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ABSTRACT

An integrated theory is developed for predicting the hydrothermomechanical (HDTM) response of fiber composite components. This integrated theory is based on a combined theoretical and experimental investigation. In addition to predicting the HDTM response of components, the theory is structured to assess the combined hydrothermal effects on the mechanical properties of unidirectional composites loaded along the material axis and off-axis, and those of angleplied laminates. The theory developed predicts values which are in good agreement with measured data at the micromechanics, macromechanics, laminate analysis and structural analysis levels.
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NOMENCLATURE
(Property and direction are given by subscripts)

A inplane stiffness array (eq. (32))
a dimension
b dimension
C coupled stiffness array (eq. (32)), heat capacity
D array of bending stiffness (eq. (32))
E elastic modulus
F function
G shear modulus
HDTM abbreviation for hydrothermomechanical
K heat conductivity
k volume ratio
M moment
m moisture
R\epsilon, R\sigma transformation matrix for strain and stress respectively
S ply uniaxial strength
T_g glass transition temperature
T_s resin softening temperature = T_g
T_c reference temperature (273 K)
w out-of-plane displacement
x, y, z structural axes reference coordinates
1, 2, 3 material axes reference coordinates
\alpha thermal expansion coefficient
\beta moisture coefficient
\( \beta_v \): void magnification factor
\( \beta_{\text{sub}} \): correlation coefficients, taken as unity if not defined
\( \epsilon \): strain
\( \epsilon_{\text{co}} \): reference plane inplane strain (eq. (32))
\( \theta \): ply orientation angle taken positive for transformations from the old to the new axis.
\( k \): local curvature (eq. (32))
\( \nu \): Poisson's ratio
\( \rho \): density
\( \sigma \): stress
\( \varphi_{\mu} \): strain magnification factor
\( \begin{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \): square array
\( \begin{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}^T \): transpose
\( \begin{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \): inverse
\( \{ \} \): column vector
\( \{ \}^T \): row vector

Subscripts
- \( C \): compression
- \( c \): composite property
- \( d \): dry property
- \( f \): fiber property
- \( g \): glass transition
- \( H \): hydro (moisture) property
- \( \ell \): ply (unidirectional) composite property
- \( m \): moisture property
- \( r \): resin property
- \( S \): shear property
- \( T \): tension
- \( t \): thermal property
v
w
x, y, z
o
1, 2, 3

void
wet property
property or variable referred to structural axes
reference temperature \( (T_o = 273 \text{ K}) \) dry property
property or variable referred to material axes

INTRODUCTION

The influence of hydrothermal environments on advanced composite mechanical properties has been extensively investigated by the composites community over the past several years (refs. 1 to 5). The various investigations thus far have generated significant fundamental knowledge for: (1) identifying the variables and mechanisms which bring about this influence, (2) establishing key relationships between these variables, and (3) providing the basis for developing an integrated theory to predict the hydrothermomechanical (HDTM) response of advanced composite structural components. The objective of this investigation is the development and description of an integrated theory for predicting the HDTM response of advanced composite structural components.

The approach pursued in developing this integrated theory consisted of the following: (1) review of work to date in order to select relationships between key hydrothermal variables (moisture and temperature) of resins and in order to identify and/or develop simple approximate relationships for relating resin physical and mechanical properties to the key hydrothermal variables, (2) performance of limited experiments to verify the conclusions arrived at from reviewing the work in (1), (3) incorporation of the simple relationships (identified in the literature or developed herein) as appropriate into composite micromechanics, composite macromechanics, laminate theory, and composite
structural analysis to **complete** the development of the desired integrated theory for the HDTM response, and (5) **application** of the integrated theory to selected examples and comparison with experimental data. Some of the governing equations are given in matrix notation in the text for convenience. Their **expanded** form is given in the Appendix.

**EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION**

The experimental program was conducted to assess the effects of water absorption on the weights and volumes of an epoxy matrix resin and fiber/epoxy resin composites as well as to provide data to compare with composite micromechanics predictions.

**Materials Investigated**

The materials evaluated in this investigation consisted of neat PR-288 epoxy matrix resin and an AS-type graphite fiber/PR-288 resin unidirectional composite.

**Materials Fabrication**

The neat PR-288 epoxy matrix resin was supplied by the 3M Company in plate form. The fiber/resin laminates were made at the Lewis Research Center using commercial AS-type graphite/PR-288 (AS/E) resin prepreg. Individual plies of prepreg were stacked in a metal mold to form 10 ply and 25 ply unidirectional laminates. A thermocouple was inserted into the laminate at one end. The cold mold was placed in a hydraulic laminating press previously heated to 450 K (350°F). The press platens were adjusted to apply contact pressure of 0.10 MPa (15 psi) on the mold. After the laminate temperature reached 311 K (100°F), contact pressure was maintained for another 3 minutes. The platen pressure was then increased gradually over a 2 minute period to 2.1 MPa (300 psi). The laminate was then cured at this pressure for a period of 2 hours. After completion of curing, the laminate was re-
moved from the press and the mold in a hot condition and allowed to cool at room temperature conditions.

Specimen Preparation and Testing

The neat epoxy resin and fiber/resin composite specimens were cut into test specimens using a diamond cutting wheel. The dimensions and designations of the specimens are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Dimensions</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neat Resin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.64 cm (0.25-in.)</td>
<td>cube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27 by 1.27 by 0.32 cm</td>
<td>Thin Resin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.50 by 0.50 by 0.125-in.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber/Resin Composite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ply - 1.27 by 1.27 by 0.13 cm</td>
<td>Thin Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.50 by 0.50 by 0.05-in.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 ply - 1.27 by 1.27 by 0.25 cm</td>
<td>Thick Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.50 by 0.50 by 0.10-in.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten test specimens of each type were prepared and characterized for weight and physical dimensions in the as-cut condition.

All of the specimens were placed in a 339 K (150°F) oven to remove absorbed water and were allowed to remain in the oven until weights and dimensions were stabilized. The specimens were then subjected to room temperature (294 to 297 K (70°F to 75°F) and approximately 50 percent relative humidity) and boiling water environments. The weights and dimensions of the specimens were periodically determined.

Results and Discussion

Figure 1 shows the effects of a boiling water moisture environment on the percentage changes in specimen volumes and weights for the thin epoxy resin specimens. These changes increased nonlinearly with time. Similar percentage changes for the thick epoxy resin specimens were
erratic and are not shown in figure 1. This erratic behavior is attributed to possible nonuniform moisture distribution through the specimen thickness.

