Dipole correlation effects on the local field and the effective dielectric constant in composite dielectrics containing high-$k$ inclusions
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Mixing dielectric polymers with high permittivity (high-$k$) inclusions can affect their electrical properties. In actuation applications of dielectric elastomers, the polarized inclusions generate additional volume polarization-related electrostriction. In energy storage applications, it is possible to store more energy in dielectric composites because of additional polarization of the inclusions and interfaces. However, mixing an electroactive polymer with high-$k$ inclusions also brings several disadvantages. The expulsion of the field from the interior of high-$k$ fillers and the presence of two poles on the filler surface along the applied field direction result in high local fields $E_L$ near the inclusion poles. The resulting field enhancement lowers the breakdown field ($E_D$) threshold for the material and therefore compromises the actuation and energy storage capabilities of dielectric composites. To mitigate this issue, the dependence of $E_L$ on the morphology of inclusion distribution, the field localization effect in chained configurations, and the role of the dipole–dipole correlation effects in the enhancement of the dipolar field of inclusions are analyzed. We show that the dipolar correlation effects are strong in large inclusion composites and their contribution to the inclusion dipole moment $\mu$ and to the local fields $E_L$ can reach 30–50%. A new method for deriving the composite permittivity from the field $E_L$ distribution, based on a caged probe technique, is also presented.

1 Introduction

Electroactive polymers and composites belong to the fast growing field of smart materials with promising applications in many directions.1–15 Initially being developed for sensors and soft actuators,16–18 vibration absorbers,19 and damping devices,20 these materials are now viewed as perfect building blocks for artificial muscles,9,12,21 drug delivery systems,22,23 nano cancer-treatment applications,24 and other multifunctional applications.14,25 The actuation of electroactive polymers is based on polarization processes in dielectric elastomers (DE)1,9,21,26–30 and porous polypropylene film electrets.10,31 Recent advances in composite DE research show that a blend of a dielectric elastomer with high-$k$ inclusions is beneficial for the actuator properties.26,32–47 The inclusions deliver additional volume polarization related electrostriction effects, which can either enhance the default Maxwell-stress contraction, or override the latter and turn the composite strain into an elongation.48–54 As shown in our recent report,54 the electrostriction effect of the dipole–dipole interactions between polarized inclusions strongly depends on the distribution morphology of inclusions.

Besides regulating the composite actuation, the mixing of electroactive polymers with high-$k$ inclusions seems to be beneficial for electric energy storage.55–58 Fig. 1 schematically illustrates the advantages of filling a capacitor with a dielectric film (DF) or with a DF which is additionally impregnated with high-$k$ inclusions. Such capacitors are the most conventional devices used in electrostatic energy storage applications. Compared to the unfilled capacitor in Fig. 1a, which can be charged up to the charge $q$ under the applied voltage $V$, the DF capacitor in Fig. 1b can be charged up to the charge $q + q_m$ under the same applied voltage. Here the excess charge $q_m$ stems from the necessity to polarize the DF layer. If the DF additionally hosts high-$k$ inclusions as shown in Fig. 1c, one more charging term $q_p$ which describes the polarization effects associated with the doping particles, will contribute to the total charge on the capacitor plates. In this case, an additional demand to polarize the inclusions and the interfaces29,60 between the inclusions and the host polymer, and to transfer a part of the external field energy to the dipole–dipole interaction energy among the inclusions makes it possible to store more energy in the composite DF.
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The mixing of an electroactive polymer with high-\(k\) inclusions, however, brings several disadvantages to the functionality of composite dielectrics. For example, the expulsion of the electric field from the interior of high-\(k\) fillers and the presence of two poles on the filler surface along the applied field direction result in the formation of high local fields \(E_L\) near the inclusion surface and around its poles. These fields, especially when they overlap between neighboring inclusions, lower the breakdown field \(E_b\) threshold in the material. As a consequence, much smaller voltages can be applied to the DE composite to actuate it,\(^{10}\) or store electrostatic energy in the composite DF. If the DE composite is prone to contraction under the applied field, then the overlapping of the dipolar fields of inclusions along the field direction will increase during the composite deformation. This will additionally decrease the breakdown field \(E_b\) threshold.

In order to mitigate this issue, all contributions to the spatial fluctuations of \(E_L\) from the inclusions should be carefully analyzed. First, the role of the inclusion distribution in the composite should be addressed with a focus on the field localization in chained inclusions. Second, sources of the dipole–dipole correlation effects and their role in enhancing the dipolar moment of inclusions should be elaborated. These correlation effects can become strong in large inclusion composites and consequently modify the composite electrostriction effects. In many model systems the importance of such dipole–dipole correlations is disregarded assuming that all inclusions develop the same induced dipole moment defined by their polarizability factor and the amplitude of the applied field \(E_0\). In dilute composites with low packing fraction \(\eta\) for fillers the dipolar correlations are always ignored. Practically in all theoretical studies the change in the dipolar correlations and thus the revision of the dipole moments of inclusions during the composite actuation has never been addressed. Our present study shows that the contribution from the dipolar correlations to the inclusion dipole moment \(\mu\) and to the local fields \(E_L\) can become significant and thus revision of the dipole moments due to dipolar correlations among inclusions should be addressed.

The purpose of the current paper is to analyze how the dipole–dipole correlation effects and the local field \(E_L(\vec{r})\) distribution in dielectric composites depend on the inclusion parameters: its packing fraction \(\eta\) and diameter \(\sigma_p\). The issue of self-consistent stabilization of the dipoles through iteration procedures for a proper consideration of the dipole–dipole correlations is thoroughly analyzed.

The remaining part of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss how the mixing of dielectric polymers with polarizable fillers enhances their functional properties. In Section 3 the dielectric behavior of the composite, the dimensionality and the percolation issues are analyzed. The role of dipolar correlations in the DE composite actuation is elaborated in Section 4. Our simulation model is outlined in Section 5, where we explain the importance of the loop correction term in the calculation of the inclusion dipole moment. Simulation results are gathered and discussed in Section 6. Finally, we conclude in Section 7.

