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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.V.</td>
<td>Coefficient of variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTRC</td>
<td>David Taylor Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_i</td>
<td>i-direction modulus of elasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft</td>
<td>foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVF</td>
<td>fiber volume fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G_{ij}</td>
<td>ij-plane shear modulus of elasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPa</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^9$ Pascals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IITRI</td>
<td>Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Joules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksi</td>
<td>one-thousand pounds per square inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbs</td>
<td>pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>millimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPa</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^6$ Pascals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msi</td>
<td>one-million pounds per square inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU_{ij}</td>
<td>ij-plane Poisson's ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psi</td>
<td>pounds per square inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sec</td>
<td>second</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

Interest in the compressive response of fiber-reinforced composite materials has resulted in numerous research programs addressing the theoretical and experimental response of composites subjected to compressive loading. These research programs have dealt exclusively with the response of composite materials 6.4 mm (0.25 inches) in thickness and less. As composite materials become more attractive for use in large Navy structures, the need to understand the mechanical response of composites greater than 6.4 mm (0.25 inches) in thickness becomes a necessity.

In this program a compression test fixture that allows the testing of composites up to one inch in thickness and greater was designed and refined. This fixture was used to evaluate the effects of constituents, fiber orientation, and thickness on the compressive response of composite materials. In addition the fixture was used to determine if the failure mechanisms observed for thick composites are similar to those that have been observed and reported for composite materials less than 6.4 mm (0.25 in.) thick.

The strength, stiffness, and failure characteristics of 48 ply, 96 ply and 192 ply carbon/epoxy and S2 glass/epoxy are discussed. Unidirectional and (0/0/90) style laminates have been investigated. The thickness of the 96 and 192 ply coupons allows the direct measurement of NU13 for the constituents and orientations listed above and this data is also reported.
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INTRODUCTION

The high specific compressive strength of composite materials make them highly attractive as candidate materials for Naval applications. In many cases the material thickness required for these applications is much greater than those that have been demonstrated to date. For example, in considering composite cylinders subjected to external pressure, scale model testing has been conducted on unstiffened cylinders nominally 203 mm (8 inches) in diameter with a wall thickness of 15 mm (0.6 inches) [1].

The results from such tests have indicated that thick walled carbon reinforced composite cylinders do not reach collapse pressures expected from a 3-D stress analysis of a thick orthotropic shell [2] coupled with allowable strength from thin uniaxial compressive strength tests. A collapse pressure equating to a laminate stress of 965 MPa (140 ksi) is expected for [0/0/90]_{ns} carbon/epoxy shells and wall stresses of 552-690 MPa (80 to 100 ksi) are routinely achieved. In contrast to these findings comparable tests of fiberglass reinforced cylinders [3] [4] have resulted in expected and achieved laminate strengths of 827 MPa (120 ksi).

Possible explanations for the unexpectedly low strength of thick carbon reinforced cylinders fall into the categories of
material issues, stress analysis issues, or manufacturing issues. In terms of materials issues the elastic constants or strengths determined for thin (less than 3.2 mm [0.125 inches]) materials may not be appropriate for materials that are greater than 6.4 mm (0.25 inches) in thickness. What are the trends for the compressive properties of composite materials with increasing thickness?

Stress analysis requirements that arise for thick composites include the need for fully three-dimensional analysis and the incorporation of nonlinear materials effects into these analyses should the effects be significant. The capability to perform complex 3-D stress analysis exists, yet accurate 3-D material data properties and 3-D failure criteria do not.

The manufacturing issues of concern for thick composite shells include effect of residual stress, material nonuniformity, the development of layer waviness, and the presence of material property gradients through the thickness of the component.

