




ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Computational Materials Science

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/commsci

Letter

Elastic properties of graphyne-based nanotubes

J.M. De Sousa^a, R.A. Bizard^d, V.P. Sousa Filho^{b,h}, A.L. Aguiar^{b,*}, V.R. Coluci^g, N.M. Pugno^{d,e,i}, E.C. Girao^b, A.G. Souza Filho^f, D.S. Galvao^c^a Instituto Federal do Piauí – IFPI, São Raimundo Nonato, Piauí 64770-000, Brazil^b Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Piauí, Teresina, Piauí 64049-550, Brazil^c Applied Physics Department and Center of Computational Engineering and Science, University of Campinas – UNICAMP, Campinas, SP 13083-959, Brazil^d Department of Civil, Environmental and Mechanical Engineering, Laboratory of Bio-Inspired and Graphene Nanomechanics, University of Trento, via Mesiano, 77, 38123 Trento, Italy^e School of Engineering and Materials Science, Queen Mary University of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, United Kingdom^f Departamento de Física, Centro de Ciências, Universidade Federal de Ceará, Fortaleza, CE 60455-760, Brazil^g School of Technology, University of Campinas – UNICAMP, Limeira 13484-332 SP, Brazil^h Instituto Federal do Maranhão – IFMA, Grajaú, Maranhão 65940-000, Brazilⁱ Ket-Lab, Edoardo Amaldi Foundation, via del Politecnico snc, I-00133 Roma, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Carbon nanotubes
Graphyne
Mechanical properties
Reactive molecular dynamics
Density functional theory
Nanotechnology

ABSTRACT

Graphyne nanotubes (GNTs) are nanostructures obtained from rolled up graphyne sheets, in the same way carbon nanotubes (CNTs) are obtained from graphene ones. Graphynes are 2D carbon-allotropes composed of atoms in sp and sp^2 hybridized states. Similarly to conventional CNTs, GNTs can present different chiralities and electronic properties. Because of the acetylenic groups (triple bonds), GNTs exhibit large sidewall pores that influence their mechanical properties. In this work, we studied the mechanical response of GNTs under tensile stress using fully atomistic molecular dynamics simulations and density functional theory (DFT) calculations. Our results show that GNTs mechanical failure (fracture) occurs at larger strain values in comparison to corresponding CNTs, but paradoxically with smaller ultimate strength and Young's modulus values. This is a consequence of the combined effects of the existence of triple bonds and increased porosity/flexibility due to the presence of acetylenic groups.

1. Introduction

Graphene became one of the most studied structures in materials science since its first experimental realization in 2004 [1]. The advent of graphene created a renewed interest in the investigation of other 2D carbon-based nanostructures such as carbon nitride [2], pentagraphene [3], phagraphene [4] and the so-called graphynes [5], among others. Proposed by Baughman, Eckhardt and Kertesz in 1987, graphyne is a generic name for a family of 2D carbon-allotropes formed by carbon atoms in sp and sp^2 hybridized states connecting benzenoid-like rings [5]. The possibility of creating different graphyne structures with different porosities, electronic and/or mechanical properties can be exploited in several technological applications, such as energy storage [6,7] and water purification [8,9]. The recent advances in synthetic routes to some graphyne-like structures [10] have attracted much attention to graphyne, since theoretical calculations have revealed interesting mechanical properties of single-layer [11,12] and multi-layer

graphyne [13], as well the presence of Dirac cones [14].

Similarly to 2D, quasi-1D carbon structures have also received special attention in the last decades. For example, CNTs have been used as field-emission electron sources [15], tissue scaffolds [16], actuators [17], and artificial muscles [18]. Because CNTs can be conceptually seen as graphene sheets rolled up into cylindrical form [19–21], the same concept has been used to propose graphyne-based nanotubes (GNTs). Preserving the same CNT (n, m) nomenclature to describe nanotubes of different chiralities, different GNT families were theoretically predicted by Coluci et. al. [22–24] (Fig. 1). GNTs exhibit different electronic properties in comparison to CNTs, for instance, γ -GNTs are predicted to have the same band gap for any diameter [25]. There is a renewed interest in their electronic properties [26]. Likewise the electronic behavior and mechanical properties of GNTs also show interesting features [27,28]. For example, molecular dynamics (MD) simulations have shown that, under twisting deformations, GNTs would be superplastic and more flexible than CNTs, with fracture occurring at

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: acrisiolins@ufpi.edu.br (A.L. Aguiar).




Fig. 1. (a) Quasi-1D nanotubes and (b) 2D carbon nanostructures. (a) From left to right: α -GNT(4, 4), CNT(11, 11), and γ -GNT(4, 4). (b) 2D carbon sheets that generated the above nanotubes.

angles three times larger than those of CNTs [29]. In another recent MD work [25] carried out with AIREBO potential, the mechanical properties of graphynes-based nanotubes of γ type (γ -GNTs) were predicted to not be very sensitive to their length and to the strain rate, while the Young's modulus (Y) values increase with larger diameters.

Although there is a great interest in the properties of GNTs, a fully comprehensive investigation of their mechanical properties has not been yet fully carried out and it is one of the objectives of the present work. In this work we have investigated the behavior of GNTs under mechanical tensile stress using fully atomistic reactive molecular dynamics (MD) and density functional theory (DFT) calculations.

2. Methodology

2.1. Molecular dynamics simulations

Fully atomistic reactive MD simulations were carried out to predict the tensile stress/strain behavior of CNTs, α -GNTs, and γ -GNTs (Fig. 2). These simulations were performed using the LAMMPS (Large-scale Atomic/Molecular Massively Parallel Simulator) [30] code with the reactive Force Field (ReaxFF) [31]. ReaxFF is a classical reactive potential suitable for studying fracture mechanics and breaking/formation. There are many ReaxFF parameter sets, in the present work we used the parametrization described in [32]. In contrast with more standard force fields, ReaxFF can describe breaking and bond formation. Its parameters are obtained from first-principles calculations of model structures and/or experimental data [31]. ReaxFF has been successfully used in the study of mechanical properties of nanostructured systems similar to those studied here [33,11,34,29,35,36].

