AFFDL-TR-66-220

-1

AD 649978

# FRACTURE OF BRITTLE MATERIALS UNDER TRANSIENT MECHANICAL AND THERMAL LOADING

Ralph L. Barnett Paul C. Hermann James R. Wingfield Chester L. Connors

**IIT Research Institute** 

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

3...

# NOTICES

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related Government procurement operation, the United States Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

Copies of this report should not be returned to the Research and Technology Division unless return is required by security considerations, contractual obligations, or notice on a specific document.

AFLC-WPAFB-MAR 68 1500

BLANK PAGES IX, XI, 14, 128, 142

AFFDL-TR-66-220

÷

Same and the second

# FRACTURE OF BRITTLE MATERIALS UNDER TRANSIENT MECHANICAL AND THERMAL LOADING

Ralph L. Barnett Paul C. Hermann James R. Wingfield Chester L. Connors

IIT Research Institute

.

# TECHNICAL REPORT AFFDL-TR-66-220 March 1967

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory Research and Technology Division Air Force Systems Command Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio Unclassified

į

IIT Research Institute		2 A REPO	BT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
rti Kesearch institute		linclas	eified
Chicago, Illinois		2 b GROU	ρ
Surcago, ittinois		None	
3. REPORT TITLE			
Fracture of Brittle Materials Under	Transient Mechani	.cal and	Thermal Loading
Final Report 5 AUTHOR(S) (Last name, litet name, initial)			······
Ralph L. Barnett Paul C. Hermann James Wingfield Chester Connors			
6. REPORT DATE	78. TOTAL NO. OF	PAGES	70. NO. OF REPS
March 1967	149		17
AF 33(615)-2468 ) AF 33(615)-2468 ) A project no.	AFFDL-TR-66-	REPORT NUN 220	68 <i>⊈ R(S)</i>
L368			
• Task 136809	Sb. OTHER REPORT this report	NO(S) (Any	other numbers that may be assigns
đ			
	search and Te	chnology	Division, Air Force
	Systems Comma	no, wrig	ht-Patterson AFB Ohio
13. 48578AGT	Systems Comma	nd, wrig	ht-Patterson AFB Ohio
The integrity of brittle elements su onds is predicted by means of an al- ion of the temperature distribution tresses, and the statistical descri- integrat: are conducted on beams a- oads. The <u>fracture probability-tim</u> iccurately predicted by the fracture lisk response to changes in the elas meters is investigated. A combined leveloped which accounts for a histo	Systems Comma bjected to time-d gorithm involving , the determinati ption of the resi nd disks under tr 2 curves obtained algorithm. The tic, thermal, and stress fracture t ry of thermal and	ependent three s on of th stance o ansient for the sensitiv statist heory fo mechani	ht-Patterson AFB Ohie thermal and mechanic teps: the determina- e thermal and mechani f the brittle materia thermal and mechanica se members are very ity of the beam and ical strength para- r brittle elements is cal loading.
The integrity of brittle elements su onds is predicted by means of an al- tion of the temperature distribution tresses, and the statistical descrip- typeriment: are conducted on beams a oads. The <u>fracture probability-tim</u> iccurately predicted by the fracture lisk response to changes in the elas meters is investigated. A combined leveloped which accounts for a histo	Systems Comma bjected to time-d gorithm involving , the determinati ption of the resi nd disks under tr 2 curves obtained algorithm. The tic, thermal, and stress fracture t ry of thermal and	ependent three s on of th stance o ansient for the sensitiv statist heory fo mechani	ht-Patterson AFB Ohio thermal and mechanic teps: the determina- e thermal and mechani f the brittle materia thermal and mechanica se members are very ity of the beam and ical strength para- r brittle elements is cal loading.

		CB LINKC
	ROLE WT ROLE	WT ROLE WT
<ol> <li>ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the mome and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee,partment of De- fense activity or other organization (corporate author) issuing the report.</li> <li>REPORT SECURTY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the over- all security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accord- ance with appropriate security regulations.</li> <li>GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Di- rective 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Alac, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as author- ized.</li> <li>REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classified.</li> <li>DESCRIPTIVE NOTES If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.</li> <li>AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Brite that name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minum requirement.</li> <li>REPORT DATE. Enter the date of the report as day, month, year; or mooth, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.</li> <li>NUMBER OF REFERENCES. Enter the total number of references cited in the report.</li> <li>CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBEN: If appropriate, enter the applicable marker of the contract or grant under which the report was written.</li> <li>A. REPORT REPORT NUMBEN: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, tesk numb</li></ol>	<ul> <li>(1) "Qualified requesters may obtreport from DDC."</li> <li>(2) "Foreign announcement and dreport by DDC is not authorized</li> <li>(3) "U.S. Government agencies may obtreport by DDC is not authorized</li> <li>(3) "U.S. Government agencies may it is report directly from DDC. Users shall request through</li> <li>(4) "U.S. military agencies may report directly from DDC. Other shall request through</li> <li>(5) "All distribution of this report directly from DDC. Other shall request through</li> <li>(5) "All distribution of this report directly from DDC. Other shall request through</li> <li>(5) "All distribution of this report directly from DDC. Other shall request through</li> <li>(5) "All distribution of this report directly from DDC. Other shall request through</li> <li>(5) "All distribution of this report directly from DDC. Other shall request through</li> <li>(5) "All distribution of this report directly from DDC. Other shall request through</li> <li>(6) "All distribution of this report directly from DDC. Other shall request through</li> <li>(7) "All distribution of the request through</li> <li>(8) "All distribution of the request that fact and enter the price, if keet and and enter the price, if keet and shall request the departmental project office or laboring for) the research and development.</li> <li>(13) ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract gas ammany of the document indicative of it may also appear elsewhere in the bornet. I additional space is required, obe stached.</li> <li>(1) is highly desirable that the abs be unclassified. Each paragraph of than indication of the military security of the indication of the suggested length is from 150</li> <li>(4) KEY WORDS: Key words are techor short phrases that characterize a reindex entries for cataloging the report is offer an indication of the suggested length is from 150</li> <li>(4) KEY WORDS: Key words are techor short phrases th</li></ul>	ing standard statements tain copies of this lissemination of this ed." nay obtain copies of Other qualified DDC 

2

201 2322222

ذ

Security Classification

l

¢

#### FOREWORD

This report was prepared by the Solid Mechanics Division, IIT Research Institute, Chicago, Illinois under Air Force contract AF 33(615)-2468. This contract was initiated under Project No. 1368, "Structural Design Concepts", Task No. 136809, "Design Techniques for Brittle Materials." The work was administered under the direction of the Flight Dynamics Laboratory with James F. Nicholson as Air Force Project Engineer.

The research was performed during the period April 1965 to November 1966. Mr. Ralph L. Barnett was program manager for this project. The authors would like to acknowledge the efforts of Seymour A. Bortz of the Ceramics Division in the area of experimental supervision and Walter D. Pilkey of the Solid Mechanics Division in the area of thermal stress analysis.

Manuscript released by authors November 1966 for publication as an AFFDL Technical Report.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved.

Allam Shown An

HOLLAND B. LOWNDES, Actg Chief Applied Mechanics Branch Structures Division

#### ABSTRACT

The integrity of brittle elements subjected to time-dependent thermal and mechanical loads is predicted by means of an algorithm involving three steps: the determination of the temperature distribution, the determination of the thermal and mechanical stresses, and the statistical description of the resistance of the brittle material. Experiments are conducted on beams and disks under transient thermal and mechanical loads. The <u>fracture probability-time</u> curves obtained for these members are very accurately predicted by the fracture algorithm. The sensitivity of the beam and disk response to changes in the elastic, thermal, and statistical strength parameters is investigated. A combined stress fracture theory for brittle elements is developed which accounts for a history of thermal and mechanical loading. CONTENTS

l I j

;

l

4

Section		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	THERMALLY AND MECHANICALLY INDUCED FRACTURE	5
	1. Introduction	5
	2. Assumptions	5
	3. Fracture Algorithm	7
	4. Example	9
III	EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM	15
	1. Beams: Thermal and Mechanical Loading	15
	2. Plates: Thermal Loading	21
	3. Plates: Thermal and Mechanical Loading	33
IV	RESPONSE PREDICTIONS	45
	1. Approach	45
	2. Materials Properties	46
	3. Thermal Analysis	48
	4. Beam Stress Analysis	55
	5. Disk Stress Analysis	60
	6. Application of the Fracture Algorithm	67
v	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	71
	1. Reliability of Results	71
	2. Sensitivity of Results	71
	3. Future Research	79
APPEN	IDIX I - Statistical Fracture Theory for Combined Stress Conditions	81
APPEN	IDIX II- Beam Analysis Computer Program	119
APPEN	MIX III-Disk Analysis Computer Program	129
REFER	RENCES	143



Preceding page blank

# ILLUSTRATIONS

のできまたいた

19.77 X

€.

Figure		Page
1	Circular Plate with Central Hole Loaded by Both Inside and Outside Tensile Stresses	10
2	Beam Loading Support and Strip Heater Arrangement	16
3	Arrangement of Beam and Thermocouples for Temperature Monitory Purposes	17
4	Refractory Brick Used as Insulating Shield to Protect the Beam Sides from Radiant Heat	19
5	Temperature Distribution Through Beam Depth	20
6	Cumulative Distribution of Al <sub>2</sub> 0 <sub>3</sub> Beam Data	24
7	Plate List Arrangement Showing Relationship of Loading Fixture, Insulation, and Heating Element	25
8	Cross Section Showing Detail of Various Test Components	26
9	General View of the Instrumental Plate in Test Mode	28
10	Detailed View of Instrumented Plate with Insulation Removed to Show Thermocouple Implants	29
11	Typical Failure Mode Aftur Application of Thermal Load	30
12	Diagram Showing Relative Locations of Thermocouples and Prefail Cracks	31
13	Diagram Showing Locations of Thermocouples	32
14	Temperature Distribution Through Plate	34
15	Cumulative Distribution of $A\ell_2 \tilde{O}_3$ Disk	36
16	Plate During Application of Both Mechanical and Thermal Load	37
17	Mechanically Loaded Plate (Compression)	38

Preceding page blank

# ILLUSTRATIONS (Contd)

227 1222

STATES CENTRA CONTRACT

÷

Figure		Page
18	Fringe Pattern Produced in Photoelastic Specimen Subjected to Compressive Mechanical Loading	39
19	Temperature Distribution Through Plate	41
20	Cumulative Distribution of A <sub>203</sub> Disk	43
21	Cumulative Tensile Strength Distribution of Alumina for a Tension Specimen with Gage Volume of 0.0982 in. <sup>3</sup>	47
22	Comparison of Tensile Strength Cumulative Distribution for Alumina to Gas-Bearing Data of C.D. Pears	49
23	Modulus of Elasticity of Alumina as a Function of Temperature	50
24	Thermal Strain of Alumina as a Function of Temperature	51
25	Poisson's Ratio of Alumina as a Function of Temperature	52
26	Thermal Conductivity of Alumina as a Function of Temperature	53
27	Gross Heat Flux Incident Upon Beam and Disk as a Function of Time	54
28	Geometry for Beam Analysis	56
29	Stress Distribution in Beam Under Thermal and Mechanical Lon Yng	58
30	Maximum Tensile Stresses in Beam Under Thermal and Mechanical Loading	59
31	Concentric Ring Geometry for Disk Analysis	61
32	Radial Stress Distributions in Disk Under Thermal Loading	64
33	Circumferential Stress Distributions in Disk Under Thermal Loading	65

ļ

# ILLUSTRATIONS (Contd)

Figure		Page
34	Maximum Tensile Circumferential Stresses in Disk Under Thermal Loading	66
35	Comparison of Theory and Experiment for Beam and Disk	70
36	Effect of 10 Percent Variation in Thermal Strain Upon the Predicted Cumulative Distributions for the Beam and Disk	73
37	Effect of 10 Percent Variation in Modulus of Elasticity Upon the Predicted Cumulative Distributions for the Beam and Disk	74
38	Effect of 10 Percent Variation in Poisson's Ratio Upon the Predicted Cumulative Distributions for the Beam and Disk	75
39	Effect of 10 Percent Variation in Weibull's Parameter m Upon the Predicted Cumulative Distributions for the Beam and Disk	76
40	Effect of 10 Percent Variation in Weibull's Parameter σ, Upon the Predicted Cumulative Distribution for the Beam and Disk	77
41	Effect of 10 Percent Variation in Weibull Parameter $\sigma_{\rm c}$ Upon the Predicted Cumulative Distributions for the Beam and Disk	78
42	Normal Stress Distributions for Various Stress States, Two-Dimensional	86
43	Comparison of Hydrostatic Tension and Pure Tension States	87
44	"Weighted" Normal Stress Diagram	89
45	Normal Stresses and Generalized Normal Stresses for Multiple Loadings	94
46	Normal Stress Diagrams, Three-Dimensional	99
47	Integration Limits on Phl	102
48	Combined Stress Theory	110
49	Approximate Combined Stress Theory	113

ix

Sales and the second

# SECTION I

# INTRODUCTION

Culminating several years of research in the application and development of statistical fracture theory, this report addresses itself to the problem of predicting the structural integrity of ceramic elements which are subjected to transient thermal and mechanical loading. Our specific objectives were fourfold:

- Develop an analysis procedure for the "thermal shock response" of brictle materials.
- (2) Verify the analysis procedure using simple ceramic elements.
- (3) Develop a combined stress theory for brittle materials.
- (4) Describe the inadequacies or shortcomings of the analysis procedure.

For reasons that will be made clear, we were unable to respond to the latter objective.

Before we describe our general method of attack, a few commen'ts appear to be in order concerning the term "thermal shock," The sudden cooling, which takes place when a very hot solid is plunged into a relatively cool liquid, creates tensile stresses on the surface of the solid which frequently cause cracking. The expression "thermal shock," which is usually associated with this rapid cooling process, seems to be sort of a biological description of the solid's reaction. In the jargon of the physical sciences, the term shock has come to represent a stationary or propagating discontinuity across some surface in a continuum. This is not what is experienced by a quenched solid which does not, for example, develop a shock wave. The complications which attend the study of shock conditions fortunately do not arise in the rapid heating or cooling of solids. Furthermore, the heating rates normally associated with leading edges and nose cones are of a lower order of magnitude than those associated with quenching.

The behavior of brittle bodies under transient thermal loadings has been treated historically as a distinct material property called thermal shock resistance. With continuing study it has become increasingly clear that such behavior is really a composite of more basic physical phenomena. In particular, the broad problem of strength prediction under thermal loading can almost be viewed as a classic problem in continuum strength analysis. It is now customary to divide the problem into the following parts:

(a) Determination of the thermal and mechanical boundary conditions

غ

- (b) Determination of the time-dependent temperature distribution
- (c) Determination of the time-dependent thermal stress distribution
- (d) Assessment of the temperature-dependent strength or resistance of the body.

In the first three cases the physical description of the processes involved and the methods of approach are well known; however, there are many analytical and computational difficulties which make the general problem very complicated. On the other hand, the latter case is concerned with a failure theory for brittle materials and the physics of this problem becomes a research subject, quite apart from any possible computational difficulties. For this reason, we have directed most of our attention to the strength aspect of the response problem.

An experimental program was designed to minimize the uncertainties which might arise in the temperature and stress determinations. For example, rother than calculate the temperature distribution and expose ourselves to possible imprecision in the characterization of the boundary conditions, we measured the distribution with thermocouples. To reduce the thermal and mechanical stress analysis to the simplest possible form, elements were sought for which a one-dimensional stress analysis was possible; we choose a beam subjected to terminal couples and heated along the bottom surface and a circular disk which was heated around the inside edge of a concentric hole.

A high purity alumina was selected for our experiments because of the wide experience accumulated with such materials. This experience manifests itself in a consistent manufacturing capability and in plentiful data for both mechanical and thermal properties. Some 60 beams and 60 disks were fabricated using Wesgo Al 995 and each member was exposed to a time varying temperature input. The beam was subjected, in addition, to monotonically nondecreasing terminal couples.

The time to failure for every test was recorded and the distribution of these times was displayed for each element by a cumulative distribution curve. The resulting two curves described the tradeoff between the fracture probability and the failure time for the beam and disk. The analytical prediction of these curves required as input the mechanical loading and the temperature distribution as functions of time. The following scalar functions of temperature were also required: modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, the thermal strain, and the statistical strength parameters for pure tension. These curves were integrated into a statistical thermal and mechanical response algorithm which embraced the conservative assumption that alumina is a series or weakest link material. It was further assumed that the tensile distribution curves for the temperatures of interest do not depend explicitly on time or load history, so that, the effects of creep, static fatigue, or general fatigue are not taken into account.

The original program strategy required that all of the temperature dependent properties be obtained from the literature with the exception of the statistical strength parameters which we wanted to develop ourselves. Unfortunately, the tension members ordered for this purpose were badly warped and had to be disregarded. Since it was not expedient to correct or reorder

3

the tension specimens, we set out to find the "tension behavior" that would predict the fracture-time distributions that were obtained experimentally.

Indeed, we found a set of Weibull parameters which made our predictions for both the beam and the disk coincide almost exactly with the measured results. This seemed remarkable considering that the beam stresses were uniaxial and mostly mechanical and that the disk stresses were biaxial and entirely thermal. Furthermore, the tensile strength distribution that we assumed was similar to the stronger results described in the literature.

While this report was being prepared, we obtained a set of tension data from Southern Research Institute that was generated for a 99.5 percent alumina using a gas bearing machine. Our assumed tension distribution fits this data precisely.

:

i l

The agreement between the theoretical and experimental results for the beam, disk and tension specimen is so close that it precludes the error analysis alluded to in our fourth objective. Instead, we have presented a variation of parameters study which illustrates the effects on the <u>fracture-time</u> curve of a  $\pm$  10 percent variation in any physical property used in our prediction scheme.

In view of the remarkable results obtained in this investigation, we feel justified in claiming to have established the potential of the statistical fracture theory approach to the thermal shock problem. It should be clearly understood that establishing a method's potential and "proving" its applicability are very different accomplishments.

# SECTION II

# THERMALLY AND MECHANICALLY INDUCED FRACTURE

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

Procedures for predicting the performance of a structure composed of a brittle material have been presented in our previous work (References 1 and 2). In this section these procedures are extended to account for time varying mechanical and thermal loading and temperature dependent material properties. The general concept of a generalized stress is replaced by an approximate biaxial Weibull type formulation for the "risk of rupture." This is a more restrictive statement and that this is a proper assumption must be justified in each application of the procedure. Also, new attention is drawn to the role of the volume of the basic tensile strength distribution specimen and to the fact that care is necessary to ensure that the procedure is always yielding at least conservative predictions.

## 2. ASSUMPTIONS

The applicability of the statistical analysis procedure or fracture algorithm in a given situation rests entirely upon the accuracy of the basic assumptions employed in the algorithm. For this reason it is desirable to state and examine all the assumptions that enter into the fracture algorithm.

It is assumed that the probability of failure of a subvolume of a brittle structure depends only upon its temperature, state of stress and volume. Effects such as creep, strain rate dependance, stress gradient dependance, static fatigue and cyclic fatigue are assumed to be insignificant if not entirely absent. Surface effects such as surface finish are assumed to be insignificant and thus the strength of a subvolume does not depend upon whether or not it is located on the surface of the structure. All the material in the basic tension specimens and in the brittle structure being analyzed is assumed to come from the same statistical population. The mechanical and thermal loadings are assumed to be known deterministically. Also, in the stress analysis of the brittle structure, it is assumed that the material is homogeneous at uniform temperature, isotropic and linearly elastic.

The earlier fracture algorithms are very general with regard to describing the strength distribution of a subvolume of material under arbitrary temperature and state of stress. In fact they are so general as to render them virtually impossible to directly apply in all but the simplest situations. The governing generalized stress has to be determined and then the strength distribution must be determined for each temperature with no requirement that the distributions be of any particular form or that the same form be preserved throughout the temperature range of interest.

In this formulation of the fracture algorithm, it is assumed that the behavior of the material under a general twodimensional state of stress can be adequately described by the approximate biaxial statistical fracture theory developed in Appendix I. In this theory, the probability of failure of a subvolume with volume  $\triangle V$  under a biaxial state of stress  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  is given by

where

F = 1 -	$\exp\left(-\frac{\Delta t}{\mathbf{v}}\right)$	$\frac{1}{2} \left[ f(\sigma_1) + f(\sigma_2) \right] $	(1)
f(ơ) =	<u></u>	for $\sigma > \sigma_u$	(2)
f(σ) =	0	for $\sigma \pm \sigma_u$	<b>\</b> - <i>i</i>

This formulation has the desirable property that, for the case of uniaxial tension ( $\sigma_2 = 0$ ), it reduces to the familiar Weibull Consequently all the procedures developed for determining form. the Weibull parameters can be utilized - providing that all the strength distributions are of the Weibull form with perhaps the parameters varying with temperature. It should be noted that the assumption expressed by Equation (1) does not automatically imply that the material is a pure series material.

When a material is not known to be a pure series material some additional care must be exercised regarding the size of the subvolumes into which a structure is divided. The reason for this is that if a material is not pure series, then a non-conservative step is performed if the volume of the subvolumes  $\Delta V$  are made smaller than the tensile strength distribution specimen volume  $\overline{v}$  in that the strength of the subvolume is overestimated. In order to avoid this problem we suggest that all subvolumes be made equal to or larger than the tensile specimen volume, i.e.,  $V \geq \overline{v}$  for all subvolumes.

## 3. FRACTURE ALGORITHM

The following statement of the fracture algorithm, along with the aforementioned assumptions has been devised specifically for the analysis of the structures tested on this program.

