University of South Carolina Scholar Commons

Theses and Dissertations

1-1-2013

Experimental and Simulation Predicted Crack Paths For AL-2024-T351 Under Mixed-Mode I/II Fatigue Loading Using An Arcan Fixture

Eileen Miller University of South Carolina - Columbia

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd Part of the <u>Mechanical Engineering Commons</u>

Recommended Citation

Miller, E.(2013). Experimental and Simulation Predicted Crack Paths For AL-2024-T351 Under Mixed-Mode I/II Fatigue Loading Using An Arcan Fixture. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/2439

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.



EXPERIMENTAL AND SIMULATION PREDICTED CRACK PATHS FOR AL-2024-T351 UNDER MIXED-MODE I/II FATIGUE LOADING USING AN ARCAN FIXTURE

by

Eileen Miller

Bachelor of Science University of South Carolina, 2011

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Science in

Mechanical Engineering

College of Engineering and Computing

University of South Carolina

2013

Accepted by:

Michael A. Sutton, Director of Thesis

Xiaomin Deng, Co-director of Thesis

Lacy Ford, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies



© Copyright by Eileen Miller, 2013 All Rights Reserved.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have made this work possible for me. I would first like to express my greatest appreciation for my advisor, Dr. Michael Sutton, for his mentorship through my career at the University of South Carolina. He has provided opportunities for me to work, learn, and grow as an engineer as well as proving support educationally, financially, and personally. I would also like to thank Dr. Xiaomin Deng for his guidance in this research project and in the classroom. His patience and expectations of excellence have been invaluable to this work and my preparation for future endeavors.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Mr. Haywood Watts and Mr. Brendan Croom for their assistance conducting experiments in the laboratory. Dr. Anthony Reynolds provided valuable guidance in conducting the experiments, and Dan Wilhelm played an instrumental role in troubleshooting with the test stand. Their help is also greatly appreciated.

I also would like to acknowledge the financial support provided by NASA's South Carolina Space Grant Consortium through the Graduate Student Fellowship which helped fund my education. Also the financial support provided by an Air Force Research Lab SBIR project and specifically AFRL engineers Dr.. Robert Reuter and Dr. James Harter is deeply appreciated. Finally, I would like to extend my thanks to the College of Engineering and Computing at the University of South Carolina where the experiments were performed.



iii

ABSTRACT

Mixed mode I/II fatigue experiments and simulations are performed for an Arcan fixture and a 6.35mm thick Al-2024-T351 specimen. Experiments were performed for Arcan loading angles that gave rise to a range of Mode I/II crack tip conditions from $0 \le \Delta K_{II}/\Delta K_I \le \infty$. Measurements include the crack paths, loading cycles and maximum and minimum loads for each loading angle. Simulations were performed using three-dimensional finite element analysis (3D-FEA) with 10-noded tetrahedral elements via the custom in-house FEA code, CRACK3D. While modeling the entire fixture-specimen geometry, a modified version of the virtual crack closure technique (VCCT) with automatic crack tip re-meshing and a maximum normal stress criterion was used to predict the direction of crack growth. Results indicate excellent agreement between experiments and simulations for the measured crack paths during the first several millimeters of crack extension.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSiii
Abstract iv
LIST OF TABLES vii
LIST OF FIGURES
LIST OF SYMBOLS xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xvi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION1
1.1 motivation1
1.2 BACKGROUND
1.3 CURRENT WORK10
CHAPTER 2 EXPERIMENTAL WORK
2.1 FIXTURE AND SPECIMEN PREPARATION12
2.2 Setup
2.3 Experimental Procedure16
2.4 LOAD PREDICTION
2.5 DETERMINATION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRACK PATHS
2.6 Experimental Results
CHAPTER 3 THEORETICAL WORK
3.1 CRACK3D
3.2 GEOMETRY, MESH GENERATION, AND BOUNDARY CONDITIONS



3.3 SIMULATION PROCEDURE
3.4 Post-Processing of Simulation Results
3.5 THEORETICAL RESULTS44
CHAPTER 4 DISCUSSION
4.1 DISCUSSION OF EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS
4.2 DISCUSSION OF THEORETICAL RESULTS
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS
CHAPTER 6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK
REFERENCES
APPENDIX A – EXPERIMENTAL DATA RECORDED
APPENDIX B – DETAILS AND TIPS FOR CRACK3D INPUT FILES GENERATION
Appendix C – Files Associated with CRACK3D for $\Phi = 45^{\circ}$



LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Scale factors used to convert digitized points from pixels to meters
Table 2.2 Percent error in crack path position 25
Table 3.1 Table of applied displacements for line on top fixture 41
Table 3.2 All combinations of simulations performed to verify convergence of solution 43
Table A.1. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$
Table A.2. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 30^{\circ}$
Table A.3. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 45^{\circ}$
Table A.4. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$
Table A.5. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 90^{\circ}$ 90



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 The three fracture modes for nominally elastic conditions
Figure 1.2 A schematic of a typical log-log plot of Paris' Law5
Figure 1.3 Diagram of Arcan fixture and specimen7
Figure 1.4 Specimen for Arcan fixture with single edge crack7
Figure 1.5 Schematic of kinked crack
Figure 2.1 Mixed mode I/II Arcan test fixture and butterfly shaped test specimen. Angle $\Phi = 0^{\circ}$ corresponds to far-field tension and $\Phi = 90^{\circ}$ is far-field shear13
Figure 2.2 (a) Dimension of specimens in inches (b) Diagram of notch and pre-crack13
Figure 2.3 Images of experimental set up for 45° loading angle14
Figure 2.4 (Top) One degree-of-freedom slide apparatus; (Bottom) Two degree-of-freedom slide apparatus15
Figure 2.5 Schematic of coordinate system in which the crack tip was tracked during Pre-cracking (solid line) and testing (dotted line)
Figure 2.6 Visual representations of the actual geometry and loading (solid line) And the assumed geometry and loading (dotted lines)
Figure 2.7 Diagram of geometry for Tada's empirical expression19
Figure 2.8 Schematic of the images digitized and an exaggerated view of how the points Were selected for determining the scale factor from pixels to meters
Figure 2.9 Coordinate system used to define crack paths from the tip of the pre-crack25
Figure 2.10 Crack growth rate along crack path for 30° loading case26
Figure 2.11 Crack growth rate along crack path for 45° loading case27
Figure 2.12 Crack growth rate along crack path for 60° loading case27



Figure 2.13 Originally digitized crack path data for 15° loading case
Figure 2.14 Digitized crack path and polynomial fit for 15° loading case
Figure 2.15 Digitized crack path and polynomial fit for 30° loading case
Figure 2.16 Digitized crack path and polynomial fit for 45° loading case
Figure 2.17 Digitized crack path and polynomial fit for 60° loading case
Figure 2.18 Crack path for $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$ determined by slide apparatus experimentally versus the crack path determined by digitization
Figure 3.1 An exaggerated local 2D view of a crack-front finite element mesh on the Plane normal to the crack-front, where the rigid springs between the node pairs have Zero length
Figure 3.2 A local view of a crack front mesh on the extended crack surface, where the Local coordinate system for a mid-node on the crack front has its origin at the node 35
Figure 3.3 Diagram of crack growth direction for MCS criterion
Figure 3.4 Diagram of a picture of actual Arcan fixture and specimen (left) and image of Finite element model geometry (right)
Figure 3.5 Image of the 3D mesh40
Figure 3.6 A 2D view of the initial 3D finite element mesh in the specimen region40
Figure 3.7 Boundary conditions at $\Phi = 30^{\circ}$
Figure 3.8 Crack path for $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$ with various initial meshes, minimum element sizes, And crack increments
Figure 3.9 2D view of the 3D deformed mesh for $\Phi = 45^{\circ}$ (top) and a close up of the Crack path and re-meshing zone around the crack front
Figure 3.10 The experimental and predicted crack path for the 15° loading case46
Figure 3.11 The experimental and predicted crack path for the 30° loading case46
Figure 3.12 The experimental and predicted crack path for the 45° loading case47
Figure 3.13 The experimental and predicted crack path for the 60° loading case47



Figure 3.14 Plot of ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} along the crack path for the 15° loading case
Figure 3.15 Plot of ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} along the crack path for the 30° loading case
Figure 3.16 Plot of ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} along the crack path for the 45° loading case
Figure 3.17 Plot of ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} along the crack path for the 60° loading case
Figure 4.1 Plot of crack path for $\Phi = 30^{\circ}$ and edge of top fixture
Figure 4.2 Plot of ΔK_{eq} and da/dN along crack length for 30° loading case
Figure 4.3 Plot of ΔK_{eq} and da/dN along crack length for 45° loading case
Figure 4.4 Plot of ΔK_{eq} and da/dN along crack length for 60° loading case
Figure 6.1 Schematic of Arcan fixture with proposed tension bar for $\Phi = 75^{\circ}$ 64
Figure B.1 A 2D schematic diagram of volumes in the specimen region used to create the Initial finite element mesh



LIST OF SYMBOLS

 $\sigma_{\theta\theta max}$ Maximum circumferential stress defined in polar coordinates around the crack tip.

- *K* Stress intensity factor.
- K_I Stress intensity factor for Mode I.
- K_{II} Stress intensity factor for Mode II.
- K_{III} Stress intensity factor for Mode III.
- σ Far field tensile stress.
- *a* Crack length.
- *w* Specimen width.
- ΔK Difference in maximum applied stress intensity factor and minimum applied stress intensity factor for fatigue loading.
- K_{max} Maximum applied stress intensity factor for fatigue loading.
- K_{min} Minimum applied stress intensity factor for fatigue loading.
- *R* Loading ratio, also known as *R*-ratio.
- σ_{max} Maximum applied far-field tensile stress for fatigue loading.
- σ_{min} Minimum applied far-field tensile stress for fatigue loading.
- *N* Number of loading cycles.
- *da/dN* Crack growth rate which is the differential amount of crack growth per number of stress cycles.
- *C* Material and *R*-ratio dependent proportionality constant for Paris' Law.
- *m* Material and *R*-ratio dependent power constant for Paris' Law.



- ΔK_{TH} Threshold ΔK . The value below which the fatigue crack will not propagate.
- K_c Fracture toughness. The value which, if K_{max} exceeds, rapid crack propagation ensues and final fracture occurs.
- F_I Function of loading, geometry, and crack orientation for determining K_I empirically.
- F_{II} Function of loading, geometry, and crack orientation for determining K_{II} empirically.
- *t* Specimen thickness.
- *P* Pin load applied using Arcan fixture.
- α Angle from the vertical direction to the first segment of a kinked crack.
- β Angle from the first segment of a kinked crack to the second segment.
- *b* Crack length for the second segment of a kinked crack.
- Φ Loading angle for Arcan fixture.
- *h* Distance from crack to uniform tensile stress for Tada's empirical solution for K_{I} .
- ΔK_{eq} Equivalent ΔK for the mixed mode loading condition.
- γ , Parameters for ΔK_{eq} .
- *γ*1, γ2
- $x_{i,f}^{\Phi}$ The ith x-position in pixels of the crack path for the font of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $x_{i,b}^{\phi}$ The ith x-position in pixels of the crack path for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $y_{i,f}^{\Phi}$ The ith y-position in pixels of the crack path for the font of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $y_{i,b}^{\Phi}$ The ith y-position in pixels of the crack path for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- Δx_i^{Φ} The standard deviation in pixels for all the x-positions of the crack path for the font of the specimen for loading case Φ .



- Δy_i^{Φ} The standard deviation in pixels for all the y-positions of the crack path for the font of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $s_{v,f}^{\phi}$ The average vertical scale factor used for converting crack path y-position from pixels to meters for the front of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $s_{h,f}^{\Phi}$ The average horizontal scale factor used for converting crack path x-position from pixels to meters for the front of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $s_{v,b}^{\phi}$ The average vertical scale factor used for converting crack path y-position from pixels to meters for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $s_{h,b}^{\Phi}$ The average horizontal scale factor used for converting crack path x-position from pixels to meters for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $\Delta s_{v,f}^{\Phi}$ The standard deviation of the vertical scale factor used for converting crack path y-position for the front of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $\Delta s_{h,f}^{\Phi}$ The standard deviation of the horizontal scale factor used for converting crack path x-position for the front of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $\Delta s_{v,b}^{\ \phi}$ The standard deviation of the vertical scale factor used for converting crack path y-position for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $\Delta s_{h,b}^{\Phi}$ The standard deviation of the horizontal scale factor used for converting crack path x-position for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $X_{i,f}^{\Phi}$ The average ith x-position in meters of the crack path for the front of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $X_{i,b}^{\Phi}$ The average ith x-position in meters of the crack path for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $Y_{i,f}^{\Phi}$ The average ith y-position in meters of the crack path for the front of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $Y_{i,b}^{\phi}$ The average ith y-position in meters of the crack path for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- ΔX_{if}^{ϕ} The standard deviation for the ith x-position in meters of the crack path for the front of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $\Delta X_{i,b}{}^{\phi}$ The standard deviation for the ith x-position in meters of the crack path for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .



xiii

- ΔY_{if}^{ϕ} The standard deviation for the ith y-position in meters of the crack path for the front of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $\Delta Y_{i,b}^{\phi}$ The standard deviation for the ith y-position in meters of the crack path for the back of the specimen for loading case Φ .
- $\Delta a/\Delta N$ Crack growth rate which is the discrete amount of crack growth per number of stress cycles.
- K_x Spring constant assumed in VCCT used in calculating the force in the x-direction.
- K_y Spring constant assumed in VCCT used in calculating the force in the y-direction.
- K_z Spring constant assumed in VCCT used in calculating the force in the z-direction.
- F_x Reaction force in the x-direction on each node on the crack front and the midnodes attached to the element just ahead of the crack front in VCCT.
- F_y Reaction force in the y-direction on each node on the crack front and the midnodes attached to the element just ahead of the crack front in VCCT.
- F_z Reaction force in the z-direction on each node on the crack front and the midnodes attached to the element just ahead of the crack front in VCCT.
- u_x Nodal displacement in the x-direction.
- u_y Nodal displacement in the y-direction.
- u_z Nodal displacement in the z-direction.
- G_I Strain energy release rate for Mode I.
- G_{II} Strain energy release rate for Mode II.
- G_{III} Strain energy release rate for Mode III.
- E Young's modulus of elasticity.
- v Poisson's Ratio.
- Δa Crack growth increment.
- θ_c Angle which the crack will propagate according to MCS criterion.
- $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ Circumferential normal stress defined in polar coordinates around the crack tip.



 $\sigma_{r\theta}$ Shear stress defined in polar coordinates around the crack tip.



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

3D-FEA	
SIF	Stress Intensity Factor
2D-DIC	
VCCT	Virtual Crack Closure Technique
MCS	Maximum Circumferential Stress
LT	Longitudinal-Transverse
MTS	Material Test System
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
CCD	Charge-Coupled Device

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 MOTIVATION

The aerospace industry has experience with a range of structural failures, oftentimes due to fatigue cracks in aircraft fuselage components that are exposed to relatively high stress levels during cyclic loading effects incurred during repeated take-off and landing events that lead to fatigue crack initiation at material defects and near stress concentrations. One of the first incidents that raised public awareness occurred in April of 1988 when 18 feet of the fuselage ripped off one of Aloha Airlines' Boeing 737s in midflight. The cabin quickly decompressed resulting in one fatality and eight serious injuries. The National Transportation Safety Board reported that undetected dis-bonding and widespread fatigue damage between rivets led to the failure of a lap joint [1]. A few months later, Continental Airlines found several 30 inch long cracks in a Boeing 737 aircraft in the same general area where damage occurred in the Aloha Airlines incident [2].

Ten years later, in October 1998, structural fatigue cracks in the fuselage of a Boeing 737s were reported [3], prompting the Federal Aviation Administration to propose the Airworthiness Directive [3]. The directive required aircraft with less than 60,000 flight cycles to be inspected initially and then inspected again every 3,000 cycles. Furthermore, aircraft would be required to receive modifications to strengthen the bulkhead before



75,000 cycles. Considering only Boeing 737s in the United States, the estimated cost of the inspections could be up to \$26 million per inspection cycle and \$71 million for modifications [3].

Despite the efforts of airlines and the Federal Aviation Administration to monitor fatigue cracks in aging aircraft, the danger of structural failure in fuselages continues into the 21st century. In 2009, fatigue at the top of the fuselage just in front of the vertical tail fin caused a 12 inch hole to rip open midflight, causing decompression of the cabin and an emergency landing of a Southwest Airline Boeing 737 [4]. Southwest Airline had another fuselage failure during flight just two years later. A section near the top of the fuselage, about five feet long and one foot wide, ripped off due to the sudden propagation of fatigue cracks in the skin of the aircraft [5].

The presence of fatigue cracks is not exclusive to commercial jetliners. In 2004, Lockheed Martin made the switch from titanium to aluminum for some structural features of the F-35 [6]. In 2010, fatigue cracks were discovered on the bulkhead of a Lockheed Martin ground test aircraft [6]. Although no structural failure occurred in these cases, the presence of fatigue cracks must be monitored to avoid potential catastrophes.

In fact, fatigue cracks are expected to form in the fuselage of modern airplanes due to repeated (a) pressurization and decompression of the cabin during every flight and (b) loading effects during take-off and landing. Thus, the propagation of cracks into critical joints continues to be an area of concern, especially since such propagation under complex stress states is not completely understood. Although procedures are currently in place to inspect and repair fatigue cracks, the ability to better predict how far a crack will



propagate and in which direction it would grow when subjected to various loading conditions could save millions of dollars in premature inspection and repair, while also identifying the severity of an existing flaw in an aero-structure.

1.2 BACKGROUND

As noted in Section 1.1, flaws in aircraft components oftentimes are exposed to complex stress states. For nominally elastic conditions, the crack tip stress states generally are decomposed into three modes of loading which are shown schematically in Figure 1.1. Mode I, the opening mode, is such that the crack surfaces move away from



Figure 1.1. The three facture modes for nominally elastic conditions.

each other and the material directly ahead of the crack is subjected to a dominant tensile stress. Mode II, the in-plane sliding mode, is such that shear loading is applied parallel to the direction of crack growth and the material directly ahead of the crack tip is subjected to a dominant in-plane shear stress. Mode III, the out-of-plane shearing mode, is



designated either out-of-plane or transverse shear, with the crack surfaces moving parallel to and across each other. Mode I crack tip conditions are generally the dominant influence on fatigue crack propagation in most aerospace metallic components (e.g., aluminum, titanium).

