Strategies to reduce the thermoelastic loss of multimaterial coated finite substrates
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Thermoelastic loss is one of the main energy dissipation mechanisms in resonant systems. A careful analysis of the thermoelastic loss is critical to design low-noise resonators for high-precision applications, such as gravitational-wave detectors. This paper presents an analytical solution to the thermoelastic loss in multimaterial coated finite substrates with realistic assumptions on the model structure and the elastic fields. The mechanism responsible for thermoelastic loss is taken as a function of material properties, operating temperature and frequency, and other design parameters. We calculate the thermoelastic loss for specific applications over a wide range of frequencies (1 Hz to 10 GHz) and temperatures (1 K to 300 K), and for a variety of substrate and coating materials. The result is relevant for gravitational-wave detectors and for experiments sensitive to mechanical dissipation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Thermoelastic dissipation arises from the thermal response generated by the elastic field in a deformable medium. In a vibrating structure, the periodic displacement field causes a temperature gradient in the elastic body, where the compressed region is hotter and the stretched region becomes cooler. Consequently, heat transfer takes place in order to reach thermal equilibrium, which results in elastic components out of phase with the elastic fields. The energy lost due to this irreversible heat flow is referred to as thermoelastic loss [1, 2]. For a coated substrate, this loss is also caused by thermal expansion mismatch between the materials that coating and substrate are made of. This type of coating-substrate structure is commonly used in mirrors used for the detection of gravitational-waves (GW), such as in the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO) [3], Virgo interferometer [4] and the Kamioka Gravitational-Wave Detector (KAGRA) [5], for which it is necessary to estimate the loss generated by this effect.

Thermoelastic loss of gravitational-wave mirrors has been extensively studied in addition to other sources of thermal noise, such as the mechanical loss intrinsic to the material and thermo-refractive noise caused by temperature fluctuations [6]. The quality factor, Q-factor, is a measure of the energy loss rate and is the inverse measure of energy loss caused by all the dissipation mechanisms present in the structure. To further improve the Q-factor of resonant systems, or the ratio of stored energy to the energy dissipated per cycle, it is essential to fully understand the thermoelastic loss and predict it for various experimental conditions.

In 1937, Zener first published an analysis of thermoelastic damping in thin resonator beams undergoing flexural vibrations [1]. Lifshitz and Roukes later refined his model and solved the fundamental equations more rigorously, leading to different approximate solutions of temperature profile and hence, different expressions of the thermoelastic loss (hereinafter referred to as φ) [7]. After solving the classical Fourier heat conduction equation, they derived φ from the attenuation of the vibration.

Fejer et al. developed an independent approach for the computation of φ in mirrors for gravitational-wave detectors; they determined the energy lost due to the elastic field induced by thermal fluctuations in the coating on an infinitely thick substrate [8]. Based on the work of Fejer et al., Somiya and Yamamoto considered a substrate of finite thickness and proposed a different form of solution to the thermal equations using the elastic response of a cylinder with finite thickness [9]. The energy dissipation resulting from the heat flow was directly extracted from the temperature gradient.

Gravitational-wave detectors, such as LIGO, are kilometer-sized interferometers that bounce a beam of light between highly reflective optical mirrors. These mirrors consist of a silica substrate and a multilayer coating that alternates layers of silica and titania-doped tantalum [10]. It is thus of high relevance to calculate the thermoelastic loss in mirrors with these types of structures. Fejer et al. and Somiya and Yamamoto, both adopted the same approach to calculate the thermoelastic loss in mirrors with multilayered coatings: the effective medium approach (EMA), in which the multilayers are abstracted as a homogeneous medium of weighted-average physical properties [8, 9].

In this paper, we present a theoretical treatment of the thermoelastic behavior of a coated substrate, based on the model described by Fejer et al. [8]. We propose that a more realistic determination of phi can be achieved using a model that i) considers a substrate of finite thickness, and ii) preserves the system configuration and the identity of the materials that compose it. The derived expressions are then applied to various structures and as will be shown in this paper, the thermoelastic loss can be minimized through careful choices of variables, such as
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operating frequency, temperature, and thickness of individual coating layers. It should be noted that our model includes only the thermoelastic loss resulting from the interaction between two or more materials of different physical properties, when they are in contact with each other; the internal loss within one material due to statistical fluctuations in temperature has been studied for finite-sized mirrors and can be combined with the coupled loss discussed in this paper to find the total thermoelastic loss [11–13].

The paper is outlined as follows: Section II presents an overview of the key equations used to evaluate the thermoelastic loss in a substrate coated by a uniform film. Thermoelastic response and the consequent heat propagation normal to the surfaces are studied. We also consider a model consisting of a multilayer coating and refine the heat equations to accommodate the alternating layers. Analytical solutions for both types of structure are derived. Finally, Section III presents the results calculated from the formulae of thermoelastic loss for various cases and discusses how material properties and external factors would impact the thermoelastic loss. Particular attention is paid to the multilayer structure without adopting the EMA, where the structure of the coating (layers and interfaces) is preserved.

II. MATHEMATICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE THERMOELASTIC LOSS

To derive an expression for the thermoelastic loss in a coated substrate, we consider a film of thickness \( l \) on a substrate with a thickness of \( h - l \), as illustrated in Figure 1. We define the surface normal to be in the \( z \)-direction. The surface is located at \( z = 0 \), and the film extends from \( z = 0 \) to \( z = l \), and the substrate from \( z = l \) to \( z = h \), where \( h \gg l \). Our model assumes that both the film and the substrate are uniform so that there is no temperature variation in the \( x-y \) plane, and the transverse dimensions are much larger than the thickness so that only thermal diffusion along \( z \)-direction needs to be taken into account.