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of ReaxFF and its parameterizations in the simulations that we run, several stretching tests in carbon nanotubes were carried out considering different sets of parameters (see Supplementary material) and they were compared to the literature. The Mattsson's set of parameters [32] showed to be adequate for our purpose, as we obtained a satisfactory stress-strain curve and




Fig. 2. Schematic of the tensile stress/strain simulations for: (a) α -GNT; (b) CNT, and; (c) γ -GNT. The arrows indicate the stretching (axial) direction.

consequently good values for critical strain, ultimate strength and Young's modulus.

In order to eliminate any residual stress present on the structures, we carried out an energy minimization followed by a NPT thermalization before starting the tube stretch (tensile) processes. The tensile calculations were performed by stretching the nanotubes until fracture within NVT ensemble at room temperature (300 K). A chain of three Nosé-Hoover thermostats was used to control initial oscillations of the temperature [37]. We used a constant engineering tensile strain rate $\epsilon = 10^{-6}/\text{fs}$ so that the nanotube length L evolves as $L(t) = L_0(1 + \epsilon t)$, where L_0 is the initial nanotube length. This strain rate is small enough to provide enough time to tube structural stabilization/reconstruction.

We considered 8 nanotubes of each type (CNT, α -GNT, and γ -GNT), equally distributed between armchair and zigzag geometries. We also calculated the mechanical properties of CNTs with similar geometrical characteristics of the studied GNTs for comparison purposes. The selected CNTs ($n, 0$), and (n, n) cases were $n = 11, 14, 25, 50$. In order to have GNTs with similar diameters, we chose ($n, 0$) and (n, n) with $n = 4, 5, 9, 18$, for both α -GNTs and γ -GNTs (Table 1).

During the stretching process we calculated the virial stress along the stretching direction z (σ_z), as defined by [38,39]:

$$\sigma_z = \sigma_{zz} = V^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^N (m_k v_{kz} v_{kz} + r_{kz} f_{kz}), \quad (1)$$

where $V = Ah = L_0 \pi d_t h$ is the volume (considering a hollow cylinder) of the nanotube with d_t being its diameter, N the number of atoms, m_k the mass, v the velocity, r the position, f the force per atom, respectively. We adopted the standard graphene thickness value of $h = 3.34 \text{ \AA}$ (graphite interlayer distance) in all our calculations.

From the linear regime of each stress-strain curve we obtained the Young's modulus values, which are defined as:

$$Y = \frac{\sigma_z}{\epsilon_z}, \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon_z = (L - L_0)/L_0$ is the applied strain along the z -direction (nanotube periodic axis) and σ_z is the tensor component of the virial stress along the z -direction. We also calculated the normalized Young's modulus values ($Y_\rho = Y/\rho$) accordingly to the density of each structure ($\rho = m/(L_0 \pi d_t h)$).

Table 1Geometry information (N = number of atoms, d_t = nanotube diameter and L = nanotube length) of the studied nanotubes in our present work.

CNT	N	d_t (Å)	L (Å)	α -GNT	N	d_t (Å)	L (Å)	γ -GNT	N	d_t (Å)	L (Å)
(11,0)	352	8.61	34.08	(4,0)	192	8.82	36.00	(4,0)	288	8.71	35.54
(14,0)	448	10.96	34.08	(5,0)	240	11.00	36.00	(5,0)	360	10.89	35.54
(25,0)	800	19.57	34.08	(9,0)	432	19.85	36.00	(9,0)	648	19.60	35.54
(50,0)	1600	39.14	34.08	(18,0)	864	39.70	36.00	(18,0)	1296	39.19	35.54
(11,11)	616	14.92	34.43	(4,4)	320	15.28	34.64	(4,4)	480	15.10	34.20
(14,14)	784	18.98	34.43	(5,5)	400	19.10	34.64	(5,5)	600	18.86	34.20
(25,25)	1400	33.90	34.43	(9,9)	720	34.38	34.64	(9,9)	1080	33.94	34.20
(50,50)	2800	67.80	34.43	(18,18)	1440	68.75	34.64	(18,18)	2160	67.89	34.20

The spatial distribution of the stress during the stretching was calculated using the von Mises stress σ_v^k , defined as:

$$\sigma_v^k = \sqrt{\frac{(\sigma_{11}^k - \sigma_{22}^k)^2 + (\sigma_{22}^k - \sigma_{33}^k)^2 + (\sigma_{11}^k - \sigma_{33}^k)^2 + 6((\sigma_{12}^k)^2 + (\sigma_{23}^k)^2 + (\sigma_{31}^k)^2)}{2}} \quad (3)$$

2.2. DFT calculations

In order to test the reliability of the MD results and also to validate them, we also carried out a systematic study of α - and γ -GNTs under uniaxial strain using DFT methods [40,41], as implemented in the SIESTA (Spanish Initiative for Electronic Simulations with Thousands of Atoms) code [42,43]. The Kohn-Sham orbitals were expanded in a double- ζ basis set composed of numerical pseudoatomic orbitals of finite range enhanced with polarization orbitals. A common atomic confinement energy shift of 0.02 Ry was used to define the cutoff radii of the basis functions, while the fineness of the real space grid was determined by a mesh cutoff of 400 Ry [44]. For the exchange-correlation potential, we used the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) [45]. The pseudopotentials were modelled within the norm-conserving Troullier-Martins [46] scheme in the Kleinman-Bylander [47] factorized form. Brillouin-zone integrations were performed using a Monkhorst-Pack [48] grid of $1 \times 1 \times 8$ k-points. All geometries were fully optimized for each strain value until the maximum force component on any atom was less than 0.01 eV/Å. For each strained structural geometry relaxation, the SCF convergence thresholds for electronic total energy were set at 10^{-4} eV.

