# UNCLASSIFIED

# AD NUMBER

## AD832929

# NEW LIMITATION CHANGE

## TO

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

## FROM

.Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Administrative/Operational Use; Apr 1968. Other requests shall be referred to RADC [EMEAM], Griffis AFB, NY 13440.

# AUTHORITY

RADC ltr dtd 17 Sep 1971

# THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

## DEVELOPMENT OF A MATHEMATICAL MODEL FOR PREDICTING LIFE OF ROLLING BEARINGS

Y. P. Chiu J. A. Martin J. I. McCool et al

SKF Industries Incorporated

This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments, foreign nationals or representatives thereto may be made only with prior approval of RADC (EMEAM), GAFB, N.Y. 13440.

AFLC, GAFB, N.Y., 23 May 68-163

#### FOREHORD

مديدان المرون والمهيد

This report was prepared by the Research Laboratory of 窗低F Industries, Inc., King of Prossia, Pennsylvania, under USAF Contract No. FJ0602-67-C-0117, which was initiated under Project No. 5519, Task No. 551902. The work was administered under the direction of the Development Engineering Branch, Engineering Division, Rome Air Development Center, with Ħr. Ħ. J. Bocchi acting as project engineer.

The following 📾 🕃 🐨 Industries, Inc. personnel contributed to this project, in addition to the authors: Dr. J. Y. Liu and Hr. F. R. Horrison. The project was under the supervision of Hr. O. G. Gustafsson and the direction of Mr. T. E. Tallian. This report covers research work conducted from December 22, 1966 through December 22, 1967. The secondary report designation is 圖 医 F Report No. AL68P003.

This technical report has been reviewed and is suproved.

Approved.

-33

Unillan J. Borchi WILLIAM J. BOCCHI

Mechanical Engineering Section Development Engineering Branch

Mariky Approved: . EETHKE

Chief, Engineering Division

FOR THE COMMANDER

GABELMAN Rovenced Studies Group Chief,

.

#### ABSTRACT

Ę

A description of rolling contact failure modes is given and the variables affecting the life of a rolling contact are identified, A mathematical model of subsurface and surface crack propagation is presented. The life to failure of volume elements in the vicinity of a defect is formulated. A term "severity" of a microdefect has been defined. The model is characterized by the inclusion of bulk material parameters, defect characteristics and parameters of geometry, stress, lubrication and surface topography. A statistical expression for the life of an entire rolling body is based on the defect life formula. The new model includes current standard bearing life prediction formulas as a special case. To assist in interpretation of the model, the stressed volume in a Hertzian elliptical stress field has been determined from the computed contours of equal reversing shear stress. A stress analysis has been conducted on the stresses near interacting asperities and around a surface defect (furrow).

(≣⊨

#### iii/iv

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Soction</u>	1	<u>P</u> 2	H <b>Q</b> 0
1	INTR	RODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1
II	PRIN	NCIPAL CONCEPTS	5
	1. 2. 3. 4.	The Principle of Rolling Bearing Life Prediction. Principal Variables of Fatigue Failure Fatigue Failure Model The Matrix Factor	5 8 9 13
	5. 6.	Prediction of the Life at a Defect	17
	7. 8.	The Statistics of Life for an Entire Rolling Body Application of Life Equations	19 22
		a. The Lundberg-Palmgren Case b. Deviation from the Lundberg-Palmgren Type	22
		Weibull Distribution	23
		Content)	23 24
		e. The Effects of Residual Compressive Stresses	 7 E
		f. Effect of Hardness	25 25
		g. Non-Hertzian Contacts	<b>2</b> 5
		h. Lubrication Effects 1. Size Effect,	26 26
	9.	The Stress-Strain Relationship	27
		a, Contour of Equal Shear Streas Range in Elliptical Herizian Contact	2A
		b. Neer Surface Stresses Due to Asperities	28
		c. Stresses Under Surface Imperfection	30
		d. Plastic Strain Determination	30
:	10.	Outlook	31
111	SYNC	DPSIS OF LUNDBERG-PALNGREN THEORY	33
	1.	Failure Probability Distribution	33
	2	Equivalent Load	39

¥

.

0

đ

•

Ð

ê

:

7

ન્યવ્યક્રમાં જેટલે હતું છે. આ ખેતવામાં તેણાં તે લેવા અને જેવ્યું આવેલા છે. તે તે આ ગામ આ ગામ આ ગામ આ

ļ

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT)

<del>ایتی</del>ی مربو

1=

ţ.

i

<u>Section</u>												Page
	3. 4.	Capa Dete	city rmir	of natio	a C In a	ompl f Ce	lete onst	Bea ants	ring in	tnə Li	fe Formula.	。40 。
		a, b,	Po1; L1ne	it Co Co	)nte itac	t		• • • •	0 1 - 0 0 4 0 0	) o c o o c • o u o o e		. 41 . 41
	5.	Fact Theo	ors Fy,	Omi	¢ed	fr(	3 m 3	he L	undb ••••	erg-Pa	1mgren 	. 42
IV	VARI	ABLE	S AN	ID MI	CHA	NIS	MS O	F RO	LLIN	G CONI	ACT FATIGUE	. 43
	1. 2.	Fail Vari	ure eble	Meci s A	iani fec	888 1111	(Ge g Fa	nera tigu	1) 18 in	Rolli	ng Contact.	. 43 . 49
		a. b. c. d.	Mate Suri Desi Oper	eria laco lgn rati	l Va Mic /ari Ig V	rial rogo ablo ari	bles eome es R able	try elat	Vari ed t	able. o Desi		. 49 . 49 na 51 . 51
	3.	lle c h	anis	185	of F	ail	170	in A	0111	ng Cor	itact	. 51
		a. b.	Subs Surs Fats	urf Iace Iguo	ace Dis	Fai tre	lure 85 8	 nd 5	jurfa	ce Inf	tlated	. 52 . 53
	4.	Fall	ure	P 7 0		Di	agra	<b>a</b> (1		ng Cor	ntact)	. 55
V	FOR	HULAS	5 FOI	r fa'	rigu	ie ci	RACK	GRO	)WTH.			, 5?
AI	STAT	r I ST I	CAL	THE	) R Y	0F	ROLL	ING	ELEN	ENT F <i>i</i>	AILURE,	. 65
	1. 2. 3. 4.	Gene Defe Dist Asym	ral oct : rib pto:	Sovo Itio Lic	rity n ci Dist	Di: "Do rib:	stri stri sfec utio	but1 t Li n of	on fe". Sma	 	Defect Life	. 65 . 67 . 68 . 70
AIT	HACI Stri	ROSCO Essec	PIC VO	stri .Uhe	ESS In	CAL A HI	CULA Ertz	TION Con	I FOR Itact	The H	IIGHLY	. 73
VIII	DETI	erëin	ATI(	)肾 ()	F SI	EAR	STR	ESS	NEAR	ASPEI	RITIES	. 87

vi

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS (CUNT)

----

يلقيد فالكفاك بكلا

<u>a e</u>

s straighter and the state of the straighter of the state of the state

THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE

mmoonnoisionaltaisilla shiga orangi ardinatedea ta 🔬

.

 assisted and the second of the second s

\*\*\*

Section		<u>Page</u>
IX	DETERMINATION OF SHEAR STRESS BENEATH A FURROW	105
	<ol> <li>Computation of Contact Pressure Near a Surface Defect</li></ol>	108
	2. Sub-surface Stress Distribution in the Vicinity of a Surface Defect	112
Appendí		
I	Formulas for Stresses in a Hertzian Stress Field	117
ĨĪ	Formulas for Stresses Corresponding to an Infinitely Narrow Contact Ellipse in a Hertzian Stress Field	121
III	Plane Contact of Asperities	125
IV	Compression of a Half Plane Containing an Idealizad. Surface Defect	129
A	Average Shear Range in the Stressed Area Enclosed by	
	a contour of Equal Shear Range in a nortzian Elliptical Contact	131
VI	Plausible Defect Severity Distributions	133
Referen	<u>1009</u>	139

#### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

÷

į

;

•

÷

÷

1

ł

1916

3

P

٠

9

Figure	,	Page
1	The Interdependence of Variables Affecting Contact Fatigue Life	54
2	Schematic Representation of Growth of Micro- cracks	<b>6</b> 1
3	Equilibrium of Stresses Acting in y-Direction	74
1	Variation of $\tau$ and $\theta_1$ with x and z	76
5	Typical Variation of Orthogonal Shear Stresses with y for given x and z.	77
6	Contours of Equal Shear Range $\tau$ in a Hertzian Elliptical Contact (a/b = 10)	79
7	Contours of Equal Shear Range $ au_{ m R}$ in a Hertzian Elliptical Contact (a/b = = )	80
8	Contours of Equal Shear Range 7 in a Hertzian Elliptical Contact (a/b = 7.5) R	81
9	Variation of S/2b with a/b and $\tau$ /p R max.	84
10	Variation of S/az with a/b, $\tau/2\tau$ and $2\tau_0/\tau_R$	65
11	Asperity Slape Distribution on Ground, Honed, and Lapped Surfaces	88
12	The Contact of an Idealized Surface Asperity	89
13	Contours of Equal Octahedral Shear Stress in an Idealized Asperity Contact	91
1 1	Variation of († ) max, and its Depth y with 45° b/a for the Simple Asperity Model	92

v111

#### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (CONT'D)

the party

astranon market and the second strategy and the second strategy of the second strategy of the second s

4

4

ə

e

ي 1993م محمد المحمد 1993م علي المحمد الم a

4

MARKEN DE MENNENDER SERVICIONER DE MARKEN Marken de m

:

Flgure		Pege
15	A Simple Model of Asperity Contact	94
16	Variation of Surface Deformation Outside the Contact Zone of the Simple Asperity Model	95
17	Variation of $ au$ and a/b with h/g for a max. Ground Surface	9 <b>9</b>
18	Variation of $ au$ and a/b with h/s for a max Honed Surface	100
19	Variation of $\tau_{max}$ and a/b with h/g for a Lapped Surface	701
20	Variation of Tmax with a/b	103
21	Schematic Representation of an Idealized Surface Defect	104
ግባ ፈሪ	Schematic Representation of Contacting Bodies Containing Surface Defects (Limiting Case R~==)	106
23	Variation of ω (= c/b or defect width/distance between two contact edges) with C <sub>e</sub>	107
21	Pressure Distribution Near a Surface Defect (for c/b = 1.2)	109
25	Variation of Meximum Contact Pressure and its Location Coordinate with Dimensionless Parameter c/b for an Idealized Defect	110
26	Variation of Maximum Contact Pressure as a function of Defect Geometric Parameter r/c and Nominal Pressure p <sub>o</sub>	111
27	Application of Nethod of Superposition for Numerical Integration to Obtsin Sub-surface Stress Distribution under a Surface Defect	113

1 x

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (CONT'D)

.

Flaure		Page
28	Contours of Equal Von-Mises Yield Criterion in Moterial around an Idealized Surface Defect	114
29	Coordinate System and Defect Cc.ls	66
30	Cumulative Distribution Function of Defect Severity with d =2.0.	134
31	Probability Density Function of Defect Severity with d = 2.0	135
32	Variation of Average Shear Range in a Contour of Equal $ au_R$ with Enclosed Area S	1 32
33	Plastic, Elastic and total Strain vs. Fatigue Life	47

ð

X

## LIST OF TABLES

I

· \*\* 1.

4

¢

and notice through a second manage

printer contractions and a

אנה לעליל אני בארוונורטיסטרוווונוטעער אוווונער אווווערטער אווווערטער אוווערטער אוווערטער אוווערטער אווווערטער א איז אין לעליל אני אוווערטטערער אווווערטערער אווווערטערער אווווערטערער אוווערטערער אווווערטערער אווווערטערער איז

•

c

í.

\*\*\*

<u>Table</u>		
		<u>Pace</u>
1	Failure Hodes of Rolling Con acts	44
II	External Variables Controlling Contact Fatigue Life	50
111	Variation of $z_0/b$ and $r_0/p_{max}$ with $a/b$ in	
	nertzian Contact	83

x 1

#### NOMENCLATURE

8

•

.

•

.

.

-

.

A	Instantaneous crack area (in <sup>2</sup> ); ratio of major to minor somi-axor of contact ollipso
A c	Crack area at end of Phase II life $(1n^2)$
A <sub>o</sub> , A <sub>f</sub>	Initial and final areas of fracture cross section (in <sup>2</sup> )
A <sub>p</sub>	Crack area at completion of Phase I life $(in^2)$
8	Major semi-axis of contact ellipse; semi-width of contact region of esperity; semi-width of contact region of idealized surface defect (in)
9 <del>]</del>	Constants
B	A function of deterministic variables
Ь	Hinor semi-axis of contact ellipse; semi-width of curved base of asperity; semi-width of free surface of idealized surface defect (in.)
С	Dynamic capacity (1b)
C <sub>0</sub>	Dimensionless parameter
C	Semi-width of idealized surface defect (in); parameter of Pareto distribution; constant exponent
D	Ductility
D <sub>a</sub>	Rolling body diameter
D n	Racoway diamoter
đ	Defect severity
đ	Average defect severity
d m	Bearing pitch diameter
do	Exponential distribution parameter

ţ

÷

CONTROL OF TRANSPORT

÷

zii

#### NOMENCLATURE (CONT'D)

UNDER DISACTOR DURING AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS A

۱. ج e

A

։։։

E	Young's modulus (lb/in <sup>2</sup> ); elliptic integral of the second kind
£ '	Reduced Young's modulus (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
e, (k)	Weibull slope
F	Elliptic integral of the first kind; bearing loed
F(d)	Defect severity distribution
F(x)	General probability distribution
F <sub>1</sub>	Distribution of smallest sample value
f	Function; surface profile coordinate
G	Life distribution
G( <sub>l</sub> )	Material function
ព្ន	Constant exponent
H	Relling body life distribution.
ĥ	Minimum elastohydrodynamic film thickness (in); oxponent
Ĩ	Function
J	Function
3	Exponent
K	Complete elliptic integral of the second kind; a function
k, (e)	Weibull shape parameter
Ĺ	Life; dimensionless elliptic coordinate; constant intercept
L 10	90% reliable life

**x111** 

#### NOMENCLATURE (CONT'D)

lg.lo	Longth of rolling track (in)
Щ.	Baterial variables; fatigue ductility coefficient
<sup>╡</sup> ╅, ╡, ╣, ╣	Functions
ជា	Number of defect cells in a rolling body
N	Number of stress cycles; function
N L	Number of cycles to failure
No	Shortest Phase I life
N <sub>x</sub> , Ny	Functions
N÷	Weibull scale parameter
P	Total load (1b); function
þ	Contect pressure (1b/in <sup>2</sup> ); exponent in load-life relationship
₽ <mark>0, (00</mark> );	Maximum Hertzian contact pressure (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
р <sup>в</sup> ех	Maximum contact pressure due to a surface defect (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
Q	Rolling rody load; function
Q <sub>c</sub>	Rolling body load for a 90% reliable life of 10° ring revolutions
R	Radius of curved tip of asperity; radius of curved contact surface (in.)
5	Idealized surface defect shoulder radius (in.)
S	Size of highly stressed area in the cross section of a rolling element (in <sup>2</sup> ); asperity spacing (in)

XIV

AMA<del>TTITT</del>A ATAU MAMANANA MANANA MANANA MANANA MANANA WANA MANANA MANANA MATTITTA ATAU MANANA MANANA MANANA MANA

#### MOMENCLATURE (CONT'D)

100

Contact cycles per revolution u Stressed volume  $(1n^3)$ ¥ Deformed profile of elastic half plane in contact v with rigid asperity (in) Load 뙭 Exponent w Bimensionless coordinates Χ. Y. Z Coordinate axe. х, y, Ź Randem variable X Fatigue ductility exponent Z An angle Ø 8, 6' Constants Matrix function Y Г Function relating Phase I crack growth rate to defect severity An increment of a function ۵ Depth of asperity tip δa Vertical distance between asperity tip and 8 contact edge Plastic strein at micro-defect € c Total macro-strain € 0 Plastic strain ۴p Number of defect cells per unit volume; reduction ñ factor accounting for sliding

X 8

#### NOMENCLATURE (CONT'D)

1

and the second secon

.