Figure 2 shows the effects of a boiling water moisture environment on the percentage changes in specimen volumes and weights for the graphite fiber/epoxy resin composite specimens. The percentage changes for both the thick and thin composites increase nonlinearly with time. The percent changes in volume and weight for the thin specimen were essentially stabilized at the termination of the tests. However those of the thick composite were still changing gradually.

Figure 3 shows the relationships between the percentage changes in the volumes and weights of the specimens subjected to room temperature and boiling water environments, respectively. The slopes of the lines drawn through these data are equal to the coefficients listed in table I. The percentage dimensional changes versus weight changes (moisture expansion coefficients) are summarized in table II.

The points to be noted from figures 1 and 2 are that the absorbed moisture appears to have reached equilibrium in the thin resin and thin composite specimens, but not in the thick composite specimens. The moisture content in the resin at equilibrium is about 7.8 percent which is comparable to that reported in the literature (ref. 1). As can be seen both weight and volume changes are the same. The corresponding changes for the thin composite are about 3 percent. This is equivalent to about a 7 percent change in the amount of resin in the composite which is about 40 percent by volume.

The points to be noted from tables I and II are that the coefficients from the room temperature exposure specimens are 1 for the resin specimens and 0.3 for the composite specimens. The coefficients from the boiling water exposure are about 1.1 for all the specimens. This indicates that
the volume expansion of the resin in the composite is the same as in the next resin and also that the in situ moisture density is about the same as that of water.

THEORY, COMPARISONS, AND DISCUSSIONS

In this part of the paper are described the flow diagram of the integrated theory for hydrothermomechanical (HDTM) response, the concepts and assumptions for developing this theory, the key governing equations for composite micromechanics, composite macromechanics, and laminate theory. Finally, the incorporation of all of these into a computer code and the coupling of this code with a structural analysis procedure for predicting the HDTM response of advanced composite structural components are described. Comparisons are made with available data.

Flow Diagram of Integrated Theory for Hydrothermomechanical (HDTM) Response

The flow diagram of the integrated theory for HDTM response of composite components is illustrated schematically in figure 4. The key elements in this diagram are blocked with single lines while the desired result is blocked with double lines. As can be seen in the diagram the key elements are composite micromechanics, composite macromechanics, laminate analysis, and structural analysis. The desired result is the HDTM response of composite components. Each key element receives input from the element preceding it and supplies input to the element following it as well as additional information. In a design procedure the HDTM response must be compared to the appropriate design criteria in order to assess the adequacy of the composite component.

Concepts and Assumptions

The two concepts underlying this integrated theory are based on:

1. the observation that "the moisture affects the resin HDTM properties only, " (refs. 1 to 5) and
2. the hypothesis that the moisture effects on...
the resin HDTM properties can be expressed as a function of the use temperature and the reduced glass transition temperature of the wet resin (T_{gwr}). The reduced glass transition temperature (T_{gwr}) is related to both glass transition temperature of the dry resin (T_{gd}) and the amount of moisture in the resin (m_r) as described in reference 6. This hypothesis implies isoparametric functional relationship between the various resin properties and may be expressed in symbolic form as follows:

resin mechanical properties \( (E, G, S)_{wr} = F_1[(E, G, S)_{dr}, T_{gwr}] \)  

resin thermal properties \( (\alpha, K, C)_{wr} = F_2[(\alpha, K, C)_{dr}, T_{gwr}] \)  

where \( E, \nu, \) and \( S \) denote modulus, Poisson's ratio and fracture stress, respectively; and where \( \alpha, K \) and \( C \) denote thermal expansion coefficient, heat conductivity and heat capacity, respectively. Moisture diffusivity and electrical conductivity are expected to have similar functional relationships.

The glass transition temperature of the wet resin \( T_{gwr} \) is given in symbolic form as follows:

\[ T_{gwr} = F_3(T_{gd}, m_r) \]  

where, as mentioned previously, \( T_{gd} \) and \( m_r \) denote glass transition temperature of the dry resin and \( m_r \) the moisture content in the resin. (See ref. 6 for the functional form of \( F_3 \)).

The following assumptions were made in developing this integrated theory: (1) the moisture diffusion in the composite is independent of the stress state, (2) the temperature distribution in the composite is independent of the stress state, (3) all the assumptions that are common to composite
linear micromechanics and macromechanics, and linear laminate theory; (4) the moisture effects in the composite are manifested through the resin as described by micromechanics; and (5) the hydrothermomechanical response of the composite structural component may be determined by solving the appropriate moisture diffusion, heat transfer, and structural problems as will be indicated later.

Relationships for Wet Resin Properties

The relationships among the wet resin mechanical properties and the room temperature dry properties and temperature (eq. (1)) were determined in this investigation using the following procedure: (1) retention ratios (wet property at test temperature divided by room temperature dry property) of wet resin and unidirectional composite properties from the literature (refs. 1, 4, 7, and 8) were plotted versus temperature, (2) a simple algebraic expression was sought to approximate the retention ratio and thereby establish the functional relationship $F_1$ in equation (1). The motivation for seeking a simple algebraic expression is that this can readily be incorporated into available composite micromechanics equations. The procedure used to establish the relationship is illustrated in figure 5. As can be seen the simple algebraic relationship

$$\frac{\text{wet resin mechanical property at test temperature}}{\text{dry resin mechanical property at room temperature}} = \frac{F_m}{\sqrt{\frac{T_S - T}{T_S - T_0}}}$$

(4)

is a good approximation of the data in the range $200 \text{K} (-100^\circ \text{F}) < T < T_S$. The notation in equation (4) is as follows: $F_m$ denotes mechanical property retention ratio, $T_S$ equals $T_{gwr}$, $T$ is the use temperature and $T_0$ equals $273 \text{K} (0^\circ \text{C})$. The temperatures are expressed in K. The moisture effect is incorporated through $T_S$ as defined in equation (3). The
corresponding relationship for the wet resin thermal properties is assumed to be the inverse of the equation (4) or

\[
\frac{\text{wet resin thermal property at test temperature}}{\text{dry resin thermal property at room temperature}} = \sqrt{\frac{T_s - T_0}{T_s - T}} \approx \frac{1}{2} \left( T_s - T_0 \right)^{1/2}
\] (5)

Equation (5) is a good approximation for the literature dry resin data (refs. 9 and 10) in the range 200 K (-100°F) < T < T_s as is shown in figure 6. It is anticipated that equation (5) will fit wet resin thermal properties equally as well in the same range. If it does not, another relationship may be found and the procedure described below can be used to incorporate the moisture effects thermal properties. Summarizing then:

\[
(E, G, S)_{wr} = (E, G, S)_{ro} \sqrt{\frac{m}{m}} \quad (6)
\]

\[
(\alpha, K, C)_{wr} = (\alpha, K, C)_{ro} \sqrt{\frac{t}{t}} \quad (7)
\]

where the subscript ro refers to dry resin properties evaluated at room temperature; and \( \sqrt{\frac{m}{m}} \) and \( \sqrt{\frac{t}{t}} \) are given by equations (4) and (5), respectively.