### 2 Enhancing the electrical properties of DE and DF composites

In practical applications, the effectiveness of the DE actuation can be measured as how much load \(M\) could be lifted by the DE actuation\(^{29}\)

\[
M = \frac{A}{g} Y \Sigma_M = \frac{A}{g} \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m \left( \frac{V}{d} \right)^2 . \tag{1}
\]

Here \(\Sigma_M\) is the Maxwell-stress strain under an open circuit condition with a constant field \(E = V/d\)

\[
 \Sigma_M = - \frac{\varepsilon_0 E^2}{Y} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_m} \right) \tag{2}
\]

and \(A\) is the DE area across the applied field \(E\), \(d\) is the thickness of the DE, \(g\) is the gravity acceleration constant, \(\varepsilon_0\) is the permittivity of the vacuum, and \(\varepsilon_m\) and \(Y\) are the permittivity and the Young’s modulus of the DE, respectively.

The electrostatic energy density in the elastomer under an applied field \(\vec{E}\) is defined as

\[
u_{DE} = \frac{1}{2 \varepsilon_0} \int_{\Omega \mathcal{F}} E(\vec{r}) D(\vec{F}) d^3 \vec{r} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m E^2 . \tag{3}
\]
where \( D = \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m E \) is the electric displacement, and the integration in eqn (3) is taken over the composite volume \( V \). Combining eqn (1) and (3) we arrive at the following expression for the effectiveness of the DE actuation,

\[
M = \frac{24}{g} u_{DE}. \tag{4}
\]

In a similar manner, the effectiveness of energy storage in dielectric films can be evaluated as how much surface charge density

\[
q = Q/A = \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m V/d \tag{5}
\]
can be accumulated on the capacitor plates under the applied voltage \( V \). The energy density in the dielectric film is written as

\[
u_{DE} = \frac{CV^2}{2Ad} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m \left( \frac{V}{d} \right)^2 \tag{6}
\]
where \( C \) denotes the film capacitance \( C = \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m A/d \). Thus the capacitor surface charge density \( q \) from eqn (5) can be written as

\[
q = \sqrt{\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m \nu_{DE}} \tag{7}
\]

From eqn (4) and (7) it is obvious that the effectiveness of the dielectric film functionality, either in actuation or in energy storage applications, explicitly depends on the energy density \( u_{DE} \) of the material. The full polarization energy of the DF or the non-actuating DE material is

\[
u_m = u_{DE} \Omega \]

under the assumption that the host polymer is nonpolar and has a homogeneous structure. For energy storage applications, the ferroelectric poly(vinylidene fluoride) (PVDF) polymer and its copolymers are potentially useful.61–66 In this case, the energy density is modified to

\[
u_{DE} = U_{m} = u_{DE} \Omega \]

where \( \Delta \) is the increase of their actuation power

\[
\Delta = \frac{\Delta U_m}{\Delta U_{\mu}} + \frac{\Delta U_{\mu}}{\Delta U_{\mu}} \tag{8}
\]

By replacing \( u_{m} \) in eqn (4) and (7) by \( u_{c} \), we see that blending the host polymer with high-\( k \) inclusions enhances its functional properties such as lifting heavier loads in actuation or storing more charges on the capacitor plates.

During the actuation process of the DE composites, the shape dependent polarization terms \( U_m \) and \( U_{\mu} \) change to

\[
U_m^* = U_m - \Delta U_m
\]

\[
U_{\mu}^* = U_{\mu} - \Delta U_{\mu} \tag{9}
\]
where the decrease of \( U_m \) is associated with the Maxwell-stress contraction of the composite, and the decrease of \( U_{\mu} \) is associated with the electrostriction effect of induced dipoles. The role of the latter is elaborated in Section 6.1. In total, the released energies \( \Delta U_m \) and \( \Delta U_{\mu} \) in eqn (9) contribute to the elastic energy of the actuation

\[
F_N = \Delta U_m + \Delta U_{\mu} = \frac{Y \Omega}{2} (\Sigma)^2. \tag{10}
\]

Therefore, eqn (8) for the total energy of the actuated DE composite, which consists of electrostatic and elastic deformation energies, can be written as

\[
u_c \Omega = U_m^* + U_p + U_{pm} + U_{\mu}^* + F_N. \tag{11}
\]

Note that this expression assumes that the volume \( \Omega \) and the energy density \( u_c \) do not change during the composite actuation.

3 Dielectric behavior of composites

The increase of the energy density \( u_c > u_{DE} \) in dielectric composites, and thus the increase of their actuation power \( M \) in eqn (3), or their charging power \( q \) in eqn (6) implies that the host polymer permittivity \( \varepsilon_m \) in eqn (3) and (6) should be replaced by an effective permittivity \( \varepsilon_{eff} \) which is greater than \( \varepsilon_m \). For the \( \varepsilon_{eff} \), which is a function of two permittivities \( \varepsilon_p \) and \( \varepsilon_m \), and the packing fraction \( \eta \) of inclusions, we will use the Maxwell–Garnett (MG) mixing rule

\[
\varepsilon_{eff} (MG) = \frac{\varepsilon_m \varepsilon_p + \varepsilon_p \eta \Delta \varepsilon}{\varepsilon_p \varepsilon_m + \varepsilon_p \eta \Delta \varepsilon} \tag{12}
\]

and the Bruggeman (BR) mixing rule

\[
\varepsilon_{eff} (BR) = \frac{1}{\eta} \left( \Delta \varepsilon (3\eta - 2) + \varepsilon_p + \sqrt{\Delta \varepsilon (2 - 3\eta) - \varepsilon_p^2} \right) + 8\eta \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_p \tag{13}
\]

where \( \Delta \varepsilon = \varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_m \). Both the MG and BR theories are mean-field theories and do not take into account correlation and exchange effects between dipoles.73–76 The physics underlying these mixing rules is given in Appendix A.

In general, the original BR equation can be written for any inclusion geometry in the following form

\[
\eta \frac{\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_{eff}}{2\eta (\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_{eff}) + \varepsilon_{eff}} + (1 - \eta) \frac{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_{eff}}{2\eta (\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_{eff}) + \varepsilon_{eff}} = 0 \tag{14}
\]

where the response parameter \( x_p \) corresponds to the depolarization factor for the inclusions \( x_p = 1/3 \) is taken for spherical inclusions in eqn (13)) and depends on the geometry of the composite. As shown in ref. 73, eqn (14) can be used to predict the percolation threshold value for the inclusions. Assuming that the inclusions are conductive particles with \( \varepsilon_p = \infty \), and then taking the limit \( \varepsilon_{eff} \to \infty \), which corresponds to the percolation of the inclusions across the sample, the percolation limit is found to be \( \eta_c = x_p \). In other words, the depolarization factor of inclusions defines their percolation threshold using the Bruggeman approach. Usually, in experimental realizations
of DE composites with spherical inclusions, for which \( \eta_c = 0.33 \), the actual packing fraction of the fillers is kept below the percolation threshold, \( \eta < 0.3 \) for avoiding the electrical breakdown of the material.