(1) At each temperature obtain the strength distribution curve  $F_{\overline{v}}(\sigma)$  for a tension specimen of volume  $\overline{v}$ . Fit the distribution curve with the form

$$F_{\overline{V}}(\sigma) = 1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{\overline{V}}{V} \left\{\frac{\sigma - \sigma_{u}}{\sigma_{o}}\right\}^{m}\right\} \text{ for } \sigma_{\geq}\sigma_{u} \qquad (3)$$

In this manner the parameters are determined as functions of temperature:  $m \propto m(T)$ ,  $\sigma_u \approx \sigma_u(T)$ and  $\sigma_o \approx \sigma_o(T)$ .

(2) For each mechanical loading and thermal loading (temperature distribution) determine the stress distribution throughout the structure:  $\sigma_i = \sigma_i(x,y,z,t), i = 1,2$ 

- (3) Divide the structure into n convenient subvolumes  $V_1, V_2, ..V_n$ . No subvolume should be smaller than the gage volume of the tension specimen;  $V_j \ge \overline{v}$ , j = 1, 2, ...n. Subvolumes should be selected with approximately homogeneous stress states.
- (4) For each value of time t determine the "worst" risk of rupture for each subvolume V<sub>i</sub>:

$$B_{ij}(t) = \frac{V_j}{v} \left\{ \max_{\substack{D_j \\ D_j}} f\left[\sigma_i(x, y, z, t); m(T), \sigma_u(T), \sigma_o(T)\right] \right\}, i=1,2$$

$$where f = \left[ \frac{\sigma_i(x, y, z, t) - \sigma_u(T)}{\sigma_o(T)} \right]^{m(T)} for \sigma_i = \sigma_u$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{for } \sigma_i \leq \sigma_u$$

$$(5)$$

and where T = T(x, y, z, t) and  $D_j$  is the region in space occupied by  $V_j$ .

(5) Determine the maximum value of each  $B_{ij}(t)$  in the interval  $0 \le t \le \tau$ :

$$B_{ij}^{*}(\tau) = \max B_{ij}(t) \qquad (6)$$

١

(6) The probability that the entire structure will survive the entire environmental history up to t = t is given by

$$L - F(\tau) = \exp\left\{\frac{1}{j=1} \left[ B_{ij}^{*}(\tau) + B_{2j}^{*}(\tau) \right] \right\}$$
(7)

or

$$1 - F(\tau) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \exp \left\{ - \left[ B_{ij}^{*}(\tau) + B_{2j}^{*}(\tau) \right] \right\} \quad (8)$$

where the term

exp 
$$\left\langle -\left[ B_{ij}^{*}(\tau) + B_{2j}^{*}(\tau) \right] \right\rangle$$
  
nts the reliability of the j<sup>th</sup>

represents the reliability of the j<sup>-</sup> subvolume, 1-F<sub>j</sub>.

# 4. EXAMPLE

Consider the problem of calculating the reliability of the circular plate shown in Figure 1 . Although the plate is assumed to be at uniform temperature and the mechanical loading does not vary with time, the problem should still illustrate several of the facets in the application of the fracture algorithm. Following the algorithm we proceed as follows.

- (1) For the purposes of this example, the tensile strength distribution is assumed to be of the Weibull type with parameters: m=3.0,  $\sigma_u = 4,130$  psi and  $\sigma_o = 5,610$  psi and the tension gage volume is  $\overline{v} = 0.0125$  in.<sup>3</sup>
- (2) Assuming a linearly elastic, homogeneous and isotropic material, the radial and circumferential stresses are found from elasticity theory to be

$$\sigma_{r} = S_{i} \left[ \frac{r_{o}^{2} - r_{i}^{2}}{r_{o}^{2} - r_{i}^{2}} \right] \left( \frac{r_{i}}{r} \right)^{2} + S_{o} \left[ \frac{r^{2} - r_{i}^{2}}{r_{o}^{2} - r_{i}^{2}} \right] \left( \frac{r_{o}}{r} \right)^{2}$$
(9)  
$$\sigma_{\theta} = -S_{i} \left[ \frac{r_{o}^{2} + r^{2}}{r_{o}^{2} - r_{i}^{2}} \right] \left( \frac{r_{i}}{r} \right)^{2} + S_{o} \left[ \frac{r^{2} + r_{i}^{2}}{r_{o}^{2} - r_{i}^{2}} \right] \left( \frac{r_{o}}{r} \right)^{2}$$

For  $S_0 = 4,956 \text{ psi}$   $S_1 = 4,460 \text{ psi}$   $r_0 = 4.0 \text{ in.}$   $r_1 = 1.0 \text{ in.}$ h = 1.0 in.

these expressions reduce to

$$\sigma_{r} = 4.99 - \frac{0.495}{r^{2}}$$

$$\sigma_{0} = 4.99 + \frac{0.495}{r^{2}}$$
(10)



į,

Figure 1 Circular Plate with Central Hole Loaded by Both Inside and Outside Tensile Stresses

- (3) The plate is divided into five concentric rings with the dimensions indicated in Table I.
  - (a) Note that each ring volume is greater than the gage volume  $\overline{v} = 0.125$  in<sup>3</sup>.
  - (b) The stress state in each ring becomes more homogeneous when the number of rings is increased.
- (4) Due to the fact that the temperature distribution is uniform, the "worst" risk of rupture is computed using the maximum stresses in the subvolume. The largest radial stress in the j<sup>th</sup> ring occurs at its outside radius b<sub>j</sub>

$$\sigma_{rj}^{*} = 4.99 - \frac{0.495}{b_{i}^{2}}$$
 (11)

The largest circumferential stress is found at the inside radius  $a_i$ 

$$\sigma_{0j}^{*} = 4.99 + \frac{0.495}{a_{j}^{2}}$$
 (12)

Thus the components of the "risk of rupture" for the j<sup>th</sup> ring are given by

> $B_{rj} = \frac{V_{i}}{v} \left[ \frac{\sigma_{ri}^{*} - \sigma_{u}}{\sigma_{o}} \right]^{m}$ (13)  $B_{\theta j} = \frac{V_{i}}{v} \left[ \frac{\sigma_{\theta j}^{*} - \sigma_{u}}{\sigma_{o}} \right]^{m}$

The values of the stresses and "risks of rupture" are tabulated in Table I .

⊬	-1
P.1.	ar npr

ذ

1222223 1 022223

XX

# PLATE EXAMPLE RELIABILITY CALCULATIONS

Circumfer-Ring ential Reli- Risk of ability Rupture" I-Fj Bgj	0.05472 0.94148	0.94996.	0.04056 0.94090	0.03936 0.93674	0.09386 0.85015	
Radial "Risk of Rupture" Brj	0.00556 (	0.01211 (	0.02045	0.02600 (	0.06868 (	
Maximum Circumfer- ential Stress σ <sub>θ</sub> (ks1)	5.48	5.21	5.11	5.06	5.04	
Maximum Radial Stress $\sigma_r$ (ksi)	4.76	4.86	16.4	4.94	4.95	
Volume 'J (in <sup>3</sup> )	3.927	5.498	7.069	8.639	21.991	
Outside Radius bj (in)	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	4.0	
Inside Radius <sup>a</sup> j (in)	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	
Rîng No. j	~	61	~ <b>1</b>	4	Ś	_

ĺ

Ì

: [ |

•

۰ د

1 ,

ţ

(5) Due to the fact that there is no variation with time, we have

$$B_{rj}^{*} = B_{rj}$$
(14)  
$$B_{\theta j}^{*} = B_{\theta j}$$

(6) Computing the ring reliabilities

$$1-F_{j} = \exp\left[-B_{rj}^{\star} - B_{\theta j}^{\star}\right]$$
(15)

and tabulating the results in Table I, the reliability of the plate is computed to be

$$1-F = \prod_{j=1}^{5} (1-F_j)$$

= (0.94148) (0.94996) (0.94090)(0.93674) (0.85015) (16)= 0.670

If the material in the plate is known to be a series material, we can drop the restriction that  $V_j \ge \overline{v}$ . This enables us to use infinitesimal rings which leads to a reliability prediction of 0.696. Thus, in this example, the partitioning of the plate into only five unit volumes results in a fair estimate of the total reliability.

# SECTION III

# EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

#### 1. BEAMS: THERMAL AND MECHANICAL LOADING

a. General Discussion

The specimen selected for flexural testing under thermal and mechanical loading was a beam 1/2 in. wide, 1 in. deep, and 10 in. long - made of Wesgo Al 995 material. The test mode was four point bending with a gage span of 4 in. Because of the additional condition of thermal loading it was necessary to construct a loading fixture which would bridge the heating apparatus (Figure 2). Further, loading was done through a point contact and roller scheme to compensate for any initial misalignment in the specimen (see detail in upper corners of Figure 2).

The thermal loading was obtained through the use of two strip heaters (R I Controls model number 5305-5A). The units consisted of parabolic reflectors which were focused to concentrate the heat flux onto the tension side of the beam. This arrangement necessitated protecting the quartz heating element from broken beam debris with a piece of heavy screen. Anticipating some change in heat flux, all temperature distributions were obtained with this screen in place. When preparations were complete, several beams were broken without the thermal loading as part of a general check on the system, and the flaxural strengths were found to be in the expected range.

b. Temperature Distribution

The temperature distribution as a function of time was obtained with the use of rapid response iron constantan thermocouples and an electronic multiple channel millivolt recording instrument, (each channel prints every 12 seconds). Six 1/16-in. diameter holes were drilled into the depth of the beam from the top side at varying depths of 0.179, 0.314, 0.451, 0.552, 0.727, and 0.863 in. (Figure 5). The temperatures were monitored with



Preceding page blank





ذ

Figure 3 Arrangement of Beam and Thermocouples for Temperature Monitoring Purposes

the beam in place in the test fixture duplicating the conditions which would be encountered during the actual testing of the specimens. A refractory brick was notched to the width of the beam to provide the insulation and shielding required to discourage all but a pure one-dimensional heat flow through the beam depth (Figure 4). The recording instrument was calibrated and the thermocouples were checked in a water bath at boiling point.

Initial trials revealed that the  $Al_2O_3$  material exhibited some transparency to thermal radiation which distorted the reading of those thermocouples nearest the hot interface. This problem was dealt with by coating this surface with a thin even layer of nickel silicate. Four sets of data, each determining a temperature distribution, were obtained. Each set was checked against the other to ascertain reproducibility. The temperature distribution curves are shown in Figure 5.

c. Test Procedure

The test procedure consisted of applying an initial load of 50 lb and energizing the strip heaters at a controlled level of 190 volts for 8 min. After 8 min. the mechanical load was increased at an approximate rate of 500 lb per min. until fracture occurred. The time to failure is taken to be 8 min. plus the duration of increasing load. The initial 50 lb loading served to preserve initial alignment and eliminate backlash during change from thermal to thermal-mechanical loading. A total of 48 beams were tested in this manner. The test machine was equipped with a load pacer device which enabled the operator to approximate a predetermined load rate. To compute the actual load rate, the time from the start of the load increase to final fracture was recorded for each test and loading rates were determined by dividing the final load minus 50 lb by the duration of the increase. Consequently, there was a loading rate associated with each test which deviated somewhat from the target number of 500 lb per min.



Figure 4 Refractory Brick Used as Insulating Shield to Protect the Beam Sides From Radiant Heat





20

いたい たいたい

From this data an estimate of the average loading rate for all tests was determined as 492.9 lb per min. This number was in turn used to determine a corrected time to failure.

The statistical significance of these operations is based on our hypothesis that the mechanical and thermal load histories are the same for all specimens; this requires that the mechanical loading rate be the same for each beam. The actual load rates are not constant and do not, therefore, exactly conform to our hypothesis. To account for the small variations in loading rate, we used the average load rate to compute a corrected time to failure which would reflect the actual failure load. This correction is possible only because the thermal stresses in the beam do not significantly contribute to its probability of failure. (See Section IV-4).

The beam fracture data is presented in Table II. Column 1 tabulates in ordered form the fracture time recorded for each test. The loading rate for each test is listed in column 5 and the average of column 5 which is the average loading rate is determined to be 492.9 lb per min. The corrected time to failure is found by dividing column 4 by 492.9 and adding 8.0 min. Table III presents the corrected and ordered data and Figure 6 illustrate the resulting cumulative distribution.

#### 2. PLATES: THERMAL LOADING

,÷

a. General Discussions

The plate specimen was made of Wesgo Al 995. The configuration was circular with a concentric 1-in. diameter hole. The overall diameter was 6 in., and the thickness dimension was 1/4 in.

The thermal loading was produced by means of a 3/4-in. diameter silicon carbide heating element (Globar) positioned perpendicular to the plate through its center hole. A purely twodimensional heat flow was encouraged by insulating both the top and bottom of the plate so that the principal heat loss would be through the outer plate edge. Pictures of this setup are shown in Figures 7 and 8.

# Table II TEST DATA - $A\ell_2O_3$ BEAM

1	2	3	ų	5	6
		TINE TO	FALLURE		CORRECTED
TIME TO	FAILURE	TIME 10	PATLURE		TINE TO
FAILURE	LOAD	FAILURE	LOAD	LOADING	FAILURE
(NIN.)	(LBS.)	MINUS	MINUS	RATE	MINUS 8 MIN.
		8 MIN.	50 LB.	COL 4/ COL 3	COL 4/492.9
11,283	1680	3.283	1630	496	3.307
11-283	1670	3.283		493	3.29
11.384	1755	3, 384	1705	504	3.459
L	1820	3.6	1770	491	3.692
<u> </u>	1940	3.75	1890	504	3.834
U_1789	1920	3.784	1870	494	3.780
11.95	2000	3.95	1950	494	3.956
11,95	2010	3.95	1960	496	3.976
11.95	2040	3.95	1990	504	4.037
12,0167	2020	4.0167	1970		3.997
12.033	2040	4.033	1990	495	4.0373
12.033	2085	4.033	2035	505	4.128
	2030	4.05	1980	489,	4.107
12.083	2110	4.082	2060	504	4.179
2.1	2060	4.1	2010	490	4,078
12.117	2030	4.117	1970	490	3.997
12.133	2090	. 4.133	2040	494	4,139
i12.15	2120	4,15	2070	498	4, 199
12.167	2095	4.167	2045	493	4.149
	2190	4.2	2100	510	4.342
12.2	2140	4.2	2090	498	4.240
12.25	2110	4.25	2060	496	4.179
12.286	2200	4.260	2150	505	4.382
12.38	2175	4.3	2125	494	4.311
12.34	2050	9.36	2030	487	4.118
		<u> </u>	21,40	484	4.341
[2. <u>45</u>			2040		
12,444	2270	<u> </u>		¥25	<u> </u>
12.534	- 3140	4,534	<u></u>		
	- 2320	4.524	2270	····· \$92 ····	
12.584	2360	.4.589	2310	504	4. \$80
12.584					
	2340		2310	493	
	2340	الا	2310		
12.75	2180	. V.75			<i>121</i>
12.746	2370		2310	······································	<u>4.70</u> 7
12.4	3405				
	.2905				
	2400	المعدية المحالي المحدد			
12.333	2460		<u>2410</u>		982
17.933	2480		1410	483	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
12,85	. 2525	4,95	2975		5.021
12.945	2110	_4.946	2460	497	5,031
			2480	1	
	2490	2.9167			
1		. 5.0167.	. 2470		\$,011
14.05	1510	5.05	I VED	497	3,931
13.2	2640	5.7	2590	N75	5.755

AVQ. - 592.9

1 1

ł

and the second se	
CORRECTED TIME TO FAILURE (MIN)	$F = \frac{1}{N+1}$
11.290	. 0204
11.307	.0408
11.459	.0612
11.692	,0816
11.780	.102
11.834	. 122
11,956	. 143
11.976	. 163
11.997	. 184
11.997	. 204
12.017	. 224
12.037	. 245
12.037	.265
12.078	.286
12,118	, 306
12.128	. 326
12.138	. 347
12.139	. 367
12.149	. 387
12.179	.407
12.179	.428
12.199	.449
12.240	. 469
12.311	. 49

A6202	BEAM DATA - CO	RRECTED TIME	TO	FAILURE
2 3	AND ASSOCIATED	PROBABILITY		

Table III

CORRECTED TIME TO FAILURE (MIN)	F = <u>i</u> N - i
12.341	.51
12.342	. 53
12.362	. 55
12.392	, 572
12.443	. 592
12.489	.613
12.504	. 633
12.580	.653
12.605	. 673
12.686	, 694
12.686	,714
12.707	.734
12.727	.754
12.768	.775
12.778	, 796
12.778	.816
12.889	. 836
12.93	.857
13.011	.876
13.021	.897
13.031	.918
13.031	.938
13.225	. 978
13.255	.98





è

•••

Plate Test Arrangement Showing Relationship of Loading Fixture, Insulation, and Heating Element Figure 7


÷

The radial loading fixture which appears in all of these photographs is present only for the mechanical aspect of the loading which is disucssed under part 3 of this section. The power input to the heating element was measured and controlled by the use of a watt meter and rheostat. The test was completed when catastrophic failure of the disk occurred. The time to failure in each test was the interval between the instant of power application and the instant of failure. The gross heat flux incident upon the disk as computed using the temperature distribution and material properties will be presented later in Section IV-3.

b. Temperature Distribution

As in the case of the beam it was necessary to obtain a temperature distribution throughout the disc as a function of time and location. Because of the axisymmetric character of the thermal loading, the location is specified by radius only. A very satisfactory way of monitoring temperatures through the disk consisted of implanting thermocouples at strategic locations on the plate (Figures 9 and 10). This precluded the possibility of instrumenting each plate tested. Hence it was necessary to obtain a definitive set of measurements from one fully instrumented disk to infer the temperature distribution which existed during all successive tests. As in the case of the beam, some transparency near the inside hole was in evidence and a graphite coating was applied to the inside edge of all plates to minimize "see through."

It should be recalled that failure is catastrophic (Figure 11) in these tests and that the time to failure is variable. Hence, the problem arises of obtaining a representative set of temperature data for a duration of time greater than the greatest time to failure expected for all tests without having the instrumented disk fail during this period. The only solution that presented itself was to "prefail" the instrumented disk. Two pieces were formed by cracks along the radial direction. See Figures 12 and 13 for explanatory diagrams showing location of the cracks and thermocouple implants. Several preliminary tests on plate specimens gave an indication of what to expect as a time to failure duration.





ذ







SAN

BOBOLOGU NINGKA



ŗ

فب



i

1

i

Using this as a guide, the instrumented disk was monitored for a time period almost twice that expected. Finally, many tests were run with this instrumented disk under a variety of circumstances which served two primary interests. First, that of obtaining a temperature distribution which, with a degree of confidence, will accurately represent the actual distribution in each test specimen. Secondly, planned differences such as dismantling setup and reassembling, immediate reruns without any disturbance and rotational reorientation of the disk with respect to the heating element gave the technicians experience which was a valuable asset in conducting the unmonitored disk experiments.

The temperature data was obtained as a millivolt reading at a particular time and position. This information has been converted to temperature-time-position measurements and replotted in a manner more useful in the program. The results of these temperature distribution tests are shown in Figure 14.

c. Fracture Testing

Results of these tests are shown in Table IV and the resulting cumulative distribution is illustrated in Figure 15.

### 3. PLATES: THERMAL AND MECHANICAL LOADING

a. General Discussion

When we formulated our original program strategy, it was contemplated that the disk element would be subjected to an axisymmetric thermal loading and a mechanical radial tensile loading. Unfortunately, the required magnitude for the tensile loading could not be achieved with the gripping scheme that we visualized. For this reason, it seemed expedient to consider a radial compressive loading which would not present special gripping problems.

Using the radial load fixture shown in Figures 16 and 17, compressive loads were applied to the disk through various types of bearing devices. We attempted to approach, as close as possible, a uniform peripheral loading. Our efforts were simply not good enough as shown by the photoelastic results in Figure 18.



TIME TO FAILURE (MIN.)	$F = \frac{i}{N+1}$
6.984	. 0244
7.766	.0488
7.9	.0732
7.967	.0986
8.150	. 122
8.516	.146
8.667	, 171
8.766	. 195
8.850	.219
9.000	. 244
9.017	. 268
9.067	. 293
9.216	.317
9.266	. 34 I
9,266	. 366
9.284	. 390
9.300	. 425
9.300	430
9.384	.463
9.467	. 488

÷

Alioo,	DISK	DATA	-	TIME	то	FAILUR	: AND	ASSOCIATED	PROBABILITY
23				(	(The	ermal L	adin	g Only)	

Table IV

TIME TO FAILURE (MIN.)	F - <u>i</u> N · I
9.750	.512
9.817	.536
9.934	.561
9,967	. 585
10.083	.610
10.217	.634
10.266	. 655
10.316	.683
10.334	. 707
10.400	.731
10.716	.755
10.750	. 780
10.833	.804
10.866	.829
10.917	.853
!1.083	.877
11.750	.902
12.350	.926
12.367	.951
12.415	.975







ż





i.

Figure 17 Mechanically Loaded Plate (Compression)

1

ļ

ł

ł

ļ

ł



Figure 18 Fringe Patterns Produced in Photoelastic Specimen Subjected to Compressive Mechanical Loading

Here, we observe not only that the stress distribution is not axisymmetric; but, that significant tensile stresses are present. As we shall see, these tensile stresses cause the disk to fail sooner than the disks without this compressive loading. This illustrates quite clearly that a compressive prestress will not necessarily strengthen a brittle element. We hasten to point out that a uniform compressive prestress would not have introduced tensile stresses and would have resulted in an increase in the plate's integrity.

b. Temperature Distribution

The temperature distribution for the disk with compressive grips in place, was obtained in the same manner previously described in part 2b of this section. The temperature distribution curves are shown in Figure 19. Because 90 percent of the periphery was used to approach a uniform mechanical loading, the effective heat sink was appreciable. Comparison with the previously obtained temperature distribution shows a strong shift to lower temperatures for the same time intervals, as expected.