Certainly all of these issues are interrelated, but they could be investigated independently to identify the relative importance of each parameter with respect to the performance of thick structures. In this investigation the effect of thickness on material response and the development of 3-D compressive properties have been addressed. The elastic constants, strength and failure mechanisms of carbon and S2 glass reinforced composites are studied as a function of increasing section
TEST METHOD DEVELOPMENT

A survey of compression test methods to identify one that would be appropriate for testing composites between 6.4 mm and 25.4 mm (0.25 and 1.00 inches) thick reveals a myriad of possible methods for materials less than 6.4 mm (.25 inches) thick, and none for greater thickness [5]. What is learned from such an investigation is that an end-loaded test coupon with simple clamping blocks on the ends was the most economical and appropriate for thick composites. The development of a fixture to test thick specimens in compression was undertaken and the following criteria were applied: the fixture must allow thick-section testing capability beginning at 6.4 mm (0.25 inches), must allow further scale up for thicker, wider, and longer specimens, must prevent load eccentricities, must allow an unsupported gage length, and must prevent splitting or brooming failures from occurring near the load introduction points.

A fixture design that met the above requirements is similar to one used by Adams [6] for 2.54 mm (0.1 inch) thick specimens, and a cross-section of the final design is shown in Fig. 1. A photograph showing the size of the 6.4 and 25.4 mm (0.25 and 1.0 inch) DTRC fixtures compared to the IITRI fixture can be found in Fig. 2. In this fixture load is applied to the ends of the specimen and clamping blocks are used to provide stability and prevent end-brooming at the point of load introduction. A
Fig. 1. Schematic of DTRC thick-section compression fixture.
Fig. 2. Photograph of 25.4 mm (1.0 inch) DTRC thick-section compression fixture and IITRI compression fixture.
hardened steel plate is inserted between both ends of the specimen and the test machine crosshead platens and act as load bearing surfaces. A self aligning spherical seat is placed between one end of the specimen and the load machine to assist in aligning the specimen axis and the loading axis.

Preliminary studies on test fixture design showed fixture alignment rods were unnecessary since the specimen thickness and the clamping blocks provided adequate fixture/specimen stability. These studies also showed that the size and number of clamping bolts was critical since significant bolt stresses develop due to through-thickness Poisson displacements. Initial compression tests with 48 ply specimens showed four 6.4 mm (0.25 inch) bolts in each half of the fixture could not withstand the stresses created by the specimen through-thickness Poisson effects. The following equation was developed to determine bolt stress as a function of applied longitudinal load:

\[
SIG_b = \frac{(NU_{13})(SIG_C)(E_b)(E_3)(A_s)(L_c)}{(E_1)(L_bE_3A_s + E_bA_tL_c)}
\]

Where

- \( SIG_b \) = bolt stress
- \( SIG_C \) = compression strength of composite sample
- \( NU_{13} \) = through-thickness Poisson's ratio of composite sample
- \( E_1 \) = longitudinal modulus of elasticity of composite material sample
- \( E_b \) = modulus of elasticity of bolts
- \( E_3 \) = through-thickness modulus of elasticity of composite material sample
- \( A_t \) = total cross sectional area of all bolts
- \( A_s \) = area of contact between sample and one
clamping block

\[ L_b = \text{length of bolts} \]
\[ L_c = \text{thickness of composite sample} \]

This equation provides the stress in each bolt as a function of specimen properties, specimen geometry, bolt modulus, and bolt length. The final bolt configuration consisted of 6 12.7 mm (0.5 inch) bolts for 48 ply and 96 ply specimens, and 10 15.9 mm (.625 inch) bolts for the 192 ply specimens. The bolt torque applied to each fixture prior to testing was 6.8, 20.3, 67.8 J (5, 15, and 50 ft.-lbs.) for the 48, 96 and 192 ply specimens respectively.

The crosshead displacement rate used in this investigation was chosen to provide a strain rate of approximately 0.0025 mm/mm/sec. The equivalent crosshead rates were 0.43 mm/sec. (48 ply specimen), 0.51 mm/sec. (96 ply specimen), and 1.02 mm/sec. (192 ply specimen).