**Composite Micromechanics**

The governing micromechanics equations which incorporate the moisture effects in the unidirectional composite (ply) response were derived using the procedures of references 11, 12, and 13. Since the number of these equations can be very large (refs. 14 and 15) herein we present those equations which are either used to predict results or are used to illustrate important phenomena.

**Volume and density relationships.** - The ply density \( \rho_{fw} \) and ply moisture \( m_f \) are given by:

\[
\rho_{fw} = \rho_{fd} + (\rho_{fd} + k_v \rho_m) (3 \beta_r k_r + k_v) m_r
\] (8)
\[ m_f = (3\beta_r k_r + k_v) m_r \rho_m / \rho_{fd} \]  

where:

\[ \rho_{fd} = k_f \rho_f + k_r \rho_r \]  

\[ \beta_r = \frac{1}{3} \left[ \frac{(\rho_{rd}/\rho_m) - k_v}{k_v} \right] \]  

\[ 1 = k_f + k_r + k_v \]

and where the notation in equations (8) to (12) is as follows: \( \rho \) denotes density; \( k \), actual volume ratio; \( m \), moisture; \( \beta \), moisture expansion coefficient; the subscripts \( f \), \( r \), \( v \), and \( l \) denote fiber, resin, void, and ply property, respectively; and the subscripts \( d \) and \( w \) denote dry and wet conditions, respectively. The presence of voids affects all the properties given by equations (8) to (11). Note that equation (11) can be used to predict the theoretical moisture expansion coefficient of the resin by setting \( k_v = 0 \). For example, typical resins have specific gravities of about 1.2. The theoretical volumetric expansion coefficient of those resins is \( 3\beta_r \) which is equal to the specific gravity of the resins or 1.2 in this example and is in good agreement with the measured coefficient of 1.1 of the boiling exposure specimens in table I. The value of \( \beta_r \) of about 0.4 is also in good agreement with literature data (ref. 1).

Equation (9) predicts a moisture content of about 2.6 percent for an AS/PR-288 composite compared to about 2.9 percent for the thin composite and 2.3 percent for the thick composite from figure 2. These comparisons show that the values predicted by equations (9) to (11) are in good agreement with measured data. They also show that the resin volume expansion is conserved in the composite as the composite expands at these moisture contents. This means that the resin is essentially incompressible and will probably behave like a viscoelastic or
viscoelastic medium. A direct conclusion from this condition is that microstress relaxation occurs in the composite. Another conclusion is that the voids in the in situ resin may collapse at the high (about 1-percent and greater) moisture content.

**Ply elastic constants.** - The governing micromechanics equations for predicting the ply elastic properties longitudinal modulus ($E_{f11}$), transverse modulus ($E_{f22}$), major Poisson's ratios ($\nu_{f12}$) and intralaminar shear modulus ($G_{f12}$), respectively, are:

\[
E_{f11} = k_f E_{f11} + k_r \frac{\mu}{m} E_{ro} \tag{13}
\]

\[
E_{f22} = \frac{\mu}{m} E_{ro} \frac{1 - \gamma \kappa_f (1 - \frac{\mu}{m} E_{ro}/E_{f22})}{1 - \gamma \kappa_f (1 - \frac{\mu}{m} E_{ro}/E_{f22})} \tag{14}
\]

\[
\nu_{f12} = k_f \nu_{f12} + k_r \nu_{ro} \tag{15}
\]

\[
G_{f12} = \frac{\mu}{m} G_{ro} \frac{1 - \gamma \kappa_f (1 - \frac{\mu}{m} G_{ro}/G_{f12})}{1 - \gamma \kappa_f (1 - \frac{\mu}{m} G_{ro}/G_{f12})} \tag{16}
\]

where

\[
G_{ro} = \frac{E_{ro}}{2(1 + \nu_{ro}^2)} \tag{17}
\]

and where $\mu_m$ is given by equation (4); the subscript $f$ denotes fiber property; the subscripts 1 and 2 denote fiber directions with 1 taken along the fiber and 2 transverse to the fiber direction. Note that the major Poisson's ratio is independent of moisture as may be verified from equation (17).

**Ply expansivities.** - The thermal expansion coefficients ($\alpha_{f11}$
and \( \alpha_{f22} \) and the moisture expansion coefficients or swelling coefficients 
(\( \beta_{f11} \) and \( \beta_{f22} \)) are given, respectively, by the following micromechanics equations:

\[
\alpha_{f11} = \alpha_{ro} \frac{f_t E_{ro} f_m k_r + \alpha_{f11} k_f E_{f11}}{f_m E_{ro} k_r + E_{f11} k_{f11}} \tag{18}
\]

\[
\alpha_{f22} = \alpha_{ro} f_t (1 - \gamma k_f)(1 + k_f \nu_{ro} E_{f11}/E_{f11}) + \alpha_{f22} k_f \tag{19}
\]

\[
\beta_{f11} = \beta_{r} k_r f_m E_{ro}/E_{f11} \tag{20}
\]

\[
\beta_{f22} = (1 - \sqrt{k_f}) \beta_{r} \left( 1 + \frac{\sqrt{k_f} (1 - \gamma k_f) f_m E_{ro}}{\sqrt{k_f} E_{f22} + (1 - \gamma k_f) f_m E_{ro}} \right) \tag{21}
\]

or for incompressible resin with \( \beta_{f11} \approx 0 \).

\[
\beta_{f22} = \beta_{f33} = \frac{3 \beta_{r} k_r \rho_{ld}}{(3 \beta_{r} k_r + k_v) \rho_{m}} \tag{22}
\]

where \( f_m \) is given in equation (4) and \( f_t \) in equation (5). At small moisture (less than 0.3 percent) contents \( \beta_{f22} \) is probably closer to the value predicted by equation (21) than equation (22) which was derived assuming conservation of volume of the in situ resin.