### c. Fracture Testing

The disks were placed in the loading fixture as shown in Figure 16 and subjected to a mechanical loading and thermal loading, the latter being superposed on the mechanical loading when it reached a prescribed level. The time to failure was recorded for each test and is given in Table No. V. Failure was defined by the first audible sound of cracking. The cumulative probability distribution is shown in Figure 20.



and the second

No.



# Table V

Al<sub>2</sub>0<sub>3</sub> DISK DATA - TIME TO FAILURE AND ASSOCIATED PROBABILITY (Mechanical and Thermal Loading)

TIME TO FAILURE (MIN.)	F = <u>i</u> N + I
3.566	.091
3.583	.182
3.600	. 272
3.917	.364
4.033	. 455
4.083	. 545
4.233	. 636
4.583	.727
4.784	.818
4.800	.91

i

ť

ĥ

Į

• •

٠.

ij

L

MATHER FROM THE REAL PROPERTY AND A DESCRIPTION OF A

のからのできるという

いちちち



è



# SECTION IV

# RESPONSE PREDICTIONS

# L. APPROACH

The central question to which this research effort addresses itself is: "Can the statistical analysis algorithm be successfully applied in the case of brittle structures exposed to thermal and mechanical loadings and, if not, why not?" Specifically, on this program we seek to explain the results of the beam and disk experiments described in Section III with the aid of the fracture algorithm presented in Section II.

There are many possible avenues of approach on this question. The straightforward approach is the most logical and involves using experimentally obtained basic material property data in conjunction with the fracture algorithm to attempt to "predict" the results of the beam and disk experiments. The difficulty with this approach is that the tensile strength distribution for alumina, at room temperature and especially at elevated temperatures, has not yet been satisfactorily defined. Each available strength distribution is probably an underestimate of the true distribution for alumina. Even if alumina were a pure series material of the Weibull type and the algorithm was performed using infinitesimal subvolumes, the use of the available strength distributions should result in conservative and not exact results. Thus, the achievement of conservative predictions is not a very sensitive test of the applicability of fracture algorithm especially if the material is close to being of the pure series type as in fact we hoped alumina would be.

The approach which was selected begins by making an additional assumption that the tensile strength distribution for alumina is independent of temperature in the range from R.T. to 1500°F. At moderate temperatures some investigators (References 3,4,5,6 and 7) do measure a slight degradation of strength with increasing temperature. However, our experience with elevated temperature

Preceding page blank

testing suggests that the experiments cannot be performed with the same precision as they can at room temperature. Thus, since a measured degradation of strength at moderate temperatures may be explained by experimental limitations, the assumption of the strength distribution being temperature independent may not be unreasonable.

Since the strength distribution is assumed to be of the Weibull type, the assumption of temperature independence requires that the parameters m,  $\sigma_{\mu}$ ,  $\sigma_{\rho}$  are independent of temperature. In this approach these parameters are left as open parameters. A trial and error procedure employing the fracture algorithm in conjunction with the stress analysis is used to attempt to simultaneously "fit" both the beam and disk experiments using a single set of values for the parameters. Using this method, a deficiency in the algorithm, experimental procedure, or the temperature independent strength assumption may be observed in two ways. First, it is entirely possible that the beam and disk experiments cannot be "fitted" satisfactorily using a single set of parameters. Second, assuming that it is possible to fit both the beam and disk experiments, it is very likely that the resulting strength distribution may be unreasonably different from the data obtained from the best strength tests.

#### 2. MATERIAL PROPERTIES

The approach just described was successfully employed. Using the single set of Weibull parameters m = 3.3,  $\sigma_u = 19,700$  psi,  $\sigma_o = 7,000$  psi with a tension gage volume of  $\overline{v} = 0.0982$  in<sup>3</sup>, both the beam and disk experiments were satisfactorily "fitted." Using these values the strength distribution is plotted in Figure 21. The mean strength can be computed to be approximately 32,400 psi. This value tends to be somewhat higher than most available tension data and begins to approach the flexural strength data. However, very recent gas-bearing data by Pears and Starrett (Reference 8) achieves some high mean strengths in tension for alumina.



When the comparison is made between this excellent data for a gage volume of 0.031 in.<sup>3</sup> to the derived Weibull type strength distribution for the same volume, Figure 22, the agreement is seen to be quite remarkable.

For the remainder of this report the tensile strength distribution, in the range from R.T. to 1500° F, shall be assumed to be given by the Weibull formulation with parameters m = 3.3,  $\sigma_u = 19,700$  psi and  $\sigma_o = 7,000$  psi. Furthermore, for the purpose of illustrating the general application of the fracture algorithm, the distribution curve shall be pretended to come from tests on a tensile specimen of gage volume  $\bar{v} = 0.0982$  in.<sup>3</sup>

The other material properties entering into the stress analysis and thermal analysis have been obtained from the literature. Thermal strain as a function of temperature after Goldsmith, Hirschhorn and Waterman (Reference 9) is shown in Figure 23. Modulus of elasticity as a function of temperature after Dally (Reference 10) is illustrated in Figure 24. Poisson's ratio as a function of temperature after Coble and Kingery (Reference 11) is shown in Figure 25. Finally the thermal conductivity as a function of temperature after Goldsmith, Hirschhorn and Waterman (Reference 9) is illustrated in Figure 26.

#### 3. THERMAL ANALYSIS

Assuming black body radiation, the heat flux Q impingent upon the surface of the beam or disk may be expressed as

$$Q = -k \frac{\partial T}{\partial n} + \sigma T^4$$
 (17)

where k is the thermal conductivity of alumina,  $\frac{\partial T}{\partial n}$  is the normal derivative of the temperature distribution into the body evaluated on the surface,  $\sigma$  is the Stefan-Boltzman constant and T is the absolute temperature on the surface. Using the temperature distribution curves for the beam and disk from Section II, Figures 5 and 13, and Figure 26 for the thermal conductivity, the heat flux Q can be computed using Equation (17). The results of these computations are plotted in Figure 27.



÷



HCHCHCAL







**RONALON** 







Figure 27 Gross Heat Flux Incident Upon Beam and Disk as a Function of Time

A CARLES IN THE AND A CARLES AND A

#### 4. BEAM STRESS ANALYSIS

The beam prototype structure is loaded, as shown in Figure 28, by terminal couples M(t) and by the temperature distribution T(z,t) induced by the heat flux Q(t) impinging on the bottom surface. The general solution of the thermal stresses in a beam with temperature dependent mechanical and thermal properties using strength-of-materials type assumptions is well known (Reference 12). By replacing the term  $\alpha$ T everywhere by  $\varepsilon_{\rm T}$ , the thermal strain, and introducing the mechanically induced bending moment distribution M(t), the stress distribution  $\sigma_{\rm x}(z,t)$  is found to be given by

$$\sigma_{x}(z,t) = -\varepsilon_{T}E + \frac{P_{T}(t)}{A} + \frac{M_{T_{z}}(t)y}{I_{z}} + \frac{[M_{T_{y}}(t) + M(t)]z}{I_{y}}$$
 (18)

where

$$P_{T}(t) = \varepsilon_{T} E d A$$
 (19)

$$M_{T_y}(t) = \int_{A} \varepsilon_T E_z dA$$
 (20)

 $M_{T_z}(t) = \int_A \varepsilon_T E y d A$  (21)

It is observed that, in this formulation with  $\varepsilon_T$  replacing  $\alpha T$ , the dependence of the solution upon the temperature distribution is now entirely implicit.

Due to the fact that the temperature distribution is independent of y the following simplifications result:



$$M_{T_{z}}(t) = 0$$

$$P_{T}(t) = b \int_{-d}^{d} \epsilon_{T} E d z$$

$$M_{T_{y}}(t) = b \int_{-d}^{-d} \epsilon_{T} E z d z$$

$$-d$$
(22)

Noting that A = 2bd and  $I = (2/3)bd^3$ , the expression for the stress distribution becomes

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{x}}(z,t) = \frac{3M(t) z}{2bd^3} - \varepsilon_{\mathrm{T}}E + \frac{1}{2d} \int_{-d}^{d} \varepsilon_{\mathrm{T}}Edz + \frac{3z}{2d^3} \int_{-d}^{d} \varepsilon_{\mathrm{T}}E z d z \quad (23)$$

Thus, given  $\varepsilon_T = \varepsilon_T(T)$ , E = E(T), T(z,t) and M(t), Equation (23) will yield the stresses in the beam.

The solution of Equation (23) has been accomplished using a digital computer (Appendix II). Using the temperature distribution curves, Figure 5, the material property curves, Figures 23 and 24, and the relationship

$$M(t) = 59.4$$
 in-lbs for  $0 \le t \le 8.0$  min  
= 59.4 + 535.3 (t-3.0) in. lbs for t 8.0 min <sup>(24)</sup>

the stress distribution is found to be as shown in Figure 29. It is observed that the stresses are small until after the mechanical load begins to increase at the 8.0 min point. Also, another consequence of the dominating mechanical loading is that the stress distribution is very nearly linear after the 9.0 min point.

Figure 30 illustrates the maximum tensile stress distribution. It is interesting to note that, using the mean tensile strength of approximately 32,-00 psi, the deterministic maximum stress theory predicts failure at about 12.6 min. From the experimental data, Figure 6, the earliest failure occurs at about 11.3 min and the median time to failure is about 12.3 min.



Stress Distributions in Beam Under Thermal and Mechanical Loading Figure 29



ذ



#### 5. DISK STRESS ANALYSIS

The disk prototype structure is loaded, as shown in Figure 31, by a tensile radial stress S on the outside surface and by the temperature distribution T(r,t) produced by the heat flux Q(t) on the inside surface. The plane stress solution in the case where the mechanical and thermal properties of the material are independent of temperature is well known (Reference 12). One method of accounting for temperature dependent properties is to represent the disk as a composite structure of concentric rings where each ring is thin enough so that the material properties within the ring can be assumed to be constant.

The analysis of the concentric rings can be readily accomplished using the Method of Initial Parameters or Transfer Matrix Method (Reference 13) due to the fact that the geometric and equilibrium conditions which must be satisfied at each interface between rings are automatically fulfilled. In addition to those parameters defined in Figure 31, the parameters and variables entering into the problem are:

- er = thermal strain
- E = modulus of elasticity
- v = Poisson's ratio
- T(r,t) = temperature distribution
- u(r,t) = radial displacement distribution
- $\sigma_{r}(r,t) =$  radial stress distribution
- $\sigma_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{t}) =$  circumferential stress distribution

Using a matrix form of this method, the stress distribution in the disk is given by

$$\sigma_{r}(r,t) = \frac{N_{r}(r,t)}{h}$$
(25)  
$$\sigma_{\theta}(r,t) = \frac{N_{\theta}(r,t)}{h}$$



where

ذ

$$\overline{N}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \overline{M}_{j}(\mathbf{r}, t) \ \overline{M}_{j-1}(\mathbf{r}_{j}, t) \ \overline{M}_{j-2}(\mathbf{r}_{j-1}, t) \dots \overline{M}_{1}(\mathbf{r}_{2}, t) \ \overline{M}_{0}(\mathbf{r}_{1}, t)\overline{\Gamma}_{0}(t)$$
and
$$\overline{N}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} u(\mathbf{r}, t) \\ N_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{r}, t) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(26)$$

$$\overline{N}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} u(\mathbf{r}, t) \\ N_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{r}, t) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(28)$$

$$N_{\theta}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{E_{1}h}{t} & v_{j} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \overline{N}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (29)$$

$$\overline{N}_{0}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{E_{1}h}{t} & v_{j} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \overline{N}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (29)$$

$$\overline{N}_{j}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{r}{\mathbf{r}_{j}} \left\{ 1 - \frac{(1 + v_{j})}{2} \overline{\Psi}_{j}(\mathbf{r}) \right\} \quad \frac{r(1 - v_{j}^{2})}{2E_{j}h} \overline{\Psi}_{j}(\mathbf{r}) \quad \frac{(1 + v_{j})\varepsilon T_{j}}{r} \int_{\mathbf{r}_{j}}^{\mathbf{r}} \eta T(\eta, t) \ d\eta$$

$$\overline{N}_{j}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{E_{1}h}{t} & v_{j} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \overline{N}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (29)$$

$$\overline{N}_{j}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{E_{1}h}{t} & v_{j} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \overline{N}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (29)$$

$$\overline{N}_{j}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{E_{1}h}{t} & v_{j}(\mathbf{r}) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad 1 - \frac{(1 - v_{j}^{2})}{2} \overline{\Psi}_{j}(\mathbf{r}) \quad 1 - \frac{(1 - v_{j}^{2})}{r^{2}T(\mathbf{r}, t)} \int_{\mathbf{r}_{j}}^{\mathbf{r}} \eta T(\eta, t) \ d\eta$$

$$1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

 $\overline{\Psi}_{j}(r) \equiv 1 - \left(\frac{r_{j}}{r}\right)^{2}$  (31)

In general Equation (26 ) leads to two nontrivial relationships which may be expressed as

$$u(r,t) = u_{0}(t) F_{1}(r,t) + N_{0}(t) F_{2}(r,t) + F_{3}(r,t)$$
(32)
$$N_{r}(r,t) = u_{0}(t) G_{1}(r,t) + N_{0}(t) G_{2}(r,t) + G_{3}(r,t)$$
where  $u_0(t) = u(r_0, t)$  and  $N_0(t) = N_r(r_0, t)$  and where  $F_i(r, t)$ and  $G_i(r, t)$ , i = 1, 2, 3, represent the cumbersome expressions that could be obtained from Equation (26). Now since the boundary conditions are

$$N_{r}(r_{0},t) = 0$$

$$N_{t}(r_{l},t) = Sh$$
(33)

the two constants of integration  $u_0(t)$  and  $N_0(t)$  are found from Equation (32) to be

$$N_{o}(t) = 0$$
  
$$u_{o}(t) = \frac{Sh - G_{3}(r_{l}, t)}{G_{1}(r_{l}, t)}$$
(34)

The system of equations, Equations (25) through (34), has been programmed on a digital computer (Appendix III). Using the temperature distribution in the disk, Figure 13, and the curves for the material properties, Figures 23, 24 and 25, the stress distribution has been computed as depicted in Figures 32 and 33. It is observed that the radial stress is always compressive and hence, according to the fracture algorithm does not contribute to the probability of failure. The circumferential stress distribution is observed to be compressive near the inside radius and tensile over most of the remainder of the disk.

The maximum tensile circumferential stress distribution is illustrated in Figure 34. Using the mean tensile strength of approximately 32,400 psi, the deterministic maximum stress theory predicts that no disk will fail up to the end of the test at 14.0 min. From the experimental data, Figure 14, the earliest failure occurs at just under 7.0 min, the median is at about 9.6 min and all specimens have failed by the 12.4 min point.



-

t

1

i

è

Figure 32 Radial Stress Distributions in Disk Under Thermal Loading



Figure 33 Circumferential Stress Distributions in Disk Under Thermal Loading



÷

Figure 34 Maximum Tensile Circumferential Stresses in Disk Under Thermal Loading

## 6. APPLICATION OF THE FRACTURE ALGORITHM

Separate, but similar, computer programs were written for the analysis of the beam and disk prototype structures (see Appendices II and III). Each program did the complete analysis of its prototype structure, including thermal analysis, stress analysis and the statistical analysis employing the fracture algorithm.

The fracture algorithm described in Section II was designed especially for the analysis of the beam and disk experiments and thus no major modifications were necessary in incorporating it into the computer programs. Steps (3), (4) and (5) are the only steps in the fracture algorithm that have not already been discussed or that are not executable in their given form. For convenience, these steps shall be repeated here along with a discussion of how the steps were accomplished in the analysis of the beam and the disk.

(3) Divide the structure into n convenient subvolumes  $V_1, V_2, \ldots V_n$ . No subvolume should be smaller than the gage volume of the tension specimen:  $V_j \ge \overline{v}, j = 1, 2, \ldots n$ . Subvolumes should be selected with approximately homogeneous stress states.

The volume of the tension specimen is  $0.0982 \text{ in.}^3$  The depth of the beam was divided into 20 equal segments thereby creating identical subvolumes of volume  $0.100 \text{ in.}^3$  The disk was subdivided into 69 ring type subvolumes, each with a volume of  $0.0996 \text{ in.}^3$ . By selecting the smallest volumes possible in each case, the homogeneity of the stress state in each subvolume was optimized.

(4) For each value of time t determine the "worst" risk of rupture for each subvolume  $V_i$ :

$$B_{ij}(t) = \frac{V_i}{v} \left\{ \max_{D_j} f[\sigma_i(x,y,z,t); m(T), \sigma_u(T), \sigma_o(T)] \right\}, i=1,2$$
(4)

where

$$f = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{i}(x, y, z, t) - \sigma_{u}(T) \\ \sigma_{o}(T) \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } \sigma_{i} > \sigma_{u}$$

$$= 0 \text{ for } \sigma_{i} \leq \sigma_{u}$$
(5)

and where T = T(x, y, z, t) and  $D_j$  is the region in space occupied by  $V_i$ .

In the computer programs, it was assumed that the maximum value of f always occurred on the boundary of the subvolume in both the case of the beam and disk. Regarding the beam subvolume, the value of f was computed at the top and bottom surfaces and the largest was selected to be the maximum value in the subvolume. In the case of the disk, f was computed on the inside radius and outside radius with largest being taken for the maximum in the ring.

Strictly speaking, the maximum value of f will not always lie on the boundary of the subvolume. Now Equation (4) is itself a conservative statement and thus, when the assumption that f is maximum on the boundary is valid, the results are still conservative. However, when the assumption is not valid the results are not conservative. Therefore it is assumed that, by making the subvolumes small enough, more often than not the maximum values will be attained on the boundary and in this manner the cumulative results for the risk of rupture for the entire structure will remain conservative.

(5) Determine the maximum value of each  $B_{ij}(t)$  in the interval  $0 \le t \le \tau$ 

$$B_{ij}^{\star}(\tau) = \max_{\substack{0 \leq t \leq \tau}} B_{ij}(t)$$
 (6)

In the computer programs, the value of time is iterated by finite amounts so the problem of determining the maximum value of  $B_{ij}(t)$  with respect to time is similar to finding the maximum of f in  $D_{i}$ . The value of  $B_{ij}$  is computed at each value of time and the largest value is selected as the maximum value. Now the true maximum value may have occurred at some intermediate value of time. So, again, an appeal is made to small increments in order to minimize the error. In the case of the beam and disk, the  $B_{ij}$ 's increased fairly monotonically with time and thus the problem was alleviated since the maximums tended to occur at the current value of time.

The remainder of t<sup>+</sup> task of placing the analyses on the computer was very straightforward. The stress analyses were programmed exactly as presented earlier in this section. The material properties that entered into the analyses were incorporated into the computer programs as functions of temperature. Data in tabular form was read into the computer and whenever a value between entries was desired, it was obtained by linear interpolation. The temperature distributions were read into the computer as two-dimensional tables and linear interpolation was again used for intermediate values. In all cases, the tables were constructed so as to tend to minimize errors arising from the use of linear interpolation.

Figure 35 is the comparison between the experiments and the "predictions" obtained from the fracture algorithm. These curves were made using the computer programs described in Appendices II and III in conjunction with the material property curves described earlier in this section. The agreement in both cases between the experiments and the theory employing the tension data is fairly remarkable in that, to our knowledge, no other investigators have achieved as good an agreement between two sets of experiments much less three sets as is the case here.



è

Figure 35 Comparison of Theory and Experiment for Beam and Disk (Using Weibull Tensile Strength Distribution with m = 3.3,  $\sigma_u = 19,700$  psi,  $\sigma_o = 7,000$  psi, and  $V_t = 0.0982$  in.<sup>3</sup>

# SECTION V DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

# 1. RELIABILITY OF RESULTS

.

We have taken the position in this investigation that we have not proved the applicability of our fracture algorithm, but, that we have established its potential for predicting thermal/mechanical response. To justify this viewpoint in the light of the amazingly close predictions, we are obliged to expose a few of the scientific shortcomings of our program. The following unanswered questions all raise doubts concerning the veracity of our results.

- (a) Have all the materials used in the beam, disks, and tennion specimens been drawn from the same statistical population?
- (b) Is high purity aluminum oxide a series material?
- (c) Temperature dependent elastic and thermal properties and statistical strength parameters were taken from the literature. Do they represent the material used in this investigation?
  - (d) What is the magnitude and character of the various parasitic stresses present in the different test specimens?
  - (e) Was the material used in our specimens homogeneous; for example, is the surface and volume material identical?

Without dwelling on the desirability of resolving these points, let us say that a more ambitious program should address itself to such questions.

#### 2. SENSITIVITY OF RESULTS

Due to the small disparity between the predicted and measured response of the beam and disk prototype structures, it is now unnecessary to conduct the error analysis originally contemplated at the beginning of the program. Instead, a variation of parameters study was performed which yields more general information. Specifically, variations of plus and minus 10 percent  $(\pm 10\%)$  were introduced into each material property versus temperature curve entering into the response analyses. The resulting theoretical curves are compared with the data in Figures 36 through 41.

