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ABSTRACT

The "stress-corrosion-fatigue" performance of several high strength-aluminum alloys was investigated by tests of hydraulic cylinders and other types of specimens. Specimens were prepared from forgings and forming stock of alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6, 7075-T73, 7079-T6, and X7080-T7 and from premium castings of alloy CH70-T7. The alternating internal pressure loading of the cylinders at frequencies between 0.15 and 20 cm in corrosive environment included hold times at load of as much as 5.4 minutes. Corrosive environment was provided by a warm salt fog at 12 hour intervals.

Alloy 7075-T73 rated best in the corrosion-fatigue tests; no stress-corrosion cracking occurred in this alloy, and the lives of forged cylinders subjected to repeated loadings to 80% of design stress in a corrosive environment were at least 10 times as long for this alloy as for forged cylinders of alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6, or 7079-T6. Fractographic examination showed that stress-corrosion cracking as well as fatigue cracking occurred in alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6, and 7079-T6 in the stress-corrosion-fatigue tests. The investigation demonstrated that stress corrosion and fatigue can interact under certain conditions to produce failures in shorter times and fewer cycles than for either phenomenon occurring by itself.
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INTRODUCTION

Forged aluminum cylinders used for landing gear, stabilizers and other aircraft systems are exposed to various combinations of cyclic loading in corrosive environments. Although these components have performed well in most applications, some parts have suffered fatigue or stress-corrosion failures. Such failures have focused attention on the need for a better understanding of the interaction of corrosion and fatigue. Corrosion-fatigue tests conducted at normal machine speeds of 120 to 10,000 cpm do not allow sufficient time for the corrosion or stress-corrosion action which may occur in less severe service environments. The possible interaction of corrosion and fatigue complicates the problem.

The Air Force Materials Laboratory, in an effort to establish a better basis for selecting aluminum alloys for hydraulic cylinders and other aircraft structural components, sponsored this research program to study the combined effects of stress-corrosion and corrosion-fatigue under appropriate loading rates and exposure conditions. Two types of test were made: (1) fatigue tests of cylinders under internal pressure in which alloy, temper, method of fabrication, stress, external environment and frequency were variables, and (2) tests of coupons taken from cylinder blanks. The latter include corrosion-fatigue tests and stress-corrosion tests of C-rings, corrosion-fatigue tests of axial-stress specimens and tensile, tear and fracture-toughness tests.
SECTION II

SUMMARY

The corrosion-fatigue and stress-corrosion performance of several high strength aluminum alloys was investigated by tests of hydraulic cylinders, C-rings and axial-stress fatigue specimens. Specimens were prepared from forgings and forging stock of alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6, 7075-T73, 7079-T76, and X7080-T7 and also from premium cast alloy CH70-T7. The primary purpose was to evaluate these alloys and fabrication processes by tests of cylinders subjected to cyclic internal pressure in a corrosive environment. A secondary objective was to determine the extent to which conventional stress-corrosion and corrosion-fatigue tests of the same materials would have predicted the "stress-corrosion-fatigue" susceptibility of the cylinders.

Frequencies of loading for the corrosion-fatigue tests of the cylinders and C-rings were in the range of 0.15 to 10 cpm. The load cycle included a hold-time at maximum load to allow time for stress corrosion to occur. These tests can be regarded as stress-corrosion tests in which the stress was periodically removed. The corrosive environment was provided by subjecting the specimens to a warm salt fog at 12-hr intervals.

In general, the investigation demonstrated that stress-corrosion cracking may occur under cyclic loading, especially at low frequencies, and that stress-corrosion and fatigue can interact under certain conditions to produce failures in shorter times and fewer cycles than for either phenomenon occurring by itself.

Overall, alloy 7075-T73 gave the best performance. Stress-corrosion cracking did not occur in any 7075-T73 specimens in the various types of tests, and cylinders of this alloy subjected to repeated loading to 80% of design stress in a corrosive environment lasted 10 times as long as any forged cylinders of 2014-T6, 7075-T6, or 7079-T6. The three latter alloys developed stress-corrosion cracks in these tests. The premium cast CH70-T7 specimens also did not exhibit any stress-corrosion cracking. In only one test did stress-corrosion cracking occur in X7080-T7 specimens.
Electron microscopic examination indicated failures to be either pure stress corrosion, pure fatigue, one followed by the other, or mixtures of the two, depending on the alloy and temper, stress level, rate of cycling, and conditions of exposure. Mixed mode failures generally started from stress-corrosion origins; apparently these cracks propagated by stress corrosion where the grains were favorably oriented and by fatigue where they were not.

In tests in laboratory air the lowest fatigue strengths were those of the cast CH70-T7 cylinders; however, at the higher stress levels in the corrosion-fatigue tests, the lives of the cast cylinders were longer than those of the wrought specimens which failed by stress corrosion. For alloy 7075-T73 and X7080-T7 cylinders tested to 80% of design stress, the fatigue lives were reduced by half as a result of introducing a hold time in the fatigue cycle.

The majority of the fatigue and stress-corrosion failures of the forged cylinders occurred in the region of a parting plane. However, the rolled rod stock, which does not contain a parting plane, was only slightly more resistant to corrosion-fatigue cracking than were the die forgings.

The static stress-corrosion tests of C-rings ranked the alloys in the same high-low resistance categories as did the stress-corrosion-fatigue tests of cylinders; but, of course, they could not predict the fatigue performance of the alloys. Neither corrosion-fatigue tests of axial-stress specimens nor corrosion-fatigue tests of C-rings in the same environments as the cylinders gave results which would have predicted the performance of the cylinders. Recommendations are made for improving the C-ring corrosion-fatigue tests.

The crack sizes (fatigue or stress-corrosion cracks) which were associated with unstable fractures of the cylinders correlated well with the critical sizes predicted from fracture-toughness tests.
SECTION III

MATERIALS

1. Production

a. Rolled rod forging stock, 4-1/2-in. diameter, in alloys 7075, 7079, X7080 and 2014. This stock was produced at Alcoa’s Massena Works from 12 x 12-in. or 14 x 14-in. cast ingot. Processing was standard but extra ultrasonic inspection and metallurgical surveillance was practiced. All of the bloom stock met contact ultrasonic inspection standards, in addition 35% of the 4-1/2-in. diameter stock was inspected to Class A, ASNT standards. No discontinuities were detected.

b. Die forgings made at Alcoa’s Cleveland Works from a portion of the 4-1/2-in. diameter stock described above. The shape selected (Fig. 1a) is a commercial die forging, normally made from 4-1/2-in. diameter stock. Its dimensions are such that the desired cylinder blanks (Fig. 1b) could be obtained with a minimum removal of parting-plane structure. The die forgings were ultrasonically inspected at Cleveland and found to meet standards for aircraft forgings.

c. Premium strength cast cylinder blanks (Fig. 1b) of alloy CH70, an alloy similar to K01 and X201.0. These were made and heat treated at Alcoa’s Cleveland Research Foundry.

The die forgings and rolled forging stock were machined to cylinder blanks, 2.3 in. I.D. by 4.08 in. O.D. by 18-in. (Fig. 1b) at Alcoa’s New Kensington Works. These were heat treated and aged at the Alcoa Research Laboratories to the specified tempers in accordance with recommended practices.

2. Tensile, Tear and Fracture Properties

Longitudinal and transverse tensile, tear and fracture toughness specimens were taken from cylinder blanks; the transverse specimens were taken both across and 90° from the parting line. The tensile and fracture toughness specimens were prepared and tested in accordance with ASTM Standard Methods E81 and E399, respectively. The tear specimens were tested as described in reference 3. The tear and fracture toughness specimens are shown in Figs. 2 - 4.

*Numbers refer to references at end of report.
Table I lists the results of the tensile-property survey made on the test materials. All alloys and products met the minimum property levels.

The most significant criteria of toughness from the tear (Table II) and fracture-toughness (Tables III and IV for notch-bend and compact tension specimens, respectively) tests are the ratios of tear strength to tensile yield strength, the unit propagation energies, and the critical plane-strain stress-intensity factors, $K_I$. Clear comparisons of the various alloys, tempers and products on the basis of some of these parameters are made difficult by two factors: First, many of the tear specimens taken from the longitudinal direction did not crack straight across the specimen (see Fig. 5), so that useful values of the unit propagation energies were not obtained in these cases. Second, because of the limitations imposed on the thickness and fatigue cracking of the fracture-toughness specimens, many of the values of $K_I$ obtained were not technically valid values of $K_{IC}$. Candidate values of $K_{IC}$ are designated $K_I$, in accordance with ASTM standard methods, and their validity checked before they are designated to be equal to $K_{IC}$.

However, broad comparisons among the various alloys, tempers and products can still be made by utilizing all the data together, and recognizing that some of the fracture toughness data, though not technically valid, provide a reasonable estimate of the true $K_{IC}$. In the latter regard, those data from specimens which: (a) were fatigue cracked at stress intensities slightly higher than the present limit, i.e., at $K_I$ between 60 and 75% of $K_{IC}$; or (b) contained a crack slightly longer than the present limit were considered to be meaningful values of $K_{IC}$, and are so designated in the tables. These values were considered together with the entirely valid data in appraising the toughness of the materials. For those tests from which the data were clearly invalid, it was considered that it was probable (though not certain) that the true value of $K_{IC}$ was higher than the calculated $K_I$. The summary listing of $K_{IC}$ values in Table V was developed upon these bases, and was used along with the tear test data in developing general ratings of the toughness of various alloys and products.

Of the materials tested the 7075-T73 and X7080-T7 samples, particularly the lower strength rolled rod samples, had the highest toughness of the group. There was not much difference, however, between the toughness of the die forgings of these materials (which had relatively high tensile yield strengths) and the toughness of the 7075-T6 and 7079-T6 samples,
particularly in the transverse direction. Alloy 2014-T6 rated lowest in all test directions for both rolled rod and die forgings. The cast CH70-T7 samples showed less directionality than the other materials. In the longitudinal direction, alloy CH70-T7 rated about on a par with alloy 7075-T6, but in the transverse direction it had higher toughness than any of the other samples.

With regard to test direction, all the wrought alloys had higher toughness in the longitudinal direction than in the transverse direction. For the die forgings, the toughness in the transverse direction across the parting plane was generally lower than that away from the parting plane (X7080-T7 was an apparent exception); the rolled rod thus has an advantage in not having this lower-toughness zone.

The specific use of some of the fracture-toughness data in analyzing the conditions under which fracture took place at the conclusion of the fatigue tests is presented in Section VI-9.
SECTION IV

SPECIMENS

1. Preparation

The investigation was concerned primarily with tests of two types of specimens taken from the 18-in. long cylinder blanks: (1) cylinders of the dimensions shown in Fig. 6, and (2) C-rings of comparable test section dimensions as shown in Fig. 7. The dimensions of the die forged and cast cylinders, shown in Fig. 6 and Table VI, were proportioned so that an internal pressure of 8000 psi would produce maximum stresses equal to 80% of the allowable design stresses, which are defined as being 2/3 of the minimum transverse tensile strengths. The cylinders from rolled stock were made to the same dimensions as those from the forgings of the same alloy.

All machined cylinders were subjected to ultrasonic inspection and met the requirements for Class A - ASNT Standards for wrought aluminum products. Inspections by fluorescent penetrants did not show any significant surface defects.

A C-ring specimen (Fig. 7) for corrosion-fatigue tests was cut from the end of each blank from which a cylinder was machined. The same specimen number was used for the two types of specimens from a blank. Similar specimens for stress-corrosion tests were cut from other cylinder blanks. In the case of the die forgings, the C-rings were oriented so that the parting plane coincided with the section of maximum bending.

2. Residual Quenching Stresses

Residual stresses were investigated in cylinders of 7075-T73, 7075-T6 and X7080-T7, whose quench water temperatures were approximately 70F, 150F and 212F, respectively. Three bonded resistance strain gages, each having elements in the circumferential and axial directions, were located 120 deg. apart around the circumference of each specimen. A 3-in. length of cylinder, containing the gages at midlength, was isolated from the specimen. This section was bored out in stages and the relaxed strains at the outer surface measured after each removal. The corresponding residual stresses were determined by the Sach's boring-out method. 
Figure 8 shows the distribution of circumferential and axial residual stress determined for the three specimens. As expected, the lower the temperature of the quench water, the higher the residual stresses. The stress gradients, all varying from tension in the interior to compression on the exterior, indicate that the bore surface was quenched less rapidly than the exterior. Residual stresses of these magnitudes (circumferential stresses of 1-4 ksi tension on the inside and 1-4 ksi compression on the outside) should have only a minor effect on fatigue performance.
SECTION V

PROCEDURES

1. Axial-Stress Fatigue and Corrosion-Fatigue Tests

A common short-time method of evaluating relations between fatigue and corrosion is to determine conventional S-N curves, without corrosion, and then to repeat the fatigue tests in a corrosive environment. Specimens for these tests, shown in Fig. 9, were of such a size as to be limited to the longitudinal direction of the cylinder blanks. The fatigue tests were made in ambient air. In the corrosion-fatigue tests the specimens were continuously immersed in an acidic (pH 0.8) salt-dichromate solution containing 30 g/l potassium dichromate, 36 g/l chromic acid, and 3 g/l sodium chloride. This electrolyte was selected because it causes rapid intergranular attack of alloys or tempers susceptible to this form of corrosion without causing appreciable general surface corrosion. The 5 kip Krouse fatigue testing machines utilized for these tests operate at a speed of 1100 cpm.