**Ply uniaxial strengths.** - The uniaxial ply strengths, tranverse tension (\( S_{f22T} \)) and compression (\( S_{f22C} \)) and intralaminar (in-plane) shear (\( S_{f12S} \)) are given, respectively, by the following micromechanics equations:
\[ S_{f22T} = \beta_{22T} \left( \frac{S_{rT0}}{E_{r0}} \right) \left( \frac{E_{f22}}{E_{r0}} \right) \frac{1}{\beta_v \varphi_{\mu22}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (23)

\[ S_{f22C} = \beta_{22C} \left( \frac{S_{rCO}}{S_{rT0}} \right) \left( \frac{E_{f22}}{E_{r0}} \right) \frac{1}{\beta_v \varphi_{\mu22}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (24)

\[ S_{f12S} = \beta_{12S} \left( \frac{S_{rSO}}{G_{r0}} \right) \left( \frac{G_{f12}}{G_{r0}} \right) \frac{1}{\beta_v \varphi_{\mu12}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (25)

where \( \beta_v \) denotes void magnification factor and \( \varphi_{\mu} \) strain magnification factor, \( S \) denotes fracture stress; the subscripts T, C, and S denote tension, compression and shear, respectively. The coefficient \( \beta_{22T}, \beta_{22C}, \) and \( \beta_{12S} \) are correlation coefficients if needed, otherwise they are assumed to be unity. The void and strain magnification factors are given by:

\[ \beta_v = 1 - \left( \frac{4k_v}{\pi k_r} \right)^{1/2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (26)

\[ \varphi_{\mu22} = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma k_f} \frac{E_{f22}/E_{f22}}{1 - \gamma k_f} \]  \hspace{1cm} (27)

\[ \varphi_{\mu12} = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma k_f} \frac{G_{f12}/G_{f12}}{1 - \gamma k_f} \]  \hspace{1cm} (28)

The uniaxial ply longitudinal tensile strength \( (S_{f11T}) \) and compressive \( (S_{f11C}) \) are given by:

\[ S_{f11T} = S_{fT} \beta_{fT} k_f + k_r \frac{S_{rT0}}{E_{f11}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (29)
\[
S_{f11C} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ S_{fC} (\beta_{fC} k_f + k_r \mathcal{F}_m E_{r0}/E_{f11}) + (\beta_{CS} S_{f12S} + S_{rCo}) \right]
\]  

(30)

where \( S_{fT} \) and \( S_{fC} \) denote fiber longitudinal tensile and compressive strength, respectively; the coefficients \( \beta_{fT} \) and \( \beta_{fC} \) are correlation coefficients if needed, otherwise taken equal to unity; \( \mathcal{F}_m \) is given by equation (4) and \( S_{f12S} \) by equation (25). It is important that the various correlation coefficients in equations (23), (24), (25), (29), and (3) be evaluated from dry room temperature data and should remain invariant with both temperature and moisture changes. These coefficients as well as \( \beta_{CS} \) in equation (30), are evaluated using the procedure described in reference 12. Though a specific set of micromechanics equations were used herein, the functional relations \( \mathcal{F}_m \) and \( \mathcal{F}_t \) should work equally well with any other set.

Comparisons with measured data. - The unidirectional (ply) properties predicted by micromechanics for an AS/3501-5 composite, using the fiber and resin properties given in table III are tabulated together with literature data (ref. 8) in table IV. The properties are for one moisture content (1.8 percent) and two temperatures (room and 366 K (200° F)). By comparing corresponding measured and predicted properties it is seen that the agreement is about 10-percent, which is considered very good, for most of the properties except \( S_{f11C} \) at room temperature, \( S_{f12S} \) at both temperatures, and \( E_{f22} \) and \( G_{f12} \) at 366 K (200° F)). One explanation may be the normal difficulties encountered in measuring these properties. There is no measured wet data for the thermal expansion coefficients.
The predicted value for $\beta_{11}$ from equation (20) with $\beta_r \approx 0.41$, $k_r = 0.4$ and $\sum_{m} E_{ro}/E_{11} \approx 0.0205$ is about 0.04 compared with 0.05 for the thin composite and with 0.02 for the thick composite, table II. This difference may be due to possible irreversible damage induced in the resin during cooling down. The predicted value for $\beta_{22}$ using equation (22) with $k_v = 0$, and $\rho_{ro}/\rho_m = 1.58$ is about 0.79. This is in good agreement (within 2-percent) with the averages of the thickness and width moisture expansion coefficients for the thin specimen, 0.75, and for the thick specimen, 0.80 (table II).

The significant result from these comparisons is that the micromechanics equations predict ply HDTM properties which are in good agreement with measured data at different hydrothermal environments. This agreement leads to the conclusion that the micromechanics equations given herein may be used to assess the composite response in different hydrothermal environments for preliminary design. Another significant conclusion is that the moisture resistance of various resins including new ones may be assessed by measuring the room temperature properties given in table III and those properties required to determine $T_s$.

Composite Macromechanics

The governing macromechanics equations pertinent to this discussion are the ply HDTM relationships and the ply combined-stress failure criteria. The ply HDTM relationships in matrix form are given by

$$\{ \epsilon_\ell \} = [E_\ell]^{-1} \{ \sigma_\ell \} + \Delta T_\ell \{ \alpha_\ell \} + \delta_\ell \{ \beta_\ell \}$$

(31)

where $\{ \}$ denotes a 3 x 1 vector and $[ ]$ a 3 x 3 array, their expanded form is indicated in the appendix. $\Delta T_\ell$ and $m_\ell$ denote the ply tem-
perature and moisture respectively. Equation (31) may be solved for
\( \sigma_\ell \) if needed. Equation (31) is written about the ply material axes (1,2,3)
with 1 along the fiber 2 transverse to it, and 3 through the thickness.
Equation (31) may be transformed to any other axes by well known trans-
formations (refs. 10, 14, 16). Note the similarity between 
\( \Delta T_\ell [\sigma_\ell] \) and 
\( m_\ell [\beta_\ell] \). This similarity offers the following two features: (1) these
terms are computationally interchangeable, and (2) they may be combined
on an element by element basis. These two features make it possible to
use available computer codes which include only the \( \Delta T_\ell \) term to pre-
dict the HDTM response of angleplied laminates. Reference 14 provides
such a computer code and an integrated theory for the structural re-
sponse of angleplied laminates subjected to thermal and mechanical
loads. This code can also be applied to the integrated theory for the
HDTM response of angleplied laminates by incorporating: (1) the two
above features and (2) the moisture effects through the micromechanics
equations described previously.