Crack propagation under Mode I loading is reasonably well understood [7]. Using a maximum circumferential stress (MCS) criterion, the predicted and actual crack trajectories during fatigue loading are perpendicular to the local $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ max direction where $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ max is the maximum circumferential stress ahead of the crack tip [8]. This direction nominally coincides with the loading direction when local conditions are not influenced by stress concentrations, material defections/inclusions, or other factors.

For high cycle fatigue, it is generally assumed that the far field stress remains linear elastic, while the local stress also remains mostly linear elastic with a small plastic zone around the crack tip (ideally, the plastic zone size would be no more than one tenth of the thickness of the specimen). The stress intensity factor (SIF), K, is a value which describes the magnitude of the local elastic stress field and is a function of the stress and geometry of the structure and crack. For Mode I loading, K_I is defined by [7]

$$K_I = \sigma \sqrt{\pi a} f(^a/_W) \tag{1.1}$$

where σ is the far field tensile stress; *a* is the crack length; and f(a/w) is a parameter which depends on the geometry of the specimen and crack orientation. Since the loading is cyclic for fatigue studies, the loading parameter, ΔK , is considered the driving force for fatigue crack propagation and is defined as follows;

$$\Delta K = K_{max} - K_{min}$$

$$4$$

$$(1.2)$$

$$www.manaraa.com$$

where max and min refer to the maximum and minimum applied values of K. Another loading parameter that has been shown to be important in fatigue studies is the loading ratio, also known as the R-ratio. The R-ratio is defined as

$$R = \frac{\sigma_{min}}{\sigma_{max}} = \frac{K_{min}}{K_{max}}$$
[1.3]

Therefore ΔK can be expressed as

$$\Delta K = (1 - R)K_{max} \tag{1.4}$$

The use of ΔK as the primary driving force in high cycle fatigue was introduced by Paul Paris in his pioneering work [9]. Paris' Law defines the relationship between ΔK and the differential amount of crack extension per stress cycle, da/dN, and is written;

$$\frac{da}{dN} = C\Delta K^m \tag{1.5}$$

Paris' Law parameters, C and m, are determined experimentally for each material and may or may not be dependent on the loading ratio, R.



Figure 1.2. A schematic of a typical log-log plot of da/dN vs. ΔK .



As shown in Figure 1.2, a typical plot of the fatigue crack propagation process has three regions. Below threshold, ΔK_{TH} , the crack will not propagate. Then in region I, the crack growth begins to transition to region II where crack propagation occurs in a manner that is predicted by Eq 1.5. In region III, the crack growth again transitions as K_{max} approaches the fracture toughness, K_c . When $K_{max} \ge K_c$, rapid crack propagation ensues until final fracture occurs.

Now consider the case where a crack is under mixed-mode loading, that is, under any combination of two or more loading types (see Figure 1.1). For the combination of Mode I and Mode II loading conditions, methods for obtaining a mixed-mode I/II stress state experimentally when applying uniaxial tensile loading include (a) use of kinked cracks, (b) use of cracks propagating away from a hole, and (c) use of an Arcan fixture [9-18].

Independent mixed mode loading studies by both Zhang *et al.* [10] and Lopez-Crespo *et al.* [11] have used an Arcan fixture to statically load an existing crack while 2D digital image correlation (2D-DIC) was used to determine K_I and K_{II} from measured displacement fields around the crack tip for various degrees of Mode I/II loading. Zhang *et al.* used an Arcan fixture with a through thickness edge notch as the one shown in Figure 1.3. Lopez-Crespo *et al.* used the same fixture with a center notched specimen. Experimental SIFs were compared to values obtained from empirical expressions for the Arcan fixture. The edge cracked solution takes the following form [12].

$$K_I = F_I \frac{P}{Wt} \sqrt{\pi a} , K_{II} = F_{II} \frac{P}{Wt} \sqrt{\pi a}$$
[1.6]

where t is specimen thickness and F_I and F_{II} are provided graphically as a function of various loading angles and $0.45 \le a/W \le 0.7$ [12]. There are some limiting factors for this



model. First, it is only valid for a range of relatively large cracks. Secondly, it only considers straight cracks. Finally, it is only valid for static cracks. Thus, this model can only be used for determining the kinking angle for the initial crack propagation event.



Figure 1.3. Diagram of Arcan fixture and specimen.



Figure 1.4. Specimen for Arcan fixture with single edge crack.

For the case of a kinked crack under uniform tensile loading (see Figure 1.5), another empirical model exits [12]





Figure 1.5. Schematic of kinked crack.

$$K_{I} = \sigma \sqrt{\pi a} F_{I}(\alpha, \beta, \frac{b}{a}), \quad K_{II} = \sigma \sqrt{\pi a} F_{II}(\alpha, \beta, \frac{b}{a})$$
[1.7]

$$\binom{F_I(\alpha,\beta,\frac{b}{a})}{F_{II}(\alpha,\beta,\frac{b}{a})} = \frac{1-\cos 2\alpha}{2} \binom{F_I^1(\beta,\frac{b}{a})}{F_{II}^1(\beta,\frac{b}{a})} - \cos 2\alpha \binom{F_I^2(\beta,\frac{b}{a})}{F_{II}^2(\beta,\frac{b}{a})} - \frac{\sin 2\alpha}{2} \binom{F_I^3(\beta,\frac{b}{a})}{F_{II}^3(\beta,\frac{b}{a})}$$
[1.8]

$$\begin{pmatrix} F_I^K\left(\beta, \frac{b}{a}\right) = \sum_{n=0}^2 F_{I,n}^k\left(\beta\right) \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^n \\ F_{II}^k\left(\beta, \frac{b}{a}\right) = \sum_{n=0}^2 F_{II,n}^k\left(\beta\right) \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^n \end{pmatrix} for \ k = 1,3$$

$$[1.9]$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} F_{I}^{K}(\beta,\frac{b}{a}) = \sum_{n=0}^{2} F_{I,n}^{k}(\beta) \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^{n+1/2} \\ F_{II}^{k}(\beta,\frac{b}{a}) = \sum_{n=0}^{2} F_{II,n}^{k}(\beta) \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^{n+1/2} \end{pmatrix} for k = 2$$

$$[1.10]$$

where $F_{I,n}^{k}$ and $F_{II,n}^{k}$ for n=0, 1, and 2 and k=1, 2, and 3 are provided in a table for $0^{\circ} \le \beta \le$ 180° [12]. Equation 1.7 is valid for $0 \le \frac{b}{a} \le 0.2$. Limitations to this model are that (a) it is applicable to kinked cracks in an infinite plate, (b) b « a, and (c) the loading must be distributed in such a way that uniform stress is applied to the region in which the crack is located. [12]

Gaylon et al. [13] performed fatigue tests using the Arcan fixture. In this study, the authors determined the crack growth trajectory for various degrees of mixed-mode I/II loading. Their results indicate that the crack trajectory is curvilinear and the stress distribution applied to the crack is non-uniform. Therefore, the two empirical models



provided by Murakami and discussed previously are not applicable to quantify the mixed mode SIFs. Also, the measured crack trajectories suggest that for all combinations of Mode I/II loading, the fatigue cracks propagate in a manner that was locally dominated by K_I , while no crack propagation occurred for the pure Mode II loading case. However, there was such large scatter in the experimental data that it is difficult to definitively identify the trends. One cause of the inconsistency in the results was determined to be the three pin loading configuration used by the authors. It was suggested that future studies use only one pin for fixing the Arcan fixture to the test stand [14]; the use of a single pin is consistent with the work of Amstutz, Boone and others at the University of South Carolina [13, 14, 18, 21-23].

Chao et al. [15] also used the Arcan fixture with the one-pin configuration to study fatigue crack propagation under various mixed-mode loading conditions. Crack trajectories were compared to stable tearing results obtained under mixed-mode monotonic loading conditions. It was observed that cracks under fatigue loading propagate in a local Mode I direction for all loading cases including pure Mode II, unlike Gaylon's results. In Chao's studies, the amount of crack growth in fatigue for Φ =75° and 90° was quite small, indicating that the crack surfaces interfered after a small amount of crack extension and impeded further crack growth. For stable tearing, after Mode II loading becomes dominant, cracks in aluminum alloys tended to propagate in the local shear direction; that is, approximately parallel to the direction of the pre-crack. This transition from Mode I dominated crack growth to Mode II dominated crack growth under stable tearing conditions is consistent with results obtained by Amstutz et al [16] [17]. In Amstutz's work, the authors used the Arcan fixture to study mixed Mode I/II



9

stable tearing crack growth. The results show that for most loading cases, where K_{II}/K_{I} < 1, the crack propagates under local Mode I conditions. However, as K_{I} approaches zero and K_{II}/K_{I} reaches a critical value (Φ =75° and 90° for Al 2024-T351), the crack begins to grow in Mode II. While this study included crack propagation, stable tearing occurs outside of the linear elastic range, and results suggest that the Mode II component has different effects in the linear elastic range than it does under elastic-plastic conditions.

Boljanovic [18] performed finite element analysis to model the results of Gaylon et al. The crack trajectories were simulated using MSC/NASTRAN [19] in a step-by-step method while applying the maximum circumferential stress (MCS) criterion to predict crack trajectory. Results of Boljanovic's work agree with Gaylon's experimental crack paths. However, the SIFs were not obtained at each step using the local crack tip field data, but were determined analytically after the simulation was performed since the stepby-step method of crack path prediction is quite time consuming. It is unclear if the analytical solution for the SIFs accounted for curvilinear crack paths.

1.3 CURRENT WORK

The objective of the current study is to (a) perform experiments and measure the crack path and (b) perform simulations and predict the fatigue crack path in an aerospace aluminum alloy undergoing applied, far-field mixed-mode I/II conditions. The Arcan fixture will be utilized to achieve far-field mixed-mode I/II conditions in 6.35mm thick Al-2024-T351 specimens. Crack paths, cycle count, and maximum and minimum loads will be measured during experiments, with loading ranging from $0 \le K_{II}/K_I \le \infty$. Simulations will then be performed using 3D-FEA. Crack trajectories will be predicted using virtual crack closure techniques (VCCT) and a MCS criterion. Local re-meshing



will be used to extend the crack. The whole fixture and specimen will be modeled using 10-noded tetrahedral elements. Predicted crack paths will be compared to the results obtained experimentally, and the results will be discussed.



CHAPTER 2

EXPERIMENTAL WORK

2.1 FIXTURE AND SPECIMEN PREPARATION

The Arcan fixture shown in Figure 2.1 was used to achieve mixed-mode I/II loading for discrete values of K_{II}/K_{I} in the range $0 \le K_{II}/K_{I} \le \infty$. The butterfly-shaped specimen shown in Figure 2.1 is machined to have tight contact with the upper and lower grips along all four straight, angled sides. Once tightly fitted into the grips, the specimen is further tightened into place using ten small bolts; five on the top part of the fixture and five on the bottom part. Around the edges of the stainless-steel grips are pairs of holes located every 15°. With loading angle Φ defined as shown in Figure 2.1, the $\Phi = 0^{\circ}$ pin holes correspond to nominally Mode I crack conditions and the $\Phi = 90^{\circ}$ pin holes represent nominally Mode II crack loading conditions. The fixture was machined from 15-5PH stainless steel with Young's modulus =2.07 x 10¹¹ Pa and Poisson's ratio = 0.30.

As shown in Figure 2.2, each butterfly-shaped specimen is 224.28 mm tall, 275.30 mm wide at the top and bottom of the specimen and 6.35mm thick. Each specimen is manufactured from Al-2024-T351 to form an LT orientation crack configuration (crack is along the transverse direction (T) and perpendicular to the rolling direction (L) in the aluminum specimen) [20] with Young's modulus = 7.11×10^{10} Pa and Poisson's ratio = 0.33. A jeweler's saw blade, size 0/6, was used to create an initial through-thickness edge notch 6.35mm long in the width direction on the left side of the specimen in the vertical



center (see Figure 2.2). The front and back surfaces of the specimens were sanded with 600 grit sand paper before final sanding with 800 grit sandpaper to remove small surface defects. Metal polish was used to create a mirror finish on the surfaces for visually tracking crack tip progression during the experiment.



Figure 2.1. Mixed mode I/II Arcan test fixture and butterfly shaped test specimen. Angle $\Phi=0^{0}$ corresponds to far-field tension and $\Phi=90^{0}$ is far-field shear.





Figure 2.2. (a) Dimensions of specimens in inches (b) Diagram of notch and precrack

2.2 SETUP

As shown in Figure 2.3, a 50 kip (227 kN) servo-hydraulic Material Test System (MTS) controlled by TestStar II software was used to apply tensile loads in displacement control to the Arcan fixture and specimen. Stainless steel clevises were placed in the hydraulic grips of the MTS test frame, and the fixture was attached with one pin on the top and another pin on the bottom. The top image of Figure 2.3 is of the complete test set-up with (a) the specimen and Arcan fixture pinned into the clevises of the test stand and (b) microscope objectives and slide apparatus for optical tracking of the propagating crack tip clamped to the test stand. The bottom image of Figure 2.3 shows the set up without the microscope objectives. The backing plate (not visible in Fig 2.3) is attached to the top and bottom pieces of the Arcan fixture and is oriented at 45°.





Figure 2.3. Images of experimental set up for a 45° loading angle.

During testing, the crack tip was tracked using the microscope objective and the slide apparatus. The objective is attached to the dual slide apparatus shown in Figure 2.4. The dual slide apparatus was designed and constructed by Mr. Haywood Watts. The apparatus consists of (a) a single, horizontally mounted manual screw driven slide manufactured by Velmex with a digital caliper to provide a metric positional measurement, (b) a second vertically-oriented Velmex slide with digital caliper that was mounted to the horizontal slide. The microscope objective was then connected to the vertical slide. Both vertical and horizontal slides operate independently, allowing for horizontal and vertical measurements of the crack tip position during the fatigue process.



Figure 2.4. (Top) One degree-of-freedom slide apparatus; (Bottom) Two degree-of -freedom slide apparatus.



2.3 EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

To mount the notched specimen into the Arcan fixture, it was first bolted into the top and bottom Arcan fixtures that were held in place by a backing plate designed to connect the top and bottom halves of the fixture and keep the assembly from moving during installation of the specimen into the fixture, minimizing initial distortions/stresses in the specimen prior to the experiment. The fixture-specimen-backing plate combination was pinned to the upper clevis, rotated about the pin to align with the bottom clevis and then the lower pin was put in place to fully install the specimen-fixture combination in the MTS test stand. Initially, the specimen is oriented to be in the Mode I configuration. Once fully installed, the backing plate is removed. Then, two sets of dual slide apparatuses were clamped to the test stand – one for tracking the crack on the front of the specimen and the other for tracking the crack on the back of the specimen. The calipers attached to the slides were zeroed at the center of the notch on the edge of the specimen, see Figure 2.5. After everything is in place, the specimens were fatigue pre-cracked an additional 6.35mm for a total crack length of 12.7mm. Fatigue loading was applied in force control according to the loads outlined in the following section at 10Hz.

After pre-cracking, the crack front was marked by cycling at a higher loading ratio (R=0.8 or R=0.9), and at about 90% of the pre-crack load. Then the backing plate was reattached to the fixture, the fixture was rotated in the test stand to the appropriate loading angle (e.g. see Figure 2.5). Once the specimen-fixture combination is correctly positioned for the specific loading angle, Φ , of interest, the backing plate was again removed and the microscope objectives were repositioned. The microscopes were re-



zeroed at the center of the notch along the edge of the specimen and the length of the precrack was re-measured.



Figure 2.5. Schematic of coordinate system in which the crack tip was tracked during precracking (solid line) and testing (dotted line)

Following the procedure outlined in the previous steps, a total of 6 experiments were performed at loading angles $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$, 30° , 45° , 60° , 75° , and 90° , with $\Phi = 90^{\circ}$ degrees being nominally Mode II crack loading. For the loading cases $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$, 30° , and 45° , the one degree of freedom slide apparatus was used for tracking the crack tip. The two degree of freedom slide apparatus was built and used to track the crack tip for $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$, 75° , and 90° . Again, fatigue loading at 10Hz was applied in force control according to the loads outlined in the following section. The crack tip position was measured approximately every 5,000 to 20,000 cycles.



2.4 LOAD PREDICTION

Load data was predicted for fatigue pre-cracking and testing based on the load predictions for tests performed previously for NASA Langley Research Center and the US Air Force [21]. Load shedding was performed to avoid the risk of initiating stable tearing or formation of a large plastic zone at the crack tip. The loading ratio, *R*, and the amplitude of ΔK_I were held constant at 0.17 and 359 Pa*m^{1/2} respectively, by allowing the load to decrease as the crack length increased.



Figure 2.6. Visual representation of the actual geometry and loading (solid lines) and the assumed geometry and loading (dotted lines).

The SIF was estimated using an empirical expression from Tada [22] that is valid for a through-thickness edge crack under uniform uniaxial tension. It was assumed that the width was the transverse dimension of the butterfly specimen at its smallest cross-section, which is also where the notch is located. As shown schematically in Figures 2.6 and 2.7,



an estimate for the uniform applied stress was obtained using the load applied at the pin divided by the cross-sectional area of the specimen using the assumed width and actual thickness, w = 152.4 mm and t = 6.35 mm.



Figure 2.7. Diagram of geometry for Tada's empirical expression.

$$f\left(\frac{a}{w}\right) = \sqrt{\frac{2w}{\pi a} \tan\frac{\pi a}{2w}} * \frac{0.752 + 2.02(a/w) + 0.37(1 - \sin\frac{\pi a}{2w})^3}{\cos\frac{\pi a}{2w}}$$
[2.1]

Using Eqs 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 [22], ΔK was estimated.



www.manaraa.com
While performing the first experiment, which was for the 15° loading case, it was observed that the crack path on the front of the specimen deviated from the crack path measured on the back surface after a few millimeters of crack extension. These observations led to the implementation of a different approach for load prediction to avoid unusual crack propagation in future experiments. The goal of the modified approach was to keep ΔK constant in order to avoid excessive plasticity in the crack tip region, crack slanting, or crack tearing. Since the method for estimating the SIF was quite crude, and did not account for the various loading angles and resulting K_I and K_{II} values, it was determined that following Paris' Law for the material was a more accurate method of crack growth control for ΔK_{eq} which is defined as follows [23];

$$\Delta K_{eq} = \gamma \Delta K_I + (1 - \gamma) \sqrt{(\Delta K_I)^2 + \gamma_1 (\Delta K_{II})^2 + \gamma_2 (\Delta K_{III})^2}$$

$$(2.2)$$

where γ , γ_1 , and γ_2 are parameters to be defined. Using ΔK_{eq} and assuming that there is no crack closure effect, the crack growth rate can be determined using Eq 1.5. That is, the authors opted to maintain the same crack growth rate throughout the experiment.