![Figure 1. Illustration of a uniform substrate coated with a layer of homogeneous material.](image)

The loss in energy due to thermoelasticity of materials is calculated for two states of stress, in-plane stress and normal stress. Detailed derivations are presented in the following sections. Thermoelastic loss is a measure of energy dissipated due to the coupling between the deformation and thermal field. Hence first, the relationship between the intrinsic elastic field and the temperature field produced by it needs to be determined. By defining the boundary conditions and solving the equilibrium equations, the thermal strain and the associated power dissipation can be found. Subsequently, the elastic energy stored in the coating can be obtained from the applied stress through the use of theory of elasticity. Finally, based on the definition of thermoelastic loss \( \phi \), an expression of \( \phi \) for the coating and the substrate can be found.

A. Formulation of the thermal field

The dynamic deformation of a body causes temperature variations. We use the linear heat equation along \( z \)-direction to find the temperature distribution coupled to the input elastic field [14],

\[
\frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial t} - \kappa_j \frac{\partial^2 \theta_j}{\partial z^2} = -\frac{E_j \alpha_j T}{(1-2\nu_j)C_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \epsilon_{0,j} \quad (1)
\]

where \( \theta_j(t, z) \) is the time/position-varying temperature, \( \kappa_j \) is the thermal diffusivity, \( E_j \) is the Young’s modulus, \( \alpha_j \) is the coefficient of linear thermal expansion, \( T \) is the background temperature, \( \nu_j \) is the Poisson’s ratio, \( C_j \) is the specific heat capacity per unit volume and \( j = f, s \) indicates quantities evaluated in the film and in the substrate, respectively. GW mirrors are exposed to high-intensity laser beams, which causes that the mirror thermal field depends on its elastic field and optical absorption. In the model presented in this paper, the thermal field only depends on the elastic field. The work on photothermal transfer function by Ballmer [15] serves as a basis for calculating the heat flow and thermal expansion caused by optical absorption.

Taking \( \theta_j(t, z) \) to be in the form of \( \theta_j(z) \exp(i\omega t) \) and the strain as \( \epsilon_0 \exp(i\omega t) \), where \( \omega = 2\pi f \) is the angular frequency, Equation 1 becomes

\[
i\omega \theta_j - \kappa_j \frac{\partial^2 \theta_j}{\partial z^2} = -i\omega \beta_j \quad (2)
\]

where \( \beta_j = (E_j \alpha_j T)/(1-2\nu_j)C_j \sum \epsilon_{0,j} \).

The boundary conditions for heat fluxes are defined as follows,

\[
\left. \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial z} \right|_{z=0} = 0,
\]

\[
\left. k_j \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial z} \right|_{z=l} = k_s \left. \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial z} \right|_{z=l},
\]

\[
\left. \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial z} \right|_{z=h} = 0
\]

where \( k \) represents the thermal conductivity.
As previously proposed by Fejer et al. [8], the final solution to the heat equation consists of two parts, a particular (p) solution of thermal field, $\theta_p(z)$, that is coupled to the strain and satisfies Equation 2, and a specific (s) solution, $\theta_s(z)$, that meets the boundary conditions. It can be written as,

$$\theta_j = \theta_{p,j}(z) + \theta_{s,j}(z)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

We solve for the thermal fields consistent with the boundary conditions (Equation 3); the calculation is restricted, and therefore, the thermal field, $\theta$ to the strain and satisfies Equation 2, and a specific (s) solution of thermal field, $\theta_s(z)$, that meets the boundary conditions. The thermal fields in the film and the substrate along the z direction are

$$\theta_f = -\beta_f + \frac{\Delta \beta \times \cosh(\gamma_f z)}{\cosh(\gamma_f l) + R \sinh(\gamma_f l) \coth(q)},$$

$$\theta_s = -\beta_s - \frac{\Delta \beta R \times \cosh(\gamma_s (h - z))}{\cosh(\gamma_f l) \sinh(q) + R \cosh(q)} \hspace{1cm} (5)$$

where $q = \gamma_s (h - l), \Delta \beta = \beta_f - \beta_s, \gamma_f = (1 + i) \sqrt{\pi f C_j/k_j}$ and $R = (k_f \gamma_f)/(k_s \gamma_s) = \sqrt{(k_s C_j)/(k_f C_s)}$.

To determine the induced stress field, $\epsilon_1$, and strain field, $\sigma_1$, by oscillatory thermal fluctuation, we assume that any expansion/contraction along z-direction is not restricted, and therefore, $\epsilon_{1,zz} = \alpha_s \theta_s$, $\sigma_{1,zz} = 0$. When considering the in-plane thermal expansion, one assumption made in the calculation is that the substrate expands freely, effectively uninfluenced by the film; however, the in-plane expansion of the film is constrained. Moreover, the film is assumed to have a uniform strain of $\alpha_s \theta_s(z = l)$, which is the expansion of the substrate at the film-substrate interface. This approximation is reasonable if the substrate is much thicker than the film, i.e., $(h - l) \gg l$. Since the free expansion in plane of the film is forbidden, stress is developed in the interior of the film and the stress level depends on the mismatch between the thermal expansion of the film and the substrate. Taking these into consideration, we find the elastic fields due to thermal mismatch:

$$\epsilon_{1,ii,j} = A_{1,ii,j} \alpha_s \theta_j,$$

$$\sigma_{1,ii,j} = B_{1,ii,j} \alpha_s \theta_j \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

The matrices $A_{1,ii,j}$ and $B_{1,ii,j}$ are defined as,

$$A_{1,ii,f} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_s \theta_s,j & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_s \theta_s,l & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_f \theta_f \end{pmatrix},$$

$$B_{1,ii,f} = \begin{pmatrix} -b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_{1,ii,s} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_s \theta_s & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_s \theta_s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_s \theta_s \end{pmatrix},$$

$$B_{1,ii,s} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $b = E_f (\alpha_f \theta_f - \alpha_s \theta_s,l)$, and $\theta_{s,l}$ represents $\theta_s(z = l)$.

### B. Applied elastic field and elastic energy

In order to calculate the oscillatory thermal field caused by an oscillatory applied stress or a vibration at some frequency $\omega$, we need to first determine the stress and strain states. Two potential cases are considered: 1) in-plane stress and 2) normal stress to the surface. The latter one is relevant to mechanical loss measurements and LIGO operation. Solutions to most other stress states can be attained by a sum of the solutions based on these two stress fields. Using the elastic boundary conditions, we find the driving elastic fields in the film, denoted by the subscript 0.