MATERIAL SYSTEMS AND SPECIMEN GEOMETRY

The two material systems evaluated in this investigation were AS4/3501-6 carbon/epoxy and S2/3501-6 fiberglass/epoxy. They were chosen to investigate the effects of carbon and glass fiber reinforcements in a common epoxy matrix in light of the mechanical response observed when these fibers are used as reinforcements in thick unstiffened cylinders.

The carbon reinforced prepreg tape was supplied by Hercules Inc. and was AS4 fiber with 3501-6 350\(^{\circ}\) F epoxy resin (150 g/cm\(^2\)
areal weight). The S2 glass reinforced prepreg was supplied by Fiberite and was S2 glass fiber also with 3501-6 350 F epoxy resin (205 g/cm² areal weight). Both systems were supplied as 12 inch wide prepreg tape and were autoclave cured at DTRC. An autoclave air temperature schedule that was slightly different than those used for thin (< 48 ply) epoxy based composites was used. This air temperature was determined from test cures on 96 and 192 ply laminates with thermocouples placed within the test panels to monitor temperature through the panel thickness during cure.

Following fabrication, samples from all panels were removed and tested for fiber volume fraction (FVF) and void content (ASTM D3171 and D2734). The following values were determined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>48 ply</th>
<th>96 ply</th>
<th>192 ply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS4/3501-6</td>
<td>58.4% /-1.33%</td>
<td>60.0% / 0.34%</td>
<td>60.3% /-0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2/3501-6</td>
<td>57.6% / 0.27%</td>
<td>53.8% / 0.97%</td>
<td>58.0% / 0.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three panel thicknesses were fabricated for this investigation; 48 ply, 96 ply, and 192 ply. Specimens were machined from these panels resulting in nominal specimen thicknesses of 6.4, 12.7, and 25.4 mm (0.25, 0.50 and 1.0 inches). [0] and [0/0/90] ns laminate stacking sequences were fabricated for the 48 and 96 ply panels, and [0/0/90] ns were fabricated for the 192 ply panels. The specimens were designed so that the width was 4 times the specimen thickness, the gage length was 5 times the specimen thickness, and the tab length was
5 times the specimen thickness (with a minimum tab length of [2.5 inches]). The nominal specimen dimensions are summarized in Table 1 and the specimen geometry is shown in Fig. 3.

Table 1. Nominal specimen dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>48 Ply</th>
<th>96 Ply</th>
<th>192 Ply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thickness</td>
<td>6.4 (0.25)</td>
<td>12.7 (0.50)</td>
<td>25.4 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm (inches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>25.4 (1.0)</td>
<td>50.8 (2.0)</td>
<td>101.6 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm (inches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>158.8 (6.25)</td>
<td>190.5 (7.5) &amp; 165.1 (6.5)</td>
<td>381.0 (15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm (inches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Length</td>
<td>31.8 (1.25)</td>
<td>63.5 (2.5) &amp; 38.1 (1.5)</td>
<td>127.0 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm (inches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab Length</td>
<td>63.5 (2.5)</td>
<td>63.5 (2.5)</td>
<td>127.0 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm (inches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab Thickness</td>
<td>3.2 (0.125)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.125)</td>
<td>4.4 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm (inches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum allowable specimen gage section length was determined on the basis of a Euler column buckling analysis that assumed the specimen acts as a pinned end column and that includes the effects of transverse shear \([7]\). The expression for the allowable length/thickness ratio is:

\[
\frac{l}{t} = 0.9069 \left[ \frac{E_x}{V_{ult}} \left( 1 - 1.2 \frac{V_{ult}}{G_{xz}} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

where

- \( l = \) specimen length
- \( E_x = \) longitudinal modulus
- \( t = \) specimen thickness
- \( G_{xz} = \) through-thickness shear modulus
SPECIMEN GEOMETRY

Fig. 3. Specimen geometry, material directions, and strain gage locations.
Y_{ult} = \text{ultimate compressive strength}

For the materials and orientations used in this study the maximum allowable gage lengths are:

- [0] S2/glass/epoxy -- 5.1
- [0/0/90] S2/glass/epoxy -- 5.3
- [0] AS4/epoxy -- 6.5
- [0/0/90] AS4/epoxy -- 7.8

