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Abstract

In this work, surface/interface effects for pull-in voltage and viscous fluid velocity effects on the dimensionless natural frequency of fluid-conveying multiwalled piezoelectric nanosensors (FC-MWPENSs) based on cylindrical nanoshells is investigated using the Gurtin–Murdoch surface/interface theory. The nanosensor is embedded in a viscoelastic foundation and subjected to nonlinear van der Waals and electrostatic forces. Hamilton’s principle is used to derive the governing and boundary conditions and is also the assumed mode method used for changing the partial differential equations into ordinary differential equations. The influences of the surface/interface effect, such as Lame’s constants, residual stress, piezoelectric constants and mass density, are considered for analysis of the dimensionless natural frequency with respect to the viscous fluid velocity and pull-in voltage of the FC-MWPENSs.

Introduction

Nanomechanical sensors and resonators, especially when combined with piezoelectric materials, are widely used in modern engineering, which encompasses numerous, diverse fields of science and technology, pharmaceutical, agricultural, environmental, advanced materials, chemical science, physics, electronics, information technology, biomedical and medical fields [1-10]. Due to this extended use of nanosensors, especially piezoelectric nanosensors in vibration devices, mathematical models and the study of vibration behavior are essential. Additionally, it is important that the size-dependent parameters for the dynamics analysis and mathematical modeling of these nanostructures be contained in the theoretical models. For this reason, surface/interface elasticity, which was addressed by Gurtin and Murdoch, is taken into consideration [11]. Also, multiwalled nanoshell (MWNS) materials are structurally built by multiconcentric single-walled nanoshell (SWNS) materials, and the mechanical properties of MWNA materials have been found to be superior to the mechanical properties of SWNSs. As a result, MWNS materials are preferred in many applications such as nanoresonators.
Many studies have been carried out on the vibration and stability analysis of nanostructures with some reviews given as follows. Strozzi and Pellicano investigated the vibration analysis of triple-walled carbon nanotubes (TWNTs) subjected to the interlayer van der Waals (vdW) force in the framework of the Sanders–Koiter shell theory [12]. Also, based on nonlocal cylindrical shell theory, Ghorbanpour Arani et al. studied nonlinear vibration and instability of double-walled boron nitride nanotubes [13]. Malihi et al. investigated the effect of nonzero initial conditions, the nonlinear coefficient of squeeze film air damping, and the van der Waals effect on the stability of torsional nanomirrors for the obtained dynamic pull-in instability voltage using the size effect [14]. Fakhrabadi et al. utilized the modified couple stress theory to investigate the effects of various fluid parameters on the pull-in voltage of carbon nanotubes conveying viscous fluid [15]. Also, the vibration analysis of viscoelastic double-walled carbon nanotubes (DWCNTs) combined with ZnO layers and subjected to magnetic and electric fields were studied by Fereidoon et al. [16]. Recently, Hashemi Kachapi et al. presented a Gurtin–Murdoch surface/interface theory to investigate linear and nonlinear vibration analysis of piezoelectric nanostructures [17-20]. Free vibration of nanometer-sized piezoelectric double-shell structures and nonlinear buckling and postbuckling behavior of functionally graded piezoelectric cylindrical nanoshells were studied by Fang et al. using the surface energy effect [21,22]. Also, Zhu et al. utilized the surface energy effect to investigate a new approach for smart control of nonlinear free vibration of piezoelectric doubly curved nanoshells and orthotropic piezoelectric cylindrical nanoshells [23,24]. Wang utilized surface strain gradient elasticity to study a meticulous solution to the anti-plane shear problem of a circular elastic inhomogeneity [25]. Nami et al. utilized nonlocal elasticity theory and trigonometric shear deformation theory to investigate the static analysis of rectangular nanoplates [26]. The Gurtin–Murdoch surface theory is presented by Sigaeva et al. to study the universal model describing plane strain bending of a multilayered sector of a cylindrical tube [27]. Karimipour et al. presented a modified strain gradient theory (MSGT) and Gurtin–Murdoch surface elasticity to investigate the size-dependent nonlinear pull-in instability [28]. A new size-dependent nonlinear model for the analysis of the behavior of carbon nanotube resonators was introduced by Farokhi et al. based on modified couple stress theory [29]. Liu et al. utilized a new finite element method for modeling thin structures with surface effects by using layered shell elements [30].