#### 1. Stress parallel to the coated surface

The boundary conditions for stress parallel to the coated surface are: $\sigma_{0,xx} = \sigma_{0,yy} = \sigma_{0,||} (\text{with the assumption of symmetry})$, and $\sigma_{0,zz} = 0$. Using Hooke’s law, we find

$$\epsilon_{0,xx,j} = \epsilon_{0,yy,j} = \frac{1 - \nu_j}{E_j} \sigma_{0,||},$$

$$\epsilon_{0,zz,j} = \frac{-2\nu_j}{E_j} \sigma_{0,||} \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

Summarizing the results in matrix form, the stress and strain fields can be expressed in the forms of

$$\epsilon_{0,ii,j} = a_{0,ii,j} \sigma_{0,||},$$

$$\sigma_{0,ii,j} = b_{0,ii,j} \sigma_{0,||}\hspace{1cm} (9)$$

where

$$a_{0,j} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1 - \nu_j}{E_j} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1 - \nu_j}{E_j} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{-2\nu_j}{E_j} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$b_{0,j} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Therefore the elastic energy stored per unit area is given by

$$E_{\text{stored},||,j} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma \times l$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{0,||} \sum b_{0,j} a_{0,j} \hspace{1cm} (11)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{0,||} l \times \frac{2(1 - \nu_j)}{E_j}$$

#### 2. Stress perpendicular to the coated surface

For stress perpendicular to the coated surface, the boundary conditions are defined as: $\sigma_{0,zz} = \sigma_{0,\perp},$
σ_{0,xx}, σ_{0,yy} \neq 0; \epsilon_{0,zz} \neq 0, \epsilon_{0,xx} = \epsilon_{0,yy} = 0. With the Hooke’s law expression, we obtain

\[
\sigma_{0,xx,j} = \sigma_{0,yy,j} = \frac{\nu_j}{1 - \nu_j} \sigma_{0,\perp}, \\
\epsilon_{0,zz,j} = \frac{\sigma_{0,\perp}}{E_j} (1 - 2\nu_j)(1 + \nu_j) \frac{1}{1 - \nu_j} 
\]

The collective results are,

\[
\epsilon_{0,ii,\perp,j} = \epsilon_{0,ii,j} \sigma_{0,\perp}, \\
\sigma_{0,ii,\perp,j} = d_{0,ii,j} \sigma_{0,\perp}
\]

where

\[
c_{0,j} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (1-2\nu_j)(1+\nu_j) & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
d_{0,j} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_j & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \nu_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
\]

Hence, the amount of elastic energy stored per unit area is given by

\[
E_{\text{stored,} \perp,j} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma \epsilon \times l = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{0,\perp,j}^2 l \sum d_{0,j} c_{0,j} \\
= \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{0,\perp,j}^2 l \times \frac{(1 - 2\nu_j)(1 + \nu_j)}{E_j(1 - \nu_j)} 
\]

**(C. Energy dissipation and thermoelastic loss**

We first consider the energy dissipated within the film. The rate of energy dissipation per unit volume in a deformed body, in this case, the film, is defined as

\[
p_{\text{diss},j} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial t}
\]

which has to be a real function. The overall film strain and strain in the case of plane stress are described as

\[
\epsilon_{f,ii,\parallel} = a_{0,ii} \epsilon_0 + A_{1,ii} f \alpha_f \theta_f, \\
\sigma_{f,ii,\parallel} = b_{0,ii} \sigma_0 + B_{1,ii} f \alpha_f \theta_f
\]

As for the case of stress perpendicular to the coated surface, we write

\[
\epsilon_{f,ii,\perp} = c_{0,ii} \epsilon_0 + A_{1,ii,f} \alpha_f \theta_f, \\
\sigma_{f,ii,\perp} = d_{0,ii} \sigma_0 + B_{1,ii,f} \alpha_f \theta_f
\]

The oscillatory stress and strain fields have a time dependence

\[
\epsilon = \epsilon_{f,ii} e^{i\omega t}, \\
\sigma = \sigma_{f,ii} e^{i\omega t}
\]

Hence, \(p_{\text{diss},f}\) can be written as

\[
p_{\text{diss},f} = \sum \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \sigma_{f,ii} \epsilon_{f,ii}}{\partial t} = \omega \sum \text{Im}[\sigma_{f,ii} \epsilon_{f,ii}]
\]

\[
= \omega \sum \text{Im}[\sigma_{0,ii} \epsilon_0 + \sigma_{1,ii} \epsilon_0 + \sigma_{0,ii} \epsilon_1 + \sigma_{1,ii} \epsilon_1]
\]

\[
= \omega \sum \text{Im}[\sigma_{1,ii} \epsilon_0 + \sigma_{0,ii} \epsilon_1]
\]

since \(\sigma_{0,ii} \epsilon_0\) is real, and \(\sigma_{1,ii} \epsilon_1\) can be neglected because the induced elastic fields are significantly smaller than the input fields.

Therefore, the energy dissipated per unit area is

\[
E_{\text{diss},f} = \tau \int_0^l p_{\text{diss},f} dz
\]

where \(\tau = 2\pi/\omega\). Substituting Equation 20 and the expressions of thermal and applied elastic fields, previously derived in Section II A, into Equation 21, we obtain the total energy dissipated in the film and the substrate for parallel and perpendicular stress fields, respectively:

\[
E_{\text{diss, total,} \parallel} = 2\pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ (2\nu_f - 2)\alpha_f \theta_1 f^{-1} \sinh(\gamma_f l) \\
+ (4 - 2\nu_f)\alpha_s \theta_1 s \cosh(\gamma_s (h - l)) \times l \\
- 2\alpha_s \theta_1 s \gamma_s^{-1} \sinh(\gamma_s (h - l)) \right]
\]

(22)

\[
E_{\text{diss, total,} \perp} = 2\pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ \alpha_f \theta_1 f^{-1} \sinh(\gamma_f l) \\
+ \frac{2\nu_f}{1 - \nu_f} \alpha_s \theta_1 s \cosh(\gamma_s (h - l)) \times l \\
- \frac{1 + \nu_s}{1 - \nu_s} \alpha s \theta_1 s \gamma_s^{-1} \sinh(\gamma_s (h - l)) \right]
\]

The detailed derivation is included in Appendix B.