Referring to these figures, it is readily observed that the beam is virtually insensitive to the mechanical properties  $\varepsilon_{\rm T}({\rm T})$ , E(T) and v(T). Poisson's ratio was recognized to be unimportant in the stress analysis of the beam. However, the fact that the thermal strain and modulus of elasticity do not play a large role in the case of the beam is probably due to the fact that the temperature distribution is too linear. With respect to the Weibull parameters m,  $\sigma_{\rm u}$  and  $\sigma_{\rm o}$  the beam is observed to behave fairly sensitively.

The effect of Poisson's ratio was included in the stress analysis of the disk. Consequently, it is interesting that the  $\pm 10\%$  variations in  $\nu(T)$  do not significantly alter the theoretical curve in Figure 38. The other figures indicate that the disk is fairly sensitive to m and very sensitive to  $\varepsilon_T(T)$ , E(T),  $\sigma_u$  and  $\sigma_o$ . It is also interesting to note that the disk curves for  $\pm 10\% \varepsilon_T(T)$  and  $\pm 10\% E(T)$ , Figures 36 and 37, are identical. This would be explained if the parameters always occurred as a product,  $\varepsilon_T E$ , as is the case in the stress analysis of the beam Equation (23). That this is not the situation in the case of the disk is readily observed by inspecting Equations (25) through (34) for the stress analysis of the disk. A simple example, however, will clear things up.



ذ





ذ

74



į,

Figure 38 Effect of 10 Percent Variation in Poisson's Ratio Upon the Predicted Cumulative Distributions for the Beam and Disk



Figure 39 Effect of 10 Percent Variation in Weibull Parameter m Upon the Predicted Cumulative Distributions for the Beam and Disk



ż





ł

ł

÷

Figure 41 Effect of 10 Percent Variation in Weibull Parameter  $\sigma_o$ Upon the Predicted Cumulative Distributions for the Beam and Disk

Consider two singly fitting concentric rings of the same material. Assume that when both rings are at the reference temperature  $T_0$ , the rings are free from stress. Also, assume that both  $\varepsilon_T$  and F are functions of temperature. Now, let us examine what happens when the inside ring (number 1) is heated to  $T_1$  and the outside ring (number 2) is heated to  $T_2$ . If the thickness of the ring  $\delta$  is small, the radius of both rings may be taken as R and thus, after being heated to  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  respectively, the stresses in the rings can be computed from elementary theory to be

$$T_{1} = -\frac{\varepsilon_{T}(T_{1}) - \varepsilon_{T}(T_{2})}{\frac{1}{E(T_{1})} + \frac{1}{E(T_{2})}}$$
(35)

$$\sigma_2 = -\sigma_1 \tag{36}$$

The form of Equation (35) demonstrates that the effect of  $a \pm N\%$  variation in  $\epsilon_{T}(T)$  will be identical to  $a \pm N\%$  variation in E(T)

#### 3. FUTURE RESEARCH

Almost all of the work which has been done in the field of statistical fracture theory has concerned itself with the analysis problem as contrasted with the design problem. The present study is no exception since we attempt to predict the behavior of a known element under a specified environment. If we are to deal effectively with the problems of how to modify an inadequate structure or how to proportion a brittle component for minimum weight when operating under severe temperatures, we must address ourselves directly to the problem of design. Our fracture algorithm provides, to be sure, a basic tool for design; but, it does not constitute a design procedure.

To improve our analysis capabilities, there are two situations to consider. In the first, we must extend our capability so that we may predict the performance of simple materials (linear, homogeneous, isotropic, series) in more severe temperature environments. In the second, we must try to characterize the behavior of more complicated materials (nonlinear, anisotropic, parallel) under room temperature and steady state elevated temperature environments.

#### APPENDIX I

## . STATISTICAL FRACTURE THEORY FOR COMBINED STRESS CONDITIONS

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

In his classic paper of 1939 (Reference 14), Weibull developed an expression for the fracture probability of a brittle material under a polyaxial stress state. Using a different point of view, we shall expand on his brief statistical treatment of this combined stress problem and we shall extend our results to cases of varying mechanical and thermal loading and to materials which cannot be represented by the Weibull distribution function.

Briefly, it is our objective to establish a fracture surface, i.e., to find a relationship among the strengths achieved under various stress states. The usual approach to this problem in either brittle or ductile materials is to find a property common to all stress states that will indicate failure or nonfailure. In ductile materials the distortion energy represents such a property since incipient flow occurs in any stress state in which the distortion energy is equal to the distortion energy obtained in a tension specimen at yield. Stated in another way, we can correlate yielding under any stress state with the distortion energy. Our approach for brittle materials is completely analogous - we shall try to find a property that will correlate with the reliabilities associated with the various possible combined stress conditions.

To avoid the "size effect" problem observed in the strength of brittle elements, i.e., increasing fracture stress with decreasing volume, we shall confine our study to <u>finite</u> volumes  $\Delta V$  of fixed size. We assume that both the material and the stress state in these basic volumes are homogeneous and that the materials used in all the volumes to be considered have been drawn from the same population. In addition, we shall restrict the study to brittle materials that are statistically isotropic, i.e., the distribution of strengths obtained from an indefinitely large number of basic volumes will be identical in every direction.

We shall assume that the principal stresses  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ ,  $S_3$  which act on a basic volume are proportional to a load factor S, i.e.,

$$S_1 = \alpha S$$
  
 $S_2 = \beta S$  (37)  
 $S_3 = \gamma S$ 

where  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are constants which define the stress state. Then, the strength of a basic element will be taken as the maximum load factor that it can equilibrate. Failure of the element is represented by its inability to equilibrate the applied loading. It is important to point out that it is possible for cracks to initiate and propagate within the basic volume without causing its failure. Materials in which cracks can be arrested or which provide alternative load paths when local failures occur are classified as parallel or seriesparallel materials. If a local failure necessarily leads to overall failure, the associated material is called a series or "weakest link" material. One can advantageously adopt an infinitesimal basic volume for the series material and, as we shall subsequently discuss, combined stress testing is greatly simplified in this case.

Only the tensile or cohesive mode of failure will be considered in this investigation. We shall ignore the influence of compressive or shear stresses on the strength of a brittle material. The potential usefulness of this tension criterion is a consequence of two observations; first, that the shear strength of brittle materials is usually an order of magnitude greater than the tensile strength and, second,

that it is extremely difficult to eliminate tensile stresses from prototype or laboratory elements. Almost every structural failure of a brittle component can be attributed to the presence of some distribution of tensile stresses.

è

#### 2. TWO-DIMENSIONAL THEORY

# a. Heuristic Development-Single Loading

When we attempt to describe the statistical fracture strength of a finite volume of material under a uniaxial stress state, the axial stress (strain) is the only reasonable choice for the statistical variate. Taking a general form for any cumulative distribution function, we can write the fracture probability F for the uniaxial stress state as

$$F(\sigma) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta V}{V}g(\sigma)\right]$$
(38)

where  $\Delta V$  is the specified volume of the basic element, v is a volume of unity and  $\sigma$  is the axial stress. The delineation of the constant  $\Delta V/v$  does not affect the generality of this expression and in the special case of a series material it provides a convenient representation. If we examine the strength of a basic volume of an isotropic material under a general homogeneous stress state, it follows that failure will depend only on the three principal stresses acting on the unit. Thus, the probability of failure of the basic volume can be designated as  $F(S_1, S_2, S_3)$  where the three principal stresses are taken as the statistical variates. For this case we shall take Equation (38) in the form

$$\frac{-\log \left[1 - F(S_1, S_2, S_3)\right]}{\Delta V/v} = g(S_1, S_2, S_3)$$
(39)

For a specified reliability (1-F), Equation (39) becomes  $g(S_1, S_2, S_3)$  equals constant, which defines our fracture surface.

On the basis that failure is caused only by tensile stresses, it seems reasonable to look for the function g within the collection of all possible tensile stresses which can occur at any point in the basic volume. In the plane stress problem, we can relate the normal stress  $\sigma_n$  acting in any direction to the principal stresses through the expression

$$\sigma_n = S_1 \cos^2 \theta + S_2 \sin^2 \theta \tag{40}$$

where  $\theta$  is the angle between  $\sigma_n$  and  $S_1$ . As  $\theta$  sweeps through all values from  $-\pi/2$  to  $\pi/2$ , Equation (40) describes every possible normal stress acting at a point. The normal stresses associated with the various directions described by  $\theta$  are shown in Figure  $4^2$  for several different stress states. The question, now, is what are the distinguishing features of these figures which will reflect the differences they cause in a material's response?

The most obvious first guess is to differentiate among these stress states by comparing the areas associated with the tensile normal stresses. However, this approach does not reflect the possibility that the magnitude of the stresses may have a different influence than their extent or distribution. For example, hydrostatic tension and pure tension stress states which lead to the same area are depicted in Figure 42a where we observe that one peak stress is twice the other. Experience indicates that the pure tension state is the more critical. On the other hand, when the maximum hydrostatic tension and pure tension stresses are equal, as indicated in Figure 43b, our intuition would select the hydrostatic state as the more critical. Unlike pure tension, oriented flaws such as cracks cannot avoid exposure to high normal stresses by assuming a preferred direction since all directions experience the same stress under hydrostatic tension. This implies that a maximum stress theory is inapplicable and unconservative, and indeed, evidence exists to support this contention (Reference 15).

The two examples depicted in Figure 43 suggest that we "weight" the ordinates of the <u>normal stress-theta</u> diagrams for different stress states and then compare their areas. Assuming a statistically isotropic material, the weighting should be independent of the orientation of the normal stress,  $\theta$ . We might use, for example, a power function to modify the normal stresses, i.e.,



Normal Stress Distributions for Various Stress States, Two-Dimensional

i i

1

; 1

. ....

;

1



è

ł





$$\sigma_n^k$$
 (41)

where D and k are constants. This alteration results in the dashed curve shown in the left side of Figure 44 . If the normal stress distribution for several stress states are weighted in this fashion, we could compare the areas of the resulting curves, i.e.,

D

ā.

224

1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 -

$$g(S_1, S_2) = Area = D \int_{\sigma_n \ge 0} \sigma_n^k d\theta$$
 (42)

where the integration extends over those values of  $\theta$  where the normal stress is non-negative. Because of symmetry we need consider only the positive normal stresses in the interval zero to  $\pi/2$ . To account for the possibility that tensile stresses below a certain magnitude  $\sigma_l$  may not cause failure, we may choose to weight the difference  $(\sigma_n - \sigma_l)$  as shown in the right half of Figure 44. The associated area is given by

$$g(S_1, S_2) = Area = D \int_{\sigma_n = \sigma_l}^{\sigma_n = \sigma_l} (\sigma_n - \sigma_l)^k d\theta$$
 (43)

Certainly, the use of a power function to weight the <u>normal</u> <u>stress-theta</u> diagrams is completely arbitrary and there are many other ways of manipulating and distorting such curves. Our problem is to find a weighting function that will reflect the influence of stress state on the reliability of a basic volume. Denoting the weighting function by f, the fracture probability becomes

$$F(S_1, S_2) = 1 - \exp\left[\frac{-\Delta V}{V} \int_{0}^{\pi/2} f(\sigma_n) d\theta\right] (44)$$

We are now in a position to describe certain guidelines for the selection of f. First, to account for the possible existence of a zero fracture probability stress  $\sigma_{\ell}$ , we must take



÷



$$f = f(\sigma_n - \sigma_l) \qquad \sigma_n \ge \sigma_l \ge 0$$

$$f = 0 \qquad \sigma_n \le \sigma_l \qquad (45)$$

The latter condition implies that both  $S_1 \leq \sigma_{\ell}$  and  $S_2 \leq \sigma_{\ell}$  and that in such cases F = 0. At the other extreme, we expect that fracture is a certainty when either  $S_1$  or  $S_2$  is positive and unbounded; hence, F = 1 implies that

 $f \rightarrow \infty$  when  $S_1, S_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ 

いち 一日本 二日本 一日本

Furthermore, we would expect on physical g. inds that the failure probability would increase continuously with increasing principal tensile stresses; thus,

f...continuous and monotone increasing.

Finally, f must be chosen in such a way that the associated  $F(S_1, S_2)$  fits the cumulative distribution curves obtained from fracture tests conducted using various stress states. In particular, it is necessary that fracture data obtained under pure tension be represented by  $F(S_1, 0)$  or  $F(0, S_2)$  and that hydrostatic tension data be represented by  $F(S_1, S_1)$ . This is a standard problem in curve fitting and one proceeds by selecting a reasonable and versatile form for f which contains  $\sigma_g$  and n additional parameters  $a_i$ ; i.e.,  $f = f\left[(\sigma_{ri} - \sigma_g); a_1, a_2, \ldots a_{nj}\right]$ . These parameters are chosen so that the curve for F passes "as close as possible" to each data point. For a series material, we note that the parameters which provide an exact fit to an infinite amount of data are intrinsic phenomenological strength properties of the material. Otherwise, they characterize approximately the strength of the basic volume.

The following typical functions may be useful candidates for  $f(S_1, S_2, S_3)$ :

For  $\sigma_n < \sigma_2$ :

$$f = 0$$

For  $\sigma_n \ge \sigma_l$ :

ł

à

$$\mathbf{f} = \left(\frac{\sigma_n - \sigma_\ell}{\sigma_c}\right)^k \equiv \mathbf{X}^k \; ; \; k \ge 0 \; ; \; \mathbf{X} \equiv \left(\frac{\sigma_n - \sigma_\ell}{\sigma_c}\right) \tag{46}$$

$$f = \mathbf{X} + a_1 \overline{\mathbf{X}}^k \qquad a_1 > 0 \ ; \ k > 0 \tag{47}$$

$$f = a_1 X + a_2 X^2 + a_3 X^3 + \dots + a_n X^n ; a_1 \ge 0$$
 (48)

$$\mathbf{f} = \exp \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{1} \tag{49}$$

$$\mathbf{f} = \exp \mathbf{X}^{k} - \mathbf{1} \quad ; \quad k > 0 \tag{50}$$

$$f = \exp(\exp(X - 1) - 1)$$
 (51)

where k,  $\sigma_{\ell}$ ,  $\sigma_{c}$ , and the  $a_{i}$ 's are statistical parameters and where  $\sigma_{n}$  is the normal stress. The first of these functions,  $f = \overline{X}^{k}$ , is the one adopted by Weibull (Reference 14). We shall interpret f as the generalized normal stress and  $\overline{f}$  as the generalized normal stress vector; in two dimensions  $\overline{f} = \overline{f}(f, \theta)$ .

b. Specific Formulas

In two dimensions the fracture probability is given by

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta \mathbf{V}}{\mathbf{v}} \int_{\mathbf{O}}^{\mathbf{\Theta}_0} \mathbf{f}(\sigma_n - \sigma_k) \, \mathrm{d}\Theta\right] \quad (52)$$

where the integration extends over the region where  $\sigma_n > \sigma_i$ ; specifically,

$$\sigma_n = S_1 \cos^2 \theta + S_2 \sin^2 \theta \ge \sigma_2$$
 (53)

Theta is the angle between  $\vec{\sigma}_n$  and  $\vec{S}_1$ .

This inequality leads to three distinct cases:

- (1)  $S_1 \ge S_2 \ge \sigma_2 \ge 0$ :
- $\theta_{0} = \pi/2$ (2)  $S_{1} \ge \sigma_{\ell}; S_{2} \le \sigma_{\ell};$  $\theta_{0} = \cos^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\ell} - S_{2}}{S_{1} - S_{2}}}$ (2)  $S_{1} \le \sigma_{\ell} \le \sigma_{\ell}$
- (3)  $S_1 \leq \sigma_\ell; S_2 \leq \sigma_\ell;$  $\Theta_0 = 0 \quad (F = 0)$

Selecting the Weibull form for f given by Equation (46) we shall determine the failure probability for pure tension and for hydrostatic tension.

<u>Pure Tension</u>:  $S_1 = \sigma_t > \sigma_2$ ;  $S_2 = 0$ 

$$F(\sigma_{t}) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta V}{V}\int_{0}^{\cos^{-1}\sqrt{\sigma_{\ell}}/\sigma_{t}} \frac{(\sigma_{t}\cos^{2}\theta - \sigma_{t})^{k}}{\sigma_{c}}d\theta\right] (54)$$

When  $\sigma_{\ell} = 0$ ,  $F(\sigma_{r})$  becomes

$$F(\sigma_{t}) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta V}{V} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} - \frac{\Gamma(k + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(k+1)} \left(\frac{\sigma_{t}}{\sigma_{c}}^{k}\right)\right]$$
(55)

<u>Hydrostatic Tension</u>:  $S_1 = S_2 = \sigma_h > \sigma_z$ 

 $F(\sigma_{\rm h}) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta V}{V} - \frac{\pi}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\rm h} - \sigma_{\rm s}}{\sigma_{\rm c}}^{\rm k}\right)\right]$ (56)

This expression has the same form as the Weibull distribution function; consequently, the estimation of  $\sigma_{\ell}$ ,  $\sigma_c$ , and k can follow well developed procedures for this purpose (References 2, 14, and 16). If biaxial hydrostatic tension data can be obtained the parameter determination for all of the forms indicated in Equation (46) through (51) will be greatly simplified since all the f's become independent of theta.

## c. Multiple Loadings

If our basic volume is subjected to a number of different loadings, we shall attempt to correlate fracture with the "worst" conditions that can arise. It is assumed that stresses which act on the basic volume prior to fracture do not significantly effect the resistance of the material. Now then, we shall separately consider every possible direction in our basic volume and identify the largest normal tensile stress which acts throughout the load history; i.e.,  $\max_{n} \sigma_{n}(t)$ . Each of these maximum normal stresses will be weighted to form the maximum generalized normal stress  $f_{max}$  which will then be summed over theta in the usual way to form g. For example, consider three distinct loadings which give rise to the same principal directions such as illustrated in Figure 45a. The collection of maximum normal stresses is indicated as the envelop of the three solid curves and the weighted envelop curve is shown as a dashed curve. We note that symmetry is preserved across the  $\sigma_n$  and the  $\theta$  axes. The fracture probability may then be written as

$$F\left[S_{1}(t), S_{2}(t)\right] = 1 - \exp\left\langle -\frac{\Delta V}{V} \int_{0}^{\pi/2} f\left\langle \left[\max_{t} \sigma_{u}(t)\right] \right. \right. \right.$$

$$\left. - \sigma_{\sharp}, a_{i} \right\rangle d\theta \right\rangle$$
(57)

where we recall that the constants  $a_{i}$  and the  $a_{i}$ 's are statistical parameters.

Although we have chosen in our previous work to represent the  $\sigma_n = \theta$  relationship in cartesian coordinates, there is no



fundamental reason for doing so. For the multiple loading problem it is more convenient to use a polar representation as shown in Figure 45b where the normal stress vector  $\overline{\sigma}_n$  and the generalized normal stress vector  $\overline{f}$  are represented in a natural way. The x-y axes are assumed to be fixed in the body and both the principal stresses and directions are taken as time dependent. Calculating the area under the weighted maximum normal stress envelop,  $f_{max}$ , to establish g, the fracture probability in twodimensional polar coordinates becomes  $\pi f$ 

$$F\left[\sigma_{xx}(t), \sigma_{yy}(t), \sigma_{xy}(t)\right] = 1 - \exp\left[\frac{-\Delta V}{V} \iint_{0 \ 0} r \ dr \ d\theta\right]$$

or

÷

$$F\left[\sigma_{xx}(t), \sigma_{yy}(t), \sigma_{xy}(t)\right] = 1 - \exp\left\langle -\frac{\Delta V}{V} \int_{0}^{\pi} \frac{1}{2} f^{2} \left\langle \left[\max_{t} \sigma_{n}(t)\right] - \sigma_{d}, a_{i} \right\rangle d\theta \right\rangle$$
(53)

where we note that symmetry is available only through the origin and where the normal stress is given by

$$\sigma_n = \sigma_{xx}(t) \cos^2\theta + \sigma_{yy}(t) \sin^2\theta + \sigma_{xy}(t) \sin^2\theta$$
 (59)

Comparing Equations (58) and (57), we find that the polar representation integrates  $f^2$  rather than f over theta. This does not lead to an essential difference in the fracture probability expressions since in each case we must find an f that fits our data. For example, if f is given by Equation (46) the exponent is absorbed by the parameter k and differences in multiplicative constants are absorbed by  $\sigma_{\alpha}$ .

## d. Thermal Loading

It has tacitly been assumed throughout this study that under fixed environmental conditions (temperature, atmosphere, humidity) the cumulative strength distributions for our basic volume do not vary with time. We do not account, for example, for the possible effects of static fatigue, creep, or continuous chemical changes in our material. Where this assumption holds we can associate a unique function f with every environmental condition. Specifically, for a uniformly distributed temperature T in our basic volume, we shall designate the generalized normal stress by  $f_T(\sigma_n - \sigma_\ell; a_i)$ . In practical situations one usually tries to use as few different forms of f as possible. For a given form, however, the statistical parameters must be taken as temperature dependent. Thus,  $f_T$ , can be written,

$$f_{T} = f_{1} \left[ \sigma_{n} - \sigma_{1}(T); a_{1}(T) \right] \qquad T_{0} \leq T \leq T_{1}$$

$$f_{T} = f_{2} \left[ \sigma_{n} - \sigma_{2}(T); b_{j}(T) \right] \qquad T_{1} \leq T \leq T_{2} \qquad (60)$$

$$f_{T} = f_{m} \left[ \sigma_{n} - \sigma_{m}(T); c_{k}(T) \right] \qquad T_{m-1} \leq T \leq T_{m}$$

where the temperature range of interest is  $T_0 \leq T \leq T_m$  and where the symbols  $\sigma_1$ ,  $\sigma_2$ ,  $\sigma_m$ ,  $a_i$ ,  $b_j$ ,  $c_k$  represent temperature dependent statistical parameters.