It should be also noted that the dimensionality of the composite is included into the BR approach through the single shape parameter \( x_p \). Hence, only the shape of inclusions is taken into account in the BR approach, whereas the shape of the host matrix is not considered at all. On the other hand, as we have shown in our recent work,\(^{54} \) the polarization of inclusions depends both on the shape of inclusions and the host matrix,

\[
\tilde{P}_p = \frac{\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_m + (\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_m) x_p x_m} \left( \frac{1}{1 + (\varepsilon_m - 1) x_m} \tilde{E} + \sum_j \tilde{E}_j \right). \quad (15)
\]

Here \( x_m \) is the depolarization factor of the host matrix along the applied field \( \tilde{E} \), and \( E_j \) is the electric field of other dipoles which contribute to the polarization of inclusions. In other words, the dimensionality of the composite is adequately accounted for in the framework of our simulation model.

The morphological structure of a composite material, in addition to being described by the geometry factors \( x_p \) and \( x_m \), is often characterized by means of the \( a-b \) connectivity factor of its phases.\(^{29} \) For the two-phase composites considered in this work, the term \( a \) describes the connectivity of the primary active phase, and the term \( b \) corresponds to the connectivity of the secondary passive phase. Layered composites, which are regarded as best candidates for artificial muscle applications, correspond to a 2-2 connectivity. For the DF matrix impregnated with spherical inclusions, we employ a 3-0 connectivity for the composite morphology, similar to the case considered in ref. 54.

**4 The role of the \( U_{\mu\mu} \) polarization term in the DE actuation**

The polarization term \( U_{\mu\mu} \) in eqn (8) is responsible for the electrostriction effect of dipolar interactions. The released energy \( \Delta U_{\mu\mu} \) in eqn (10) generates a strain \( \Sigma \), which strongly depends on the spatial distribution \( \{ \tilde{R}_i \} \) of inclusions.\(^{29} \) In random composites \( \{ \tilde{R}_i \} = \text{rand (} \Omega \text{)} \), where the inclusions are randomly distributed in the composite volume \( \Omega \), the electrostrictive strain is negative, \( \Sigma_z < 0 \). Therefore, random DE composites contract stronger than the pure DE under the Maxwell-stress strain \( \Sigma_M < 0 \),

\[
|\Sigma| = |\Sigma_z| + |\Sigma_M| > |\Sigma_M| \quad (16)
\]

This behavior constitutes the main mechanism used in experimental studies to achieve higher actuation responses in high-\( k \) composites. However, for a few regular lattice composites, such as for the BCC and FCC composites, the electrostriction related effects lead to the elongation of the composite along the applied field, \( \Sigma_z > 0 \). Thus, the resulting strain \( \Sigma \) of the DE composite depends on the competition between the negative Maxwell-stress strain \( \Sigma_M \) and the positive electrostrictive strain \( \Sigma_z \),

\[
\Sigma = \Sigma_M + \Sigma_z. \quad (17)
\]

As it will be shown in Section 6.2, the strength of \( \Sigma_z \) depends on the inclusion size \( \sigma_p \). Therefore, regardless of how strong \( \Sigma_M \) is, it is always possible to detect the right size for the dispersed inclusions in order to make \( \Sigma > 0 \) and elongate the composite along the applied field.

In addition to boosting the functional properties of actuators and energy storage films, the inclusions are also the source of several degrading factors to the composite operation. First, blending hard inclusions into the DE decreases its elasticity and thus compromises the composite strain \( \Sigma \). Second, the expulsion of the local field \( E_i \) from the interior of inclusions, the increase of \( E_i \) near the inclusion poles, and the trapping of space charges at the inclusion–polymer interface decrease the dielectric breakdown field \( E_b \) threshold. We will use a spring-bead simulation model for the composite\(^{54} \) to investigate how the local field \( E_i \) distribution and dipole–dipole correlations depend on the inclusion parameters.

**5 Description of the simulation model**

We consider \( N \) spherical inclusions of volume \( V_p = \pi \sigma_p^3/6 \) and dielectric permittivity \( \varepsilon_p \) distributed in a cubic box of size \( L \).

The packing fraction \( \eta = N V_p/\Omega \) of inclusions is regulated by changing the volume \( \Omega \) of the cubic box. A homogeneous distribution of inclusions is implemented in order to avoid their compact clustering and the lowering of the breakdown field \( E_b \) threshold in the material. Under the applied field \( \tilde{E}_0 \) along the \( z \)-axis, each inclusion gains an induced dipole moment \( \tilde{p}_i^0 \),\(^{54} \)

\[
\tilde{p}_i^0 = \tilde{p}_0^\text{in}(E_0) + \tilde{p}_0(E_i) \quad (18)
\]

where the first part \( \tilde{p}_0^\text{in}(E_0) \) is the pure dipole moment of a spherical inclusion \( i \),

\[
\tilde{p}_i^0 = 4\pi \varepsilon_0 \left( \frac{\sigma_p}{2} \right)^3 \frac{\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_p + 2\varepsilon_m} \tilde{E}_0 \quad (19)
\]

and the second part \( \tilde{p}_0(E_i) \) is the excess dipole moment of the inclusion \( i \) from the fields of other inclusions \( j \) (\( 1 \leq j \leq N \), \( j \neq i \)) and their periodic images in neighboring cells,

\[
\tilde{p}_0(E_i) = 4\pi \varepsilon_0 \left( \frac{\sigma_p}{2} \right)^3 \frac{\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_p + 2\varepsilon_m} \sum_j \varepsilon_m \tilde{E}_j \left( \tilde{\mu}_i^j \right) \quad (20)
\]

The field \( \tilde{E}_j \) in eqn (20) depends on the dipole moment \( \tilde{p}_j^0 \) of inclusion \( j \), thus the dipole moment of each inclusion depends on the dipole moment of all other inclusions. In other words, eqn (18)–(20) should be solved through consecutive iterations for stabilizing the dipole moments \( \tilde{p}_i^0 \) of inclusions. The importance of such dipolar correlation effects has been overlooked in most theoretical studies assuming that they are negligible in dilute (\( i.e. \) small \( \eta \)) composites.