For the next experiment, the 30° loading case, pre-cracking was performed according to the loads originally predicted. However after the specimen was rotated, the new method of determining the loading was performed. From the previous test data, it was determined that a crack growth rate of $\approx 6 \times 10^{-5}$ mm/cycle was a safe rate to run the experiments and maintain nominally linear elastic conditions.. A loading ratio R = 0.4 was chosen for the experiment. This crack growth rate was maintained by allowing the crack to grow until the rate increased to $\approx 8 \times 10^{-5}$ mm/cycle. The load was then dropped by approximately 5%, resulting in a crack growth rate of $\approx 4 \times 10^{-5}$ mm/cycle. This



process was repeated to maintain an average crack growth rate of $\approx 6 \times 10^{-5}$ mm/cycle and therefore maintain a constant average ΔK_{eq} during the experiment.

For loading angles 45°, 60°, 75°, and 90°, the new pre-cracking loads and method of load shedding to control crack growth rate were recomputed to maintain an approximately constant crack growth rate. In all the remaining experiments, R = 0.4. Cycle count, crack growth, and load data for each experiment are provided in Appendix A. Recall for experiments for $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$, 30°, and 45° only the one degree of freedom horizontal uni-slide was used to visually track the crack so the recorded value in the appendix is only the x position as shown in Figure 2.5. For $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$, x' and y' positions are recorded and reported in the appendix. Recorded data for $\Phi = 75^{\circ}$ is not reported since the crack did not propagate after applying hundreds of thousands of load cycles using the same loads as applied in the $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$ experiment.

2.5 DETERMINATION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRACK PATHS

In order to obtain the experimental crack path for each loading case, images of the front and back of each specimen were necessary after the fatigue tests were conducted. The surfaces of each of the specimens had to be prepared so that when images were obtained, the crack would be visible and there would be no reflection on the surface. First, the surface was sanded with 600 grit sand paper to roughen the surface and remove the mirror finish. Then dry pigment was rubbed into the crack. The surface was sanded again to remove excess pigment on the surface, leaving the remaining pigment in the crack.



A 2.5 Megapixel Point Grey CCD camera was positioned on a tripod to ensure that images were taken perpendicular to the surface of the specimen. The specimen was positioned, and two rulers were placed on the surface of the specimen – one vertically and the other horizontally-- to provide a scale when the images were digitized. Images were taken of the front and back surfaces, and loaded into GetData Graph Digitizer software [24]. First, using the ruler, 5 points were created at position (X,Y) and 5 more points were created at (X+1", Y+1") as shown in Figure 2.8.



Figure 2.8. Schematic of the images digitized and an exaggerated view of how the points were selected for determining the scale factor from pixels to meters.



The distance between each set of points for the front (*f*) and back (*b*) of specimens for each loading case, Φ , were determined in pixels and averaged to be used for a scale factor. For each specimen, the average value and the standard deviation of the vertical and horizontal scale factors for each case for the front (back), $s_{v,f}^{\phi} \pm \Delta s_{v,f}^{\phi} (s_{v,b}^{\phi} \pm \Delta s_{v,b}^{\phi})$ and $s_{h,f}^{\phi} \pm \Delta s_{h,f}^{\phi} (s_{v,b}^{\phi} \pm \Delta s_{v,b}^{\phi})$ respectively, are given in Table 2.1. Then *i* points were selected along the front and back crack paths for each loading case, $(x_i^{\phi}, y_i^{\phi})_f$ and $(x_i^{\phi}, y_i^{\phi})_b$, and exported to Microsoft Excel. It was assumed that the error associated with selecting the points along the crack path was $\Delta x_i^{\phi}, \Delta y_i^{\phi} \approx \pm 1$ pixel. Points along the path were converted from pixels to meters using the scale factor, to give metric positions $(X_i^{\phi}, Y_i^{\phi})_f$ and $(X_i^{\phi}, Y_i^{\phi})_b$.

$$X_{i}^{\Phi} = s_{h}^{\Phi} * x_{i}^{\Phi}, Y_{i}^{\Phi} = s_{v}^{\Phi} * y_{i}^{\Phi}$$
[2.3]

The standard deviation for the front and back of each specimen associated with the crack path position, $(X_i^{\phi}, Y_i^{\Phi})_f$ and $(X_i^{\phi}, Y_i^{\Phi})_{b}$, was determined using error propagation for multiplication [25]:

$$\Delta X_{i,f}^{\Phi} = X_{i,f}^{\Phi} * \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta s_{h,f}^{\Phi}}{s_{h,f}^{\Phi}}\right)^{2} + \left(\frac{\Delta x_{i}^{\Phi}}{x_{i,f}^{\Phi}}\right)^{2}}, \Delta Y_{i,f}^{\Phi} = Y_{i,f}^{\Phi} * \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta s_{v,f}^{\Phi}}{s_{v,f}^{\Phi}}\right)^{2} + \left(\frac{\Delta y_{i}^{\Phi}}{y_{i,f}^{\Phi}}\right)^{2}}$$
$$\Delta X_{i,b}^{\Phi} = X_{i,b}^{\Phi} * \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta s_{h,b}^{\Phi}}{s_{h,b}^{\Phi}}\right)^{2} + \left(\frac{\Delta x_{i}^{\Phi}}{x_{i,b}^{\Phi}}\right)^{2}}, \Delta Y_{i,b}^{\Phi} = Y_{i,b}^{\Phi} * \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta s_{v,b}^{\Phi}}{s_{v,b}^{\Phi}}\right)^{2} + \left(\frac{\Delta y_{i}^{\Phi}}{y_{i,b}^{\Phi}}\right)^{2}}$$
[2.4]

The percent error in the crack path for each loading case, Φ , is defined as the maximum percent error of the X_i^{Φ} and Y_i^{Φ} points on the front and back of the specimen and is as follows:



$$Percent \ Error^{\Phi} = 2 * \langle \frac{\Delta X_{i,f}^{\Phi}}{X_{i,f}^{\Phi}}, \frac{\Delta X_{i,b}^{\Phi}}{X_{i,b}^{\Phi}}, \frac{\Delta Y_{i,f}^{\Phi}}{Y_{i,f}^{\Phi}}, \frac{\Delta Y_{i,f}^{\Phi}}{Y_{i,b}^{\Phi}} \rangle_{max} * 100$$

$$(2.5)$$

and are reported in Table 2.2. As shown in Table 2.2, the estimated errors are small and assumed to be negligible. From this point forward only the average crack path points will be considered in analysis.

Using Microsoft PowerPoint, the images for the front and back of each specimen were set to $\approx 50\%$ transparency and layered on top of each other. It was observed that the specimen was slightly rotated in a couple of those images. The images were rotated such that the edges of the specimen in both images were aligned. Using the angle of rotation used in Power Point to align the images, the crack paths corresponding to those images were rotated by the same angle. Then, the average points for each specimen were translated to the coordinate system shown in Figure 2.9. The X and Y points along the crack for the front and back of each specimen were plotted, and a second order polynomial was fitted to the data using least squares. To verify that the digitized crack path was accurate, a plot of the polynomial fit was layered on top of the image of the specimen.



Loading Case	Front Image Scale Factor (m/pixel x 10 ⁻⁵)		Back Image Scale Factor (m/pixel x 10 ⁻⁵)	
	Vertical Scale	Horizontal Scale	Vertical Scale	Horizontal Scale
15°	6.44 ± 0.03	6.41 ± 0.02	6.43 ± 0.02	6.39 ± 0.01
30°	7.14 ± 0.05	7.09 ± 0.04	7.14 ± 0.06	7.13 ± 0.03
45°	6.50 ± 0.07	6.48 ± 0.02	6.56 ± 0.02	6.52 ± 0.02
60°	6.48 ± 0.02	6.51 ± 0.00	6.55 ± 0.01	6.52 ± 0.03

Table 2.1. Scale factors used to convert digitized points from pixels to meters.

Table 2.2. Percent error in crack path position.

Loading Case	Percent Error
15°	1.0%
30°	1.3%
45°	2.2%
60°	0.8%



Figure 2.9. Coordinate system used to define crack paths from the tip of the pre-crack.



For the cases where the two degree of freedom slide apparatus was used, the x and y data points recorded during the experiment in the coordinate system shown in Figure 2.5 were rotated and translated into the coordinate system in Figure 2.9, in addition to digitizing the crack path.

2.6 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

For the experiments performed using the modified load prediction method of controlling the crack growth rate, the discrete crack growth rate $\Delta a/\Delta N$ was plotted along the crack length *a* in Figures 2.10-2.12.



Figure 2.10. Crack growth rate along crack path for 30° loading case.





Figure 2.11. Crack growth rate along crack path for 45° loading case.



Figure 2.12. Crack growth rate along crack path for 60° loading case.

For loading cases 15°, 30°, 45°, and 60°, fatigue crack propagation occurred, and for loading cases 75° and 90°, no crack propagation occurred. Figure 2.13 shows the originally digitized crack path for the 15° loading case. Figure 2.14 shows the data for the 15° loading case crack path before crack slanting occurred along with the polynomial fit for the data. Figures 2.15-2.17 show the digitized crack path data for the front and back



of the specimens for the 30° , 45° , and 60° loading cases respectively along with the polynomial fit for each data set.



Figure 2.13. Originally digitized crack path data for 15° loading case.





Figure 2.14. Digitized crack path and polynomial fit for 15° loading case.



Figure 2.15. Digitized crack path and polynomial fit for 30° loading case.





Figure 2.16. Digitized crack path and polynomial fit for 45° loading case.



Figure 2.17. Digitized crack path and polynomial fit for 60° loading case.



The rotated and translated crack path determined experimentally using the two degree of freedom slide apparatus and the digitized crack path for $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$ were plotted in Figure 2.18 to verify the accuracy of the digitization process. The following plot shows that the two methods of obtaining the experimental crack path are in good agreement with each other. The calipers used for measuring the amount of travel of the slide and microscope objective have an accuracy of 0.00127mm which results in less than 0.01% error in the measuring process. Even though the digitized crack path for $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$ had 0.8% error (Table 2.2), the digitization process has more opportunity to induce error through obtaining, aligning, digitizing, and scaling the images. While error in either path is negligible, the process of directly measuring the crack tip location using the dual caliper apparatus during the experiment is accurate, efficient, and has less opportunity for inducing error.



Figure 2.18. Crack path for $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$ determined by slide apparatus experimentally versus the crack path determined by digitization.



CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL WORK

3.1 CRACK3D

CRACK3D is a three-dimensional finite element code first developed by the University of South Carolina and later jointly by the University of South Carolina and Correlated Solutions, Inc.. It is capable of simulating elastic-plastic stable tearing crack extension and linear-elastic fatigue crack propagation, both with curved crack fronts and curvilinear crack paths for mixed-mode conditions. Two methods of crack growth simulations are available: nodal release and local re-meshing. Nodal release assumes that the crack path is known prior to running the simulation and is useful in evaluating crack growth events with known crack paths from experimental measurements or for what-if design scenarios. In the case that the crack path is to be predicted, local re-meshing is used to extend the crack [1] [2] [3]. For the case of fatigue crack propagation, there are three steps to crack growth predictions: (1) will the crack grow? (2) in what direction will it grow? (3) how far will it extend for a certain number of loading cycles or how many loading cycles will be required to extend the crack by a certain amount?

For determining if the crack will propagate, $\Delta K > \Delta K_{TH}$ must be true as discussed in Section 1.2. CRACK3D can be used to evaluate ΔK , which can be used to check if $\Delta K > \Delta K_{TH}$ is satisfied. Once this crack growth criterion is met, CRACK3D can be used to simulate the crack growth process and predict (a) the direction of crack growth and (b)



the variations of stress intensity factors with the amount of crack growth, which can be used to predict the number of loading cycles as a function of the amount of crack growth.

In CRACK3D the determination of stress intensity factors is done using the method of three-dimensional virtual crack closure technique (3D-VCCT) [3] [1] [2] [4] [5], which is based on the approach of the strain energy release rate [6], which is the amount of energy released per unit thickness per unit crack extension when new crack surfaces are created during crack extension. The 3D-VCCT can be used in finite element simulations to calculate accurately and efficiently the mixed-mode strain energy release rates, G_{I} , G_{II} , and G_{III} , which are related to the mixed-mode stress intensity factors K_{I} , K_{II} , and K_{III} . Since fatigue crack propagation often occurs under nominally linearly elastic conditions, it is assumed that the amount of energy required to extend the crack a small increment is the same as the amount of energy required to close the crack. In Mode I, the work required to close the crack per unit thickness is equivalent to one half the nodal force multiplied with the opening displacement. In VCCT, this product between the nodal force and opening displacement is approximated by using the nodal force at nodes immediately ahead of the crack front and the crack opening displacement at corresponding nodes immediately behind the crack front from the same finite element solution. Okada et al. [4] applied VCCT to three-dimensional analysis using tetrahedral elements. Deng et al. [3] [1] [2] later adopted Okada's 3D-VCCT for general crack growth simulations by proposing a locally structured re-meshing approach.



To illustrate the 3D-VCCT, consider crack growth simulations using the nodal release option. The extended crack is created by separating the crack front and mid- nodes attached to the element just ahead of the crack front into coincident nodal pairs. It is assumed that these nodal pairs are connected with a stiff spring with length zero as shown in Figure 3.1.



Figure 3.1. An exaggerated local 2D view of a crack-front finite element mesh on the plane normal to the crack front, where the rigid springs between the node pairs have zero length.

Stiff spring constants, K_x , K_y , and K_z , which are large but otherwise arbitrary values set in the nodal release option, and the displacements, u_x , u_y , and u_z , of the upper (+) and lower (-) nodes are used to compute the forces, F_x , F_y , and F_z (Eq 3.1) for each node, where the coordinate system is such that x is along the direction of crack extension, y is perpendicular to crack extension, and z is through the thickness and tangent to the crack front.

$$F_x = K_x(u_x^+ - u_x^-), F_y = K_y(u_y^+ - u_y^-), F_z = K_z(u_z^+ - u_z^-)$$
[3.1]





Figure 3.2. A local view of a crack front mesh on the extended crack surface, where the local coordinate system for a mid-node on the crack front has its origin at the node.

Figure 3.2 shows the view of the crack front through the thickness where l is one elements length and elements 1, 2, and 3 only. S₁, S₂, and S₃ are the areas of the sides of the tetrahedral elements on the extended crack surface for elements 1, 2, and 3 respectively. Nodes 1, 2, and 3 are nodes located on the crack front where node 1 is attached to elements 1, 2, and 3 and node 2 is only attached to element 1.

Some nodes, such as 1 in Fig. 3.2, share element surfaces therefore the resultant forces, F_x , F_y , and F_z for node 1, must be divided among the surfaces S_1 , S_2 , and S_3 . For element surface 1,

$$F_{x1} = \frac{S_1 F_x}{S_1 + S_2 + S_3}, F_{y1} = \frac{S_1 F_y}{S_1 + S_2 + S_3}, F_{z1} = \frac{S_1 F_z}{S_1 + S_2 + S_3}$$
[3.2]



Then for element surface 1, the 3-D strain energy release rates, G_{I} , G_{II} , and G_{III} , are estimated by summing up the work required to close the nodal pairs on the element surface and are expressed as [4]

$$G_{I} \approx \frac{1}{3S_{1}} \sum_{i} F_{yi} u_{yi}, G_{II} \approx \frac{1}{3S_{1}} \sum_{i} F_{xi} u_{xi}, G_{III} \approx \frac{1}{3S_{1}} \sum_{i} F_{zi} u_{zi}$$
 [3.3]

where u_{xi} , u_{yi} and u_{zi} are the relative displacements between the top and bottom crack surfaces at nodes behind the crack front that correspond to nodal forces F_{xi} , F_{yi} , and F_{zi} for *i* nodes attached to the element surface ahead of the crack front. Finally, the SIFs for plane strain are related to strain energy release rates by

$$K_{I} = \sqrt{\frac{G_{I}E}{1-\nu^{2}}}, K_{II} = \pm \sqrt{\frac{G_{II}E}{1-\nu^{2}}}, K_{III} = \pm \sqrt{\frac{2G_{III}E}{2(1+\nu)}}$$
[3.4]

where E is Young's modulus and v is Poisson's ratio. It is noted that the signs for K_{II} and K_{III} are the same as the signs of the relative displacements behind the crack front along the x and z axes, respectively.

It is noted that the SIF values described above correspond to the maximum loading value applied during a loading cycle. Once the SIFs for the maximum applied load are predicted using the VCCT, the direction in which the crack will propagate is predicted using MCS criterion [5]. The MCS criterion assumes that a crack will grow in the direction, θ_c , that maximizes the local circumferential stress, $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$, at a specified location ahead of the crack tip. The local stress around the crack tip can be expressed as a function of SIF and position with respect to the crack tip in polar coordinates (r, θ) (see Figure 3.3).

$$\sigma_{\theta\theta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \left(K_I \left(\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\right)^2 - \frac{3}{2} K_{II} \sin\theta \right)$$
$$\sigma_{r\theta} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi r}} \cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \left(K_I \sin\theta + K_{II} (3\cos\theta - 1) \right)$$
[3.5]

Where $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ is the circumferential normal stress near the crack tip and $\sigma_{r\theta}$ is the shear stress.





Figure 3.3. Diagram of crack growth direction according to the MCS criterion.

It can be shown that that $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ is maximum or minimum when the shear stress $\sigma_{r\theta}$ is zero. So setting $\sigma_{r\theta}$ from Eq 3.5 to zero

$$0 = (K_I \sin \theta + K_{II} (3 \cos \theta - 1))$$

$$[3.6]$$

and solving for θ ,

$$\theta_c = 2 \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{\frac{\kappa_I}{\kappa_{II}} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{\kappa_I}{\kappa_{II}}\right)^2 + 8}}{4} \right)$$
[3.7]

The root that maximizes $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ gives θ_c as the direction in which the crack will extend [5].

To apply the VCCT in crack growth simulations using the local re-meshing option (instead of the nodal release option), the local mesh immediately ahead and behind the crack front must be properly structured, so that the local mesh immediately behind the crack front can be viewed as being shifted by one element size from the local mesh immediately ahead of the crack front, Therefore, once crack growth is determined to occur along a certain direction with a certain increment, the new mesh around the new crack front is generated such that there is a structured mesh (within a local re-meshing



zone around the new crack front) with equal number of elements behind the crack front and ahead of the crack front. [3] [1] [2]

A fatigue crack growth rate model, such as the Paris' Law, is used to determine how many cycles it will take for the crack to grow the amount of crack extension chosen by the user [7]. However, since mixed-mode conditions are considered, ΔK as presented in Chapter 1 is no longer Mode I. After K_I , K_{II} , and K_{III} are predicted, ΔK_I , ΔK_{II} , and ΔK_{III} can be computed using Eq 1.2, and ΔK_{eq} from Eq 2.2. Again, assuming that there is no crack closure effect, the crack growth rate can be determined using a Paris-type Law as in Eq 1.5.