Periodic boundary conditions were imposed, with perpendicular lattice vectors a_x and a_y large enough (~ 40 Å) to simulate vacuum and avoid spurious interactions between periodic images. Similar to MD methodology, each strain level is defined as $\varepsilon_z = (L - L_0)/L_0$, where L_0 and L hold for the relaxed and strained nanotube length, respectively. Again, the graphyne nanotube was treated as a rolled membrane with thickness h equal to 3.34 Å and area equals to $\pi d_t L_0$, where d_t is the nanotube diameter. In the DFT study, the axial stress component σ_z is related to the strain component ε_z with the static relation $\sigma_z = (1/V)(\partial U / \partial \varepsilon_z)$, where $V = L\pi d_t h$ is the volume of the strained nanotube membrane.

3. Results

The obtained critical strain (ε_c) and the ultimate strength (US) MD values for the studied nanotubes are presented in Table 2. The complete structural failure (fracture) of both zigzag-aligned CNTs and γ -GNTs occurred around similar ε_c . On the other hand, different ε_c were observed for armchair CNTs and γ -GNTs. Especially, α -GNTs showed the highest ε_c values for both zigzag and armchair nanotubes. We attributed these differences to the large pore size (see Fig. 1), notably for α -GNTs, and the characteristic bonding between acetylene groups in GNTs. γ -GNTs have hexagonal rings bonded to each other by acetylene groups that are not present in CNTs. This type of arrangement on GNTs

Table 2Critical strain (ε_c) and ultimate strength (US) values for CNTs, α - and γ -GNTs.

CNT	ε_c	US (GPa)	α -GNT	ε_c	US (GPa)	γ -GNT	ε_c	US (GPa)
(11,0)	0.16	122	(4,0)	0.24	45	(4,0)	0.14	81
(14,0)	0.14	111	(5,0)	0.24	49	(5,0)	0.12	68
(25,0)	0.14	118	(9,0)	0.25	46	(9,0)	0.13	79
(50,0)	0.13	115	(18,0)	0.25	45	(18,0)	0.14	81
(11,11)	0.18	166	(4,4)	0.18	44	(4,4)	0.11	47
(14,14)	0.16	170	(5,5)	0.18	44	(5,5)	0.09	48
(25,25)	0.17	167	(9,9)	0.19	45	(9,9)	0.11	48
(50,50)	0.18	166	(18,18)	0.18	44	(18,18)	0.12	49

significantly affects their mechanical properties.

The GNTs and CNTs structural failure (fracture) processes can be better understood following the evolution of the von Mises stress distributions from the MD snapshots of the tensile stretch (Figs. 3–5). From these Figures it is possible to observe high stress accumulation lines (in red) along the bonds parallel to the externally applied strain direction. These lines are composed of single and triple bonds in the armchair α -GNTs and only by double bonds in the zigzag α -GNTs (Fig. 3). Fracture patterns of α -GNTs indicate that bond breaking evolves initially from the single bonds for armchair nanotubes (highlighted rectangle of Fig. 3(b)) until complete fracture (Fig. 3(c)). As in the armchair case, the zigzag α -GNT presents high stress accumulation along the chain of double bonds (as those are parallel to the nanotube main axis – see Fig. 3(f)), with bond breaking starting from these bonds (highlighted in Fig. 3(g)). Fig. 3(d), (e) show the covalent bonds of an armchair α -GNT before and after applying strain along the nanotube main axis. The initial hexagonal shape of the pore changes to a more rectangular-like shape (red dashed rectangle in Fig. 3(d)). This evolution patterns are consequences of the high tube flexibility, and it is responsible for the significant differences in the critical strain for armchair and zigzag α -GNTs. Similar behavior was reported for graphyne membranes [49]. Because the pores of zigzag α -GNTs (Fig. 3(j)) are more flexible, they exhibit larger critical strain than armchair α -GNTs (Fig. 3(e)). The instants of the complete fracture are shown in Fig. 3(h).

Similar results were also observed for armchair/zigzag γ -GNTs (Fig. 4) and CNTs (Fig. 5). Fig. 4(d), (e), (i), (j) show how the aromatic ring and the neighboring acetylene groups change during stretching. For the armchair γ -GNT, the six acetylene chains work as stress transmitter to the aromatic ring until the ring fracture. For the zigzag γ -GNT the fracture pattern is different with the fracture occurring on the single bonds of the acetylene groups. For CNTs (Fig. 5), the stress is highly accumulated on the zigzag chains along the direction of the nanotube main axis, as in GNTs. The fracture starts from the bonds parallel and nearly parallel to the nanotube main axis for the zigzag and armchair CNTs, respectively. Because CNTs lack the acetylene chains, the structure is more rigid, the stress is accumulated directly on the hexagonal rings, the critical strains are smaller, and the ultimate




Fig. 3. Representative MD snapshots of a tensile stretch of the armchair (4, 0) (top) and zigzag (4, 0) (bottom) α -GNT. (a, f) Lateral view of the strained nanotube colored accordingly to the von Mises stress values (low stress in blue and high stress in red). (b, g) Zoomed view of the starting of bond breaking. (c, h) MD snapshot of the nanotube just after fracture. Diagrams showing the ring dynamics of the armchair ((d) and (e)) and zigzag ((i) and (j)) α -GNT can also be seen.

strength value is larger.

