1: Schematic of a bicrystal interface and the distribution of a given excess thermodynamic quantity across the interface structure along the transverse direction z .

Figure 2: Decomposition of the in-plane eigenstrain $\epsilon^{*,S}$ related to the change of the interface structure.

Figure 3: Illustration of the atomic surfaces composing the Cu/Cu₂O interface. Details of the setup of atomistic simulations are summarized in Table 1.

Figure 4: Variation of the interfacial excess energy $\Gamma|_{\epsilon^S=0, \sigma^\perp=0}$ as a function of the mismatch strain $\epsilon^{m,S}$ for an incoherent Cu/Cu₂O (for $\epsilon^S = 0$ and $\sigma^\perp = 0$). Dashed line (— —) is based on the theoretical framework presented in equation (16), square symbols (■) are from atomistic simulations. Interfacial elasticity properties used in equation (16) are presented in Table 2.

(a) Mismatch strain: $\epsilon^{m,S} = -1.476\%$

(b) Mismatch strain: $\epsilon^{m,S} = 1.34\%$

(c) Mismatch strain: $\epsilon^{m,S} = 5.421\%$

(d) Mismatch strain: $\epsilon^{m,S} = 2.524\%$

Figure 5: Variation of the interfacial excess energy $\Gamma|_{\epsilon^S=0}$ as a function of the transverse tensile stress $\sigma^\perp$ (for $\epsilon^S = 0$) for an incoherent Cu/Cu₂O interface with various mismatch strains. Dashed line (---) is based on the theoretical framework presented in equation (16), square symbols (■) are from atomistic simulations. Interfacial elasticity properties used in equation (16) are presented in Table 2.

(a) Mismatch strain: $\epsilon^{m,S} = -1.476\%$

(b) Mismatch strain: $\epsilon^{m,S} = 1.34\%$

(c) Mismatch strain: $\epsilon^{m,S} = 5.421\%$

(d) Mismatch strain: $\epsilon^{m,S} = 2.524\%$

Figure 6: Variation of the interfacial excess energy $\Gamma|_{\sigma^\perp=0}$ as a function of the biaxial strain ϵ^S (for $\sigma^\perp = 0$) for an incoherent Cu/Cu₂O interface with various mismatch strains. Dashed line (---) is based on the theoretical framework presented in equation (16), square symbols (■) are from atomistic simulations. Interfacial elasticity properties used in equation (16) are presented in Table 2.

819 **Appendix A. Nomenclature and list of symbols**

820 We denote in boldface a vector $\mathbf{a}$ of the Euclidian space $\mathbb{E}$ only by its element a_i
821 (i.e. $\mathbf{a} = a_i \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i$) where we employ the use of Einstein's convention of summation over
822 repeated indices. The component $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_i$ is an element of $(\hat{\mathbf{e}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{e}}_2, \hat{\mathbf{e}}_3)$, a positive oriented
823 orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{E}$ with dimension 3. Similarly a second-rank Euclidian tensor
824 $\mathbf{A}$ designated in a boldface character is simply written as A_{ij} ($\mathbf{A} = A_{ij} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i \otimes \hat{\mathbf{e}}_j$). A
825 third-rank Euclidian tensor $\underline{\mathbf{A}}$ designated by an underlined character is simply writ-
826 ten as A_{ijk} ($\underline{\mathbf{A}} = A_{ijk} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i \otimes \hat{\mathbf{e}}_j \otimes \hat{\mathbf{e}}_k$). A fourth-rank Euclidian tensor $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{A}}}$ designated by a
827 doubly underlined character is simply written as A_{ijkl} ($\underline{\underline{\mathbf{A}}} = A_{ijkl} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i \otimes \hat{\mathbf{e}}_j \otimes \hat{\mathbf{e}}_k \otimes \hat{\mathbf{e}}_l$).
828 A character not in boldface or not underlined indicates a scalar. The symbol “.”
829 between two tensors designates the product contracted once, while the symbol “:”
830 designates the product contracted twice. Roman indices used in tensorial notations
831 range from 1 to 3 (three-dimensional) and Greek indices range from 1 to 2 (two-
832 dimensional), unless otherwise indicated.

833

834 **Notation indexing:**

- $[\cdot]_{\pm}$ – denotes a variable defined in medium “+” or “−” respectively.
- $[\cdot]^S$ – denotes a variable defined in the plane of the interface.
- $[\cdot]^\perp$ – denotes a variable defined transverse to the interface.