For the direct evaluation of the dipolar correlation effects in eqn (18)–(20) we introduce a loop correction term \( \langle \mu \rangle_L \) to the
pristine dipole moment $\mu_p^0$ of inclusions, which we define as

$$\langle \mu \rangle_L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \mu_p^i - 1. \quad (21)$$

Here all inclusion dipoles $\mu_p^i$ are stabilized by solving eqn (18)-(20) by iterative loops, and the loop correction is averaged over them. Without the dipole stabilization procedure, the loop correction term is $|\mu|_L = 0$. The $|\mu|_L$ explicitly contains the contribution from the fields of all other inclusions, and implicitly includes the dipole–dipole correlation effects between the inclusions. As it will be shown below, these loop corrections can cause twice stronger local fields in the composite compared to the case when no loop corrections are included.

Once all the dipoles $\mu_p^i$ in the composite are stabilized, the system is then ready for running MD simulations to calculate the composite strain $\Sigma$ and the local field distribution $E_L$. We use NPT ensemble molecular dynamics simulations using a Verlet algorithm and a Nose thermostat for the inclusions in the host polymer. Elastic properties of the host matrix are modeled through springs with spring constants $\chi$ which connect each inclusion to its $n_b$ nearest neighbors. We identify the correct $\chi$ for which the simulation predicted the Young’s modulus $Y_{MD}$ to be equal to the composite modulus $Y$. In eqn (22) $\Delta r_{ij} = |\vec{r}_{ij} - \vec{r}_{ij}^0|$ is the bond length deformation between the inclusions $i$ and $j$, and $\Sigma$ is the strain along the $i = x, y, z$ axis. For the random composite we chose $n_b = 14$ from the list of the first nearest neighbors for each inclusion. The nearest-neighbor separation distance in the random inclusion distribution is defined as $r_p = 0.554(V_p^{1/3})$. In the BCC composite, where the inclusions occupy the nodes of the BCC lattice, each inclusion is connected to its 8 neighbors from the first coordination shell of radius $r_p \sqrt{3}/2$, and 6 neighbors from the second coordination shell of radius $r_p$, thus making the total $n_b = 14$ again. The lattice constant of the BCC structure is defined as $r_p = (2V_p^{1/3})^{1/3}$.

In simulation runs the evolution of the stress-free initial system with $E = 0$ to a new state with balanced electrostatic and elastic forces is controlled by the equivalence of the pressure components in all three directions. The pressure is calculated using the force virials

$$P = \frac{1}{3\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \vec{F}_{ij} \cdot \vec{E}_{ij} \quad (23)$$

where the forces $\vec{F}_{ij}$ between the inclusions $i$ and $j$ include both the electrostatic forces $\vec{F}_{ij}^E$ between the dipoles $i$ and $j$, and the elastic forces

$$\vec{F}_{ij}^{\text{elastic}} = \chi (r_p - r_{ij}) \frac{\vec{r}_{ij}^0}{r_{ij}} \quad (24)$$

Here $\vec{r}_{ij} = \vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j$, and for the elastic forces the summation in eqn (23) goes over the $n_b$ neighbors of the inclusion $i$.

The long-range nature of dipole–dipole interactions in $\vec{F}_{ij}$ is handled using the Ewald’s summation technique. For the full description of the simulation model the reader is referred to ref. 54.

For the calculation of the local field $E_L(\vec{r})$ distribution we create a temporary mesh network $\{\vec{r}_i\} = \{x_i, y_i, z_i\}$ in the composite with 400 points in each direction. The components of $E_L(\vec{r}_i)$ are calculated as a sum of the dipolar fields $E_j$ of all inclusions and their periodic images in neighboring cells,

$$E_L(x_i) = \sum_j E_j(x_i), \quad E_L(y_i) = \sum_j E_j(y_i), \quad E_L(z_i) = \sum_j E_j(z_i) + E_0 \quad (25)$$

where $x_i, y_i$, and $z_i$ are the coordinates of mesh points $\vec{r}_i$. The amplitude of the total field at the mesh points $\vec{r}_i$ is defined as

$$E_L(\vec{r}_i) = |E_L(\vec{r}_i)| = \sqrt{E_L^2(x_i) + E_L^2(y_i) + E_L^2(z_i)} \quad (26)$$

6 Results

6.1 Dipole–dipole correlation effects in composites

The loop correction $|\mu|_L$ is plotted in Fig. 2 as a function of $\eta$ in the polarized composite prior to its actuation. For the BCC composite $|\mu|_L = 0$ because of the mutual cancellation of the field contributions from the neighboring dipoles. In random composites $|\mu|_L$ has quadratic $\eta$ dependence. At $\eta = 0.3$ the contribution from $|\mu|_L$ reaches about 40% of the value of $\mu_o$. As a result, the actuation of the DE will be much stronger compared to its actuation with dipoles $\mu_o^p$. It is also obvious that during the DE actuation the loop corrections should always

![Fig. 2 Loop correction term $|\mu|_L$ from eqn (21) for the dipole moment of inclusions as a function of inclusion packing fraction $\eta$ before the composite actuation. Line with circles – random composite and line with squares – regular BCC composite. The other system parameters are: applied field $E_0 = 50$ MV m$^{-1}$, $\varepsilon_m = 2$, $\varepsilon_p = 100$, $\sigma_p = 2$ μm, and $Y = 0.1$ MPa.](image-url)
be maintained in order to guarantee that the change in the inclusion distribution morphology following the shape change of the composite happens under the condition of fully stabilized dipoles. While in experimental studies the adjustment of dipoles to the shape change of the sample is instant and self-consisting, in numerical approaches this adjustment is usually implemented through the iterative loops. Our simulations show that the number of loop correction steps for stabilizing the dipoles $\mu_i$ in eqn (18)–(20) depends on $\eta$, and for high $\eta > 0.2$, it reaches several hundred iteration steps. In computer simulations the dipole moment stabilization process can be tracked and the dipolar correlation effects can be separately examined. Note that in experimental studies, such stabilization process happens instantly and the loop correction term cannot be estimated separately.