To the best knowledge of the author, the surface/interface effect on pull-in voltage, viscous fluid velocity effects and dimensionless natural frequency (DNF) of multiwalled piezoelectric nanosensors conveying viscous fluid has not yet been studied. In the present study, the effect of surface/interface parameters such as Lame’s constants ($\lambda$, $\mu$), residual stress ($\sigma_0$), piezoelectric constants ($e_{31p}$, $e_{32p}$) and mass density ($\rho$) are studied for analysis of dimensionless natural frequency with respect to viscous fluid velocity $\bar{u}_f$ and pull-in voltage $\bar{P}_{DC}$ of fluid-conveying multiwalled piezoelectric nanosensors (FC-MWPENSs) subjected to direct electrostatic DC voltage with nonlinear excitation, nonlinear van der Waals force and viscoelastic foundation. As a guide to the reader, all notation and symbols are presented in Table 1.

### Table 1: Notation and symbols used in this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h_{Nm}$</td>
<td>thickness of nanoshell</td>
<td>$h_{pn}$</td>
<td>piezoelectric layer thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>piezoelectric nanoshell length</td>
<td>$E_{pn}$</td>
<td>Young modulus of piezoelectric layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_n$</td>
<td>the mid-surface radius</td>
<td>$\nu_{pn}$</td>
<td>Poisson’s ratio of piezoelectric layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>axial direction</td>
<td>$\rho_p$</td>
<td>mass density of piezoelectric layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>circumferential direction</td>
<td>$\theta_{31pn}$, $\theta_{32pn}$</td>
<td>piezoelectric constants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>radius direction</td>
<td>$\eta_{33pn}$</td>
<td>dielectric constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{Nm}$</td>
<td>Young’s modulus of nanoshell</td>
<td>$s_{kn}$</td>
<td>piezoelectric inner and outer surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_{Nm}$</td>
<td>Poisson’s ratio of nanoshell</td>
<td>$\lambda_{kn}$, $\mu_{kn}$</td>
<td>Lame’s constants of piezoelectric layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{Nm}$</td>
<td>mass density of nanoshell</td>
<td>$E_{pn}$</td>
<td>electric field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_n$</td>
<td>nanoshell inner and outer surface</td>
<td>$D_{zpn}$</td>
<td>electric displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_{kn}$, $\mu_{kn}$</td>
<td>Lame’s constants of nanoshell</td>
<td>$\tau_{0n}$</td>
<td>residual stress of piezoelectric layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_0$</td>
<td>residual stress of nanoshell</td>
<td>$e_{31pn}$, $e_{32pn}$</td>
<td>surface piezoelectric constants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{kn}$</td>
<td>nanoshell interface mass density</td>
<td>$\rho_{kn}$</td>
<td>piezoelectric surface mass density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mathematical Formulation

A schematic diagram of a multiwalled piezoelectric nanosensor with an embedded fluid-conveying inner layer, two piezoelectric layers, and a viscoelastic foundation medium in the outer layer is shown in Figure 1a–c. The geometrical parameters of the cylindrical shell are the length $L$, the mid-surface radius $R_n$ with nanoshell thickness $2h_N$ and coated by two piezoelectric layers with total thickness $2h_{pn}$ for the outer wall, and also the mid-surface radius $R_{k+1}$ and nanoshell thickness $2h_{N(k+1)}$ for the other inner wall layers. All of the physical and geometrical properties of the mentioned nanostructures for single-walled piezoelectric nanoresonators can be seen in work done by Hashemi Kachapi et al. in reference [18,20]. The governing equations and the solution procedure can be found in Supporting Information File 1.