A	Severity function
θ	Slope angle of asperity sides; an angle
٨	Crack growth rate function
λ	Constant proportional to radius of asperity tip; reduction factor for roller end stress con- centration
λ(Ν)	Material condition after N cycles
ν	Poisson's ratio
Q	Geometry parameter
σ <sub>0</sub>	Surface roughness
σ <sub>0</sub> (p <sub>0</sub> )	間aximum Hertzian contact pressure (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
σ <sub>x</sub> , σ <sub>y</sub> , σ <sub>z</sub> ,	Normal stresses in x, y and z direction $(1b/in^2)$
σ <sub>11</sub> σg, σ <sub>g</sub>	Principal stresses (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
σD	Von-Hises yield stress (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
а,	Yield strength (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
<sup>т</sup> ху, <sup>т</sup> уз, <sup>т</sup> хг	Orthogonal shear stresses (1b/in <sup>2</sup> )
ና <del>ዓ</del>	Shear stress on plane inclined at angle 0 to surface plane (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
î R	Reversing shear range (1b/in <sup>2</sup> )
์ วิ	Meximum amplitude of 7 (lb/in <sup>2</sup> ) yz
foct	Octahedral shear stress (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
6	Complex number ( = x + is)

xvi

#### NOMENCLATURE (CONT'D)

513

<sup>T</sup> .15°	Shear stress on plane inclined at 45° to surface plane (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
ក កាឧ X	Naximum value of $\tau$ (lb/in <sup>2</sup> ) 45°
ģ	A function of bearing geometry parameters
(0	Function of shear stress range and depth coordinate
₿.	Angular coordinate
ω	Ratio of surface defect shoulder width to the width of contact edge
Subscripts	
I, II, III	Pertaining to Phases I, II and III of crack growth
1, 2	Pertaining to contacting bodies 1 and 2
i, o	Pertaining to bearing inner and outer ring
i	Pertaining to i-th cell
V, S	Pertaining to "weak" volume and surface elements (or cells)

aringtwoododfaithodfautiotsfillann naadalaan gedigdaaanaanaanaanaaaaaaaa

9

\*\*\*\*\*\*

ì

ļ

xvii

#### EVALUATION

1. The present technique for predicting the life of a group of rolling element bearings does not consider the many factors known to affect bearing life, and for large bearings the technique is clearly inadequate. This contract is the first part of a two part effort to develop a practical engineering tool for the determination of the expected life of any group of bearings. This first contract was to consider all the variables that affect bearing life and the possible failure mechanisms involved, and then to develop equations which would contain parameters to account for those variables known to affect bearing life. These objectives have been accomplished and the results of this contract have provided a number of equations containing parameters characterizing material, geometry, load, defect severity, and environmental variables.

2. The above mentioned equations contain constants and function signs which must be evaluated and determined from test and field data before the technique can be used as an engineering tool. This is to be accomplished in the second effort. The results of these efforts will be included in a mechanical reliability handbook and should provide an improved prediction technique. United for the HILLIAN J. BOCCHI Mechanical Engineering Section Development Engineering Branch

ā

aviii

#### SECTION I

#### INTRODUCTION AND SUBBARY

This is the Final Beport Issued in fulfillment of Rome Air Development Center Contract No. F30602-67-C-0147 on "Development of Enthematical Models Predicting Life of Large Roller B arings".

-

The objective of this work is to determine the variables which cause the life of (large) rolling bearings to vary from the life predicted by the existing design methods; to determine the effects of those variables on the life of rolling bearings and to formulate an improved mathematical model for the prediction of rolling bearing life.

The present study covers the first year of this effort and has led to a general model of bearing failure. A subsequent effort is currently underway (RADC Contract No. F30602-68-C-0147) to cover future development of the model and to make the formulas sufficiently specific for engineering use.

This report is divided in several sections summarized as follows:

<u>Section II</u> is a description of the principal concepts developed in this Contract. Using the currently accepted formula as a starting point, this section brings together all the new concepts generated in this study and explores the usefulness of the new model. An outlook on future research is given.

Section III presents a synopsis of the currently accepted Lundberg-Falmgren bearing fatigue life theory which forms the basis of the ASA standard for bearing rating and is the starting point for the present study. This section is included in recognition of the fact that the fundamental work of Lundberg and Palmgren may not be easily accessible to all readers.

Section IV extracts from recent literature, the principles of fatigue failure theory required for this study, as follows:

- A Survey of rolling contact failure identities among which is spalling failure. This failure mode is the subject of the present study.
- 2. A listing is given of variables affecting contact fatigue life. These variables are grouped into four main cetegories. viz. material variables, surface

zicrogeometry verishies, design verishies and operating veriables.

- 3. An evaluation is presented of the interdependence of the variables and their effect on subsurface and surface initiated spalling occurrences.
- 4. A model is offered of fatigue failures. Subsurface and surface initiated fatigue failures, are distinguished which compete to promote spalling failures in rolling contact. In both subsurface and surface failures, the fatigue process is described as a sequence of phases of fatigue crack generation, propagation, and final fracture, (i.e., spalling) at a "most critical" crack in the rolling element. Grack generation in rolling contact is postulated to result from localized plastic strain concentration around stress raisers.

Section Y creers the formulation of an expression for the crack growth rat as a function of strength and stress parameters, ductility, and prestic micro-strain.

This concept is applied to a situation where defects of known "severity" exist in a uniform matrix, to yield a formula for the fatigue life of a defect.

Section VI gives a statistical theory of failure for an entire rolling body, based upon the relationship between life and defect severity developed in Section V. In this model, a rolling body is conceived as being built up of a large number of small cells each of which contains exactly one defect (including "defects" of no influence at all). The severity of the defect present in any cell is a random variable. The distribution of life over identically located cells in a population of rolling bodies similarly made and operated, is found through a transformation of distributions between severity and life.

The distribution of rolling body life is expressed as a compound of the individual cell life distributions. The asymptotic distribution of shortest cell life is derived for the case where all cell lives are commonly distributed.

<u>Section VII</u> covers a required stress analysis in a Hertzian contact. The micro-strain range in the highly stressed volume (or surface) is calculated.

Section VIII presents a specialized electic stress analysis for detormination of the maximum shear stress near an idealized surface asperity. Section IX presents a stress enalysis for the determination of naxiaum shear stress beneath a furrow-shaped surface defect.

Analytical details are supplied in several Appendices.

TOTAL ACCOUNTS OF A DECIMATION OF A DECIMATICA DECIMATION OF A DECIMATION OF A

倡

•

.

3/4

#### SECTION II

#### PHINCIPAL CONCEPTS

A mathematics: model of rolling contact fatigue is a complex subject. Numerous aspects of metallurgical, mechanical, and statistical nature have to be considered in its development. At the present stage of the development, many of these details are still open. Others have been covered in quite some depth. The present report is a Summary of the studies to date. It will take up the several aspects of the problem in turn, at whatever depth is currently accessible. There is the possibility with this presentation that the reader may be diverted from the principal underlying concepts by the complexity of detail. In order to prevent this and to facilitate evaluation of work accomplished from the point of view of the engineer, who will ultimately use the theory for practical life predictions, a review of the principal concepts is offered in the present Section. No proofs or references will be cited: these are either given in the subsequent Sections or referenced there.

#### 1. THE PRINCIPLE OF ROLLING BEARING LIFE PREDICTION

and a second second

- ultra litt.

statuendoreansperendonoonentaanseetteette

0110117-0

Rolling bearing life is defined here as fatigue life. Causes of failure other than fatigue are considered avoidable and are, therefore, eliminated from life prediction. Fatigue li e is predicted on the basis of a cumulative damage concept, i.e. that with repeated application of cyclic stresses, irreversible material changes take place which ultimately result in failure. This concept, with its statistical implications, was first applied to rolling contact life prediction by Lundberg and Palmgren. The Lundberg-Palmgren concept, universally used today, revolves around a phenomenological equation of the following form, between numbers of cycles to failure, and macroacopic mechanical variables:

$$\log \frac{1}{S(N)} \sim N^{e} \varphi(\tau_{o}, z_{o}) V \qquad (2.1)$$

where S(N) = the probability of <u>survivel</u> to N cycles To = maximum shear stress **smp**litude

- zo = depth co-ordinate of To
- V = stressed volume
  - $\varphi$  = function sign
  - e = constant

This equation explicitly contains the number of cycles, a maximum shear stress and its depth co-ordinate, and the "stressed volume" which latter, however, is nover expressed in absolute terms, only as a factor of proportionality.

The Lundberg-Pelmgren life prediction theory consists of the application of Equation (2.1) to the required wide variety of geometrical and kinematic conditions which characterize a complex assembly such as a rolling bearing.

Physically, Equation (2.1) teaches that the cumulative probability of survival decreases with increasing number of cycles N, and with increasing size of the rolling contact system (stressed volume). The specific choice of the function  $\varphi$  (70, 20) was made by Lundberg and Palmgres once and for all, and is given in Equation (2.2)

$$\varphi(\tau_0, z_0) \approx \tau_0^c z_0^{-h} \qquad (2.2)$$

#### c,h: constants > 0

This equation states that the survival probability decreases with increasing shear stress range, but increases for groater values of the depth co-ordinate of the maximum shear stress range.

By applying elastic analysis to the contact situation, Lundberg and Palegren derived detailed statements regarding the effect of the pertiment macro-geometry parameters influencing normal surface pressures in the contact, the subsurface shear stresses resulting from these pressures and the kinematic parameters determining numbers of cycles in terms of bearing ring revolutions. Equation (2.1) is readily modified to take account of time-variable or space-variable loading by using the "Palmgren-Miner hypothesis" of damage accumulation, stating that fatigue damage accumulates at a rate depending only on load conditions at the current time, so that Equation (2.1) can be written in the form;

 $\log \frac{1}{S(N)} \sim \int \left[ \int \varphi \left( \tau_0, z_0 \right) dN \right]^{\Theta} dV \quad (2.3)$ 

The phenomenological nature of Equations (2.1) through (2.3) results in an impasso if one attempts to incorporate into life prediction, newly acquired knowledge regarding the effect of parameters other than contact geometry and kinematics, since these equations offer no clue as to the proper rele of such parameters in defining life. For this reason, past attempts at

refining the Lundberg-Palmgren theory have relied on the fact that Equations (2.1) and (2.3) are proportionalfties, i.e. they contain a freely available constant multiplier relating the absolute magnitude of life to the probability of survival. This multiplier is intended by Lundberg and Palmgren as the material constant, but has, from time to time, been used to incorporate a variety of correction factors.

The limitations of this approach are obvious, and it has therefore been decided in the present study of improved life prediction methods to abanden attempts at modifying the basic Lundberg-Palmgren equation. Rather, it was decided to generate novel equations from which the Lundberg-Palmgren equations can be obtained as a special case.

The new equations were derived using a more detailed physical model of fatigue failure rather than as purely phenomenological equations. It is recognized that the use of such a model has many pitfalls, the most obvious being that its details may not be verifiable. However, the drawbacks are more than compensated by the heuristic value of a detailed model and can be rendered harmless by insisting that non-verifiable details of the model should not enter into the final engineering formula for life prediction.

Before leaving this brief review of Lundberg-Palmgren theory, it is noted that Equation (2.1) is equivalent to:

$$H(N) = 1 - S(N) = 1 - \exp \left\{-\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)^{e}\right\}$$
 (2.4)

<u>Article and a state of the sta</u>

i.e. failures are distributed according to a Weibull distribution with zero lower bound, characteristic life N<sup>#</sup> and dispersion exponent e. This distribution appears in the Lundberg-Palmgren formulation as a result of deliberate choice, as a useful distribution for the description of fatigue phenomena, and its appearance does not stem from extreme value considerations. This point will be of interest later.

#### 2. PRINCIPAL VARIABLES OF FATIGUE FAILURE

Section IV gives a detailed review of the variables governing a fatigue failure situation. There, it is deduced that the variables fall is four main categories: material variables, surface microgeometry variables, design variables, and operating variables.

Material variables are those influencing the "strength" of the rolling system. Current fatigue investigations (chiefly of the non-rolling type) consider yield strength and ductility of the material as dominant bulk (or matrix) strength variables. Modifying these are residual stresses and work hardening effects, acquired, in part, during the course of fatigue life. In rolling contact, the materials used are of high hardness, and such materials de not react with their matrix strength. Rather, rolling contact life appears to be determined by the strength of the material in the vicinity of inevitable material imperfections such as inclusions in the matrix or microcracks. Thus, the nature of these imperfections is a dominant variable.

Surface microgeometry variables determine the detailed nature of the contact through which leads are transmitted to the material. The generalized roughness of the surface determines the topography of the contacting surface elements, the plastic behavior of the material immediately adjacent to the surface, and interacts with lubrication, as will be seen presently.

There are localized imperfections on surfaces, mostly in the form of sharp depressions ("furrows"). which form stress raisers near their edges and are influential in failure. Of course, there can be many other types of surface variables, some of them artificial as induced by coating, special treatment of the surface, etc. The design variables of the rolling contact are dealt with extensively by the Leadberg-Palmgree theory, and they are, therefore, quite familiar. Track length, conformity between rolling elements, dimensions and number of these elements, contact angles, parameters defining the precise cross track geometry and many others are influential, primarily because they determine the macroscopic (Nertzian) stress field and the number of cycles as a function of bearing ring rotation. They also determine the magnitude of the highly stressed volume.

Operating variables encompass the external anvironment in which the rolling contact system must ondure, including load, speed, lubrication, temperature, and atmospheric conditions. The influence of load in determining the atress field is obvious, and so is that of speed in determining the number of cycles per unit time. However, these two variables also interact with the lubricant to determine the hydrodynamics of the often-present pressurebearing elastohydrodynamic (EHD) lubricant film is the costact, which redistributes stresses and has important effects on the microbehavior of the contact area (asperity interaction). Temperature enters by influencing both the material strength and the lubrication, and atmospheric conditions can be of consequence if they influence lubricant behavior or cause corresive effects.

This list of influential parameters deters the theorist by its multiplicity. The only practicable approach to the development of a life prediction formula in the presence of such a multitude of variables is to find a flexible, simple concept describing failure mechanism, and then solve the problem of introducing each variable by defining its impact on that mechanism. Success of such as attempt depends on the proper choice of the mechanism and will necessarily be limited. There will always be variables that the model cannot accommodate, and as time passes, the influence of these will become more and more recognized, leading ultimately to the abandonment of the model. However, the model will serve well in the interim if it permits account to be taken of the most important parameters recognized to date. In what follows, such a model will be outlined. It appears at the present stage of the study to have the required flexibility and to accommodete many of the most important parameters, including all those which the Lundberg-Pelagrea theory utilizes. It will remain for further study to develop the specific formulations for the incorporation of new parameters into this model and to show whether it is sufficiently free from inherent contradictions to be practically This further effort is currently underway. used.

3. THE FATIGUE FAILURE MODEL

A THE REPORT OF A DESCRIPTION OF A DESCRIPT

. **-** 1

Our failure model visualizes fatigue damage as the growth of a crack. There are plastic flow occurrences, carbon migration, and, of course, first of all, dislocation motions in the matrix as a result of cyclic stressing, which precede or are concurrent with crack formation. However, for modeling purposes, these subtler occurrences are not helpful in fixing ideas of fatigue damage because no may is known to measure the degree to which they are shortening life expectancy. The effect of a crack on life is intuitively clear: when the crack has become large enough a piece

9

of material will separate from the surface, forming the fatigue spall defined in rolling contact technology as fatigue failure. Crack growth is visualized as irreversible, so that a suitable measure of crack size satisfies the concept of "damage" as irreversible progress towards failure. The fatigue phenomenon starts, accordingly, with the initiation of a crack, and proceeds through stages of its growth until the crack has become large enough to form a spart. Fatigue life, as determined by the crack in question, begins with the onset of cycling and terminates when the spall forms. Of course, it can be argued that a rolling contact system may be functional in the presence of a spall of tolerable size. There is room to accommodate this argument in the model, as will be pointed out later, but the current description of the failure terminates with first spalling. anna guana anna manna manna anna an an anna a

It is convesient to describe failure generation in three phases:

Phase I begins immediately upon the onset of cyclic stressing, a G is consumed by the formation and growth of a microcrack. A definition of a microcrack will be given below. From the point of view of the model, it is characterized by the fact that it is small enough not to interact with other microcracks that may be present in the rolling element.

In Phase II, the crack grows macroscopically until, at the end of this phase, it has reached a critical size, defined by the fact that it is now large enough to cause the initiation of precipitous crack growth (in Phase III).

Phase III is occupied by precipitous crack growth at a rate greatly in excess of Phase II growth. This precipitous cracking forms the spall itself. This Phase may be virtually instantaneous or consume substantial length of time, depending on whether ane specifies a minimum spall size, which is accepted as a failure, and depending on a variety of material and operating conditions.