### 6.2 Evolution of the dipole–dipole correlations during the composite deformation

Simulation results of the composite strain are plotted in Fig. 3 for the random and BCC composites as a function of the inclusion diameter $\sigma_p$. The field $E_0 = 50$ MV m$^{-1}$ was applied along the $z$ axis, and the host matrix and inclusion permittivities were $\varepsilon_m = 2$ and $\varepsilon_p = 100$, respectively, and the packing fraction was fixed to $\eta = 0.0083$. For the elasticity modulus of the host matrix we choose $Y = 0.1$ MPa which is a typical value for dielectric elastomers. The inclusion diameter is varied between 200 nm and 4 $\mu$m. A similar composite with $\sigma_p = 200$ nm and $\eta = 0.0083$ was considered in our previous paper$^{54}$ where the following strain values were reported: $\Sigma_z = -5\%$ for the random composite, $\Sigma_z = +2\%$ for the BCC composite, and $\Sigma_M = -11\%$ for the Maxwell-stress strain. Our simulation results in Fig. 3 clearly indicate that as $\sigma_p$ increases, or equivalently, as the induced dipole moment $\mu_i$ increases, the strength of the electrostriction driven strain $\Sigma_z$ also increases. For the random composite the electrostrictive driven negative strain $\Sigma_z$ becomes twice stronger than $\Sigma_M$ for $\sigma_p > 2\, \mu$m. Thus, making the inclusions bigger at a fixed $\eta$ is beneficial for obtaining stronger composite actuation. For $\sigma_p > 2.3\, \mu$m the positive electrostrictive strain in the BCC composite overrides the Maxwell-stress strain $\Sigma_M$. As a result of this, the total strain $\Sigma$ of the composite becomes a net elongation deformation along the field direction.

According to eqn (11), the composite actuation $\Sigma_z$ can be viewed as an attempt of the composite to minimize its electrostatic energy through a shape change. Such minimization is followed by the strengthening of dipole–dipole correlation effects, which obviously affects the loop correction $\langle \mu \rangle_L$ term in eqn (21). This correction term is plotted in Fig. 4 as a function of $\sigma_p$ for the strain data $\Sigma_z$ shown in Fig. 3. It is seen that in an actuated composite with non-zero $\Sigma_z$ the loop correction $\langle \mu \rangle_L$ becomes stronger. For example, as seen from Fig. 2, in a non-actuated composite the loop correction is nearly negligible for the random composite with $\sigma_p = 2\, \mu$m and $\eta = 0.0083$. Now, when the composite is actuated, the loop correction reaches almost $15\%$ at the same $\sigma_p$ and $\eta$. Qualitatively a similar increase of $\langle \mu \rangle_L$ is visible for the BCC composite in Fig. 3. It is worth noting that the loop correction is always positive regardless of the sign of the strain $\Sigma_w$. In other words,
during the composite actuation the dipoles displace in a such way that their dipole moments get an additional enhancement. This is possible only when the parallel oriented dipoles tend to form nose-to-tail conformations. Or, the actuation of the composite lowers its electrostatic energy by increasing the dipole–dipole attraction between the induced dipoles.

The interesting question is why larger inclusions at a fixed \( \eta \) stimulate stronger strains and loop corrections. If \( \sigma_p \) increases \( z \) times, \( \sigma_p^{(2)} = \sigma_p^{(1)} \), then the nearest-neighbor distance \( r_p^{(2)} = 0.5 \eta^{-1/3} \sigma_p^{(2)} = 1 \) between the inclusions will increase \( z \) times, and the dipole moment of the inclusion \( \mu_0^{(2)} = \mu_0^{(1)} \) will increase \( z^3 \) times. Therefore, for a pair of inclusions with dipoles \( \mu_0^{(2)} \) separated by a distance \( r_p^{(2)} \), the field \( E_2 \) created by one of the inclusions at the center of the other inclusion is

\[
E_2 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(2)}}{r_p^{(2)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = E_1
\]

In other words, the field distribution in the composite should not change when \( \sigma_p \) is increased at a fixed \( \eta \). However, this conclusion contradicts the results shown in Fig. 2. A possible reason for the increase of \( \langle \mu \rangle_L \) in larger inclusion composites might be the increase of the coupling constant \( G = V(\mu_{\text{in}})/k_B T \), which determines the strength of the interaction energy \( V(\mu_{\text{in}}) \) between the dipoles \( \mu_i \) and \( \mu_j \) with respect to their thermal energy \( k_B T \). By testing the strength of the interaction potential \( V_k = \mu_0^{(2)}B_k \) between the dipoles \( k = 1 \) for composites with smaller inclusions of size \( \sigma_1 \), and \( k = 2 \) for composites with larger inclusions of size \( \sigma_2 = 3\sigma_1 \),

\[
V_2 = \mu_0^{(2)}E_2 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(2)}}{r_p^{(2)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_m} \left( \frac{\mu_0^{(1)}}{r_p^{(1)}} \right)^3 \]

we see that indeed the dipole–dipole interaction potential in a larger inclusion composite increases \( z^3 \) times. Therefore, the reason for stronger loop corrections in larger inclusion composites is the increased coupling constant \( G \) between neighboring inclusions.

### 6.3 Local field \( E_L \) distribution in the composite

The enhancement of the loop corrections in Fig. 2 and 4 directly indicates that the volume averaged local field

\[
E_L = \frac{1}{V} \int E_L(\hat{r}) d^3r
\]

is also enhanced across the composite. However, it should be noted that this enhancement is a volume averaged effect, and in some areas of the composite an opposite effect, i.e., the field depletion effect, might occur. First, the local field \( E_L(\hat{r}) \) is strongly inhomogeneous in the composite.\(^{5,44,55,81-83}\) The field is high at two poles of the inclusion and between two inclusions oriented along the applied field (vertical direction), whereas it is weak between horizontally placed inclusions. When the packing fraction \( \eta \) increases, according to our recent results in ref. 55, the inhomogeneity of \( E_L(\hat{r}) \) distribution becomes more sharper. Second, for some particular inclusion configurations the field enhancement concept can completely fail. For example, we consider a pair of inclusions placed along the z-axis with a fixed separation distance \( \delta_z = 1.5 \sigma_p \) along the z-axis, as shown in the inset picture. Blue line – the value of \( E_z \) at the inner pole of the pair. Red line – the value of \( E_z \) at the north pole of bulk inclusions. The other system parameters are: applied field \( E_0 = 50 \text{ MV m}^{-1}, \sigma_p = 70 \text{ nm}, \sigma_m = 30 \text{ nm}, \varepsilon_m = 2.25 \).