The stress-strain curves for α -GNTs, γ -GNTs, and CNTs with similar diameters (Fig. 6) are characterized by the existence of linear (elastic) and plastic regimes, where the bonds start to break until reaching a complete fracture, which is characterized by an abrupt stress drop. The Young's modulus values of the nanotubes studied here are presented in Table 3. The obtained Young's modulus of the (25, 25) and (25, 0) CNTs were 995 GPa and 821 GPa, respectively, in good agreement with the average value 1020 GPa of single-walled CNTs obtained by Krishnan et al. [50]. As expected from the dynamics of the pore shape, γ -GNTs exhibit higher Young's modulus values when compared to α -GNTs ones. The average Young's modulus values of the (5, 5) γ -GNT calculated here was 465 GPa, which is in agreement with a recent study, developed with the use of (AIREBO) potential, in which the obtained Young's modulus value was 466 GPa [25,28].

The normalized Young's modulus Y_p are presented in Table 3. While the α -GNTs values are small, the corresponding ones of γ -GNTs and CNTs are comparable, indicating that when the density is taken into account, in spite of their porosity, it is still possible to have graphyne structures with relative high Y_p values. This is clearly evidenced for the case of (9, 0) γ -GNT, which possesses an even higher Y_p in comparison to conventional CNTs.

In Fig. 7 we present the stress-strain curves obtained from DFT calculations for some α -GNTs, γ -GNTs, and CNTs superimposed with the same curves obtained from MD simulations. As we can see from the Figure, there is a good agreement between the methods, especially regarding the linear regime (Young's modulus values) and ultimate strength (US) values, although there is a tendency of larger values from DFT results.

The α -GNTs are predicted to have the lowest Young's modulus value




Fig. 4. Representative MD snapshots of a tensile stretch of the armchair (4, 4) (top) and zigzag (4, 0) (bottom) γ -GNT. (a, f) Lateral view of the strained nanotube colored accordingly to the von Mises stress values (low stress in blue and high stress in red). (b, g) Zoomed view of the starting of bond breaking. (c, h) MD snapshot of the nanotube just after fracture. Diagrams showing the ring dynamics of the armchair ((d) and (e)) and zigzag ((i) and (j)) γ -GNT can also be seen.

when compared to γ -GNTs and the corresponding CNTs. We also obtained similar fracture patterns from both MD and DFT methods which bond breaking evolves initially, for example, from the single bonds for α -GNTs (see [Supplementary material](#)). Interestingly, α -GNTs become stiffer as they are stretched. The values of Young's modulus for α -GNTs are almost twice from the unrestrained configuration (171 GPa and 80 GPa for (4,4) and (4,0), respectively) to strained configuration of $\epsilon_z = 0.18 - 0.24$. Also, the large flexibility of α -GNTs leads to critical strains up to 40% of their original length and considerable toughness values, as can be seen in [Table 4](#).

In [Fig. 8](#) we plot the ultimate strength (US) as a function of the Young's modulus values for CNTs, γ -GNTs and α -GNTs, for DFT and MD results. As we can see from this Figure, there is a good agreement between DFT and MD results as the structures occupy different niche values. With relation to these aspects, conventional CNTs perform better as they possess the highest Young's modulus and ultimate

strength values, followed by γ -GNTs with intermediate values and lastly by α -GNTs with lower values.

Despite our study was focused in first-order elastic properties and fracture behavior, we have performed non-linear analysis of our stress-strain curves. Since the graphyne nanotubes studied here in our paper are typical 1D nanomaterials, the higher-order elastic modulus tensor C is, by definition, very simple. Following the nomenclature used in [\[13\]](#), the C_{11} , C_{111} , C_{1111} , C_{11111} coefficients are respectively the second-order elastic constants (SOEC), third-order elastic constants (TOEC), fourth-order elastic constants (FOEC), and fifth-order elastic constants (FFOEC) values. Therefore, the stress-strain curves of graphyne nanotubes were fitted with a non-linear polynomial relation up to 4th order of strain:

$$\sigma(GPa) = \alpha \epsilon_z + \frac{\beta}{2!} \epsilon_z^2 + \frac{\gamma}{3!} \epsilon_z^3 + \frac{\delta}{4!} \epsilon_z^4 \tag{4}$$




Fig. 5. Representative MD snapshots of a tensile stretch of conventional CNTs (armchair (11, 11) (top) and zigzag (11, 0) (bottom)). (a, d) Lateral view of the strained nanotube colored accordingly to the von Mises stress values (low stress in blue and high stress in red). (b, e) Zoomed view of the starting of bond breaking. (c, f) MD snapshot of the nanotube just after fracture.




Fig. 6. Stress-strain curves obtained for CNTs ((25, 25) and (25, 0), green color), α -GNTs ((9, 9) and (9, 0), red color), and γ -GNTs ((9, 9) and (9, 0), blue color) at 300 K.

Coefficients ($\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$) of Eq. (4) are the non-linear elastic constants (SOEC, TOEC, FOEC and FFOEC, respectively) of such 1D system. The results of the non-linear elastic constants are grouped in SOEC, TOEC, FOEC and FFOEC and listed in Table 5 in units of GPa.

From Table 5, we can see that TOECs and FFOECs are all negative while all FOECs are positive, except in the case of α -GNT(4,4) within DFT framework and γ -GNT(4,4) within MD framework. This behavior is similar to that was found by Peng et al. [13] in the study of 2D graphyne stretched membranes. As discussed before, the DFT stress strain curves show that γ -GNT tubes will soften when the strain is larger than an ideal strain. From the view of electron bonding, this is due to the bond weakening and breaking and determined by the negative TOECs

and FFOECs values, since the negative values of TOECs and FFOECs ensure the softening of those graphyne tubes under large strain beyond ideal strains. In the case of α -GNT(4,4), the DFT stress-strain curves show that there is a local hardening before the softening close to the rupture. We suggest that those effect are not observed α -GNT(4,4) within MD framework due to temperature effects.

4. Conclusions

We investigated the structural and mechanical properties of graphyne tubes (GNTs) of different diameters and chiralities, through fully atomistic reactive molecular dynamics and DFT calculations. We also

Table 3
Young's modulus (Y) and normalized Young's modulus (Y_ρ) values for CNTs, α - and γ -GNTs.