The objective of a mathematical life formula is to describe crack growth through the above three phases. In order to describe crack growth, one selects a measure of crack size A and formulates an equation of the form:

$$A = f_1 (N, X_1)$$
 (2.5)

where A = creck size f<sub>1</sub> = function sign K<sub>1</sub> = undefined parameters N = number of stress cycles

At the present state of the study, it seems best to select a form of Equation (2.5) common in current fatigue theory, viz. one defining the first derivative of crack size (the crack growth rate) in terms of the relevant variables:

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = f_{g}(N, A, X_{i}) \qquad (2.6)$$

where  $f_{-} = function sign$ 

Life prediction is then accomplished by determining from Equation (2.6) that value of the number of cycles  $N_{L}$  which corresponds to a critical crack size  $A_{c}$ , causing immediate spalling, i.e.

$$N_{t} = f_{s}(A_{c}, X_{i}) \qquad (2.7)$$

where N<sub>L</sub> = life at failure A<sub>c</sub> = critical crack size at spalling

Many current theories of fatigue failure use the crack growth Equation (2.6) in the following simple form:

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = \Lambda(e_c, D) \cong \Lambda(e_c(N), D(N))$$
(2.8)

where  $\Lambda =$  function sign

e = plastic strain at the propagating crack front D = ductility

According to Equation (2.8), the only variables entering the crack propagation equation are a <u>plastic</u> strain (measured at the propagating crack front) and a measure of material ductility. Specific definitions of these two variables in terms of measurable physical quantities are open at this point, both because appropriate definitions for the rolling contact situation have not previously been determined, and also because the plastic strain  $e_c$  is a microparameter which is not directly measurable. Note that Equation (2.8), for all its simplicity, contains many assumptions. Only the first derivative of crack size appears explicitly. (The crack size itself enters by way of its influence on  $e_{c}$ .) Only variables measurable at the location of the propageting crack front appear, and these only with their values assumed at the time of the N-th stress cycle. (Of course, the equation is compatible with a dependence  $\epsilon_c(N)$  and D(N), and the specific form of this dependence determines whether this formula satisfies the Palmgren-Hiner hypothesis.) There is hardly room for concern about restrictiveness at this point, however, since even Equation (2.8) is much too general to be practically applicable.

In order to add definition to Equation (2.8), the concept of "defects" is introduced. A defect is a location in the material or at the surface, at which there is a tendency of crack generation. It will be assumed that this tendency manifest: itself in Equation (2.8) by some property of the defect causing  $s_c$  to be higher at the defect than elsewhere in the vicinity.

A simple form of this relationship can be written by <u>assuming</u> that one can select (as in uniaxial tension) a critical scalar  $\varepsilon_0$ of the <u>total</u> (elastic plus plastic) macroscopic strain field as it would exist at the defect location, in the absence of the defect, such that  $\varepsilon_c$  depends only on  $\varepsilon_0$ , on defect severity and on the yield strength  $\sigma_y$  of the matrix, i.e.

 $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathbf{c}} = \boldsymbol{f} \left(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathbf{0}}, \, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \tag{2.9}$ 

The defect severity factor 0 is defined as a "strain raising" factor characteristic of the defect. Conveniently, 0 is defined for all <u>real</u> defects with strain raising properties, but also for an "ineffective defect" with no severity at all, i.e. one which does not raise the magnitude of the strain. For purposes of statistical treatment, it is convenient to define such "ineffective" properties.

Introducing Equation (2.9) into Equation (2.9), one has

 $\frac{dA}{dN} = \Lambda \left(\Theta, e_0, \sigma_y, D\right)$  (2.10)

It is convenient to separate the variables influential in crack growth into the two groups: variables related to defects, and matrix variables. In Equation (2.10), 0 is the variable related to defects, whereas co, dy, and D are related to the matrix. For simplicity, the matrix effects are consolidated into a single function Y, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial N} = \Lambda \left( \Theta, \gamma \right); \ \gamma = \gamma \left( e_0, \sigma_y, D \right)$$
(2.11)

The new assumptions underlying Equations (2.9) through (2.11) are that there is a scalar  $e_0$  of the macrostrain field which, alone, among strain field characteristics, determines  $e_c$ , and that all matrix parameters exert their influence on crack growth via a single quantity  $\gamma$ . Neither of these assumptions is essential in order to arrive at a workable model, but are made here in the absence of a more refined understanding of the actual physical situation, to arrive at a relatively simple formulation.

Further development of Equation (2.11) requires use of a further restrictive concept such as the hypothesis of multiplicative effects on fatigue life. This concept, also used by Lundberg and Palmgren, asserts that the rate of fatigue damage (crack growth) can be expressed as a product of a number of independent factors, i.e.

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = \prod_{i} \left( \varphi_{i}^{a_{i}} \right) \qquad (2.12)$$

where  $\phi \approx$  unspecified independent factors  $\Pi =$  multiplication operator  $a_1 \approx$  constants

Applying this concept to Equation (2.11), one may, by suitable definition of the functions  $\Theta$  and  $\gamma$ , absorb in them the function  $\Lambda$ , and write

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = \Theta \cdot \gamma$$
 (2.13)

We will proceed now to the examination of the matrix factor  $\gamma$  and the defect factor  $\Theta$ .

#### 4. THE MATRIX FACTOR Y

From the definition of  $\gamma$  given in Equation (2.11), it is a function of a critical total macrostrain scalar at the location of the growing crack front, and of a yield strength and a ductility measure.

The yield strength measure  $\sigma_y$  will be a microyield stress, since small scale plastic occurrence: are at issue in rolling contact fatigue. It must be taken with its value at the time of the N-th stress cycle, to account for work hardening or work softening of the matrix.

The ductility is defined in static tassile tasts as the reduction it cross sectional grea at fracture. It is not obvious that this simple definition will apply under the conditions of contact fatigue, but is is intuitively convincing that one should include in the formula a material ductility property measuring the amount of plastic strain the matrix can absorb before it cracks. A variety of metallurgical parameters, but also some operating conditions, will determine ductility. The most important operating condition is hydrostatic compressive stress. It is generally believed that the high hydrostatic compression component existing in most of the Hertzian contact stress field retards crack formation. This fact will manifest itself in a point-wise varying asine of the ductifity parameter D when examining material elements located at different points within the Hertzian stress field. Inasmuch as it may depend on work hardening, ductility can be a function of N. Thus, the ductility parameter is already known to depend on material constants, on a parameter of the stress field, and can depend on N. It may also be related to other operational parameters, e.g. to cycling rate. These relationships are symbolized by the following equation:

$$D = D(\mathbf{M}, \sigma_{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{N}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}) \qquad (2.14)$$

Turning to the critical macrostrain parameter  $e_0$ , it is obviously dependent on the variables of load W, contact geometry  $\rho$ , position under the contact  $\tilde{x}$ , and elastic modulus E, defining between them the elastic Hertz stress field. With a quasi-elastic assumption, these parameters give a relationship of the form

$$\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0 (N, E, \overline{N}, \rho)$$
 (2.15)

where # = load
 E = elastic modulus
 X = position vector
 ρ = contact geometry parameters

The "quasi-clastic" assumption operates on the scale of the whole Hertzian stress field and disregards the vicinity of defects. It postulates that the macroscopic total strain  $e_0$  can be calculated from the elastic (Hertzian) stress field of the rolling contact. This is the case if the leads are sufficiently low that, at most, very small amounts of macroscopic plastic flow take place so that the plastic component of total strain is negligible

and that plastic flow does not result in a significant redistribution of elastic stresses. Except for the generation of residual stresses due to cyclic stressing, this is a reasonable assumption in all practical rolling contact fatigue situations. The question of residual stresses will require separate examination. Generally, they are handled by assuming that, after a small number of cycles, the residual stresses have "shaken down" to a constant value. Then, they act as a superimposed static stress field and combine with the cyclic stresses. The resulting time-variable stress field is, of course, different from that existing without residual stresses, and assumptions must be made regarding the effect of this difference on crack propagation. A common assumption in fatigue theory is that superposition of a static stress field does not alter the plastic strain  $\epsilon_{\rm C}$  influencing crack growth rate. However, the hydrostatic compression component of the residual stress field may modify the ductility D.

Everything said above about quasi-elastic behavior is restriced to the matrix at locations remote from defects. Due to the stress raising effect of defects, it is, of course, possible that localized plastic occurrences take place in small volumes in their vicinity. Such microplasticity is, in fact, the condition of cracking in the proposed model.

For any given defect G, and given matrix strength  $(\sigma_y)$ , it is possible to delineate that portion of the Hertzian stress field within which the macrostrain  $\epsilon_0$  is high enough to cause plastic microstrain  $\epsilon_c$ . For a given population of defects, there will be a "realistic" maximum severity  $\Theta$ . One can delineate a highly stressed area in the Hertz stress field within which all microplastic occurrences occasioned by defects of "realistic" severity will be confined. This definition of a "highly stressed zone" will be adopted in what follows, and the cross sectional area of this highly stressed zone, in a plane perpendicular to the rolling direction, will be designated by S,

5. THE DEFECT SEVERITY FACTOR O

ACTIVITY OF A STATE OF A DATA AND A DATA AND

-7Ē

The effect of a "defect" in generating plastic strain in its vicinity is manifestly very complex. A simple relationship for  $\Theta$  will be proposed as follows:

$$\Theta(N) = \Theta(d, A(N), 5)$$
 (2.16)

where d = initial defect severity A = A(N), crack size after N cycles S = size of the highly stressed zone

The variables of  $\Theta$  are: d, the severity of the defect at the onset of cyclic stressing; A(N), the crack size at the time of the N-th stress cycle; and S, the cross sectional area of the highly stressed zone in the Hertz contact.

As mentioned before, crack propagation can be envisioned as occurring in three phases. The first phase, microcrack propagation, can be defined using Equation (2.16) by postulating that the crack is so small that, by comparison, the size of the highly stressed zone can be considered infinite, so that for Phase I:

$$\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{I}} = \mathbf{\Theta}_{\mathbf{I}} \ [\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{N})]; \ \mathbf{A} \leq \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{D}} \tag{2.17}$$

where A = self-propagating crack size at the end of Phase I

Phase II, on the other hand, can be defined as extending from that point in time where the crack has grown sufficiently large to outweigh, in its effect on propagation rate, the original defect. Such a crack does not require the defect to propagate, it is "self-propagating". For a crack of this size, or larger, the size of the highly stressed zo... can no longer be considered infinite, so that one has:

$$\Theta_{II} = \Theta_{II}(A(N), S); A_n \le A \le A_c \qquad (2.18)$$

where  $A_c$  = critical crack size

Here, A is the crack size at the termination point of Phase II. This size crack is sumed to lead to a spall "instantaneously" by a precipitous fract. A mechanism. This does not suggest that the relling contect system becomes inoperative immediately, although this may be the case. However, there is a "catastrophic" growth step between the crack of size A<sub>c</sub> and the completed spall, i.e.

$$\frac{dA}{dN} \Rightarrow \text{ or } A \Rightarrow A_{c}$$
 (2.19)

One can assume that the critical creck size is related to the size of the highly stressed zone. or, in its simplest form:

$$A_e = k_1 S \qquad (2.20)$$

where **t**<sub>1</sub> = comstant

#### 6. PREDICTION OF THE LIFE AT A DEFECT

ararya ingi purusi andi gera na angan dan na angan na na angan na na angan na na

Substituting Equations (2.17) and (2.18) respectively, into Equation (2.13), one obtains the following formulas for crack propagation rate during Phases I and II:

$$\left(\frac{dA}{dN}\right)_{I} = \gamma_{I}(e_{0}, \sigma_{y}, D) \cdot \Theta_{I}[d, A(N)]; A \leq A_{p}$$
(2.21a)  
$$\left(\frac{dA}{dN}\right)_{II} = \gamma_{II}(e_{0}, \sigma_{y}, D) \cdot \Theta_{II}(A(N), S); A_{p} \leq A \leq A_{c}$$
(2.21b)

where subscripts I and II apply to Phases I and II respectively.

Using the proviously explained multiplicative hypothesis on the function 8, these equations may be rewritten as follows:

$$\left(\frac{dA}{dN}\right)_{I} = \gamma_{I}(e_{0}, \sigma_{y}, D) \cdot f_{1}(A) \cdot \tilde{f}(d); A \leq A_{p}$$
(2.22a)  
$$\left(\frac{dA}{dN}\right)_{I} = \gamma_{II}(e_{0}, \sigma_{y}, D) \cdot f_{2}(A/S) \cdot f_{3}(A); A_{p} \leq A \leq A_{c}$$
(2.22b)

In Equation (2.22b), two functions  $f_{2}$  and  $f_{3}$  are shown, one representing the effect of relative crack size by comparison to the size of the highly stressed zone, and the other any remaining direct effect of absolute crack size (as hypothesized e.g. by Lundberg and Palmgren when introducing the effect of the depth co-ordinate  $z_{0}$  of the maximum shear stress range.) Note that in Equation (2.22b), the original defect severity d does not appear. Therefore, this equation contains only macrostrain and matrix variables, and is independent of the original defect population. In Equation (2.22a), on the other hand,  $\lceil(d) \rceil$  is different for each individual defect, and the equation is, therefore, dependent on the defect population.

Integration of the differential Equations (2.22a) and (2.22b) leads to the following forms:

$$J_{I}$$
 (A)  $\approx N \gamma_{I} \Gamma(d)$  (2.23a)

$$f_{TT}(A, A/S) = N \gamma_{TT}$$
 (2.23b)

Substituting A<sub>p</sub> into Equation (2.23a) yields a value N<sub>1</sub>, the life at the end of Phase I. Substitution of A<sub>c</sub> into the Equation (2.23b) yields a value N<sub>11</sub>, the duration of Phase II life.

The life N<sub>L</sub> from the beginning of cycling through the end of Phase II life is then obtained as the sum of these two phase-lives N<sub>L</sub> = N<sub>I</sub> + N<sub>I</sub>(. Phase III life may or may not be 0, depending on the definition of failure as discussed above.

In principle, then, it is possible to obtain a prediction of life to failure at a particular defect with severity d, from Equations (2.23a) and 2.23b).

It is noted that the apparent arbitrariness in the selection of the self-propagating crack size  $A_{ij}$  will not influence the total life  $N_{\underline{i}} = N_{\underline{i}} \div N_{\underline{i}\underline{i}}$  if the hypotheses outlined previously are correct, because the Equations (2.23a) and (2.23b) were both obtained from Equation (2.16) by neglecting, for Equation (2.23a), the influence  $A_p$ , and for Equation (2.23b) the influence of d. Inesauch as these approximations are valid, the two equations merely describe two pertions of the same function A(N), and their domains of validity overlap so that the selection of  $A_p$  is, within limits, discretionery.

Solving Equations (2.23a) and (2.23b) for N, and substituting as described above, one obtains the following expressions for life to failure N<sub>f</sub> (at the and of Phase II)

$$N_{I} = \frac{f_{I} (A_{p})}{\gamma_{I} [(d])}$$
(2.24a)

1

$$N_{II} = \frac{f_{II} (A_e, A_e/S)}{\gamma_{II}}$$
(2.24b)

$$N_{L} = N_{I} \div N_{II} \qquad (2.24c)$$

One must nottle on a suitable value of  $A_p$  and determine that value of  $A_G/S$  at which the crack becomes critical. Assuming these decisions can be reached generally,  $\gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma(d)$  remain, in Equation (2.24a), as functions of external parameters and S and  $\gamma_2$  in Equations (2.24b). All parameters of these remaining functions are observable.

7. THE STATISTICS OF LIFE FOR AN ENTIRE BOLLING BODY

•

In determining the life of a finite-size rolling body, one starts with Equations (2.24) for life in the vicinity of a given defect, and uses statistical theory to obtain life for a volume of material containing a multitude of defocts. Failure of the rolling body will occur through "competition" between a multitude of petential defects acting as failure nuclei. According to the definition of Phase I fatigue, microcracks grow at a multitude of defects, at differing rates, and independently of each other. One of these microcracks, or several, will reach the beginning of Phase II, withis the life of the part. These will then proceed to accumulate Phese II life until such a time as one of them has generated a crack of critical size A<sub>n</sub>, at which a spall forms, whereupon the rolling body is considered failed. All other defects which have entered Phase II show, at the time of failure, cracks of less than critical size. In the proposed model, variations in original matrix strength within a rolling body are considered small enough to be neglected (this position can be revised later if necessary). This leaves two main sources of variability: the systematic point-wise variability of the macrostrain field in the contact zone (and the consequent variability of work hardening and residual stresses) and a random variability of defect severity and location with reference to the contact zone. It is the effect of these variables on the life calculated from Equations (2.24a) and (2.24b) that determine the outcome of the competition among defects for the generation of the crack leading to failure.

A statistical treatment which can be used to describe this competition will be illustrated for Phase I.

Phase II life will be considered a deterministic quantity, calculable for each point in the rolling body, from the knowledge of macroscopic strain and matrix parameters alone.