2. Cylinder Fatigue Tests

New equipment and procedures were designed for the cylinder corrosion-fatigue tests. The cylinders were closed at the ends with threaded aluminum caps fitted with O-ring seals. As indicated in Fig. 10 they were enclosed in chambers so that the exterior surfaces were in a controlled atmospheric environment, with or without the addition of corrosive media. The test chambers were mounted on racks as shown in Figs. 11 and 12. Provision was made in the racks for 39 specimens.

Internal hydraulic pressure was provided by an MTS closed-loop, electro-hydraulic loading system coupled to a 10,000 psi capacity pressure intensifier. The pressure fluid was oil with a corrosion inhibitor added (MIL Spec. 052-600-0605). Pressures in the system were monitored by a fluid pressure transducer in the line supplying the specimens. The pressurization system shut down by the loss of oil when a specimen failed.

In order to check the reliability of the cylinder-fatigue-test procedure, a static pressure-strain survey was made
on one specimen. The results, Fig. 13, showed good agreement between measured and calculated hoop tensions at the center of the cylinder over the full 8000 psi range of test pressures. Both circumferential and longitudinal stresses at the end of the cylindrical test section were greater than calculated, indicating a small stress concentration.

The fluctuating pressures for the fatigue tests are controlled by a calibrated pressure cell located at the intensifier. For the sinusoidal loadings the pressures were applied at the maximum rate at which good correlation could be maintained between the measured stresses in a cylinder located near the end of the line, the pressure cell reading at the end of the line and the pressure cell at the intensifier.

The volume of each cylinder was about 78 cu in. Sixty cubic inches of this were taken up by a piece of aluminum rod, 2-1/4 in. diameter by 15-1/2 in. long, placed in the cylinder cavity. This was done to reduce the required volume of hydraulic fluid.

Air, at a humidity controlled generally to 50 ±5%, was circulated through the test chambers; control was accomplished using an Aminco Unit. It was desired to control metal temperatures to 85°F to ensure condensation of the salt fog. However, cylinder temperatures were influenced by room temperature and speed of pressurizing, so that the metal temperature varied from 85 to 110°F. Temperature variation in this range was believed not to have a major effect on the test results.

a. Simulated Seacoast Environment

The simulated seacoast environment was provided by fogging the test chambers at 12-hour intervals with a warm salt fog. For one minute the test chambers were sprayed with a 115°F solution of 5% sodium chloride (NaCl) in deionized water buffered to a pH range of 4-5. Air valves on the inlets closed the chambers off during the salt fog and during a subsequent seven-minute period of draining and purging. For the remainder of the 12-hour period, conditioned air, at a humidity of 50 ±5%, was circulated through the chamber.

b. Loading of Cylinders Tested in Simulated Seacoast Environment

To allow time for corrosive action to occur, the pressures in the simulated seacoast environment were cycled at a frequency
such that, for most all a, it would require six months or more to accumulate the number of loadings which produced fatigue failure in the tests in laboratory air. The pressure was held at maximum for 80% of the period and then cycled, using a sine type curve, to minimum and back to maximum. For example, the hold time was 5.4 minutes per cycle for the tests to 80% of design stress. These tests could also be considered to be interrupted stress-corrosion tests.

3. Cylinder Stress-Corrosion Tests

A limited investigation was made of the stress-corrosion cracking characteristics of cylinders under constant internal pressure. Duplicate specimens of 7075-T6 and 7075-T73 were placed in test chambers at the same time as the corrosion-fatigue tests, but the hydraulic pressure was held constant at 8000 psi by means of check valves.

4. C-Ring Fatigue Tests

Figures 14 and 15 show the apparatus developed to conduct these tests. Provision was made for testing 36 specimens at one time. The rings were loaded to produce maximum tensile stresses on the inside surface equal to the interior hoop tensions applied to the cylinders. Bending stress-deflection relations were determined for typical C-rings and these were used as a basis for the machine loadings.

The moving parts of the mechanism are actuated by small automobile brake cylinders. Oil pressure moves each piston and the attached yokes as far as the preset stops will permit. In this way C-rings, attached to the moving yoke, are strained to the desired level. A small preload is maintained on the C-ring by a spring and when a ring cracks the resulting drop in preload trips a timer, indicating the time to failure.

Figure 16 shows relations between C-ring deflection and bending stresses on the section of maximum moment. The interesting point to be noted is that the circumferential tension at midwidth is 15 to 20% higher than at the edges of the specimen. Although not indicated in the figure, the stress distribution is reversed on the outside surface of the C-ring, with the edge stresses being higher. This situation, not covered by the usual stress and deflection formulas, results from restraint of transverse bow. Since the average measured bending stresses in Fig. 16 are in fair agreement with calculated values for a given ring deflection, this relationship was adopted for loading the C-rings for all flexural fatigue and stress-corrosion tests. This means
that the midwidth stresses were higher, and the edge stresses slightly lower, than the computed stresses.

The tests in conditioned air, without salt-fog injections, were made as rapidly as equipment permitted. Under corrosive conditions, however, the cycle times were increased by the use of hold times as in the cylinder tests.

The C-ring tests differed from the cylinder tests in three important respects: (1) The test surface of the C-ring was 1/4 in. from the original forged surface while that of the cylinder was about 1/2 in. from this surface; consequently, the C-ring had a more pronounced parting plane structure; (2) The C-rings were stressed by constant deformation and the cylinders were stressed by constant load (pressure); thus, in the C-ring test the load tends to relax as cracks propagate through the thickness, resulting in longer lives; and (3) In the cylinder tests, the simulated seacoast environment was fairly uniform in the various test chambers; however, in the C-ring tests the concentration of salt deposits varied along the length of the chamber, and was fairly light on specimens remote from the nozzles. This latter behavior probably accounted for some of the scatter in C-ring test results, since triplicate C-ring specimens from a given alloy and product were positioned at different locations relative to the nozzle.

5. C-Ring Stress-Corrosion Tests

Because the C-ring is a standard stress-corrosion test specimen appropriate for cylinder parts, tests of this type were made on all alloys and products. The purpose of these tests was to establish the stress-corrosion resistance of the test materials and to investigate possible correlations between stress-corrosion and corrosion-fatigue behavior. The C-rings were of the same size as used in the fatigue tests. They were stressed statically by means of threaded studs located on the C-ring diameter. Expansion of the diameter induced tensile stresses on the inner surface, as in the corrosion-fatigue tests. C-rings were stressed to 80, 55, and 30% of the design stresses for the different alloys.

The following exposures were used in the C-ring stress-corrosion tests:

1. Simulated seacoast environment as described in Section V.2.a. The lower two chambers on the rack of the C-ring fatigue apparatus shown in Fig. 15 were used for this purpose.
2. **Seacoast atmosphere** at Alcoa's exposure station at Point Judith, Rhode Island. The Point Judith facilities, facing south into the Atlantic Ocean, are located 300 feet from the water's edge on a rocky beach, a few feet above sea level. Specimens face the ocean but are tilted 45° upward. The specimens are inspected periodically for failures.

3. **Alternate immersion** in a 3.5% NaCl solution, which is the most widely used test for many aluminum alloys and therefore established a common reference datum. These tests employed a 3.5% by weight NaCl solution made from reagent grade salt and distilled water. The salt concentration was maintained by frequent additions of water to compensate for loss of water by evaporation. The pH was maintained within a range of 6.7 to 7.4.

The alternate-immersion cycle consisted of total immersion of the specimens for 10 minutes each hour. For the remaining 50 minutes per hour the specimens air dried at 75 to 80°F and 45 to 50% relative humidity. The specimens were tested for the standard exposure period of 84 days. They were inspected daily for failure.
SECTON VI

TEST RESULTS

1. Fatigue and Corrosion-Fatigue Tests of Axial-Stress Specimens

The results of the fatigue tests of 1/8-in. thick, longitudinal, axial-stress specimens are presented in Table VII and Figs. 17 to 22. For reference, a scatter band reported for axial-stress fatigue tests of round specimens for the strongest alloy, 7075-T6, is shown on each plot. Also, the average S-N curve from Fig. 17 for 7075-T6 specimens tested in the acidic salt-dichromate solution is shown on the plots for the other alloys. For each of the wrought alloys the results for the specimens tested in air tend to cluster about the lower bound of the scatter band. This is reasonable since it is common for rectangular specimens to give lower results than round specimens in the range of $10^5$ to $10^6$ cycles. The results for the rolled rod and forged specimens of the five alloys are equivalent. For lives beyond $10^6$ cycles the fatigue strengths of the cast CH70-T7 specimens are half or less than the strengths of the wrought products.

Testing these specimens in the acidic salt-dichromate solution dropped the fatigue strength of the wrought products by 50% or more. In this medium there is little difference between the results for the sand castings and the wrought materials. However, there does appear to be some advantage for alloys 7079-T6 and X7080-T7.

2. Fatigue Tests of Cylinders in Air

The results of the fatigue tests of cylinders tested in laboratory atmosphere with controlled humidity are listed in Tables VIII to XIII and plotted in Fig. 23. Clearly, the cast cylinders had the lowest fatigue strengths. There is substantial overlap of the lives obtained for the wrought cylinders stressed to 80% of design stress, but alloys 2014-T6 and 7075-T73 showed some advantage.

The maximum test pressure in the wrought cylinders which did not fail in six million cycles to 3,000 psi (30% of design stress) was increased to 5,000 psi; and for those cylinders which did not fail in eight million cycles to that pressure, the pressure was increased to 6,500 psi. To determine if the prior stressing affected the life, one of the 7075-T6 and one of the 7075-T73 cylinders, having such a history, were tested to failure.
at 8,000 psi. The lives of these specimens were greater than those of virgin specimens of these alloys tested at 8,000 psi. Obviously, the prior life was not detrimental. For the lower test pressures alloy 7079-T6 had the shortest lives and 7075-T73 the longest.

If the above comparisons were made on the basis of maximum net stress, as on a normal stress-cycle plot, the evaluation would be altered somewhat. Because the sand cast specimens were the lowest stressed, the advantage of the wrought products would be greater. The advantage of alloy 7075-T73 would be reduced since it was the lowest stressed of the wrought alloys.

3. Static Stress-Corrosion Tests of Cylinders

The two 7075-T6 cylinders subjected to hydrostatic pressures of 8,000 psi (80% of design) failed by stress corrosion after 7 and 8 days' exposure to the simulated seacoast environment. One of these failures is pictured in Fig. 24a. Neither of the 7075-T73 cylinders failed in 15 months. Thus, these tests confirm that alloy 7075-T73 is highly resistant to stress corrosion.

4. Stress-Corrosion-Fatigue Tests of Cylinders in Simulated Seacoast Environment

As is listed in Tables VIII to XIII, both stress-corrosion and fatigue failures occurred in the cylinders subjected to repeated loading in the simulated seacoast environment. The lives for the various alloys are compared in Tables XIV and XV and in Fig. 25. For alloys 7079-T6, 2014-T6 and 7075-T6, failures occurred by stress-corrosion cracking at a pressure of 8,000 psi after fewer than 1/10 as many loadings as required to cause fatigue failures in the tests in air. Thus, their lives were much shorter than those of alloys 7075-T73, X7080-T7 and CH70-T7 which failed by fatigue. The longest lives were for alloy 7075-T73.

The fatigue lives of the 7075-T73 and X7080-T7 cylinders pressurized to 80% of design stress in the simulated seacoast environment are about half the lives of specimens tested in air. Because the failures of these specimens initiated on the inside surface, the difference is obviously not a result of the salt spray. Apparently, it is a result of the 5.4 min. hold time in the load cycle. The fact that the one 7075-T73 cylinder pressurized along with those being sprayed, but not itself sprayed, had a life only slightly longer than those being sprayed adds credence to this conclusion. The hold times did not reduce the lives of the cast cylinders. Many of the specimens subjected to the hold time at
80% of design stress had multiple fatigue origins, whereas only a single origin was visible in the fracture surfaces of the wrought specimens subjected to the uninterrupted sinusoidal loadings.

Two of the 7075-T6 forged cylinders pressurized to 50% of design stress failed at a life less than 1% of that at which the sinusoidal tests were stopped without any failure of the 7075 specimens. The lives of most of the X7080-T7 cylinders were also surprisingly short. Because the failures of these short-lived specimens initiated on an inside surface, the short lives must be a result of the load cycle rather than corrosion. However, stress-corrosion cracking did occur in all three cylinders from 2014-T6 forgings and in two of the 7079-T6 cylinders from rolled rod. At the longer lives, most of the fatigue failures initiated externally at corrosion pits. Four of six 7075-T73 cylinders survived 1,000,000 or more pressurizations to this stress level; only one other specimen, a 2014-T6 cylinder of rolled rod stock, survived this many loadings.

Overall, the best cylinder performance in the corrosion-fatigue, as well as air-fatigue tests, was obtained with alloy 7075-T73. Second rating should probably go to alloy X7080-T7 because it was more resistant to stress-corrosion than alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6 and 7079-T6. The cast alloy would rate ahead of alloys 7079-T6 and 7075-T6 in the corrosion-fatigue tests.

The parting plane of the forgings was a common location of failure of the cylinders. Eighteen of 29 failures of the forged specimens tested in laboratory air initiated in a parting plane. For the forgings tested in the simulated seacoast environment, the corrosion fatigue or stress-corrosion origins were usually in a parting plane. Some of the specimens had many stress-corrosion cracks in the region of the parting plane. However, the rolled rod stock, which does not contain a parting plane, was only slightly more resistant to stress-corrosion cracking than were the die forgings.