835 **Strain and stress definitions:**

- ϵ^S – interfacial in-plane strain tensor.
- $\epsilon^{*,S}$ – interfacial structure eigenstrain tensor.

$\epsilon^{0,S}$	– in-plane molar volume change eigenstrain tensor.
$\epsilon^{m,S}$	– in-plane structural mismatch strain tensor.
ϵ^*	– eigenstrain tensor.
ϵ	– strain tensor.
σ	– stress tensor.
τ	– residual stress tensor.
κ	– relative interface curvature.

836 **Interfacial thermodynamic quantities:**

$\mathcal{F}$	– total free energy.
Ψ	– bulk free-energy density per unit volume.
p^S	– interfacial power density of internal forces.
Γ	– interfacial excess energy.
Γ_0	– residual interfacial excess energy.
Σ^S	– coherent surface stress.
Υ^S	– incoherent surface stress.
$\Delta^\perp$	– transverse excess strain.
$\mathbb{D}^\perp$	– thermodynamic conjugate of the transverse stress field $\sigma^\perp$.
$\Gamma^{(1)}$	– residual surface stress.
$\Lambda^{(1)}$	– residual transverse interfacial deformation.
$\Upsilon^{(1)}$	– residual incoherent surface stress.
M^S	– interface bending moment.

837 **Bulk constants:**

λ	– Lamé constant.
μ	– shear modulus.
α	– coefficient of thermal expansion.
$\underline{\underline{\mathbb{C}}}$	– stiffness tensor.
$\mathbb{M}$	– compliance tensor.
$\underline{\gamma}$	– transverse coupling tensor.

838 **Interfacial constants:**

$\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}^{(2)}$	– interface in-plane elastic stiffness tensor.
$\underline{\underline{\Lambda}}^{(2)}$	– interface transverse compliance tensor.
$\underline{\underline{\Upsilon}}^{(2)}$	– interface in-plane incoherency stiffness tensor.
$\underline{\underline{\Phi}}$	– interface in-plane structural interfacial mismatch coupling tensor.
$\underline{\underline{\mathbb{H}}}$	– interfacial Poisson’s effect tensor.
$\underline{\underline{\mathbb{K}}}$	– interface transverse structural interfacial mismatch tensor.
$\lambda^S, \lambda^{*,S}$	– surface Lamé constants.
$K^S, K^{*,S}$	– biaxial surface moduli.
$\nu^S, \nu^{*,S}$	– interfacial Poisson’s ratios.
$E^\perp, E^{*,\perp}$	– interfacial transverse Young’s moduli.
α^S	– interfacial coefficient of thermal expansion.
d_0, d_0^*	– thermal-mechanical coupling coefficient.

839 **Variables used in the atomistic model:**

$e^{(i)}$	– total energy of atom i .
$e^{(0)}$	– atomic bulk energy.
N	– number of atoms.
n, m	– scaling factors to obtain various mismatch strains in the atomistic model.

- ℓ – crystal lattice parameter.
- W, L, D – dimensions of the atomistic simulation box.
- A_0 – surface area.

840 **Miscellaneous symbols:**

- $\mathcal{S}$ – imaginary, two-dimensional surface.
- Ω – semi-infinite crystal.
- z – position across the interface.
- h – arbitrary distance away from the interface.
- $\mathbf{x}$ – position vector.
- $\mathbf{x}^S$ – interfacial position vector.
- $\mathbf{u}$ – displacement field.
- ∇^S – surface gradient.
- $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}^S)$ – interface unit normal upward pointing from the reference phase.
- V^0 – molar volume.
- $g(\mathbf{x})$ – variation of the structural mismatch.

841 **Appendix B. “T-decomposition”: General anisotropic elasticity with eigen-**
842 **strains due to lattice mismatch**

843 In the following “T-decomposition” (Qu and Bassani, 1993; Dingreville and Qu,
844 2008), subscripts $\alpha, \beta, \kappa, \lambda$ vary from 1 to 2, and Roman subscripts j vary from 1
845 to 3 with the following conventions:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S &= \sigma_{\alpha\beta} , \quad \tau_{\alpha\beta}^S = \tau_{\alpha\beta} , \quad \tau_{\alpha\beta}^S = \tau_{\alpha\beta} , \quad \epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^S = \epsilon_{\kappa\lambda} , \\ \sigma_j^\perp &= \sigma_{3j} , \quad \tau_j^\perp = \tau_{3j} , \quad \epsilon_\alpha^\perp = 2\epsilon_{\alpha 3} , \quad \epsilon_3^\perp = \epsilon_{33} , \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

where superscripts S and $\perp$ respectively denote the in-plane and transverse parts of stresses and strains.