3.2 GEOMETRY, MESH GENERATION, AND BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

The Arcan fixture and specimen were modeled as shown in Figure 3.4. The fixture and specimen are connected by bolts. For simplicity, this fixture-specimen connection is approximated by a continuous bond at the fixture-specimen boundary. To this end, the bolts are not modeled and the fixture and specimen are treated as three solid regions with different thicknesses. Also, the outside radius of the fixture in the model corresponds to the radius of the center of the pin holes on the actual fixture.

An idealized through-thickness edge notch and pre-crack exactly 12.7mm long was modeled as the initial crack in the exact geometric vertical center of the specimen and is perfectly horizontal into the width of the specimen. Material properties for the fixture and specimen are Young's modulus = 2.07×10^{11} Pa and 7.11×10^{10} Pa and Poisson's ratio = 0.30 and 0.33 respectively. Both materials are modeled as being elastic-plastic through the use of their actual stress-strain curves.





Figure 3.4. Diagram of a picture of actual Arcan fixture and specimen (left) and image of finite element model geometry (right).

The volumes were then meshed with 10 noded tetrahedral elements. Figure 3.5 shows the initial mesh generated, and Figure 3.6 shows the initial three zones of the mesh. As discussed in Section 3.1 for local re-meshing, structured elements were created one element ahead and one element behind the crack front. Then a transition zone was created from the structured element to the far field mesh. Elements in this zone should transition from the local minimum element size to a maximum element size at the boundary of the local re-meshing zone. The far-field mesh away from the local region can be coarse, provided it can adequately transfer loading information to the crack front local region.





Figure 3.5. Image of the 3D mesh.







The first mesh shown in Figure 3.6 has two elements through the thickness. A second refined mesh was generated with 4 elements through the thickness in the structured area to check for convergence of the mesh.

For each loading angle, Φ , a set of lines (one on the top fixture and the other on the bottom fixture) corresponding to the center of the pins were created on the surface of the fixture model in the through-thickness direction. The boundary conditions were such that the displacement of the bottom line was set to zero in the x and y directions ($u_x \& u_y = 0$) and only the z displacement specified was of the center point on the bottom line ($u_z=0$). The displacement of the corresponding top line had a magnitude of 1 x 10⁻³mm along the direction of loading, Φ , as shown in Figure 3.7, which was decomposed into x and y components (see Table 3.1).



Figure 3.7. Boundary conditions at $\Phi = 30^{\circ}$.

	Table 3.1.	Table of	applied	displacement	ts for line	on top fixture
--	------------	----------	---------	--------------	-------------	----------------

Loading Case	Displacement in x direction	Displacement in y direction
	$(u_x) [1 \ge 10^{-3} \text{ mm}]$	$(u_y) [1 \ge 10^{-3} \text{ mm}]$
15°	-0.259	0.966
30°	-0.500	0.866
45°	-0.707	0.707
60°	-0.866	0.500



3.3 SIMULATION PROCEDURE

The initial finite element meshes were created using ANSYS 14 [9]. Mesh data for both the initial and initial refined meshes was exported from ANSYS using the "NWRITE" and "EWRITE" commands, and the files were named NODES.DAT and ELEMS.DAT respectively according to the CRACK3D manual.

There are 3 input files for CRACK3D for simulations using the local re-meshing option. The first file, CRACK3D.MSH, contains the mesh information. The second file, CRACK3D.DAT, is used to define the analysis type, parameters for analysis, and boundary conditions. The last file used only for local re-meshing, CRACK3D.GEO, defines the boundary lines and surfaces in which the crack and re-meshing are contained.

Two CRACK3D.MSH and CRACK3D.GEO files were created. One set of files was for the initial mesh with 2 elements through the thickness at the crack front, and the second file was for the initial mesh with 4 elements through the thickness. MESH3D, a preprocessor for CRACK3D, was used to generate the CRACK3D.MSH file from the NODES.DAT and ELEMS.DAT files. CRACK3D.GEO was created with the help of ANSYS macros created by Dr. Weiming Lan. Output from the macros was compiled in Microsoft's Notepad to create the CRACK3D.GEO file.

The CRACK3D.DAT file was created in Microsoft's Notepad following the CRACK3D manual. A different CRACK3D.DAT file was created for each of the loading cases. The crack growth simulation was performed using local re-meshing for fatigue crack growth with VCCT and the MCS criterion for crack growth direction prediction. Parameters for ΔK_{eq} defined in Eq 2.2 were chosen as follows: $\gamma=0$, $\gamma_1=1$, $\gamma_2=1$. Paris Law data from CRACK3D was not used for life prediction because the parameters for the



specific material and loading ratio being simulated were not currently available so that parameters for a different *R*-ratio were input. Also, the minimum element size, maximum element size, radius for the local re-meshing region, and increment for crack growth were defined. Boundary conditions were input for the specific loading case as described above in Section 3.2. As an example, the input files for the simulation for loading case $\Phi = 45^{\circ}$ are contained in Appendix C.

The first simulations were performed to check for convergence of the crack path. For the 15° loading case, simulations were performed using the first initial mesh with 2 elements through the thickness and with the initial refined mesh containing 4 elements through the thickness. The minimum element sizes equivalent to 1 /2 the thickness, 1 /4 the thickness, and 1/8 the thickness were used, and crack growth increments for 0.001m and 0.002m were used. The maximum element size and re-meshing zone size remained constant at 0.006m and 0.012m respectively. Table 3.2 shows all the combinations of simulations performed to check convergence.

Number of elements through thickness of initial mesh	Minimum element size [m]	Crack growth increment [m]
	002	0.001
2	.003	0.002
	0015	0.001
	.0013	0.002
	0015	0.001
4	.0013	0.002
	00075	0.001
	.00073	0.002

	Table 3.2. All	combinations of	f simulations	performed t	to verify conver	gence of solution
--	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-------------	------------------	-------------------

Simulations were performed for loading cases $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$, 30° , 45° , and 60° . In some cases the local re-meshing operation in CRACK3D had numerical difficulties and could



not continue when the crack growth amount reached a specific value. In such cases, the local re-meshing parameters such as the minimum element size, the maximum element size, or re-meshing region size were adjusted slightly in a trial and error fashion. Also, sometimes the first initial mesh with 2 elements through the thickness was used while other times the refined mesh was used. After simulations were performed using CRACK3D, POST3D was run which converted results from CRACK3D into result files compatible with ANSYS for further post-processing.

3.4 POST PROCESSING OF SIMULATION RESULTS

CRACK3D.SIF is an output file from CRACK3D which contained x, y, z, G_{I} , G_{II} , G_{III} , K_{I} , K_{II} , and K_{III} for each node along the crack front at each crack growth increment. CRACK3D.CXT contains the total reaction load for each crack growth increment. The total reaction load was summed over the nodes along the top line which the displacements were specified and was defined in the CRACK3D.DAT file. The data from these two files was imported to Microsoft Excel for post-processing of each simulation.

The reaction load from the prediction and the maximum load applied in the experiment were used to create a scale factor for the SIFs, since for nominally linear elastic conditions the load and SIF remain proportional. The SIF values were scaled to the experimental values for the maximum load. Then, ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} were calculated using Eq 1.4.

3.5 THEORETICAL RESULTS

The crack path for each of the simulations run for convergence check were plotted. No crack propagation occurred for the simulations with minimum element size of 1 /8 of the thickness (0.00075 m).





Figure 3.8. Crack path for $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$ with various initial meshes, minimum element sizes, and crack increments.

Figure 3.9 shows the deformed mesh for loading case $\Phi = 45^{\circ}$ for a = 0.03 m with

a close up of the crack and re-meshing zone.



Figure 3.9. 2D view of the 3D deformed mesh for $\Phi = 45^{\circ}$ (top) and a close up of the crack path and re-meshing zone around the crack front.



For loading cases $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$, 30° , 45° , and 60° , Figures 3.10-3.13 show the comparison between the experimental crack paths and the predicted crack paths.



Figure 3.10. The experimental and predicted crack path for the 15° loading case.



Figure 3.11. The experimental and predicted crack path for the 30° loading case.





Figure 3.12. The experimental and predicted crack path for the 45° loading case.



Figure 3.13. The experimental and predicted crack path for the 60° loading case.



The ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} for each loading cases $\Phi = 15^\circ$, 30° , 45° , and 60° are plotted along the crack length *a* in Figures 3.14-3.17.



Figure 3.14. Plot of ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} along the crack path for the 15° loading case.



Figure 3.15. Plot of ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} along the crack path for the 30° loading case.





Figure 3.16. Plot of ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} along the crack path for the 45° loading case.



Figure 3.17. Plot of ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} along the crack path for the 60° loading case.



CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 DISCUSSION OF EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

There are several issues that require discussion. First, as noted in Section 2.5, the experimental crack paths were determined through an imaging-digitization-scaling process, where imaging was performed on the fatigue specimen after completion of the crack growth process. Results from this process gave consistent results for all loading angles, Φ , and hence the resulting crack paths are used for direct comparison to the simulation predictions.

Secondly, regarding the crack growth process, as shown in Figures 3.10 to 3.13, there is excellent agreement between the measured and predicted crack growth paths. Furthermore, as shown in Figures 3.14 to 3.17, the simulation data shows that the crack growth process is occurring under nominally Mode I conditions, with $\Delta K_{II} = 0$, confirming that the fatigue crack tended to propagate under locally tensile conditions. For small loading angles, the crack growth direction is approximately perpendicular to the loading direction. However, as loading angle increases, the crack deviates from the perpendicular direction, implying that the local Mode I direction is no longer perpendicular to the loading angle. In fact, the curvilinear trend of the crack path which begins around x = 0.03m is the result of the influence of the loading process via the Arcan fixture on the stress field in the specimen. For $\Phi = 30^{\circ}$, Figure 4.1 shows a plot of



the crack path, with an additional line indicating the edge of the top fixture. Clearly, the Arcan fixture is sufficiently close to the crack path to have an influence on the local crack tip stress field in the specimen. In fact, the data for all loading angles show that as the crack approaches the steel fixture, it begins to turn and follow the edge of the upper fixture. Since the thickness of the Arcan fixture is much greater than the specimen and is manufactured from stainless steel, the crack turns to follow the "path of least resistance". That is, it would require more energy to create new surfaces inside the fixture, so the crack turns to continue propagating in the aluminum specimen.



Figure 4.1. Plot of the crack path for $\Phi = 30^{\circ}$ and edge of top fixture.



Thirdly, we were unable to observe crack growth for $\Phi = 75^{\circ}$ and $\Phi = 90^{\circ}$. There are two plausible reasons why the crack did not grow in these cases. Firstly, other studies have shown that the stress distribution for the Arcan fixture is not uniform, with the largest gradients occurring in the 75° orientation [1]. The relatively short initial notch and initial pre-crack used in the experiment may have positioned the crack tip in an area of negative or low stress. This may have put the crack into compression or kept ΔK_{eq} below ΔK_{TH} , the threshold value required to initiate crack growth in the material. Preliminary FEA by the author was consistent with this observation. Another possibility for both $\Phi =$ 75° and 90° is that the Mode II component of the far field loading is larger than the Mode I component. In such cases, there may not be sufficient Mode I loading to open the crack tip and overcome friction and local plastic deformation along the contacting crack surfaces to allow the fatigue crack to propagate.

4.2 DISCUSSION OF THEORETICAL RESULTS

Prior to discussing the results for the Arcan fatigue studies, it is important to note that benchmark studies have been performed, and it has been verified that CRACK3D is able to accurately predict the crack path for elastic plastic stable tearing using the Arcan fixture to achieve mixed-mode loading conditions using local re-meshing [2] [3] [4] [5] [6]. The direction of crack extension for stable tearing is predicted with a different criteria, crack opening displacement [2] [3] [4] [5] [6], while as discussed here, VCCT and MCS criterion are used in predicting the direction of fatigue crack propagation.

An important aspect of the simulations studies is to confirm consistency in the predicted crack path for each loading angle. The convergence of the predicted crack path



for $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$ was checked, and the plot in Figure 3.8 shows there is good agreement in the predicted crack path for all combinations of initial meshes, crack growth increments, and minimum element sizes, with the lone exception of simulations where minimum element size was 0.00075m. It was observed that the various combinations did not provide the same amount of crack growth, though the results from all combinations gave generally consistent trends in crack growth path across all converged simulations.

It is worth noting that, for each simulation, at a certain point CRACK3D was unable to re-mesh the volume according to the re-meshing criteria provided in the code. Thus, the program was terminated at this point. Though the precise reason for the inability to continue propagating the fatigue crack is not fully understood, it must be stated that there is no theoretical reason why there should be an issue in the ability to predict the direction of crack propagation for longer amounts of crack extension using MCS criterion. Since other fatigue studies were performed with CRACK3D where the crack grew all the way across a different specimen geometry, the most likely reason for the limited amount of crack extension is that CRACK3D could not arrange elements in an acceptable manner inside the size of the re-meshing region for this specimen geometry to "match" the surrounding, un-meshed region. The effect of overall geometry is most clearly evident in Figure 4.1. Here, as the crack propagated, the re-meshing region approached the interface of the specimen and the fixture (see Fig 4.1). Since the code currently does not have the ability to define internal boundaries to control the re-meshing near material boundaries, as the re-meshing region approached the fixture boundary, the program could not re-mesh the region satisfactorily, resulting in termination of the crack growth process. Even with these issues, our convergence analysis does show that any of



53

these combinations of re-meshing parameters will give similar results when re-meshing is possible.

As shown in Figures 3.10 - 3.13, the predicted and experimental crack paths are in good agreement with each other in the region where re-meshing was achievable. As commented above regarding the robustness of CRACK3D, the simulations with the longest predicted crack path for each loading case were reported.

As noted previously, Figures 3.14 – 3.17 show that ΔK_{II} quickly goes to zero along the predicted crack path, conditions that are consistent with the use of MCS criterion for predicting the direction of crack growth. For the first case, $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$, for the segment of crack path considered, the load was held constant, and so it is expected that ΔK_I increases as shown in Fig. 3.14. However after crack slanting occurred for $\Phi = 15^\circ$, ΔK_I for the remaining experiments was held approximately constant (see Figure 3.15 - 3.17) via a modified method of load shedding to control the crack growth rate and maintain crack tip conditions that were nominally consistent with elasticity assumptions (e.g., small plastic zone relative to specimen dimensions). This was necessary so that crack growth occurred under conditions that reflected local stress intensity factor control. Figures 2.10 and 2.11 show that, for most crack lengths, the crack growth rate, da/dN, was maintained between the range of 4 x 10^{-5} mm/cycle and 8 x 10^{-5} mm/cycle, while also ensuring that the plastic zone size at the crack tip was small. For loading angle Φ =45°, near the end of the experiment the crack growth range was below these limits for da/dN, ranging from a minimum of 2 x 10⁻⁵ mm/cycle to a maximum of 4 x 10⁻⁵ (see Figures 2.11 and 2.12), which increased the time required to complete the experiment but did not alter the nominally elastic conditions required for these studies.



There are several comments to be made in regards to the efficiency and effectiveness of this modified method for controlling the change in SIF during the experiment. First, during one of the experiments the crack measurement system (microscope objectives, calipers) had to be re-zeroed. Since the crack lengths were re-measured and were slightly different (shorter) afterwards, one negative value for da/dN was obtained immediately after the re-zeroing process. This data point is not shown in Figure 2.10. Causes for other outliers in the data not shown in Figures 2.10 - 2.12 include (a) slight errors in the measured crack lengths while the experiment was being performed, (b) local variations in material (e.g., inclusions) or (c) other defects introduced in the manufacturing process. The effects identified in (a-c) were somewhat magnified in this study since crack growth was measured over very short cycle counts Thus, changes in crack growth for any of the reasons noted above will appear as steep gradients in the $\Delta a/\Delta N$ data. If crack growth had been averaged in over a much larger time frame (more cycles), then these effects would be more muted.

Secondly, the goal of this modified load shedding technique was to maintain an average constant da/dN, and so far it has been discussed that in general that goal was achieved with only a few outliers in the data. However for short segments of crack growth increasing or decreasing trends in da/dN exist (Figures 2.10- 2.12). These trends in the data can be seen in Figure 2.10 between 40 and 60 mm of crack length and in Figure 2.11 and 2.12 at the beginning of the experiment around 10 mm of crack length. However for the experiment with Φ =60°, in an effort to maintain the specified range of crack growth rates, the loads were increased too much and the crack growth rate jumped beyond the set limits. In this case, over short cycle counts the load was decreased until



55
da/dN was back in the appropriate range. It is noted that these trends are the result of the difficulty in the practical application of this modified load shedding approach. The inability to precisely control da/dN means that ΔK_{eq} does not actually remain constant during the experiment and could potentially result in ΔK_{eq} becoming too large and the nominally elastic conditions may not be present.

Thirdly, this modified method is based on the premise that, according to Paris' Law (Eq 1.5), da/dN and ΔK_{eq} are proportional. Thus, trends in the measured crack growth rate and the computed ΔK_{eq} at the crack tip should be consistent throughout the crack growth process. To determine whether this approach gave consistent results, predicted values for K_I and K_{II} were scaled to the experimental values using the resultant load from the simulations and the maximum load applied during the experiment. ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} were then calculated using Eq 1.4 and ΔK_{eq} was calculated according to Eq. 2.2 with parameters $\gamma = 0$, $\gamma_1 = 1$, and $\gamma_2 = 1$ as discussed in Section 3.3. Figures 4.2-4.4 show a direct comparison of the scaled ΔK_{eq} and the discrete crack growth rate recorded during function experiment, the $\Delta a/\Delta N$, as a of crack length, а.



Figure 4.2. Plot of ΔK_{eq} and da/dN along crack length for 30° loading case.





Figure 4.3. Plot of ΔK_{eq} and da/dN along crack length for 45° loading case.



Figure 4.4. Plot of ΔK_{eq} and da/dN along crack length for 60° loading case.

Figures 4.2 - 4.4 show that the trend in ΔK_{eq} follows the trend in da/dN as expected from Paris' Law (Eq 1.5).