5. Fatigue Tests of C-Rings in Air

The results of the C-ring tests in laboratory air (50 ±5% humidity) are listed in Tables XVI to XXI and plotted in Fig. 26. As for the cylinders, the CH70-T7 rings were the only ones to fail at a stress of 30% of design stress; however, at 80% of design stress the cast C-rings had lives as long as most of the wrought specimens. Generally, the results of the C-rings do not correspond very well with those of the cylinders. Typically the lives of the C-rings were on the order of ten times those of the cylinders though this ratio varied substantially for different alloys. The X7080-T7 C-rings stressed to 80% of design stress had extraordinarily long lives. However, shorter
lives were obtained at a stress of 65% of design stress for two specimens which had previously been stressed to 30 and 50% of design stress. An X7080-T7 specimen subjected to the same lower stresses had a short life when stressed to 80% of design stress. The life of a 7075-T73 specimen having a similar load history was within the wide scatter of specimens stressed only to 80% of design stress.

At stresses of 65% of design stress the large scatter in the lives for 7079-T6 and X7080-T7 rings encompasses the relatively short lives of alloy 2014-T6 and the longer lives of alloy 7075-T73.

6. C-Ring Stress-Corrosion Tests

The results of the stress-corrosion tests of static-loaded C-rings are given in Tables XXII to XXIV. A comparison of the stress levels resulting in failures is made in Fig. 27 for the die forgings and the casting and in Fig. 28 for the rolled rod stock.

Because the C-ring specimens were stressed in bending to a constant deflection, it was possible that the occurrence of many tiny cracks would cause sufficient stress relaxation to prevent obvious, visible cracking. Consequently, specimens that did not show visible cracks were examined metallographically to determine whether or not they contained minute cracks. Examples where metallographic examination revealed minute stress-corrosion cracks are shown in Figs. 29 - 31.

These tests are significant from two aspects:

(1) they establish the resistance to stress-corrosion cracking of the actual lots of material involved in the contract; and

(2) they put the special environment developed for the corrosion-fatigue tests in perspective with an actual seacoast exposure and with a well known accelerated test medium.

a. Stress-Corrosion Resistance of Contract Materials

The results obtained in all three environments are in good agreement with prior experience on the products and alloys involved.
Perhaps the obvious observation is that, for susceptible alloys and tempers, the short-transverse grain structure in the parting plane of die forgings is more critical than is the less directional, transverse grain structure in the rolled rod. This is indicated to some extent by failure times in alternate immersion (Table XXII) but is more apparent from the levels of stress causing failures in the other two environments (compare Figs. 27 and 28).

As expected, alloys 7075-T73 and CH70-T7 were the most resistant to stress-corrosion cracking; even at the highest stress no failures occurred in any environment. The next most resistant alloy was X7080-T7 for which the only failures were die forged specimens at the 80% stress level (34.6 ksi) in the simulated seacoast environment (Fig. 27). It should be pointed out that the alternate immersion test is not the most discriminating stress-corrosion cracking test for alloy X7080 and that three to five years of atmospheric exposure are required to define susceptibility to stress-corrosion cracking with reasonable confidence.

The other three alloys, 2014-T6, 7075-T6 and 7079-T6, were susceptible at all stress levels in the alternate immersion test and at the high stresses in the other two environments. In the simulated and actual seacoast environments 2014-T6 was slightly more resistant than the other two alloys.

b. Simulated Seacoast Environment

The intent of the special acidic-salt spray environment was to simulate, under reproducible laboratory conditions, exposure to seacoast atmosphere, which is one of the most potent stress-corrosion cracking media of commonly encountered, natural environments. If successful, such a test medium has the advantage of: (a) permitting frequent inspection of the specimens; and (b) eliminating seasonal climatic variations.

The stress-corrosion cracking data on the static-loaded C-rings (Tables XXII to XXIV and Figs. 27 and 28) show good agreement between the stress levels at which failure occurred in the simulated and natural seacoast environments; both of these environments were somewhat less severe than alternate immersion. It was hoped that the simulated environment would be somewhat accelerated over the natural atmosphere. Unfortunately, the inspection periods at the Point Judith station were not frequent enough to provide a precise comparison. The ranges in failure times available, however, show appreciably quicker failures in the simulated environment only for the 7075-T6 and 7079-T6.
die forged specimens at the 80 and 55% stress levels and the X7080-T7 and 2014-T6 die forgings at the 80% stress. For all other cases, either no failure has occurred or failure times are similar.

It was hoped that the stress-corrosion cracking failure times in the simulated environment would be such that there would be opportunity for both stress-corrosion and corrosion-fatigue mechanisms of failure to be operative at the particular loading cycles employed in the corrosion fatigue tests. However, because stress-corrosion cracking failure times vary with both applied stress and alloy, this objective cannot be attained without adjustment of the loading cycle for individual alloy and stress conditions.

As shown by Fig. 32, the depth and extent of general pitting attack in the simulated environment was similar to that in seacoast atmosphere. In both these media numerous shallow pits developed that resulted in a general roughened or "weathered" surface condition. In contrast, the alternate immersion test caused deeper and discrete sites of attack.

7. Stress-Corrosion-Fatigue Tests of C-Rings in Simulated Seacoast Environment

The results of the fatigue tests of C-rings in the simulated seacoast environment are included in Tables XVI to XXI and summarized in Tables XXV and XXVI. Alloy 7079-T6 C-rings had the shortest lives at a stress of 80% of design stress. The lives of the other alloys overlapped, with the 7075-T73 specimens tending to have the longest lives. The lives of the CH70-T7 C-rings were longer than most of the C-rings from the forgings and rolled rods. Generally, the C-rings from the forgings had shorter lives than those of the rod. The fact that most of the failures occurred in the midwidth of the C-rings is consistent with the stress being higher there than at the edges.

The reduction in life was less for the C-rings stressed to 50% of design stress than for any of the other tests in the salt spray. This is probably due to the fact that the hold time (4.8 sec) was least for these tests. The lives of two of the forged 7075-T6 specimens were within the scatter of results for the specimens tested in laboratory air. The lives of the cast specimens were shorter than those of all but two wrought specimens. Alloys 7079-T6 and 7075-T6 would rate lowest of the wrought alloys in these tests.
8. Comparison of Stress-Corrosion Tests

Table XXVII compares the time to produce stress-corrosion failure in several types of tests. For the rolled rod specimens, and to a lesser degree for the forged specimens, the times required to produce failure in the corrosion-fatigue tests of C-rings were generally less than those of the statically loaded C-rings tested in the same environment.

Figure 33 is an interaction diagram, which compares the stress-corrosion, corrosion-fatigue, and fatigue results for the 7075-T6 and 7075-T73 cylinders pressurized to 80% of design stress. The points on the horizontal line are the results of fatigue tests in laboratory air, which were run at 20 cpm; the diagonal line is for the stress-corrosion-fatigue tests in the simulated seacoast environment, and the vertical line shows the results of static stress-corrosion tests in the simulated seacoast environment. The advantage of alloy 7075-T73 in the simulated seacoast environment is obvious. As was discussed previously, the 7075-T73 cylinders tested at 0.15 cpm failed from the interior surface so the reduction in life for these specimens was apparently a result of the hold time in the cycle.

Figure 34a shows a similar plot for the 7075-T6 C-rings and cylinders. The fatigue lives obtained for the cylinders and C-rings tested in laboratory air overlap but in the stress-corrosion tests the C-rings lasted several times as long as the cylinders. Surprisingly, the 7075-T6 C-rings tested at 1.5 cpm in corrosive environment did not suffer any reduction in fatigue life. More typical behavior is shown in Fig. 34b for 7079-T6 C-rings and cylinders.

As noted on Fig. 34a and 34b, a 7075-T6 C-ring and a 7079-T6 C-ring that were inspected after failure showed evidence of both stress-corrosion and fatigue, whereas the cylinders that were likewise inspected gave evidence only of stress corrosion. This difference is consistent with the different rates of loading used, as reflected by the location on the chart of the lines corresponding to the cylinder and C-ring tests. For a given time of exposure, the cylinders were not subjected to as many fatigue cycles.

There are other differences between the cylinder and C-ring test conditions which may account for the lack of correlation in the test results. For one thing, as mentioned previously, the cylinders were tested under constant load while
the C-ring test was a constant deformation-type test, so that the load (stress) relaxed as a crack propagated through the thickness. In addition, the state of stress was not the same in the two tests: in the cylinder the ratio of hoop to longitudinal stress was 2:1; while in the C-ring the hoop stress was about 6 times the transverse stress. Also, the entire periphery of the cylinder was stressed uniformly while only a small area of the C-ring was stressed to the maximum level. This is believed to be significant because salt buildup occurred predominantly on upward surfaces and the region of maximum stress in the C-rings was in the vertical plane. Finally, the salt buildup was not uniform in the C-ring test chambers. A modification of the C-ring equipment to provide more uniform wetting of the specimens would be desirable.


Of the 102 cylinders subjected to cyclic loading in various environments, complete fractures of the entire 8-in. length of test section were obtained in 71. In these a fatigue or stress-corrosion crack, or a combination of the two grew in size to the point where unstable crack growth resulted in fracture. Table XXVIII shows the shape and measured principal dimensions of the cracks in specimens tested in air. This type of data, together with the average hoop tensions producing failure and the average transverse values of \( K_c \) from Table V, were used to analyze those fractures which took place by unstable crack growth.

The fracture-mechanics analysis was made using the procedures described in Ref. 6. The stress intensity at fracture, \( K_{IF} \), was calculated from the relationship

\[
K_{IF} = (1.1) \sqrt{\pi} \frac{a}{Q} \sigma \sqrt{a/Q}
\]

where
- \( \sigma \) = average (through-the-thickness) gross-section circumferential stress in the cylinder wall at maximum pressure, ksi
- \( a \) = maximum depth of part-through crack at instability, in.
- \( Q = \phi^2 - 0.212 \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{YS}} \right)^2 \)
- \( \phi \) = complete elliptical integral of the second kind in which \( a/2c \) is the argument
\[ \sigma_{YS} = \text{tensile yield strength, ksi} \]

\[ 2a = \text{maximum length of part-through crack, in.} \]

By assuming that \( K_c \) should be equal to the known value of \( K_Ic \), the fracture conditions can be predicted for a particular crack size or operating stress, as either:

\[ \frac{a}{Q} = \frac{1}{1.21w} \left( \frac{K}{Q} \right)^2, \text{ or} \]

\[ \sigma = \frac{K_{Ic}}{(1.21 \pi a/Q)^{1/2}} \]

The calculations were based on the assumption that the analysis of part-through cracks under plane-strain conditions was appropriate. It is recognized that the analysis is not strictly applicable in many cases because the depth of the crack exceeded one-half the wall thickness; where this occurred, the ligament between the crack tip and the opposite wall was probably too thin to maintain plane-strain conditions, hence, some type of mixed mode or plane-stress failure would be expected. Another simplification was the use of the average stress on the wall; it is recognized that the circumferential stresses were not uniform through the wall thickness and, in fact, stresses at the inner surface may have been as much as 30 per cent greater than those at the exterior surface. Finally, no correction factors were applied to compensate for other geometrical effects (i.e., bending curvature, or multiple cracks). These simplifications are controversial to some extent, so the raw data for the wrought alloys are included in Table XXIX.

The results of the analyses are shown in Table XXIX. In general, the values of stress intensity at fracture, \( K_{Ic} \), agreed reasonably well with the \( K_{Ic} \) values, independent of the nature of the cracks. Average \( K_{Ic} \) values ranged from 14 per cent below to 14 per cent above the \( K_{Ic} \) values, with individual values from 28 per cent below to 31 per cent above \( K_{Ic} \). While the \( K_{Ic} \) values were about evenly split above and below the \( K_{Ic} \) values, there was a trend for the \( K_{Ic} \) value to be below \( K_{Ic} \) when the cyclic stress was relatively low, and above \( K_{Ic} \) when the cyclic stress was relatively high.

Overall, these computations indicate that the fracture-mechanics analysis does a fair job of analyzing the conditions under which fractures developed in these cylinders, particularly when one considers that prior to the advent of fracture mechanics there was no analytical way to make such calculations. The differences observed may be related as much to problems in measuring \( K_{Ic} \) accurately as to shortcomings of the analysis.
An additional point to be made is the fact that no unstable fractures developed for 07%O-T?]0 alloys with the highest indicated transverse fracture toughness (Kt = 33 kai/IRR). Instead failures were by leakage through cracks. The computed stress intensities, Kt, for some of these cracks were about 30 kai/IRR. Thus the fact that no unstable fractures developed is further support for the usefulness of Kt to judge whether fracture would be expected by leakage or unstable fracture.

