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ABSTRACT

Mode I stress intensity factors $K_I$ were computed for round compact specimens by the boundary collocation method. Results are presented for ratios $A_t/R_o$ in the range 0.3 to 0.8, where $A_t$ is the distance from the specimen center to the crack tip for a specimen of diameter $2R_o$.

INTRODUCTION

ASTM Standard Method of Test E 399 for Plane Strain Fracture Toughness of Metallic materials is presently confined to two rectangular shaped specimens: bend or compact [1].

In order to economize on test specimen stock and machining for testing of structures such as discs and solid cylinders, a round compact specimen is an obvious substitute for the rectangular compact specimen [2-5]. For this reason, and to evaluate existing experimental and finite element results on the round compact specimen, an independent analytical study was made. The method employed is quite versatile in that a range of load line locations can be assigned and results derived by the superposition of two independent solutions obtained by the boundary collocation method with 60 boundary stations and an overdetermined system of equations as detailed in Ref. 6.

APPROACH

Figure 1(a) shows a cracked round compact specimen, of diameter $2R_o$, loaded through pins by opposed tensile forces $P$, normal to the crack. The line of action of the load is offset by the distance $X$ from the center of the specimen. The analytical solution to this configuration is based on the model shown in Fig. 1(b). There are two independent variables $X/R_o$ and $A_t/R_o$, where $A_t$ is the distance measured from the center of the model to the crack tip.

The analysis follows that of a previous paper on cracked ring segments [7], in that the loading of the specimen is characterized by the statically equivalent combination of resultant force $P$, chosen to act through the mid-net section, and complementary couple $M$, as shown in Fig. 2. For the cracked ring segment there is an additional independent parameter $R_i/R_o$, where $R_i$ is the inner radius. The approach taken here was to estimate the limit of the stress intensity coefficients (defined in Ref. 7) $\Gamma_P$ and $\Gamma_M$ as $R_i/R_o \rightarrow 0$, in the expectation that these limits would represent appropriate values for the round compact specimen.

It is necessary to consider the limitations of applicability of the present results to practical specimens which are loaded by opposed tensile forces acting through pins. If the crack tip is sufficiently close to the load line, the difference between the actual distribution of loading forces and that assumed in the present analytical model cannot be neglected. Guidance in this respect was obtained from Ref. 8, which deals with the ASTM Standard E399 rectangular compact specimen. For crack length to width ratios less than 0.3, the difference between $K_I$ obtained from an assumed simple boundary load condition as used here and one which models the localized pin loading, becomes significant. One may compare the two speci-
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men types on the basis of the same relative crack lengths \((a/W)\) for the rectangular compact specimen and \(A_t/R_0\) for the round compact specimen. This is shown in Fig. 3 where a rectangular compact specimen is superimposed on a round compact specimen. Both specimens have the same relative crack length ratio of 0.3. From this representation and the results of Ref. 8, it is surmised that the analytical results presented will apply to the load line locations \(X_0 > 0\), and \(A_t/R_0\) greater than 0.3.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the round compact specimen, as shown in Fig. 1, there are two independent variables, \(X_0/R_0\) and the relative crack length to outer radius ratio, \(A_t/R_0\). With load \(P\) applied at \(X_0\), the mid net section nominal bending moment is \(M = P(X_0 + (R_0 + A_t)/2)\). The ratio \(\sigma_M/\sigma_P\) algebraically reduces to \(3(2X_0/R_0 + A_t/R_0 + 1)/(1 - A_t/R_0)\).

The values of \(\Gamma_P\) and \(\Gamma_M\) were obtained using the boundary collocation technique with 60 boundary stations and an overdetermined system of equations as detailed in Ref. 6. The results for the limit case as \(R_i\to 0\), were based on examination of the trends shown in Figs. 4 and 5. From this output the estimated limit values in Table I of \(\Gamma_P\) and \(\Gamma_M\) were obtained.