Five specimens of each thickness and orientation were evaluated for the 48 and 192 ply thicknesses, and four of each (two with a 3:1 l/t ratio and two with a 5:1 l/t ratio) were evaluated for the 96 ply thickness. Foil backed electrical resistance strain gages were used in this investigation to monitor strain. Single gages or unstacked 0/90 CEA-06 type gages were used with lengths of 3.2 or 6.4 mm (.125 of .250 inches). The 48 ply and one-half of the 96 ply specimens were instrumented with a longitudinal gage on each face. The remaining half of the 96 ply and all of the 192 ply specimens were instrumented with strain gages on both faces and both edges as shown in Fig. 3.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results from this program include longitudinal modulus of elasticity, inplane and through-thickness Poisson's ratio, ultimate compression strength, and ultimate compression strain at failure. These data as well as the observed failure mechanisms
are discussed in the next three sections. Tables 2 and 3 summarize the elastic constant, strength, and strain-to-failure data.

ELASTIC CONSTANTS

The longitudinal modulus of elasticity ($E_x$) was recorded for all three specimen thicknesses and $NU_{xy}$ and $NU_{xz}$ were recorded for the 96 ply and 192 ply specimens. The $E_x$ data from Table 3 is represented in graphical form in Fig. 4. This plot shows that the longitudinal moduli for these materials is independent of specimen thickness. The values of $E_x$ can be adjusted for fiber volume fraction effects from 115.8 GPa (16.8 Msi) (60 % FVF) for the [0] AS4/3501-6 converts to 125.5 GPa (18.2 Msi) (65 % FVF) and from 51.0 GPa (7.4 Msi) (55 % FVF) to 60.0 GPa (8.7 Msi) (65 % FVF) for the [0] S2/3501-6 specimens.

A comparison of $NU_{xy}$ and $NU_{xz}$ for the unidirectional 92 ply specimens show both the carbon and fiberglass materials to be transversely isotropic. The measured values of $NU_{xz}$ for the $[0/0/90]_n$s laminates was compared to theoretically predicted value in reference [8] and agree well.

When reducing the strain-strain data used to determine $NU_{xz}$ for the $[0/0/90]_n$s laminates, significant nonlinearities in the curves were observed as shown in Fig. 5. These nonlinearities were quantified by comparing the initial and final slope of the $NU_{xz}$ strain-strain curves. The initial slope was determined by the secant tangent method between .1 and .3 percent strain, and
Fig. 4. Longitudinal modulus as a function of thickness.
96 Ply \([0/0/90]\) S2/Epoxy

![Graph showing through-thickness Poisson's ratio nonlinearity.](image)

Fig. 5. Through-thickness Poisson's ratio nonlinearity.
Table 2. Summary of Elastic Constant Results

Longitudinal Modulus, GPa (Msi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS4/3501-6</th>
<th>S2/3501-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Plies</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>117.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>115.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{NU}^{xy} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS4/3501-6</th>
<th>S2/3501-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Plies</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{NU}^{xz} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS4/3501-6</th>
<th>S2/3501-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Plies</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Summary of strength and strain-to-failure results

Ultimate Compression Strength, MPa (ksi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Plies</th>
<th>[0]</th>
<th>[0/0/90]</th>
<th>[0]</th>
<th>[0/0/90]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>988.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(168.2)</td>
<td>(154.7)</td>
<td>(184.9)</td>
<td>(143.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>852.2</td>
<td>891.5</td>
<td>976.3</td>
<td>930.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(123.6)</td>
<td>(129.3)</td>
<td>(141.6)</td>
<td>(134.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>841.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>797.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(122.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(115.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Longitudinal Strain-to-Failure, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Plies</th>
<th>[0]</th>
<th>[0/0/90]</th>
<th>[0]</th>
<th>[0/0/90]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>&gt;1.48</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the final slope was determined by the same method between strain-at-failure and .2 percent less than strain-at-failure. The results of this comparison are shown in Fig. 6. Since the nonlinearities in $NU_{xz}$ were so significant a test was conducted on two 192 ply laminates to determine if the nonlinearities were reversible. For one AS4 and one S2 glass reinforced coupon the first compression test was conducted to 75 % of ultimate stress, the load was slowly reversed and the specimen was reloaded to
NUxz Change for [0/0/90] Laminates