Fig. 5 The dependence of the local field \( E_z \) at the poles of inclusions on the packing fraction \( \eta \). A pair of inclusions are fixed at a separation distance \( \delta_z = 1.5 \sigma_p \) along the z-axis, as shown in the inset picture. Blue line – the value of \( E_z \) at the inner pole of the pair. Red line – the value of \( E_z \) at the north pole of bulk inclusions. The other system parameters are: applied field \( E_0 = 50 \text{ MV m}^{-1}, \sigma_p = 70 \text{ nm}, \sigma_m = 30 \text{ nm}, \varepsilon_m = 2.25 \).

The for the random and BCC composites we plot a 3D \( E_L(\hat{r}) \) distribution in Fig. 6. In Fig. 6A and C the total field \( E_L(\hat{r}) \) from eqn (26) with and without loop corrections \( \langle \mu \rangle_{\text{L}} \) for the random composite are shown. A detailed analysis of these figures reveals that the loop corrections are mostly localized in areas of chained clusters in Fig. 6C. In these areas the loop corrections make \( E_L(\hat{r}) \) twice stronger compared to the case of no loop correction in Fig. 6A. In some areas of the chained configuration in Fig. 6C the field \( E_L \) reaches 18 \( E_0 \) (about 1 \( \text{GV m}^{-1} \)), which is twice larger than the typical breakdown field for dielectric elastomers \( E_b \approx 500 \text{ MV m}^{-1} \). Therefore, in the experimental realization of such random composites, specific care should be taken to avoid any accidental chain-like clustering of inclusions along the applied field. Otherwise, the composite is prone to electrical breakdown.

In Fig. 6B and D the z-components of the field distribution \( E_z = E_L(\hat{z}) \) are shown with the purpose of highlighting the occurrence of negative field patches around the inclusions. These patches with \( E_z = -E_0 \) are oriented perpendicular to the applied field direction. The formation of negative field patches is a consequence of huge field localization between chained
inclusions. In other words, if the patches occupy more area in the composite, then the higher field will localize in chained clusters, and the composite will contract. The high field domains $5 < E_r/E_0 < 13$ are separately shown in Fig. 7. The composite will
primarily shrink along the string-like field domains. At the same time, these string-like areas of the composite will be more vulnerable to the dielectric breakdown.

In Fig. 6E and F, as a comparison to the random composite case, we plot the \( E_i(r) \) and \( E_z \) distributions in the regular BCC composite. Here the field fluctuations along and perpendicular to the applied field are moderate, \( E_i(r) \) reached 4\( E_0 \) at the inclusion poles, and \( -E_0 \) at the inclusion equator. Neither field localization nor negative field patches are detected. The regular BCC composite elongates only within some window of the initial distortion ratio parameter \( \theta = c/a \), where \( c \) is the lattice constant of the regular lattice in the \( z \) axis direction, and \( a \) is the lattice constant in the \( x \) and \( y \) directions. Therefore, it will be interesting to compare the field distributions in contracting and elongating BCC composites in order to understand the link between the morphology of \( E_i(r) \) or \( E_z \) and the strain \( \Sigma_z \). This task is beyond the scope of the present research.

### 6.4 Calculation of the composite permittivity from the distribution of \( E_i(r) \)

In experimental studies and engineering applications, the effective permittivity \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \) of the composite is usually determined using broadband dielectric spectroscopy,\(^{35,36} \) finite element method (FEM) based approaches,\(^{44,61,62} \) the finite-difference time-domain (FDTD) method,\(^{84} \) and an equivalent capacitance model.\(^{85} \) In the simulations the effective permittivity \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \) can be determined from

\[
\langle \varepsilon(r)E_z^2(r) \rangle_\Omega = \varepsilon_{\text{eff}}(E_z)^2_\Omega \tag{30}
\]

in which \( E_z \) is the local electric field at position \( r \) in the composite, \( \varepsilon(r) \) is the local dielectric constant, and angular brackets denote the volume average.\(^{86} \) For our two-phase composite model, \( \varepsilon(r) = \varepsilon_p \) inside the particles, and \( \varepsilon(r) = \varepsilon_m \) in the host matrix. A direct implementation of eqn (30) is only possible when the local field \( E_i(r) \) is roughly homogeneous across the dielectric elastomer, which is the case of low dielectric contrast composites with \( \varepsilon_p/\varepsilon_m < 10 \).\(^{87} \) Otherwise, for high-\( k \) inclusion composites with high dielectric contrast, huge field gradients near the poles and between the inclusions limit the proper averaging of \( E_i(r) \) and \( E_i^2(r) \) in eqn (30).\(^{88} \) In this case specific care should be taken for accurately solving Maxwell equations near the singular points of polarized inclusions. Nevertheless, and rigorously speaking, while it is possible to determine the local field at any given point in the composite, it is not possible to determine it at all composite points for the proper volume averaging in eqn (30).