The ply combined-stress failure criterion used in this investigation
is that developed in-house (LeRC combined stress failure criterion which
is described in ref. 12) and is available in the computer code (ref. 14).

Laminate Analysis

**Governing equations.** - The laminate analysis part of the integrated
theory for predicting the HDTM response of composite components is
available in the computer code (ref. 14). The governing laminate analysis
equations include those for predicting the HDTM response of the laminate
and those for predicting the ply HDTM strains and stresses. The
equations for the laminate HDTM response are:
where \( N, M, \epsilon, \kappa \) are 3 \times 1 vectors (see appendix for expanded form) denoting, respectively: inplane force, bending moment, reference plane strains, and local curvatures; \( A_c, C_c, \) and \( D_c \) are 3 \times 3 arrays denoting; axial, coupled, and bending stiffness, respectively. These arrays are determined from ply properties using laminate analysis procedures (refs. 8, 14, and 16). The subscript \( c \) denotes composite (laminate) property or variable, and the subscripts \( m \) and \( t \) denote moisture and thermal properties. Note that \( N_{ct} \) and \( M_{ct} \) are the thermal forces and moments and \( N_{cm} \) and \( M_{cm} \) are the hydro forces and moments. Equation (32) is an important result of laminate theory and is generally used to predict the following:

1. HDTM laminate relationships required in structural analysis.
2. Laminate forces (displacements) when the displacements (forces) are known from structural analysis
3. Ply HDTM stresses
4. Residual and hydro stresses
5. Laminate warpage from hydrothermal stresses.

The ply HDTM strain and stresses are, respectively, given by:

\[
\{\epsilon_f\} = [R_{f\epsilon}] \{\epsilon_{cO}\} - z_{\ell} \{\epsilon_{cO}\} - z_{\ell} \{\kappa_{c}\}
\tag{33}
\]

\[
\{\sigma_{f}\} = [E_{f}] \{ [R_{f\epsilon}] \{\epsilon_{f}\} - m_{\ell} \{\beta_{\ell}\} - \Delta T_{\ell} \{\alpha_{\ell}\} \}
\tag{34}
\]

where \( R_{f\epsilon} \) is a 3 \times 3 strain transformation matrix which is a function
of $\theta$ measured from the laminate structural axes to the ply material
axis (see appendix for expanded form), and $z_\ell$ is the normal distance
from the reference plane to the center of the ply. The ply hydrothermal
strains and stresses for symmetric laminates with uniform temperature
and moisture conditions are, respectively, given by:

$$\{\epsilon_{\ell HT}\} = m \langle R_{f\ell} \{\beta_c\} - \{\beta_\ell\} \rangle + \Delta T \langle R_{f\ell} \{\alpha_c\} - \{\alpha_\ell\} \rangle \quad (35)$$

$$\{\sigma_{\ell HT}\} = [E_{\ell}] m \langle R_{f\ell} \{\beta_c\} - \{\beta_\ell\} \rangle + \Delta T \langle R_{f\ell} \{\alpha_c\} - \{\alpha_\ell\} \rangle \quad (36)$$

where the subscript HT denotes hydrothermal property and the other
symbols have been previously defined. As can be observed from equa-
tions (35) and (36) combination of moisture ($m$) and temperature ($\Delta T$)
may exist which will result in zero hydrothermal strains and stresses.
As can also be observed hydrothermal environments when both moisture
and temperature increase or decrease induce the largest hydrothermal
strains or stresses.

**Application - laminate elastic properties.** - The laminate analysis
just described was used to analyze some of the laminates tested in ref-
ERENCE 8. The results obtained for elastic properties are summarized
in table V. The comparisons show that the predicted values are in good
agreement with measured data (within 10 percent) except for the shear
moduli of laminates I and II where the predicted values are 18 and
15 percent higher, respectively. A possible reason for this large dif-
fERENCE is inaccuracy of the experimental values arising from the dif-
ficulty in measuring shear properties.

**Application - hydrothermomechanical stresses.** - The predicted ply
HDTM stresses for one of these laminates are summarized in bar-chart form in figure 7, both individually and combined. The uniaxial strengths are also shown. The following points are worthy of note in figure 7:

1. The hydro and residual stresses have opposite signs with the hydro stress dominating (about 3-times as high for some stresses).

2. The hydro and mechanical stresses have the same sign for the longitudinal and transverse stresses in the 45° plies and the transverse stress in the 0° plies.

3. The mechanical load is the dominant source of the shear stress in the 45° plies.

4. The transverse residual stress magnitude is about equal to the uniaxial transverse strength in the 0° and 45° plies. It is possible that this stress caused transply cracking in these plies prior to moisture conditioning of the laminate.

5. The mechanical load shear stress in the 45° plies exceeds the corresponding uniaxial strength ($S_{12}$).

6. The hydrothermal stress contribution to the longitudinal stress in the 0° plies is negligible compared to mechanical stress.

7. It appears that fracture was initiated by shear failures of the 45° plies and completed when the 0° plies failed in longitudinal tension.

One important conclusion from the above discussion is that the ply hydrothermal stresses in angleplied laminates are substantial and need to be considered in both analysis and design.

Application - laminate fracture. - Predicted laminate fracture stresses for combined HDTM load conditions are compared with measured data (ref. 8) using a bar-chart in figure 8. Note in this
figure both measured data ranges and predicted ranges are shown by horizontal lines in the bars. The lower bound of the predicted fracture stress is based on first ply failure (usually induced by transverse or shear stress) while the upper bound is based on failure of the remaining major load carrying plies (not necessarily fiber fractures). The predicted fracture stresses are based on room-temperature-dry uniaxial ply strengths and room-temperature-wet ply hydrothermal elastic properties. This was done for two reasons: (1) the lower bound on laminate fracture stress predicted using room-temperature-wet ply strengths was considered to be unrealistically low and, (2) to compensate for possible in situ ply transverse and intralaminar shear strengths which are suspected to be higher than the uniaxial values tested under the same HDTM environment.