Consider an inhomogeneous linear elastic solid subjected to eigenstrains ϵ_{ij}^* , the strain energy density per unit undeformed volume (Lagrangian approach) is given by:

$$\Psi = \Psi_0 + \tau_{ij} (\epsilon_{ij} - \epsilon_{ij}^*) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{C}_{ijkl} (\epsilon_{ij} - \epsilon_{ij}^*) (\epsilon_{kl} - \epsilon_{kl}^*) , \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where ϵ_{ij} and ϵ_{ij}^* are respectively the Lagrangian total strains and eigenstrains.

The elastic (Lagrangian) strains are given by $\epsilon_{ij}^e = \epsilon_{ij} - \epsilon_{ij}^*$. The Piola-Kirchhoff stresses associated to the elastic (Lagrangian) strains are given by:

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \epsilon_{ij}^e} = \tau_{ij} + \mathbb{C}_{ijkl} (\epsilon_{kl} - \epsilon_{kl}^*) . \quad (\text{B.3})$$

As such, the energy density Ψ , the in-plane stresses $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S$ and the transverse stresses $\sigma_j^\perp$ can be decomposed in terms of their in-plane and transverse parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &= \Psi_0 + \frac{1}{2} \tau_{\alpha\beta}^S (\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^S - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{*,S}) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S (\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^S - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{*,S}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \tau_j^\perp (\epsilon_j^\perp - \epsilon_j^{*,\perp}) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_j^\perp (\epsilon_j^\perp - \epsilon_j^{*,\perp}) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S = \tau_{\alpha\beta}^S + \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda} (\epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^S - \epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^{*,S}) + \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta 3k} (\epsilon_k^\perp - \epsilon_k^{*,\perp}) , \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\sigma_j^\perp = \tau_j^\perp + \mathbb{C}_{3j\kappa\lambda} (\epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^S - \epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^{*,S}) + \mathbb{C}_{3j 3k} (\epsilon_k^\perp - \epsilon_k^{*,\perp}) . \quad (\text{B.6})$$

From equation (B.6), the transverse strains can be expressed as,

$$\epsilon_k^\perp = \epsilon_k^{*,\perp} - \mathbb{M}_{kj}^\perp \tau_j^\perp + \mathbb{M}_{kj}^\perp \sigma_j^\perp - \gamma_{k\alpha\beta} (\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^S - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{*,S}) , \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where $\mathbb{M}_{kj}^\perp$ and $\gamma_{k\alpha\beta}$ are given by:

$$\mathbb{M}_{kj}^\perp = \mathbb{C}_{3k 3j}^{-1} , \quad \gamma_{k\alpha\beta} = \mathbb{M}_{kj}^\perp \mathbb{C}_{3j\alpha\beta} . \quad (\text{B.8})$$

859 Introducing equation (B.7) into equation (B.5), the surface stress tensor $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S$ is given
 860 by:

$$\sigma_{\alpha\beta}^S = \hat{\tau}_{\alpha\beta}^S + \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda}^S \left(\epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^S - \epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^{*,S} \right) + \gamma_{j\alpha\beta} \sigma_j^\perp, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

861 where

$$\hat{\tau}_{\alpha\beta}^S = \tau_{\alpha\beta}^S - \tau_j^\perp \gamma_{j\alpha\beta}, \quad \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda}^S = \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda} - \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta 3k} \gamma_{k\kappa\lambda}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

862 Introducing both equations (B.7) and (B.9) into equation (B.4), the energy density
 863 Ψ finally becomes:

$$\Psi = \hat{\Psi}_0 + \hat{\tau}_{\alpha\beta}^S \left(\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^S - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{*,S} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{C}_{\alpha\beta\kappa\lambda}^S \left(\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^S - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{*,S} \right) \left(\epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^S - \epsilon_{\kappa\lambda}^{*,S} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_j^\perp \mathbb{M}_{jk}^\perp \sigma_k^\perp, \quad (\text{B.11})$$

864 where

$$\hat{\Psi}_0 = \Psi_0 - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{M}_{jk} \tau_j^\perp \tau_k^\perp. \quad (\text{B.12})$$