To express the statistics of Phase I life, consider the highly stressed zone to be composed of elementary "cells" of uniform size, selected small enough to contain only one defect, but large enough for a crack of size  $A_p$  to be wholly confined within the cell. Then, Phase I fatigue damage, originated within a cell, will remain confined within it. Fatigue damage existing in one cell will not influence the behavior of adjacent cells. On this assumption, Phase I life of each cell is independent of the life of all other cells.
Assume new that there is a known probability distribution of defects of varying severities d for each cell, i.e. there is a known cumulative distribution function F(d) such that is any cell

$$Preb (d_1 \le d) = F(d)$$
 (2.25)

where F = cumulative distribution function of d

Then, Equation (2.24a), establishing a functional relationship between d and N<sub>I</sub>, permits determination of a transformed probability distribution G(N) such that

Prob (
$$N_{1} \leq N_{1}$$
) = G ( $N_{1} \neq \tilde{T}$ ) (2.26)  
where G = cumulative distribution function of  $N_{1}$   
 $\bar{T}$  = position vector

In the general case where the functions  $f_{\rm I}$ ,  $\gamma_{\rm L}$ , and I in Equation (2.24a) vary from point to point in the rolling body because of the non-uniformity of the macrostrain field, or for any other reases, the distribution  $G(N_{\rm I})$  will depend on the position vector  $\tilde{\bf x}$  shown in Equation (2.26).

Equation (2.26) states the (cumulative) probability that the cell with position co-ordinate  $\vec{x}$  will reach the end of Phase I life in N<sub>I</sub> cycles or less.

From Equation (2.26), statements can be made regarding the probability of failure of the entire rolling body. The rolling body will fail if exactly one of its cells fail. It is, therefore, required to express the probability distribution of the life of that cell in the rolling body which fails first of all cells.

If the fetigue phenomena is each cell are independent as assumed, the probability that the rolling body <u>survives</u> is the product of the survival probabilities of all cells is it, i.e. the life distribution of an entire rolling body is:

 $H(N_{T}) = 1 - H[1 - G_{1}(N_{T})]$ (2.27)

where H = cumulative distribution function of N<sub>I</sub> for the <u>entire</u> rolling body I: multiplication operator

Equation (2.27) follows from Equation (2.26) by observing that the probability of survival is obtained by subtracting the probability of failure from unity.

 $\mathbf{20}$ 

Equation (2.27) is general. A special case is that for which all  $G_i$  are identical. This is a simple approximation of the case of a thrust loaded bearing ring (the Hertz stress field is independent of contact position) in which there is a single defect distribution throughout the ring and the defects are infrequent so that a "coll" can be represented by a short "slice" of ring between two closely spaced cross-sections. In this simple case, Equation (2.27) reduces to the following:

$$H(N_{T}) = 1 \sim [1 - G(N_{\tilde{1}})]^{m}$$
 (2.28)

where m = number of cells in the rolling body

As is shown in a later section of this report for certain general classes of distributions  $G(N_{\underline{1}})$ , and for increasing M, Equation (2.28) approaches the form of a Weibull distribution:

$$H(N_{I}) = I - exp\left(-\left\{\frac{N_{I} - N_{o}}{N^{*}}\right\}\right)$$
 (2.29)

where N<sup>19</sup> ~ m-1/k = a "characteristic life" or scale parameter k = constant dispersion exponent N<sub>0</sub> = minimum life, (N<sub>0</sub> (3))

The constants are determined by the specifics of the distribution function  $G(N_I)$ .  $N_0$ , the minimum Phase I life, can be considered zero, since a creck of size  $A_p$  may pre-exist in the matrix. Equation (2.29) emerges from general theorems on the asymptotic properties of extreme value distributions and is not a separate hypothesis.

In the model presented, the (Phase I) life distribution of a rolling body is not merely observed as a phenomenological fact, it is related to the physically meaningful distribution of defects. The relationship between the distributions F(d) in Equation (2.25) and  $G(N_I)$  in Equation (2.26) permits inferences from one distribution to the other, thereby identifying suitable measures of defect severity. As shown in subsequent sections, it is possible to conjecture appropriate defect they have on the life distribution of the part.

Equation (2.29) contains a volume effect on Phase I life. For cells of fixed size, their number m is proportional to the stressed volume. Therefore

$$N^{\circ} \sim V^{-1/k}$$
 (2.30)

i.e. the scale parameter of the Weibull life distribution is an inverse function of the stressed volume as in the Lundberg-Palmgren theory.

The observable life  $N_L$  of an entire rolling body is, according to Equation (2.24c), the sum of Phase I and Phase II lives at the defect where  $N_L$  will be abortest. This can be calculated <u>simply</u>, only under one of the following two conditions for Phase II life  $N_{17}$ :

(a)  $N_{II} \ll N_{I}$ , or

()) N<sub>IIN</sub> romatant

For either condition, the shortest N<sub>L</sub> will coincide with the shortest N<sub>I</sub>, so that N<sub>I</sub> can be taken from Equation (2.27), (2.28) or (2.29). N<sub>II</sub> is then calculated from Equation (2.24b) for the  $\overline{X}$  at which the shortest N<sub>I</sub> occurred and the two are added.

If neither of the above conditions for N<sub>II</sub> is satisfied, then the (deterministic) variation of N<sub>II</sub> with  $\bar{x}$  may cause the shortest N<sub>L</sub>. For this case, the statistical treatment must include N<sub>II</sub> and this may lead to difficulties in satisfying the assumption of independence of all failures required for Equation (2.27).

# **0. APPLICATION OF THE LIFE EQUATIONS**

Equations (2.248), (2.24b), and (2.24c), and the statistical interpretation contained in Equations (2.25) to (2.29), represent the framework of the proposed fatigue life prediction model. In order to apply this model, it is necessary to make specific assumptions for all functions. This work will be pursued in the mert project year. It is instructive, however, to illustrate the approaches that can be taken towards application of the model by considering a few special examples at this time.

a. The Lundberg-Palagren Case

The following is an example of one of several possible methods by which the Lundberg-Palmgreu formulas can be obtained as a special case of the proposed model.

If, in Equations (2.24a), (2.24b), and (2.24c), one assumes that  $\Gamma(d)$  is a material constant,  $\gamma_T$  depends only on the maximum shear stress range  $\tau_0$ ,  $A_p$  is proportional to a linear dimension of the bigbly stressed cross section, say,

the depth co-ordinate  $z_0$  of the maximum shoar stress range and  $N_{\pm T}=0$  , then one obtains

$$N_{L} \sim \frac{f_{I}(z_{0})}{\gamma(\tau_{0})} \text{ or } N_{L} \gamma(\tau_{0}) f_{I}^{-1}(z_{0}) = \text{const.}$$
(2.31)

If one uses power functions for  $\gamma$  and  $f_{1}$ , then:

$$N_L = \frac{\tau_0 c/e}{z_0 h/e} = const. \qquad (2.32)$$

The designation of the constant exponents is that used in Equations (2.1) and (2.2). Equation (2.32) states that the life distribution of each defect and consequently that of the entire rolling body, is scaled by the maximum alternating shear stress To and its depth co-ordinate  $z_0$  exactly as specified by the Lundberg-Palmgren theory. Equation (2.30) states that the stressed volume is another scale factor for life. Equations (2.29) and (2.32) are equivalent to Equations (2.1), (2.2), and (2.4). Thus, the Lundberg-Palmgren formula appears as a special case of the new model.

# b. Deviations from the Lundbarg-Palmgren Typa Weibull Distribution

It has been found experimentally that there is a non-zero minimum life prior to which there is no finite probability of bearing failure. This fact is not explicable by the Lundberg-Palmgren theory. However, it is immediately obvious if Equation (2.24b) is assumed to give a non-zero value for  $N_{TT}$ . In this case,  $N_T$  may still be distributed according to a Weibull distribution with  $N_0 = 0$ , Equation (2.29), but the total life to failure  $N_T$  will have a positive minimum value.

c. Effect of Material Cleasness (Inclusion Content)

Assume that there are two materials, one "cleaner", the other of lesser cleanness, i.e. possessing different inclusion severity distributions F(d) per Equation (2.25), but otherwise identical. The probability of encountering inclusions of great severity is higher for the material of lesser cleanness. One can then expect a larger number of effective stress raisers in any given rolling body made of the less clean material. According to Equation (2.24a), the relationship between Phase I life N<sub>I</sub> and defect severity is inverse. Consequently, the distribution of lives G(N) in Equation (2.26) will show shorter lives with higher probability for the steel of lower cleanness.

The distribution of cell life will be scaled to lower values. The scale parameter  $N^{\pm}$  in Equation (2.29) will be a smaller number, i.e. typical colling body life will be reduced.

d. Two Composing Failure Hodes

Assume there is not one family of defects (e.g. inclusions) but two families (e.g. inclusions and surface defects). Assume that these two families of defects operate independently of each other and each has a severity distribution. It is possible to define cells such that they have either one or the other type of defect, but not both. This state of affairs is realistic: failure in rolling contact has been shown to occur either subsurface (e.g. from inclusions) or to start at the rolling surface (due to surface defects). Cells with inclusions are volume elements not extending to the surface, cells with surface defects are surface areas underlaid by a thin "skin" of material. The distribution of the two types of defects is independent.

One obtains two cell life distributions of the type of Equation (2.26): one for inclusions and the other for surface defects:

Prob 
$$(N_1 \leq N_{I,V}) = G_V (N_I | x, y, z)$$
 (2.33a)  
Prob  $(N \leq N_{I,S}) = G_S (N_I | x, y)$  (2.33b)

di Antonini Archeonanna an an Arthrean Ana Benthon an Dunc**el** Barta Dun

Equation (2.33a) applies to subsurface volumes (three co-ordinates), and Equation (2.33b) applies to surface areas (two co-ordinates).

The probability of rolling body failure can be obtained by considering that survival of the rolling body necessitates survival of all cells from both populations. Accordingly, in analogy to Equation (2.27)

$$H_{N_{I}} = 1 - \left( \prod_{V} \left[ 1 - G_{V}(N_{I}) \right] \prod_{V} \left[ 1 - G_{S}(N_{I}) \right] \right) \quad (2.34)$$

or substituting from Equation (2.29)

 $H(\mathbb{N}_{I}) = 1 - \left( [1 - G_{V}(\mathbb{N}_{I})]^{m_{V}} [1 - G_{g}(\mathbb{N}_{I})]^{m_{g}} \right) (2.35)$ 

apore m<sub>y</sub> = number of cells with inclusions m<sub>a</sub> = number of cells with surface defects

One can determine whether the resulting asymptotic distribution for a large number of cells is a Weibull distribution by comparing the haracteristics of the cell life distributions  $G_y$  and  $G_s$ .  $H(N_1)$  will be Weibull only if  $G_y$  and  $G_s$  are sufficiently similar.

ក្នុងស្ថិតនៅទោះជាមនុទ្ធជាក្រុមជាស្ថិតជាក្រុមអំណាលនៅជាដែលស្រីជាជាក្រុមជាមិនស្ថិតជាមិនបានជានិយាយជាបានប្រាស់អានា

# e. The Effect of Residual Compressive Stresses in the Material

If there are residual stresses in the highly stressed zone, their hydrostatic pressure component can be expected to influence ductility. Accordingly,  $\gamma_{I}$  and/or  $\gamma_{II}$  will change. This may have an effect on crack initiation (Phase I), or only on crack propagation (Phase II). Depending on experimental evidence, appropriate modifications can be introduced in the first or the second of Equations (2.24).

It is also possible to account for the effect of the nonhydrostatic component of residual stresses if a reasonable assumption can be made regarding the effect of a <u>static</u> stress component on the microplastic strain  $e_0$ . As said earlier, many fatigue theories assume that this effect is nil.

#### f. Effect of Hardness

TRACT SUMMARY MARKED

TIME A DECIMATION OF THE DECIM

aptic: TO DE CONTRACTION OF A CONTRACT AND A

Ч

Three parameters:  $\varepsilon_0$ ,  $\sigma_y$  and D enter the matrix strength function Y Equation (2.11). Clearly, the assumption made by Lundberg and Palmgren that the only stress-variables influencing life are the maximum alternating clastic shear stress and its depth co-ordinate, is tenable only if the material is kept a constant so that  $\sigma_y$  and D do not vary. For different materials,  $\gamma$ will depend on the excess of elastic stress above the microyield stress  $\sigma_y$ , which is known to be related, although not equivalent, to indentation hardness. Thus, a general expression for  $\gamma$  will contain a material strength parameter of the type of hardness.

g. Non-Hertzian Contacts

Practical contacts are non-Hertzian in two respects:

Reller to race contacts are macroscopically non-Hertzian because roller profiles are not correctly approximated by second order surfaces (roller crowning, edge effects.)

All contacts are microscopically non-Hertzian because of the presence of surface asperities, which will be discussed later. No Hertzian essumption is inherent in any of the derivations gives above. Provided that the total strain can be defined point-wise in the contact, it is possible to calculate cell life and hence rolling body life, using the proposed model. a. Lubrication Effocts

The most thoroughly explored lubrication effects to date. are those of elastohydrodynamic lubrication, i.e. the transmitta? of contact pressure via a pressurized viscous film of lubricant. The effects of such a film on life can be treated on two levels: the macroscopic redistribution of pressure brought about by the elastohydrodynamic film can be used to correct the macroscopic strain field in the matrix which defines the function Y. Microscopically, it is possible to describe the influence of a <u>martial</u> elastohydrodynamic film on asperity interactions. The result is a modification of the microstress field in the yicinity of the surface, and a new distribution of cell life in the population of cells containing surface defects. In principle, it is thus possible to calculate these elastohydrodynamic effects on rolling bedy life.

i. Size Effects

Because the present study is ultimately aimed at improvements in radar antenna bearings, and radar antenna bearings are among the largest made, size effects are of great importance. The model presented offers several clues to size effects.

The solf-propagating crack size  $A_p$  is defined as the smallest crack which progresses at a rate independent of the original defect. Clearly, the magnitude of this crack must depend on the "effective radius" of the most severe original defect, i.e. it must be related to the volume within which the stress raising effect of the defect is felt. This volume elmost certainly is proportional to defect diameter. Accordingly,  $A_p$  depends on the size distribution of the Phase I life of a defect, it produces a size effect on this life. Absolute bearing size will enter inte this effect inashuch as it influences steel processing practices, and thereby the size distribution of defects.

The other Phase I size effect concerns the cell size introduced in connection with Equation (2.25). Since cells should contain only one defect, their size is related to the defect specing. This spacing is, again, influenced by absolute bearing

size through the correlation between reduction is cross sectional area undergone by the steel during rolling or forging and defect distribution. Cell size indirectly enters Equation (2.20) because the number of cells present in a given rolling body depends on their size. Of course, the distribution F(d) in Equation (2.25) also depends on cell size as that the offect is not a simple one. Given a defect size distribution and a cell size, the stressed volume of the rolling body. In terms of multiples of unit cell volume, introduces the volume effect of life, represented by Equation (2.30).

Turning new to size effect on Phase II life, Equation (2.24b) shows two size effects. One is represented by  $A_C$ It is the (hypothetical) effect of absolute crack size on propagation rate. The other, more obvious effect, is represented by the ratio  $A_C/S$  and represents the fact that a crack must grow to a certain size with reference to the size of the highly stressed zone before a spall can form (the crack must propagate from the depth of maximum shear stress to the surface, or vice versa, since spalls are typicall of a depth comparable to that of the location of maximum shear stresses). This effect is related to absolute bearing size through S.

There are, of course, numerous size effects implied in Equation (2.15) relating total macrostrain to external load and contact geometry. Most of these effects are accounted for in the Lundberg-Falmgree theory. Steel processing effects are also implied in Equation (2.15) through the fact that the yield strength  $\sigma_y$  may well depend on the absolute size of the part. The same applies to the ductility parameter D in Equation (2.14). Clearly, the proposed model effors ample room for the exploration of size effects, providing, of course, that the necessary experimental evidence can be secured.

# 9. THE STRESS-STRAIN RELATIONSHIP

The relationships between external load, resulting elastic stresses, total strein  $\epsilon_0$  defined in Equation (2.15) and microplastic strain  $\epsilon_c$  defined in Equation (2.9) are key elements of the model. In the present state of the work, no choice has been made among the possible approaches by which  $\epsilon_c$  can be related to a calculated stress field. Hewever, it seems obvious that high plastic strains will be associated with high shear stresses, and considerable effort was spent in identifying sources of high shear stress analyses, described in subsequent sections, are of importance.

# 2. Contours of Equal Shear Streas Range in Elliptical Hartz Contact

The proposed model requires a definition of 5, the highly stressed zone. A logical definition may be the zone bounded in each cross section by a suitably selected line of equal shear stress range, and extending around the relling body. Since calculations for such lines are not available from the literature, they have been computed and are shown in this report. Numerical equations and graphical relationships have been developed from which greas 9, bounded by selected contours of equal shear stress runge, can be obtained. One way in which these contours may be used is by observing that the distorted tubular arnulus between any two contours is a zone of roughly equal shear stress range. and therefore presumably equal total macrostrain fo. It is, therefore, an area in which the functions  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_{11}$ of Equations (2.24a) and (2.24b) can be considered constant (with, perhaps, a secondary influence of the variable hydrostatic compression on ductility.) A correct way of evaluating Equation (2.27) to obtain rolling body life might be to consider the distribution functions  $G_{i}(N_{T})$  identical for cells within each of these annuli of equal shear stress range; to apply Equation (2.28) to one assaular set of cells at a time, and then to compute H(N) from Equation (2.27) by multiplying the survival probability functions for each annulus.