When a basic volume is subjected to a temperature history T(t) and a stress history  $\sigma_{ij}(t)$ , we once again identify the "worst" condition in every direction. Here, we should recognize that the largest normal tensile stress in a given direction does not necessarily lead to the largest generalized normal stress. What we must find is the maximum combination of normal stress and weighting. For a single stress state, the envelop of maximum generalized normal stresses is given by

$$f_{\max} = \max_{T} f \left[ \sigma_{n} - \sigma_{l}(T); a_{i}(t) \right]$$
(61)

When the stress state varies, this maximum envelop is defined by

$$\mathbf{f}_{\max} = \max_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{t})} \left\{ \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{t}) - \sigma_{\mathbf{t}} \left[ \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{t}) \right] \right\}$$
(62)

where the statistical parameters  $\sigma_g$  and  $a_i$  depend explicitly on the temperature and implicitly on the time parameter t. Adopting polar coordinates with fixed axes x-y in the basic volume, we form the function g by summing this  $f_{max}$  over theta; thus,

ż

X

3

$$F\left[\sigma_{xx}(t), \sigma_{yy}(t), \sigma_{xy}(t)\right] = 1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{\Delta V}{V}\right\} - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \max_{t} f_{T(t)}\right\rangle$$

$$\langle \sigma_{n}(t) - \sigma_{\ell}[T(t)]; a_{i}[T(t)] \rangle^{2} d\theta \rangle$$
 (63)

where  $f_T$  is defined by Equation (60) and  $\sigma_n$  is given by Equation (59). This expression predicts the fracture probability of a basic volume under biaxial time varying stresses and subjected to a changing temperature environment.

# 3. THREE-DIMENSIONAL THEORY

# a. Single Loading

Following the two-dimensional development, we propose to correlate the behavior of the basic volume under a general stress state with some function of the totality of normal tensile stresses in three dimensions. In the belief that any tensile normal stress can occasionally cause a fracture by virtue of its magnitude and relative orientation with respect to a random flaw, we once again assume isotropy and weight each normal stress vector  $\overline{\sigma}_n$  according to its magnitude only. Using the polar coordinates defined in Figure 46a, the normal stress in three dimensions can be written in terms of the three principal stresses; thus,

$$\sigma_n = \cos^2 \phi (S_1 \cos^2 \psi + S_2 \sin^2 \psi) + S_3 \sin^2 \phi$$
 (64)

The normal stress diagrams associated with several important stress states are sketched in Figure 46 where we observe the following:

- Symmetry makes it possible to consider only one quadrant.
- (2) The hydrostatic stress state gives rise to a spherical surface.
- (3) The zero probability stress  $\sigma_{\vec{k}}$  can be represented as a sphere of radius  $\sigma_{\vec{k}}$  which can be subtracted from each diagram to yield  $\sigma_n - \sigma_{\vec{k}}$ .
- (4) If the three principal stresses are positive, the volume of the normal stress diagram is given by

 $V = \frac{\pi}{210} \left[ 5(s_1^3 + s_2^3 + s_3^3) + 3(s_1^2 s_2 + s_1^2 s_3 + s_2^2 s_1 + s_2^2 s_3 + s_3^2 s_1 + s_3^2 s_2) + 2s_1 s_2 s_3 \right]$ (65)


A Suma Sec

Figure 46 Normal Stress Diagrams, Three-Dimensional

This expression is useful as a computer check.

Now, adopting the same types of weighting functions f described in Section 2-a, we can write an expression for the fracture probability of a basic volume subjected to a threedimensional stress state; thus,

$$F(S_1, S_2, S_3) = 1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{\Delta V}{v} \iiint_{\sigma_n = \sigma_\ell}^{f} r^2 dr \cos\phi d\phi d\psi\right\} (66)$$

where the integration extends over that portion of the first quadrant where the normal stress is greater than the zero probability stress. More specifically,

$$F(S_1, S_2, S_3) = 1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{\Delta V}{V} \int_{O}^{\pi/2} \frac{\pi/2}{d\psi} \int_{L}^{\psi_U} \frac{1}{3} f^3\left(\sigma_n - \sigma_\ell; a_1\right) \cos\phi d\phi\right\} (67)$$

where we delineate four distinct cases:

E2

$$(1) \quad S_1 \stackrel{*}{=} S_2 \stackrel{*}{=} S_3 \stackrel{*}{=} \sigma_k$$

÷

$$\phi_{L} = 0$$

$$\phi_{U} = \pi/2$$
(2)  $S_{1} = S_{2} = S_{3} = \sigma_{\ell}$ 

$$\phi_{L} = 0$$

$$\phi_{U} = 0$$
F = 0
(3)  $S_{1} = S_{2} = \sigma_{\ell}$ ,  $S_{3} = \sigma_{\ell}$ 

$$\phi_{L} = 0$$

$$\phi_{U} = \cos^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\ell} - S_{3}}{S_{1} \cos^{2}\psi + S_{2} \sin^{2}\psi - S_{3}}}$$

(4) 
$$S_3 \ge \sigma_{\ell}$$
,  $S_1 \le S_2 \le \sigma_{\ell}$   
 $\phi_L = \cos^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{S_3 - \sigma_{\ell}}{S_3 - S_1 \cos^2 \psi - S_2 \sin^2 \psi}}$   
 $\phi_H = \pi/2$ 

The integration limits in cases 3 and 4 are derived in Figure 47. Using the Weibull form for f given by Equation (46),we shall determine the failure probabilities for several important cases. Pure Tension:

Case 4; 
$$\sigma_{n} = \sigma_{n}(0, 0, \sigma_{t}); \phi_{L} = \cos^{-1} \sqrt{\sigma_{t} - \sigma_{\ell}} / \sigma_{t}; \phi_{U} = \pi/2$$

$$F(0,0,\sigma_{t}) = 1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{\Delta V}{v} \int_{0}^{\pi/2} \frac{\pi/2}{d\psi} \int_{\cos^{-1} - \sqrt{\sigma_{t} - \sigma_{\ell}}}^{\pi/2} \frac{3k}{\cos\phi \, d\phi}\right\} (68)$$

For  $\sigma_{\ell} = 0$ ,

$$g(0,0,\sigma_{t}) = \frac{\pi}{6(6k+1)} \left(\frac{\sigma_{t}}{\sigma_{c}}\right)^{3k}$$
(69)

Comment: This formula for g is much simpler than the corresponding g in the two-dimensional case described by Equation (55). It has the same form as that found in the conventional Weibull distribution function and, consequently, the estimation techniques described in References 2, 14 and 16 can be used to establish the statistical parameters  $\sigma_c$  and k.



Figure 47 Integration Limits on PHI

Hydrostatic Tension: 3-D

Case 1; 
$$\sigma_{n} = \sigma_{n}(S_{h}, S_{h}, S_{h}); S_{h} \geq \tau_{\ell}; \phi_{L} = 0; \phi_{U} = \pi/2$$
  

$$F(S_{h}, S_{h}, S_{h}) = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta V}{V} \int_{0}^{\pi/2} d\psi \int_{0}^{\pi/2} \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{S_{h} - \sigma_{\ell}}{c_{c}}\right)^{3k} \cos\phi \, d\phi\right)$$
(70)

$$g(S_{h},S_{h},S_{h}) = \frac{\pi}{6} \left\{ \frac{S_{h} - \sigma_{\ell}}{\sigma_{c}} \right\}^{3k}$$
(71)

Comment: We can compare the magnitudes of hydrostatic tension  $S_h$ and pure tension  $\sigma_t$  when each produces the same failure probability in a basic volume  $\Delta V$ . Equating the two functions g given by Equations (69) and (71) and taking  $\sigma_l = 0$ , we obtain

$$\left(\frac{S_{h}}{\sigma_{t}}\right) = \left(\frac{1}{6k+1}\right)^{1/3k}$$
(72)

Hydrostatic Tension: 2-D

ذ

Case 3;  $\sigma_n = \sigma_n(\sigma_h, \sigma_h, 0)$ ;  $\sigma_\ell = 0$ ;  $\phi_L = 0$  '  $\phi_U = \pi/2$ 

$$F(\sigma_{\rm h},\sigma_{\rm h},0) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta V}{v} \int_{0}^{\pi/2} d\psi \int_{0}^{\pi/2} \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\rm h} \cos^2 \phi}{\sigma_{\rm c}}\right)^{3k} \cos \phi \, d\phi\right]$$
(73)

$$g(\sigma_{\rm h},\sigma_{\rm h},0) = \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{12(3k+\frac{1}{2})} \frac{\Gamma(3k+1)}{\Gamma(3k+\frac{1}{2})} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\rm h}}{\sigma_{\rm c}}\right)^{3k}$$
 (74)

Comment: The expression for  $g(\sigma_h, \sigma_h, 0)$  is more complicated than the corresponding  $g(\sigma_h, \sigma_h)$  obtained from Equation (56) in our two-dimensional treatment of the hydrostatic tension plane stress problem. For equal reliabilities we can compare the biaxial hydrostatic state with the pure tension state by equating the functions g given by Equations (69) and (74); thus,

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_{\rm h}}{\sigma_{\rm t}}\right) = \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma\left(3k + \frac{1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(3k + 1\right)}\right]^{1/3k} \qquad 3-\text{D Theory}$$
(75)

We form the corresponding expression, using the two-dimensional theory, by equating Equations (55) and (56) and replacing the letter k by k'; thus,

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_{\rm h}}{\sigma_{\rm t}}\right) = \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma\left({\rm k}' + \frac{1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left({\rm k}' + 1\right)}\right]^{1/{\rm k}'} \qquad (76)$$

To compare the (2-D) and (3-D) theories, the same input data must be used to establish the respective parameters. Therefore, if each theory is fit to the same tension data, we can equate Equations (55) and (68) to obtain the relationships among the various parameters, i.e.,

$$\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{\Gamma(\mathbf{k}' + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\mathbf{k}' + 1)} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}}}{\sigma_{\mathbf{c}}'}\right)^{\mathbf{k}'} = \frac{\pi}{6(6\mathbf{k} + 1)} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}}}{\sigma_{\mathbf{c}}}\right)^{3\mathbf{k}}$$
(77)

The equivalence is escablished if

÷,

$$k' = 3k$$
 (78)

$$\sigma_{c}' = \sigma_{c} \left[ \frac{3(2k'+1)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(k'+\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(k'+1)} \right]^{1/k'}$$
(79)

Since only one parameter appears in Equation (75) we simply replace 3k by k' to see that Equations (75) and (76) are identical. In general, the (2-D) and (3-D) theories both predict the same fracture curve for the plane stress problem when the Weibull f is used. <sup>\$1<sup>\*\$</sup>2<sup>\*5</sup>,<sup>5</sup>3<sup>=-5</sup>:</sup>

÷

No. And Association

Case 3; 
$$\sigma_{n} = S \cos 2\phi$$
;  $\sigma_{\ell} = 0$ ;  $\phi_{L} = 0$ ;  $\phi_{U} = \pi/4$   
 $F(S,S,-S) = 1 - \exp \begin{bmatrix} \pi/2 & \pi/4 \\ -\frac{\Delta V}{v} \int d\psi \int \frac{1}{3} \frac{|S \cos 2\phi|}{\tau_{c}}^{3k} \cos\phi d\phi \end{bmatrix}$  (80)

k=1: 
$$g(S,S,-S) = \frac{-7}{6} \left(\frac{8\sqrt{2}}{35}\right) \left(\frac{S}{\sigma_c}\right)^3$$
 (81)

$$k=2:$$
  $g(S,S,-S) = \frac{\pi}{6} \left(\frac{512\sqrt{2}}{3003}\right) \left(\frac{S}{\sigma_c}\right)^6$  (82)

Comment: In situations where an axial prestress is brought onto a beam or column member, it may be important to know the increased tensile resistance in the transverse directions. The transverse integrity without prestressing can be estimated by the biaxial hydrostatic tension case. Comparing Equation (74) with Equations (81) and (82) we find,

for kal,

$$\frac{\frac{3/2}{12(3+\frac{1}{2})} - \frac{r(3+1)}{r(3+\frac{1}{2})} \left\langle \frac{\sigma_{h}}{\sigma_{c}} \right\rangle^{3} = \frac{\pi}{6} \left\langle \frac{8\sqrt{2}}{35} \right\rangle \left( \frac{s}{\sigma_{c}} \right)^{3}$$
(83)

$$S = 1.1222 \sigma_{\rm h}$$
 (84)

for k#2,

$$\frac{\frac{3/2}{12(6+\frac{1}{2})}}{\frac{1}{12(6+\frac{1}{2})}} \frac{\frac{\Gamma(6+1)}{\sigma_{c}}}{\frac{\sigma_{c}}{\sigma_{c}}} = \frac{\pi}{6} \left(\frac{512\sqrt{2}}{3003}\right) \left(\frac{S}{\sigma_{c}}\right)^{6}$$
(85)

$$S = 1.0594 \ \sigma_{h}$$
 (86)

Thus, our axial prestress increases the transverse strength by 12.3 percent when k=1 and by 5.9 percent when k=2.

$$S_1 = S_2 = -S_3 = S_3 = S_3$$

n Sec.

「おおちないたちの

ذ

Case 4:  $\sigma_n = -S \cos 2\phi$ ;  $\sigma_l = 0$ ;  $\phi_L = \pi/4$ ;  $\phi_U = \pi/2$ 

$$F(-S,-S,S) = 1 - \exp \left[ -\frac{\Delta V}{V} \int_{0}^{\pi/2} d\psi \int_{\pi/4}^{\pi/2} \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{-S \cos 2\phi}{c} \right)^{3k} \cos \phi \, d\phi \right]$$
(87)

k=1: 
$$g(-S, -S, S) = \frac{\pi}{6} \left( \frac{8\sqrt{2}-9}{35} \right) \left( \frac{S}{\sigma_c} \right)^3$$
 (88)

k=2: 
$$g(-S, -S, S) = \frac{\pi}{6} \left( \frac{835 - 512\sqrt{2}}{3003} \right) \left( \frac{S}{\sigma_c} \right)^6$$
 (89)

Comment: It is possible to increase the axial tensile strength of a member by applying a transverse compression loading. The problem arises, for example, in certain collet type grips for tension members. Such grips produce a radial compression state which is proportional to the tensile loading. The resulting increase in resistance at any reliability level can be determined by comparing Equation (69) with Equations (88) and (89); hence,

for k=1,

$$\frac{\pi}{6(6+1)} \left( \frac{\sigma_{\rm L}}{\sigma_{\rm c}} \right)^3 = \frac{\pi}{6} \left( \frac{8\sqrt{2}-9}{35} \right) \left( \frac{8}{\sigma_{\rm c}} \right)^3$$
(90)

$$S = 1.2924 \sigma_{r}$$
 (91)

for k=2,

$$\frac{\pi}{6(12+1)} \left(\frac{\sigma_{c}}{\sigma_{c}}\right)^{6} = \frac{\pi}{6} \left(\frac{835-512\sqrt{2}}{3003}\right) \left(\frac{S}{\sigma_{c}}\right)^{6}$$
(92)

$$S = 1.1299 \sigma_{\rm t}$$
 (93)

Hence, an increase of 29.2 percent in the tensile strength is obtained when k=1; 13 percent when k=2.

#### b. Mechanical and Thermal Load History

ذ

Following the development of Section 2-d, we shall once again consider a basic volume subjected to a temperature history T(t) and a stress history  $\gamma_{ji}(t)$ . The extension of our previous treatment of this problem to three dimensions requires that we use the three-dimensional form for the normal stress and the appropriate summation of the maximum generalized stress  $f_{max}$  given by Equation (62).

Using cartesian tensor notation, the components of the stress vector  $\underline{T}$  acting on a plane with unit normal  $\underline{n}$  can be written in terms of the stresses.

The magnitude of the normal stress vector,  $\neg_n$ , is given by the scalar product of the stress vector and the unit normal vector; thus,

$$\sigma_n = T_i n_i = \sigma_{ji} n_j n_i$$
(95)

Interpreting the components of the unit normal vector  $n_i$  as the direction cosines of <u>n</u>, we can relate the  $n_i$ 's to the polar coordinates shown in Figure 46a.

$$n_1 = \cos\phi \cos\psi$$
  
 $n_2 = \cos\phi \sin\psi$  (96)  
 $n_3 = \sin\phi$ 

Substituting Equations (96) into (95) we obtain

$$\sigma_{n} = \cos^{2} \phi (\sigma_{11} \cos^{2} \psi + \sigma_{22} \sin^{2} \psi) + \sigma_{33} \sin^{2} \phi$$

$$+ \sigma_{12} \cos^{2} \phi \sin^{2} \psi + \sigma_{23} \sin^{2} \phi \sin^{2} \psi + \sigma_{31} \sin^{2} \phi \cos^{2} \phi$$
(97)

For the most general loading, we can expect only that the normal stress vectors will be symmetic with respect to the origin; consequently, we must consider all of the normal stresses above the 1-2 plane. On this basis we can write down the fracture probability; thus,

$$F[\sigma_{ij}(t)] = 1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{\Delta V}{V} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \frac{\pi/2}{d\psi} \int_{1}^{\frac{1}{3}} \left\langle \max_{t} f_{T(t)} \left\langle \tau_{n}(t) - \tau_{\ell}[T(t)] \right\rangle \right\rangle$$

$$a_{i}[T(t)] \left\langle \gamma_{n}(t) - \tau_{\ell}[T(t)] \right\rangle$$
(98)

where  $\sigma_n$  is given by Equation (97) and  $f_T$  by Equation (60). The function f contained in the definition of  $f_T$  should meet the conditions described in Section 2-a.

4. THE FRACTURE SURFACE

٤

ter stratter ertrette bestratter meditiere saturere saturere stratter defenden seconden seconden saturer

a. Exact Theory

For a specified reliability (1-F) and a given basic volume  $\Delta V$ , Equation (39) defines the fracture surface which describes the resistance of the basic volume under various stress states. We customarily normalize such surfaces by relating all behavior to that under pure tension. Then, the fracture surface becomes

$$\frac{g(S_1, S_2, S_3)}{g(0, 0, -r)} = 1$$
(99)

All points on this fracture surface have the same fracture probability; points falling inside have lower fracture probabilities and points falling outside have higher ones. In the two-dimensional problem the fracture surface can be represented as a curve defined by

۵

$$\frac{g(S_1, S_2)}{g(\sigma_r, 0)} = 1$$
(100)

Specializing this formula to the Weibull power function with  $\sigma_{\ell} = 0$  we obtain,

$$\int \left[ \left( \frac{s_1}{\sigma_t} \right) \cos^2 \theta + \left( \frac{s_2}{\sigma_t} \right) \sin^2 \theta \right] d\theta = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{\Gamma(k + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(k + 1)}$$
(101)  
$$\sigma_n \ge 0$$

We have already evaluated this expression for the hydrostatic tension case in Equation (76). Numerical results for this case are tabulated in Table VI together with two other stress states. We should point out once again that, when the power form of f is used, the stress ratios can also be computed from Equation (99) when  $S_3$  is set equal to zero.

Table VI

STRENGTH RATIOS FOR TWO-DIMENSIONAL STRESS STATES

Stress State	Strength Ratio	k=1 ·	k=2	k=3	k=0
Pure Tension (° <sub>t</sub> ,0)	~t/~t =	1	1	· 1	1
Hydrostatic Tension $(\sigma_h, \sigma_h)$	c <sub>h</sub> /σ <sub>t</sub> =	1/2	(3/8) <sup>1/2</sup>	(5/16) <sup>1/3</sup>	1
Biaxial Tension $(\sigma_b, \sigma_b/2)$	$\frac{\pi_b}{\pi_t} =$	2/3	(12/19) <sup>1/2</sup>	(40/63) <sup>1/3</sup>	1
Pure Shear $(\sigma_s, -\sigma_s)$	$\sigma_{\rm s}/\sigma_{\rm t} =$	π/2	$(3/2)^{1/2}$	$(15\pi/32)^{1/3}$	1

The fracture curve associated with Table VI is shown in Figure 48. We observe that the maximum stress theory,  $\max(S_1, S_2) \leq \sigma_t$ , coincides with the case k= $\infty$ . It was pointed out by Weibull (Ref. 14) that k= $\infty$  corresponds to a classical deterministic material with an ultimate strength equal to  $\sigma_c$ . We also find in Figure 48 that the tensile



÷

Figure 48 Combined Stress Theory (Weibull Form)

strength increases as the transverse compressive stress becomes greater. Physically, the compressive stress can be attributed with closing up some of the cracks which might otherwise be critical under the tensile loading.

As the compressive stress increases indefinitely, our theory indicates that the tensile strength becomes unbounded. This is clearly contrary to reality; but, it is not a surprising result since no provision has been made in our theory to account for compressive-shear failures. The emergence of another failure mode provides a limitation on the range of applicability of our theory. The ragged line in Figure 48 is meant to indicate such a limitation.

b. Approximate Theory

į

If the behavior of a basic volume under a general stress state was equivalent to the behavior of three basic volumes each under a distinct principal stress, the survival of the basic volume would require the simultaneous survival of each unit. Under these conditions the reliability of the basic volume would be given by

$$1-F_{a} = [1-F(S_{1})] [1-F(S_{2})] [1-F(S_{3})]$$
 (102)

where F(S) is the fracture probability of a basic volume under a pure tensile stress S.