10. Metallographic Examinations

Metallographic examinations of selected samples were made: (1) to determine the type of failure; (2) to characterize the various fracture modes; and (3) to determine the degree of interaction between fatigue and corrosion as represented by the features of fracture surfaces. This work involved visual examination, light microscope examinations of sections polished and etched by conventional procedures, transmission electron microscope (TEM) examinations using the standard oxide replica technique, and direct examination of fracture surfaces with the scanning electron microscope (SEM). Examinations were concerned primarily with cylinder and O-ring specimens exposed to the simulated seacoast environment. Some examinations were made of cylinder specimens fatigued in air, and special comparisons were made to determine the effects on fracture appearance of specimen life in the corrosion-fatigue test.

a. Cylinders Exposed to Simulated Seacoast Environment at 80% of Design Stress

The group of specimens selected for examination consisted primarily of corrosion-fatigue specimens from forgings and rod of 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and 2014-T6 alloys, forged X7080-T7 and cast CH70-T7. Fractures, extending the full length of the test section, occurred after only a small portion of the cross sectional area had been penetrated (Fig. 24). With 7079-T6 cylinders, failures initiated on the outer surface and resulted from the development of a single crack (Fig. 38). There was a gradual transition from the cracked region (slow fracture) to the region of rapid tension failure (fast fracture) (Fig. 39). In 2014-T6 and 7075-T6 cylinders, in which fracture also initiated on the outer surface, the fracture surface included many cracks, and the areas of slow and fast fracture could be readily distinguished (Fig. 40). With these two alloys, there were also many small auxiliary cracks adjacent and parallel to the main fracture (Figs. 41 and 42). Fractures in the X7080-T7 and CH70-T7 samples initiated on the inner surface of the cylinders and appeared similar to those shown in Figs. 37 and 38.

Light microscope examinations were made as an aid in establishing the fracture type in cylinders from 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and 2014-T6 forgings. Little information could be gained from cross sections of the fracture surface and, since the 7079-T6 specimens had no auxiliary cracks, the failure of 7079-T6 could
not be diagnosed by this means. With the 2014-T6 and 7075-T6 cylinders, however, sections of auxiliary cracks indicated the fracture mode. In both 2014-T6 and 7075-T6 specimens auxiliary cracks followed an intergranular and interfragmentary path and had no transgranular segments which would suggest fatigue cracking (Figs. 43 and 44). In addition, the auxiliary cracks followed the directionality of the microstructure which was at a considerable angle to the direction of maximum stress. These features are strong indication that the failures were primarily the result of stress corrosion.

Examinations were also made of sections of the auxiliary cracks in the 7075-T6 cylinders stressed under constant pressure and exposed to the simulated seacoast environment (stress-corrosion test). These cracks also developed along intergranular and interfragmentary paths and followed the directionality of the microstructure (Fig. 45). The similarity between these cracks and those in the corrosion-fatigue cylinders indicated that failures in the corrosion-fatigue test were primarily the result of stress corrosion rather than fatigue.

Light microscope examinations were also made of cross sections of auxiliary cracks in cylinder specimens from 7075-T6 and 2014-T6 rod (there were no auxiliary cracks in 7079-T6 specimens). All cracks followed intergranular or interfragmentary paths (Fig. 46). While the crack path was the same in specimens from forgings and rod, crack propagation was more difficult in the rod material because the pronounced microstructural directionality of the forging was absent. This accounts for the longer lives encountered with specimens from rod when the failure mode was stress-corrosion cracking.

In addition to the visual and light microscope examinations, fracture surfaces in the slow-fracture region were examined with the scanning electron microscope (SEM). In cylinder specimens from forgings and rod of 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and 2014-T6 from the corrosion-fatigue tests and of forged 7075-T6 from the stress-corrosion test, all fractures had a faceted appearance characteristic of stress corrosion, with cracks and corrosion penetrating along grain and fragment boundaries (Figs. 47 - 50). A thorough search was made of the slow fracture regions of these corrosion-fatigue specimens, looking particularly for striations and other features indicative of fatigue fracture. None were found. Thus, the cracking was by the stress-corrosion mode until the sample could no longer sustain the load and sudden failure occurred.

Fracture in the X7080-T6 cylinder, which initiated on the inner surface, was characterized by a distinct ray pattern at the initiation point and striations in other areas of the slow-fracture region (Fig. 51) both of which are characteristic of fatigue failure. Fracture in CH70-T7 also initiated on the inside of the cylinder and was, therefore, of the fatigue type, although typical fatigue markings were not prominent.
In a further characterization of fracture appearance, specimens from forgings of 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and 2014-T6 subjected to the fatigue and corrosion-fatigue test and of 7075-T6 exposed to the stress-corrosion test (constant load) were examined with the TEM, using oxide replica techniques. For the corrosion-fatigue specimens, the slow-fracture region had a faceted appearance of the type shown in Fig. 52. This was in sharp contrast to the dimpled surface seen in the fast-fracture region (Fig. 53), which is characteristic of tensile fracture. It also differed greatly from the striation patterns characteristic of the fatigue fractures (Fig. 54). The slow-fracture region of the 7075-T6 specimen in the stress-corrosion test also showed the faceted appearance (Fig. 55). This confirms the conclusion that the failures of these cylinders in the corrosion-fatigue test were solely of the stress-corrosion variety.

b. Cylinders Exposed to Simulated Seacoast Environment at 50% of Design Stress

Metallographic examinations were made of the fracture of cylinders of all products in which failures initiated on the outside (7079 rod and forgings of 2014-T6 and 7075-T6), and of 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and X7080-T7 cylinders having inside fracture origins. The fracture of the shortest lived 2014-T6 specimen had a granular appearance throughout the slow-fracture region, and auxiliary cracks followed an intergranular path (Fig. 56). Failure was therefore of the stress-corrosion type. The fractures of a 7075-T6 and two 7079-T6 cylinders had a granular appearance at the crack initiation point (Figs. 57 and 58) but ray patterns (Fig. 57) and striations elsewhere. It was concluded that these failures were of the fatigue type, initiating at stress-corrosion cracks. The failures of some of the longer lived specimens initiated at corrosion pits.

The cylinders having inside origins were of 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and X7080-T7. All had ray patterns from the origin as well as fatigue striations away from the origin and were typical fatigue fractures. Their appearance was of the type shown in Fig. 51.

c. C-Rings Exposed to Simulated Seacoast Environment at 80% of Design Stress

Metallographic examinations were also made of C-ring specimens from forgings of 7079-T6, 7075-T6, X7080-T7 and 2014-T6 alloys. As has been described previously, these specimens were taken so that the most highly stressed region in the C-ring was at the parting plane of the forging. Thus, the stress was in the short transverse direction with respect to the microstructure, the most critical situation as regards stress-corrosion cracking.
Scanning electron microscope examinations of fracture surfaces showed a purely stress-corrosion fracture in the one sample of 2014-T6 examined. The fracture initiation region had a very granular appearance and the ray pattern that has been generally characteristic of fatigue was absent (Fig. 59a). Elsewhere, the faceted appearance and intergranular penetration typical of stress corrosion was evident (Fig. 59b).

In contrast, fracture surfaces showed a very definite mixture of fracture modes in 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and X7080-T7 alloys. At the fracture initiation points, ray patterns characteristic of fatigue fracture were apparent but they were frequently rather indistinct and had a granular appearance (Fig. 60a). In areas primarily in the early fracture region, but not exclusively in such regions, areas having the distinct features of stress-corrosion cracking were apparent (Fig. 60b). In other regions, generally more prevalent toward the end of the slow-fracture region, the striation patterns typical of fatigue were found, (Fig.60c). Thus, at high magnifications, there were no visible indications of interaction between the two fracture modes. The change in the appearance of the ray pattern at the fracture initiation point, however, is definite evidence of interaction.

Additional evidence of the mixed-fracture mode was seen in light microscope cross sections of auxiliary cracks in C-rings of 7075-T6 and X7080-T7. These examinations were complicated by the fact that the alloys were unrecrystallized and either fatigue or stress-corrosion cracks would develop in the same general direction. At relatively low magnification (Fig. 61) the mixed modes are suggested, and at higher magnification, separate areas in which cracking followed intergranular and transgranular paths were observed.

d. C-Rings Exposed to Simulated Seacoast Environment at 50% of Design Stress

Metallographic examinations in this group were concerned only with the stress-corrosion-susceptible alloys 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and 2014-T6. In the 7079-T6 specimens examined, considerable corrosion of the fracture surface made diagnosis uncertain. It appeared, however, that failure was of the mixed-mode type, as had been the case at the higher stress level. With the 7075-T6 and 2014-T6 specimens, failures were definitely of the mixed-mode type, showing an indistinct ray pattern near the origin and separate areas of intergranular faceted fracture and fatigue striations. Appearance was similar to that shown in Fig. 60.
e. Cylinders Fatigue Tested in Air

In the fatigue tests of cylinders in laboratory air at 50% relative humidity, it had been expected that failures would initiate on the inner surface because the stress was appreciably higher there than on the outer surface. In a number of specimens, however, failure initiated on the outside surface. SEM examinations were made to compare the surfaces of fractures initiating on the outer and inner surfaces. Fractures originating on the inner surface were characterized by ray patterns at the origin and pronounced striation patterns (Fig. 62). Some of those originating on the outer surface showed the same characteristics, indicating that they were of the fatigue variety and had presumably initiated at a stress raiser. Other fractures originating on the outer surface had a granular pattern at the origin and no semblance of a ray pattern (Fig. 63a). Away from the origin, however, these fractures showed the pronounced striations characteristic of fatigue (Fig. 63b). Thus, cracks of this type were substantially fatigue cracks having a stress-corrosion crack as their origin.

f. Effect of Cycle Rate and Waveform in Fatigue

Earlier in this report it was pointed out the hold period at maximum stress and the rate of cycling had an apparent effect on fatigue life. SEM examinations were made to determine whether this difference was reflected in fractographic features. For this comparison, two 7075-T73 cylinder specimens, both of which had failed from an inside origin, were selected. One had been stressed sinusoidally at a rate of 20 cycles per minute; the other had been stressed at 0.15 cycles per minute with a hold time at maximum stress of 5.4 minutes on each cycle. The appearance of the fractures at the origin and at approximately equal distances away from the origin is shown by Fig. 64. There is indication that the ray and striation patterns are more distinct with the combination of slower cycling rate and hold time, although more samples would have to be examined to determine whether this was the general case. Measurements indicate a somewhat faster propagation rate for the slow rate-hold time combination. This difference in striation spacing is roughly proportional to the fatigue lives of the specimens (22,000 vs 39,000).

g. Effect of Specimen Life in Corrosion-Fatigue Test on Fracture Appearance

In the corrosion-fatigue tests of cylinders stressed to 80% of design stress, most specimens of the stress-corrosion-
susceptible alloys 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and 2014-T6 failed after relatively short lives. All those examined failed by a purely stress-corrosion mode. To answer the question of whether fracture appearance differed with test life, special examinations were made of two cylinders from 2014-T6 rod having lives of 1573 and 18,920 cycles. The slow-fracture region of the short-lived specimen had a granular faceted appearance throughout, similar to that shown in Fig. 48. The long-term failure had primarily the same appearance, although because of the longer exposure, the grains near the origin were heavily pitted after the stress-corrosion crack had passed (Fig. 65a). Near the outer edge of the slow-fracture region, however, and just before ultimate failure, a few areas of fatigue striations were observed (Fig. 65b). While the two types of failure were found on this fracture, no interaction of one failure mode with the other was observed and the failure was judged to be of the stress-corrosion type.

h. Possible Stress-Corrosion-Fatigue Failure Mechanisms

The mixed mode failures suggest one mechanism by which stress-corrosion and fatigue can interact in a corrosion-fatigue test. A number of fractures initiated as stress-corrosion cracks and then changed to the mixed-mode type. These were characterized by regions having the features of either stress corrosion or fatigue without any other distinctive features that could be attributed to the combination of the two. Other investigations have shown that the propagation of stress-corrosion cracks is highly dependent on the directionality of grain structure with respect to the stressing direction. Combining these observations suggests that the mixed mode cracks were stress-corrosion cracks as long as a favorable grain orientation was available. When a region having unfavorable boundary orientation was encountered, the stress-corrosion crack would be stalled while it sought favorably oriented structure to either side of the difficult area. This would increase the local stress on this area and, with the cyclic stressing, fatigue action would breach the obstacle. Once the unfavorably oriented area had been passed, stress-corrosion cracking could resume.
The corrosion-fatigue and stress-corrosion performance of several high strength aluminum alloys was investigated by tests of hydraulic cylinders, C-rings and axial-stress fatigue specimens. Specimens were prepared from forgings and forging stock of alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6, 7075-T73, 7079-T6, and X7080-T7 and also from premium cast alloy CH70-T7. The cyclic loads of the cylinders and C-rings in the corrosion-fatigue tests were in the 0.15 to 10 cpm frequency range and included a hold time at load to allow time for stress corrosion to occur. The investigation led to the following principal conclusions for the tests in the corrosive environment.

1. In general, it was demonstrated that stress-corrosion cracking may occur under cyclic loading, especially at low frequencies, and that stress corrosion and fatigue can interact under certain conditions to produce failures in shorter times and fewer cycles than for either phenomenon occurring by itself.

2. Electron microscope examination indicated failures to be either pure stress corrosion, pure fatigue, one followed by the other, or mixtures of the two, depending on the alloy and temper, stress level, rate of cycling and conditions of exposure. Mixed mode failures generally started from stress-corrosion origins. Apparently, these cracks propagated by stress corrosion where the grains were favorably oriented and by fatigue in other areas.

3. Overall, alloy 7075-T73 gave the best performance; no stress-corrosion failures occurred in this alloy. The lives of forged cylinders loaded by cyclic internal pressure to 80% of design stress in a simulated seacoast environment were at least 10 times as long for 7075-T73 as for alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6, and 7079-T6.