Results and Discussion

A verification study is investigated in work by Hashemi Kachapi et al. [18–20] with full details for single-walled (SW) and double-walled (DW) piezoelectric nanostructures. In this section, the effects of surface/interface parameters of FC-MWPENS, such as Lame’s constants ($\lambda_{I,S}$, $\mu_{I,S}$), residual stress ($\sigma_{I}$), piezoelectric constants ($e_{31p}$, $e_{32p}$) and mass density ($\rho_{I}$), are investigated for analysis of the dimensionless natural frequency with respect to viscous fluid velocity $\bar{u}_f$ and pull-in voltage $\bar{V}_{DC}$. In order to simplify the presentation, CC,
Figure 1: Fluid-conveying multiwalled piezoelectric nanosensor. (a) Illustration of van der Walls forces between two adjacent tubes of a multiple shell cross section of a multiwalled carbon nanotube (MWCNT). (b) Modeling of a $1...k+1$ tube of a MWCNT as a fluid-conveying nanosensor with surface model. (c) Modeling of the last tube of a MWCNT as a piezoelectric nanosensor with surface/interface model.
SS and CS represent the clamped edge, simply supported edge and clamped-simply supported edge, respectively. The material properties of the different layers of aluminum (Al) nanoshell and piezoelectric layers (PZT-4) are shown in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively [18,20].

The other bulk and surface geometrical parameters of FC-MWPENS are shown in Table 4 [18,20].

The value of the mid-surface radius for different PENS are presented as following: for single-walled PENS (SWPENS): \( R = R_{\text{out}} \); for double-walled PENS (DWPENS): \( R_1 = R_{\text{in}}, R_2 = R_{\text{out}} \); and for triple-walled PENS (TWPENS): \( R_1 = R_{\text{in}}, R_2 = R_{\text{mid}}, R_3 = R_{\text{out}} \).

### Table 4: The material and geometrical parameters of FC-MWPENS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( R_1 ) (m)</th>
<th>( R_2 ) (m)</th>
<th>( R_3 ) (m)</th>
<th>( L/R_1 )</th>
<th>( h_{N(2,3)}/R_1 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{-9} )</td>
<td>( 1.5 \times 10^{-9} )</td>
<td>( 2 \times 10^{-9} )</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( h_3/R_1 )</td>
<td>( b_3/R_3 )</td>
<td>( K_{pen} ) (N/m(^2))</td>
<td>( K_{p3} ) (N/m)</td>
<td>( V_{p3} ) (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.9995035 \times 10^{15}</td>
<td>2.071273</td>
<td>1 \times 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{w3} ) (N·S/m)</td>
<td>( C_{v0w3}^{1} ) (N/m(^3))</td>
<td>( C_{v0w3}^{11} ) (N/m(^3))</td>
<td>( V_{03} )</td>
<td>( V_{O3} ) (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{-3} )</td>
<td>9.91866693 \times 10^{15}</td>
<td>2.201667 \times 10^{31}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu_1 ) (Pa·s)</td>
<td>( \Phi_1 ) (kg/m(^3))</td>
<td>( \dot{u}_1 ) (m/s)</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: Two cases of surface density studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p^1 ) (kg/m(^2))</td>
<td>( p^5 ) (kg/m(^2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.46 \times 10^{-7}</td>
<td>5.61 \times 10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, the relationship between the DNF and the different MWPENR length-to-radius ratios \( L/R_1 \) is shown in Figure 2 for three vibrational modes. These results are shown for two cases of surface density corresponding to Table 5 (due to the fact that the surface/interface density plays an important role in analysis of natural frequency and nonlinear frequency response).

In this section, the effect of surface/interface parameters, such as Lame’s constants \((\lambda_{I,S}, \mu_{I,S})\), residual stress \( (\sigma_{0I,S}) \), piezoelectric constants \((e_{33I,S}, e_{31I,S}) \) and mass density \( (\rho_{I,S}) \), of fluid-conveying multiwalled piezoelectric nanosensors are studied for analysis of the dimensionless natural frequency (DNF) with respect to viscous fluid velocity \( \dot{u}_f \) and pull-in voltage \( V_{DC} \). For this work, the material and geometrical parameters in Tables 2–4 are used. In all of the following results of the analysis of DNF on viscous fluid velocity \( \dot{u}_f \) and pull-in voltage \( V_{DC} \), respectively, the values of \( V_{DC} = 5 \) and \( \dot{u}_f = 0.1 \) are used.