For a Weibull material subjected to pure tension, the reliability is expressed as

where  $\sigma_{\mu}, \sigma_{\mu}, m$  are the Weibull statistical parameters.

The associated approximate combined stress theory

$$\left[1-\mathbf{F}_{a}(\mathbf{S}_{1},\mathbf{S}_{2},\mathbf{S}_{3})\right] = \exp\left\{-\frac{\Delta V}{\mathbf{v}}\left[\left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_{1}-\sigma_{u}}{\sigma_{o}}\right)^{m} + \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_{2}-\sigma_{u}}{\sigma_{o}}\right)^{m} + \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_{3}-\sigma_{u}}{\sigma_{o}}\right)^{m}\right]\right\} \quad (1)$$

where

خ

$$R_{i} = S_{i} \quad \text{when} \quad S_{i} > \sigma_{u}$$
$$R_{i} = \sigma_{u} \quad \text{when} \quad S_{i} \leq \sigma_{u}$$

Comparing the combined stress case with the pure tension case at the same reliability, we obtain the fracture surface

$$\left(\frac{S_1 - \sigma_u}{\sigma_t - \tau_u}\right)^m + \left(\frac{S_2 - \sigma_u}{\sigma_t - \sigma_u}\right)^m + \left(\frac{S_3 - \sigma_u}{\sigma_t - \sigma_u}\right)^m = 1$$
(105)

This results in the two-dimensional fracture diagram shown in Figure 49 when  $S_3$  is set equal to  $\sigma_u$ . To compare the approximate results to the exact theory, we select the parameters in both theories to match the same tension data. Here, we need only note that m=k and that the k's used in Figure 49 correspond to those used in Figure 48

We can observe from Figures 48 and 49 that the approximate and exact theories are identical for the cases k=1 and  $k=\infty$ . Between these values, the exact theory will be found to be the more conservative. We shall determine the largest deviation between the theories by examining the case of hydrostatic tension which lies along a 45 deg line.

In two dimensions, the approximate reliability for the hydrostatic case is found by setting  $R_1 = \sigma_h$ ,  $R_2 = \sigma_h$ , and  $R_3 = \sigma_u$ . Then, comparing this reliability with that of the tension case, we find

$$\left(\frac{\tau_{\rm h}}{\tau_{\rm t}}\right) = (1/2)^{1/m}$$
 (106)



Figure 49 Approximate Combined Stress Theory

113

Forming the ratio between this expression and that described by Equation (76) for the exact case, we obtain

è

$$\frac{(\sigma_{\rm h}/\sigma_{\rm t})\,{\rm approx}}{(\sigma_{\rm h}/\sigma_{\rm t})\,{\rm exact}} = \left[\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{\Gamma({\rm m}+1)}{\Gamma({\rm m}+\frac{1}{2})}\right]^{1/{\rm m}} {\rm m=k}$$
(107)

This ratio is tabulated in Table VII for different values of m. The largest value occurs at near m=3 and shows a deviation from the exact theory of 16.9 percent. This discrepancy is smaller at all other m's and for all other stress states.

Table VII COMPARISON OF EXACT AND APPROXIMATE COMBINED STRESS THEORIES

m	Two Dimensions $\frac{({}^{\sigma}h^{/\sigma}t)}{({}^{\sigma}n^{/\sigma}t)}$ approx $\frac{({}^{\sigma}n^{/\sigma}t)}{({}^{\sigma}n^{/\sigma}t)}$ exact	Three Dimensions $\frac{(\sigma_{\rm h}/\sigma_{\rm t})_{\rm approx}}{(\sigma_{\rm h}/\sigma_{\rm t})_{\rm exact}}$
1	1.000	1.000
2	1.154	1.291
3	1.16935	1.32635
4	1.163	1.316
5	1.153	1.297
10	1.110	1.215
60	1.000	1.000

Setting  $S_1 = S_2 = S_3 = S_h$  in Equation (105), we obtain the approximate ratio of hydrostatic strength to tensile strength for equal reliability; thus,

$$\left(\frac{S_{h} - c_{u}}{c_{h} - c_{u}}\right) = (1/3)^{1/m}$$
(108)

1.5.

When  $\sigma_u = 0$ , we can compare this expression to the exact ratio given in Equation (72).

$$\frac{(S_{h}/\sigma_{t})_{approx}}{(S_{h}/\sigma_{t})_{exact}} = \left(\frac{2m+1}{3}\right)^{1/m} \qquad (109)$$

where we have taken 3k=m so that both theories describe the same tension behavior. This ratio is tabulated in Table VII; it assumes its maximum value at m=3.04. For this value of m the deviation from the exact theory is 32.6 percent; furthermore, this discrepancy persists over a wide range of important values of m.

### 5. OBSERVATIONS AND REMARKS

### a. Experimental Verification

1. The integrity of a basic volume is not generally an intrinsic property of the material, but rather, a complicated combination of crack initiations, propagations, and arrestments. For this reason, we must try to characterize the behavior of a particular basic volume. To do this, nominally identical volumes must be used for all the tests designed to establish a fracture surface.

2. The theory assumes that a basic volume is subjected to a homogeneous stress state; consequently, its verification requires that we meet this condition experimentally. Furthermore, the loading on a basic volume must be increased proportionally throughout the test. We note, for example, that the case of hydrostatic tension produces no shear stress unless the loading is incremented sequentially.

3. If the definition of failure is taken as the inability of a basic volume to equilibrate the applied loading, we must take pains to identify the fracture load. We must not, for example, allow a crack from outside the basic volume to propagate into the unit and cause its failure. Furthermore, we must not terminate our test because a fracture has occurred outside of the basic volume. When the entire specimen is the basic volume, this latter problem does not exist; if not, we face a problem in the interpretation of data which has not presently been solved. With low strength materials it is sometimes possible to mend (cement, glue) a fracture outside of the gage length and proceed with the test.

4. The construction of a fracture diagram requires that strength values be used with the same reliability level. Often, however, one finds that such diagrams plot the average strength values. Unfortunately, the average strengths from tests using different stress ratios do not generally represent the same reliability. It is permissible, for instance, to use the median stress for each type of loading. 5. The elimination of parasitic stresses from brittle tension specimens is one of the most exacting problems in the area of material testing (Reference 17). One can anticipate that the problem will be magnified for combined stress testing.

b. Weakest Link Materials

÷

1. When failure at any point in a body necessarily constitutes overall failure of the body, the material is classified as a series or weakest link material. Now, if we define overall failure as failure at a point, we create in effect a series material. In this instance, the problem is to find some way of measuring the first pointwise failure. For example, if the incipient mobilization of the first crack in a body could be detected, we could use this feature as an overall failure criterion and thereby obtain a series material.

Because the behavior of a series material is understood, we can separate the volume and  $\beta$  ometry aspects from the behavior of a test specimen and, thereby, make it possible to identify an intrinsic property of the material. Anticipation of this possibility prompted us to single out the volume ratio  $\Delta V/v$  in all our studies.

2. Consider a component which is constructed from a series material. To establish its reliability we can divide it into n imaginary basic volumes and recognize that the overall survival of the component requires the simultaneous survival of each basic volume. Thus, the reliability of the body,  $(1-F_b)$ , can be written

$$1 - F_{b} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 - F_{i}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta V_{i}}{v} g_{i}(S_{1}, S_{2}, S_{3})\right]$$
(110)

where the reliability of the basic volume,  $1-F_{i}$ , has been taken from Equation (39). For an infinitesimal basic volume we obtain,

$$1 - F_b = \exp\left[\frac{-1}{v} \iiint_{g}(s_1, s_2, s_3) dv\right]$$
(111)

3. A very large basic volume of a series material follows the maximum stress theory. To see this we can take the limit of F in Equation (67) as  $\Delta V \rightarrow \infty$ . If this is done we observe that F = 0, when f = 0 and that F = 1 when  $f \neq 0$ . But, f becomes different from zero only when  $\sigma_n > \sigma_{\ell}$ ; consequently, if the normal stress in any direction becomes slightly greater than  $\sigma_{\ell}$ , fracture is a certainty. This is, of course, a statement of the maximum stress theory.

#### APPENDIX II

#### BEAM ANALYSIS COMPUTER PROGRAM

In this appendix, the computer program which was employed in the analysis of the beam prototype structure shall be described. The program combines the fracture algorithm of Section II with the beam thermal and stress analyses and material property curves of Section IV into a single package. A listing of the program as written in Fortran II for the IBM 7094 is included in this appendix.

The program consists of a main program containing the thermal, stress and statistical analyses and of function subprograms for describing the functions T(z,t), E(T),  $\varepsilon_T(T)$ , k(t), m(T),  $\sigma_u(T)$  and  $\sigma_o(T)$ . The program has been specialized to some extent by specifying the geometry of the beam and its loading. However, the temperature distribution and the material property versus temperature curves are entered into the program via tables and hence the effects of variations in these curves may be readily obtained.

As an aid in using the program, a listing describing some of the more important variables entering into the program is also included in this appendix.

Listing of Significant Program Variables:

DEPTH (1)	i <sup>th</sup> depth in beam, measured from the bottom
DTIME	size of time interval between computations
E(I)	i <sup>th</sup> entry in table of modulus of elasticity vs. temperature
ET(I)	temperature corresponding to E(I)
FBTEIP (Z,TIME)	function subprogram for computing the tempera- ture in the beam at depth Z and time TIME
FE(T)	function subprogram for computing the modulus

- FSO(T) function subprogram for computing the Weibull parameter  $\sigma_{\rm o}$  at the temperature T
- FSU(T) function subprogram for computing the Weibull parameter  $\sigma_{i}$ , at the temperature T
- FTS(T) function subprogram for computing the thermal strain  $\varepsilon_{\rm T}$  at the temperature T
- FXM(T) function subprogram for computing the Weibull parameter m at the temperature T

HIMP gross heat flux impingent upon the bottom of the beam

NE number of entries in E(T) input table

- NJ number of entries with respect to t in T(z,t) input table
- NPRINT number of time increments between occurrences of detailed output printouts
- NSO number of entries in  $\sigma_{\alpha}(T)$  input table
- NSU number of entries in  $\sigma_{ij}(T)$  input table
- NTK number of entries in k(T) input table
- NTS number of entries in  $\varepsilon_{T}(T)$  input table
- PFL(I) probability of failure of the i<sup>th</sup> subvolume up to current value of time

PINT initial load on beam

- POF probability of failure of entire beam up to current value of time.
- PRATE rate at which load increases after t = TIMEP
- RISK risk of rupture of entire beam up to current value of time
- RR(I) risk of rupture in the i<sup>th</sup> subvolume at current value of time

- RRMAX(I) maximum value of RR(I) up to current value of time
- RRT(I) risk of rupture computed using the values of stress, temperature, etc. at DEPTH (I) and at current value of time
- SMAX(I) maximum value of STR(I) up to current value of time
- STR(I) total stress acting at DEPTH(I)
- STRM(I) mechanical component of STR(I)
- STRT(I) thermal component of STR(I)

÷

- TIMEM maximum value of time for which computations are to be carried out
- TIMEP value of time at which load begins to increase
- TK(I) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of thermal conductivity vs. temperature
- TKT(I) temperature corresponding to TK(I)
- TRRM(I) time at which RRMAX(I) is achieved
- TS(I) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of thermal strain vs. temperature
- TST(I) temperature corresponding to TS(I)
- TT(J) j<sup>th</sup> value of time corresponding to WSO(I)
- TTAB(I,J) temperature at depth ZT(I) and time TT(J)
- WSO(I) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of Weibull  $\sigma_{o}$  vs. temperature
- WSOT(J) temperature corresponding to WSO(1)
- WSU(I) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of Weibull  $\sigma_{\mu}$  vs. temperature
- WSUT(I) temperature corresponding to WSU(I)
- WXM(I) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of Weibull m vs. temperature
- WXMT(I) temperature corresponding to WXM(I)
- ZT(I) i<sup>th</sup> value of depth corresponding to TTAB(I,J)

121

# PROGRAM LISTING

x

÷

CM		UNIAXIAL STATISTICAL STRENGTH ANALYSIS PROGRAM
		DIMENSION ITAB(10+100)+ZT(10)+TS(10)+TST(10)+E(10)+ET(10)+TK(10)+T
	1	KT(10)•WXM(10)•WXMT(10)•WSU(10)•WSUT(10)•WSO(10)•WSOT(10)•TT(40)
		COMMON TTAD. 2T. TS. TST. E. ET. TK. TK. TWXM.WXMT.WSU.WSUT.WSU.WSUT.TT.JJ
	1	• DTIME
	-	DIMENSION RR (20) . DEPTH (21) + STR (21) - STRM (21) - STRT (21) - SMAX (21) - RRMA
	1	Y (20) • TORM (20) • 90 T (2) • 96 F (20)
	•	A (20) 7 ( A B (1 ) 20) 7 ( A (1 ) 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 1 ) 7 ( ( 2 4 ) 1 ) 1 ) 1 ) ) )))))))))))))))))))
	E	DIALASTON ESTERITINE A.7
	2	WRITE DUTEUT THEFE OFF Foonat Toostal United Beam Deder Mersianteal & Turdaal Contine A
	7	FORMAT (48414LUMINA BEAM UNDER MECHANICAL + THERMAL LUADING /
	_	READ INPUT TAPE 5.10.PINT.PRAIL.IMEP
	10	FORMAT (3F10.8)
		WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6.12.PINT.PRATE.TIMEP
	12	FORMAT (6HUPINT=+F10+2+3X+6HPRATE=+F10+2+3X+6HTIMEP=+F5+3)
		READ INPUT TAPE 5.17.STIME.DIIME.TIMEM.NPRINT
	17	FORMAT (3F10.5.15)
	•	WRITE OUTPUT TARE 6.19. DTIME. TIMEM. NPRINT
	19	FORMAT (THODTIME=+F5.3.3X.6HTIMEM=+F7.3.3X.THNPRINT=+I3)
	20	DEAT TADIT TADE 5.22-ALLATS AL ANTS ANTA ANTA ANTA ANTA
	22	
	66	FURTHER FURTHER FARE & SALELENTS, NESNIK, NIM, NELLENER
	•	WRITE DUTFUL TAPE BECKENDENTSETSTENTENNENTSUSDENSG
	24	LOUMUI (440072413424440122412422420000000000000000000
		IF (NJ) 40+40+30
	30	00 35 J=1.NJ
		READ INPUT TAPE 5+32+(TTAB(I+J)+I=1+8)
	32	FORMAT (8F10.4)
	35	CONTINUE
	40	READ INPUT TAPE 5+42+(ZT(I)+I=1+8)
	42	FORMAT (0F10.8)
	Δ5	TF(NTS) 55-55-47
	47	00 52 tel.NTS
		DFAH TADIT TADE S.49. (T) TS(T)
	۸ <b>۵</b>	Каны согод тиск эчих ратахийн сос
	47	LOWART IL TRAALTOOL
	26	
	22	IF (NC) BD+DD+DF
	57	DO 62 TELONE
		READ INDUT TAPE 5+59+ET(1)+E(1)
	59	FORMAT (F10.4.P10.2)
	53	CONTINUE
	65	1F(NTK) 75+75+67
	67	DO 72 I=1+NTK
		READ INPUT TAPE 5.69.TKT(I).TK(I)
	69	FORMAT (F10.4+F10.6)
	72	CONTINUE
	76	
	00	
	20	LINE/-FWVM/FIER/-F/ 100776 //17017 7806 //26/////////////////////////////////
	<u> </u>	
	95	PURMAT (DRUZT= + + 9 + 4 + 7 + 10 + 4)
		WHITE DUTPUT TAPE 0.97
	97	FORMAT (54 TIME)
		D0 102 J=1.NJ
		WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+100+TT(J)+(TTAU(I+J)+(#1+8)

```
100 FORMAT (1H ,F5+2,F8+2,7F10+2)
102 CONTINUE
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6,105
105 FORMAT (27MUTEMP (R) TSTRAIN (IN/IN))
    DG 110 1=1+NTS
    WRITE CUIPUT TAPE 6+107+TST(1)+TS(1)
107 FORMAT (1H +F8+2+5X+1PE14+6)
110 CONTINUE
    WRITE NUTPUT TAPE 6+115
115 FCRMAT (35HOTEMP (R)
                         MOD OF ELASTICITY (PSI))
    NG 150 1=1+NF
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+107+ET(I)+E(I)
120 CONTINUE
    WRITE OUIPUT TAPE 6+125
125 FURMAT (JAHOTEMP (R)
                          THERMAL CONU (UTU/FTOHROR))
    DO 130 I=1-NTK
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+107+TKT(I)+TK(I)
130 CONTINUE
    IF (TIMPH-TT (NJ))135+135+132
132 TIMEMETT(NJ)
135 TIME=HTTME+STTME
    1=0
    KZ=0
    11=1
    じっこ
    GO 137 1=1+21
    DLPTH(I) = 0.099 + LOATF(I=1)
    SHAX(I)=0.
    RRMAX(T)=0.
    PFL(I)=0.
337 TRRM(1)=0.
    10 141 [=1+NYM
    READ THPHT TAPE 5. 69.WXHT(1).WXM(1)
    WRITE OUIPHT TAPE GALADALAWANT(I)ALAWAN(L)
140 FORMAT (AHUWYMT(,11,2H)=+F10+2+3H(H)+5X+4HWXH(+11+2H)=+F5+4)
141 CONTINUE
    00 145 t=L+NSU
    READ INPUT TAPE RUSSINGUT(1) INSULL)
    WRITE MUTPHT TAPE GALAJATAWSUTII) + LAWSU(1)
143 FORMAT (649WSUT(+11+24)=+FL9+2+34(R)+5A+44WSU(+11+24)=+F10+2+54(PS
   11))
145 CONTINUE
    70 148 T=1+NSO
    READ SUPUT TAP+ SASPAWSOT(1)AWSO(1)
    WRITE HUTPHT TAPE 6.147.1.WSUT(1).1.WSU(1)
147 FORMAT (MMUWSOT(+11+2H)=+F10+2+3H(H)+5X+4HWSO(+11+2H)=+F10+2+5H(PS
   11))
148 CONTINUE
150 TIME=TIME+UTIME
    1=1+1
    1F (TIME-TIMEM) 155+155+5
155 IF (TIME=TIMEP) 156.156.157
156 AL=PINT
    60 TU 154
```

è

```
157 AL=PINT+PRATEP(TIME=TIMEP)
158 BM=1+147504L
    <u>∏</u>=0.5
    6-0=3
   18=50
    NZ#101
    PNSENS
    PNS1=1.GZPNS
    7STEP(1)=-1.n
    11=2005
    10 166 3=2+11
160 7STEP (.) = 2STEP (J-) + PNS1
    2STEP(M2)=1.0
    10 170 J='+N.
    ZZ==25TEP(J)+0+0.5
    T1=FHTEMP(/Z+TINE)
    TEMPIJISII
    TSTPA(1)=FIS(11)
170 YOURD())=FE(T1)
    H#257EP(M2)-25TEP(N2-1)
    FT=0.0
    BMT=1.0
    PT=H+B+(TSTRA(1)+YOUMO(1)+TSTRA(N2)+YOUHO(N2))+0.5+0
    HMT=HOHO((STRA(1)OYOUNU(1)OZSTEP(1)+(STPA(NZ)OYOUNU(NZ)OZSTEP(NZ))
   100-200005
    N=NZ-1
    DO LAU JEZIN
    100 RMT#HMT+HON#TSTRA(J) 0YOUHO(J) 9ZSTEP(J) 00002
    SECHUH=2.00800003/3.0
    10 140 J=1.51
    リビアニーリビアフォィリンテクショ
    QUEPTH(J)
    15=FH18H6(0*+(0F))
    STR(J)=++55(T2)+FE(T2)+PT/(D+2,40)+UEP+(HMT+HM)/SECMUM
    STRT(J:=-FIS(72)0FE(12)+PT/(H42,40)+DEPOHMT/SECMOM
190 STRM(J)=STR(J)=STR(J)
200 TO2EUTSHP (0.0.TINE)
    T1=FUT+(IP(11.05+T1"E)
    10241=(11-10)0240.
    HEAPTN=-16HAN9PTE(T7)/3600+
    HR 11=(1.11110.000)0(1)000121600.
    HIMP=HEATIN+HRAD
    HISK=0.
    3519=12.000
    12+1=1 0+5 00
    2=:16012(1)
    TEMP(1)=+31EMP(2.TIME)
    T=TEMP(I)
    VM=FX(((7)
    SUSESULTI
    50=650(1)
    IF (STR(1)-SMAL(1)) 215+215+210
```