The loss factor is generally defined as the ratio of energy dissipated per radian to the potential energy in a cycle. In this case, the potential energy is the elastic energy stored in the strained material. The consideration of an infinite substrate prevents the analysis of the elastic energy stored in the substrate, and only the strain energy of the coating can be considered. Therefore, to allow a direct addition/subtraction of all loss components (mechanical and thermoelastic), the denominator has to be consistently defined for these loss factors as the elastic energy of the entire system (coating and substrate). In this paper, we consider the stored potential energy in both the coating and the substrate.

According to Equations 11 and 15, the stored energy
in the entire system can be written in the form of

\[
E_{\text{stored,total,||}} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 l \times \frac{2(1 - \nu_f)}{E_f} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 (h - l) \times \frac{2(1 - \nu_s)}{E_s},
\]

\[
E_{\text{stored,total,\perp}} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 l \times \frac{(1 - 2\nu_f)(1 + \nu_f)}{E_f(1 - \nu_f)} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 (h - l) \times \frac{(1 - 2\nu_s)(1 + \nu_s)}{E_s(1 - \nu_s)}
\]

(24)

Therefore, the thermoelastic loss \( \phi \) can thus be calculated from

\[
\phi_{||} = \frac{|E_{\text{diss,total,||}}|}{2\pi \times E_{\text{stored,total,||}}},
\]

\[
\phi_{\perp} = \frac{|E_{\text{diss,total,\perp}}|}{2\pi \times E_{\text{stored,total,\perp}}}.
\]

(25)

Typically the substrate is significantly thicker than the film, i.e., \((h - l) \gg l\), implying that the total stored energy is mostly contained in the substrate (the second terms of Equations 24). As a result, by using a thicker substrate, which leads to a larger elastic energy stored in the substrate (while having little impact on the temperature gradient and inducing only a small increase in the energy lost per cycle due to thermoelasticity), we see a decrease in \( \phi \). It should be noted that this is different from the dilution factor considered in mechanical loss extraction from GeNS measurement [16], since the thermoelastic loss is coupled, due to the interactions between coating and substrate, and cannot be separated. Somiya and Yamamoto showed that \( \phi \) decreases with the substrate thickness and hits a plateau at a certain thickness [9]. As per the definition of thermoelastic loss (Eq. 25), adding more material to the substrate increases the system stored energy, while the energy dissipated remains almost unchanged. Thus, using a thicker substrate would lead to a lower thermoelastic loss. The thermoelastic loss plateau discussed above is a direct consequence of only taking into account the film elastic energy. The substrate effect will be discussed in more detail in Section III.

D. Multilayer coating on a finite substrate

In this section, we consider a coating made of alternating layers of two materials attached on a homogeneous substrate, which resembles the dielectric mirror coating used in gravitational-wave detectors, as depicted in Figure 2. We make the assumptions that i) the outer surface is not subjected to any heat flux, namely, that heat transfer only takes place within the films and substrate, and ii) each component is only affected by its nearest neighbors. These assumptions are likely to be valid in most cases as the temperature fluctuation caused by the driving stress is reasonably small so that there would not exist a large temperature difference across the coated body. Therefore, the thermoelastic dissipation can be divided into two parts: energy loss due to thermal conduction between 1) the coating layers, and 2) between the first deposited layer and the substrate.

Focusing on the interaction in the multilayer coating, we assume that each layer is uniform and the system is in steady state. To find the energy dissipation between coating layers made of two different materials, we begin by considering the thermal field in a single layer and assuming that its derivative is zero at the center, a direct consequence of continuity. The thermal fields are then solved using the boundary conditions and a model consisting of two half-layers [depicted in Figure 2(a)], where the temperature profile and heat flux are deemed symmetric.

![Figure 2. Illustration of a multilayer coating on a uniform substrate: (a) depicts a schematics of the model used to calculate the loss between layers, and (b) to calculate the loss between the first deposited layer and the substrate, where \( N \) represents the number of layers in the coating, \( t_1 \) the thickness of a single coating layer made of Material 1, \( t_2 \) the thickness of a single coating layer made of Material 2, and \( t_s \) the substrate thickness. The red lines show an example of the temperature profile across coating and substrate.]

The thermal field solutions are similar to those derived in Section II A, with the boundary conditions now being

\[
\left. \frac{\partial \theta_{f_1}}{\partial z} \right|_{z=0} = 0 ,
\]

\[
k_{f_1} \left. \frac{\partial \theta_{f_1}}{\partial z} \right|_{z=\frac{t_1}{2}} = k_{f_2} \left. \frac{\partial \theta_{f_2}}{\partial z} \right|_{z=\frac{t_1}{2}},
\]

\[
\left. \frac{\partial \theta_{f_2}}{\partial z} \right|_{z=\frac{t_1}{2} + \frac{t_2}{2}} = 0
\]

(26)

Solving for the thermal fields in the two materials, we get

\[
\theta_{f_1} = \theta_{p,f_1} + \theta_{1,f_1} \cosh(\gamma_{f_1} z),
\]

\[
\theta_{f_2} = \theta_{p,f_2} + \theta_{1,f_2} \cosh \left( \gamma_{f_2} \left( \frac{t_1}{2} + \frac{t_2}{2} - z \right) \right)
\]