Examining the bars in figure 8, it is seen that the measured and predicted ranges overlap in 13 of the 15 cases. The two cases where they do not overlap are laminate 1 under longitudinal tension and under longitudinal compression. In both of these cases the predicted values are lower than the measured data by about the same amount. One reason the predicted longitudinal compression fracture stress is lower may be the in situ enhancement of the ply longitudinal compressive strength.

The important observation from the data in figure 8 is that dry ply strength data should be used to predict laminate fracture stresses in order to obtain reasonable agreement with the measured data. Another one is that the predicted lower bound on fracture stress appears to be on the conservative side. The results of this stress analysis show that the LeRC ply combined-stress strength criterion can be used for pre-
dicting laminate fracture under combined HDTM loads. One significant conclusion from the previous discussion is that the in situ ply strengths may be higher than those determined under uniaxial tests.

**Application - hydrostresses.** Theoretical ply transverse hydrostresses in \((\theta/0/ - \theta/0)_s\) laminates of different composite systems are shown in figure 9 as a function of \(\theta\). These hydrostresses correspond to 2.5 percent moisture and were predicted using equation (36) with \(\Delta T = 0\) and \(m = 0.025\). As can be seen from the curves in figure 9 the transverse hydrostresses are compressive, increase with increasing \(\theta\) and leveling at about \(\theta = 60^\circ\), and are sensitive to composite system, ranging from about 0.034 GPa (5 ksi) for Kevlar/epoxy (KEV/E) to about 0.19 GPa (28 ksi) for boron/epoxy (B/E). The corresponding intralaminar shear stresses are shown in figure 10. The intralaminar shear stress increases very rapidly with \(\theta\) peaking at about \(\theta = 45^\circ\). It is sensitive to composite system ranging from about 0.014 GPa (2 ksi) for KEVE to 0.083 GPa (12 ksi) for B/E.

Comparable plots in \([\pm \theta]_s\) laminates are shown in figure 11 for transverse stress and in figure 12 for intralaminar shear. In these laminates the ply transverse hydrostress increases very rapidly, with \(\theta\) peaking at \(45^\circ\), and is symmetric about \(45^\circ\). It is strongly influenced by the composite system ranging from about 0.034 GPa (5 ksi) for KEV/E to about 0.19 GPa (28 ksi) for B/E. Note that these ranges are about the same as those for the \([\theta/0/ - \theta/0]_s\) except that the variation with \(\theta\) is different. The corresponding intralaminar shear stresses are shown in figure 12. This stress is antisymmetric with respect to \(45^\circ\), has two peaks at about \(\theta = 30^\circ\) and \(\theta = 60^\circ\), and depends on the composite system, ranging from about 0.014 GPa (2 ksi) for KEV/E to about 0.069 GPa (10 ksi) for B/E or S-glass/epoxy (S-G/E).
The major conclusion to be drawn from the above hydrostress results is that the transverse stresses are compressive in an increasingly uniform moisture environment and as such they may enhance the ply in situ transverse strength.

The ply hydro stresses induced in a B/E unidirectional laminate during moisture absorption are shown in figure 13 and during desorption in figure 14. The moisture profiles used in these predictions were obtained from reference 1. The curves show that large transverse stresses can be induced. These stresses are compressive in the outer plies and tensile in the inner plies during moisture absorption. During desorption the transverse stress is tensile in the outer and center plies and compressive in the intermediate plies. The longitudinal stress is negligible for both cases. Note that curves for both stresses have the same but reflected shape of the moisture curve. The magnitude of the transverse tensile stress is about 0.090 GPa (13 ksi) for the absorption case and is about 0.048 GPa (7 ksi) for the desorption case compared to the corresponding strength of about 0.055 GPa (8 ksi). One conclusion from these results is that rapid moisture absorption or desorption may induce transply cracks. For a more extensive discussion on hydro stresses see reference 17.

Structural Analysis

The structural analysis part of the integrated theory described herein consists of the coupling of the composite mechanics computer code (ref. 14) with a general purpose finite element structural analysis program, for example, NASTRAN (ref. 15). Referring to figure 4 the integrated theory for the HDTM response is completed when the laminate analysis supplies the material properties (eq. (32)) required
in NASTRAN to generate the element stiffness, and when NASTRAN predicts the HDTM structural response displacement vector ($\epsilon_{c0}$ and $\kappa_c$, eq. (32)) required by laminate theory to perform the laminate stress analysis.

A simple example of HDTM structure response of a composite component is the free warpage of an angleplied laminate subjected to nonuniform moisture distribution through the thickness. One way to assess this warpage is to fix the laminate at one corner and determine the lateral displacement at the diagonally-opposite corner. This structural response may also be predicted by the following close form equation for a rectangular flat laminate

$$w = \frac{1}{2} \left( a^2 \kappa_{cxx} + b^2 \kappa_{cyy} + 2ab \kappa_{cxy} \right)$$

where $w$ is the corner displacement, $a$ and $b$ the side dimension, and $\kappa_c$ are the local curvatures which are determined from equation (32).

Corner displacements obtained for a square laminate $a = b = 25.4 \text{ cm}$ ($a = b = 10 \text{ in.}$) for two laminate configurations $[\pm 30]_s^2$ and $[30/0/-30/0]_s^5$ from an AS/E composite and subjected to three different nonuniform through-the-thickness moisture profiles are summarized in figure 15. As can be seen in this figure the corner displacement due to warpage induced by moisture can be substantial. Note that corner displacements greater than 2.54 cm (1-in.) are probably beyond the limits of linear structural analysis. It is interesting to note that the linear and parabolic moisture profiles induce approximately the same warpage.

The variation of the warpage corner displacement as a function of ply angle is shown in figure 16 for laminates with hyperbolic moisture profiles. Note that the warpage is sensitive to laminate configuration and is sensitive to certain moisture profiles. One conclusion from this dis-
Discussion is to take advantage of these sensitivities to assess stress relaxation due to viscoelastic (viscoplastic) behavior of moist resins.