4. Stress-corrosion cracking did not occur in any of the premium cast CH70-T7 specimens. Alloy X7080-T7 also demonstrated good resistance to stress-corrosion cracking, with no failures of this kind occurring under most test conditions.

5. All but one of the cylinders of alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6 and 7079-T6 that were cycled to 80% of design stress developed stress-corrosion failures. Stress corrosion also
occurred in some of the lower stressed cylinders and many of the C-rings of these alloys.

6. The static stress-corrosion tests of C-rings ranked the alloys in the following decreasing order of resistance to stress-corrosion cracking:

(1) 7075-T73, CH70-T7 (no failures)
(2) X7080-T7 (some failures at 80% of design stress)
(3) 2014-T6, 7075-T6, 7079-T6 (susceptible at 30, 55, and 80% of design stress)

This is also the general ranking obtained in the stress-corrosion-fatigue tests of cylinders except that alloy X7080-T7 ranked ahead of CH70-T6 in the cylinder tests.

7. Although the corrosion-fatigue tests of coupons did not rank the alloys in the same order as that obtained in the stress-corrosion-fatigue tests of cylinders, the results of this investigation suggest that for given service loading conditions a useful laboratory test using coupons could be developed.

The following observations, although not having a direct bearing on stress-corrosion-fatigue behavior, are also of interest:

1. Reducing frequency of loading and introducing a hold time at load reduced by 50% or more the fatigue lives of the wrought cylinders which failed by fatigue action. However, the difference in load cycle did not appear to affect the lives of the cast cylinders.

2. The fatigue failures of some of the 7079-T6 cylinders tested using sinusoidal loading in laboratory air appeared to develop from stress-corrosion cracks.

3. When tested in air, alloy CH70-T7 generally had significantly lower fatigue strengths than the wrought products, even though it performed better in stress-corrosion-fatigue than several of the wrought alloys.

4. For the die forgings the fracture-toughness values obtained in the transverse and longitudinal directions for alloys 7075-T6 and 7079-T6 were almost as high as those of 7075-T73.
and X7080-T7. Alloy 2014-T6 rated the lowest from a fracture-toughness standpoint. For transverse specimens the fracture toughness of the alloy CH70-T7 was higher than that of any of the wrought alloys.

5. The crack sizes (fatigue or stress-corrosion crack) which were associated with unstable fracture of the cylinders correlated well with values predicted from the fracture-toughness tests.

6. In the static stress-corrosion tests the simulated seacoast environment proved to be quite similar to actual seacoast atmosphere both as regards the stress levels causing failures and the extent of general corrosion.
SECTION VIII

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this investigation serve to emphasize the complex nature of the stress-corrosion, corrosion and fatigue interaction. It is proposed that additional work be done to provide more information on the stress-corrosion-fatigue behavior of high-strength aluminum alloys, as follows:

1. Additional tests of cylinders should be made to fill in some of the gaps in the results for the alloys evaluated in this investigation. These should include tests under a steady stress in a stress-corrosion environment of alloys 2014-T6, 7079-T6 and X7080-T7, for comparison with the results of stress-corrosion-fatigue tests reported herein. Additional cylinder tests should be made at higher loading rates in the corrosive environment to obtain more information on the interaction of corrosion and fatigue. The effect of loading rate on fatigue strength in laboratory air is also in question as a result of this investigation, and some additional tests should be made to provide further data on this point. Finally, a few tests should be made at different hold-times under stress in the fatigue cycle to determine whether the time to stress-corrosion failure under intermittent loading depends more on the time under stress or the total time in the corrosive environment.

2. Because the corrosion-fatigue tests of cylinders appeared to be effective in rating alloys in regards to performance of hydraulic cylinders in a relatively mild saline environment, additional tests of this nature should be made to evaluate new forging alloys such as 7175-T736, 7049-T73 and MA15-T7X.

3. The test of C-rings should be modified to provide more uniform specimen exposure and to obtain more rapid stress corrosion, with reduced local corrosion. With these alterations C-ring tests should provide an economical method of seeking answers to some of the following basic questions regarding the stress-corrosion-fatigue interaction:

A. What effect does the interaction of stress-corrosion mode of failure and fatigue mode of failure have on:
(1) Relationship between stress and cycles to failure in fatigue tests?

(2) Relationship between stress and time to failure in stress-corrosion tests?

B. In what range of cyclic loading conditions will stress-corrosion cracking occur?

C. Will some conditions of cyclic loading lower the threshold stress for stress-corrosion cracking obtained in static tests?

D. What effect does aging treatment have on above factors?
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Fig. 1 - Steps in processing of test cylinders from die forgings.
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KAHN TYPE TEAR TEST SPECIMEN
**THICKNESS, B, IN.**  
**WIDTH, W, IN.**  
**LENGTH, IN.**  
**CRACK LENGTH, \( a_t \), IN.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1/4</th>
<th>1/2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1/4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W-L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-W</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including at least 0.050 in. of fatigue crack

**NOTCH-BEND FRACTURE TOUGHNESS SPECIMEN**  
**FIGURE 3**
COMPACT TENSION FRACTURE TOUGHNESS SPECIMEN

FIGURE 4
FIG. 5. FRACTURE PATTERNS OF TEST SPECIMENS, SERIES 18 AND 19.

Pin-hole

Diagonal

Normal
PARTING LINE FOR DIE FORGINGS

SPECIMEN REQ'D.

ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA
ALCOA RESEARCH LABORATORIES
ENGINEERING DESIGN DIVISION

"C" RING SPECIMEN FOR HYDRAULIC CYLINDER FATIGUE & CORROSION TEST

IN CHG OF S.C.H. DESIGN
SCALE 1"=1" DRAWN S.GLOZIK

FIG 7
Residual stress distributions through cylinder wall were determined by means of "honing-out" method of measurement. Values at outer surface were determined from final readings taken after isolation of wall using containing "wet" resistance strain gages applied to cylinder specimens.

Fig. 8
AXIAL STRESS FATIGUE SPECIMEN FOR TESTS IN LABORATORY ATMOSPHERE OR SUBMERGED IN HIGHLY CORROSIVE LIQUID.

FIG. 9
FIG. 10. ARRANGEMENT OF CYLINDER FOR FATIGUE TEST IN CONTROLLED ENVIRONMENT (See Fig. 4 for closure cap thread detail)
FIG. 12. FACILITIES FOR FATIGUE TESTING OF HYDRAULIC CYLINDERS
FIG. 14. APPARATUS FOR FATIGUE TESTING C-RINGS IN CONTROLLED ENVIRONMENT
MACHINE FOR FATIGUE AND CORROSION-FATIGUE TESTS OF C-RINGS IN CONTROLLED ENVIRONMENT

Enclosures at bottom of rack are for stress-corrosion tests of C-rings in same environments.
Comparison of Measured and Calculated Stresses in C-Rings
Legend

- Rolled rod forging stock
- Die forging

Open symbols - specimen tested in ambient
Air
Solid symbols - specimen tested in acidic salt-
dichromate solution

R = 0.0

AXIAL STRESS FATIGUE TESTS
OF ALLOY 7075-T6

Fig. 18
FATIGUE LIVES OF CYLINDERS - NO CORROSIVE ENVIRONMENT
FIG. 24. FAILURE OF 7075-T6 DIE FORGED SPECIMEN #18 IN STATIC STRESS-CORROSION TESTS IN SIMULATED SEACOAST ENVIRONMENT

(8000 psi pressure; hoop stress on exterior = 29.8 ksi)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOY &amp; TEMPER</th>
<th>MAX. STRESS, KSI I.D.</th>
<th>(80% OF DESIGN) O.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-T6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T73</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFECT OF ENVIRONMENT ON FATIGUE LIFE OF HYDRAULIC CYLINDERS**
EFFECT OF ENVIRONMENT ON FATIGUE LIFE OF HYDRAULIC CYLINDERS

Fig. 25b
COMPARISON OF THE STRESS-CORROSION PERFORMANCE OF STATIC-LOADED C-RINGS FROM THE DIE FORGINGS AND CAST IN THREE CORROSIVE ENVIRONMENTS.

Fig. 27
COMPARISON OF THE STRESS-CORROSION PERFORMANCE OF STATIC-LOADED C-RINGS FROM THE ROLLED ROD STOCK IN THREE CORROSIVE ENVIRONMENTS.

Fig. 28
a Cross-section through C-ring from 2014-T6 rod stock, stressed to 80% of design stress after 44 days' exposure to alternate immersion. Many short stress corrosion cracks of the type illustrated were found. (X100)

b Higher magnification of region outlined above more clearly showing the intergranular nature of the cracking, which is typical of stress-corrosion cracking in aluminum alloys. (X500)

**STATIC STRESS-CORROSION CRACKING OF C-RING FROM 2014-T6 ROLLED ROD STOCK IN ALTERNATE IMMERSION TEST**

64  

Fig. 29
a Cross-section through C-ring from 7075-T6 rod stock, stressed to 80% of design stress after 44 days' exposure to alternate immersion. Many short stress corrosion cracks of the type illustrated were found. (X100)

b Higher magnification of region outlined above more clearly showing the intergranular nature of the cracking, which is typical of stress-corrosion cracking in aluminum alloys. (X500)

STATIC STRESS-CORROSION CRACKING OF C-RING FROM 7075-T6 ROLLED ROD STOCK IN ALTERNATE IMMERSION TEST
Cross-section through one of the C-rings from 7075-T6 die forging stressed to 30% design stress after 293 days' exposure to the simulated seacoast environment. These rings were removed from test because of exfoliation in the test region but microscopic examination showed small stress corrosion cracks were also present. (X100)

Higher magnification of region outlined above showing the crack is following an intergranular path, which is typical of stress-corrosion cracking in aluminum alloys. (X500)

STATIC STRESS-CORROSION CRACKING OF C-RING FROM 7075-T6 FORGING IN SIMULATED SEACOAST ENVIRONMENT
30 Days A. I.  
70 Days S. S. E.  
210 Days S. A.

Illustrates appearance of three C-rings from the 7075-T6 forging after exposure to 3.5% NaCl - alternate immersion, simulated seacoast environment and seacoast atmosphere at a stress of 55% design stress. Note that the corrosivity of the simulated seacoast environment is similar to the actual seacoast atmosphere causing a general roughening of the surface. In contrast, the alternate immersion test is more corrosive and develops discrete pits.

FIG. 32. TYPICAL STRESS-CORROSION FAILURES OF STATICALLY LOADED C-RINGS
STRESS-CORROSION-FATIGUE TESTS OF 7075-T6 AND 7075-T73 CYLINDERS

Maximum Stress = 80% of Design

Fig. 33
STRESS-CORROSION-FATIGUE TESTS OF 7075-T6 CYLINDERS AND C-RINGS

Maximum Stress = 80% of Design

Fig. 34a
STRESS-CORROSION-FATIGUE TESTS OF 7079-T6 CYLINDERS AND C-RINGS

Maximum Stress = 80% of Design
Fracture of 7079-T6 cylinder no. 7 resulting from fatigue crack propagating from outside surface (wall thickness 0.306 in.)
FRACTURE OF 7075 T73 CYLINDER NO. 7 RESULTING FROM FATIGUE CRACK PROPAGATING FROM INSIDE SURFACE (WALL THICKNESS 0.350 IN.)
FAILURES OF CH70-T7 CYLINDERS RESULTING FROM FATIGUE CRACKS PROPAGATING FROM INSIDE SURFACE (WALL THICKNESS 0.364 IN.)

Fig. 37
Figure 38

Longitudinal splitting of cylinder in corrosion-fatigue test. Single crack initiation site in 7079-T6 cylinder is indicated by arrow.
Single initiation site in Fig. 38 at higher magnification, showing gradual transition from slow-fracture to fast-fracture region (X5).

Figure 39

Multiple cracking sites and difference in appearance of slow and fast-fracture regions characteristic of 2014-T6 and 7075-T6 cylinders in corrosion-fatigue test (X5).

Figure 40
Multiple auxiliary cracks adjacent to main fracture in 7075-T6 corrosion-fatigue specimen (X30).

Figure 41

Multiple auxiliary cracks adjacent to main fracture in 2014-T6 corrosion-fatigue specimen (X30).

Figure 42
Intergranular and interfragmentary path of one of the auxiliary cracks (Fig. 42) in 2014-T6 cylinder in corrosion-fatigue test (X500).

Figure 43

Intergranular and interfragmentary path of auxiliary crack (Fig. 41) in 7075-T6 cylinder from corrosion-fatigue test (X500).

Figure 44
Intergranular and interfragmentary path of auxiliary crack in 7075-T6 cylinder from stress-corrosion test (X500).

Figure 45
Cross sections of auxiliary cracks in cylinders from rod exposed to corrosion-fatigue test (X500).

Figure 46
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Scanning electron micrograph (SEM) of fracture surface in slow-fracture region of 7079-T6 cylinder in corrosion-fatigue test (X1000).

Figure 47

SEM of fracture surface in slow-fracture region of 2014-T6 cylinder in corrosion-fatigue test (X1600).

Figure 48
SEM of fracture surface in slow-fracture region of 7075-T6 cylinder in corrosion-fatigue test (X900).

Figure 49

SEM of fracture surface in slow-fracture region of 7075-T6 cylinder in stress-corrosion test (X1000).

Figure 50
a Ray pattern at origin (X70)

b Fatigue striations (X2600)

SEM of slow-fracture surface (inside origin) of cylinder from X7080-T7 forging in corrosion fatigue test.