(27)
And $\theta_{1,f_1}$ and $\theta_{1,f_2}$ are defined as

$$\theta_{1,f_1} = \frac{\Delta \beta'}{\cosh(\gamma_{\theta f_1}^2) + R' \sinh(\gamma_{\theta f_1}^2) \coth(\gamma_{\theta f_2}^2)},$$

$$\theta_{1,f_2} = -\frac{\Delta \beta' R'}{\coth(\gamma_{\theta f_1}^2) \sinh(\gamma_{\theta f_2}^2) + R' \cosh(\gamma_{\theta f_2}^2)}$$

where $\Delta \beta' = \beta_{f_1} - \beta_{f_2}$ and $R' = (k_{f_1} \gamma_{f_1})/(k_{f_2} \gamma_{f_2}) = \sqrt{(k_{f_1} C_{f_1})/(k_{f_2} C_{f_2})}$. The energy dissipated for parallel and perpendicular fields in the adjacent films (illustrated in Figure 2(a), indicated by subscript $a$, respectively, is thus obtained:

$$E_{\text{diss},a,\|} = 2\pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ (2\nu_{f1} - 2) \alpha_{f_1} \theta_{1,f_1} \gamma_{f_1}^{-1} \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma_{f_1} t_1}{2}\right) \right]$$

$$+ (4 - 2\nu_{f1}) \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(\gamma_{s} t_s) \times \frac{t_1}{2}$$

$$- (2 - 2\nu_{f2}) \alpha_{f_2} \theta_{1,f_2} \gamma_{f_2}^{-1} \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma_{f_2} t_2}{2}\right)$$

$$+ (4 - 2\nu_{f2}) \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(\gamma_{s} t_s) \times \frac{t_2}{2}$$

$$E_{\text{diss},a,\perp} = 2\pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ \alpha_{f_1} \theta_{1,f_1} \gamma_{f_1}^{-1} \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma_{f_1} t_1}{2}\right) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{2\nu_{f1}}{1 - \nu_{f1}} \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(\gamma_{s} t_s) \times \frac{t_1}{2}$$

$$+ \alpha_{f_2} \theta_{1,f_2} \gamma_{f_2}^{-1} \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma_{f_2} t_2}{2}\right)$$

$$+ \frac{2\nu_{f2}}{1 - \nu_{f2}} \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(\gamma_{s} t_s) \times \frac{t_2}{2}$$

From elasticity theory, the elastic energy stored in the case of parallel and perpendicular fields, respectively, in these half layers can be expressed as

$$E_{\text{stored},a,\|} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 \frac{t_1}{2} \times \frac{2(1 - \nu_{f1})}{E_{f_1}}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 \frac{t_2}{2} \times \frac{2(1 - \nu_{f2})}{E_{f_2}},$$

$$E_{\text{stored},a,\perp} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 \frac{t_1}{2} \times \frac{(1 - 2\nu_{f_1})(1 + \nu_{f_1})}{E_{f_1}(1 - \nu_{f_1})}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 \frac{t_2}{2} \times \frac{(1 - 2\nu_{f_2})(1 + \nu_{f_2})}{E_{f_2}(1 - \nu_{f_2})}$$

Similarly, for the thermoelastic loss due to heat conduction between the last layer of Material 2 and the substrate (illustrated in Figure 2(b), indicated by subscript $b$, we can find the energy dissipated in the form of

$$E_{\text{diss},b,\|} = 2\pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ (2\nu_{f_2} - 2) \times \alpha_{f_2} \theta_{1,f_2} \gamma_{f_2}^{-1} \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma_{f_2} t_2}{2}\right) \right]$$

$$+ (4 - 2\nu_{f_2}) \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(\gamma_{s} t_s) \times \frac{t_2}{2}$$

$$- 2\alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \gamma_{s}^{-1} \sinh(\gamma_{s} t_s)$$

$$E_{\text{diss},b,\perp} = 2\pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ \alpha_{f_2} \theta_{1,f_2} \gamma_{f_2}^{-1} \sinh\left(\frac{\gamma_{f_2} t_2}{2}\right) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{2\nu_{f_2}}{1 - \nu_{f_2}} \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(\gamma_{s} t_s) \times \frac{t_2}{2}$$

$$- \frac{1 + \nu_s}{1 - \nu_s} \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \gamma_{s}^{-1} \sinh(\gamma_{s} t_s)$$

where $\theta_{1,f_2}$ and $\theta_{1,s}$ are defined as

$$\theta_{1,f_2} = \frac{\Delta \beta''}{\cosh(\gamma_{f_2} t_2) + R'' \sinh(\gamma_{f_2} t_2) \coth(\gamma_{s} t_s)},$$

$$\theta_{1,s} = -\frac{\Delta \beta'' R''}{\coth(\gamma_{f_2} t_2) \sinh(\gamma_{s} t_s) + R'' \cosh(\gamma_{s} t_s)}$$

and where $\Delta \beta'' = \beta_{f_2} - \beta_s$ and $R'' = (k_{f_2} \gamma_{f_2})/(k_s \gamma_s) = \sqrt{(k_{f_2} C_{f_2})/(k_s C_s)}$.

And the energy stored for parallel and perpendicular fields in the form of

$$E_{\text{stored},b,\|} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 \frac{t_2}{2} \times \frac{2(1 - \nu_{f_2})}{E_{f_2}}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 \frac{t_2}{2} \times \frac{2(1 - \nu_s)}{E_s},$$

$$E_{\text{stored},b,\perp} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 \frac{t_2}{2} \times \frac{(1 - 2\nu_{f_2})(1 + \nu_{f_2})}{E_{f_2}(1 - \nu_{f_2})}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^2 \frac{t_2}{2} \times \frac{(1 - 2\nu_s)(1 + \nu_s)}{E_s(1 - \nu_s)}$$