Fourthly, load control was used to determine the crack growth rate since it directly alters ΔK_{eq} (instead of using crude empirical expressions). Even though Figs 4.2-4.4 show that ΔK_{eq} is a viable approach, there are some challenges associated with controlling the crack growth rate in experiments. First, some previous knowledge of loading and crack growth rates must be known to have a starting point to ensure that the experiments are



within the nominally linear elastic range. Secondly, the procedure is quite time consuming since the crack must be measured approximately every 5,000 cycles until the rate is established (see the first 20mm of crack growth for $\Phi = 45^{\circ}$ and $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$ in Figures 4.3 and 4.4 respectively). After the rate was established, it was determined that the load had to be decreased \approx every 25,000 cycles. Thus, unless an automated approach is developed to perform the crack growth rate estimations, the experimentalist must be near the test stand through the duration of the experiment to take the crack growth measurements for these cycle count intervals. Thirdly, the loads should be adjusted in small increments to minimize changes that might cause crack closure or other unwanted effects. This slow adjustment can take 10 to 20 mm of crack growth, and thus the ΔK_{eq} is not held constant for the whole experiment. In this regard, it is noted that a more accurate way of predicting loads for the experiment is to use ΔK_{eq} values obtained by performing FEA before the experiment to determine the maximum loads which can be applied and the maximum crack length the loads can be used before the plastic zone at the crack tip becomes too large. However, this would require a priori knowledge of the crack path, which is generally not the case. Fourthly, though simply changing loads slightly to maintain modest crack growth rates is effective for the experimentalist, changing the loads during the experiment also makes the simulations more time consuming. Multiple models and simulations have to be performed for each load step if load boundary conditions are used. This avoids more post- processing on the back end. However, it is very time consuming to build multiple models. A more efficient way is to use one simulation in displacement control. The reaction load can be scaled at each crack growth increment with the loads for the corresponding crack growth increment from the



experiment. This requires more post- processing and accurate records for the experiment. Also, if the *R*-ratio is not held constant through the experiment, the life prediction using Paris' Law (Eq. 1.5) can become more difficult since the constants C and m may depend on R and the rate data must be known for the whole range of loading ratios used.

Finally, it is noted that standards for fatigue testing suggest that they be run using constant amplitude (constant load levels) [31]. This method is most efficient experimentally and in simulations. However with ΔK increasing, not as much crack growth can be obtained before large plasticity occurs at the crack tip or stable tearing initiates. As discussed earlier, the method of load shedding selected in this study was chosen to obtain the maximum amount of crack extension under nominally elastic conditions.



CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Fatigue crack growth experiments have been performed successfully on an edgecracked Arcan specimen manufactured from 2024-T351 aluminum and subjected to farfield mixed mode I/II loading with loading angles $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$, 30° , 45° , and 60° . Experimental results from these experiments included (a) crack paths, (b) crack extension vs. fatigue cycles and (c) the minimum and maximum loads applied during each cycle. Results show that (a) the two degree of freedom slide apparatus developed especially for these experiments is an effective and efficient method of determining experimental crack paths, eliminating the cumbersome post-processing requirements for digitizing and scaling images of the specimen after crack extension had occurred, (b) crack extension occurs along different curvilinear paths for each loading angle, extending from the original crack tip towards the upper Arcan grip, (c) initial kinking angle of the fatigue crack indicates that the local Mode I direction deviates the direction perpendicular to the loading angle as the Mode II component of loading increases, (d) the load shedding process used to maintain crack growth rates in a specific range that was used for $\Phi = 30^{\circ}$, 45°, and 60° is consistent with controlling ΔK_{eq} , as shown through direct comparison of experimental crack growth rates and predicted ΔK_{eq} values at points along the measured crack paths, and (e) further study is required for loading angles $\Phi = 75^{\circ}$ and 90° where fatigue crack growth was not observed experimentally.



60

Simulations of the fatigue crack growth process for the Arcan fixture-specimen combination have been performed using a custom-finite element code for fracture analysis, CRACK3D. In this code, VCCT is used to quantify the local stress intensity factors and the MCSC is used to determine the direction of current crack extension. Results from the simulations show that (a) CRACK3D is an effective simulation platform for fatigue crack growth in many cases, (b) the re-meshing algorithms in CRACK3D are not readily adaptable for crack growth near material junctures where there are significant differences in element size; the ability to handle such cases is currently being developed, but not yet available, (c) direct comparison of the experimental results and predictions indicate that the measured and CRACK3D predicted crack paths using local re-meshing to maintain accuracy in the local fields are in excellent agreement over the range of crack growth where the simulations were convergent, (d) predictions using an idealized notch and pre-crack yield little error between the predicted and experimental crack paths, and(e) indicate that the direction of crack propagation corresponds to the direction which maximizes Mode I and minimized Mode II, which is consistent with results from previous studies [1] [2]



61

CHAPTER 6

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK

It is recommended that for the current study, a life prediction be completed using the predicted values of ΔK_{eq} and Paris' Law (Eq 1.5) to compare predicted *da/dN* to the experimental crack growth rate ($\Delta a/\Delta N$). Currently the rate data for R = 0.4 is not available, and the Paris' Law constants for R = 0.4 are unknown for Al-2024-T351. The data may be available through the last version of AFGROW [1] available to the public [2], though this has not yet been verified.

While the current study only compared the predicted crack path to the experimental crack path, it is recommended that further experiments be conducted to obtain the experimental values of ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} for comparison. It has been shown that DIC is an accurate method of obtaining SIFs around the crack tip [3] [4]. Currently, a script in MATLAB [5] has been created to use the displacement field around the crack tip, accounting for rigid body translation and rotation, in William's solution [6] to iteratively solve for values of K_I and K_{II} until the solution has reached convergence using a Levenberg-Marquardt least squares [7] to solve the over-determined system of non-linear equations. To implement this experimentally, it is suggested that for various crack lengths, the specimen be statically loaded to zero, maximum, and minimum force with images of the crack tip being obtained at each load level. Then DIC can be conducted for



the maximum and minimum loads with the image at zero force being the reference image. From those displacement fields corresponding to the maximum and minimum loads and the method of determining the SIFs discussed above, ΔK_I and ΔK_{II} can then be determined using Eq 1.2.

It has been suggested that further experiments be conducted to experimentally determine SIFs, and as discussed in the Chapter 4, the current method of load prediction is not efficient while performing the experiment or for the simulation post-processing. Since the crack paths have now been determined, it is recommended that for this second set of experiments FEA be used to predict the loads for the experiment. It would be optimal to keep constant amplitude for as long a crack path as possible before having to perform load shedding to keep the number of load shedding steps at a minimum.

The current work did not provide sufficient information for $\Phi = 75^{\circ}$ and 90°, and further work is necessary to understand fatigue crack propagation when Mode II is dominant. It is recommended that a finite element model of the fixture and specimen with the fatigue pre-crack should be built. The stress fields at the crack tip should be evaluated. To perform experiments at these loading angles, it may be necessary to grow the fatigue pre-crack further, into a region of higher stress or to keep the pre-crack in the same location but apply higher loads.

If previous studies show that fatigue cracks always propagate in Mode I, it may be because the local Mode I direction is the only direction providing enough opening without friction of the surfaces caused by the shear and cyclic loading. Stable tearing cracks propagate in the Mode II direction for $\Phi = 75^{\circ}$ and 90°, but for that case, there is



no cyclic loading and the loads are increased to overcome the friction between the surfaces. It is recommended that a tensile bar should be used to apply a constant K_I to the Arcan specimen while cyclic loading is applied at either $\Phi = 75^{\circ}$ and 90°, as shown in Figure 6.1. That tension may provide enough opening of the crack tip to allow the fatigue crack to propagate in the Mode II direction . The tension bar should be manufactured carefully such that it does not interfere with the ability to visibly track the crack growth. It should also not apply a moment to the specimen if possible, and the tensile load applied should be able to be held constant and be able to be adjusted. The load should also be recorded, and it is suggested that a strain gage to be used to do so.



Figure 6.1. Schematic of Arcan fixture with proposed tension bar for $\Phi = 75^{\circ}$.



REFERENCES

- National Transportation Safety Board, "Aloha Airlines, Flight 243, Boeing 737-200, N73711," 1988.
- [2] R. Witkin, "Cracks are Found on Aging Jetliner," *The New York Times*, 18 October 1988.
- [3] Federal Aviation Administration, "FAA to order Inspections for Fatigue Crack on Boeing 737's," 1998.
- [4] "Southwest Checks Fleet after Hole forces Landing: Hole in fuselage causes pressure-loss scare on Boeing 737," *Associated Press*, 14 July 2009.
- [5] L. Stark, M. Hosford and M. S. James, "Southwest Air Emergency: Inspection Program Missed Crack in Plane," 3 April 2011. [Online]. Available: http://abcnews.go.com/US/southwest-air-emergency-inspection-program-missedcracks-plane/story?id=13286094#.UbtcfpXD_IU. [Accessed June 2013].
- [6] S. Trimble, "Fatigue Cracks Raise Questions about Key Decision in F-35 Redesign," *Flight*, November 2010.
- [7] H. L. Ewalds and R. J. Wanhill, Fracture Mechanics, London: Edward Arnold Ltd, 1984.
- [8] F. Erdogan and G. C. Sih, "On the crack extension in plates under plane loading and transverse shear," *Journal of Basic Engineering*, no. 85D, pp. 519-527, 1963.
- [9] P. Paris and F. Erdogan, "A critical analysis of crack propagation laws," *Journal of Basic Engineering*, pp. 528-534, 1963.
- [10] R. Zhang and L. He, "Measurement of mixed-mode stress intensity factors using digital image correlation," *Optics and Lasers in Engineering*, pp. 1001-1007, 2012.



- [11] P. Lopez-Crespo, A. Sherenlikht, E. A. Patterson, J. R. Yates and P. J. Withers, "The stress intensity of mixed mode cracks determined by digital image correlation," *Journal of Strain Analysis*, pp. 769-780, 2008.
- [12] Y. Murakami, Stress Intensity Factors Handbook, vol. 1, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987.
- [13] S. A. Fawaz, "Personal Conversation," 2009.
- [14] J., S. G. D. M. H. J.M Greer, "Some comments on the Arcan mixed-mode (I/II) test specimen," *Engineering Fracture Mechanics*, pp. 2088-2094, 2011.
- [15] S. Liu, Y. J. Chao and R. R. Gaddam, "Fracture Type Transition under Mixed Mode I/II Quasi-static and Fatigue Loading Conditions," in *Society for Experimental Mechanics*, 2004.
- [16] B. E. Amstutz, M. A. Sutton and D. S. Dawicke, "Experimental Study of Mixed Mode I/II Stable Crack Growth in Thin 2024-T3 Aluminum," *Fatigue and Fracture*, *ASTM STP 1256*, vol. 26, pp. 256-273, 1995.
- [17] B. E. Amstutz, M. A. Sutton, D. S. Dawicke and M. L. Boone, "Effects of Mixed Mode I/II Loading and Grain Orientation on Crack Initiation and Stable Tearing in 2024-T3 Aluminum," *ASTM STP 1296*, vol. 27, pp. 105-125, 1997.
- [18] S. Boljanovic and S. Maksimovic, "Analysis of the crack growth propagation process under mixed-mode loading," *Engineering Fracture Mechanics*, no. 78, pp. 1565-1576, 2011.
- [19] "MSC Software," [Online]. Available: www.mscsoftware.com/product/msc-nastran.
- [20] "ASTM International," [Online]. Available: http://www.astm.org/Standards/E399.htm.
- [21] D. D. S. Dawicke, Interviewee, *Personal communication, NASA Langley Research Center*. [Interview]. 2011.
- [22] H. Tada, P. C. Paris and G. R. Irwin, The Stress Analysis of Cracks Handbook, 3rd ed.
- [23] Richard, Buchholz, Kullmer and Schollmann, "2D- and 3D-mixed mode fracutre criteria," *Key Engineering Materials*, pp. 251-260, 2003.



- [24] "GetData Graph Digitizer," [Online]. Available: http://www.getdata-graph-digitizer.com/.
- [25] V. Lindberg, "Uncertainties and Error Propagation Part I of a manual on Uncertainties, Graphing, and the Vernier Caliper," 1 July 2000. [Online]. Available: www.rit.edu/~w~uphysi/uncertainties/Uncertaintiespart2.html#muldiv. [Accessed July 2013].
- [26] X. Deng, X. Ke, M. A. Sutton, E. E. Miller and H. W. Schreier, "3D VCCT wiht locally structured re-meshing for evaluation mixed-mode stress intensity factors in crack grwoth simulations along curved crack paths," in *presentation at the Society of Engineering Science 49th Annual Technical Meeting*, Georgia Tech, GA, USA, Oct 10-12,2012.
- [27] X. Deng, X. Ke, M. A. Sutton, E. E. Miller and H. W. Schreier, "Locally structured re-meshing to enable accurate determination of stress intensity factors using 3D VCCT for crack growth simulations with curved crack paths," in *presentation at the International Symposium on Solid Mechanics in Honor of Professor Xing Zhang*, Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, China, Nov.3,2012.
- [28] X. Den, X. Ke, M. A. Sutton, E. E. Miller and H. W. Schreier, "FEM for 3D SIF determination for fatigue crack growth simulations iwth curved crack fronts and paths," in to be presented at the ASME 2013 International Mechanical Engineering Congress & Exposition, San Diego, CA, USA, Nov. 15-21,2013.
- [29] H. Okada, H. Kawai and K. Araki, "A virtual crack closure-integral method (VCCM) to compute the energy release rates and stress intensity factors based on quadratic tetrahedral finite elements," *Engineering Fracture Mechanics*, pp. 4466-4485, 2008.
- [30] "ANSYS," [Online]. Available: www.ansys.com/products.
- [31] "ASTM E468 11 Standar Practice for Presentation of Constant Amplitude Fatigue Test Results for Metallic Materials," [Online]. Available: www.astm.org/Standards/E468.htm.
- [32] "AFGROW," [Online]. Available: www.afgrow.net.
- [33] U. S. A. F. Rob Reuter, Interviewee, Personal Conversation. [Interview].
- [34] "MATLAB," [Online]. Available: www.mathworks.com/products/matlab/.



- [35] G. R. Irwin, "Analysis of stresses and strains near the end of a crack traveling a plate.," *Transaction of ASME, Journal of Applied Mechanics,* vol. 24, pp. 361-364, 1957.
- [36] K. Levenberg, "A method for the solution of certain non-linear problems in least squares," *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, vol. 2, 164-168.



Appendix A – Experimentai	L DATA RECORDED
---------------------------	-----------------

Cycles(N)	X-position of crack tip	Maximum Load	Minimum Load
	[m]	(Pmax) [N]	(Pmin) [N]
Pre-cracking			
50,000	0.0067	48308	7962
100,000	0.0073		
130,000	0.0081	45630	7558
150,000	0.0092	43392	7166
170,000	0.0100	38277	6592
177,000	0.0105	36867	6183
187,000	0.0110		
197,000	0.0115	35532	5907
202,000	0.0116	34153	5725
212,000	0.0121		
217,000	0.0123	32650	5542
221,000	0.0124		
225,400	0.0126		
225,400	0.0126		
	Markin	g Crack Front	
231,000	0.0127	28384	14203
240,000	0.0127		
260,000	0.0128		
275,000	0.0129		
290,000	0.0129		
		Test	
290,000	0.0124		
300,000	0.0127	31756	5396
315,000	0.0132		
330,000	0.0137		
345,000	0.0143		
360,000	0.0149		
375,000	0.0157		
390,000	0.0165		

Table A.1. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 15^{\circ}$.



405,000	0.0173		
420,000	0.0183		
430,000	0.0190		
440,000	0.0198		
450,000	0.0206		
460,000	0.0215		
470,000	0.0225		
480,000	0.0236		
487,500	0.0243		
495,000	0.0254		
500,000	0.0260		
505,000	0.0267		
510,000	0.0274		
515,000	0.0282		
520,000	0.0290		
525,000	0.0299		
530,000	0.0308		
535,000	0.0318		
540,000	0.0329		
545,000	0.0340		
550,000	0.0351		
555,000	0.0364		
560,000	0.0378		
565,000	0.0394		
570,000	0.0413		
573,000	0.0423		
576,000	0.0434		
579,000	0.0448		
582,000	0.0461		
585,000	0.0477		
588,000	0.0490		
591,000	0.0507		
594,000	0.0526		
597,000	0.0551		
598,000	0.0560		
598,300	0.0561	29109	4568
598,600	0.0562		
598,800	0.0563		
599,000	0.0566		
599,300	0.0567	27116	4528
599,600	0.0568		



599,900	0.0568		
600,200	0.0570		
600,400	0.0571		
600,600	0.0571		
600,800	0.0573		
601,000	0.0573	25261	4551
601,400	0.0574		
601,800	0.0575		
602,200	0.0577		
602,600	0.0578		
603,000	0.0578	23335	4551
603,600	0.0581		
604,200	0.0582		
604,800	0.0583		
605,400	0.0585		
606,000	0.0586	20982	4551
606,600	0.0586		
607,600	0.0588		
608,600	0.0590		
608,800	0.0590		
609,600	0.0591	19172	4546
610,800	0.0593		
612,000	0.0594		
613,800	0.0596		
615,600	0.0602		
617,400	0.0604	17433	4519
618,200	0.0604	15760	4515
620,600	0.0605		
623,000	0.0607		
623,400	0.0609		
630,000	0.0618	14234	4453
638,000	0.0620	12677	4453
640,000	0.0621		
662,000	0.0626	11468	4462
676,000	0.0628		
696,000	0.0630	9791	4444
726,000	0.0630		
761,000	0.0632		
781,000	0.0633		
801,000	0.0634		
821,000	0.0634	7580	6076



861,000	0.0634		
925,000	0.0634		
1,005,000	0.0634	8447	6761
1,030,000	0.0634	8447	5916
1,045,000	0.0634	19990	16005
1,057,000	0.0636	•	
1,067,000	0.0637		
1,081,000	0.0638		
1,093,000	0.0639	8332	4728
1,123,000	0.0640		
1,195,000	0.0640		
1,270,000	0.0640		
1,320,000	0.0640	9070	4453



Cycles(N)	X- position of crack tip [m]	Maximum Load (Pmax) [N]	Minimum Load (Pmin) [N]		
	Pre-cracking				
50,000	0.0060	45012	4897		
100,000	0.0063				
150,000	0.0095				
160,000	0.0098	36386	4813		
170,000	0.0103				
175,000	0.0105	35279	4622		
180,000	0.0107				
185,000	0.0109	34100	4599		
190,000	0.0111				
197,000	0.0114				
202,000	0.0116	32948	4613		
210,000	0.0119				
215,000	0.0122				
220,000	0.0124	31662	4546		
225,000	0.0127				
	Marking	Crack Front			
240,000	0.0128	30768	15391		
250,000	0.0129				
285,000	0.0130				
315,000	0.0131				
340,000	0.0133				
	Te	esting			
345,000	0.0113	29945	4791		
346,000	0.0115	51155	45416		
348,000	0.0117				
350,000	0.0118	49108	19648		
355,000	0.0121	47334	18949		
360,000	0.0124				
365,000	0.0127				
370,000	0.0130	45461	18304		
375,000	0.0132				
380,000	0.0134	43899	17691		
385,000	0.0137				
387,000	0.0139				
390,000	0.0140	42765	17183		

Table A.2. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 30^{\circ}$.