è

```
210 SMAX(I)=STR(I)
215 IF(STR(1)-50) 220,220,225
220 RRF(I)=0.
    GO TO 230
225 RRT(I)=0+14((STR(I)=SU)/SO) 44KM
230 CONTINUE
    10 260 I=1+20
    IF (RRT(I) - HRT(I+1)) 240,244,245
240 RR(I)=RRT(1+1)
    60 TO 250
245 RR(1)=PRT(1)
250 (F(RR(T)-RRMAX(I)) 260,260.255
255 RRMAX(T)=28(T)
    TRRN(I)=TIME
    C=RR(I)
    PFL(1)=1.-EXPF(-C)
260 RISK=RTSK+RRMAX(I)
    POF=1.-EXPF(-RISK)
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6.300.TIME.AL.BM.TGRAD.BSTR
300 FORMAT (6HOTIME=+F5+2, 3HMIN+4X+13HAPPLIEU LOAD=+F6+1,3HLD5+4X,12HB
   1END MOMENT=+F6.1+SHIN-LBS+4X+1UHICMP URAD=+F7.1+4HK/PT+4X+DHUSTR=+
   2F8.2.34PS11
    WRITE OUTOUT TAPE 5.305 HEATIN. HIMP. KISK. POF
305 FORMAT (15M NET HEAT FLUX=+F6+C+11HUTU/FT24SEC+4X+16HGROSS HEAT FL
   1UX#+F6.2+11H4TU/FT24SEC+4X+5HKISK=+1Pt14+8+4X+10HFAIL PHUB=+0PF10+
   29)
    K1=1+(J-1)/NPRINT
    TF(K1-+2) 150+150+310
310 K2=K1
    WRITE OUIPUT TAPE 6+315
315 FORMAT (ABHONEPTH (IN)
                              TEMP (R)
                                         STRESS (PSI)
                                                         MAX SIR (PSI)
   1 RR TEMPORARY
    WRITE DUTPUT TAPE 6+320
320 FORMAT (1H . TUX. SOHAR LAYER
                                    RR LAYER MAX
                                                    TIME (MIN)
                                                                 FAIL PR
   108 )
    1=0
330 1=1+1
    1F(1-21) 315+345+364
335 WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6.340, DEPTH(I), TEMP(I), STH(I), SMAX(I), HRT(I)
443 FORMAT (1A .F7:3.7X.F7.2.64.F8.1./X.F8.1./X.1PE12.6)
    1F(1-20) 350,350,330
350 WRITE OUTPUT TAPP 6+355+RR(I)+RRMAX(I)+TRRM(I)+PEL(I)
355 FORMAT (1); .69x.1PE12.6.3x.1PL12.6.5x.0PP6.3.4x.4F10.8)
    GO TU 330
360 WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+365
365 FORMAT (SAHOPEPTA (IN)
                              MECH STRESS (PSI)
                                                   THERMAL STRESS (PSI))
    DO 375 1=1+21
    WRITE CUIPUT TAPE 6.JTU. DEPTH(1). SIMM(1). STRT(1)
370 FORMAT (1H +F5+3+16X+F8+1+15X+F8+1)
375 CONTINUE
    GO TO 150
    END
```

خز

いき きんぶん きょうがん

÷ свт	BEAM TEMPERATURE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION
	FUNCTION FUTEMP(Z)TIME)
	DIMENSTON (TAB(10,100) + ZT(10) + TS(10) + TS(10) + E(10) + ET(10) + TK(10) + T
	1KT(1C) * WM(1C) * WMT(1C) * WSO(10) * WSO(10) * WSO(10) * WSOT(10) * TT(4C)
	COMMON TTAH,ZT+TS+TST,E+ET+TK+TKT+WAM+WAMT+WSU+WSU+WSU+WSU+T+T+JJ
10	IF ( ( IMF = ( ) ( ) ) ) (( 420 + 20 + 20 + 20 + 20 + 20 + 20 + 20
20	
30	11-7 Th (7-/ T (1)) \
37	· ************************************
••• G	- 11
45	TTIETARETI. (a)
د ۲	TTTIII)TAH(TTLI.))
•	TIJ1=TTAP(III=T)
	TILJ1#TTA6(II=1.J=1)
	TZ1=T(1,)+(T*MF+T)(,)+())R(Y))J=(1,))/0+5
	Y2=Y1J1+(Y1M)-Y)(JJ-1))0(Y1J-)1J1)/0.5
	FUTEMF-T/1+(7-/T/11-1))+(T4-T21)/(2T(11)-2T(11-1))+459.6
	RETURN
	END
CFTS	THERMAL STRAIN AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE
	FUNCTION FTS/TI
	DIMENSTON TTABLE +100) +2T(10) +15(10) +(5T(10) +E(10) +E(10) +TK(10) +T
	1K(('0)+W/((10)+W/((10)+WSU((10)+WSU((10)+WSU((10)+YT(40)
	- CUMPICITY TEAM & FEETSATSE LEETSTK & TREEWANNEWANTEWSULWSULWSULETY (JJ-
10	1992
11 11	10101 10101 10101
20	FTS2TS/T1+(T+TST/T)39/75/T+))#TS/T5/T5/T5/T++)_TST/T+)
r. U	RETURN
	ENI
CER	MONHIELS OF REALTERSTY S.C. & PUPPETALS OF TRANSPORT
4, <b>F</b> F	FUNCTION FRITT
	DIMENSION (TOB(10+)CUL+27(10)+IS(LUL+IST(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(10)+F(1
	1KT(10) ************************************
	CUMMON TTAM . T. TS. ST. C. CT. TK. TK I. WAM . WAMT. WSU. WSUT. WSU. WSUT. T. JJ
	1.071ME
	1=1
10	IF(T-ET(I+1)) 20.20.15
15	1 th 1 w 1
	GU TU 10
20	FE=[(1)+(T=E*(1))*(*(1+1)=F(1))/(E1(1+1)=E1(1))
	RETIAN
	END

ΥÌ.

THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE CFTK FUNCTION FIR(T) DIMENSION (TAB(10+100)+27(10)+(S(10)+(S(10))+E(10)+E(10)+(K(10)+T 1KT(10) •WXM(10) •WXMT(10) •WSV(10) •WSUT(10) •WSO(10) •WSOT(10) •TT(40) COMMON TTAH, / T, TS, TST, E, FFFFFFFFFFFFWAM, WAMT, WSU, WSUT, WSU, WSUT, T, JJ 1.DTIME 1≓1 10 IF(T+TF(1+1)) 20+20+15 15 1=1+1 60 TU 10 20 FTK=TK(1)+(T+TKT(1))\*(TK(1+1)+FK(1))/(TKF(1+1)+TKT(1)) RETURN END WEIBULL M AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE CFX4 FUNCTION FXM(T) DIMENSION TIAB(10+100) +ZT(10) +TS(10) +TST(10) +E(10) +ET(10) +TK(10) +T 1KT(10), 4xH(10), WXMT(10), WSU(10), WSUT(10), WSU(10), WSOT(10), TT(40) COMMON TTAHAZTATSATST.C.STATKATKITAWXMAWXMTAWSU.WSUTAWSU.WSUTATT.JJ 1,DTIME 1=1 10 IF(T-WXNT(I+1)) 20+20,15 15 <u>1</u>≈1+1 60 TO 10 20 FXM=WXM(I)+(T-WXMT(I))\*(WXM(I+1)-WXM(1))/(WXMT(I+1)-WXMT(I)) RETURN END CESU WEIGHLE SU AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE FUNCTION FSU(T) DIMENSION (TAB(10+190)+ZT(10)+T\$(10)+T\$(10)+K(10)+K(10)+K(10)+T ]KT(10)+WX4(14)+WXMT(10)+WSU(10)+WSU(10)+WSU(10)+WSUT(10)+FT(40) COMMON TTAH, ZT. TS. TST. E. ET. TK. IKT. WXM. WXMT. WSU. WSU. WSU. WSU. T. T. J. 1.DTIME. 1=1 10 IF(T-WSUT(1+1)) 20.20.15 15 I=I+1 GO TO 10 20 FSU=wSiI(1)+(T-WSiIT(1))\*(JSII(1+1)-JSII(1))/(JSIIT(1+1)-WSIIT(1)) RETURN ENU CFSO WEIBULL SO AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE FUNCTION FSO(T) DIMENSION ||TAB(10+100)+ZT(10)+TS(10)+TST(10)+E(10)+ET(10++TK(10)+T TK.L(10) \*MX.4(19) \*MXWL(10) \*M2A(10) \*M2AL(10) \*M2A(10) \*M2AL(10) \*LL(40) COMMON TTAH, ZT. TS. TST. E. ET. TK. IKT. WXM. WAMT. WSU. WSUT. WSU. WSUT. T. JJ 1.DTIME 1=1 10 IF(T-wsot(I+1)) 20+20,15 15 I=I+1 GO TO 10 RETURN END

# APPENDIX III DISK ANALYSIS COMPUTER PROGRAM

The computer program used in the analysis of the disk prototype will be described in this appendix. The program is similar to the one employed in the beam analysis - the greatest difference being due to the fact that the disk is under a biaxial state of stress while the beam was under only a uniaxial state of stress. Again, the fracture algorithm of Section II is combined with the thermal and stress analyses of the disk and the material property curves of Section IV. A listing of this program as written in Fortran II for the IBM 7094 is included in this appendix.

The program is composed of a main program consisting of the thermal, stress and statistical analyses and of function subprograms for describing the functions T(r,t), E(T),  $\varepsilon_T(T)$ , v(T), k(T), m(T),  $\sigma_u(T)$  and  $\sigma_o(T)$ . The dimensions of the disk along with an arbitrary applied uniform stress at the outside radius have been incorporated into the program. The temperature distribution and the material property versus temperature curves are entered into the program through the use of tables and hence the effects of variations in these curves may be readily obtained.

As an sid in using the program, a listing describing some of the more important variables entering into the program has been included in this appendix.

Listing of Significant Program Variables:

- DTIME size of time interval between computations
- E(I) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of modulus of elasticity vs. temperature
- ET(1) temperature corresponding to E(1)

FDTEMP function subprogram for computing the temperature in (R,TIME) the disk of radius R and time TIME

Preceding page blank

- FE(T) function subprogram for computing the modulus of elasticity at the temperature T
- FNU(T) function subprogram for computing Poisson's ratio at the temperature T
- FSO(T) function subprogram for computing the Weibull parameter  $\sigma_{\rm o}$  at the temperature T
- FSU(T) function subprogram for computing the Weibull parameter  $\sigma_{i,j}$  at the temperature T
- FTK(T) function subprogram for computing the thermal conductivity k at the temperature T
- FTS(T) function subprogram for computing the thermal strain  $\epsilon_{\rm T}$  at the temperature T
- FXM(T) function subprogram for computing the Weibull parameters m at the temperature T
- HIMP gross heat flux impingent upon the inside radius of the disk

NE number of entries in E(T) input table

NJ number of entries with respect to t in T(r,t) input table NNU number of entries in v(T) input table

NPRINT number of time increments between occurrences of detailed output printouts

- NSO number of entries in  $\sigma_{\alpha}(T)$  input table
- NSU number of entries in  $\sigma_{ij}(T)$  input table
- NTK number of entries in k(T) input table
  - NTS number of entries in  $\varepsilon_{T}(T)$  input table
- NXM number of entries in m(T) input table

PFR(I) probability of failure of the i<sup>th</sup> ring type subvolume up to current value of time

130

- POF probability of failure of entire disk up to current value of time
- RAD(I) i<sup>th</sup> radius for ring subvolume
- RISK risk of rupture of entire disk up to current value of time RRR(I) radial risk of rupture of i<sup>th</sup> ring at current value of time RRRMAX(I) maximum value of RRR(I) up to current time
- RRTR(I) radial risk of rupture computed using stresses, temperatures, etc. at RAD(I)
- RRTT(I) circumferential risk of rupture computed using stresses, temperatures, etc. at RAD(I)
- RT(I) i<sup>th</sup> radius corresponding to TTAB(I,J)
- S uniform tensile stress applied at outside radius of disk SRMAX(I) maximum value of STRR(I) up to current time
- press (1) maximum varue of pros(1) up to case ent crue
- STMAX(I) maximum value of STRT(I) up to current time
- STRR(I) total radial stress at RAD(I)
- STRRM(I) mechanical component of STRR(I)
- STRRT(I) thermal component of STRR(I)
- STRT(I) total circumferential stress at RAD(I)
- STRTM(1) mechanical component of STRT(1)
- STRTT(I) thermal component of STRT(I)
- TIMEM maximum value of time for which computations are to be carried out
- TK(1) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of thermal conductivity vs. temperature
- **TKT(I)** temperature corresponding to TK(I)
- TRMAX(I) time at which RRRMAX(I) occurred
- TS(I) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of thermal strain vs. temperature
- TST(1) temperature corresponding to TS(1)

j<sup>th</sup> value of time corresponding to TTAB(I,J) TT(J) TTAB(I,J) temperature at radius RAD(I) and time TT(J)TTMAX(I) time at which RRTMAX(I) occurred  $i^{\text{th}}$  entry in table of Weibull  $\sigma_{o}$  vs. temperature WSO(I) WSOT(I) temperature corresponding to WSO(I)  $\textbf{i}^{\texttt{th}}$  entry in table of Weibull  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_n$  vs. temperature WSU(I) WSUT(I) temperature corresponding to WSU(I) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of Weibull m vs. temperature WXM WXMT(I) temperature corresponding to WXM(I) i<sup>th</sup> entry in table of Poisson's ratio vs. temperature XNU(I) XNUT(I) temperature corresponding to XNU(I)

## PROGRAM LISTING

÷

CM		BT /	1 Y T	Δ١	5 1	۲۵۱		Ţτ	r 1		<b>۲</b>	06	N G	ты	٥						50	- 0	A 14									
<b>W</b> 11		- ni	1Ê Ñ	Sti	<u>่</u> กพ่		1 1 0 7 1 0	101	2.	۲n	01	τ <u></u>	NG T 1	12	, .	TS	ι, (1)	01		יקד	TI	1 n	ጠ ነገ	5/1	n١	• F	<b>T</b> ( )		. T	* * 1	<u>م</u> ر.	Ŧ
		1	(10	).	XNI	1(1	En 1	• ¥	จีย	Ύί	ĩ'n	3.4	ม่ม	M (	1.1	1.	wx	Ma	i	10	) • i	N S		- ` 4   (1 )	- W	9 E 611	1 1 2 T 1 1		لتة. لتنام	en1	101	1
		2850	ĴŦ (	10	1 • 1	11	(4)	1	•••	, ·	•0	<i>,</i> ,		•••	- •						, ,		• • •	. 0 /		34	1 * 4	L V į	1 11	301	101	
		CON	4MO	N	TTA	18	RT		ς.	тs	τ.	F.	FΤ	• T	κ.	Ŧκ	τ.	XN	10	• ¥ î	vu	"a	WXN	للا م 4	XM	۲.	w S I	ها م ا	1511	TLW	sn.	น
		1501	r • T	T.	1.1	••••		• •	., ,			.,		, ,		1.15				,	••	• •		1 1 1	~		100			1 7 7	301	71
		nt	10 11	Sti	ĴN.	R		70	۱.	S T	RD	17	กา	13	TR	11	11	• •	s	τΩi	чM	17	in.	. 5 7	ЯR	T /	701			T M /	701	_
		IST	а <del>т</del> т	171	<u>.</u>	5	. 10	. <del>.</del>	70	1.	5 r	мδ	X I	70	· ·	чч чч	18		n.		2.12	τr	171	11. 11.	00	11	יעי וחיד	 	, 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	110	101	7
		2888	A MS	XI	781)		2 P T	MΔ	Ϋ́ι	70	۰. ۱.	TR	MΔ	x 7	70	) •	TT	MΔ	x	, ,. , 7(	33	. Pi	E LA I	,,, ,,,,	1	n (	101	110	1 11	(10	1 7	
		 	1F N	Sti	λN	p <	sτF	PI	52	1.	Pn	1 9	5 (	52	1.	15	тн	Δ (	6;	2	. VI		Mn	157		15	M D /	171	11.	<b>1 A 4</b>	621	
		1780	115	Ζ.		3)	nv	TP	$\Delta t$	52	• 3	14	1.	īn	ήP	ь. ь.t	4.				1 1	2 ( 2 (	a	いい					•••	~~ `	361	•
	5	ิพิกา	TF	0	ITE	0	ί.Υ	AP	F	6.	່າ	• •		• • •	• ·	- 1	<b>.</b>	5.	•		• • •											
•	7	FOR	2MA	T	14,	(H)	Δ1.	HM	L TN	Δ	ůr	٩K	n	ΝŊ	FΒ	м	۲C	нА	N.	10	<b>a</b> i	+	Tè	4 6 0	мΔ		1.04		NG	١		
	•	RE	AD .	T MI	2117		ΓΔP	F	÷.	10	• 6	-n	тт	ME	• 1	T 14	¥ M	N N	110	н т г	N T		11							•		
	10	FO	ZMΔ	T	( 36	117	1.5	. 1	Ś.		10	10	••	· •	• 1	•	<u> </u>		••••	. 7 .	•••											
	• •	- WR1	TTP:	່ຕເ	116	201	T T	ΔΡ	ŕ	6.	1 5	- 5	. n	17	Mh	. T	тия	IF M	• • •	N IO I		Νт										
	15	FOR	ама	T	1.11	1119	=	104	. 2	. 1	4.2 2	7.H	7 U 17 T	1 M	)	т I 4 F	<u>.</u>			X . /	5 H '	тт:	MEN	. = .	57	. 7	. 41				M <b>T -</b>	_
		1131	1	•	ų <del>–</del> ,		J V		• -	10		ψu	51			• •	-	<b>4</b> 77				1.61			: 1	• •	<b>4</b> 4 1			r N 1	( <b>4</b> ] <del>-</del>	•
	20	REA	'n	T AL	2117	1	640	•	ς.	22	• 11	.1.	N T	s.	ΝN	u .	NF	- N		( . )	<b>. X</b> <i>I</i>	4 a i	NSI	l . N	50						•	
	22	FOR	AMA	1	181	5)				••• ••		•••		•••		<b>-</b> ,			• • •		,		Ψ.									
	<b>4</b> 0 14	WR	TE	់កា	ĴTP	101	r r	ΔP	F.	6.	24	. N	J.	ΝT	<b>S</b> •	nn	υ.	NE	• 1	NTI	د ، ا	NXI	M . N	เรม	• N	so						
	24	FOF	AM5	Y	(4)	101	Ja	• 1	۹.	ЗX	94	HN	۳S	Ξ.	13	• 3	X .	4H	INF	NU	2.	13	• 3)	(.3	HN	Ła	• 13			<b>4</b> H N	TK =	•
	-	113	XE	,41	INX	(M;	• 1	3.	чX	• 4	HN	SU	Ξ.	ĪŠ	Ł.	X.	41	NS	iU:	× • )	i.	)	••••			-					14-	Ŧ
		IF	INJ	) 4 (	3 • 4	iU,	30	•			•		•	-			-	-	-			•										
	30	<b>DO</b>	35	່ງ:	=1.	N.	1																									
	-	REA	۵u	INF	2117	1	AP	E I	5+	32	• (	TT.	AB	(1	÷J	) •	1=	1.	14	2)												
	32	FOR	AH5	Ť :	(12	:+ e	.1	)			·			-			•			•												
	35	CON	111	NII																												
	40	REA	VD -	INF	2117	' 1	AP	8	5.	42	• (	RŤ	er.	) •	1=	1,	12	>														
	42	FOF	AMS	T	112	!+ e	• 3	}																								
	45	IF	NT	519	;Q,	50	),4	7																								
	47	no	49	्राः	:1,	NT	8																									
		REA	D	INF	11	1	١P	t i	5 •	48	• 7	SŤ	(Ï	) 🔹	T 5	(T	)															
	48	FOF	AM	T	1+1	υ.	4.	F 1	7•	۹)																						
	49	CON	ITI	NU			_																									
	50	TF (	MAN	U١٩	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	25	• 5	1																								
	51	00	53	1:	=1,	NI.	1:1 		_																							
		REA		INE	T		۲P	t I	<b>E</b> 9.	4 P	• X :	HU.	<b>T</b> (	[)	• X I	ΗŲ	(1	)														
	53	COM	ITI	N118																												
	55	IF	NE	) 4 5	3 <b>4</b> 4	5.	57																									
	57	00	62		:1,	NF						<b>.</b> .																				
	<b>r</b> . <b>r</b> .	NLA		INF			94	£. '	5¶'	59	۰E	т (	1)	۰E	(1	2																
	27	FUN		1.64	10	1 # 4	• • •	10	. <	}																						
	50	- GUP - V P P	1 T 1 1	יוא		**	,	~																								
	57	111	11/	N 1 ] *-	179	12	• <b>t</b> i	ſ																								
	n /	00 00	17. 11	= ] ~ (4 T	2 <b>1 4</b> 511₹	⊡rvi] • • •	۲ ۱ ۸ ۳		2			· •	, <del>,</del>	1	* *		•															
	60	- R C P	MA	1 176 7 1 2	: 1 A	1	4 P 	а. 1 л	- 1   - 4	б <b>У</b> .	• [	N 1	11	• •	1.6	• •	1															
	77	- 1° U M - 1° M A	1. M. 1. W. M. 1	1 1 P 6 1 I B	: • •	7 <b>e</b> 4	• • •	Ŧ0	.0	1																						
	16																															

```
75 00 90 I=1,NJ
90 TT(I)=FLOATF(I-1)
   WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+95+(RT(I)+1=1+12)
95 FORMAT (SHOHT=, 12F9.3)
   WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6.97
97 FORMAT(5H TIME)
    DO 102 J=1+NJ
   WRITE OUTPUT TAPE (+100,TT(J)+(TTAB(I+J)+I=1+12)
100 FORMAT/1H +F5.2+12F9+1)
102 CONTINUE
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+105
105 FORMAT (27HUTEMP (R) TSTRAIN (IN/IN))
    DG 110 I=1+NTS
    WRITE OUTPUN TAPE 6+107+TST(I)+TS(I)
107 EORMAT(1H +FN.2.5x.1PE14.8)
110 CONTINUE
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+112
112 FOPMAT(25HUTFMP (R) POISSON RATIO)
    DO 115 1=1+NNU
    WRITE OUIPUT TAPE 6.114.XNVT(1),XNU(1)
114 FORMAT(1H +F8.2+6X.F6.4)
115 CONTINUE
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+119
119 FORMAT(35HUTEMP(R) MOD OF ELASTICITY (PSI) )
    DC 120 I=1+NF
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6.107.ET(I).E(I)
120 CONTINUE
    WRITE OUTPUT FAPE 6-125
                         THERMAL COND (BIU/FT9HR4R))
125 FORMAT(3MHOTEMP (R)
    DO 136 1=1.NTK
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPP 6.107.TKT(1).TK(1)
130 CONTINUE
    IF (TIMFM-TI(MJ))135+135+134
132 TIMEMETT(NJ)
135 TIME==TIME
    J=0
    K2=0
    11=1
    JJ=2
    LL=0
    RAD(1)=.5
    DC 137 1=2+70
137 RAD(1)=SORTE (RAD(1-1)002+.12601159)
    00 139 1=1.70
    SRMAX(T)=0.
    STMAX(T)=0.
   RRRMAX(T)=0.
    RRIMAX(I)=U.
    TRMAX(T)=0.
    TTHAX(T)=0.
```

```
139 PFR(I)=0.
    DO 141 I=1+NXM
    READ INFUT TAPE 5.69.WXMT(I).WAN(I)
    WRITE CHITPHI TAPE A.140.1.WXMT(I).1.WXM(I)
140 FORMATIGHUWXMT(+11+2H)=+110+2+3H(R)+5X+4HWXM(+11+2H)=+16+4)
141 CONTINUE
    10 145 I=1+NSU
    PEAU IMPUT TAPE 5+59+WSUT(J)+WSU(L)
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+143+1+WSUT(1)+1+WSU(1)
145 FORMATIANOWSHT(,11,2H)=,F1U,2+3H(R)+5++4HWSU(+11+2H)=+1U+2+5H(P51
   1))
145 CONTINUE
    10 149 1=1+450
    READ INFUR TAPE 5+59+WSCT(1)+WSC(1)
    WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+146+T+WSUT(1)+1+WSU(1)
146 FORMAT(6H0WS0T(+11,2H)=+F1C+2+3H(K)+5X+4HWS0(+11+2H)=+F1U+2+5H(PS1
   1))
149 CONTINUE
150 TIME=TIME+UTIME
    11=1.1+1
    TE (11MF-T1MEM) 155+155+5
155 P=50.25
    PSTFP(1)=0.5
    NR=51
    NT=50
    RSTEF(NR)=1.0
    PNT=NT
    N=NT
    00 160 J=?+N
160 RSTEP(J)=RSTEP(J-1)+(2.5/PNT)
    H=.25
    NO 170 J=1+NT
    TR=(85TEP(J+1)+RSTEP(J))/2+(+85TEP(J)
    T=F117E4P(TH+T17E)
    TEMPICIST
    YOUND(1)=FE(Y)
    15186(J)=F15(1)
    P0155(J)=PNU(T)
17C CONTINUE
    N=N Y
    00 175 J=1+N
    F&(J+1)=L.U-(RSTFP(J)/PSTEP(J+1))002
    TPA(J+1+1+1)=(+5*FP(J+1)/K57EP(J))+(1+0+(1+0+P0155(J))/2+09RA(J+1)
    1)
    TPA(J+1+1+2)=R57FP(J+1)0(1+0-P0155(J)002)0PA(J+1)/(Y0UM0(J)0H02+0)
    TPA((+1+1+3)=(1.0+00155(()))/2.0015THA(U) +HSTEP(U+1)0PA(U+1)
    TPAIJ+1+X+1)=(YOUNC(J) 0HCRA(J+1))/(&+PR5TEP(J))
    Abv(1+1+5+5)=1+0+(1+0+6122(1))+844(1+1)\$+0
     TPA (J+1+2+3) ==H0Y0(M0(J) *151K4(J) *KA(J+1)/2+0
    0+0=(1+t+1+1)=0+0
     TPA(J+1.4.2)=0.0
```