#### b. Near-Surface Stresses Due to Asperities

A major result of research into rolling contact fatigue, referenced later in this report, has been the recognition that destructive spalling fatigue failure of rolling bearings is often proceeded and precipitated by "surface fatigue", a sequence of evenus starting with plastic flow in the immediate subsurface layers of material, followed by profuse microcracking at the surface, and eventually leading to spall formation for surface crigiated cracks. This series of phenomena was found to be icontion veleted and has been associated with the thickness of the elastry drudynamic lubricant film, compared to the roughness of the cost ating surfaces. Until recestly, it was thought that elastebydroffynamic films prevent surface fatigue by reducing tractive (teagestic) forces at the surfaces which, in the shuence of a full lestabused ynamic film, are transmitted between contecting critics. Because the magnitude of these hypothetical tracti inces cannet be determined generally, and because everel pieces of Acetracictory evidence could not be accommedated. methemati's modeling of surface originated fatigue was at a standstill.

In the last months, it has been proposed that surface fatigue occurrences be explained by purely normal Hertzian pressure. acting in esperity dimensions. The role of the electohydrodynamic film is. In this wiew, that it proverts sharp pressure gradients from arising at each separate asperity, whereas these pressure dregies's do occhi Apereael two seberities come juto conject through a boundary lubricant film. This hypothesis, if proven correct, can serve as a basis of mathematical modeling for surfaces. To explore its workability, stress analysis was conducted on a model asperity, represented by a prismatic ridge topped by a small radius. It is shown in subsequent sections of this report that high neer-surface shear stresses arise under the model aspority when it is pressed against a flat surface (or opposing asperity), and that the magnitude of this shear stress depends on two parameters: the degree of depression of the asperity (in pertial elestohydrodynamic contact this is determined by the film thickness to roughness ratio) and by the typical slope of the asperity side. Experimentally, it was shown that asperities on relatively rough, e.g. as~ground, surfaces have steep slopes of the order of  $30^\circ$ , asperities on finely honed surfaces have only slopes of the order of 4°, whereas the finest achievable lapped surfaces of bearing balls have asperity slopes of less than 1°. Calculation shows that the shear stresses under ground asperities reach the yield strength of hard steel for relatively little aspority depression, these under asperities of hened surfaces break into the plastic range at substantial depression values (low film thicknesses) only, whereas those on lapped surfaces should not become plastic under any conditions.

텩

۔ تحقیقہ میں ہے۔ محمد ہے a. E

3

In principle, it should be possible, based on this analysis, to calculate the life of calls immediately adjacent to a rough surface, based on Equations (2.24a) to (2.24c). :...

The sequence of events leading to surface originated failure is this: Near-surface plasticity occurs under contacting asperities, and eventually causes microcracks at the surface to a shallow depth of several hundred microinches. The life prior to the formation of these cracks can be calculated from Equations (2.24a) to (2.24b). The formation of surface fatigue cracks (not to be confused with deep cracks which may eriginate at the surface and will be discussed subsequently) represents a failure phase prior to Phase I. Experimentally, it is a distinct phase both more widespread and more rapid of progression than the subsequent spalling. The surface equipped with microcracks can be treated as a source of Phase I crack generation because the microcracks are so small and shallow that they do not show an apparent tendency

to interact. The near-surface volume of material thus acquires a large population of new defects, viz. the surface fatigue (racks. One can thus enter Equations (2.24a) to (2.24a) again and calculete spalling fatigue life for this population of defects.

c. Stresses Onder a Surface Imperfection

Aside from the generalized roughness of the surface, there are localized imperfections, generally of the scratch or furrow type, on every practical bearing surface. It has been recognized recently that such furrows are points of origin for spells. They represent a second population of defacts (alluded to proviously) which compotes with the subsurface defects of the inclusion type to gezerate spalling failures. Hacreas the Lundborg-Palagron theory is capable of prodicting life for failures originating at inclusions by using the macroscopic shear stress range in lieu of the total strain parameter  $c_0$  , and by assuming that the stress relaing properties of the inclusions (their severity) are a material constant, the same approach is not feasible for surface originated failures because there is no high shear stress at the surface of a Hertzian contact between ideally second autraces is the absence of traction. This difficulty discppears, however, if it can be shown that high shear streames arise in the vicinity of localized surface importections when they enter the Hertzies contact pres. The stress analysis gives in a later section of this report has shown that this is the case. The surface stress field was calculated under a furrow type imperfection. represented by a long prismatic depression in a plane. The depression has two rounded edges and sufficient depth to provert contact at the bottom below the rounded edges. High shear stresses mere found under the rounded edges, and their zelationship to the geometric permeters of the defoct were determined. This calculation permits the ussignment of a severity Afjae te é trigece gallei.

d. Flastic Straig Determination

According to Equation (2.0), the plastic strain physically relevant to crack propagation rate is  $e_0$ , the strain at the site of the crack front. It is convenient and simple to visualize this strain as the robult of a pre-existing total strain  $e_0$  in the undisturbed matrix on which operates the strain raising effect of the defect. This description has been used in the preceding discussion. However, the critical (maximum) plastic strain actually existing at a crack front dees not, in general, depend on a single strain scalar of the macroscopic strain field.

ł

The actual strain field in the vicinity of an imperfeetion is quite complex and, even if the macrostrain in the vicinity of the inclusion can be considered uniform, depends on all three pristical straims. Thus, generally

 $\mathbf{s}_{p} = f \left( \mathbf{s}_{1:0} \ \sigma_{y}, \ \Theta_{1:0} \right) \tag{2.36}$ 

414

with different defect severity factors applicable along each principal strain axis.

The preceding paragraphs contain two examples for the calculation of a defect-induced maximum <u>shear</u> stress, based on defect geometry (i.e. severity) and assuming a simple macrostress field. Given this maximum shear stress at the defect, it may be possible to put forth a simple model of plastic flow at the defect, yielding  $\varepsilon_c$ .

Whother it will be necessary for the application of the model to proceed to the actual determination of the plastic strain magnitude at defects, or whether calculation of a maximum shear stress, attached to known defects, is a sufficient refinement of the Lundberg-Pelmgren macroshear stress criterion to accommodate currently available experimental evidence is a subject for future investigation.

# 10. OUTLOOK

A mathematical model for the prediction of the life of rolling contacts has been proposed, based on a concept of crack propagation from pre-existing defects. Numerous parameters characterizing the material and geometry of the contact and the operating conditions are incorporated in the model, including lead, lubrication, matrix strength, defect population, and defect severity.

Further work now underway is aimed at closer definition of as many of the influential variables as feasible, considering currently available information. Starting with the Lundberg-Pelmgren prediction of bearing life, the incorporation of experimentally documented effects not proviously accounted for, will be attempted, and prediction will be correlated with life test results.

While as all-laciusive and completely verified life prediction formule is not is sight, it appears likely that a worthwhile improvement over past prediction methods can be achieved for these design, manufacturing, and operating conditions of relling bearings where experimental data suffice for the determination of parameter values required in the formula.

32

•

...

# SECTION III

#### SYNOPSIS OF LUNUSERG-PALIGREN THEORY

The first successful systematic attempt to treat rolling bearing fetigue life analytically was made by G. Lundberg and A. Pelmgrom in 1947, under sponsorship of AB & ESF, Gothenburg, Sweden (1)<sup>4</sup>. This work was further pursued with a special view towards <u>roller</u> bearing fatigue life and reported in (2).

This work of Lundberg and Palmgren is the basis for the life prediction method standardized by the Anti-Friction Bearing Hanufacturers Association (AFBMA) (2), the AS3 (4) and ISO (5) for computing rolling bearing life.

# 1. FAILURE PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION

- 17) -

n i i

The following is Lundberg-Pelmgren's development of the probability S(L) that a bearing ring will survive to life L. S, in today's parlance is termed a reliability function. Its arithmetic complement F(L) = 1 - S(L) is the cumulative form of a failure probability function.

Let  $\lambda(N)$  be a hypothetical function which describes the fatigue "condition" of a differential volume  $\Delta V$  of a ring or rolling element material at a depth z below the rolling surface after N cycles of stress are endured by that volume. Let  $\Delta\lambda(N)$ represent the change in the material fatigue condition within a small number of additional cycles  $\Delta N$ .

The probability that the volume develops a "failure" (i.e., a crack) in the interval (N, N+ $\Delta$ N ) is taken to be

$$f(\lambda(N)) \cdot \Delta \lambda(N) \cdot \Delta V \qquad (3.1)$$

The probability of <u>not</u> developing a failure (crack) in this interval is the prithmetic complement, of Equation (3.1), i.e.

$$1 - f(\lambda(N)) \cdot \Delta \lambda(N) \cdot \Delta V$$

\*Numbers in parantheses refer to the References at the end of this report

If AS(N) denotes the probability that the volume element endures N cycles without crecking, then by the product law of probability theory,

$$\nabla 2(N+\nabla M) = \nabla 2(M) \cdot \left[ I - \lambda(Y(M)) \nabla Y(M) \cdot \nabla A \right]$$
(3.5)

and the second s

Dividing by. AN and re-arranging gives

$$\frac{\Delta S(N+\Delta N) - \Delta S(N)}{\Delta N} = -f(\lambda(N)) \cdot \Delta S(N) \cdot \frac{\Delta \lambda(N)}{\Delta N} \cdot \Delta V \qquad (3.3)$$

Taking limits as  $\Delta N \Rightarrow 0$  gives, by definition of the derivative.

$$\frac{d \Delta S(N)}{\Delta S(N) dN} = - f(\lambda(N)) \cdot \frac{d\lambda(N)}{dN} \cdot \Delta V \qquad (3.4)$$

Or since  $-\frac{d\Delta S(N)}{dN\Delta S(N)} = \frac{d}{dN} \log \frac{1}{\Delta S(N)}$  one has:

$$\frac{d}{dN} \left( \log \frac{1}{\Delta S(N)} \right) = \Delta V \cdot f(\lambda(N)) \frac{d\lambda(N)}{dN}$$
(3.5)

Integrating both sides from 0 to N and remembering that  $\Delta S(0) \approx 1$  gives:

$$\log \frac{1}{\Delta S(N)} = \Delta V \cdot \int_{0}^{N} f(\lambda(N)) \frac{d\lambda(N)}{dN} dN = \Delta V \cdot G(\lambda(N)) \quad (3.6)$$

apere

÷

$$G(\lambda(N)) = \int_{0}^{N} f(\lambda(N)) \frac{d\lambda(N)}{dN} dN$$

The probability that the satire volume V will endure N sycles is. (assuming independence of the volume elements), the product of the probability that the individual elements will endure.

In equation form,

$$S(N) = \Delta S_{1}(N), \Delta S_{2}(N), \dots, \Delta S_{3}(N)$$

$$(3.7)$$

so that:

TTTTTTTTT

$$\log \frac{1}{S(N)} = \sum_{j=1}^{P} \log \frac{1}{\Delta S_j(N)}$$
(3.9)

5

Using Equation (3 6) gives:

$$\log \frac{1}{S(N)} = \sum G(\lambda(N)) \Delta V$$
(3.9)

As  $\Delta V \rightarrow 0$  the summation becomes an integral and one has

$$\log \frac{1}{S(N)} = \int_{V} G(\lambda(N)) dV \qquad (3.10)$$

Changes in the material condition at a depth z are taken to depend on;

- a) macrostress T(N) which is most dangerous from the point of view of material fatigue. This stress is, based on observations, tuken to be the alternating shear stress in the direction parallel to rolling.
- b) the material condition  $\tau(N)_{e}$
- c) the depth z

Thus the change in material condition  $d\lambda(N)$  for a small number of load cycles dN may be written:

$$\frac{d\lambda(N)}{dN} = J(\lambda(N), \tau(N), z) \qquad (3.11)$$

The reliability function S(L) is uniquely determined from Equations (3.10) and (3.11) if the functions G and J are known.

It is postulated that these functions are power functions as follows:

$$G(\lambda(N)) = k(\lambda(N))^{G}$$
(3.12)

$$J(\lambda(N), \tau(N), z) = (\lambda(N)) \cdot K(\tau(N), z) \qquad (3.13)$$

Shere g and j are constants.

From Equations (3.11) and (3.13)

$$\left(\lambda(N)\right)^{3} d\lambda(N) = \mathbb{K}\left(\tau(N), z\right) dN \qquad (3.14)$$

From Equations (3.10) and (3.12), the condition S(N=0)=1 requires that  $\lambda(N=0)=0$ 

Integration of Equation (3.14) between the limits of O and N therefore gives:

$$\frac{\left(\lambda(N)\right)^{j+\lambda}}{j+\lambda} = \int_{0}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left(\tau(N), z\right) dN \qquad (3.15)$$

Introducing  $j + 1 = \frac{g}{2}$  gives:

$$\lambda(N) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{q}{2} \cdot \int_{0}^{N} K(\tau(N), z) dN \end{bmatrix}_{\frac{q}{2}}^{\frac{p}{2}}$$
(3.16)

Using Equations (3.12) and (3.16) in Equation (3.10) gives:

$$\log \frac{1}{S(N)} = k \left( \frac{\alpha}{\Theta} \right)^{\theta} \int_{V} \left[ \left( \int_{V}^{N} K(\tau(N), z) dN \right)^{\theta} \right] dV \qquad (3.17)$$

If the amplitude T(N) is independent of N. equation (3.17) becomes:

$$\log \frac{1}{S(N)} \sim N^0 \int_{V} K^0(\tau, z) dV \qquad (3.10)$$

In a Hertz stress field of given geometry, the value of  $\tau(z, x)$  at depth z and coordinate position x measured perpendicular to the rolling direction from the midpoint of the contact ellipse is given by:

$$\tau = \tau_0 \cdot f\left(\underbrace{X}_{a}, \underbrace{X}_{a}\right) \tag{3.19}$$

.

where  $\tau_0$  and  $z_0$  represent the maximum shear stress amplitude and a is the half axis of the contact ellipse in the direction across the receway. A THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF TH

DATEN BAHU KUTANIN DAN U BURARAN MANANAN DATAN DATA

Using Equation (3.19) in Equation (3.16) gives:

$$\log \frac{1}{5(N)} \sim N^{2} \int_{0}^{R} \int_{0}^{e} \int_{e}^{e} K^{2} \left( \tau_{0} f\left(\frac{x}{2}, \frac{z}{20}\right), z \right) dx dz dy$$

where lo is the length of the ruceway

Introducing the change of variables  $\mu = \frac{X}{2}, \quad V = \frac{Z}{Z_0}$ 

gives: 
$$\int_{V} K^{\Theta}(\tau, z) dV = a \cdot z_0 \cdot 1_0 \cdot \varphi(\tau_0, z_0)$$
(3.20)

where

نی بر نیز ا

62

$$\varphi(\tau_0, z_0) = \int_0^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty K^0 \tau_0 f(u, v), z_0 V du dv$$

Using Equation (3.20) in (3.18) gives :

$$\frac{1}{S(N)} \sim N^{\frac{1}{2}} a \cdot z_0 \cdot 1_0 \phi(\gamma_0, z_0)$$
(3.21)

The relationship log sind or:

$$F(N) = 1 - S(N) = 1 - exp - \left(\frac{N}{N_0}\right)^{e}$$

defines the probability distribution of bearing lives when many identical bearings are operated under identical conditions. This distribution is today known as a (two parameter) Weibull distribution.

It is postulated that

$$\varphi\left(\tau_{\theta}, z_{\theta}\right) = \tau_{\theta}^{c} z_{\theta}^{-h} \tag{3.22}$$

where c and h are unknown positive constants which satisfy the intuitively reasonable relationship that:

S(N) = 1 if  $\tau_0 = 0$  or  $z_0 = 0$ .

Using Equation (3.22) in Equation (3.21) gives:

 $\log \frac{1}{S(N)} \sim \frac{\frac{2n}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{\frac{2}{N}} e^{\frac{2}{N} e^{$ 

At this point in the development, the quantities 70 and 20 are related through Hertz's equations for the contact of elastic bodies, to the bearing geometry (rolling body diameter Da, raceway diameter Dn and receway curvature in a plane perpendicular to the rolling direction) the elastic constants of the material (Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio) and the contact force Q. The contact force is here assumed constant and independent of position on the ring. The notion of an equivalent load is later introduced to account for those cases (e.g. the stationary outer ring of a radially loaded bearing) where load varies with ring position.

Also introduced is the number of contact cycles per revolution u defined through the relationship. (3.24) N = uL (3.24) where L is bearing life in millions of revolutions.

For point contact, the half-width of the contact ellipse is replaced by its expression in terms of load from the Hertzian equations.

In the 1947 treatment, the half-width a for line contact is taken equal to three quarters of the roller length. The 1952 extension of the work deals specifically with roller bearings and introduces a new expression relating stress and effective roller length.