Fig. 6. NUxz change for [0/0/90]\textsubscript{ns} laminates.
failure. The strain-strain data for the test to failure tracked the data for the initial test, attributing this nonlinearity to a reversible phenomena and not damage development.

The strain gages used to determine $\nu_{xz}$ were mounted on the edge of the compression test specimens as described earlier, so the effect of free-edge stresses must be considered when analyzing the edge strain data. To estimate the sign and magnitude of the sigma z stress a free-edge stress analysis that utilizes a force and moment balance in the free-edge zone as suggested by Pagano and Pipes [9] was performed. This analysis indicated that the sigma z stresses on the free-edge of the 192 ply carbon and S2 glass laminates is less than 13.8 MPa (2 ksi) and is compressive. Therefore the effect of these stresses would be to decrease the free-edge Poisson strains compared to strains away from the free-edges, making the edge-measured $\nu_{xz}$ nonlinearities more conservative than in the center of the laminates.

A similar comparison for nonlinearities seen in the longitudinal moduli is shown in Fig. 7. These nonlinearities are not as significant as those for $\nu_{xz}$ however a drop in modulus of 20 % could significantly effect strength and stability analyses for thick composite shells.

Nonlinearities for the longitudinal modulus and $\nu_{13}$ for the unidirectional specimens were also measured and the results are summarized below;
Fig. 7. Longitudinal modulus change for [0/0/90]_ns laminates.
ULTIMATE COMPRESSION STRENGTH

Figure 8 shows the ultimate compressive strength as a function of specimen thickness for both materials and orientations. These curves show a sharp decrease in compression strength with increasing thickness for the unidirectional specimens. Even at a thickness of 6.4 mm (0.25 in.) the strength of the unidirectional carbon and fiberglass coupons was lower than strengths determined using shear loading test techniques such as the IITRI, Celanese, or sandwich beam methods documented in ASTM D3410. Unidirectional compression strengths from end-loaded coupons are typically reported to be lower than from the methods in D3410 [10] [11], and the strengths measured using 6.4 mm (0.25 inch) thick specimens in this investigation are comparable to those previously reported. Due to the continually decreasing strength in testing 12.7 mm thick unidirectional specimens and the lack of interest in nesting large numbers of unidirectional plies even in thick laminates, no 192 ply unidirectional coupons were fabricated or tested.

The strength of the AS4/epoxy \([0/0/90]_{ns}\) laminates dropped 13.8 % in going from 6.4 to 12.7 mm (0.25 to 0.5 inches) and dropped 5.6 % in going from 12.7 to 25.4 mm (0.5 to 1.0 inches).
Fig. 8. Strength as a function of thickness.
The S2 glass/epoxy laminates showed a lower decrease from 6.4 to 12.7 mm (0.25 to 0.5 inches) (9.9 %) than from 12.7 to 25.4 mm (0.5 to 1.0 inches) (14.2 %). Although this trend of decreasing strength with increasing thickness appears significant it should be considering that the volume of these specimens is increasing much more quickly than the thickness. The [0/0/90]_ns specimens reported above drop roughly 20 % when increasing the thickness from 0.4 to 25.4 mm (0.25 to 1.0 inches), or by a factor of four. By contrast the same drop in strength occurs with a specimen volume increase from 25.56 cm\(^3\) (1.56 in.\(^3\)) to 1229 cm\(^3\) (75 in.\(^3\)), or by a factor of 48. Considering that it is widely believed that compression failure in composite materials is triggered by local events then this trend in strength is encouraging for the order of magnitude increase in material volume. In fact it is believed that further reductions in strength would not be seen with significantly thicker specimens.