CNT	Y (GPa)	$Y_\rho \left(\frac{\text{GPa} \cdot \text{m}^3}{\text{kg}} \right)$	α -GNT	Y (GPa)	$Y_\rho \left(\frac{\text{GPa} \cdot \text{m}^3}{\text{kg}} \right)$	γ -GNT	Y (GPa)	$Y_\rho \left(\frac{\text{GPa} \cdot \text{m}^3}{\text{kg}} \right)$
(11,0)	710	0.3185	(4,0)	80	0.0711	(4,0)	581	0.3386
(14,0)	811	0.3662	(5,0)	77	0.0680	(5,0)	525	0.3061
(25,0)	821	0.3699	(9,0)	75	0.0668	(9,0)	657	0.3831
(50,0)	881	0.3956	(18,0)	70	0.0621	(18,0)	633	0.3684
(11,11)	953	0.4298	(4,4)	171	0.1518	(4,4)	430	0.2530
(14,14)	998	0.4553	(5,5)	157	0.1414	(5,5)	465	0.2761
(25,25)	995	0.4532	(9,9)	145	0.1285	(9,9)	463	0.2742
(50,50)	911	0.4137	(18,18)	149	0.1325	(18,18)	472	0.2842




Fig. 7. Stress-strain curves obtained from DFT and MD calculations for conventional CNTs, α -GNTs and γ -GNTs.

Table 4
Toughness (τ) for different nanotubes calculated from DFT calculations.

Chirality	τ (GJ/m ³)
α -GNT (4,0)	7.68
α -GNT (4,4)	7.38
γ -GNT (4,0)	9.63
γ -GNT (4,4)	5.58
CNT (7,7)	15.99
CNT (11,0)	15.87
CNT (20,0)	13.93
CNT (12,12)	14.00

considered conventional carbon nanotubes (CNTs), for comparison purposes. Our results show that the complete structural failure (fracture) of both zigzag-aligned CNTs and γ -GNTs occurred around similar critical strain values (ϵ_c), but quite distinctly for armchair CNTs and γ -GNTs. In particular, α -GNTs showed the highest (ϵ_c) values for both zigzag and armchair nanotubes. With relation to the fracture patterns, under stretch the stress accumulation occur along lines of covalent bonds parallel to the externally applied strain direction. These lines are composed of single and triple bonds in the armchair α -GNTs and only by double bonds in the zigzag α -GNTs. Similar results were obtained for γ -GNTs. The stress-strain curves for α -GNTs, γ -GNTs, and CNTs with similar diameters are characterized by the existence of linear (elastic) and plastic regimes, where the bonds start to break and propagate until reaching a complete fracture. But in contrast to CNTs, graphyne nanotubes exhibit significant diameter-dependent structural transitions




Fig. 8. Ultimate Strength (US) values as function of the Young's modulus values for different structures. CNTs, γ -GNTs and α -GNTs are respectively in black, blue and red. Filled (open) symbols hold for MD (DFT) results.

Table 5
Non-linear elastic constants (in units of GPa) obtained for all simulated systems. Validation of continuum description of stress-strain curves are indicated by the maximum strain used (ϵ_z^{max}) in the non-linear fitting which is close to the observed critical strain (ϵ_c).

Nanotube	SOEC (α)	TOEC (β)	FOEC (γ)	FFOEC (δ)	ϵ_z^{max}
CNT(11,0)-DFT	1016.21	-5317.03	17730.05	-228023.99	0.22
CNT(7,7)-DFT	1048.51	-7174.16	65476.32	-701708.82	0.22
γ -(4,0)-DFT	469.51	-450.39	30111.25	-962105.16	0.18
γ -(4,4)-DFT	498.24	-2429.72	34641.83	-691508.93	0.17
α -(4,4)-DFT	33.62	3335.77	-35642.25	131374.36	0.30
α -(4,0)-DFT	77.13	-963.66	48210.28	-479692.13	0.22
γ -(4,0)-MD	516.43	-8464.34	425043.55	-6667006.00	0.14
γ -(4,4)-MD	195.40	12351.78	-358263.30	4398955.07	0.11
α -(4,4)-MD	125.30	-2263.14	101451.39	-914086.19	0.18
α -(4,0)-MD	178.09	-6582.69	164428.52	-1364723.00	0.24

after threshold (ϵ_c). With relation to the Young's modulus values, as expected CNTs exhibit larger values than graphyne nanotubes, but when these values are density normalized (Y_ρ), the graphyne and CNTs values are comparable, indicating that in spite of their porosity, it is still possible to have graphyne structures with relative high Y_ρ values.

Data availability

The data required to reproduce the work reported in the manuscript can be found in José Moreira de Sousa – email:josemoreiradesousa@gmail.com.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