Figure 51
Transmission electron micrograph typical of fracture appearance in slow-fracture region of 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and 2014-T6 cylinder in corrosion-fatigue test (X15,000).

Figure 52
TEM showing dimpled rupture characteristic of tensile failure in fast-fracture region of cylinders in corrosion-fatigue test (X15,000).

Figure 53
TEM showing striations typical of fatigue failure in slow fracture region of cylinders in corrosion fatigue test (x15,000).

Figure 54
TEM showing faceted appearance of slow-fracture region of 7075-T6 cylinder in stress-corrosion test (X15,000).

Figure 55
Granular appearance of fracture and intergranular path of auxiliary crack in 2014-T6 cylinder.

Figure 56
Figure 57  Granular appearance at origin and adjoining ray pattern (X50).

Figure 58  Granular appearance at origin (X500).

Fracture appearance typical of 7079-T6 and 7075-T6 cylinders in corrosion fatigue test at 50% of design stress.
a Granular appearance at origin (X50)

b Faceted appearance and intergranular penetration (1000X).

SEM of fracture of C-Ring from 2014-T6 forging exposed in corrosion fatigue test.

Figure 59
a Indistinct ray pattern at origin (X20)

b Faceted, intergranular fracture (X500)

c Fatigue striations (X2000)

SEM typical of C-Rings from 7079-T6, 7075-T6 and X7080-T7 forgings exposed to corrosion-fatigue test.

Figure 60
Cross sections of auxiliary cracks in C-Rings indicating mixed fracture mode (X100).

Figure 61

91
SEM showing appearance typical of fractures having inside origin in cylinder subjected to fatigue in laboratory air.

Figure 62

92
a Granular appearance at origin (X280)

b Fatigue striations (X2400)
SEM showing appearance of fracture having outside origin in cylinder subjected to fatigue in laboratory air.

Figure 63
a Intergranular penetration and pitting on grain surfaces (X850).

b Fatigue striations near end of slow-fracture region (X1300).

SEM of fracture surface of cylinder from 2014-T6 rod having long life in corrosion-fatigue test.

Figure 65
95
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy and Temper</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Longitudinal</th>
<th>Transverse</th>
<th>Transverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tensile Yield</td>
<td>Tensile Yld</td>
<td>Tensile Yld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strength, %</td>
<td>Strength, %</td>
<td>Strength, %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in 3 to 5</td>
<td>in 3 to 5</td>
<td>in 3 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min 75 65 7</td>
<td>Min 75 65 7</td>
<td>Min 75 65 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Rolling**
  - **T974-74**
    - Rolled rod: 314975
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 79.4
        - Strength: 68.0
        - Long: 19.0
    - **Minimum**:
      - Tensile Yield: 76.8
      - Strength: 62.8
      - Long: 11.0

- **Die Forging**
  - **315023**
    - **Average**:
      - Tensile Yield: 80.0
      - Strength: 69.8
      - Long: 17.0
    - **Minimum**:
      - Tensile Yield: 74.6
      - Strength: 62.6
      - Long: 11.5

- **T974-T7**
  - **Rolled rod**
    - 314976
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 70.0
        - Strength: 67.0
        - Long: 12.0
      - **Minimum**:
        - Tensile Yield: 65.0
        - Strength: 60.0
        - Long: 7.0

  - **Die Forging**
    - 315024
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 78.0
        - Strength: 61.0
        - Long: 10.0
      - **Minimum**:
        - Tensile Yield: 70.0
        - Strength: 49.0
        - Long: 7.0

- **T954-74**
  - **Rolled rod**
    - 314977
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 77.0
        - Strength: 67.0
        - Long: 12.0
      - **Minimum**:
        - Tensile Yield: 71.0
        - Strength: 60.0
        - Long: 7.0

  - **Die Forging**
    - 315029
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 78.0
        - Strength: 67.0
        - Long: 12.0
      - **Minimum**:
        - Tensile Yield: 70.0
        - Strength: 60.0
        - Long: 7.0

- **A100-77**
  - **Rolled rod**
    - 314978
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 71.0
        - Strength: 64.0
        - Long: 12.0
      - **Minimum**:
        - Tensile Yield: 65.0
        - Strength: 60.0
        - Long: 7.0

  - **Die Forging**
    - 315049
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 71.0
        - Strength: 63.0
        - Long: 10.0
      - **Minimum**:
        - Tensile Yield: 65.0
        - Strength: 55.0
        - Long: 7.0

- **201-76**
  - **Rolled rod**
    - 314979
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 71.0
        - Strength: 64.0
        - Long: 12.0
      - **Minimum**:
        - Tensile Yield: 65.0
        - Strength: 60.0
        - Long: 7.0

  - **Die Forging**
    - 315021
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 71.0
        - Strength: 63.0
        - Long: 12.0
      - **Minimum**:
        - Tensile Yield: 65.0
        - Strength: 60.0
        - Long: 7.0

- **C150-T7**
  - **Premium casting**
    - 314944
      - **Average**:
        - Tensile Yield: 69.0
        - Strength: 62.0
        - Long: 7.0
      - **Minimum**:
        - Tensile Yield: 63.0
        - Strength: 57.0
        - Long: 5.0

**Notes:**
- Offset equals 0.2 per cent.
- Tangential specimens parallel to parting plane, if any.
- Tangential specimens perpendicular to parting plane.
- Mechanical property limits from Alcoa Aluminum Handbook (1967) where specified. Otherwise, minimums are tentative.
- Failed near end of gage length.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot No.</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Assumed</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Test Date</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
<th>Drift Date</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
<th>Drift Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>Rolling</td>
<td>A205</td>
<td>B128</td>
<td>B128</td>
<td>2023-01-01</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2023-01-01</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2023-01-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Rolling</td>
<td>A205</td>
<td>B128</td>
<td>B128</td>
<td>2023-01-02</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2023-01-02</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2023-01-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Rolling</td>
<td>A205</td>
<td>B128</td>
<td>B128</td>
<td>2023-01-03</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2023-01-03</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2023-01-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Offsets equal 0.2 percent.
* Drift dates in direction of loading.
* Drift dates plus minus.
* Drifts past slightly displaced.
* Drifts past changed direction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All and Temper</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Specimen Number</th>
<th>Longitudinal (1-V, Axial)</th>
<th>Transverse (V-U, Tangential) 90° or Parallel Plane</th>
<th>Transverse (V-U, Tangential) Across Parting Plane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original Thickness, Length, Span, $K_T$</td>
<td>Meaningful* $K_T$</td>
<td>Original Thickness, Length, Span, $K_T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in., s, in.</td>
<td>$\text{ksi} \cdot \text{in.}$</td>
<td>in., s, in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-5.76 Rolled Rod</td>
<td>314975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-9.76 Rolled Rod</td>
<td>314977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17000-T7 Rolled Rod</td>
<td>314979</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6 Rolled Rod</td>
<td>315001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH50-T7 Premium Casting</td>
<td>135004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Judged from compliance with criteria in ASTM Method E199-77, with minor deviations as covered by notes below:

(a) Crack length slightly outside tolerance: $a < 0.5(K_T^0)^{0.5}$.
(b) Specimen not quite thick enough to insure plane-stress conditions: $h < 0.5(K_T^0)^{0.5}$.
(c) Slightly excessive yielding prior to 5% mean offset.
(d) Fatigue crack front curvature slightly greater than specified; $q_{0.5}$ documented.
(e) Stress intensity during fatigue cracking slightly higher than presently recommended; $K_T^0 = X + 0.2K_T^0$.

$K_T^0$ is the candidate value of $K_T$ from the fracture toughness test, which must meet certain criteria concerning achievement of cracking under plane-stress conditions before it can be assigned $K_T^0$ designation.
### TABLE IV
RESULTS OF PLANE-STRAIN FRACTURE TOUGHNESS TESTS OF COMPACT TENSION SPECIMENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy and Temper</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Specimen Number</th>
<th>Transverse (W-L, Tangential); 90° From Parting Plane</th>
<th>Transverse (W-L, Tangential); Across Parting Plane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specimen Number</td>
<td>Thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 in.</td>
<td>4 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>315003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-T6</td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>315022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7080-T7</td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>315099</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>315021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T73</td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>315024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7070-T7</td>
<td>Premium Casting</td>
<td>314004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Judged from compliance with criteria in ASTM Method E399-70T, with minor deviations as covered by notes below:

(a) Crack length slightly outside tolerance; a < 2.5(Ea/σb)².
(b) Specimen not quite thick enough to insure plane-strain conditions; b < 2.5(Ea/σb)².
(c) Slightly excessive yielding prior to 5% percent offset.
(d) Fatigue crack front curvature slightly greater than specified: e36 R.
(e) Stress intensity during fatigue cracking slightly higher than presently recommended; 0.6Ea = K ≈ 1.95Ea.

* K in the candidate value of Eaq from the fracture toughness chart, which must meet certain criteria concerning achievement of cracking under plane-strain conditions before it can be assigned Eaq designation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy and Temper</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Plane-Strain Fracture Toughness, $K_{IC}$, ksi/In.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L-W Notch Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>Rolled Rod</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-T6</td>
<td>Rolled Rod</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7080-T7</td>
<td>Rolled Rod</td>
<td>(&gt;30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>(&gt;30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>Rolled Rod</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T73</td>
<td>Rolled Rod</td>
<td>(&gt;35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die Forging</td>
<td>(&gt;35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH70-T7</td>
<td>Premium Casting</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values in parentheses are best engineering estimates of $K_{IC}$ from tests in which entirely meaningful results were not obtained. Other values are average results of meaningful values presented in Table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy</th>
<th>Tensile Strength(^a), ksi</th>
<th>Design Stress, ksi (2/3 (F_{tu}))</th>
<th>Cylinder Dimensions(^c), in.</th>
<th>Hoop Tension(^d), ksi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.D.</td>
<td>wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Die Forged</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-26</td>
<td>71(^a)</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>3.101</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-173</td>
<td>62(^a)</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>3.201</td>
<td>0.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-10</td>
<td>70(^a)</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7080-T7</td>
<td>65(^b)</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>3.161</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>64(^a)</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>3.177</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Premium Cast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch70-T7</td>
<td>60(^b)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.229</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Specified minimum values for transverse specimens, Ref. 7.
\(^b\) Tentative minimum for transverse specimens.
\(^c\) Dimensions apply to cylinders machined from rolled rod as well as from die forgings.
\(^d\) Based on formulas for thick-wall cylinders.
\(^e\) 80% of design stresses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table VII. Results of Serial Colony Plate Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serial Dilution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Values represent colony counts. NaI = Sodium Iodide

**Table VIII. Results of Serial Colony Plate Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Serial Dilution</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dilution</strong></th>
<th><strong>Neutralized</strong></th>
<th><strong>Non-NaI</strong></th>
<th><strong>NaI</strong></th>
<th><strong>Neutralized</strong></th>
<th><strong>Non-NaI</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7075-76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Values represent colony counts. NaI = Sodium Iodide
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cylinder Spec.</th>
<th>Fatigue Loading</th>
<th>Max. Stress, No. of Cycles</th>
<th>Description of Failure</th>
<th>Type Initiation</th>
<th>Position(1)</th>
<th>Parting Plane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lab Air</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>22,800 Fatigue Inside - No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>Fatigue Inside - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40,800</td>
<td>Fatigue Inside - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54,300(1)</td>
<td>Fatigue Inside - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seacoast</strong></td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>889 SCC(6) Outside 2:00 Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seacoast</strong></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>2,760 SCC(6) Outside 1:00 - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lab Air</strong></td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>505,100 Fatigue(6) Outside - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seacoast</strong></td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>212,400 SCC-Fatigue(6) Outside 8:30 Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seacoast</strong></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>971,000 Fatigue(6) Outside(9) 7:30 - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lab Air</strong></td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>6,000,610 None -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Circulating laboratory air at 50 ±1% relative humidity.
(2) Specimen coupons subjected to 1-in. injections of warm salt mist at 1-hr intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in (1).
(3) For tests in seacoast environment, cycle ambiently between minimum pressure of 400 to 600 psig and maximum indicated. For tests in seacoast environment pressure held at maximum indicated for 80% of cycle time, then dropped sinusoidally to minimum of 200 to 400 psig.
(4) For tests in seacoast environment, salt buildup and corrosion product was heaviest on top side of specimen (i.e., 12 o'clock position).
(5) Not included in log mean life.
(6) Based on metallographic examination, others on visual appearance.
(7) Prior at corrosion 120.