The $E_{\text{diss}}$ and $E_{\text{stored}}$ in the first deposited layer of Material 2 are double counted in the two models. Taking it into account, the final expression of the total thermoelastic load of a multilayer coating on a uniform substrate is given by

$$\phi = \frac{E_{\text{diss},a} \times N - E_{\text{diss},a_2} + E_{\text{diss},b}}{2\pi \times (E_{\text{stored},a} \times N - E_{\text{stored},a_2} + E_{\text{stored},b})}$$

where $N$ is the total number of layers, $E_{\text{diss},a_2}$ and $E_{\text{stored},a_2}$ stand for the energy dissipated and stored in half a layer of Material 2, correspondingly.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we present estimates of thermoelastic loss for various cases, which are calculated using the equations presented in previous sections. The input elastic field, unless specified, uses the normal stress field described in Section II B, as it is commonly seen in many applications and used in the measurement of coating properties. The physical properties of materials used in the calculation are listed in Table I.
Table I. Elastic and thermal properties at room temperature of materials used for the calculation of $\phi$, Young’s modulus $E$, Poisson’s ratio $\nu$, thermal expansion coefficient $\alpha$, specific heat per unit volume $C_V$, and thermal conductivity $k$. The temperature dependencies of the thermal properties ($\alpha$, $C_V$ and $k$) are implemented as reported in their corresponding references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>$E$ (GPa)</th>
<th>$\nu$</th>
<th>$\alpha$ (10^{-6} K^{-1})</th>
<th>$C_V$ (10^6 J m^{-3} K^{-1})</th>
<th>$k$ (W m^{-1} K^{-1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVD $a$-Si</td>
<td>115^a</td>
<td>0.18^a</td>
<td>2.4^a [17]</td>
<td>2.4 [18]</td>
<td>91.0 [19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-Si</td>
<td>169 [20]</td>
<td>0.28 [20]</td>
<td>2.6 [21]</td>
<td>1.6 [22]</td>
<td>92.0 [23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-GaAs</td>
<td>85.5 [27]</td>
<td>0.31 [27]</td>
<td>5.75 [27]</td>
<td>1.74 [27]</td>
<td>46 [27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-Al$<em>{0.92}$Ga$</em>{0.08}$As</td>
<td>100 [28]</td>
<td>0.32 [28]</td>
<td>5.2 [28]</td>
<td>1.7 [28]</td>
<td>70 [28]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a PVD $a$-Si elastic properties are obtained using $E = 2G(1 + \nu)$, where $E = (1 - \nu)140$ GPa [29], and the shear modulus $G = 49$ GPa [30], both experimentally measured.

^b PVD $a$-Si thermal expansion coefficient temperature dependence is assumed to be the same than for c-Si reported in Ref. [21].

^c PVD $a$-SiO$_2$ thermal properties temperature dependence is assumed to be the same as for fused $a$-SiO$_2$ reported in Refs. [31, 32].

A. Thickness and frequency dependence

The thermoelastic loss of single-layer coated substrates was first investigated. $\phi$ of amorphous silicon ($a$-Si) films of various thicknesses, deposited on fused silica and crystalline Si ($c$-Si) substrates at room temperature (RT) is plotted in Figure 3 as a function of frequency. Numerical values of $\phi$ can be obtained from Equation 25, for a frequency range from 1 to 10$^7$ Hz. The calculated $\phi$ shows a non-monotonic behavior with one or two inflection points as a function of frequency, with the peak shifting towards lower frequency as the film thickness increases.

For the effect of thickness, our results show that a thicker film would yield higher thermoelastic loss, which is a direct outcome of a larger temperature difference, and thus a higher heat flux between the film and the substrate. The substrate thickness also has an impact on $\phi$: thicker substrates lead to an approximately proportional reduction in the thermoelastic loss, which is demonstrated in Figure 4. As discussed at the end of Section II C, while the elastic energy stored is linearly proportional to the substrate thickness, there is only a marginally small increase in the overall energy dissipation, which results in near proportional damping. Eventually, $\phi$ would approach zero at infinite substrate thickness, as the energy loss caused by thermal expansion mismatch would be vanishingly small in comparison to the elastic energy stored in the substrate.

Considering that both film and substrate thicknesses have an impact on the thermoelastic loss, we note that certain film to substrate thickness ratios may cause the thermoelastic loss to be one of the main energy dissipation mechanisms in the system.

B. Effect of input stress field

As previously mentioned in Section II B, another common type of stress is in-plane stress. Figure 5 compares the thermoelastic loss for the in-plane and perpendicular stress components. It can be seen that the peak frequency and the peak loss are only slightly affected; the difference is within 3% and 11%, respectively. Other types of bulk stress and shear stress can also be incorporated into the calculation, which makes the model presented in this work versatile.
C. Multilayer coating

We now consider a multilayer coating consisting of amorphous silicon and amorphous silica on top of a fused silica substrate. The substrate thickness is set to be 100 µm and the layer thicknesses are selected to follow the quarter-wavelength rule, \( \lambda/4n \), where \( \lambda \) is the wavelength of the operating laser and \( n \) is the refractive index [33]. We first investigated the effect of the number of layers. As can be seen in Figure 6, while the peak frequency remains almost unaffected, the thermoelastic loss increases in proportion to the number of layers with constant layer thickness, or in other words, the amount of material.

The thermoelastic loss models from Fejer et al. [8] and Somiya and Yamamoto [9] consider the EMA to approximate the two materials used in the multilayer coating as one homogeneous film with their averaged physical properties. In contrast, our method treats each layer as an individual component and computes the loss generated from heat transport across all interfaces. In Figure 7 we compare the results obtained by the model presented in this work and the EMA. The total film thickness was kept constant while the layer thicknesses were varied. It can be seen that, the three peaks of the loss curves are approximately at the same level, which is as expected since \( \phi \) is proportional to the total volume of the system. However, our model predicts that the number of interfaces plays a role and affects the peak position in frequency; as the layer thickness decreases, or equivalently, the number of interfaces increases, the peak position is shifted towards higher frequencies, which effectively lowers \( \phi \) in the frequency range of interest for GW detectors (100 Hz to 10 kHz), such as LIGO, Virgo and KAGRA. These results suggest that by reducing the layers thickness without changing the overall thickness of the coating, increasing the number of interfaces, the thermoelastic loss at a certain frequency can be reduced.

D. Comparison of Mirror Coatings for Gravitational-wave Detectors

Based on the model presented in Section II D, the thermoelastic loss of multilayer coating is calculated for various combinations of materials and layer thicknesses at three excitation frequencies, 100 Hz, 1 kHz and 10 kHz. The predicted values are listed in Table II. Our calculation shows that the choice of mirror coating and substrate in Advanced LIGO (the current LIGO generation); using a coating made of amorphous titania-doped tantala and
amorphous silica and a fused silica substrate, has the lowest thermoelastic loss at all three frequencies compared to other candidate materials.