J.M. De Sousa: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Data_curation, Writing_%E2%80%93original_draft, Writing_%E2%80%93review_%26_editing. **R.A. Bizaio:** Methodology, Software, Validation, Data_curation, Writing_%E2%80%93review_%26_editing. **V.P. Sousa Filho:** Validation, Data_curation, Writing_%E2%80%93review_%26_editing. **A.L. Aguiar:** Methodology, Software, Validation, Data_curation, Writing_%E2%80%93review_%26_editing. **V.R. Coluci:** Validation, Data_curation, Writing_%E2%80%93review_%26_editing. **N.M. Pugno:** Validation, Data_curation, Writing_%E2%80%93review_%26_editing. **E.C. Giraio:** Validation, Data_curation, Writing_%E2%80%93review_%26_editing. **A.G. Souza Filho:** Methodology, Writing_%E2%80%93review_%26_editing, Resources, Supervision. **D.S. Galvao:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing_%E2%80%93review_%26_editing, Resources, Supervision.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by CAPES, CNPq, FAPESP, ERC and the Graphene FET Flagship. J.M.S., R.A.B. and D.S.G. thank the Center for Computational Engineering and Sciences at Unicamp for financial support through the FAPESP/CEPID Grant 2013/08293-7. J.M.S., A.G.S.F, A.L.A. and E.C.G. acknowledge support from PROCAD 2013/CAPES program. E.C.G. acknowledges support from CNPq (Process No. 307927/2017-2, and Process No. 429785/2018-6). J.M.S., A.L.A. and E.C.G. thank the Laboratório de Simulação Computacional Cajúna (LSCC) at Universidade Federal do Piauí for computational support. V.R.C. acknowledges the financial support of FAPESP (Grant 16/01736-9). A.L.A. and V.P.S.F. acknowledges CENAPAD-SP for computer time and the Brazilian agencies CNPq (Processes No. 427175/2016-0 and 313845/2018-2) for financial support. R.A.B. is supported by UE H2020 Neurofibres n. 40102909. N.M.P. gratefully acknowledges the support of the grants by the European Commission Graphene Flagship Core 2 n. 785219 (WP14 “Composites”) and FET Proactive “Neurofibres” n. 732344 as well as of the grant by MIUR “Departments of Excellence” grant L. 232/2016, ARS01-01384-PROSCAN and PRIN-20177TTP3S.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.commat.2019.109153>.