It is observed that for all modes, the DNF decreases when the \( L/R_1 \) ratio increases. Also, the DNF for mode 3 is higher than that for modes 1 and 2. It is clear from this figure that in the case of higher surface/interface density (case 1), the inertia of
the shell is increased and its stiffness is reduced, which leads to a decreased DNF compared to the case without surface/inter-face effects. Also, with decreasing surface/interface density (case 2), the inertia of the system is increased, and with increasing stiffness, DNF increases compared to the case without surface/interface effects.

In all of the following results, the lower surface/interface density (case 2) is used in the analysis of DNF on viscous fluid velocity $\bar{u}_f$ and pull-in voltage $\bar{V}_{DC}$.

The effects of viscous fluid velocity $\bar{u}_f$ and direct pull-in DC voltage on the pull-in instability analysis on the DNF ($\bar{\omega}_n$) of FC-MWPENS are presented in Figure 3 and Figure 4 and for different boundary conditions. It can be seen that in all boundary conditions, the natural frequency decreases with increasing fluid velocity and voltage DC. Also, due to the system softening in the SS boundary condition (with and without surface/interface and low natural frequency in this case), FC-MWPENS is at a higher critical fluid velocity and lower pull-in voltage than other boundary conditions. After the SS boundary condition, the other boundary conditions CS and CC reach the zero due to being softer. For zero natural frequency, FC-MWPENS becomes unstable and this physically implies that the FC-MWPENS loses its stability due to the divergence via a pitchfork bifurcation.

Figure 5 and Figure 6 illustrate the effects of different surface and interface Lame’s constants, $\lambda_{I,S}$ and $\mu_{I,S}$, for viscous fluid velocity $\bar{u}_f$ and pull-in instability analysis on DNF of FC-MWPENS. It is clear that the increasing surface/interface Lame’s constants $\lambda_{I,S}$, due to increasing FC-MWPENS stiffness, DNF and critical fluid velocity increase and pull-in voltage in $\lambda_{I,S} = 0$ and $\lambda_{I,S} = -2$ has a maximum and a minimum value.

The effects of different surface and interface Lame’s constants, $\mu_{I,S}$, and $\mu_{I,S}$, for viscous fluid velocity $\bar{u}_f$ and pull-in instability analysis on DNF of FC-MWPENS are presented in Figure 7 and Figure 8. Similar to $\lambda_{I,S}$, it is clear that by increasing both surface/interface Lame’s constants $\mu_{I,S}$, due to increasing FC-MWPENS stiffness, the DNF and also the critical fluid velocity and pull-in voltage increase.
Figure 6: The effects of surface/interface Lame’s constants $\lambda_{I,S}$ for pull-in voltage on DNF of SS FC-MWPENS.

Figure 7: The effects of surface/interface Lame’s constants $\mu_{I,S}$ for fluid velocity $\dot{u}_f$ on DNF of SS FC-MWPENS.

Figure 8: The effects of surface/interface Lame’s constants $\lambda_{I,S}$ for pull-in voltage on DNF of SS FC-MWPENS.

Figure 9: The effects of surface/interface residual stress $\tau_{0}^{R}$ for fluid velocity $\dot{u}_f$ on DNF of SS FC-MWPENS.

Figure 10: The effects of surface/interface Lame’s constants $\mu_{I,S}$ for pull-in voltage on DNF of SS FC-MWPENS.

Figure 11: The effects of surface and interface residual stress, $\tau_{0}^{R}$ and $\tau_{0}^{k}$, for viscous fluid velocity $\dot{u}_f$ and pull-in instability analysis on DNF of FC-MWPENS. As can be seen in the analysis of DNF, increasing the surface/interface residual stress $\tau_{0}^{R}$ leads to increasing FC-MWPENS stiffness, and as a result, the DNF and pull-in voltage increase and critical fluid velocity decreases.