E. Dependence on Temperature

Thermoelastic loss is closely related to working temperature since the thermal field induced is affected by $T$, as seen in Equation 1. In addition, the thermal properties of materials (coefficient of thermal expansion $\alpha$, specific heat $C_V$, and thermal conductivity $k$) are temperature dependent. As a result, $\phi$ varies with temperature. The elastic properties depend much less on temperature than the other properties so here we assume that they do not change with temperature, and we use measured values where possible and made estimations when those are not available for the thermal properties to calculate the temperature dependence of $\phi$. We assume that amorphous silicon has the same thermal expansion coefficient of its crystalline form [21] and its thermal conductivity and heat capacity are taken from Refs. [18, 19]. The values for thermal properties of fused silica were taken from Refs. [31, 32, 37]. Substituting in these temperature-dependent properties, the relationship between $\phi$ and temperature can then be analyzed.

Figure 8 illustrates that the thermoelastic loss of 100 nm-thick $\alpha$-Si deposited onto a silica substrate of 100 $\mu$m thick at 10 K is significantly lower than that at RT for all frequencies, and the inflection point shifts towards higher frequencies as temperature decreases.

It is known that the thermal expansion coefficient of crystalline silicon, $\alpha_{c-Si}$, is zero at 17.6 K and 123.7 K [21, 38]. Hence, the future cryogenic gravitational-wave detector, LIGO Voyager, that plans to operate at 123.7 K will greatly reduce the thermoelastic loss by making the test mass and one of the coating materials from silicon, as proposed by Adhikari et al. [39]. $\alpha$-Si has good mechanical loss and optical reflectivity compared to the currently used $\text{Ta}_2\text{O}_5$ coating [40–42]. Future LIGO Voyager plans to use crystalline silicon for the mirror substrate, and amorphous silicon as the high-index material and silica as the low-index layer for the mirror coating. This detector will operate at cryogenic temperatures to further reduce the loss and improve the sensitivity beyond the detection limits of the current GW detectors.

We calculated the thermoelastic loss of the proposed multilayer stack of $\alpha$-Si/$\alpha$-SiO$_2$ films for the LIGO Voyager mirror coating at three different excitation frequencies. As plotted in Figure 9, the thermoelastic loss increases with increasing vibration frequency, which agrees with what is observed in the calculated loss at RT.

The predicted loss shown in Figure 9 is based on the structure in which $\alpha$-SiO$_2$ is the last layer and in contact with the substrate. We note that when $\alpha$-Si is the last layer, the thermoelastic loss is lower at any temperature; as the discrepancy between the thermal behavior of $\alpha$-Si and $c$-Si is smaller than that between $\alpha$-SiO$_2$ and $c$-Si (black dashed line in Figure 9). If the thermal expansion coefficient of $\alpha$-Si is not exactly zero at the same temperatures as for $c$-Si (17.6 K and 123.7 K), then the $\phi$ two minima seen in Figure 9 would split into two local minima each, one to the left and one to the right. This could affect the current plans of making 123.7 K the operating temperature for LIGO Voyager.
The thermoelastic loss curve shifts toward higher frequencies while keeping the total thickness of the system constant, affecting the thermoelastic loss. We find that a thicker coating increases the thermoelastic loss, and in contrast, a thicker substrate reduces it. Additionally, we further extend our analytical solutions to multilayered structures and substrates of finite thickness. The numerical results obtained highlight how material properties, measurement temperatures and for different frequencies. We highlight the relevance of the mismatch between the physical properties of substrate and first layer at their interface.

**IV. CONCLUSIONS**

We present a mathematical model that estimates the thermoelastic loss associated with a coating on a substrate of finite thickness. The numerical results obtained highlight how material properties, measurement temperatures and frequency, and experimental system design affect the thermoelastic loss. We find that a thicker coating increases the thermoelastic loss, and in contrast, a thicker substrate reduces it. Additionally, we further extend our analytical solutions to multilayered structures and demonstrate that thermoelastic loss correlates with the number of layers (interfaces) for a given volume, which is a relevant parameter in the design of gravitational-wave detector mirrors. By increasing the number of layers, while keeping the total thickness of the system constant, the thermoelastic loss curve shifts toward higher frequencies. We also calculate and compare the thermoelastic loss of the current Advanced LIGO mirror coating and potential candidates for future gravitational-wave detectors. We pay particular attention to the amorphous silicon/amorphous silica coating designed for LIGO Voyager and calculate its thermoelastic loss over a range of temperatures and for different frequencies. We highlight the relevance of the mismatch between the physical properties of substrate and first layer at their interface.
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**Appendix A: Thermal field solutions**

As discussed in Section II A, two components are required for the expression of thermal fields in z-direction, the particular solution and the specific solution. The particular solution is assumed not to depend on in-plane position if the film/substrate is uniform. Looking at Equation 2, we can conclude that

\[ \theta_{p,j} = -\beta_j \]  

(A1)

Using the boundary conditions, we can solve for the specific solution

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_{s,f} &= \theta_{1,f} \cosh(\gamma_f z), \\
\theta_{s,s} &= \theta_{1,s} \cosh[\gamma_s(h - z)]
\end{align*}
\]

(A2)

and \( \gamma_j = (1 + i)\sqrt{\omega/(2\kappa_j)} = (1 + i)\sqrt{\pi fC_j/k_j} \), so that

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial \theta_{p,j}}{\partial t} - \kappa_j \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{p,j}}{\partial z^2} &= -i\omega \beta_j, \\
\frac{\partial \theta_{s,j}}{\partial t} - \kappa_j \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{s,j}}{\partial z^2} &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