One other fact determined in the strength study is that the low compressive strength experienced in thick, unstiffened, carbon reinforced composite cylinders is not attributable to the effect of thickness on uniaxial compressive strength. That is the strength of the thick [0/0/90]_ns AS4/epoxy coupons did not drop to a level of 552-690 MPa (80-100 ksi) as seen in testing of thick-walled shells.

FAILURE MECHANISMS

The failure mechanisms observed in fractured specimens were
similar for all of the specimen thicknesses tested. Failures consistently occurred at either the gage-section tab intersection point or the specimen ends. Failures at the specimen ends were well restrained by the clamping blocks and the resulting failure characteristics were well maintained. In contrast failure that occurred at the gage-section tab intersection resulted in excessive delamination since there was no through-thickness restraint. Figures 9 and 10 show the 96 and 192 ply \( [0/0/90]_{ns} \) fractured specimens.

The dominant characteristics at both failure locations were shear planes and kink bands. The kink bands were located along the shear planes and varied in dimension. The shear planes for all specimens except the unidirectional carbon/epoxy were oriented through the thickness, that is straight across the width of the specimen and at an angle through the thickness. The shear plane of the unidirectional carbon/epoxy specimens was oriented at an angle across the coupon width, and straight through the thickness. Figure 11 shows a close-up of the kink-bands on the ends of a carbon and S2 glass 96 ply laminate. Figure 12 shows kink-bands at the gage-section tab intersection for two 192 ply specimens.

The predominant difference in the failure characteristics between the carbon and S2 glass 25.4 mm (1.0 inch) thick coupons is that the carbon coupons completely separated upon failure whereas the S2 glass coupons remained intact.
Fig. 9. 96 ply $[0/0/90]_{16S}$ fractured specimens.
Fig. 10. 192 ply [0/0/90]_{32s} fractured specimens.
Fig. 11. Close-up of kink-bands in 96 ply $[0/0/90]_{16S}$ specimens.
Fig. 12. Close-up of kink-bands in 192 ply \([0/0/90]_{32s}\) specimens.
CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions from this investigation concern the effect of thickness on the compressive response of [0] and [0/0/90]_s carbon and fiberglass reinforced composite materials. The longitudinal modulus of these materials was insensitive to sample thickness. The inplane and through-thickness Poisson's ratios were also independent of thickness, however large changes in the through-thickness Poisson's ratio with applied load were observed for the [0/0/90]_s laminates. A change in NU_xz of 57.4 % was recorded for the S2/3501-6 laminates.

The strength of the [0] specimens was very sensitive to thickness in tests conducted on coupons up to 12.7 mm (0.5 in.) thick. The [0/0/90]_s laminates showed a decrease in strength of approximately 22 % from 6.4 mm (0.25 in.) to 25.4 mm (1.0 in.). The failure characteristics for both materials in all thicknesses was similar to observations regularly reported for thin composite coupons. The presence of shear planes and kink-bands through the specimen thickness predominated. Delaminations were routinely observed propagating from the kink-bands and resulted in excessive damage development when failures occurred in the vicinity of the gage-section. When failures occurred within the clamping blocks delamination was suppressed and the resulting failure characteristics were much more preserved.

In reference to the objective of this research as summarized in the introduction, the trends in material properties, strength
and failure mechanisms of thick composites do not account for the observed response of thick composite shells when subjected to hydrostatic pressure. The strength of thick, carbon reinforced laminates has been found to be at least as high as for thick fiberglass reinforced laminates. With the exception of the nonlinearities seen in the through-thickness Poisson's ratio, the material elastic constants reported are equivalent to those found in thin coupons. The effect of the these nonlinearities on shell response will not be known until these effects are incorporated in 3-D shell analysis. However since the nonlinearities reported are greater for the fiberglass than the carbon composites, it appears that they will not provide an explanation for the poor response of thick unstiffened carbon reinforced shells compared to fiberglass shells.
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