The effect of surface piezoelectricity constants $e_{31p}^{R}$ and $e_{32p}^{R}$ for viscous fluid velocity $\dot{u}_f$ and pull-in instability analysis on DNF of FC-MWPENS is presented in Figure 11 and Figure 12. It is observed that the increase in the negative surface piezoelectricity constants $e_{31p}^{R}$ and $e_{32p}^{R}$ leads to increasing FC-MWPENS stiffness, and as a result, the DNF, critical fluid velocity and pull-in voltage increase.

Figure 12: The effects of surface/interface residual stress $\tau_{0}^{R}$ and $\tau_{0}^{k}$ for viscous fluid velocity $\dot{u}_f$ on DNF of SS FC-MWPENS.

Figure 13 and Figure 14 illustrate the effects of surface and interface mass density, $\rho_{0}^{S}$ and $\rho_{0}^{k}$, for viscous fluid velocity $\dot{u}_f$ and pull-in instability analysis on DNF of FC-MWPENS. As it can be seen, with an increasing surface/interface mass density $\rho_{0}^{S}$, due to increasing FC-MWPENS stiffness, the DNF significantly increases and also the critical fluid velocity and pull-in voltage slightly decrease.

In Figure 15 and Figure 16, the effects of all surface and interface parameters for viscous fluid velocity $\dot{u}_f$ and pull-in insta-
bility analysis on DNF of SS FC-MWPENS are presented. It can be seen that by ignoring the surface/interface density $\rho^{I,S}$, the inertia of the system will greatly decrease and due to increasing FC-MWPENS stiffness, the system will have a maximum DNF compared to other cases. Also when the surface/interface effects are not taken into account, due to the decreasing nanoshell stiffness, it has a lower DNF than the case with all surface/interface effects. In the cases without all surface/interface effects, the critical fluid velocity and also the pull-in voltage reach zero sooner than the rest of the parameters. In the cases without surface/interface density $\rho^{I,S}$ and with all surface/interface effects, the pull-in voltage and critical fluid velocity reach zero later than the rest of the parameters and the system loses its stability due to the divergence via a pitchfork bifurcation.

**Conclusion**

In the current study, the effect of the surface/interface parameters of a fluid-conveying multiwalled piezoelectric nanosensor are studied for analysis of the dimensionless natural frequency with respect to viscous fluid velocity $\tilde{u}_f$ and pull-in voltage $\tilde{V}_{DC}$. The piezoelectric nanosensor is simultaneously subjected to direct electrostatic DC voltage with nonlinear excitation, nonlinear van der Waals forces and a viscoelastic foundation.
For this purpose, Hamilton’s principles, the assumed mode method combined with Lagrange–Euler’s equations are used. The results demonstrated that in the case of higher (lower) surface/interface densities, the inertia of the shell is increased (decreased) and its stiffness is reduced (increased), which leads to a decreasing (increasing) natural frequency compared to the case of without surface/interface effects. Also, by increasing both surface/interface Lame’s constants, $\lambda_{S}$ and $\mu_{S}$, and the negative surface piezoelectricity constants, $e_{11}^{SP}$ and $e_{12}^{SP}$, due to the increasing FC-MWPENS stiffness, the DNF and also the critical fluid velocity and pull-in voltage increase. In addition, in the analysis of DNF, it was found that increasing the surface/interface residual stress $T_{0}^{S}$ leads to increasing FC-MWPENS stiffness, and as a result, the DNF and pull-in voltage increase and critical fluid velocity decreases. Increasing the surface/interface mass density, $\rho_{S}$, due to increasing FC-MWPENS stiffness, it was found that the DNF significantly increases and also the critical fluid velocity and pull-in voltage slightly decrease. Finally, by ignoring the surface/interface density, $\rho_{I,S}$, the system will have a maximum DNF compared to other cases. In cases without all surface/interface effects, the critical fluid velocity and also the pull-in voltage reached zero sooner than the rest of the parameters. In the cases without surface/interface density $\rho_{I,S}$ and with all surface/interface effects, the pull-in voltage and critical fluid velocity reach zero later than the rest of the parameters.
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