*Specimens had prior loading history, as indicated.*
## RESULTS OF FATIGUE TESTS OF HYDRAULIC CYLINDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cylinder Type</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Fatigue Life (hrs)</th>
<th>Max. Stress (psi)</th>
<th>Description of Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air(1)</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Coast(2)</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Coast</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Inside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Inside(?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maximum Stress x 10 of Design Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cylinder Type</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Fatigue Life (hrs)</th>
<th>Max. Stress (psi)</th>
<th>Description of Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Inside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Coast</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Inside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Inside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Coast</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Inside(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Fatigue(?) Outside(?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maximum Stress x 100 of Design Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cylinder Type</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Fatigue Life (hrs)</th>
<th>Max. Stress (psi)</th>
<th>Description of Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(1) Circulating laboratory air at 50 ± 5% relative humidity.
(2) Specimen enclosures subjected to 1-min. injections of warm salt mist at 15-min intervals. Air balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in (1).
(3) For tests in laboratory air hydraulic pressure cycled sinusoidally between minimum pressure of 30 to 400 psi and maximum indicated for 80% of cycle time, then dropped sinusoidally to minimum of 200 to 400 psi.
(4) For tests in sea coast environment, salt fog test and corrosion product was heaviest on top side of specimen (3 to 6 o'clock position).
(5) Based on macrographic examination.
(6) Initiation possibly from stress-corrosion crack.
(7) Specimens had prior loading history, as indicated.
### Table 1: Results of Fatigue Tests of Nominally Polished Alloys*<sup>2</sup> Test Specimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cylinder</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Bore</th>
<th>No. of</th>
<th>Description of Fatigue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105i</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.470</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Potclay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105i</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>9.350</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Potclay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasort</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>105i</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>9.350</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Potclay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum Stress = 10% of Yield Value

| Lab Air     | 1        | 105i | 23.4  | 16.4  | 9.350 | 15    | Potclay                |
|             |          |      |       | 17.760 |       |       |                        |
|             |          |      |       | 19.960 |       |       |                        |
|             |          |      |       | 24.960 |       |       |                        |
| Seasort     | 2        | 105i | 1.347  | 16.4  | 9.350 | 15    | Potclay                |
|             |          |      |       | 17.760 |       |       |                        |
|             |          |      |       | 19.960 |       |       |                        |
|             |          |      |       | 24.960 |       |       |                        |
| Seasort     | Rolled   | 105i | 1.347  | 16.4  | 9.350 | 15    | Potclay                |
|             |          |      |       | 17.760 |       |       |                        |
|             |          |      |       | 19.960 |       |       |                        |
|             |          |      |       | 24.960 |       |       |                        |

(1) Circulation laboratory air at 55 ± 5% relative humidity.
(2) Specimens machined subjected to 0.002 in. deviations of the nominal size at 1-in. intervals. For balance of the tests, specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air only.
(3) Specimens machined subjected to 0.002 in. deviations of the nominal size at 1-in. intervals. For balance of the tests, specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air only.
(4) For tests in laboratory air, the waterplane pressure was approximately between 75% to 125% of the maximum indicated. For tests in seawater environment, pressure held at maximum indicated for 90% of the time, then dropped sinusoidally to minimum of 75% to 125%.
(5) For tests in seawater environment, all bullies and corrosion products were measured at the sides of maximum.
(6) Based on metallographic examination.
(7) Based on corrosion pit.

*Specimens had prior loading history, as indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cylinder</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Pressure, psig</th>
<th>Temp.</th>
<th>Exposure, hr</th>
<th>Stress, psi</th>
<th>No. of Cycles</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description of Fatigue</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Fatigue, psi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>46,750</td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea coast</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea coast</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>SCC-Partridge</td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCC-Partridge</td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>12,950</td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Table 1:** Results of Fatigue Tests of Stainless Steel

- **Table 2:** Results of Fatigue Tests of Stainless Steel

---

(1) Circulating laboratory air at 90 ± 5% relative humidity.
(2) Tests were conducted at 33% relative humidity. For tests below 33%, the specimens were exposed to the circulating laboratory air as in (1).
(3) For tests in laboratory air with an exposure cycle consisting of 24-hr. cycles, the specimens were held at ambient temperature for 24-hr. cycles, then dropped instantaneously to a minimum of 300 to 400°F.
(4) Material removed after test, with no evidence of corrosion or pitting. No observation made on any of the specimens.
(5) Based on metallographic examination.
(6) Origin of corrosion pit.

*Specimen had prior loading history, as indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Test Code</th>
<th>Fatigue - Fatigue</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Test Code</th>
<th>Fatigue - Fatigue</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max stress, % of design value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Test Code</th>
<th>Fatigue - Fatigue</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max stress, % of design value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Test Code</th>
<th>Fatigue - Fatigue</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max stress, % of design value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Test Code</th>
<th>Fatigue - Fatigue</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
<th>Fatigue - Intermittent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.
(2) Specimen exposed to thermal cycling of warm and cold at 1-hour intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in item 1.
(3) For tests in laboratory air internally pressure cycled simultaneously between minimum pressure of 30 psi and maximum indicated. For tests in vacuum environment pressure held at maximum indicated for 80% of cycle time, then dropped simultaneously to minimum of 30 psi in 5 psi per hour.
(4) For tests in vacuum environment, all failure and corrosion products were cleared on top side of specimen 9 to 10 cycles position.
(5) Not included in life mean value.
(6) Specimen subjected to same 10 times cycle as specimen tested in vacuum environment.
(7) Original corrosion pits.
(8) Specimen had prior loading history, as indicated.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cylinder Stock</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Fatigue Loading (3)</th>
<th>Max. Stress, ksi</th>
<th>No. of Cycles</th>
<th>Description of Failure</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Initiation Position</th>
<th>Perforating Flaws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air (1)</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>Inside</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,370</td>
<td>Inside</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life 10,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast (2)</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>12,290</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>Inside 4:00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,950</td>
<td>Inside</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life 18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>82,330</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92,660</td>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93,100</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life 91,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>649,800</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>Inside</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>714,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>903,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life 749,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Circulating laboratory air at 50 ±5% relative humidity.

(2) Specimen enclosures subjected to 1-min. injections of warm salt mist at 12-hr intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in (1).

(3) For tests in laboratory air hydraulic pressure cycled sinusoidally between minimum pressure of 200 to 400 psi and maximum indicated. For tests in seacoast environment, pressure held at maximum indicated for 80% of cycle time, then dropped sinusoidally to minimum of 200 to 400 psi.

(4) For tests in seacoast environment, salt buildup and corrosion product was heaviest on top side of specimen (9 to 3 o'clock position).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy &amp; Temper</th>
<th>Cylinder Type</th>
<th>Fatigue Lives For Duplicate Cylinders</th>
<th>Tests in Laboratory Environment (%)</th>
<th>Tests in Corroded Seawater Environment (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>11,600 11,600 11,600; i.m.l. = 11,600</td>
<td>58.4 58.4 58.4</td>
<td>3.75 3.75 3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27.7)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>No tests</td>
<td>1.0 1.0 1.0</td>
<td>2.0 2.0 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>10,600 10,600 10,600; i.m.l. = 10,600</td>
<td>56.4 56.4 56.4</td>
<td>4.0 4.0 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27.7)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>No tests</td>
<td>1.0 1.0 1.0</td>
<td>2.0 2.0 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T7</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>11,100 11,100 11,100; i.m.l. = 11,100</td>
<td>57.7 57.7 57.7</td>
<td>4.75 4.75 4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>No tests</td>
<td>1.0 1.0 1.0</td>
<td>2.0 2.0 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>46,600 46,600 46,600; i.m.l. = 46,600</td>
<td>54.7 54.7 54.7</td>
<td>7.25 7.25 7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14.2)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>No tests</td>
<td>1.0 1.0 1.0</td>
<td>2.0 2.0 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T73</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>35,300 35,300 35,300; i.m.l. = 35,300</td>
<td>52.2 52.2 52.2</td>
<td>6.5 6.5 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33.0)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>No tests</td>
<td>1.0 1.0 1.0</td>
<td>2.0 2.0 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH70-21</td>
<td>Premium cast</td>
<td>10,200 10,400 10,200; i.m.l. = 10,400</td>
<td>50.0 50.0 50.0</td>
<td>5.25 5.25 5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32.0)</td>
<td>Premium cast</td>
<td>12,000 12,400 12,000; i.m.l. = 12,400</td>
<td>52.2 52.2 52.2</td>
<td>6.5 6.5 6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Cylinders cycled at approximately 20 cpm in circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.

(2) Cylinders cycled at approximately 5 cpm, with 5-min. hold time at maximum stress for each cycle. Specimen enclosures subjected to 1-min. injections of warm salt mist at 10-cp intervals. For balance of time specimens are exposed to circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.

* i.m.l. indicates log-mean-fatigue life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy &amp; Temp.</th>
<th>Cylinder Stock</th>
<th>Tests in Laboratory Environment (1)</th>
<th>Tests in Simulated Service Environment (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>3 # 8,000,000 without failure</td>
<td>51,940; 42,490; 211,550; 1.m. = 50,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.7)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>85,630; 150,000; 584,000; 1.m. = 193,132</td>
<td>20,365; 25,120; 43,270; 30 tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>1 # 1,661,000; 2 # 8,000,000 without failure</td>
<td>23,700; 134,000; 205,550; 100,145; 110,750; 125,340; 50 tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.6)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>85,630; 150,000; 584,000; 1.m. = 193,132</td>
<td>20,365; 25,120; 43,270; 30 tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>1 # 2,177,000; 2 # 8,000,000 without failure</td>
<td>848,750; 969,500; 197,340; 125,340; 50 tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21.4)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>85,630; 150,000; 584,000; 1.m. = 193,132</td>
<td>20,365; 25,120; 43,270; 30 tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T3</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>3 # 8,000,000 without failure</td>
<td>696,600; 1,019,750; 892,000; 279,870; 151,145; 114,157; 40 tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.6)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>All failed at 30% of design stress (12.3 ksi)</td>
<td>82,335; 92,660; 33,085; 1.m. = 749,000; 60 cpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5070-T7</td>
<td>Precision cast</td>
<td>All failed at 30% of design stress (12.3 ksi)</td>
<td>82,335; 92,660; 33,085; 1.m. = 749,000; 60 cpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Cylinders cycled at approximately 60 cpm in circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity. All die forged cylinders had previously withstand 8,260,000 cycles at 30% of design stress without failure at 60 cpm.

(2) Cylinders cycled at approximately 16 cpm with 15-min hold time at maximum stress for each cycle. Specimen enclosures subjected to 1-min. injections of warm salt mist at 12-hr intervals. For balance of time specimens are exposed to circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.

(3) 1.m. indicates log-mean-fatigue life.

(4) Did not fail in 1,200,000 loadings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Fatigue Loading</th>
<th>Fracture Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max. Stress</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) Circulating laboratory air at 50 ± 5% relative humidity.
(2) Specimen enclosures subjected to 1-min. injections of warm salt mist at 12-hr. intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in (1).
(3) Minimum stress in cycle approximately 0.6 ksi.
(4) Failure origins within central half of specimen unless noted otherwise.
*Specimen had prior stress history as indicated.
# TABLE XVII. RESULTS OF FATIGUE TESTS OF C-RINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Max. Stress (ksi)</th>
<th>Fract. Location</th>
<th>No. of Cycles</th>
<th>Distance from Max. Moment, Degrees</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>Approx</td>
<td>29,880</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4&quot; from edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
<td>6,030</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,560</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,370</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mined SCC and fatigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Maximum Stress = 80% of Design Value

| Lab Air     | Die   | Ap#       | 30.4              | Approx          | 93,200        | 5                                 |          |
|             | Forged| 5#       |                   |                 | 2,998,100     |                                   |          |

## Maximum Stress = 65% of Design Value

| Lab Air     | Die   | Ap#       | 30.4              | Approx          | 93,200        | 5                                 |          |
|             | Forged| 5#       |                   |                 | 2,998,100     |                                   |          |

## Maximum Stress = 50% of Design Value

| Lab Air     | Die   | Ap#       | 23.4              | Approx          | 10,780,000    | 10                                | None     |
|             | Forged| 10#      |                   |                 |               |                                   |          |

## Maximum Stress = 30% of Design Value

| Lab Air     | Die   | 14.0      | 36                | Approx          | 2,462,600     | None                              |          |
|             | Forged| 5        |                   |                 |               |                                   |          |

Notes:
1. Circulating laboratory air at 50 ± 5% relative humidity.
2. Specimens exposed to 3-min. injections of warm salt mist at 12-hr. intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in (1).
3. Minimum stress in cycle approximately 0.4 ksi.
4. Failure origins within central half of specimens unless noted otherwise.

*Specimen had prior stress history as indicated.
### Table XVIII. Results of Fatigue Tests of C-ings Alloys Z7970-77

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Fracture Location</th>
<th>Maximum Moment, kipf</th>
<th>Maximum Stress, % of Design Value</th>
<th>Distance from Maximum Moment, Degrees</th>
<th>Position °</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>36#</td>
<td>Approx 36</td>
<td>125,500</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2&quot; from edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Coast</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
<td>38,800</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mixed SCC and fatigue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Coast</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
<td>100,800</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>36#</td>
<td>Approx 36</td>
<td>86,800</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>36#</td>
<td>Approx 36</td>
<td>10,788,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Coast</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,879,700</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Coast</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,377,100</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,020,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. Circulating laboratory air at 50 ± 5% relative humidity.
2. Specimen enclosures subjected to 1-min. injections of warm salt mist at 12-hr. intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in (1).
3. Minimum stress in cycle approximately 0.4 ksi.
4. Failure origins within central half of specimen unless noted otherwise.