For point contect, these substitutions lead (for the contect at aither bearing ring) to:

where § contains bearing geometrical parameters to powers which are linear combinations of the exponents c. h and e. The rolling body dismeter appears, in the function \$. only in the form ba/dm, where dm is the pitch dismeter of the rolling elements. The survival probability given by Equation (3.25) is that of the ring-rolling element contact. Both the ring and the rolling element are considered equally likely to fail.

Qc is defined to be the ring load Q for which the life for the fixed value S=0.9 is one million revolutions.

load G to tourd trout the rite r to the two same strated bropopility number  $\sigma$ 

 $0^{\frac{C-h+1}{2}} L_{10}^{\theta} = 0^{\frac{\theta-h+1}{2}}$ 

 $L_{10} = \left(\frac{\hat{Q}_{c}}{\hat{Q}}\right)^{c} = \left(\frac{\hat{Q}_{c}}{\hat{Q}}\right)^{p}$ 

07

where  $p = \frac{c+h+b}{a \Theta}$ 

The rolling element load Q is proportional to the bearing load F, and hence, Ci or Co the dynamic capacity of the (inner or outer ring) contact, defined as the bearing load for which the ring will endure one million revolutions with a survival probability of 0.90, is proportional to Qc. Accordingly, from Equation (3.26);

$$L_{10} = \left(\frac{c}{F}\right)^{p} \tag{3.27}$$

(3.26)

#### 2. EQUIVALENT LOAD

From Equation (3.25) the logarithm of the reciprocal of the survival probability is proportional to  $Q^{H}$ , where  $H = \frac{C-h+1}{2}$  and Q may vary with angular position  $\phi$  on the bearing ring, i.e.  $Q = Q(\phi)$ .

In view of Equation (3.25), the summing over the complete ring, of probabilities that individual ring segments of angular length will survive, gives rise to:

$$\log \frac{1}{2} \sim \int_{0}^{2\pi} Q^{W}(\psi) L^{\theta} \frac{Dn}{\theta} d\psi = Q_{\theta}^{W} \pi D_{\eta} L^{\theta}$$
(3.20)

whorein

$$Q_{\theta} = \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{\theta} Q^{\theta}(\psi) d\psi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
(3.29)

Qe is thus the equivalent constant ring load for which the ring contact survival probability is the same as it is under the spatially variable loading.

A continuous load distribution, the components of which integrate to equal the applied radial and axial load, is introduced as an approximation of the discontinuous rolling element loads and the integral of Equation (3.29) is evaluated as a function of the ratio of radial and axial load.

### 3. CAPACITY OF A COMPLETE BEARING

The probabilities  $S_i$  and  $S_o$  that the bearing inner and outer ring contacts, respectively, will endure beyond a life L under a bearing load F are given by :

$$\log \frac{1}{S_4} = k_F F^{\mu} L^{e}$$
(3.30)

$$\log \frac{1}{S_0} = k_0 F^{W} L^c$$
(3.31)

where k<sub>i</sub> and k<sub>o</sub> are constants of proportionality.

The probability S that the complete bearing survives to life L is the product of  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  hence :

$$\log \frac{1}{5} = (k_1 + k_0) \cdot F^{W} \cdot L^{e}$$
 (3.32)

By definition when in Equations (3.30) to (3.32) the survival probability is taken equal to 0.9 and the life L - 1 the loads will be equal to the respective dynamic capacities. Thus,

$$\log \frac{1}{0.9} = k_1 C_1^{W} = k_0 C_0^{W} = (k_1 + k_0) \cdot C^{W}$$

from which it is found that ;

$$\frac{1}{c^{N}} = \frac{1}{c_{t}^{N}} + \frac{1}{c_{0}^{N}}$$
(3.33)

# 4. DETERMINATION OF COFSTANTS IN THE LIFE FORMULA

a. Point Contact

は、新聞が教育は、経営部門部門の経営の経営に、あたいと家でも

Taking logarithms of Equation (3.25) gives log log  $\frac{1}{8}$  - elog L plus terms not containing L. e is the parameter characterizing the dispersion of lives L of a sample of identical bearings operated under identical conditions. e is today generally designated as the "Weibull slope" of the life distribution. Bearing life test results yield an estimate of e as the slope of the straight line which is obtained when the percentage of unfailed bearings is plotted against life on paper so ruled that the ordinate is proportional to log log  $\frac{1}{8}$  and the abscissa to log L (such a diagram is called a Weibull plot). From Equation (3.27) it is seen that the expense  $p = \frac{c-h+1}{se}$  may be determined from tests conducted under various loads F as the slope of the line obtained when L and F are plotted on log-log paper.

Finally, from Equation (3.28) the exponent  $\frac{sc+h-s}{C-R+N}$  may be found as the slope of the line on logarithmic coordinates of the value of Qc (or C) plotted against roller diameter Da. The tests must, in view of the fact that De/dm appears in the function §, be run for constant values of Da/dm.

The results of these three test series are then solved simultaneously to give c, h and e.

b. Line Contact

The treatment of the line contact problem given in the 1947 work (1) is amplified and revised in the 1952 publication, (2) which is devoted exclusively to roller bearings. In this treatment, the contact load is taken to be proportional to the 1.1 power of the deformation; in the earlier work a linear relationship was assumed for line contacts.

It was found that for line contact the exponent p in the loadlife relationship is 4 rather than 3 as in the point contact case.

It is possible for some roller bearings to have point contact within one range of loads and line contact within another. It is even possible, under some conditions in a roller bearing, for the roller to make line contact with one raceway and point contact with the other.

As a compromise made for simplicity's sake a conservative compromise exponent of p = 10/3 is assumed. The conacity is thereby modified by a factor which is calculated so that when line contact prevails at both contacts the error in using the exponent 10/3 rather than 4 is made as small as possible over the most frequently used life range. In computing the capacity of roller bearings, a reduction factor( $\lambda < 1$ ) is introduced as an attempt to account for the stress concentration which may occur at roller ends as well as the effect of inexactly aligned rollers.

Another reduction factor  $\exists < l$  is introduced for thrust loaded bearings to account for the effect of the greater sliding undergone by the rolling bodies. In thrust loaded bearings, roller loading is not cyclic, but remains virtually constant, exacerbating the problem of rolling element sliding and \*=action forces.

#### 5. FACTORS OMITTED FROM LUNDBERG-PALNGREN THEORY

Lundberg and Palmgren, in their preface, acknowledge the absence, from their development, of several factors known to affect endurance life. Specifically cited as areas for future investigation are:

- a) Effect of stress history
- b) Work hardening

2

- c) Lubricant effect on stress distribution
- d) Effect of residual stresses (set up in the rings by interference fits)
- e) Effect of edge loading in line contact.(2)
- f) Effect of radial load on contact angle in ball bearings.
  g) Effect of indexing of the ball rotational axis which:
- since any given point on the ball is cyclically stressed for only part of the bearing life, results in a lesser number of failures initiating in the bell moterial than in the ring material
- h) Effect of surface traction (in thrust loaded bearings)
- 1) Effect of geometrical imperfections on load distribution.

Many other life factors are, of course, susent from the Lundborg end Palmgren treatment without having been specifically enumerated by these authors.

# SECTION IV

#### VARIABLES AND MECHANISH OF BOLLING CONTAGE FATIGUE

# 1. FAILURE MECHANISMS (GENERAL)

aiem. Annea et Annessaeranning

. המשמע ה

ronsur an anon the first of the second se

The definition of functional failure in molling bearings depends on the application. Except in instrument bearings in which torque is often the main criterion in defining "failure", the most common definitions of functional failure involve visible damage to the rolling tract. As an example of specific interest, the failure of many large radar antenna pedestal bearings has been found to fail under this definition involving smearing, spalling and surface distress in the rolling track. From these broad concepts of failure, several groups of reasonably well defined changes in the rolling bearings can be identified which represent failure modes (6).

The failure of a particular bearing is a consequence of several competing modes of failures classified in Table 1. Among the modes of bearing failure, the present study pertains to the prediction of contact <u>fatigue</u> life (mode 3 of Table 1). This is justified since wear and plastic flow (failure modes 1 and 2 of Table 1) can be eliminated in most rolling bearings by suitable design and operation controls whereas cracking (failure mode No. 4) is not, specifically, a rolling contact failure. On the other hand, all loaded rolling contacts are eventually subject to fatigue failure. The functional feilure due to contact fatigue is characterized by the emergence of a fatigue crack causing removal of a sizable piece f metal from the rolling surface (spalling). The spalling itself is preceded by the initiation and propagation of one crack out of possibly several, which arise in the rolling element through stress cycling.

The present study considers that the fatigue process in rolling contact is associated with the generation and propagation of fatigue cracks in the bearing material and the fatigue life is taken as the number of cycles at which fracture (spalling) occurs. This is a concept taken from numerous fatigue studies most of which are not for rolling contacts. Fatigue theories related to fatigue crack behavior in materials can be divided into two distinct approaches; one is the so-called "angineering" (or "phenomenological") approach (e.g., Manson (7), Coffin (8) and Morrow (9) on low cycle fatigue and Dugdale (10), Paris (11) on sheet specimens) which is interested in quantitative treatment

# Table I

Ę

تھ. - تەر چەر

*"*"

僵

# FAILURE MODES OF ROLLING CONTACTS

1.	Wear type failures	1,1	Surface comoval
			1.1.1 Pemoval of loose particles ('Wear'')
			1.1.2 Chemical or electrical surface removal
		1.2	Cumulative material transfer between surfaces ("Smearing")
2.	Plastic flow	2.1	Loss of contact geometry due to cold flow
		2.2	Destruction by material soft- ening due to unstable over- heating
3.	Contact fatigue	3.1	Syalling
		3 <b>.2</b>	Surface distress
4.	Bulk failurss	1.1	Overload cracking
		4.2	Overheat cracking
		4.3	Bulk fatigue
		4.4	Fretting of fitted surfaces

4.5 Permanent dimensional changes

•

•

i

of macroscopic variables; and the other is the metallargical (comicroscopic) approach (e.g. Laird (12), Houd (13) and 6.osskreutz (14)) which deals with the basic microscopic phenomenn such as dislocations, slipbands and microcrack initiation in material under cyclic strain.

< f=

 $\hat{Q}$ 

÷ ع

.7

đ 

大学

20 

儘

Both approaches teach that plastic occurrences, either macroscopic (such as in low cycle fatigue) or microscopic (in high cycle fatigue (19)) are a source of crack generation and propagation under fatigue loading.

Many attempts have been made to relate quantitatively the fatigue life to the magnitude of cyclic plastic strain. In published literature, quantitive treatment has been made by Manson st. al. regarding crack generation and propagation in notched specimens (15) without taking into account the microscopic plastic behavior. The prediction of the life for a complete machine component has been found very difficult because of the complexities in geometry and loading. Peterson in (16) has studied quantitatively the fatigue problem in turbine components associated with cracking due to thermal cycling by determining cyclic plastic strain concesponding to the condition of operation, taking account of stress concentrations. Rice and Brown (41) have attempted to interpret the fatigue fracture of loaded structural elements in terms of fatigue crack propagation and to formulate the fundamentals of a statistical theory in these terms.

Quantitative treatment as described above has to rely on many assumptions and phenomenological conclusions from specimen testing. The basic physical mechanisms of crack generation and propagation in materials under fatigue loading is of course a subject of much fundamental research in metallurgy. Hore specifically, cracking at non-metallic inclusions has been a subject of considerable interest in basic metallurgical studies but quantitative treatment correlating various macroscopic quantities has not been available for engineering design application.

From the reviewed literature, the following can be gleaned:

In spite of the great physical complexity involved in the process of crack initiation from inclusions, it is well recognized that non-metallic inclusions are stress (or strain) raisers and potential sites of plastic deformation. The above described literature points to a close association between fatique life and the magnitude of the cyclic plastic strain. It may be possible to build a fatigue life model by predicting the number of stress cycles needed to generate a selfpropagating crack as a function of the magnitude of (cyclic) plastic strain at the stress raisers. The plastic strain is, in turn, dependent on the macro-strain field and the inkerent characteristics of the stress raiser. Such an engineering approach has been used by Menson & Hirschberg (15) and by Peterson (16) to relate crack initiation life to the stress concentration factor at a notch.

The quantitative dependence of fatigue life on fatigue ductility and plastic strain can be described as follows:

Coffin (8) and Manson (26) has investigated the fatigue behavior in a wide range of materials by strain cycling at constant strain amplitude about zero mean strain. In the low cycle region where failure occurs in 10<sup>5</sup> cycles or less, the fatigue life is found to be related to the plastic strain amplitude by an equation of the following form for all materials:

$$\Delta \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{H} \left( 2\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{f}} \right)^{\mathbf{Z}}$$
(4.1)

where  $\Delta \sigma_{\rm p}$  = total plastic strain amplitude

N<sub>e</sub>

= number of cycles to failure

🗐 and z 🛛 = constants

Hunson (15) has extended the freatment of strain cycling data to cover the entire range of fatigue lives, from the low cycle region where strains are predominantly plastic to the high cycle regions where strains are predominantly elastic. Hanson's equation relating total strain amplitude and cycles to failure is given by:

$$\Delta \varepsilon_{\mathrm{T}} = \Delta \varepsilon_{\mathrm{p}} + \frac{\Delta \sigma}{E} = \exists (2N_{f})^{2} + L(2N_{f})^{\forall} \qquad (4.2)$$

where  $\Delta s_{ au}$  = total strain amplitude

Δε<sub>p</sub> = plastic strain amplitude <u>Ac</u> = Δε<sub>e</sub> = elastic strain emplitude H and z = the same constants given in Equation (4.1) L = a constant, (see Figure 33)



t de trajecturés entréfero

:

Figure 33. Plastic, Elastic and total Strain vs. Fatigue Life

#### where E = Young's modulus

se is fran 13.354 get activations to 1554 and and modeling and activation and an indication of the first of the first of the second of the first of the first of the second of the first of the first of the second of the first o

and w = a constant, (see Figure 33)

This general equation covering the entire range of cycling lives is shown in Figure 33 and represents a curve which can be expressed as the sum of the two straight line components. The steeper component to the left represents the plastic strain component while the elastic strain component is represented by the line with shallow slope. The fatigue behavior of a material can therefore be characterized by the four constants of Equation (4.2) i.e. H, z, L,: and w.

The plastic portion of the curve reflects the matrix properties of the material while the fact that the elastic portion of the curve slopes at all is due to the presence of defects. This latter conclusion follows when one considers that, in purely elastic reversals of strain, nothing changes in the metal to cause failures. Since failure does occur in the nominally elastic stress range, it must be due to localized yielding, probably in the vicinity of defects.

Thus, failures in the elastic region are defect dominated. The plastic region of the curve, however, is derived from tests where large plastic strains develop throughout the bulk material. While it is true that defects will exert some influence on this portion of the curve, properties of the matrix, e.g. strain hardening and ductility, will tend to dominate the results. The predominance of matrix properties in the plastic region has been confirmed by matrix properties in the plastic region and has been confirmed by Norrow (49). He states that little, if any, difference can be found between clean and dirty steels of similar processing and composition when tested in the plastic strain region.

Thus the plastic portion of the curve is suited to describe the ductility properties of candidate materials. The intercept of the plastic strain line at  $2N_f = 1$  (H of Equation (4.2)) and the slope of the line (z) are considered fundamental fatigue properties by Manson and Morrow. They have been given the names "fatigue ductility coefficient" and "fatigue ductility exponent" by Morrow (16).

It is apparent from inspection of Figure 33 that an increase in the intercept value (I), for a fixed slope (z), will translate the line upwards, giving increased fatigue lives. Similarly a decrease in the slope at a fixed intercept will rotate the line upwards with the same effect on life.

# 2. VABLABLES AFFECTING FATISLE IN ROLLING CONTACT

Hany variables have been found to affect fatigue life of rolling bearings. Based on the current knowledge of the operation, lubrication, metallurgy and theory of fatigue fracture of rolling bearings. Table 2 presents an extensive list of "external" variables which control the fatigue life of a rolling contact. These variables can be grouped into categories as shown below:

a. Haterial Variables

shiriyi Bala

1.1. Strain cannot remove the support of property standarments, and standarment and standards as an example of stallard strain as a stant of stallard strain strain standards.

 Factors that effect the material yield strength aud ductility: material analysis, hardness, soft constituents (retained austenite, forrite, bainite), grain size, alloy segregation.

2) Factors that modify the applied stress field: residual stresses originating from heat treatment, grinding and plastic flow during operations.

3) Haterial imperfections acting as stress raisers such as non-metallic inclusions or imbedded micro-cracks. (Lenticular carbides which develop during bearing operation may also serve as localized stress raisers.) 4) Bodulus of electicity and Poisson ratio, as they affect material rigidity and control the maximum stress level.

b. Surface Micro-Geometry Variables

1) Surface imperfections such as grinding furrows, scratches and dents which serve as surface stress raisers.