The field averaging procedure can be sufficiently simplified for a high dielectric contrast, \( \varepsilon_p/\varepsilon_m > 30 \), composites with no clustering condition for inclusions. The left part of eqn (30) can be rewritten as

\[
\langle \varepsilon(r)E_z^2(r) \rangle_\Omega = \langle \varepsilon_p E_p^2 \rangle_\Omega + \langle \varepsilon_mE_k^2 \rangle_\Omega
\]

where \( E_p \) is the local field inside the inclusion,

\[
E_p = \frac{3\varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_p + 2\varepsilon_m}(E_0 + \eta E_0).
\]

Here we include the additional field term \( \eta E_0 \), which corresponds to the total local field created by other inclusions \( j \) at the center of the inclusion \( i \). For the \( E_z \) in the host matrix we assume \( E_z = \gamma E_m \) with the enhancement factor \( \gamma > 2 \). In composites with homogeneous distribution of inclusions, each inclusion can be assumed as an individual particle sitting in a spherical shell of the host matrix of volume \( V_1 \). Then, by partitioning the whole system into \( N \) spherical volumes \( V_p \) and \( N \) shell volumes \( V_{sh} \), \( N = N_p + N_{sh} \) or \( N_{sh}/N = 1 - \eta \), for eqn (31), we get

\[
\langle \varepsilon(r)E_z^2(r) \rangle_\Omega = \frac{9\varepsilon_p\varepsilon_m^2}{(\varepsilon_p + 2\varepsilon_m)^2} \eta(1+\eta)^2 E_0^2 + \frac{3\varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_p}(1-\eta).
\]

The ratio of the second term to the first term on the left side of this equation

\[
\Theta_1 = \frac{\varepsilon_p}{9\varepsilon_m^2} \left( 1 + 4\frac{\varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_p} \left( \frac{\varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_p} \right)^2 \frac{1-\eta}{(1+\eta)^2} \right)
\]

is a suitable measure of the relative contribution of the particle interiors to the effective permittivity \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \). For typical high-\( k \) inclusion composites with \( \varepsilon_p/\varepsilon_m > 30 \), \( \gamma > 2 \), and \( \eta < 0.3 \), for the lower bond of \( \Theta_1 \), we get \( \Theta_1 > 20 \). This means that the contribution from the energy density inside the inclusions to \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \) is less than 5% from the contribution of the field energy in the host matrix. Similar arguments can be used to estimate the field average \( \langle E_i(r) \rangle \) in right side averaging in eqn (30). Here, for a similar parameter \( \Theta_2 \)

\[
\Theta_2 = \frac{\gamma}{\eta(1+\eta)} \left( \frac{3\varepsilon_p + 2\varepsilon_m}{3\varepsilon_m} \right)
\]

which measures the relative contribution of the particle interiors to \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \), and for the same composite parameters \( \varepsilon_p/\varepsilon_m > 30 \), \( \gamma > 2 \),
and $\eta < 0.3$, we get $\theta_2 > 40$. Thus, the field averaging in high-$k$ composites has no more than 3% contribution from the particle interiors. Therefore, based on the theoretical predictions for the parameters $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$, up to the packing fractions $\eta < 0.3$ it is completely safe to use only the host matrix averaging in eqn (30) for high-$k$ composites.

For the calculation of $\langle E_L \rangle_{\Omega}$ and $\langle E_L^2 \rangle_{\Omega}$ in the host matrix, we create a field-testing probe of octahedral shape with six inclusions occupying its nodes, and another probe particle is placed at its center as shown in Fig. 8. The cage nodes have the same properties as the inclusions: they develop induced dipole $\mu^i_p$ under the applied field $E_0$ and react to the polarization field of other inclusions. The probing cage is then placed at the positions $\vec{r}_c$ in the composite, and the average of the local field $E_L(\vec{r}_c)$ at its center is calculated as,

$$\langle E_L(\vec{r}_c) \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^{N-7} E_j(\mu^i_p) \right\rangle \Omega.$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

Here the averaging $\langle \cdots \rangle_\Omega$ is done by random insertions of the cage into the vacant positions in the composite. The role of the octahedral cage is twofold. First, the cage nodes shield the probe particle from the close proximity of other inclusions and therefore minimizes the effect of huge field fluctuations at the cage center $\vec{r}_c$. Second, for the chosen geometry of the cage, the combined effect of the cage node dipoles at the probe center is zero, i.e., the probe particle exclusively reacts only to the field of other composite inclusions.

For high packing fractions $\eta > 0.1$ the volume averaging in eqn (36) has bad statistics because of the decreasing number of successful probe insertions into the composite. For these cases it is more efficient to place the probing cage at the center of the simulation box $\vec{r}_c = 0$, and then generate random inclusion distributions around the cage. Repeating this procedure several hundred times with different random particle generations guarantees good statistical averaging in eqn (36).

Calculated $\varepsilon_{eff}$ from eqn (30) is plotted in Fig. 9 as a function of $\eta$ for $E_0 = 100$ MV m$^{-1}$, $\varepsilon_m = 4.3$, $\sigma_p = 50$ nm, $\varepsilon_p = 150$. The other system parameters are: $E_0 = 100$ MV m$^{-1}$, $\varepsilon_m = 4.3$, $\sigma_p = 50$ nm, $\varepsilon_p = 150$.

![Fig. 8](attachment:figure8.png)  
**Fig. 8** Schematic illustration of the octahedral cage devised to probe the local field in the composite. The central particle shown in green is the probe particle at the center of which the field $E_L(\vec{r})$ is measured. Only the dipoles of the cage-forming inclusions are shown.
A small deviation between the BR mixing rule and our simulation results at higher $\eta > 0.22$ might be a consequence of the loop correction term given by eqn (21), which is not accounted for in the mixing rule approaches. There is also a small discrepancy between our findings and the experimental results of ref. 89. We did additional simulations with an increased particle size $\sigma_p = 70$ nm, and got the same data for $\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}$. In other words, a moderate change in the particle size, while keeping the packing fraction the same, has very small impact on $\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}$. Obviously, at high $\eta$ the dipolar approach should be replaced with more realistic representations of the particle polarization. The implementation of two opposite charges on the particle poles might be a good starting approximation for taking into account higher order multipole contributions to the inclusion–inclusion interactions.

As shown in ref. 73 and 74 the polymer–particle bounding layer starts to play an essential role in nanometer particle sizes. Consequently, the Bruggeman approach should be modified by assuming a core–shell particle in a host matrix and by adding an additional term to eqn (14). In this case $\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}$ also becomes a function of the particle size $\sigma_p$ because the shell fraction depends on $\sigma_p$. Assuming a typical shell thickness of a few (2–5) nanometers, it is believed that for the particles bigger than 100 nm the bare-core model should be a reliable approximation. As has been mentioned above, for the surface-initiated polymerization from the nanoparticles, the bare-core approach is always an applicable model regardless of the size of the inclusions.