395,000	0.0142		
397,000	0.0144		
400,000	0.0145	41453	16610
405,000	0.0147		
410,000	0.0149		
416,000	0.0152		
422,000	0.0156		
428,000	0.0159		
434,000	0.0162		
440,000	0.0166		
445,000	0.0170		
450,000	0.0173	40087	16085
455,000	0.0176		
460,000	0.0179	38886	15578
465,000	0.0182		
470,000	0.0185		
475,000	0.0189	37561	15071
480,000	0.0192		
485,000	0.0195	36493	16859
490,000	0.0199		
495,000	0.0202	35501	14221
500,000	0.0205		
505,000	0.0207	34536	13852
510,000	0.0211		
515,000	0.0214		
520,000	0.0217	33642	13460
525,000	0.0218		
530,000	0.0221		
535,000	0.0224	32752	13118
540,000	0.0227		
545,000	0.0229	31876	12784
550,000	0.0232		
555,000	0.0236		
560,000	0.0238	31071	12464
565,000	0.0241		
570,000	0.0243	30301	12144
575,000	0.0246		
580,000	0.0249		
585,000	0.0252	29545	11850



590,000	0.0254		
595,000	0.0257		
600,000	0.0260	28824	11561
605,000	0.0262		
610,000	0.0265	28104	11298
615,000	0.0267		
620,000	0.0270		
625,000	0.0272	27437	11032
630,000	0.0274		
635,000	0.0277		
640,000	0.0279	26778	10760
645,000	0.0282		
650,000	0.0285		
655,000	0.0287	26133	10533
660,000	0.0289		
665,000	0.0291		
667,000	0.0293	25515	10315
672,000	0.0295		
677,000	0.0296		
682,000	0.0299		
685,000	0.0300		
695,000	0.0304	24923	10080
705,000	0.0309		
715,000	0.0312	24341	9835
725,000	0.0317		
735,000	0.0320	23789	9626
740,000	0.0322		
750,000	0.0326	23229	9399
755,000	0.0328		
765,000	0.0332	22708	9199
770,000	0.0333		
775,000	0.0335		
780,000	0.0337		
785,000	0.0339	22210	8981
795,000	0.0342		
802,500	0.0345		
807,500	0.0347	21712	8790
812,500	0.0348		
817,500	0.0350		



827,500	0.0354		
832,500	0.0355	21205	8585
837,500	0.0357		
842,500	0.0359		
847,500	0.0360	20782	8363
852,500	0.0362		
857,500	0.0364		
862,500	0.0365		
867,500	0.0367		
872,500	0.0369	20346	8162
877,500	0.0370		
882,500	0.0372		
887,500	0.0374		
892,500	0.0374	19924	7962
897,500	0.0377		
902,500	0.0378		
908,500	0.0369		
914,500	0.0382	19439	7802
920,500	0.0383		
926,500	0.0385		
932,500	0.0387		
938,500	0.0389	19021	7651
944,500	0.0391		
950,500	0.0392		
956,500	0.0394		
962,500	0.0396	18598	7464
968,500	0.0397		
974,500	0.0399		
980,500	0.0401		
986,500	0.0402		
995,500	0.0404	18207	7313
1,005,500	0.0407		
1,015,500	0.0410		
1,025,500	0.0412	17811	7144
1,035,500	0.0414		
1,055,500	0.0419		
1,075,500	0.0423	17415	6984
1,095,500	0.0427		
1,115,500	0.0432	17050	6828



1,135,500	0.0436	16676	6681
1,155,500	0.0440		
1,185,500	0.0446	16307	6543
1,215,500	0.0452		
1,230,500	0.0475		
	0.0000		
1,245,500	0.0457		
1,260,000	0.0460		
1,275,000	0.0462		
1,290,000	0.0465		
1,305,000	0.0468		
1,320,000	0.0471		
1,335,000	0.0474		
1,350,000	0.0478		
1,365,000	0.0483		
1,380,000	0.0487		
1,395,000	0.0491		
1,410,000	0.0496		
1,425,000	0.0501		
1,440,000	0.0507		
1,455,000	0.0513		
1,470,000	0.0519		
1,495,000	0.0530		
1,510,000	0.0536		
1,530,000	0.0546		
1,540,000	0.0552		
1,550,000	0.0558		
1,560,000	0.0565		
1,564,000	0.0567		
1,574,000	0.0574		
1,584,000	0.0581		
1,594,000	0.0589		
1,604,000	0.0595		
1,614,000	0.0603		
1,624,000	0.0610	14973	5978
1,629,000	0.0613	14572	5907
1,634,000	0.0616		
1,639,000	0.0620		
1,644,000	0.0624		



1,654,000	0.0630	14265	5769
1,659,000	0.0634		
1,669,000	0.0640	13959	5627
1,679,000	0.0647		
1,684,000	0.0649	13727	5480
1,689,000	0.0653		
1,694,000	0.0656	13425	5342
1,699,000	0.0660		
1,704,000	0.0663	13118	5236
1,709,000	0.0665		
1,714,000	0.0669		
1,719,000	0.0672		
1,724,000	0.0676		
1,729,000	0.0678	12838	5120
1,734,000	0.0682		
1,739,000	0.0686		
1,744,000	0.0690	12544	5004
1,749,000	0.0693	12277	4915
1,754,000	0.0696		
1,759,000	0.0699	12010	4804
1,764,000	0.0702		
1,769,000	0.0704		
1,774,000	0.0708		
1,779,000	0.0711		
1,784,000	0.0714	11752	4706
1,789,000	0.0717		
1,794,000	0.0720		
1,799,000	0.0724		
1,804,000	0.0727	11499	4599
1,809,000	0.0730		
1,814,000	0.0733		
1,819,000	0.0736		
1,824,000	0.0740		
1,829,000	0.0744	11223	4506
1,834,000	0.0747	10983	4390
1,839,000	0.0750		
1,844,000	0.0753	10787	4297
1,854,000	0.0760		
1,859,000	0.0764		



1,864,000	0.0767	10556	4186
1,869,000	0.0770		
1,874,000	0.0773		
1,879,000	0.0776		
1,884,000	0.0780		
1,889,000	0.0785	10289	4110
1,894,000	0.0790	10066	4026
1,899,000	0.0792	9622	3852
1,904,000	0.0796		
1,909,000	0.0799	9408	3763
1,914,000	0.0802		
1,919,000	0.0806		
1,924,000	0.0809	9194	3679
1,929,000	0.0812	8994	3603
1,934,000	0.0815		
1,939,000	0.0819	8785	3510
1,944,000	0.0821		
1,949,000	0.0825		
1,954,000	0.0829		
1,959,000	0.0832	8585	3438
1,964,000	0.0836		
1,969,000	0.0839	8385	3363
1,974,000	0.0842		
1,979,000	0.0845	8198	3292
1,984,000	0.0848		
1,989,000	0.0852		
1,994,000	0.0856	8016	3216
1,999,000	0.0859		
2,004,000	0.0862		
2,009,000	0.0866		
2,014,000	0.0870	7642	3003
2,019,000	0.0872	7464	2936
2,024,000	0.0876		
2,029,000	0.0879	7295	2874
2,034,000	0.0882		
2,039,000	0.0885		
2,044,000	0.0888		
2,049,000	0.0893		
2,054,000	0.0896	7122	2874



2,059,000	0.0899		
2,064,000	0.0903	6966	2811
2,069,000	0.0907		
2,074,000	0.0910	6806	2749
2,079,000	0.0914	6637	2682
2,084,000	0.0917		
2,089,000	0.0920	6486	2620
2,094,000	0.0924		
2,099,000	0.0928	6352	2549
2,104,000	0.0931	6205	2487
2,109,000	0.0935		
2,114,000	0.0937	6058	2433
2,119,000	0.0940		
2,124,000	0.0943		
2,129,000	0.0945		
2,134,000	0.0949		
2,139,000	0.0953	5907	2220
2,144,000	0.0957		
2,149,000	0.0960	5765	2313
2,154,000	0.0964		
2,159,000	0.0968	5765	2313
2,164,000	0.0971	5636	2260
2,169,000	0.0974		
2,174,000	0.0978	5494	2060
2,179,000	0.0982	5356	1993
2,184,000	0.0985	5231	2100
2,189,000	0.0988		
2,194,000	0.0991	5098	2046
2,199,000	0.0995		
2,204,000	0.0998	4982	1828
2,209,000	0.1001		
2,214,000	0.1003	4849	1953
2,219,000	0.1007		
2,224,000	0.1011	4728	1899
2,229,000	0.1014	4613	1855
2,234,000	0.1017		
2,239,000	0.1019		
2,244,000	0.1023	4515	1646
2,249,000	0.1027	4390	1761



2,254,000	0.1030	4284	1721
2,259,000	0.1034	4177	1486
2,264,000	0.1036		
2,274,000	0.1041		
2,284,000	0.1045		
2,294,000	0.1052		
2,299,000	0.1055	4075	1624
2,304,000	0.1058		



Cycles(N)	X-Position of Crack Tip	Maximum Load (Pmax)	Minimum Load
	[m]	[N]	(Pmin) [N]
	Pre	-cracking	
25,000	0.0064	68356	26961
40,000	0.0073		
55,000	0.0082	61025	24278
70,000	0.0092	57871	23353
80,000	0.0097	55469	22157
90,000	0.0103	53005	21280
100,000	0.0108	51528	20440
110,000	0.0113		
120,000	0.0116	47124	18981
130,000	0.0121		
140,000	0.0125	45372	18264
	Markin	g Crack Front	
145,000	0.0094	43851	26338
150,000	0.0094	47787	28722
160,000	0.0095		
170,000	0.0096		
185,000	0.0098		
	7	Testing	l
195,000	0.0094	42458	17081
200,000	0.0094	47089	18273
205,000	0.0095		
210,000	0.0096	48930	19661
215,000	0.0098		
220,000	0.0099		
225,000	0.0100		
235,000	0.0103		
245,000	0.0107		
255,000	0.0113		
260,000	0.0115		
265,000	0.0118		
275,000	0.0124		
285,000	0.0131		
290,000	0.0135		
295,000	0.0139	47823	18949
300,000	0.0141	46511	18313

Table A.3. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 45^{\circ}$.



305,000	0.0146		
310,000	0.0149	44927	17691
315,000	0.0152		
320,000	0.0156	43014	17148
325,000	0.0159	41497	16605
330,000	0.0162		
335,000	0.0165		
340,000	0.0168	40163	16107
345,000	0.0171		
350,000	0.0173		
355,000	0.0177	38700	15622
360,000	0.0182		
365,000	0.0184	37441	15168
370,000	0.0187		
375,000	0.0191		
380,000	0.0194	36391	14750
385,000	0.0197		
390,000	0.0200		
395,000	0.0203	35363	14337
400,000	0.0206		
405,000	0.0209		
410,000	0.0213		
415,000	0.0216	34429	13950
420,000	0.0219		
425,000	0.0222		
430,000	0.0225	33504	13598
435,000	0.0228		
440,000	0.0231		
445,000	0.0235		
450,000	0.0238	32708	13269
455,000	0.0240		
460,000	0.0244		
465,000	0.0247	31778	12882
470,000	0.0250		
475,000	0.0254		
480,000	0.0258	30986	12557
485,000	0.0261		
490,000	0.0265		
495,000	0.0267	30190	12242



500,000	0.0271		
505,000	0.0270	29461	11943
510,000	0.0277		
515,000	0.0280		
520,000	0.0283	28740	11650
525,000	0.0286		
530,000	0.0289		
535,000	0.0293		
540,000	0.0296		
545,000	0.0300		
550,000	0.0303	28042	11370
555,000	0.0306		
560,000	0.0310		
565,000	0.0313	27361	11107
570,000	0.0316		
575,000	0.0319	26694	10823
580,000	0.0323		
585,000	0.0325		
590,000	0.0328		
595,000	0.0332		
600,000	0.0335	26089	10578
605,000	0.0338		
610,000	0.0341		
615,000	0.0344		
620,000	0.0348		
625,000	0.0351		
630,000	0.0354	25484	10324
635,000	0.0358		
640,000	0.0361	24892	10080
645,000	0.0364		
650,000	0.0367		
655,000	0.0371		
660,000	0.0374	24318	9857
665,000	0.0437		
670,000	0.0380		
675,000	0.0384		
680,000	0.0388	23856	9626
685,000	0.0391		
690,000	0.0395		



695,000	0.0398		
700,000	0.0401	23220	9399
705,000	0.0405		
710,000	0.0409		
715,000	0.0411	22708	9190
720,000	0.0415		
725,000	0.0418		
730,000	0.0421	22192	8990
735,000	0.0424		
740,000	0.0428		
745,000	0.0431	21205	6361
750,000	0.0434		
755,000	0.0437		
760,000	0.0440		
765,000	0.0442		
770,000	0.0446		
775,000	0.0449		
780,000	0.0452		
785,000	0.0456		
790,000	0.0459	20742	8394
795,000	0.0462	20275	8207
800,000	0.0464		
805,000	0.0468		
810,000	0.0471	19505	7847
815,000	0.0473	18972	7678
820,000	0.0475	18554	7504
825,000	0.0478		
830,000	0.0482		
835,000	0.0482	18162	7344
840,000	0.0484	17762	7188
850,000	0.0487	17379	7037
860,000	0.0491		
870,000	0.0494		
880,000	0.0498		
890,000	0.0502		
900,000	0.0506		
910,000	0.0511		
920,000	0.0514	16997	6877
930,000	0.0518		



940,000	0.0522		
950,000	0.0527	16997	6739
960,000	0.0601		
970,000	0.0534	16267	7473
980,000	0.0538		
990,000	0.0542	15929	6445
1,000,000	0.0547		
1,010,000	0.0551	15920	6285
1,020,000	0.0554	15244	6170
1,030,000	0.0557		
1,040,000	0.0561		
1,050,000	0.0564	14910	6023
1,060,000	0.0568		
1,070,000	0.0571	14586	6170
1,080,000	0.0573		
1,090,000	0.0577		
1,100,000	0.0580	14265	5769
1,110,000	0.0583		
1,120,000	0.0586		
1,130,000	0.0590		
1,140,000	0.0593	13959	5640
1,150,000	0.0596		
1,160,000	0.0599		
1,170,000	0.0603		
1,180,000	0.0606		
1,190,000	0.0610		
1,200,000	0.0613	13660	5525
1,210,000	0.0617		
1,220,000	0.0621		

المنسارات المستشارات

Cycles(N)	X-Position of	Y-Position of	Maximum Load	Minimum Load
	Crack Tip [m]	Crack Tip [m]	(Pmax) [N]	(Pmin) [N]
		Pre-crackin	g	
30,000	0.0072	0.0006	67346	26769
45,000	0.0081	0.0006		
60,000	0.0090	0.0006	60451	24350
75,000	0.0097	0.0006	55798	23282
90,000	0.0104	0.0005		
105,000	0.0109	0.0005	50292	21182
120,000	0.0114	0.0006		
135,000	0.0119	0.0007	46177	19688
150,000	0.0124	0.0007	46270	19221
165,000	0.0129	0.0007		
		Marking Crack	Front	
175,000	0.0131	0.0006	54646	33984
185,000	0.0133	0.0007		
240,000	0.0133	0.0007	42859	11908
		Testing		
240,000	0.0070	0.0113		
250,000	0.0071	0.0113	43370	18789
260,000	0.0071	0.0113	47565	19763
270,000	0.0071	0.0114	51292	21182
280,000	0.0071	0.0114		
290,000	0.0071	0.0114	53739	20377
300,000	0.0071	0.0116	61817	20156
330,000	0.0076	0.0115		
350,000	0.0081	0.0115		
360,000	0.0084	0.0116		
385,000	0.0093	0.0120		
410,000	0.0115	0.0123		
435,000	0.0140	0.0129	55149	22188
460,000	0.0168	0.0135	50999	20426
485,000	0.0189	0.0141		
510,000	0.0211	0.0148	41609	16605
535,000	0.0234	0.0155	39415	15625
560,000	0.0257	0.0162	36617	14759
585,000	0.0274	0.0167	32630	13225

Table A.4. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 60^{\circ}$.



610,000	0.0291	0.0173	30977	12562
635,000	0.0306	0.0179	29469	11943
660,000	0.0318	0.0183	26716	10814
685,000	0.0324	0.0186	23224	9399
705,000	0.0329	0.0187		
725,000	0.0333	0.0189		
745,000	0.0338	0.0191		
765,000	0.0343	0.0193		
785,000	0.0349	0.0195		
805,000	0.0356	0.0198		
825,000	0.0361	0.0200		
845,000	0.0368	0.0203		
865,000	0.0376	0.0206		
885,000	0.0385	0.0210		
905,000	0.0391	0.0212	22192	8990
930,000	0.0400	0.0217		
950,000	0.0408	0.0220		
970,000	0.0415	0.0223	21205	8585
990,000	0.0421	0.0227		
1,010,000	0.0429	0.0230		
1,030,000	0.0436	0.0234	20271	8661
1,050,000	0.0442	0.0237		
1,070,000	0.0450	0.0241		
1,090,000	0.0457	0.0243	19403	7856
1,110,000	0.0462	0.0247		
1,130,000	0.0468	0.0249		
1,150,000	0.0472	0.0252	18585	7486
1,170,000	0.0479	0.0255		
1,190,000	0.0486	0.0259		
1,210,000	0.0492	0.0263	17771	7188
1,230,000	0.0500	0.0268		
1,250,000	0.0504	0.0270	17001	7313
1,270,000	0.0510	0.0274		
1,290,000	0.0516	0.0278		
1,310,000	0.0523	0.0282		
1,330,000	0.0531	0.0283	16276	6868
1,350,000	0.0535	0.0291		
1,370,000	0.0543	0.0296		
1,390,000	0.0548	0.0299	15578	6592



1,410,000	0.0555	0.0303		
1,440,000	0.0562	0.0308	14906	5863
1,460,000	0.0565	0.0311	14270	5760
1,480,000	0.0568	0.0313		
1,500,000	0.0572	0.0315		
1,520,000	0.0576	0.0318		
1,540,000	0.0580	0.0321		
1,560,000	0.0583	0.0324		
1,580,000	0.0587	0.0327		
1,600,000	0.0592	0.0330		
1,620,000	0.0597	0.0334		
1,640,000	0.0602	0.0339		
1,660,000	0.0609	0.0343		



Cycles(N)	X-Position of	Y-Position of	Maximum Load	Minimum Load
	Crack Tip [m]	Crack Tip [m]	(Pmax) [N]	(Pmin) [N]
		Pre-cracki	ng	
0	0.0065	0.0000	67128	26961
5,000	0.0065	0.0000		
15,000	0.0066	0.0002		
25,000	0.0071	0.0003		
35,000	0.0078	0.0002		
45,000	0.0082	0.0001	60207	24341
55,000	0.0088	0.0001		
65,000	0.0092	0.0001	54855	22148
75,000	0.0095	0.0000		
85,000	0.0101	0.0000		
95,000	0.0104	0.0001	50470	20453
105,000	0.0109	0.0001		
120,000	0.0116	0.0001	46849	18972
130,000	0.0110	0.0001		
140,000	0.0124	0.0001		
150,000	0.0128	0.0001		
		Testing		
150,000	0.00024	0.01259	44206.4	17677.2
155,000	0.00024	0.01262		
165,000	0.00024	0.01262		
175,000	0.00024	0.01262		
185,000	0.00024	0.01273		
195,000	0.00024	0.01273		
205,000	0.00024	0.01273		
225,000	0.00024	0.01273		
235,000	0.00024	0.01273		

Table A.5. Experimental data recorded data for $\Phi = 90^{\circ}$.