÷
1	75 TPA(J+1,3,3)=1.0
•	$CVIF_{\mu}(1,1,1)=1+0$
	OVIPA(1.1,2)=0.0
	GVIPA(1,1,1,3)=0.0
	OVIPA(1,2,1)=0.0
	OVIPA(1,2,2)=1,0
	OVIPA(1,2,3)=0.0
	OVIPA(1,3,1)=0.0
	OVIPA(1+3+2)=0+0
	OVIPA(1+3+3)=1+0
	DO 180 F=1+3
	DO 180 L=1+3
1	50 OVIPA12,K,L)=TPA(2,K,L)
	N=NT+1
	JF (N-3) 195,185,185
1	85 DO 196 J=3+K
	DC 190 L=1+3
	DG 190 M=1+3
1	90 OVIPA(J+L+M)=TPA(J+L+1)*OVIPA(J+1+1+M)+TPA(J+L+2)*OVIPA(J+1+2+M)+
	LTPA(JoLo3)@UVIPA(J-lo3oM)
1	95 TP=(P=0VJPA(NT+1+2+3))/OVIPA(N1+1+2+1)
	DO 246 K=1+TO
	J=1
	bJ=bVh(k)
2	ON RE=KSTFF(J)
	IF(R2+P3) 265+210+225
2	105 J=J+1
	60 10 200
ě	10 KC 512 12143
	no 235 (=(+3
2	15 TOIPA(I.L)=OVIPA(J.T.L)
	TF (J=1) 237+237+222
7	20 J=J=1
	60 10 235
2	25 1#1#1
	KF181+594(K2(57))//41/840 9596/14 - 15976/200741/840
	(N(PA(141)))(D(PA= (P(3))(0(1100(100))(D(0)))(0(11))(D(0))))
	THIS WITE NEW TERNING TO THE TO THE THE THE TO THE
	**************************************
	TNTPAL9_21=1_0+11_0+POTSA(11)988122+U
	THITPE (3. HITTHAY CHIMAL IN AT STRAILL) ORT 1/2+0
	THING IN THE CONTRACT OF A DECOMPOSE OF A DECOMPOS
	THIPA (3.2120.0
	0.12 (L.F.) 21 21 0
	00 230 121+3
	DG 230 1#1•3
2	30 TOIPA(1,1)=THIPA(L,1)00VIPA(J,1,1)+(NIPA(L,2)00VIPA(J,2,1)+
•	1TNIPA(L+3) "QVIPA(3+3+1)
2	35 DISP=10010104(1+1)+T();PA(1+3)
•	T=FNTEWF(R],TIME)
	STPR(K)= (TPOTUID4(2+1)+ TO)PA(2+2))/P
	_STRT(K)=FE(T)+DISP/P1+FNU(I)+SIAH(K)+FE(1)MPTS(T)

TP0==OVIPA(NT+1,2:3)/OVIPA(NT+1:2:1) DISPO=TP0+101PA(1+1)+TU1PA(1+3) STRRT(K) = (TP0+T01P4(2,1)+TU1PA(2,3))/H STRIT(#)=FE(T)+DISPO/R1+FNU(1)+SIKRT(K)-FE(T)+FTS(T) STRRM(k)=STRR(K)=STRRT(K) STRIM(K)=SIRT(K)+STRIT(K) 240 CONTINUE 250 TO=FUTEMP(U.5+TTHE) T1=FUTEMP(0,55+TTME) TGRAD=(T1-10) 4240. HEATIN=-1GRAD#FTV(T0)/3600+ HRAD=(1.71//10.009) 0(T0004)/3600. HIMP=HEATIN+HKAD PISK=0. RISKR=n. RISK1=0. LO 300 I=1.70 TR=RAD(I) TEMP(I)=+UIEHP(TP,TIME) T=TEMP(I) XMOFXMIT) SU=P 50(T) SO=FSU(T) 1F (STRP (I) - SPMAX (I)) 465.665.260 260 SEMAX(1)=STRE(1) 265 IF (STRR(1)-50)270.270.275 270 BRTP (1)=0. GO 10 278 275 PRTP(1)=.09959/5650((STRP(1)-50)/50)00XM 276 IF (STRT (1) - STNAX (1) )265.485.280 280 STMAX(1)=STPY(1) 285 1F (STRT (1) -SU) 290.295. 290 RRTT(1)=0. GO TO 100 295 RRTT(1)=.099597545#((STRT(1)=50)/50)#\*XM 306 CONTINUE DO 350 141.69 TF (HPTP(1)-FUTH(1+1))310+310+315 310 RRP(1)=PHTH(T+1) 03F 07 00 315 RER(T)=PRTH(T) 320 TP (RPR (1) - RRPNAX (1) ) 328+324+325 325 RREMAX(1)=464(1) TRMAX(T)=TINE 356 CH=BHHVVX(I) 1F(AA1+(1)++PTT(1+1))33C.335+335 330 RRT(1)=RRT1(1+1) GO TO 340 335 PRT(1)=HHT1(1) 340 JF(RPT(1)-4PTMAX(1))348+348+348 345 RRTMAX(T)=HRT(1) TTMAX(T)=TIME

÷

348 CT=RRTMAX(I) PFR(J)=1++EXPF(+CP+CT) RISKR=RISKR+RRRNAX(I) 350 RISKT=PISK(+PRIMAX(I) RISK=RISKR+RTSKT POFR=1.=EXPF(-R1SKR) POFT=1,-EXPF(-RISKT) FCF=1+-EXPM(-RISK) WRITE OUIPUT TAPE 6.360, TIME. S. TU. TGRAD 360 FOPMAT(640TI1E=+F5.2+3HMIN+4X+15HAPPEIED STRESS=+F7+1+3HPSI+4X+10H ISURE TEMP=+F6.1.1HF.5%.10HIEMP GHAU=+F7.1) WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6.365.HEATIN.HRAD.HIMP 365 FORMAT(19H NET HEAT FLUX=+F6+2+11HF107FT24SEC+4X+9HHEAT MADF+F4+2+ 111HBTU/FT24SEC+4X+16H6R055 HEAT FLUX=+F6+1+11H6TU/FT245EC) WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6,370, POFR, POFT, RISK, POF 370 FORMATIISH RAD FAIL PROBESFIUSHSAXSISH TAN FAIL PROBESFIUSBSAXSI3H IOVERALL PISK=, IPF14.8.19H OVERALL FAIL PROB=, OPF10.8) K1=)+(LL-1)/NPPIHT 1F(K1-42)156,150,375 375 K2=K1 WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+380 380 FOPMAT (99HU PARTUS TEMP STHHM STRTM STRHT STR SRYAX 111 STMR STRY SIMAL ) DO 340 J=1.70 WRITE OUTPUT TARE 6.385.FAULUS.TEMP(I).STRRM(I).STRTM(U).STRRT(I). 1STRTI(1) + SIRR(1) + STPT(1) + SPMAX(1) + S(MAX(1) 385 FORMAT(1H +FA.4.9F10.0) 390 CONTINUE WRITE OUTPUT TAPE 6+395 395 FORMAT (29HU PAU RR\*R KHYT) WRITE DUTPUT TAPE 6+400 400 FORMAT(1H +38X+76PRRR RRT RRRMAX TRMAX RRIMAX TTHAX MER ) 1 t≡0 OPFR=U. PF9(70)=-1. 410 1=1+1 1F(PER(1)+0PER)420,410,420 420 WRITE CUTPUT JAPE 6.425.PAU(I) .PREP(I) .NRTT(I) 425 FORMAT(1H +FS.3,1FF14.6+F14.6) 1F(1-69)430,430,150 430 (FFR(11) 437,431,432 431 OPER=0. GO TO 410 432 OPFR=PFR(1) WRITE OUIPUT TAPE 5.435. RRK(1). RKK(1). RKKMAX(1). TRMAX(1). RRTMAX(1) 1.TTMAX(I).MEB(I) 435 FOPMAT(14 .35x.10E14.6.2E14.6.UPP/.3.1PE14.6.0PF7.3.1PE14.6) GO TO 419 END

ذ

```
CDT
          DISK TEMPERATURE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION
ڼ
          FUNCTION FUTEMP(RATIME)
          TIMENSION TTAB(12+100)+RT(12)+TS(10)+TST(10)+E(10)+ET(10)+TK(10)+T
          1KT(10),XMU()N),XMUT(10),WXM(10),WXMT(10),WSU(10),WSUT(10),WSU(10),
          2WSOT(10) \bullet T((40))
          COMMON TTAN, RT&TS&TST.E.FT&TK, TKT&XNU&XNUT, WXM, WXMT&WSU&WSUT, WSO, W
          1SOT, TT, JJ
       10 IF(TIMF=TT(JJ))30+30+20
       20 JJ=JJ+1
          GC TO 10
       30 11=2
       35 IF(R-RT(II))45.45.40
       40 JI=II+)
          GO TO 35
       45 TIJ=TT/2(IT+JJ)
          (LL+1+11)HATT#L11T
          (1-LL+[1) 44TT=[LIT
          TI1J1=TTAB(11=1+JJ=1)
          TR1=TI)J1+(TINE=TT(JJ=1))*(TI1J=T11J1)
           TR=TIJ1+(TIMF+TT(JJ-1))+(TIJ-TIJ1)
          FDTEMP=TH1+(R-HY(II-1))+(TR-TR1)/(RT(II)-RT(II-1))+459.6
          RETURN
          ENU
    CFTS
          THERMAL STRATH AS & FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE
          FUNCTION FIS(T)
          DIMENSION (TAS(12+)00)+FT(12)+TS(10)+IST(10)+E(10)+ET(10)+TK(10)+T
1
         1KT(10)+XNU(10)+XNUT(10)+WXM(10)+WXMT(10)+WSU(10)+WSUT(10)+WSU(10)+
         2WSOT(1n) + T1(40)
          COMMON ITAM #RTOTSOIST CECETOTKOIK ISANUOANUTOWAMOWAMIOWSUSWSUTOWSOOW
         1SOT, TT, JJ
          1=1
       10 IF(T+TST(1+1))20,20,15
       15 1=1+1
          66 TO 10
       20 #f5=r5(1)+(t-t5)(t))*(t5(1+1)-t5(1))/(t5t(1+1)-t5t(1))
          PETURN
          END.
    CFE
          MODULUS OF ELASTICITY AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE
          FUNCTION FELT)
          D1ME*STON 1108(12+100)+FT(12)+TS(10)+TST(10)+E(10)+E(10)+TK(10)+T
          1KT(1C)+>+U(10)+X+UT(1C)++X+(10)+WX+T(10)+WSU(1C)+WSUT(10)+WSU(10)+
          2WS01(10)+TT(40)
          COMMON TYAMARTATSATST.EAFTATKAYKTAXNUAXNUTAWAMAWXMIAWSUAWSUTAWSOAW
         150T+YT+JJ
          1=1
       10 IF(T-ET(1+1)) 20.20.15
       15 1=1+1
          60 TO 10
       20 FE=E(1)+(T+ET(1))*(E(1+1)+E(1))/(ET(1+1)+ET(1))
          PETURN
          ENG
```

·	
CFNU	POISSUM RATIO AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE
	DIMENSION TYAB(123100) +RT(12) +TS(10) +TST(10) +F(10) +FT(10) +TK(10) +T
	1KT(10), XNU(10), XFUT(10), WAM(10), WAMT(10), WSU(10), WSUT(10), WSU(10),
	24307(10)+TI(40) - COMMON TTAM-PT-IST.F.F.T.TK-IKI-XNU-XNUT-WXM-WXMT-WSU-WSUT-USD.W
	1SOT+TT+JJ
10 10	I=I+1 I=I+1
	GO TO IC
20	FNU#XNU(1)+(T+XNUT(1))#(XNU(1+1)-XNU(1))/(XNUT(1+1)-XNUT(1))
	END
CFTK	THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE
•	FUNCTION FIR(T) DIMENSION (174)(124)(0) (PT(12) (TS(10) (TST(10) (E(10) (ET(10) (TK(10) (T
	1KT(10) « XNU(10) • XNUT(10) • WXN(10) • WXN(10) • WSU(10) • WSUT(10) • WSU(10) •
	2WSOT(10)+T1(40)
	SOTATIALU
_	1=1
10	· 16(1+1/2/1+1)) 50/50/12
* -	ACTO 10
20	) FTK=TK(T)+(T=TKT(J))+(TK(I+1)=TF(L))/(TKT(I+1)=TFT(J))
	PC1(HN FND
CFXM	WEIBULL M AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE
	-FUNCTION FFM(T) 
	1KT(10) + X = UT(10) + W = UT(10) + UT(10) + W = UT(10) + UT(10) + W = UT(10) + UT(10)
	2WSOT(10)+TF(40) COMMUNE TTAM. DT. TELTST ELETATESTATESTATESTATEMANSMANSMANSMANSMANSMANSMANSMANSMANSMANS
	1=1
10	) [F(T+WXHT(T+1)) 20+29+19 - T-T-1
X	60 TO 10
24	1 #XM=WX+(1)+(1-WX+(1))+(WX+(1+1)-WXH(1))/(WXH1(1+1)-WXH1(1))
	RETUR+. FKD

CESU WEIGUEL SU AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE	
FUNCTION FSU(T)	
DIMENSION TIAB(12,100), RT(12), TS(10), IST(10), E(10), ET(1	0).1K(10).T
1KT(10)+2MU(10)+2MUT(10)+V2M(10)+WAMF(10)+WSU(10)+WSUT(1	01.450(10).
2WSOT(1/1) + T(40)	
COMMON TTANARTATSATSI FAFTATKATKITANUANUTAWAMAWAMTAWAN	WS. T. WSAL
	442014M208M
10 75/15 mar 51/17 / 13 / 13 / 15 / 15	
10 10 (100 00) (141) / (48041) 10 10 (100 00) (141)	
	_
20 F3(=W2((1)+(1=W2(((1)))))(W2((1+1))=W2((1)))(W2((1(1+1))=W2(	TIDD
RETURN	
ENU	
CESO WEIGULL SU AS A FUNCTION OF TEMPERATURE	
FUNCTION FSO(T)	
DIMERSION ITAB(12+100)+RT(12)+TS(10)+TST(10)+E(10)+ET(10	0),TK(10),T
1KT(10)*XMU(10)*XMUT(10)*VKM(J0)*WXMT(10)*WSU(10)*WSUT(10	U),wSU(10).
2WS0T(10)+TI(40)	
COMMON TTAN, PYSTS+TSTSESFTSTK+IKT+XNU+XNUTSWAM+WXMISWSU	.WSUT.WSO.W
1507 . TT . J	
1=1	
10 TF(T++S01(T+1)) 20+20-15	
60 TO 10	
20 FSD2wSD111+17_wSAT11110/wSD11+11_wS0111111//WSD111411_WSD1	***
D& AIRN Pris Common(11.7.1mm/d.(/11)/AOU/1.71mu/d.(711.1MO/1/1.71mM/d)	* * * * *

REI GA

## REFERENCES

- 1. Barnett, R. L., "Utilization of Refractory Nonmetallic Materials in Future Aerospace Vehicles," Part 1, "Review of Structural Design Techniques for Brittle Components Under Static Loads," FDL-TDR-64-123, September, 1964.
- Barnett, R. L., Costello, J. F., Hermann, P. C. and Hofer, K.E., "The Behavior and Design of Brittle Structures," AFFDL-TR-65-165, September, 1965.
- 3. Schwartz, B., <u>Thermal Stress Failure of Pure Refractory</u> <u>Oxides</u>; J. Amer. Cer. Soc., 35 (12), 325-33, 1952, (S-950).
- 4. Hess, F. O., Investigation of Pure Oxide Ceramic Materials Intended for High Temperature and High Stress Applications; FIAT Final Report No. 924, September 1946, PB 47012, (S-434).
- 5. Ryshkewitsch, E., <u>The Compressive Strength of Pure Refractories</u> Ber. Deut. Keram. Ges., 22, 54-65, 1951, (S-905)
- 6. Ryshkewitsch, E. One Component Oxide Ceramics on the Basis of <u>Physical Chemistry</u>, Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 1948 (S-907).
- 7. Christian, W. J., et. al., "Evaluation of Thermal Protective Systems for Advanced Aerospace Vehicles," ML-TDR-64-204, Vol. II, April 1965.
- Pears, C. D. and Starrett, ., "Experimental Studies of Weibull Volume Theory," AFML 66-228, 1966.
- 9. Goldsmith, A., Hirschhorn, H. J. and Waterman, T. E. "Thermophysical Properties of Solid Materials," WADC TR-58-476, Vol. III, November 1960.
- Dally, J. W., "Design Data for Materials Employed in Thermal Protective Systems on Advanced Aerospace Vehicles," ML-TDR-64-204, Vol. III, August, 1965.
- 11. Coble, R. L. and Kingery, W. D., "Effect of Porosity on Physical Properties of Sintered Alumina," J. Amer. Cer. Soc., 39 (11), pp. 377-85, 1956.
- 12. Boley. B. A. and Weiner, J. H., <u>Theory of Thermal Stresses</u>, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1950, pp. 288-311.
- Pestel, E. and Leckie, F., <u>Matrix Methods in Elastomechanics</u>, McGraw Hill, New York, 1963.
- 14. Weibull, W., "A Statistical Theory of the Strength of Material: Ing. Vetenskaps Akad., <u>151</u>, pp. 1-45, 1939.

Preceding page blank

- Grassi, R. C. and Cornet, I., "Fracture of Gray-Cast-Iron Tubes Under Biaxial Stresses," J.A.M., June, 1949, pp. 178-182.
- 16. Gregory, L. D., and Spruill, C. E., "Structural Reliability of Re-entry Vehicles Using Brittle Materials in Primary Structure," IAS Aerospace Systems Reliability Symposium, Salt Lake City, April, 1962.
- Barnett, R. L. and McGuire, R. L., "Statistical Approach to Analysis and Design of Ceramic Structures," Amer. Cer. Soc. Bull., Vol. 45, No. 6, June 7, 1966.