CONCLUSIONS

The major results and conclusions of an investigation to provide an integrated theory for predicting the hydrothermomechanical (HDTM) response of advanced composite components are as follows:

1. An integrated theory was developed to predict the HDTM response of advanced composite components. This theory incorporates the hydrothermal effects in composites through micromechanics, macromechanics and laminate analysis all of which are parts of a composite mechanics computer code. The computer code is coupled with a major structural analysis finite element computer program to complete the integrated theory.

2. A simple relationship was established which relates the mechanical properties of the wet resin to its room temperature dry properties and to its wet glass-transition temperature. The corresponding thermal properties relationship is the reciprocal of the mechanical properties relationship.

3. The resin conserves its volume in a hydro environment. The density of the in situ moisture is about the same as water. Voids in the in situ resin may collapse at high moisture contents (greater than 1-percent).

4. Composite micromechanics predicts hydro expansion and ply mechanical properties (elastic and strength) which are generally in good agreement with measured data under different hydrothermal environments.

5. Laminate theory predicts laminate wet properties which are within 10-percent of measured data.

6. Laminate theory in conjunction with the LeRC failure criterion
predicts laminate fracture stress ranges which overlap with those of the measured data. The predicted lower bound on fracture stress tends to be below the measured data scatter in general.

7. The hydro stresses in the plies of angleplied laminates reach magnitudes in the transverse direction and in intralaminar shear which are comparable to corresponding ply strengths.

8. The ply hydro transverse stress is either tensile or compression depending on whether moisture is absorbed or desorbed. The profiles of ply stresses through-the-thickness of the laminate are mirror images of the corresponding moisture profile. The ply hydro stresses depend on moisture content and profile, laminate configuration and composite system. K/E angleplied laminates have the lowest ply hydro stress and B/E or S-G/E the highest.

9. Nonuniform moisture through the laminate thickness induces severe laminate warpage. This warpage depends on laminate configuration and can produce corner displacements several times the laminate thickness.

10. Hydro stress in angleplied laminates can be predicted using the equivalence feature between hydro and thermal expansions.

11. In situ ply strength may be enhanced by hydrothermal environments as compared with uniaxial data. The in situ resin may behave like a viscoelastic or viscoplastic medium in hydrothermal environments. Moisture induced warpage in angleplied laminates may be an effective means to assess stress relaxation in a hydrothermal environment.
APPENDIX
(Vector and array expansion)

\[ \{ \epsilon_\ell \}^T = [ \epsilon_\ell ] = [ \epsilon_{\ell11}, \epsilon_{\ell22}, \epsilon_{\ell12} ] \]

and similarly for all other vectors.

\[
[E_\ell]^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}
1/E_{\ell11} & -\nu_{\ell21}/E_{\ell22} & 0 \\
-\nu_{\ell12}/E_{\ell22} & 1/E_{\ell22} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1/G_{\ell12}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
[A_C] = \begin{bmatrix}
A_{c11} & A_{c12} & A_{c13} \\
A_{c21} & A_{c22} & A_{c23} \\
A_{c31} & A_{c32} & A_{c33}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and similarly for \([E_c], [C_c], \text{ and } [D_c]\).

\[ \{ N_c \}^T = [N_c] = [N_{cxx}, N_{cyy}, N_{cxy}] \]

and similarly for \( \{ N_{ct} \}, \{ N_{cm} \}, \{ M_c \}, \{ M_{ct} \}, \text{ and } \{ M_{cm} \}\).