Applying the principle of superposition to the stress intensity factor \(K\), the equation relating the stress intensity coefficients \(\Gamma\), \(\Gamma_P\) and \(\Gamma_M\) where \(\Gamma = K_F/(\sigma_P + \sigma_M) \sqrt{A_t(1 - A_t/R_0)}\) and is derived as

\[
\Gamma = \left(\frac{\sigma_P}{\sigma_P + \sigma_M}\right) \Gamma_P + \left(\frac{\sigma_M}{\sigma_P + \sigma_M}\right) \Gamma_M
\]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Through algebraic manipulation one obtains

\[
\left(\frac{\sigma_P}{\sigma_P + \sigma_M}\right) = \frac{1 - A_t/R_0}{2(3X_0/R_0 + A_t/R_0 + 2)} \hspace{1cm} (2)
\]

and

\[
\left(\frac{\sigma_M}{\sigma_P + \sigma_M}\right) = \frac{3(2X_0/R_0 + A_t/R_0 + 1)}{2(3X_0/R_0 + A_t/R_0 + 2)} \hspace{1cm} (3)
\]

As shown in Fig. 4, \(\Gamma_M\) converges rapidly with decreasing \(R_i/R_0\) ratios. In contrast, \(\Gamma_P\), Fig. 5 is not as well behaved as \(\Gamma_M\). However, this uncertainty in \(\Gamma_P\) is not critical since the coefficient of this term in Eq. (1) is small compared with the coefficient of \(\Gamma_M\) (i.e., the specimen is primarily deformed in bending).

Table II shows a comparison of the present results obtained through superposition with the finite element results of Ref. 5 and the experimental results of Refs. 2 and 5. Very good agreement is obtained.

In Ref. 8, for the standard rectangular compact specimen, it was determined that the pin loaded holes can have a significant effect on the stress intensity factor. It is inferred from those results that the analytical results presented here will apply to load line locations \(X_0 > 0\), and \(A_t/R_0\) values greater than 0.3.
NUMERICAL RESULTS

A specific example of using Eq. (1) to obtain the stress intensity coefficient $\Gamma$ follows.

For $X_o = R_o/2$, one obtains from Eq. (2)

$$\frac{\sigma_P}{\sigma_P + \sigma_M} = \frac{1 - \frac{A_t}{R_o}}{(7 + 2 \frac{A_t}{R_o})}$$

and from Eq. (3)

$$\frac{\sigma_M}{\sigma_P + \sigma_M} = \frac{6 + 3 \frac{A_t}{R_o}}{(7 + 2 \frac{A_t}{R_o})}$$

For $\frac{A_t}{R_o} = 0.5$, from Table I $\Gamma_p = 0.635$ and $\Gamma_M = 1.02$. Thus,

$$\Gamma = 0.0625(0.635) + 0.9375(1.02) = 0.996$$

CONCLUSIONS

An analytical solution to the model of the round compact specimen (an obvious substitute for the rectangular compact specimen for testing round product forms) has been obtained by the boundary collocation method. Through application of the principle of superposition, the solution for a wide range of load line locations can be obtained. Very good agreement was obtained when compared with available experimental and finite element results for ratios of $\frac{A_t}{R_o} > 0.3$.

Round compact specimens can be used to economize on specimen stock and machining for structures such as discs and solid cylinders.
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TABLE I. - ESTIMATED LIMIT
VALUES OF $\Gamma_P$ AND $\Gamma_M$ AS $R_i/R_o \to 0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\frac{A_t}{R_o}$</th>
<th>$\Gamma_P$</th>
<th>$\Gamma_M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. - COMPARISON OF PRESENT RESULTS WITH THOSE OF REFS. 2 AND 5 FOR $X_o/R_o = 0.5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\frac{A_t}{R_o}$</th>
<th>Present collocation results, $\Gamma$</th>
<th>Experimental results, [2] $\Gamma$</th>
<th>Experimental results, [5] $\Gamma$</th>
<th>Finite element results, [5] $\Gamma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[
\Gamma = \frac{\sigma_P}{\sigma_P + \sigma_M} \Gamma_P + \frac{\sigma_M}{\sigma_P + \sigma_M} \Gamma_M
\]

where \( \Gamma = \frac{K_t}{\left(\sigma_P + \sigma_M/\pi A_1/\left(1 - A_1/R_0\right)\right)} \).
Figure 4. - Convergence of $I_M$ with decreasing $R_i/R_o$ ratios for $A_i/R_o$ ratios in the range of 0.3 to 0.8.
Figure 5. - Convergence of $f_p$ with decreasing $R_i/R_o$ ratios for $A_i/R_o$ ratios in the range of 0.3 to 0.8.