References

- [1] K.S. Novoselov, A.K. Geim, S.V. Morozov, D. Jiang, Y. Zhang, S.V. Dubonos, I.V. Grigorieva, A.A. Firsov, Electric field effect in atomically thin carbon films, *Science* 306 (5696) (2004) 666–669, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1102896> URL:<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/306/5696/666>.
- [2] A. Thomas, A. Fischer, F. Goettmann, M. Antonietti, J.-O. Müller, R. Schlögl, J.M. Carlsson, Graphitic carbon nitride materials: variation of structure and morphology and their use as metal-free catalysts, *J. Mater. Chem.* 18 (41) (2008) 4893–4908.
- [3] S. Zhang, J. Zhou, Q. Wang, X. Chen, Y. Kawazoe, P. Jena, Penta-graphene: a new carbon allotrope, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 112 (8) (2015) 2372–2377.
- [4] Z. Wang, X.-F. Zhou, X. Zhang, Q. Zhu, H. Dong, M. Zhao, A.R. Oganov, Phagraphene: a low-energy graphene allotrope composed of 5–6–7 carbon rings with distorted dirac cones, *Nano Lett.* 15 (9) (2015) 6182–6186.
- [5] R. Baughman, H. Eckhardt, M. Kertesz, Structure-property predictions for new planar forms of carbon: layered phases containing sp² and sp atoms, *J. Chem. Phys.* 87 (11) (1987) 6687–6699.
- [6] K. Srinivasu, S.K. Ghosh, Graphyne and graphdiyne: promising materials for nanoelectronics and energy storage applications, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 116 (9) (2012) 5951–5956.
- [7] H.J. Hwang, J. Koo, M. Park, N. Park, Y. Kwon, H. Lee, Multilayer graphynes for lithium ion battery anode, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 117 (14) (2013) 6919–6923.
- [8] S. Lin, M.J. Buehler, Mechanics and molecular filtration performance of graphyne nanoweb membranes for selective water purification, *Nanoscale* 5 (23) (2013) 11801–11807.
- [9] J. Kou, X. Zhou, H. Lu, F. Wu, J. Fan, Graphyne as the membrane for water desalination, *Nanoscale* 6 (3) (2014) 1865–1870.
- [10] M.M. Haley, Synthesis and properties of annulenic subunits of graphyne and graphdiyne nanoarchitectures, *Pure Appl. Chem.* 80 (3) (2008) 519–532.
- [11] S.W. Cranford, M.J. Buehler, Mechanical properties of graphyne, *Carbon* 49 (13) (2011) 4111–4121.
- [12] Y. Zhang, Q. Pei, C. Wang, Mechanical properties of graphynes under tension: a molecular dynamics study, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 101 (8) (2012) 081909.
- [13] Q. Peng, W. Ji, S. De, Mechanical properties of graphyne monolayers: a first-principles study, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 14 (38) (2012) 13385–13391.
- [14] B.G. Kim, H.J. Choi, Graphyne: hexagonal network of carbon with versatile dirac cones, *Phys. Rev. B* 86 (11) (2012) 115435.
- [15] W.A. De Heer, A. Chatelain, D. Ugarte, A carbon nanotube field-emission electron source, *Science* 270 (5239) (1995) 1179–1180.
- [16] B.S. Harrison, A. Atala, Carbon nanotube applications for tissue engineering, *Biomaterials* 28 (2) (2007) 344–353.
- [17] R.H. Baughman, C. Cui, A.A. Zakhidov, Z. Iqbal, J.N. Barisci, G.M. Spinks, G.G. Wallace, A. Mazzoldi, D. De Rossi, O.J.S.R. Rinzler, G. Andrew, M. Kertesz, Carbon nanotube actuators, *Science* 284 (5418) (1999) 1340–1344.
- [18] M.D. Lima, N. Li, M.J. De Andrade, S. Fang, J. Oh, G.M. Spinks, M.E. Kozlov, C.S. Haines, D. Suh, J.F. Foroughi, et al., Electrically, chemically, and photonically powered torsional and tensile actuation of hybrid carbon nanotube yarn muscles, *Science* 338 (6109) (2012) 928–932.
- [19] S. Iijima, et al., Helical microtubules of graphitic carbon, *Nature* 354 (6348) (1991) 56–58.
- [20] M. Dresselhaus, G. Dresselhaus, R. Saito, Physics of carbon nanotubes, *Carbon* 33 (7) (1995) 883–891.
- [21] R. Saito, G. Dresselhaus, M.S. Dresselhaus, et al., Physical Properties of Carbon Nanotubes vol. 35, World Scientific, 1998.
- [22] V. Coluci, S. Braga, S. Legoas, D. Galvao, R. Baughman, Families of carbon nanotubes: graphyne-based nanotubes, *Phys. Rev. B* 68 (3) (2003) 035430.
- [23] V. Coluci, S. Braga, S. Legoas, D. Galvao, R. Baughman, New families of carbon nanotubes based on graphyne motifs, *Nanotechnology* 15 (4) (2004) S142.
- [24] V. Coluci, D. Galvao, R. Baughman, Theoretical investigation of electromechanical effects for graphyne carbon nanotubes, *J. Chem. Phys.* 121 (7) (2004) 3228–3237.
- [25] M. Li, Y. Zhang, Y. Jiang, Y. Zhang, Y. Wang, H. Zhou, Mechanical properties of γ -graphyne nanotubes, *RSC Adv.* 8 (28) (2018) 15659–15666.
- [26] R. Bizaio, T. Botari, E. Perim, N.M. Pugno, D. Galvao, Graphyne nanotubes: materials with ultralow phonon mean free path and strong optical phonon scattering for thermoelectric applications, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 122 (2018) 22688–22698, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbon.2017.04.018> URL:<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0008622317303743>.
- [27] H. Zhao, D. Wei, H. Shi, X. Zhou, Thermal conductivities of graphyne nanotubes from atomistic simulations, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* 106 (1) (2010) 69–75.
- [28] Y. Yang, X. Xu, Mechanical properties of graphyne and its family – a molecular dynamics investigation, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* 61 (1) (2012) 83–88.
- [29] J.M. de Sousa, G. Brunetto, V.R. Coluci, D.S. Galvao, Torsional ‘superplasticity’ of graphyne nanotubes, *Carbon* 96 (2016) 14–19.
- [30] S. Plimpton, Fast parallel algorithms for short-range molecular dynamics, *J. Comput. Phys.* 117 (1) (1995) 1–19.
- [31] A.C. Van Duin, S. Dasgupta, F. Lorant, W.A. Goddard, Reaxff: a reactive force field for hydrocarbons, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 105 (41) (2001) 9396–9409.
- [32] T.R. Mattsson, J.M.D. Lane, K.R. Cochrane, M.P. Desjarlais, A.P. Thompson, F. Pierce, G.S. Grest, First-principles and classical molecular dynamics simulation of shocked polymers, *Phys. Rev. B* 81 (2010) 054103, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.81.054103>.
- [33] T. Botari, E. Perim, P. Autreto, A. van Duin, R. Paupitz, D. Galvao, Mechanical properties and fracture dynamics of silicene membranes, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 16 (36) (2014) 19417–19423.
- [34] A. Nair, S. Cranford, M. Buehler, The minimal nanowire: mechanical properties of carbon byrne, *Europhys. Lett.* 95 (1) (2011) 16002.
- [35] J.M. de Sousa, T. Botari, E. Perim, R. Bizaio, D.S. Galvao, Mechanical and structural properties of graphene-like carbon nitride sheets, *RSC Adv.* 6 (2016) 76915–76921.
- [36] R. Bizaio, T. Botari, E. Perim, N.M. Pugno, D. Galvao, Mechanical properties and fracture patterns of graphyne (graphitic) nanowiggles, *Carbon* 119 (2017) 431–437, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbon.2017.04.018> URL:<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0008622317303743>.
- [37] D.J. Evans, B.L. Holian, The nose–hoover thermostat, *J. Chem. Phys.* 83 (8) (1985) 4069–4074.
- [38] A.K. Subramanian, C. Sun, Continuum interpretation of virial stress in molecular simulations, *Int. J. Solids Struct.* 45 (14) (2008) 4340–4346.
- [39] A.P. Garcia, M.J. Buehler, Bioinspired nanoporous silicon provides great toughness at great deformability, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* 48 (2) (2010) 303–309.
- [40] P. Hohenberg, W. Kohn, Inhomogeneous electron gas, *Phys. Rev.* 136 (1964) B864–B871, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.136.B864>.
- [41] W. Kohn, L.J. Sham, Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation effects, *Phys. Rev.* 140 (1965) A1133–A1138, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.140.A1133>.
- [42] P. Ordejón, E. Artacho, J.M. Soler, Self-consistent order-n density-functional calculations for very large systems, *Phys. Rev. B* 53 (1996) 10441.
- [43] D. Sánchez-Portal, E. Artacho, J.M. Soler, Density-functional method for very large systems with LCAO basis sets, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* 65 (1997) 453.
- [44] E. Anglada, J.M. Soler, J. Junquera, E. Artacho, Systematic generation of finite-range atomic basis sets for linear-scaling calculations, *Phys. Rev. B* 66 (2002) 205101, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.66.205101>.
- [45] J.P. Perdew, K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, Generalized gradient approximation made

- simple, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996) 3865–3868, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.3865> <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.3865>.
- [46] N. Troullier, J.L. Martins, Efficient pseudopotentials for plane-wave calculations, Phys. Rev. B 43 (1991) 1993.
- [47] L. Kleinman, D.M. Bylander, Efficacious form for model pseudopotentials, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48 (1982) 1425–1428, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.48.1425>.
- [48] H.J. Monkhorst, J.D. Pack, Special points for brillouin-zone integrations, Phys. Rev. B 13 (1976) 5188–5192, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.13.5188>.
- [49] J. Zhao, N. Wei, Z. Fan, J.-W. Jiang, T. Rabczuk, The mechanical properties of three types of carbon allotropes, Nanotechnology 24 (9) (2013) 095702.
- [50] A. Krishnan, E. Dujardin, T. Ebbesen, P. Yianilos, M. Treacy, Young's modulus of single-walled nanotubes, Phys. Rev. B 58 (20) (1998) 14013.