2) General surface roughness as induced by methods such as grinding, homing and lapping, and as characterized by a) amplitude, e.g., the composite r.m.s. surface roughness defined as the square root of the sum of the squares of the r.m.s. roughnesses of two surfaces rolling together and b) a plasticity parameter of the asperities, such as their typical slope.

3) Compositional and hardness properties of the surface.

4) Surface contings,

Operating Variables	l. Load 2. Spood 3. Temperajure 4. Spin-roll Ratio 5. Lubricant 2. viscasity 8. boundary iubricating ability
Dosign Variabius	I. Rolling Track Length (pitch da) 2. Groove Conformity 3. Ball Dismeter 4. Roller Length 5. Roller Length 6. Crown & Blending
Surface Micro-geomotry Variation	<ul> <li>Surface Imperfections</li> <li>acretion furrows</li> <li>acretion</li> <li>c. dents</li> <li>dents</li> <li>dents</li></ul>
Material Varlables	<ul> <li>I. Identerial Strength @ Ductility</li> <li>a. hardness</li> <li>b. alloy segregation</li> <li>c. grain size and orientation</li> <li>d. soft concituent</li> <li>2. Residual Stress</li> <li>3. Idaterial impurities</li> <li>a. Inclusions</li> <li>a. Inclusions</li> <li>c. Imbedded micro- cracks</li> </ul>

3

/謳

9

e

••

e

איזי אייגיאוווועטענעטעטענעטעטאנאוווןן

50 ′ 4. Elastic Moduius

c. Design Veriebles Related to Design Dimensions

1) Bolling body design such as rolling track length (pitch diameter), groove conformity, ball (roller) diameter and number of rolling elements, contact angle, roller length and crowning and Flending radii, accuracy parameters influencing load distribution, dimensions controlling sliding, etc. These variables affect stress distribution, stressed volume and number of stress cycles.

2) Cage and auxiliary par s design as it affects rolling element forces.

d. Operating variabies such as:

ansarumonsialilikiristan ara

厦

1) Load magnitude and direction as it affects stress level and stressed volume.

2) Speed, as it affects lubrication (e.g., EHD film thickness).

3) Temperature, as it affects lubrication and material strength.

4) Lubricant properties, a) rheological properties, e.g. (1) viscosity and (2) boundary lubricating ability (chemistry, additives, etc.)

5) Atmospheric conditions, contaminants, atc.

The above listed variables are believed to be applicable for rolling bearings of all types and sizes, including large radar antenna pedestal bearings.

3. MECHANISMS OF FAILURE IN ROLLING CONTACT

The prosent study is based on the concept that there are two competing fatigue mechanisms operating to promote spalling failure in rolling contact, namely, sub-surface initiated failure and surface initiated failure. In the former the cracks are generated from highly stressed sub-surface regions, whereas in the latter, fatigue cracks are generated from the rolling surface. Recent findings of metallurgical investigations (6, 17, 18) support this classification of failure mechanisms, Structural changes have been observed in bearing material under

51

10. A state of the second state

:

repeated loading (17, 18). These structural changes encompas-(1) plastic deformation around sub-surface weak points (e.g., "butterflics"), which ind cates that the micro-defects act as stress raisers, (2) the formation of plastic deformation bands ("white etching areas") in the sub-surface high shear stress zone signifying the existence of a region within which the yield limit is exceeded for some volumes and (3) near-surface microplastic occurrences at asperities and at surface defects. P

.

.

Among the structural changes described, the formation of "butterflies" bround inclusions has long been closely associated with sub-surface crack generation (1, 18). A similar association between structural changes and crocking has recently been demonstrated for the near surface changes (3 above) and with some indirection, for the generalized changes (2 above).

The following summarizes current knowledge of the two fotigue failure mechanisms described:

a. Sub-surface Failure

 $\{a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4\}$ 

The concept of sub-surface failure is well covered in the Lundberg-Palmgren theory (1) in which the fatigue crack is assumed to start from weak points, e.g., slag inclusions, In current terminology, these weak points give rise to the local stress concentrations and plastic flow in the surrounding matrix material. According to Lundberg-Palmgren the site of crack generation is the zone of high shear stress in the sub-surface region of a rolling element. Fatigue cracks are found to start at weak volumes and to grow under repeated loads until an advanced stage of fatigue cracking is reached. This stage is characterized by the distortion of the macroscopic stress field due to the cracks. Eventually the destructive process of spalling sets in at one (or more) locations causing removal of a sizeable piece of metal from the surface.

It is recognized that the formation of localized plastic deformation around inclusions (i.e., the "Butterfly" structure) is stress dependent. In (1), Lundberg and Palmgren hypothesized that the actual stresses at sub-surface "weak" points of the material are proportional to the magnitude of the macroscopic stress and are modified by factors dependent on the size and microscopic shape of each of the "weak points" (inclusions). Recent metallurgics! investigation has

supported this hypothesis, e.g., Littman and Widner (18) pointed out that each non-metallic inclusion has its own stress concentration factor which depends on the size, shape, physical and mechanical properties of the inclusion; Martin and Eberhardt (17) have shown that "Butterfly" structure can occur at locations where the calculated "macro" stress's are below the threshold level of plastic flow indicating that inclusions are stress raisers. b. Surface Distress and Surface Initiated Fatigue

The above described sub-surface failure will occur for any lubrication and for smooth surfaces (thick elastohydrodyBamic films). Under such conditions, life to failure appears to be independent of both lubricant and surface texture. There is, however, an altogether different mode of rolling contact fatigue referred to as surface distress (6, 20). Although surface distress does not imply raceway destruction, it is a precursor and often a precipitator of spalling failure, apparently by generating sovere surfaceadjacent defects (about 100 µin. depth) which then serve as crack initiation points (6). Metallurgical evidence has shown that this "ourface distress" involves a type of plastic working end subsequent fatigue microcracking of the immediate surface-adjacent layers of the metal. The occurrences of near-surface plastic deformation are of the following two kinds:

a) Wide-spread microplastic flow at surface asperities caused by asperity interaction;
b) localized plastic flow at surface imporfections, such as grinding furrows, scratches and debris deats.

Regarding the occurrence of near-surface plastic deformation, Tallian (6) has suggested that it is controlled by the elastohydrodynamic lubricant film and by surface roughness parameters, e.g., the composite surface roughness r.m.s. and a typical asperity slope angle. In (6) it is hypothesized that the near surface plastic occurrences are a consequence of severe interaction of asperities. The approach of the contacting asperities depends on the mean EHD film thickness defined as the distance between the mean line of the two asperity profiles. The degree of approach determines the severity of the plasticity in the asperity.

It has also been reported, based on recent investigations of failed bearings (17), that for rolling bearings made of improved clean steel (obtainable by the vacuum melting process), a larger fraction of failures is found to be associated with the surface defects. This is because of THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF VARIABLES AFFECTING CONTACT FATIGUE LIFE

 $\overline{T}_{i}^{i} = 0$ 

/==



Figure 1. The Interdependence of Variables Affacting Contact Fatigue Life

.

fewer and smaller subsurface non-metallic inclusions being available to initiate fatigue cracks in clean steel; thus the role of surface defects becomes more important. 

# 4. FAILURE PROCESS DIAGRAM (ROLLING CONTACT)

. MPm

. india wite

URA URA

modulation with

Taking into account the previously described failure variables and failure mechanisms, it is possible to draw a diagram of the rolling contact failure process. Figure 1 shows this diagram which depicts the interdependence of the variables and their effects on subsurface and surface initiated spalling occurrences. This chart is a brief, self-explanatory, illustration of the previously described failure process.

The interacting effects of the variables are shown in captions enclosed in the rectangular blocks of Figure 1. The arrows mounted on the lines signify an effect.

The "terminations" of this flow chart, shown on the right hand side of Figure 1, represent 1) subsurface spalling occurrences controlled by <u>subsurface</u> crack initiation within a stressed volume and 2) subsurface spalling occurrences controlled by the <u>surface</u> crack initiation within a stressed area.

The stressed area and volume are determined from the quasi-elastic subsurface and surface stress field. Subsurface (or surface) crack initiation is affected by subsurface (or surface) weak points and the magnitude of subsurface (or surface) plastic streinThis, in turn, dependents on the quasi-elastic stress field and the material yield strength which have the effect of controlling the amount of plastic deformation for a given stress field.

Ductility is believed to have the ability to suppress crack initiation and propagation in a material matrix under a given cyclic macrostrain field. It is, of course, a matrix parameter.

In Figure 1, the variables listed on the left side consist of two kinds, i.e., 1) material impurities and surface imperfections acting as weak points and 2) the variables affecting the macrostress field in the material.

The following describes the external variables which affect the macrostress field in bearing material:
a. The effect of design variables (dimensions), elastic modulus, and load on the elastic macrostress field has been well covered in the Lundberg-Palmgren theory (1) based on the application of Hertzian theory (32).

•

•

.

٥

۵

b. Residual stress serves as a stress modifier.

c. The lubricant properties, speed and temperature at the rolling contacts are parameters which have been found in recently developed elastohydrodynamic theory to affect END film thickness. Bolling contact experiments have shown (40) that the END film thickness and surface finish (characterized by surface roughness ENS and asperity slope angle) have significant influence on the occurrence of surface distress or near-surface micro-plasticity (6,44).

d. The effect of speed i.e. strain rate (or the time a material element is under stress) and temperature in the highly stressed volume (or surface) on material strength is hypothesized on the basis of non-rolling contact experience.

## SECTION V

### FORMULAS FOR FATIGUE CRACK GROWTH

Both sub-surface and surface failure mechanisms require a crack initiation phase followed by a crack propagation phase to reach the point of a functional failure (spalling) of a rolling element (6).

אווידעי אירועסט עלעירעט אינע עראינעט אינערע אינערעט אינערעט אינערעט אינערעט אינערע אינערע אינערע אינערע אינערע

:

The crack initiation in material under cycling stressing is, in general (except in sharply notched specimens), a process requiring many cycles of stressing. The necessary conditions for crack initiation are generated by plastic deformation eround material inhomogeneities or stress raisers as a result of cyclic stressing. The crack initiation phase can be defined as that involving the formation of cracks on the microscopic scale. It is usual to consider that this phase is ended when a self-propagative crack emerges at the site of crack initiation, i.e., one which propagates without further influence of the original defect.

An analysis by Henson and Hirschberg (15) postulates that the time to the initiation of a fatigue crack depends on the magnitude of the cyclic plastic strain at the strain raiser. The strain raiser considered in (15) is a macroscopic one, i.e., a notch in a specimen. As usual, the fatigue process is divided into two stages, i.e., crack initiation and crack propagation. A certain crack size, called "engineering size", is used to denarcate the two stages. It was found that when an "engineering size" crack emerges, at the notch the controlling strain for further crack growth no longer depends on the strain concentration factor at the notch but on the nominal straid in the specimen. Because the strain range is relatively high at the motch. the role of micro-defects can be neglected. The concept in this analysis is useful in understanding crock initiation in rolling contact, although it is realized that is rolling contact material the strain raisers are actually all microscopic.

In roiling contact the micro-defects can be treated, for convenience, as strain reisers. Little is known about the cyclic strain concentration near a microstress raiser, that is, for a given real inclusion, there is no adequate means to know either by observation or by analysis the strain raising factor. Metallurgical experience (3) has shown that the size of an inclusion has a large effect on crack initiation life; other variables such as shape and content may also have an effect on crack initiation. The size and shape of the defects present in

in any volume of metal are stochastic quantities. This calls for a statistical troatmest in which the cyclic strain raising factor or severity (designated as d) of a defect, as a function of its size, shape and content, is introduced as a random variable.

In formulating mathematical models of rolling contact fatigue for the surface and sub-surface failure mechanisms, it is hypothesized that the fatigue cracks in both mechanisms initiate from micro-defects or "weak points". In the sub-surface failure mechanisms, the micro-defects are embedded i: the matrix material whereas is surface failures pre-existing surface micro-defects and surface fatigue cracks are considered as the weak points of a surface element. This "pre-existing micro-defect hypothesis" is postulated, of course, only for hard steels as used in bearings.

Current concepts of metal fatigue assert (22) that the controlling parameters of fatigue life are the applied cyclic strain and material ductility as they influence crack growth. The rate of growth of a crack is denoted by dA/dN where A is the instantaneous crack area and N is the number of stress cycles. It is hypothesized that the growth rate dA/dN of a crack is dependent on the plastic microstrain 60 and ductility. D. prevailing in the vicinity of a "defect" consisting of a "pre-existing original" defect and of the crack initiated therefrom.

Thus,

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = \Lambda \left( s_{c}, 0 \right)$$
 (5.1)

The ductility D has been defined in static test as (21):

$$D = \log(A_0/A_F) = \log \frac{1}{1-E.A.}$$
 (5.2)

where  $A_0$  and  $A_f$  are the initial and final area of the fracture cross section in the tensile test, and E.A. is the conventional reduction in area,

However, there exist other ductility related quantities which can be defined from fatigue tests. It was shown by Coffin (3) that a straight line results when plotting the logarithm of cycles to failure against the logarithm of cyclic reversing plastic strain in specimen fatigue tests, i.e.,

$$\Delta \epsilon_{p} \approx \mathbb{E} \left( 2 N_{f} \right)^{2}$$
 (5.3)

syste

- Asp: the reversed cyclic plastic strain
- Nf : number of cycles to failure
  - : a material constant called the fatigue ductility coefficient (9)
- z : S CONStant

Thus, H and z are ductility related constants which can be determined from specimen tests of material. The above introduced quantity D can be considered as a function of H and z.

It is known (23) that increasing hydrostatic compression increases material ductility. In the above formula, (Equation 5.1), the beneficial effect of compressive hydrostatic stress can be taken into account by the use of the ductility D existing under the given stress conditions.

The hypothesis expressed in Equation (5.1) takes account of the facts that (1) microplastic deformation is a critericu for fatigue crack generation; and for a given ductility, the crack generation rate increases with the magnitude of cyclic plastic strain amplitude at the stress raiser and (2) the generation or the growth of a crack is controlled by the material ductility, i.e., highly ductile material cracks less rapidly.

It is assumed that there exists a macroscopic strain  $e_0$  at the location of the defect if the defect were absent so that a quantity called "defect severity" can be defined as the strain raising factor operating on  $e_0$  to give the strain at the (sub-surface or surface) defect. G, the severity of a combined defect and crack is hypothesized as a function of the original defect severity, d, the instantaneous crack area A and the size of the stressed volume (for sub-surface fatigue) or area (for surface fatigue) S, i.e.:

$$\Theta = \Theta(d, A(N), S)$$
 (5.4)

The severity of localized plastic strain concentration around the defect (as demonstrated e.g. by "Butterfly" structure) is dependent on: 1) the strain raising properties of the defect.  $\odot$  2) the macrostrain  $c_{\Theta}$  assuming the strain raiser is absent and 3) the yield strength  $\sigma_y$  of the matrix material, i. e.

$$e_{c} = e_{c} (e_{0}, \sigma_{y} \ominus)$$
(5.5)

:

\* co is defined as total (elastic plus plastic) macrostrain.

Introducing Equations (5.4) and (5.5) into Equation (5.1) one has:

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = \Lambda \left(\hat{e}, \epsilon_0, \sigma_y, D\right)$$
 (5.6)

It is convenient to separate the variables influential in crack growth into two groups: variables related to defects and matrix variables. In Equation (5.6),  $\Theta$  is the variable related to defects whereas  $e_0, \sigma_y$  and D are related to the matrix. For simplicity, the matrix effects are consolidated into a single function Y\_i.e.:

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = \Lambda (\Theta, \gamma),$$

$$\frac{d}{V} = (e_{\Theta}, \sigma_{y}, D) \qquad (5.7)$$

Assume that the crack growth rate dA/dN can be expressed as a product of the severity function and the matrix function, i.e.:

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = \Theta \cdot \gamma \tag{5.8}$$

Using this designation, the defect function plays the role of a "proportionality constant" between the crack rate and the matrix function of the macrostrain  $\epsilon_0$  the ductility D and the micro-yield strength  $\sigma_y$ . This proportionality constant is, of course, an inherent quality of a given defect.