7 Conclusions

The mixing of dielectric elastomers or films with high-$k$ inclusions enhances their functional properties such as the strength of their actuation and their energy storage capabilities. Such enhancement is linked to the additional volume polarization related electrostriction effects enabled by the inclusions. The polarization of inclusions and electrostriction effects can be described at three different levels. Within the first and the lowest level, it is assumed that the polarization of the inclusion only depends on the applied field and there is no field exchange between the dipoles which can alter the amplitude of dipoles. Such an approach is applicable to dilute composites with low packing fraction for inclusions, and is often used in the actuation of ferrogels. Within the second level, the amplitude of the induced dipoles, in addition to the applied field, also reacts to the field of other dipoles. However, this field exchange contribution is assumed to not depend on the spatial distribution of inclusions. Finally, in the third and the most realistic level, the field exchange and correlation effects between dipoles are fully taken into account. The current study is based on this third level of approximation for the electroactive composites. We have shown that the dipole moments of inclusions should be carefully stabilized through iterative loops in order to properly account for the dipole–dipole correlation and field exchange effects. According to our simulation results, the loop correction term strongly depends on the inclusion parameters, and might substantially alter the local field distribution in the composite, along with boosting the electrostriction effects in the composite. Because of the positive feedback from the loop corrections to the inclusion dipole moment, the coupling between dipoles increases which leads to higher composite strains. At the same time positive loop corrections point to the increasing of the dipole–dipole attraction during the composite actuation. A detailed analysis of the 3D local field distribution in the composite reveals that the loop corrections are mostly localized into the areas of chained clusters, where the field becomes twice stronger compared to the field distribution with no loop corrections. However, these areas of localized field in the composite are responsible for the lowering of the breakdown field $E_b$, threshold, which compromises the actuation and energy storage capabilities of dielectric composites.

A new method for deriving effective permittivity of the composite from the calculated local field distribution is presented. It is shown that in high-$k$ composites the contribution from the particle interiors to the $\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}$ is negligible. For the proper averaging of the local field $E_i$ in the host matrix we devise a shielding cage with a field-probing particle in its center. The calculated $\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}$ as the ratio of the averaged field energy to the energy of the averaged field appears in good agreement with empirical mixing rules.

The implications of presented results are important for devising new and reliable electroactive composites. First, for keeping the breakdown field $E_b$ high, according to our results, a proper optimization of the size, permittivity, packing fraction, and distribution of inclusions should be carried out. A detailed knowledge on the field enhancement effect, which also implies a proper accounting for the dipolar correlation effects, is the necessary tool for preventing the breakdown of the DE and DF composites in the fast growing field of artificial muscles, robotic and mechatronic applications. Second, the positivity of the loop correction $\langle \mu \rangle_i$, which increases the dipole moments of inclusions, directly accounts for the additional energy input into the polarization and the dipole–dipole interaction energies in the composites. Or, in other words, the positivity of $\langle \mu \rangle_i$ leads to a much higher energy storage in the composite. Our simulations show that the strength of $\langle \mu \rangle_i$ depends on the local arrangement of dipoles, such that the chained configurations host higher local fields. Therefore, the morphology of particle distribution, especially, an optimal assembly of chained configurations, is an essential factor in devising new composites with effective energy storage features.

It should be noted that our simulation model does not take into account the impurity ions in the polymer matrix and the free space charges in high-$k$ fillers, which can greatly contribute to the pole formation on the filler surface, and also, perhaps, to the pole screening effects. The trapping of space charges at the inclusion pole sites can also form a remanent inclusion dipole moment when the external field is removed. We also ignore the existence of an interface between the inclusion and the matrix with an intermediate dielectric permittivity between $\varepsilon_{\text{in}}$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{p}}$, which, however, can be easily incorporated into our simulation model.

A Dielectric permittivity mixing rules for composite materials

Let us assume that a sphere of radius $R$ containing $N$ polarizable spherical particles of radius $r$ and permittivity $\varepsilon_{\text{p}}$ is
immersed in a medium with a permittivity \( \varepsilon_m \). When the sphere is polarized under the applied field \( E \), its dipole moment becomes

\[
\vec{M} = 4\pi R^3 \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_m E
\]  
(A.1)

where \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \) is the apparent permittivity of the sphere. It is straightforward to accept that

\[
\vec{M} = N \vec{\mu}_p
\]  
(A.2)

where \( \vec{\mu}_p \) is the induced dipole moment of particles, for which we have

\[
\vec{\mu}_p = 4\pi \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} - \varepsilon_m E
\]  
(A.3)

Then, from eqn (A.1)–(A.3) we get

\[
\frac{\varepsilon_{\text{eff}} - \varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_{\text{eff}} + 2\varepsilon_m} = \eta \frac{\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_p + 2\varepsilon_m}
\]  
(A.4)

which is the Maxwell–Garnett (MG) equation, and the packing fraction of particles is defined as \( \eta = N R^3 / R^3 \). Eqn (A.4) can be solved to obtain \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \) given by eqn (12) in the main text. The MG mixing rule is applicable for low \( \eta \) and does not take into account the interaction between induced dipoles \( \vec{\mu}_p \).

Another approach to the mixing rule is based on considering both components, the inclusions and the host matrix, as perturbations to the local field in the composite. Each component is assumed to be formed from particles of spherical shape and embedded in a uniform effective medium with \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \), which will be determined self-consistently. Considering that the average field in the composite is \( E \), each inclusion will have an induced dipole

\[
\vec{\mu}_p = 4\pi \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} - \varepsilon_m E
\]  
(A.5)

and, similarly, each matrix particle will develop a dipole moment

\[
\vec{\mu}_m = 4\pi \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_m E
\]  
(A.6)

Both these dipoles will change the local field \( E \), and it is straightforward to assume that the contributions from these dipoles compensate each other in order to keep \( E \) unchanged. This condition can be written as

\[
N_p \vec{\mu}_p + N_m \vec{\mu}_m = 0
\]  
(A.7)

where \( N_p \) and \( N_m \) are the number of inclusions and the matrix particles respectively. Then eqn (A.7) can be rewritten as

\[
\eta \frac{\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_{\text{eff}}}{\varepsilon_p + 2\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}} + (1 - \eta) \frac{\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_{\text{eff}}}{\varepsilon_m + 2\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}} = 0.
\]  
(A.8)

This is a quadratic Bruggeman (BR) equation for \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \) and has two solutions. One of them is a physically sensible solution and is given by eqn (13) in the main text. The other solution is typically negative and has no physical meaning.
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