01. Stress-strain curves using several ReaxFF sets.

Several stretching tests in conventional and graphyne carbon nanotubes were carried out considering different sets of ReaxFF parameters.




Figure 1. Stress strain curve of a-GNT(4,0), CNT(11,0) and g-GNT(4,0) using ReaxFF-2013 [1] parameters.




Figure 2. Stress strain curve of α -GNT(4,0), CNT(11,0) and γ -GNT(4,0) using ReaxFF-CHO [2] parameters.




Figure 3. Stress strain curve of α -GNT(4,0), CNT(11,0) and γ -GNT(4,0) using ReaxFF-Mattsson [3] set of parameters.




Figure 4. Stress strain curve of α -GNT(4,0), CNT(11,0) and γ -GNT(4,0) using ReaxFF-Budzien [4] set of parameters.




Figure 5. Stress strain curve of α -GNT(4,0), CNT(11,0) and γ -GNT(4,0) using ReaxFF-FC [5] set of parameters.




Figure 6. Stress strain curve of a-GNT(4,0), CNT(11,0) and g-GNT(4,0) using ReaxFF-FeOH [6] set of parameters.




Figure 7. Stress strain curve of α -GNT(4,0), CNT(11,0) and γ -GNT(4,0) using ReaxFF-Muller [7] set of parameters.




Figure 8. Stress strain curve of a-GNT(4,0), CNT(11,0) and g-GNT(4,0) ReaxFF-RDX [8] set of parameters.




Figure 9. Stress strain curve of α -GNT(4,0), CNT(11,0) and γ -GNT(4,0) using ReaxFF-VOCH [9] set of parameters.

Table 01. Comparison between different ReaxFF set of parameters

ReaxFF set	α -GNT(4,0)			γ -GNT(4,0)			CNT(11,0)		
	Y.M. (GPa)	Critical strain (%)	US (GPa)	Y.M. (GPa)	Critical strain (%)	US (GPa)	Y.M. (GPa)	Critical strain (%)	US (GPa)
Ref.[1]	102.1	28.2	45.0	310.8	45.7	59.0	429.5	32.9	130.0
Ref.[2]	96.5	22.0	38.6	662.8	20.0	74.3	1018.0	24.5	109.9
Ref.[3]	80.0	24.0	45.0	581.0	14.0	81.0	710.0	16.0	122.0
Ref.[4]	79.8	31.8	55.3	567.9	21.2	91.5	681.9	19.1	158.5
Ref.[5]	77.6	34.5	58.5	547.7	20.2	94.6	859.5	20.3	193.0
Ref.[6]	74.6	36.2	71.1	524.6	17.0	90.0	708.7	20.4	191.9
Ref.[7]	78.1	34.66	58.5	547.7	20.1	94.6	859.5	20.3	193.0
Ref.[8]	79.3	27.2	48.0	559.5	20.4	86.4	667.5	19.5	155.0
Ref.[9]	102.4	43.6	35.6	652.6	21.2	63.3	1011.9	24.7	110.7

02. Bond Length Evolution

In order to illustrate how the bonds behave during the stretch process, we calculated the average bond length considering 5 simple and triple bonds randomly selected in the direction of the applied strain as a function of the strain for the (9,9) α -GNT (MD framework) and (4,4) α -GNT (DFT framework) as one can observe in Figure 10a and 10b respectively. It is possible to see that the simple bonds stretch much more than the triple ones, what makes the fracture start at the simple bonds. After the fracture, there is a significative relaxation of simple bonds stretching.




Figure 10: Average bond length evolution of simple and triple bonds in α -GNT(9,9) nanotubes within MD framework (a) and α -GNT(4,4) within DFT framework (b).



03. References

- [1] SRINIVASAN, Sriram Goverapet; VAN DUIN, Adri CT; GANESH, Panchapakesan. Development of a ReaxFF potential for carbon condensed phases and its application to the thermal fragmentation of a large fullerene. **The Journal of Physical Chemistry A**, v. 119, n. 4, p. 571-580, 2015.
- [2] VAN DUIN, Adri CT et al. ReaxFF: a reactive force field for hydrocarbons. **The Journal of Physical Chemistry A**, v. 105, n. 41, p. 9396-9409, 2001.
- [3] MATTSSON, Thomas R. et al. First-principles and classical molecular dynamics simulation of shocked polymers. **Physical Review B**, v. 81, n. 5, p. 054103, 2010.
- [4] BUDZIEN, Joanne; THOMPSON, Aidan P.; ZYBIN, Sergey V. Reactive molecular dynamics simulations of shock through a single crystal of pentaerythritol tetranitrate. **The Journal of Physical Chemistry B**, v. 113, n. 40, p. 13142-13151, 2009.
- [5] SINGH, Sandeep Kumar et al. Thermal properties of fluorinated graphene. **Physical Review B**, v. 87, n. 10, p. 104114, 2013.
- [6] ARYANPOUR, Masoud; VAN DUIN, Adri CT; KUBICKI, James D. Development of a reactive force field for iron–oxyhydroxide systems. **The Journal of Physical Chemistry A**, v. 114, n. 21, p. 6298-6307, 2010.
- [7] MUELLER, Jonathan E.; VAN DUIN, Adri CT; GODDARD III, William A. Development and validation of ReaxFF reactive force field for hydrocarbon chemistry catalyzed by nickel. **The Journal of Physical Chemistry C**, v. 114, n. 11, p. 4939-4949, 2010.
- [8] STRACHAN, Alejandro et al. Shock waves in high-energy materials: the initial chemical events

in nitramine RDX. **Physical Review Letters**, v. 91, n. 9, p. 098301, 2003.

[9] CHENOWETH, Kimberly et al. Development and application of a ReaxFF reactive force field for oxidative dehydrogenation on vanadium oxide catalysts. **The Journal of Physical Chemistry C**, v. 112, n. 37, p. 14645-14654, 2008.

α -Graphyne



γ -Graphyne