\[
[R_{\ell\theta}]^{-1} = (R_{\ell\theta})^T = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos^2\theta & \sin^2\theta & -\sin2\theta \\
\sin^2\theta & \cos^2\theta & \sin2\theta \\
\frac{1}{2}\sin2\theta & \frac{1}{2}\sin2\theta & \cos2\theta
\end{bmatrix}
\]
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### TABLE I. - MOISTURE EXPANSION VOLUME COEFFICIENTS FOR EPOXY RESIN AND FIBER/RESIN COMPOSITE SPECIMENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room temperature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin resin</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick resin</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin composite</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick composite</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiling water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin resin</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick resin</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin composite</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick composite</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II. - MOISTURE EXPANSION COEFFICIENTS FOR LINEAL DIMENSIONS FOR FIBER/RESIN COMPOSITE SPECIMENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specimen directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin composite</td>
<td>0.05 0.5 1.0 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick composite</td>
<td>0.02 0.9 0.7 0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III. FIBER AND RESIN PROPERTIES AND COEFFICIENTS USED IN THE MICROMECHANICS EQUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>SI (English)</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS graphite fiber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal modulus</td>
<td>$E_{TT}$</td>
<td>GPa (MSI)</td>
<td>221 (32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse modulus</td>
<td>$E_{TT}$</td>
<td>GPa (MSI)</td>
<td>138 (2.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear modulus</td>
<td>$G_{TT}$</td>
<td>GPa (MSI)</td>
<td>138 (2.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson's ratio</td>
<td>$v_{TT}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal thermal exp. coeff.</td>
<td>$a_{TT}$</td>
<td>$^\circ K^{-1}/^\circ F^{-1}$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^{-6}$ $(-0.56 \times 10^{-6})$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse thermal exp. coeff.</td>
<td>$a_{TT}$</td>
<td>$^\circ K^{-1}/^\circ F^{-1}$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^{-5}$ $(5.6 \times 10^{-6})$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal tensile strength</td>
<td>$S_{TT}$</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>2.7 (400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal compression</td>
<td>$S_{TT}$</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>2.7 (400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3501-5 Resin room temperature (ref. 6 dry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulus</td>
<td>$E_{To}$</td>
<td>GPa (MSI)</td>
<td>4.1 (0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson's ratio</td>
<td>$v_{To}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal exp. coeff.</td>
<td>$a_{To}$</td>
<td>$^\circ K^{-1}/^\circ F^{-1}$</td>
<td>$5.7 \times 10^{-5}$ $(32 \times 10^{-6})$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture exp. coeff.</td>
<td>$\delta_{T}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile strength</td>
<td>$S_{To}$</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>0.048 (7.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression strength</td>
<td>$S_{Co}$</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>0.25 (36.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear strength</td>
<td>$S_{To}$</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>0.048 (7.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>$\beta_{CB}$ equation (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IV - COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND PREDICTED MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF ANGLED PLAIN LAMINATES AS/3501-5 IN HYDROTHERMAL ENVIRONMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Units SI (English)</th>
<th>Properties with 1.8 percent moisture</th>
<th>Room temperature</th>
<th>200°F</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Measured</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>kg/m(^3) (lb/in.(^3))</td>
<td>1.6\times10^4 (0.57)</td>
<td>1.6\times10^4 (0.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal modulus</td>
<td>( E_{11} )</td>
<td>GPa (MSI)</td>
<td>131 (19.1)</td>
<td>135 (19.5)</td>
<td>133 (19.3)</td>
<td>133 (19.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse modulus</td>
<td>( E_{22} )</td>
<td>GPa (MSI)</td>
<td>8.6 (1.25)</td>
<td>4.21 (0.61)</td>
<td>5.18 (0.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear modulus</td>
<td>( G_{12} )</td>
<td>GPa (MSI)</td>
<td>3.73 (0.54)</td>
<td>1.73 (0.25)</td>
<td>2.28 (0.33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. expansion coeff.</td>
<td>( \alpha_{11} )</td>
<td>K(^{-1}) (°F(^{-1}))</td>
<td>-5.6\times10^{-7} (-0.31\times10^{-6})</td>
<td>-4.0\times10^{-7} (-0.22\times10^{-6})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long. compressive strength</td>
<td>( S_{11C} )</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>0.891 (130)</td>
<td>0.891 (130)</td>
<td>0.319 (134)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long. tensile strength</td>
<td>( S_{11T} )</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>1.65 (240)</td>
<td>1.66 (242)</td>
<td>1.66 (241)</td>
<td>1.66 (241)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse tensile strength</td>
<td>( S_{22T} )</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>0.034 (5.9)</td>
<td>0.020 (2.9)</td>
<td>0.023 (3.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse compressive strength</td>
<td>( S_{22C} )</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>0.202 (29.5)</td>
<td>0.110 (16.0)</td>
<td>0.119 (17.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-plane shear strength</td>
<td>( S_{12S} )</td>
<td>GPa (KSI)</td>
<td>0.045 (6.5)</td>
<td>0.035 (5.1)</td>
<td>0.023 (3.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>cm (in.)</td>
<td>0.014 (0.0055)</td>
<td>0.0140 (0.00552)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From reference 8.
TABLE V. - COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND PREDICTED ELASTIC PROPERTIES OF ANGLEPLIED LAMINATES
AS/3501-5 WITH 1.8 PERCENT MOISTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laminate</th>
<th>Long. modulus GPa (MSI)</th>
<th>Trans. modulus GPa (MSI)</th>
<th>Shear modulus GPa (MSI)</th>
<th>Major Poisson's ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I[(0/±45°2/0]/±45°h</td>
<td>Measured 43 (6.3)</td>
<td>21.2 (3.0)</td>
<td>22.2 (3.21)</td>
<td>5.54 (0.803)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted 43 (6.3)</td>
<td>23 (3.2)</td>
<td>26.2 (3.80)</td>
<td>5.59 (0.781)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% difference 0</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
<td>+16.4</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II[0/±45°2/0]/90/0]h</td>
<td>Measured 89.7 (13.0)</td>
<td>29 (4.2)</td>
<td>10 (1.5)</td>
<td>2.24 (0.325)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted 89.7 (13.0)</td>
<td>31 (4.5)</td>
<td>11 (1.6)</td>
<td>2.19 (0.318)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% difference 0</td>
<td>+7.1</td>
<td>+6.7</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III[(0/±45°90)/2]h</td>
<td>Measured 46.1 (6.68)</td>
<td>45.7 (6.62)</td>
<td>16.1 (2.34)</td>
<td>2.42 (0.350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted 49.7 (7.20)</td>
<td>49.7 (7.20)</td>
<td>16.1 (2.70)</td>
<td>2.30 (0.333)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% difference +7.8</td>
<td>+8.7</td>
<td>+15.4</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Room temperature wet property. Measured data from reference 8.

Fig. 1. - Moisture absorption characteristics of thin epoxy resin specimens in boiling water.
Fig. 2. - Moisture absorption characteristics of fiber/resin composite specimens in boiling water.

Fig. 3. - Comparison of weight and volume changes of resin and composite specimens in boiling water.
Fig. 4. Flow diagram of integrated theory for predicting the hydrothermomechanical response of advanced composite components.

Fig. 5. Temperature-moisture effects on composite and matrix mechanical properties (AS/3501).
HM GRAPHITE/4617 EPOXY UNIDIRECTIONAL
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Fig. 6. - Temperature effects on thermal coefficient of expansion for unidirectional fiber/resin composites.

Fig. 7. - Predicted residual, hydro, mechanical and combined stresses of a multidirectional graphite-epoxy laminate.
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Fig. 9. - Theoretical ply transverse stresses induced by 2.5% moisture in composite system [8, 0, -8, 0]_s for several materials.

Fig. 10. - Comparison of measured and predicted fracture stresses of angle-ply laminates AS/3501-5 with 1.8% moisture.
Fig. 10. - Theoretical ply shear stresses induced by 2.5% moisture in composite system $[\theta, 0, +, 0]$ for several materials.

Fig. 11. - Theoretical ply transverse stresses induced by 2.5% moisture in composite system $[\theta, 0, +, 0]$ for several materials.
Fig. 12. - Theoretical intralaminar ply shear stresses induced by 2.5% moisture in composite system \([R, \theta]\) for several materials.

Fig. 13. - Predicted stresses induced by moisture in unidirectional boron/epoxy laminate exposed to atmosphere of 100% relative humidity for 28 days.
Fig. 14 - Predicted stresses induced by moisture in unidirectional boron/epoxy laminate and 1.7 hr at 205°F.

Fig. 15 - Predicted warpage induced by 1.5-percent moisture in AS4/3501-D0 laminate protected on one side for linear, parabolic, and hyperbolic ply moisture distributions.

Corner displacement ratio, \( \frac{w_{	ext{MAX}}}{w} \)

- Linear
- Parabolic
- Hyperbolic

Moisture, %

- 0
- 1.6
- 2.4

Stress, ksi

- 10
- 20
- 30
- 40
- 50

Stress, GPa

- 0.1
- 0.2
- 0.3
- 0.4
- 0.5

Original page is of poor quality.
Fig. 16. - Predicted warpage induced by 2.5 percent moisture in AS/E laminates with one surface protected. (Hyperbolic moisture profile.)