APPENDIX B – DETAILS AND TIPS FOR CRACK3D INPUT FILES GENERATION

First, the geometry has to be created to accommodate the crack and the three zones in the mesh, and steps for building the geometry will now be discussed. The volume for the top fixture was created by creating keypoints at the position where the end of each of the two diagonal lines and the straight line segment for the bottom edge of the fixture are located. Then keypoints were created at a radius of 0.14 m and in approximately 7° intervals being sure that keypoints were positioned at the same location where the center of the pin holes are on the fixture. A spline through the keypoints was used to create the arc of the top edge of the fixture. The front area was created by selecting the lines. The volume was created by extruding the area along the normal direction in an amount equivalent to the thickness of the grip. To create the bottom fixture, the top fixture volume was then reflected about the x-axis then again about the y-axis. The volume, areas, lines, and keypoints remaining from the first reflection was deleted. Material properties for the fixture were assigned to the two volumes.

The initial geometry was created using multiple volumes in order to create a crack and volumes for the three zones of the mesh: a locally structured finer mesh immediately around the crack front to facilitate 3D VCCT, a far-field coarser mesh away from the crack front region, and a graded mesh in a transitional zone between the far-field coarser mesh and the locally structured finer mesh, as shown in Figure B.1. Specifically, volumes 1, 2, 3, and 4 are for the locally structured mesh, volumes 5, 6, 7, and 8 are for the transitional zone with a graded mesh, and volumes 9, 10, 11, and 12 are for the far-field


mesh. The crack is created in ANSYS by creating the bottom surfaces (seen as lines in the 2D view in Fig. B.1) of volumes 5 and 1 in the same position as the top surfaces (seen as lines in Fig. B.1) of volumes 8 and 4. The lines do not share the same end point at the edge of the specimen however they share the same keypoints at the crack front (i.e. the coincident vertices and edge of volumes 1, 2, 3, and 4 share the same keypoints and line).



Figure B.1. A 2D schematic diagram of volumes in the specimen region used to create the initial finite element mesh.

The volumes were created in the same way the fixture volumes were created: by creating keypoints, then lines, areas, and extruding the areas along the normal to create volumes. Material properties were assigned to all the volumes of the specimen geometry. To create connectivity, all the volumes for the fixture and specimen were glued together with the exceptions of volumes attached to the areas which are the top and bottom crack surfaces: volume 5 was not glued to 8 and volume 1 was not glued to 4.

Secondly, A structured mesh was created in volumes 1, 2, 3, and 4 by first meshing the surface areas with mapped triangular element. Size division for the elements was set



such that each edge of the volume was one element length so that the minimum element size is one half of the thickness. The volume was then freely meshed using 10 noded tetrahedral elements, and the area elements were deleted. The element and node numbers were compressed. Then the size division for each of the remaining lines for the remaining volumes of the specimen was set to be maximum element size. The remaining volumes for the specimen and fixture were freely meshed using 10 noded tetrahedral elements.

Thirdly, The CRACK3D.GEO file was created. The CRACK3D.GEO file defines the surface boundary of the geometry by listing nodes attached to areas and lines on the outside of the geometry. That is, areas or lines, contained within the geometry do not need to be included. In defining surface areas for CRACK3D, surface areas may be comprised of multiple areas in ANSYS. In defining surface lines, lines may also be comprised of multiple lines, however, lines can old boarder two surface areas. Take for example, in Figure B.1, all areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are considered one area, and boundary lines do not include the lines such as the line separating areas 4 from 6. It is also only necessary to include the boundaries in which the crack propagation is contained. Since the crack will not grow into the fixture, only specimen boundaries were included in the .GEO file. In listing the lines, the nodes must be listed along boundary lines in order along the line, and in listing the elements on the boundary surfaces, this file requires that area normals in ANSYS be pointing away from the geometry listing the nodes attached to the elements on the boundary surfaces in a counter clockwise manner. The area normals were plotted, and it was verified that for each surface area of the specimen and fixture, the area normal was pointing outwards. If a normal was not pointing outwards, the area normal was reversed.



Fourthly, for the re-meshing parameters in the CRACK3D.DAT file, based on benchmark studies, it is sufficient to have a minimum structured element size of one half of the specimen thickness. It is suggested that the local re-meshing zone be 6 to 10 times larger than the minimum element size. The maximum element size may be coarse but sufficient for transferring the load data to the crack front and equivalent to the element size in the far field mesh. It is also suggested that the far field mesh be uniform so that during crack extension the maximum element size in the re-meshing zone is constant and consistent with far field mesh elements. In CRACK3D the amount of crack extension (crack increment) at a crack growth step is chosen by the user as an input.



Appendix C –Files Associated with CRACK3D for Φ = 45°

This appendix contains the input and output files for CRACK3D for the 45° loading case simulation. However CRACK3D.MSH is not included since that file was generated via ANSYS and MESH3D software while CRACK.GEO and CRACK.DAT are included since those files are user generated according to the CRACK3D user manual. The only output files reported where those used for post-processing: CRACK3D.SIF and CRACK3D.CXT.

CRACK3D.DAT

Arcan 4 elem through thickness 3 1 0 2 1 -100



6

7

16784 16763

16786 16765 2

16764

16785

2

2

9	16612	16597	2
10	16650	16665	2
11	16770	16749	2
12	16787	16766	2
13	16772	16751	2
14	16788	16767	2
15	16774	16753	2
16	16789	16768	2
17	16776	16755	2
18	16611	16596	2
19	16647	16647	-1
20	16705	16705	-1
21	16704	16704	-1
22	16703	16703	-1
23	16702	16702	-1
24	16701	16701	-1
25	16700	16700	-1
26	16699	16699	-1
27	16595	16595	-1
28	16678	16678	-2
29	16791	16791	-2
30	16808	16808	-2
31	16793	16793	-2
32	16809	16809	-2
33	16795	16795	-2
34	16810	16810	-2
35	16797	16797	-2
36	16626	16626	-2
37	16679	16679	-2
38	16801	16801	-2
39	16802	16802	-2
40	16803	16803	-2
41	16804	16804	-2
42	16805	16805	-2
43	16806	16806	-2
44	16807	16807	-2
45	16627	16627	-2

2 -1 -1

Loading for 45 deg case 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0

 $\begin{array}{c} 12196 & 110 & -0.000000707 & 0.000000707 & 0 \\ 13255 & 110 & -0.0000000707 & 0.0000000707 & 0 \\ 13254 & 110 & -0.0000000707 & 0.0000000707 & 0 \\ 13253 & 110 & -0.0000000707 & 0.0000000707 & 0 \\ 11546 & 110 & -0.0000000707 & 0.0000000707 & 0 \\ 1233 & 110 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2499 & 110 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2498 & 111 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2497 & 110 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 583 & 110 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$



5

1233 2499 2498 2497 583

100 0.5 0 0 0



CRACK3D.GEO

9 21 0 6

76 78 96 50 52 58 58 1078 1080

1



2





7506 5801 7633 7505 7601 7600 6690 7631 6692 7612 7611 6691 7628 5847 5849 7617 5848 7618 7630 6692 7631 7614 7611 7603 6690 6688 7632 6689 7610 7609 7633 5801 5847 7601 5846 7599 7632 7631 6690 7602 7612 7609 7628 7631 7632 7584 7602 7606 7633 6688 6642 7598 6687 7590 7633 7632 6688 7583 7610 7598 7626 7627 5851 7593 7620 7621 6694 6692 7630 6693 7614 7613 7627 7626 7630 7593 7608 7585 7633 7628 7632 7582 7606 7583 7633 5847 7628 7599 7617 7582 5849 7627 7628 7619 7592 7618 5849 5851 7627 5850 7620 7619 7627 7631 7628 7607 7584 7592 7630 7631 7627 7603 7607 7585 6642 7506 7633 7507 7600 7590 6696 7634 6686 7595 7597 6697 5851 5853 7626 5852 7622 7621 5845 7634 5855 7589 7591 5856 7626 7629 7630 7586 7605 7608 6694 7629 6696 7616 7615 6695 6694 7630 7629 7613 7605 7616 5853 5855 7625 5854 7624 7623 7626 7625 7629 7594 7604 7586 7625 7634 7629 7588 7587 7604 7629 7634 6696 7587 7595 7615 7625 5855 7634 7624 7591 7588 5845 7562 7634 7561 7596 7589 7562 6686 7634 7563 7597 7596 7625 7626 5853 7594 7622 7623 5801 10450 7506 10418 10417 7505 10450 5801 8863 10418 8862 10416 8865 8867 10448 8866 10429 10428 8861 10376 10451 10375 10413 10415 10447 10446 10444 10397 10421 10422 8869 10447 8867 10431 10430 8868 10453 6642 7506 10408 7507 10406 10446 8869 8871 10432 8870 10433 9607 9609 10445 9608 10435 10434 9605 9607 10452 9606 10410 10412 10446 10447 8869 10397 10431 10432 9609 10444 10445 10436 10398 10435 10443 10448 10447 10424 10395 10423 9611 10444 9609 10437 10436 9610 8871 10451 10446 10414 10399 10433 10451 10445 10446 10404 10420 10399 10449 8863 8865 10426 8864 10427 10447 10444 10443 10422 10396 10423 7506 10450 10453 10417 10405 10406 10444 10446 10445 10421 10420 10398 6642 10453 9615 10408 10407 9616



4

5313 5608 5302 5597 5599 5314 5427 5607 1991 5600 5594 5428 5425 5311 5427 5606 5605 5426 5311 5607 5427 5602 5600 5605 5607 2003 1991 5601 2004 5594 5313 5425 5608 5604 5596 5597 5313 5311 5425 5312 5606 5604 5416 5608 5425 5595 5596 5424 5311 2001 5607 5310 5603 5602 5416 5559 5608 5560 5598 5595



5



6

16762 16702 16700 16767 16701 16753 16762 16700 16764 16753 16768 16763 16764 16700 16595 16768 16699 16755 16764 16597 16529 16765 16754 16758 16647 16704 16664 16705 16749 16665 16760 16527 16664 16748 16663 16759 16760 16533 16527 16756 16534 16748 16597 16523 16529 16758 16528 16754 16531 16764 16529 16752 16758 16530 16760 16664 16704 16759 16749 16766 16531 16533 16762 16532 16750 16757 16762 16764 16531 16763 16752 16757



7

16702 16783 16781 16788 16782 16772 16704 16702 16781 16703 16772 16787 16595 16612 16785 16611 16786 16776 16785 16700 16595 16789 16699 16776 16781 16569 16563 16777 16570 16769 16781 16563 16649 16769 16648 16780



8





5290 5393 5288 5357 5356 5289
5387 5306 5388 5341 5338 5351
5207 5390 5300 5341 5350 5351
5590 5595 5592 5559 5544 5550
5386 5396 5394 5316 5342 5340
5386 5394 5385 5340 5354 5352
2013 5398 5386 5328 5321 5373
5392 5393 5290 5344 5357 5358
5386 5393 5396 5317 5339 5316
2001 5284 5211 5210 5280 5210
2001 3384 3311 3319 3380 3310
5384 2007 2009 5378 2008 5376
5399 5296 5286 5324 5297 5325
5304 5395 5298 5348 5318 5303
5394 5396 5387 5342 5341 5343
5313 5383 5302 5382 5381 5314
5392 5292 5391 5359 5360 5345
5202 5292 5391 5359 5360 5345
5302 5385 5387 5381 5355 5309
5383 5384 5385 5377 5375 5374
5391 5292 5294 5360 5293 5361
5385 5384 2009 5375 5376 5370
2009 2011 5385 2010 5371 5370
2013 2005 5398 2014 5329 5328
5384 2001 2007 5319 2006 5378
5307 5302 5301 5331 5345 5332
5207 5200 5290 5215 5224 5225
5397 5390 5389 5315 5354 5555
5398 5393 5386 5326 5317 5321
5385 5394 5383 5354 5353 5374
5296 5399 5390 5324 5322 5363
5389 5306 5388 5365 5366 5350
5390 5395 5389 5333 5349 5334
2013 5386 2011 5373 5372 2012
5399 5300 5395 5323 5347 5320
5299 5207 5290 5226 5225 5250
5366 5597 5369 5350 5355 5350
5397 5391 5390 5332 5346 5315
5390 5294 5296 5362 5295 5363
5383 5313 5384 5382 5379 5377
2011 5386 5385 5372 5352 5371
5389 5395 5304 5349 5348 5364
5300 5399 5286 5323 5325 5301
5300 5377 5200 5325 5325 5301
5388 5300 5308 5300 5307 5307
5387 5388 5308 5351 5367 5368
5394 5387 5383 5343 5355 5353
5398 2005 5288 5329 5287 5327
5304 5306 5389 5305 5365 5364
5392 5290 5292 5358 5291 5359
5384 5313 5311 5379 5312 5380
5392 5397 5396 5331 5337 5330
5302 5387 5308 5360 5368 5300
5002 5507 5500 5507 5500 5507 5209 5205 5200 5219 5247 5200
J270 J37J J300 J310 J34/ J277
10523 1059/ 10008 10598 10609 16605
16345 16525 16608 16603 16610 16607
16608 16298 16345 16602 16346 16607
16345 16343 16525 16344 16526 16603
16608 16525 16523 16610 16524 16605
16600 16298 16608 16601 16602 16606
16608 16597 16600 16609 16604 16606
16600 16597 16595 16604 16596 16599



16615 16595 16623 16616 16620 16625 16623 16595 16612 16620 16611 16624 16561 16612 16559 16619 16613 16560 16426 16380 16615 16425 16614 16618 16615 16623 16426 16625 16622 16618 16424 16623 16561 16617 16621 16562 16612 16561 16623 16619 16621 16624 16623 16424 16426 16617 16427 16622 16298 16600 16301 16601 16630 16300 16462 16635 16627 16633 16636 16631 16460 16462 16627 16461 16631 16628 16635 16299 16301 16629 16302 16634 16299 16635 16462 16629 16633 16463 16635 16600 16595 16637 16599 16632 16635 16595 16627 16632 16626 16636 16301 16600 16635 16630 16637 16634 16615 16627 16595 16639 16626 16616 16644 16460 16627 16638 16628 16643 16380 16644 16615 16641 16646 16614 16382 16379 16497 16381 16496 16640 16627 16615 16644 16639 16646 16643 16382 16644 16380 16645 16641 16383 16497 16460 16644 16498 16638 16642 16382 16497 16644 16640 16642 16645 16981 5797 5799 16939 5800 16937 16976 16301 16299 16929 16302 16957 16909 16978 16972 16930 16954 16969 16980 16977 16979 16940 16946 16934 16974 16973 16976 16960 16959 16958 16976 16299 16975 16957 16962 16952 16920 16977 16922 16928 16949 16921 16973 16298 16301 16933 16300 16961 16972 16462 16460 16971 16461 16932 16907 16909 16972 16908 16969 16968 5799 5796 16979 5798 16931 16945 16460 16907 16972 16906 16968 16932 16980 16979 5915 16934 16944 16942 16977 16924 16922 16948 16923 16949 5797 16981 16913 16939 16938 16914 5799 16979 16981 16945 16935 16937 10 16924 16980 16925 16941 16943 5915 10 16980 5914 16943 16942 16920 16974 16977 16964 16955 16928 16298 16973 16916 16933 16967 16915 16973 16974 16918 16960 16965 16966 16913 16981 16978 16938 16936 16951 16972 16299 16462 16970 16463 16971 16972 16975 16299 16963 16962 16970 16977 16974 16976 16955 16958 16956 16918 16916 16973 16917 16967 16966 16920 16918 16974 16919 16965 16964 16980 16924 16977 16941 16948 16940 16975 16979 16977 16947 16946 16927 16979 5796 5915 16931 5916 16944 16911 16913 16978 16912 16951 16950 16976 16975 16977 16952 16927 16956