* Specimen had prior stress history as indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Fatigue Loading</th>
<th>Fracture Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max. Stress, Freq</td>
<td>Distance from Max. Moment, Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>кал</td>
<td>cpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>±10</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>101,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±8</td>
<td>109,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±9</td>
<td>109,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>133,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>±10</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>101,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±8</td>
<td>109,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±9</td>
<td>109,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>133,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>±1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>14,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±1/2</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>44,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>±1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>97,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±1/2</td>
<td>131,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>±5±6±4±5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>230,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±5±6±4±5</td>
<td>230,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±5±6±4±5</td>
<td>0.1&quot; from edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>±4±6±5±4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>4,891,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±4±6±5±4</td>
<td>1,788,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±5±6±4±5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>±20±11±12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1,591,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±20±11±12</td>
<td>1,996,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>2,688,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>±D±E±F±D</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>10±4,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±D±E±F±D</td>
<td>2,184,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>4,844,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) Circulating laboratory air at 50 ± 5% relative humidity.
(2) Specimen enclosures subjected to 24-hr. injections of warm salt mist at 12-hr. intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in (1).
(3) Minimum stress in cycle approximate; 0.4 kall.
(4) Failure origins within central half of specimen unless noted otherwise.
* Specimen had prior str. str. history as indicated.
### Table XX: Results of Fatigue Tests of O-Rings

**Alloy 7075-T73**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Max. Stress</th>
<th>Fatigued</th>
<th>No. of Cycles</th>
<th>Distance from Max. Moment</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>Approx</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>Approx</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>318,868</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1&quot; from edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1&quot; from edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
<td>206,900</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2&quot; from edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>177,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2&quot; from edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>5#</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>Approx</td>
<td>1,076,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>4#</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>Approx</td>
<td>10,788,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,793,300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>2,125,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,657,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>3,069,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td>3,270,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Die</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Approx</td>
<td>2,462,600</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. Circulating laboratory air at 50 ± 5% relative humidity.
2. Specimen enclosures subjected to 1-min. injections of warm salt mist at 12-hr. intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in (1).
3. Maximum stress in cycle approximately 0.4 ksi.
4. Failure origin within central half of specimen unless noted otherwise.

* Specimen had prior stress history as indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Spec. No.</th>
<th>Fatigue Loading</th>
<th>Fracture Location</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spec. No.</td>
<td>Max. Stress</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1-1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td>418,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td>227,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td>380,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td>413,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Air</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Log-mean-life</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,569,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

(1) Circulating laboratory air at 50 ± 5% relative humidity.
(2) Specimen enclosures subjected to 1-min. injections of warm salt mist at 12-hr. intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air as in (1).
(3) Minimum stress in cycle approximately 0.4 ksi.
(4) Failure origins within central half of specimen unless noted otherwise.

*Specimen had prior stress history as indicated.
### TABLE XXII. RESULTS OF STRESS-CORROSION TESTS ON STATIC-LOADED C-RINGS EXPOSED FOR 84 DAYS TO ALTERNATE-IMMERSION TEST IN 3.5\% NaCl SOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy &amp; Temper</th>
<th>Max Stress, ksi</th>
<th>Number Failures (F)/Number Exposed (N) and Time to Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Die Forged or Cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-T6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7080-T7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T73</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH70-T7 (cast)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specimens 4.08" O.D. by 3/16" thick by 1" wide. Parting plane in rings from die forgings located at section of maximum bending stress. Ring opened up to develop tensile stresses on inside surface.

Exposure cycle consisted of 10-min immersion in solution and 50-min exposure in air at 80°F and 45% relative humidity.

OK 84 means specimens survived 84-day test period with no evidence of stress-corrosion cracking as determined by visual or metallographic examination. Suffix (a) means that specimens were removed from test at time indicated and the presence of stress-corrosion cracks confirmed by metallographic examination.

(1)
### TABLE XXIII: RESULTS OF STRESS-CORROSION TESTS ON STATIC-LOADED C-RINGS EXPOSED IN LABORATORY TO SIMULATED SEACOAST ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy &amp; Temper</th>
<th>Max. Stress, ksi</th>
<th>Number Failures (F)/Number Exposed (N) and Time to Failure</th>
<th>Die Forged or Cast</th>
<th>Rolled Rod Stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F/N</td>
<td>Time in Days</td>
<td>F/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>19, 20, 26</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>59, 67, 70</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3 at 293(a)</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-T6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>6, 8, 11</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>40, 95, 95</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>104, 191, 1 0k^b 365</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7080-T7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>173, 179, 193</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>1 0k 293(†), 2 0k^b 365</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti8</td>
<td>2.14-T6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>8, 12, 32</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>92, 99, 249</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>1 0k 293(†), 2 0k^b 365</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T73</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>1 0k 293(†), 2 0k^b 365</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH70-T7</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>1 0k 293(†), 2 0k^b 365</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cast)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specimens 4.08" O.D. by 3/16" thick by 1" wide. Parting plane in rings from die forgings located at section of maximum bending stress. Ring opened up to develop tensile stresses on inside surface.

Environment provided by saturating specimen enclosures with warm salt mist at 12-hr intervals. For balance of time specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.

- Removed after 1 year's exposure
- Removed from test at 293 days for metallographic examination which confirmed that the specimen was free from any stress-corrosion cracking.
- All three specimens removed from test at 293 days because of exfoliation in the test area. Metallographic examination showed incipient stress-corrosion cracking was also present.
TABLE XXIV. RESULTS OF STRESS-CORROSION TESTS ON STATIC-LOADED C-RINGS EXPOSED TO SEACOAST ATMOSPHERE AT POINT JUDITH, R. I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy &amp; Temper</th>
<th>Max. Stress, ksi</th>
<th>Number Failures (F)/Number Exposed (N) and Time to Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Die Forged or Cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-T6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7080-T7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T73</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH70-T7 (cast)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specimens 4.08" O.D. x 3/16" thick by 1" wide. Parting plane in rings from die forgings located at section of maximum bending stress. Ring opened up to develop tensile stresses on inside surface.

(1) Times to failure:
- A indicates failure between 103 and 210 days
- B indicates failure between 211 and 289 days
- C indicates failure between 290 and 366 days
a Removed from test at 730 days, metallographic examination confirmed that specimen was free of stress-corrosion cracking.
b Removed from test at 730 days, metallographic examination detected incipient stress-corrosion cracking.
## TABLE XIV. SUMMARY OF FLEXURAL FATIGUE TEST RESULTS OF C-RINGS UNDER HOOP TENSIONS EQUAL TO 80% OF DESIGN STRESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy &amp; Temper (Max. Test Stress, ksi)</th>
<th>C-Ring Stock</th>
<th>Fatigue Lives for 3 or 4 Specimens, Cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tests in Laboratory Environment (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,000  20,800  33,600  119,000; l.m.l. $= 37,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6 (37.9)</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>No tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-T6 (37.4)</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>29,800  37,400  40,400; l.m.l. $35,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>No tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7008-T7 (34.6)</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>2,680,000  3,263,000  8,838,000; l.m.l. $= 34,800  35,500  74,800; l.m.l. $= 85,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>No tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6 (34.2)</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>103,200  109,300  209,700; l.m.l. $= 133,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>No tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T73 (33.0)</td>
<td>Die forged</td>
<td>49,400  741,700  1,483,000; l.m.l. $= 378,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>No tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH70-T7 (32.0)</td>
<td>Premium cast</td>
<td>56,200  103,700  121,900; l.m.l. $= 89,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) C-rings flexed at approximately 30 cpm in laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.

(2) C-rings flexed at approximately 90 cphr, with 32-sec hold time at maximum stress for each cycle. Specimen enclosures subjected to 1-min injections of warm salt mist at 12-hr intervals. For balance of time specimens are exposed to circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.

$ l.m.l. indicates log-mean-fatigue life.
### Table XXXII: Summary of Flexural Fatigue Test Results of C-Rings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy &amp; Temper</th>
<th>C-Ring Stresses</th>
<th>Tests in Laboratory Environment (2)</th>
<th>Tests in Simulated Seawater Environment (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No tests</td>
<td>No tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T670-76</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>1,617,603</td>
<td>1,724,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28.7)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>1,724,200</td>
<td>1,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T670-76</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>1,617,603</td>
<td>1,724,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28.7)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>1,724,200</td>
<td>1,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8215-07</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>3,102,573</td>
<td>1,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>1,710,000</td>
<td>1,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633-07</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>4,831,201</td>
<td>4,831,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>4,831,201</td>
<td>4,831,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-77</td>
<td>Die Forged</td>
<td>1,725,200</td>
<td>1,725,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29.2)</td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>1,725,200</td>
<td>1,725,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2610-79</td>
<td>Premium cast</td>
<td>1,617,603</td>
<td>1,617,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 failed @ 30% of design stress (11.7 ksi)</td>
<td>1.5 (L - 1.0) x 1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) C-rings flexed at approximately 36 rpm in circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.

(2) C-rings flexed at approximately 12 rpm with 4.8 sec hold time at maximum stress for each cycle. Specimens enclosures subjected to 12hr intervals at 100 hr intervals. For balance of time specimens are exposed to circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.

(3) 1.5 L indicates low-mean-fatigue life.

(4) Indicates did not fail in 1,100,000 loadings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alloy &amp; Temper</th>
<th>Max. Test Stress, ksi</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Cylinders</th>
<th>C-Rings</th>
<th>Stress-Corrosion</th>
<th>Simulated Seacoast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrosion-Fatigue (Triplicate Tests)</td>
<td>Corrosion-Fatigue (Triplicate Tests)</td>
<td>Alternate-Immersion (Duplicate Tests)</td>
<td>Simulated Seacoast (Triplicate Tests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>3.5, 4.4, 5.5</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>12, 15, 18</td>
<td>7, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>10, 25, (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17, 24, 30</td>
<td>44, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-T6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>0.2, 1.7, 2.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.2, 2.8, 5.2</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>2.6, 3.6, 12.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.6, 6.7</td>
<td>7, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7080-T7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>(32, 40, 47)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(13, 13, 28)</td>
<td>None in 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>(64, 85, 84)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(38, 44, 64)</td>
<td>None in 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>2.4 to 3.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5, 15, 55</td>
<td>3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rolled</td>
<td>5.9, 29, 71</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>36, 51, 77</td>
<td>44, 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Includes time at load only.
b Test in 3.5% NaCl solution. Cycle consisted of 10-min. immersion followed by 50 min. in air at 80°F and 45% relative humidity. All other tests (corrosion-fatigue or stress-corrosion) were conducted in simulated seacoast environment produced by saturating specimen enclosures with warm salt mist at 12-hr intervals. For balance of period specimens were exposed to circulating laboratory air at 50% relative humidity.
c Numbers in parenthesis indicate fatigue rather than stress corrosion failures.
d Underlined numbers indicate mixtures of stress-corrosion and fatigue cracking.

---

**Load Cycles for Corrosion-Fatigue Tests**

- **Cylinders**
  - Hold-time: 5.4 min
  - Rate: 9 cphr

- **C-Rings**
  - Hold-time: 32 sec
  - Rate: 90 cphr
### TABLE XXVIII
RESULTS OF FATIGUE TESTS OF HYDRAULIC CYLINDERS IN NONCORROSIVE ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cylinder Description of Fatigue Crack (a)</th>
<th>Alloy and Temper</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Dimensions, in.</th>
<th>O.D. Wall Spec. No.</th>
<th>Max. Test Cycles to Point of Failure</th>
<th>Max. Shape</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>a, in.</th>
<th>2c, in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7075-T6 Die Forging</td>
<td>7075-T6</td>
<td>Forging</td>
<td>3.101</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7079-T6 Die Forging</td>
<td>7079-T6</td>
<td>Forging</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7080-T7 Die Forging</td>
<td>X7080-T7</td>
<td>Forging</td>
<td>3.161</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-T6 Die Forging</td>
<td>2014-T6</td>
<td>Forging</td>
<td>3.177</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-T73 Die Forging</td>
<td>7075-T73</td>
<td>Forging</td>
<td>3.201</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH70-T7 Premium Casting</td>
<td>CH70-T7</td>
<td>Casting</td>
<td>3.229</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) "In" or "Out" refers to interior or exterior surface of specimen; -P indicates failure in parting plane of die forgings.

(b) Fatigue cracks penetrated outer surface, stopping test, but there was no general failure. Specimens No. 7 and 8 of CH70-T7 developed cracks 5 and 6-1/2 in. long, respectively. In all other cases the fatigue cracks led to general instability failure, with splitting over entire length of test section.

(c) a = max. depth of fatigue crack through thickness of cylinder wall.

2c = max. length of fatigue crack, normal to "a" direction.
| Table: Fracture Mechanics: Tensile fractures in various cyclic internal pressure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Cycle Stress, ksi</th>
<th>Depth, in.</th>
<th>Crack Denters, in.</th>
<th>$E_{2}$, ksi</th>
<th>$E_{2}$, ksi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambient</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt fog</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with similar entries for other test types and materials.
### Abstract

The "stress-corrosion-fatigue" performance of several high-strength aluminum alloys was investigated by tests of hydraulic cylinders and other types of specimens. Specimens were prepared from forgings and forging stock of alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6, 7075-T73, 7079-T6, and X7080-T7 and from premium castings of alloy CH70-T7. The alternating internal pressure loading of the cylinders at frequencies between 0.15 and 20 cpm in corrosive environment included hold times at load of as much as 5.4 minutes. Corrosive environment was provided by a warm salt fog at 12 hour intervals.

Alloy 7075-T73 rated best in the corrosion-fatigue tests; no stress-corrosion cracking occurred in this alloy, and the lives of forged cylinders subjected to repeated loadings to 80% of design stress in a corrosive environment were at least 10 times as long for this alloy as for forged cylinders of alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6, or 7079-T6. Fractographic examination showed that stress-corrosion cracking as well as fatigue cracking occurred in alloys 2014-T6, 7075-T6, and 7079-T6 in the stress-corrosion-fatigue tests. The investigation demonstrated that stress corrosion and fatigue can interact under certain conditions to produce failures in shorter times and fewer cycles than for either phenomenon occurring by itself.
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