(A3)
The continuity of temperature and thermal flux at $z = l$ requires

$$\theta_{p,f}(z = l) + \theta_{1,f} \cosh(\gamma_f l) = \theta_{p,s}(z = l) + \theta_{1,s} \cosh(\gamma_s (h - l)),$$

$$k_f [\theta'_{p,f}(z = l) + \theta_{1,f} \gamma_f \sinh(\gamma_f l)] = k_s [\theta'_{p,s}(z = l) - \theta_{1,s} \gamma_s \sinh(\gamma_s (h - l))].$$

(A4)

$\theta'_{p,f}$ and $\theta'_{p,s}$ are zero for uniform film and substrate. Substitute in $\theta_{p,f}$ and $\theta_{p,s}$ and solve for $\theta_{1,f}$, we get

$$\theta_{1,f} = \frac{\Delta \beta}{\cosh(\gamma_f l) + R \sinh(\gamma_f l) \coth(q)},$$

$$\theta_{1,s} = -\frac{\Delta \beta R}{\coth(\gamma_f l) \sinh(q) + R \cosh(q)} \frac{\Delta \beta R}{\coth(\gamma_f l) \sinh(q) + R \cosh(q)}$$

(A5)

where $q = \gamma_s (h - l)$, $\Delta \beta = \beta_f - \beta_s$ and $R = (k_f \gamma_f)/(k_s \gamma_s) = (k_f C_f)/(k_s C_s)$.

The thermal field solutions can thus be expressed as a sum of the particular and the specific solutions and be written as

$$\theta_f = -\beta_f + \frac{\Delta \beta \times \cosh(\gamma_f z)}{\cosh(\gamma_f l) + R \sinh(\gamma_f l) \coth(q)},$$

$$\theta_s = -\beta_s - \frac{\Delta \beta R \times \cosh(\gamma_s (h - z))}{\coth(\gamma_f l) \sinh(q) + R \cosh(q)} \frac{\Delta \beta R \times \cosh(\gamma_s (h - z))}{\coth(\gamma_f l) \sinh(q) + R \cosh(q)}$$

(A6)

**Appendix B: Energy dissipation due to thermoelastic response**

Substituting Equation 20 and the expressions obtained previously in Section II B into Equation 21, we get

$$E_{\text{diss},f} = \tau \int_{l}^{h} \omega \sum \text{Im}[\sigma_{1,ii} \epsilon_{0,ii} + \sigma_{0,ii} \epsilon_{1,ii} + \text{Im}[\sigma_{1,ii} \epsilon_{0,ii} + \sigma_{0,ii} \epsilon_{1,ii}]] dz$$

$$= \tau \omega \sigma_0 \int_{l}^{h} \text{Im}[d_{0,f}] dz$$

(B1)

where $d_{0,f,\parallel} = B_1 a_0 + b_0 A_1 = (-2 - 2 \nu_f) \alpha_f \theta_f + (4 - 2 \nu_f) \alpha_s \theta_s$ and $d_{0,f,\perp} = B_1 a_0 + d_0 A_1 = \alpha_f \theta_f + 2 \nu_f (\alpha_s \theta_s)/(1 - \nu_f)$.

In previous calculations in Section II A, we have shown that $\theta_{p,f}$ is a constant and a real number. Hence Equation B1 can be simplified into

$$E_{\text{diss},f,\parallel} = 2 \pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ (2 \nu_f - 2) \frac{\alpha_f \theta_{1,f}}{\gamma_f} \sinh(\gamma_f l) \right]$$

$$+ (4 - 2 \nu_f) \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(q) \times l,$$

$$E_{\text{diss},f,\perp} = 2 \pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ \frac{\alpha_f \theta_{1,f}}{\gamma_f} \sinh(\gamma_f l) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{2 \nu_f}{1 - \nu_f} \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(q) \times l \right]$$

(B2)

where $q = \gamma_s (h - l)$.

A similar derivation for the substrate can be done by following all the procedures discussed above. The energy dissipated in the substrate can be determined and expressed in

$$E_{\text{diss},s} = \tau \int_{l}^{h} \omega \sum \text{Im}[\sigma_{1,ii} \epsilon_{0,ii} + \sigma_{0,ii} \epsilon_{1,ii,s}] dz$$

$$= \tau \omega \sigma_0 \int_{l}^{h} \text{Im}[d_{0,s}] dz$$

(B3)

where $d_{0,s,\parallel} = 2 \alpha_s \theta_s$ and $d_{0,s,\perp} = (1 + \nu_s) \alpha_s \theta_s/(1 - \nu_s)$. And

$$E_{\text{diss},s,\parallel} = 2 \pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ -2 \frac{\alpha_s \theta_{1,s}}{\gamma_s} \sinh(q) \right]$$

$$E_{\text{diss},s,\perp} = 2 \pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ \frac{1 + \nu_s}{1 - \nu_s} \frac{\alpha_s \theta_{1,s}}{\gamma_s} \sinh(q) \right]$$

(B4)

In order to calculate the thermoelastic loss in the film and the substrate, the total energy dissipated and the total elastic energy stored have to be found. The total energy dissipated is simply the sum of $E_{\text{diss},f}$ and $E_{\text{diss},s}$ and is given by

$$E_{\text{diss,total,\parallel}} = E_{\text{diss},f,\parallel} + E_{\text{diss},s,\parallel}$$

$$= 2 \pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ (2 \nu_f - 2) \frac{\alpha_f \theta_{1,f}}{\gamma_f} \sinh(\gamma_f l) \right]$$

$$+ (4 - 2 \nu_f) \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(q) \times l$$

$$- 2 \frac{\alpha_s \theta_{1,s}}{\gamma_s} \sinh(q) \right]$$

(B5)

$$E_{\text{diss,total,\perp}} = E_{\text{diss},f,\perp} + E_{\text{diss},s,\perp}$$

$$= 2 \pi \sigma_0 \times \text{Im} \left[ \frac{\alpha_f \theta_{1,f}}{\gamma_f} \sinh(\gamma_f l) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{2 \nu_f}{1 - \nu_f} \alpha_s \theta_{1,s} \cosh(q) \times l$$

$$- 1 + \nu_s \frac{\alpha_s \theta_{1,s}}{\gamma_s} \sinh(q) \right]$$

(B6)