109





































240 244 239 186 185 195












www.manaraa.com















www.manaraa.com



www.manaraa.com



10318 10275 10319 9785 9782 9737 10314 10327 10313 9679 9678 9742 10182 10183 10237 10061 10002 10001 6664 10218 10217 10094 10025 10097 6674 10212 6676 10107 10106 6675 6670 10215 10214 10100 10028 10103 10263 10212 10213 9945 10030 9946 10225 6650 6648 10080 6649 10081 10189 2108 2106 10152 2107 10153 10287 10242 10243 9846 9899 9847 2080 2078 10203 2079 10125 10124 2080 10203 10202 10124 10041 10127 6662 6660 10219 6661 10093 10092 10232 5404 5402 10066 5403 10067 10209 10260 10259 9951 9882 9954 10178 10339 2120 9630 9640 10164 10307 10334 10306 9693 9692 9749 10295 10333 10332 9707 9655 9710 10311 10310 10267 9745 9801 9798 10267 10216 10217 9937 10026 9938 10218 10268 10217 9936 9935 10025 10317 10323 10324 9670 9664 9673 10304 10260 10261 9812 9881 9813 10336 10299 10320 9702 9699 9651 10329 10292 10330 9716 9713 9658 10292 10329 10291 9716 9715 9765 10292 10248 10293 9837 9834 9764 10226 10276 10225 9920 9919 10017 10276 10234 10281 9865 9859 9781 10281 10282 10321 9776 9734 9733 10270 10313 10269 9795 9794 9872 10204 2076 10205 10123 10120 10039 10204 10257 10256 9959 9885 9962 10256 10301 10300 9818 9756 9821 10257 10301 10256 9819 9818 9885 10192 10245 10244 9983 9897 9986 5404 10231 5406 10069 10068 5405 10279 10230 10231 9909 10011 9910 10278 10232 10228 9913 10014 9914 10231 10232 10278 10010 9913 9908 10207 10259 10233 9956 9955 10037 10207 10208 10259 10034 9953 9956 10341 10208 10207 9627 10034 9631 10223 6652 10224 10085 10082 10019 10211 10212 10262 10031 9948 9947 6676 10212 10211 10106 10031 10109 10211 10210 6678 10032 10111 10108 6678 6676 10211 6677 10109 10108 10275 10274 10224 9867 9924 9921 5410 5408 10229 5409 10073 10072 10217 10268 10267 9935 9874 9938 10328 10327 10290 9660 9720 9717 2102 2100 10192 2101 10147 10146 2100 2098 10193 2099 10145 10144 10182 9609 9607 10168 9608 10169 10231 5404 10232 10069 10066 10010











145

26 326 327 328 126

1

2

126 142 141 140 139 138 137 136 135 134 133 6704 6705 6706 6707 6708 6709 6710 6711 6712 6753 6754 6698

المستشارات

5 63 5 63 37 37 5 63 63 5 19 19 5 17 9 17 17 17 5 19 19

3

5857 7564 7565 7566 6698

4

26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 14 5913 5912 5911 5910 5909 5908 5907 5906 5905 5904 5903 5902 5901 5900 5899 5898 5897 5896 5895 5894 5893 5892 5891 5890 5889 5888 5887 5886 5885 5884 5883 5882 5881 5880 5879 5878 5877 5876 5875 5874 5873 5872 5871 5870 5869 5868 5867 5866 5865 5864 5863 5857

5

5857 5858 5859 5860 5861 5862 5845 5856 5855 5854 5853 5852 5851 5850 5849 5848 5847 5846 5801 8862 8863 8864 8865 8866 8867 8868 8869 8870 8871 8872 8861 8877 8876 8875 8874 8873 2015

6

6698 6699 6700 6701 6702 6703 6686 6697 6696 6695 6694 6693 6692 6691 6690 6689 6688 6687 6642 9616 9615 9614 9613 9612 9611 9610 9609 9608 9607 9606 9605 9617 9618 9619 9620 9621 2067

7

2015 2068 2069 2070 2067

8

2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2005 2014 2013 2012 2011 2010 2009 2008 2007 2006 2001

9

2067 2121 2120 2119 2118 2117 2116 2115 2114 2113 2112 2111 2110 2109 2108 2107 2106 2105 2104 2103 2102 2101 2100 2099 2098 2097 2096 2095 2094 2093 2092 2091 2090 2089 2088 2087 2086 2085 2084 2083 2082 2081 2080 2079 2078 2077 2076 2075 2074 2073 2072 2071 1990 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 1991

10



2001 2002 2003 2004 1991

11

2001 5310 5311 5312 5313 5314 5302 5309 5308 5307 5306 5305 5304 5303 5298 17961 17960 17974 17962

12

1991 5428 5427 5426 5425 5424 5416 5423 5422 5421 5420 5419 5418 5417 5412 18039 18036 18038 18037

13

17962 18126 18127 18128 18037

14

17962 17963 17964 17965 17966 17967 17968 17969 17970 17971 17972 17973 16559 16613 16612 16611 16595

15

16647 16705 16704 16703 16702 16701 16700 16699 16595

16

18037 18050 18049 18048 18047 18046 18045 18044 18043 18042 18041 18040 16563 16648 16649 16650 16647

17

18690 18691 18692 18693 18694 18695 18696 18697 18698 18699 18700 18701 16527 16663 16664 16665 16647

18

18616 18617 18618 18619 18620 18621 18622 18623 18624 18625 18626 18627 16523 16598 16597 16596 16595

19

18616 18780 18781 18782 18690

20

18616 18628 18614 18615 2 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 1 40 39 38 37 36 26

21

18690 18703 18702 18704 155 165 164 163 162 161 160 159 127 132 131 130 129 128 126



www.manaraa.com

CRACK3D.SIF

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.00000E+00 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3

1 -0.63500E-01 0.00000E+00 -0.23812E-02 0.37165E-03 0.10656E-03 0.37377E-05 0.54455E+04 - 0.29159E+04 0.44700E+03

2 -0.63500E-01 0.00000E+00 -0.79375E-03 0.39629E-03 0.10753E-03 0.46060E-06 0.56231E+04 - 0.29291E+04 0.15692E+03

3 -0.63500E-01 0.00000E+00 0.79375E-03 0.37837E-03 0.10506E-03 0.34734E-06 0.54945E+04 - 0.28952E+04 -0.13627E+03

4 -0.63500E-01 0.00000E+00 0.23812E-02 0.38625E-03 0.11748E-03 0.46666E-05 0.55514E+04 - 0.30616E+04 -0.49947E+03

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.20000E-02 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.62004E-01 0.13276E-02 -0.23812E-02 0.75121E-03 0.31880E-06 0.16848E-06 0.77420E+04 0.15949E+03 0.94904E+02

2 -0.62004E-01 0.13276E-02 -0.79375E-03 0.79535E-03 0.36949E-06 0.31913E-07 0.79662E+04 - 0.17170E+03 0.41304E+02

3 -0.62004E-01 0.13276E-02 0.79375E-03 0.79535E-03 0.34982E-06 0.32934E-07 0.79662E+04 - 0.16707E+03 -0.41959E+02

4 -0.62004E-01 0.13276E-02 0.23813E-02 0.77147E-03 0.29758E-06 0.19412E-06 0.78457E+04 0.15409E+03 -0.10187E+03

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.40000E-02 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.60510E-01 0.26575E-02 -0.23812E-02 0.89194E-03 0.62888E-06 0.12236E-08 0.84361E+04 0.22400E+03 0.80879E+01

2 -0.60510E-01 0.26575E-02 -0.79375E-03 0.94345E-03 0.68460E-06 0.35363E-08 0.86762E+04 0.23372E+03 0.13749E+02

3 -0.60510E-01 0.26575E-02 0.79375E-03 0.94319E-03 0.84510E-06 0.33224E-08 0.86751E+04 0.25967E+03 -0.13327E+02



4 -0.60510E-01 0.26575E-02 0.23813E-02 0.91714E-03 0.75434E-06 0.40909E-08 0.85544E+04 0.24533E+03 -0.14788E+02

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.60000E-02 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.58945E-01 0.39018E-02 -0.23812E-02 0.10424E-02 0.24602E-08 0.23384E-07 0.91198E+04 -0.14011E+02 0.35356E+02

2 -0.58945E-01 0.39018E-02 -0.79375E-03 0.11053E-02 0.63708E-08 0.30365E-08 0.93908E+04 - 0.22546E+02 0.12741E+02

3 -0.58945E-01 0.39018E-02 0.79375E-03 0.11061E-02 0.71879E-08 0.57638E-08 0.93942E+04 - 0.23948E+02 -0.17554E+02

4 -0.58945E-01 0.39018E-02 0.23813E-02 0.10718E-02 0.37370E-07 0.32012E-07 0.92474E+04 - 0.54605E+02 -0.41368E+02

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.80000E-02 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.57387E-01 0.51558E-02 -0.23812E-02 0.11912E-02 0.32908E-08 0.11088E-07 0.97489E+04 -0.16204E+02 0.24346E+02

2 -0.57387E-01 0.51558E-02 -0.79375E-03 0.12643E-02 0.70049E-08 0.29710E-08 0.10044E+05 - 0.23641E+02 0.12603E+02

3 -0.57387E-01 0.51558E-02 0.79375E-03 0.12599E-02 0.12317E-07 0.38677E-08 0.10026E+05 - 0.31349E+02 -0.14379E+02

4 -0.57387E-01 0.51558E-02 0.23813E-02 0.12210E-02 0.15173E-07 0.23911E-07 0.98704E+04 - 0.34794E+02 -0.35752E+02

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.10000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.55835E-01 0.64181E-02 -0.23812E-02 0.13308E-02 0.10571E-07 0.87559E-08 0.10305E+05 -0.29042E+02 0.21635E+02

2 -0.55835E-01 0.64181E-02 -0.79375E-03 0.14127E-02 0.86960E-08 0.20416E-09 0.10617E+05 0.26341E+02 0.33036E+01



3 -0.55835E-01 0.64181E-02 0.79375E-03 0.14136E-02 0.24837E-08 0.10044E-08 0.10620E+05 - 0.14077E+02 -0.73275E+01 4 -0.55835E-01 0.64181E-02 0.23813E-02 0.13692E-02 0.14156E-07 0.10934E-07 0.10452E+05 - 0.33608E+02 -0.24177E+02

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.12000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.54287E-01 0.76841E-02 -0.23812E-02 0.14626E-02 0.92988E-08 0.20640E-08 0.10803E+05 0.27239E+02 0.10504E+02

2 -0.54287E-01 0.76841E-02 -0.79375E-03 0.15574E-02 0.18122E-07 0.93540E-09 0.11147E+05 0.38026E+02 0.70714E+01

3 -0.54287E-01 0.76841E-02 0.79375E-03 0.15557E-02 0.26493E-07 0.37783E-09 0.11141E+05 0.45977E+02 -0.44943E+01

4 -0.54287E-01 0.76841E-02 0.23813E-02 0.15045E-02 0.11177E-08 0.29300E-08 0.10956E+05 0.94435E+01 -0.12515E+02

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.14000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.52732E-01 0.89416E-02 -0.23812E-02 0.15860E-02 0.16973E-07 0.14073E-08 0.11249E+05 0.36800E+02 0.86736E+01

2 -0.52732E-01 0.89416E-02 -0.79375E-03 0.16916E-02 0.19714E-07 0.59647E-09 0.11618E+05 0.39661E+02 0.56468E+01

3 -0.52732E-01 0.89416E-02 0.79375E-03 0.16832E-02 0.10127E-07 0.18859E-08 0.11589E+05 0.28426E+02 -0.10041E+02

4 -0.52732E-01 0.89416E-02 0.23813E-02 0.16344E-02 0.22974E-07 0.12336E-08 0.11420E+05 0.42814E+02 -0.81208E+01

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.16000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.51168E-01 0.10189E-01 -0.23812E-02 0.17012E-02 0.39117E-07 0.71751E-09 0.11651E+05 0.55867E+02 0.61933E+01



2 -0.51168E-01 0.10189E-01 -0.79375E-03 0.18082E-02 0.36286E-07 0.63876E-10 0.12011E+05 0.53807E+02 0.18479E+01

3 -0.51168E-01 0.10189E-01 0.79375E-03 0.18068E-02 0.82220E-07 0.81703E-09 0.12007E+05 0.80995E+02 -0.66089E+01

4 -0.51168E-01 0.10189E-01 0.23813E-02 0.17491E-02 0.21554E-07 0.11258E-08 0.11813E+05 0.41470E+02 -0.77578E+01

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.18000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

3 -0.49593E-01 0.11421E-01 0.79375E-03 0.19172E-02 0.55772E-07 0.20859E-08 0.12368E+05 0.66708E+02 0.10560E+02

4 -0.49593E-01 0.11421E-01 0.23813E-02 0.18547E-02 0.26017E-07 0.19943E-09 0.12165E+05 0.45561E+02 -0.32652E+01

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.20000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.48007E-01 0.12640E-01 -0.23812E-02 0.18917E-02 0.66330E-07 0.27124E-09 0.12286E+05 0.72749E+02 -0.38079E+01

2 -0.48007E-01 0.12640E-01 -0.79375E-03 0.20160E-02 0.71559E-07 0.14384E-09 0.12683E+05 0.75562E+02 -0.27730E+01

3 -0.48007E-01 0.12640E-01 0.79375E-03 0.20118E-02 0.88642E-07 0.24471E-08 0.12670E+05 0.84099E+02 0.11438E+02

4 -0.48007E-01 0.12640E-01 0.23813E-02 0.19478E-02 0.50861E-07 0.80686E-09 0.12466E+05 0.63703E+02 0.65676E+01

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.22000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3



1 -0.46407E-01 0.13840E-01 -0.23812E-02 0.19787E-02 0.69089E-07 0.29344E-09 0.12565E+05 0.74246E+02 -0.39607E+01

2 -0.46407E-01 0.13840E-01 -0.79375E-03 0.21077E-02 0.85531E-07 0.31981E-09 0.12968E+05 0.82610E+02 -0.41348E+01

3 -0.46407E-01 0.13840E-01 0.79375E-03 0.21035E-02 0.13675E-06 0.24518E-08 0.12955E+05 0.10446E+03 0.11449E+02

4 -0.46407E-01 0.13840E-01 0.23813E-02 0.20370E-02 0.87836E-07 0.13225E-10 0.12749E+05 0.83716E+02 0.84083E+00

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.24000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.44791E-01 0.15019E-01 -0.23812E-02 0.20479E-02 0.12539E-06 0.50449E-08 0.12783E+05 0.10002E+03 -0.16422E+02

2 -0.44791E-01 0.15019E-01 -0.79375E-03 0.21819E-02 0.18469E-06 0.57208E-09 0.13194E+05 0.12139E+03 0.55301E+01

3 -0.44791E-01 0.15019E-01 0.79375E-03 0.21824E-02 0.19846E-06 0.24257E-08 0.13196E+05 0.12584E+03 0.11387E+02

4 -0.44791E-01 0.15019E-01 0.23813E-02 0.21062E-02 0.15600E-06 0.52980E-09 0.12964E+05 0.11157E+03 0.53219E+01

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.26000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.43155E-01 0.16168E-01 -0.23812E-02 0.21119E-02 0.88676E-07 0.30555E-08 0.12981E+05 0.84115E+02 -0.12781E+02

2 -0.43155E-01 0.16168E-01 -0.79375E-03 0.22547E-02 0.10418E-06 0.74047E-10 0.13413E+05 0.91173E+02 -0.19896E+01

3 -0.43155E-01 0.16168E-01 0.79375E-03 0.22510E-02 0.71895E-07 0.49060E-09 0.13402E+05 0.75739E+02 -0.51212E+01

4 -0.43155E-01 0.16168E-01 0.23813E-02 0.21712E-02 0.68106E-07 0.12286E-08 0.13162E+05 0.73717E+02 0.81041E+01

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.28000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01



SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.41505E-01 0.17298E-01 -0.23812E-02 0.21698E-02 0.20511E-06 0.17686E-08 0.13158E+05 0.12793E+03 -0.97236E+01

2 -0.41505E-01 0.17298E-01 -0.79375E-03 0.23086E-02 0.25158E-06 0.96179E-09 0.13572E+05 0.14168E+03 -0.71705E+01

3 -0.41505E-01 0.17298E-01 0.79375E-03 0.23055E-02 0.34365E-06 0.18926E-08 0.13563E+05 0.16559E+03 0.10059E+02

4 -0.41505E-01 0.17298E-01 0.23813E-02 0.22313E-02 0.23404E-06 0.65428E-08 0.13343E+05 0.13665E+03 0.18702E+02

LOADING INCREMENT NUMBER = 1

Energy release rates & SIFs for crack front#: 1 (This is an open crack front)

Total crack extension so far: 0.30000E-01 Multiplicative factor used to scale loading: 0.10000E+01

SEGMT# X Y Z G1 G2 G3 K1 K2 K3 1 -0.39831E-01 0.18392E-01 -0.23812E-02 0.22169E-02 0.12940E-06 0.46224E-08 0.13300E+05 0.10161E+03 -0.15720E+02

2 -0.39831E-01 0.18392E-01 -0.79375E-03 0.23662E-02 0.18496E-06 0.40042E-09 0.13740E+05 0.12148E+03 -0.46266E+01

3 -0.39831E-01 0.18392E-01 0.79375E-03 0.23638E-02 0.18353E-06 0.38330E-08 0.13733E+05 0.12101E+03 0.14315E+02

4 -0.39831E-01 0.18392E-01 0.23813E-02 0.22830E-02 0.20926E-06 0.15014E-09 0.13497E+05 0.12922E+03 0.28331E+01



CRACK3D.CXT

Arcan 4 elem through thickness

INFORMATION OF LOAD VERSUS TOTAL CRACK INCREMENT

AT SPECIFIED MASTER NODE POSITION

(Reference Z-COORDINATE: 0.00000)

LOADING	G CR	ACK FRONT TOTAL CRACK			TOTAL LOADS ON ALL SPECIFIED NODES			
INCREME	NT	NUMBER	INCREMEN	NT X-	LOAD	Y-LOAD	Z-LOAD	COMBINED
1	1	0.00000	0.21361E+02	-0.21362	E+02	-0.29745E-12	0.30210E+02	
1	1	0.00200	0.21236E+02	-0.21236	E+02	-0.42413E-08	0.30033E+02	
1	1	0.00400	0.21086E+02	-0.21086	E+02	-0.39401E-08	0.29820E+02	
1	1	0.00600	0.20909E+02	-0.20909	E+02	0.35147E-08	0.29570E+02	
1	1	0.00800	0.20704E+02	-0.20705	E+02	-0.41428E-09	0.29281E+02	
1	1	0.01000	0.20473E+02	-0.20473	E+02	-0.12057E-08	0.28953E+02	
1	1	0.01200	0.20216E+02	-0.20216	E+02	-0.35862E-08	0.28590E+02	
1	1	0.01400	0.19935E+02	-0.19936	E+02	0.14178E-07	0.28193E+02	
1	1	0.01600	0.19633E+02	-0.19633	E+02	0.53847E-09	0.27765E+02	
1	1	0.01800	0.19310E+02	-0.19311	E+02	0.18068E-08	0.27309E+02	
1	1	0.02000	0.18970E+02	-0.18971	E+02	0.28869E-08	0.26828E+02	
1	1	0.02200	0.18614E+02	-0.18614	E+02	0.45479E-08	0.26324E+02	
1	1	0.02400	0.18243E+02	-0.18244	E+02	0.32076E-08	0.25800E+02	
1	1	0.02600	0.17860E+02	-0.17861	E+02	0.27318E-08	0.25259E+02	
1	1	0.02800	0.17466E+02	-0.17467	E+02	0.89362E-09	0.24701E+02	
1	1	0.03000	0.17062E+02	-0.17063	E+02	-0.32270E-08	0.24130E+02	



www.manaraa.com