In the crack initiation phase, the effect of stressed area 5 on  $\oplus$  can be neglected. The function  $\oplus_I$  can be written as a product of a function of d designated by  $\Gamma(d)$ a function of A, designated by  $f_I(A)$ . Thus one has:

$$\Theta_{T} = f_{T}(A), r(d)$$
 (5.9)

and

þ

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = f_{\underline{I}}(A) \Gamma(d), \gamma_{\underline{I}}(\sigma_y, D, \epsilon_0)$$

In the crack initiation period, the matrix material parameters  $\sigma_y, D$  and macro-strain  $\varepsilon_0$  can be considered to be constants with cycling. Latting  $\gamma_I$  be independent of N. Equation (5.9) can be further written as follows after integration with respect to N:

$$f_{I}(A) = N_{I} \cdot \gamma_{I} \cdot \Gamma(d) \qquad (5.10)$$

ihtifihtissintunaisintatunan tununutun tununutun tununutun tununutun setematikan



NUMBER OF CYCLES, N

لتقتيد

Figure 2. Schomatic Representation of Growth of Hicro-Cracks

A quantity  $\aleph_{1}$  representing the number of stress cycles required to reach a crack size  $A_{\rm D}$  may be defined from:

$$f_{\mathbf{I}}(\mathbf{A}_{p}) = \mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{\Gamma}(\mathbf{d})$$
 (5.11)

where  $f_T$  represents a function.

Since  $A_{p}$ , the self propagating crack size, is a constant, Equation (5.10) implies that for a given defect with severity "d" existing in the highly stressed volume, there is a corresponding life  $N_{I}$  to crack generation in numbers of cycles, associated with this defect. Thus, Equation (5.6) can be solved for  $N_{I}$ :

$$N_{I} = \frac{f_{I}(Ap)}{v_{\Gamma}(d)}$$
(5.12)

The function r(d) can be assumed to be an increasing function of d, thus increasing d corresponds to decreasing N<sub>I</sub>. Equation (5.12) implies that every defect has a life associated with its defect severity for a given matrix factor  $Y_I$ . Figure 2 shows a schematic representation of growth of micro-cracks from defects of various severities and the dependence of cycles to self-propagating crack generation, on original defect severity d as defined in Equation (5.12), provided that the matrix parameter is the same for each case. The graph shows that increasing d corresponds to increasing slopes of the curves plotting A against N (i.e., the crack rate) and shorter life to crack generation.

The degree of concentration of the plastic strain around an original defect diminishes the distance from the original defect. One can define a macroscopic size of the crack beyond which the crack propagation rate is dependent only on the plastic strain at the crack tip and no longer on the plastic strain around the original defect. (An analogy of this case is given in Hanson's fatigue life analysis of notched specimens in (15)). Thus, for large A, it can be assumed that the severity of a "defect after N cycles" is dependent on the instantaneous crack area A and the applied strain cobut is independent of the original defect severity d. The propagation of a crack of this size constitutes Phase II of the fatique process. For a large crack area, an increasing ratio A/S corresponds to an increase of stress concentration at the crack tip. For such cracks dA/dR increases with A/S. Taking into account this size effect, we assume that the severity

function  $e_1$  is product of a function of A and a function of  $\frac{A}{2}$  as follows:

$$\frac{dA}{dN} = \Theta_{II}(A,S) \cdot \gamma_{II}(\Theta, 0, \sigma_y)$$
 (5.13)

$$\theta_{II} = f_{g}(A/S) \cdot f_{e}(A) \tag{5.14}$$

where the use of the function  $Y_{\underline{1}\underline{1}}$  denotes the fact that this function may be different for the propagation and initiation phases.

Integrating Equation (5.13) gives:

$$\int_{A_{2}}^{A_{2}} \frac{dA}{f_{3}(A) f_{a}(A/3)} = Y_{11} \int_{N_{1}}^{N} dN \qquad (5.15)$$

where  $N_{11}$  now represents the number of cycles measured from the starting time when  $A=A_p,$  Equation (5.15) becomes upon integration .

$$f_{\Pi}(A, A/S) = \gamma_{\Pi} N$$
 (5.16)

The crack area reaches critical size  $A_{\rm C}$  after  $N_{\rm JI}$  cycles in Phase II where, from Equation (5.16):

$$N_{II} = f_{II} (A, Ac/S) / \gamma_{II}$$
(5.17)

The total number of cycles  $N_{L}^{}$  required to produce a creck of size  $A_{c}^{}$  is :

$$N_{L} = N_{I} + N_{\Pi}$$
(5.18)

Neglecting any additional cycling requires in Phase III for a crack to grow from size  $A_{\rm C}$  to produce failure,  $\aleph_{\rm L}$  represents the life in cycles associated with a defect of severity d. It is not yet known whether the amount of life thus neglected may be appreciable.

Using Equations (5.12), (5.17), Equation (5.18) becomes

$$N_{L} = \frac{f_{I}(A_{p})}{\gamma_{I} \cdot \Gamma(d)} \div \frac{f_{II}(A_{c}, A_{c}/A_{B})}{\gamma_{I}}$$
(5.19)

Equation (5.19) is purely deterministic in nature, that is, if the functions are all known and the ductility and stressed area are prescribed, then Equation (5.19) will yield the number of cycles that elepse until a crack emanating from a defect of designated severity d situated in the stress field so as to be subjected to a strain  $e_{\rm fl}$ , achieves the area  $A_{\rm c}$ .

It has been shown in non-rolling fatigue testing (22) that the crack initiation phase has higher dependence on applied stress (or strain) than the crack propagation phase, which implies that the increase of stress level will shorten the crack initiation phase more rapidly than the crack propagation phase ( (24), (25)). Thus the Phase I/Phase II ratio decreases with increasing stress level.

The formation of a spall from a critical sized crack is considered a rapid process associated with cleavage and dimple rupture (27). It is recognized (26) that final fracture is a complex subject in itself, especially, when large plastic strain is involved. It is assumed that the critical crack size  $A_c$  is related to the size of the stressed area S in a rolling element cross section:

 $A_{e} = k_{1}S, k_{1} = const.$  (5.20)

a falligen de seren de s

It is assumed that after reaching a critical crack size the fracture enters a new phase, i.e., Phase JII, which involves a relatively rapid cracking (spalling) process, resulting in a visible spall on rolling surface.

## SECTION VI

n services spectra (1991) in the construction of the construction of the construction of the construction of the

# STATISTICAL THEORY OF ROLLING ELEMENT FAILURE

#### 1. GENERAL

n at ster to a

1

Figure 29 illustrate, more fully the meaning that attaches to some of the terms introduced previously and required in the subsequent development.

View A in Figure 29 is an arbitrary cross section through a rolling body showing the area 5 of the highly stressed volume defined to be the volume within which the stress critical for fatigue exceeds a designated magnitude.

The highly stressed zone is divided into a large number of cubical cells of small volume. The volume is so selected that within it can be contained an "engineering size" crack as it exists at the end of failure Phase I. Each of these cells is considered to contain a defect from which a crack may initiate.

Defect severity, as defined in Section V, is a function of a defect's size, shape and composition.

In effect, under this model, the ring is assumed to be built solely of cells containing defects, each having different severity. Naturally for clean steels a large proportion of the cells will be occupied by defects having a severity close to unity, (i.e. with no effect on the strain at the cell).

View B of Figure 20 is a side view of the rolling body stretched out into a rectangle. The length denoted by 1s is the circumference at the neutral axis of the rolling body cross section. View B also shows how the stressed area S varies with the coordinate y for a general loading condition.

Equation (5.12) of Section V states that each cell in the highly stressed zone of the rolling body has associated with it a number of stress cycles required for a crack originating in that cell to become of critical size. Equation (5.17) defines an additional life increment  $N_{II}$  for a cell's crack to grow to critical size.



ļ

The lives N<sub>I</sub> in any set of cells are statistically independent.

The Phase II cell lives  $N_{II}$  are not necessarily independent of each other. It is highly likely that the  $N_{II}$  life of one cell will be altered if a crack in a nearby cell completes its Phase I life and the crack extends beyond the initial cell boundaries.

Hithout the independence assumption the problem of finding the . probability distribution of the rolling body life is quite complex.

The treatment which follows will focus on Phase I life under the assumption that Phase II life is either i) negligible compared to Phase I life or ii) constant for every cell.

The Phase I life predicted by equation (5.12) is a deterministic function of the defect severity and the operating variables.

Stochastic considerations enter when one considers that the defects in a steel matrix vary in their severity.

Every defect in a rolling body has a potential Phase I life. The rolling body life is the smallest of these. The defects in any one rolling body constitute a sample from a population of defects with varying severities. The defect producing the smallest Phase I life will thus vary randomly between rolling bodies so that the life of a randomly selected rolling body is a random variable.

We soek the probability distribution of rolling body Phase I life over the population of rolling bodies which are subject to identical material, geometrical and environmental conditions. At this stage in theory, we ignore the (relatively small) variability betweer and within components, of the matrix properties such as yield strength, and ascribe the variation in life between rolling bodies to the variability in defect severity.

2. DEFECT SEVERITY DISTRIBUTION

18 17 17 The severity of the defect, situated at coordinates x, y and z, is assumed to be a continuous random variable independent of the defect location coordinates. That is, a defect having given severity is not predisposed to be located near any particular set of x, y and z coordinates (group of vol::me elements in the rolling body).

Let F(d) denote the cumulative distribution function for defect severity. Then, the probability that the severity d, of the defect located at soordinates x. y and z is less than a value d, is given by the continuous function F(d).

$$Prob\left[d, < d|(x, y, z)\right] = F(A) ; d \ge 1$$
 (6.1)

## = 0 ; d< 1

Where  $d_1$  represents a realized value of severity and where the left hand side in the above statement is read: "the probability of  $d_2 \le d$  given a set of values x, y, and z is ....".

The fact that the given coordinates x, y and z do not appear as parameters in the expression for F(d) states what was said above about the independence of the severity distribution from the defect coordinates.

Surface, as opposed to subsurface, defects pose no special problem at this point. They simply represent the special case z=0, where the cells on the surface degenerate into square platelets of negligible depth. No information presently exists concerning the functional form for F(d). Two forms will be advanced in Appendix VI which satisfy some plausible general conditions that any defect severity distribution must possess. Other distributions just as plausible may be found however, and experimental information is ultimately required to choose between candidate severity distributions. Nonetheless, valuable insight can be gained regarding the stasistics of possible failure, without precise knowledge of this distribution. The discussion will therefore proceed in terms of a general, unspecified, severity distribution F(d).

### 3. DISTRIBUTION OF "DEFECT LIFE"

From Equation (5.12) one may find the relationship between a defect's severity d and its phase I life  $N_{\rm I}$  as follows:

$$d = r^{-1} \left( \frac{B}{N} \right)$$
 (6.2)

shere

 $\int_{V_T}^{-1} denotes the inverse of the function <math>\int (d) defined in Section V$ ,  $B = \frac{f_I(A_D)}{V_T}$  is a non-random quantity depending on  $A_D$ ,  $e_0$ ,  $\sigma_y$  and  $\Omega$ . Equation (6,2) may be used to transform the distribution of defect severity into a distribution of life associated with the defect population.

Assuming that the function  $\Gamma$  is a single valued and monotonically increasing function of d, one may write:

$$G(N_{I}|x,y,z) = \operatorname{Prob}\left[N_{1} < N_{I}\right] = \operatorname{Prob}\left[d_{1} > \Gamma^{-1}\left(\frac{B}{N_{I}}\right)\right] \qquad (6.3)$$
$$= 1 - \operatorname{Prob}\left[d_{1} < \Gamma^{-1}\left(\frac{B}{N_{I}}\right)\right]$$

united to a suffering the second

From equation (6.1)

$$G(N_{\underline{i}} | x, y, z) = I - F\left[\Gamma^{-1}\left(\frac{B}{N_{\underline{i}}}\right)\right]$$
(6.4)

Equation (6.4) is the distribution of life at coordinate position x, y and z associated with the population of defects having the severity distribution of Equation (6.1).

Of course in any given rolling body, the volume element at x, y, z will have a specific defect severity and hence a determined life calculable from Equation (5.12). It is when one considers the varying values of the severity of the defect that can occupy the cell located at coordinates x, y and z in different rolling bodies from the population of such bodies, that a distribution of cell life results.

Every cell has, associated with it, a distribution function of the form of Equation (6.4), wherein the parameters (since they depend on D,  $\epsilon_0$ , and S) will depend upon the location of the cell.

The life of a complete rolling element is identical to the life of that cell which, of all the cells, has the shortest Phase I life according to Equation (5.12).

From probability theory, the probability that at least one cell produces failure before NI cycles is the complement of the probability that all cells survive beyond NI cycles.

Assuming independence of the cell lives, (as one may, for Phase I life considered here, based on the choice of cell size to include completely a crack of "engineering size"), the probability that all cells survive is the product of the probability that each survives. Thus H (N<sub>I</sub>) is given by:

$$H(N_{I}) = I - \prod_{i} \left[ I - G_{i}(N_{I}) \right]$$
(6.5)

where  $G_i$  denotes the distribution of Equation (6.4) at the 1-th cell in the structure. The symbol  $m_i$  denotes that the terms evaluated at each cell in the structure including the surface cells are to be multiplied together.

Equation (6.5) is of great generality and could be  $ev \approx luated$ numerically for any general shape and loading condition if the functions in Equation (6.5) and the severity distribution of Equation (6.1) were known,

These functions are not presently known however, and may not be practically determinable in the near future. One has as a recourse, the option of making plausible assumptions of the unknown function forms.

In view of the uncertainty with which any function can be assumed, it is preferable in this regard to limit the number and restrictiveness of such assumptions. In particular it is preferred to assume, if possible, only the asymptotic behavior of a given function rather than its specific form since this merely limits the possible functions to an admissible class.

At the present state of theory, we will restrict the discussion to applications wherein the distributions  $G_{\underline{i}}(N_{\underline{i}})$  may be considered identical for all values of  $\underline{i}$ .

This corresponds to the Lundberg-Palagren assumption on failure locations for the case of thrust loaded bearings. The Lundberg-Palagren assumption is, breadly, that all points <u>inside</u> a highly stressed zone are equally likely to fail and no point outside this zone will fail. For a thrust loaded bearing, the highly stressed area is the same in all cross sections, and thus the above stated case applies.

4. ASYMPTOTIC DISTRIBUTION OF SMALLEST DEFECT LIFE IN A ROLLING BODY

If a random sample of size m is drawn from a distribution baying a distribution function F(x) the ordered values  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ . . .  $x_n$  (where  $x_1, < x_2, < \dots, x_n$ ) are thomsolves random variables having a distribution, over repeated samples, of a form which depends upon order number i, sample size m and parent distribution F(X).

In particular for i = 1, that is for the smallest member of the sample, the distribution  $F_1(X_1)$  is given by, (45):

$$F_{1}(R_{1}) = 1 - \left[1 - F(R_{1})\right]^{H}$$
 (6.6)

As the sample size m increases, the distribution  $F_1(X_1)$ under sather general conditions converges to a specific form. In the cases where it does converge, it will converge to one of three distributional forms, depending upon the behavior of the parent distribution F(x) in the vicinity of the smallest admissible value for x (See Gumbel, (47) p. 162).

The Weibull distribution is one such limiting form for the distribution of smallest values and it is applicable to parent distributions which have <u>finite</u> admissible values. In order for the distribution of  $x_1$ , to converge to the Weibull distribution, the parent distribution  $\mathcal{N}(x)$  must behave like a power function in x in the vicinity of the minimum admissible value, that is:

$$F(\mathbf{x}) \longrightarrow \beta(\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}_0)^k \tag{6.7}$$

Where  $\beta$  and k are positive constants and  $x_0$  is the smallest admissible value. If Equation (6.7) is satisfied, it has been shown (Epstein (2)) that for  $x < x_0$ ,  $F_1(x_1)$  has the following form:

$$F_1(x_1) = 1 - \exp\left[-B(x_1 - x_0)^k\right]$$
 (6.0)

Thus the distribution of rolling body lives (shortest defect lives) will be Weibull distributed if the parent distribution of cell Phase I life  $G(N_I)$  satisfies the condition of Equation (6.7) wherein the minimum Phase I life corresponding to infinite defect severity is  $\omega$  9.

$$\lim_{N \to N_0} G(N_{\underline{I}}) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \left[ 1 - F \left[ \Gamma^{-1} \left( \frac{\underline{n}}{N_{\underline{I}}} \right) \right] = \beta N_{\underline{I}}^{k}$$
(6.9)

If Equation (6.9) is satisfied for the actually applicable functions F and F, the distribution H (NI) becomes, by Equation (6.8):

$$H(N_{I}) = 1 - \exp\left[-\pi\beta(N_{I})^{k}\right] = 1 - \exp\left[-\left(\frac{N_{I}}{N^{*}}\right)^{k}\right] \qquad (6.10)$$

where  $N^{\circ} = 1/(\underline{n}\beta)$ .

.....

and the WeiMMIN.

saliyetan ahwallan isina adalah ahasa amata a

Sample size m is the total number of defects (cells in a rolling body.

Denoting the number of defects per sait velume by N, one bas:

$$f = \eta S_{1,e} = \eta V \tag{6.11}$$

Substituting (6.11) in (6.10) gives

$$H(N) = 1 - exp - \left(\frac{N_{\tilde{L}}}{(\beta \eta v)^{-1/4}}\right)^{k}$$
(6.12)

Equation (6.12) shows the stressed volume appearing as a scale parameter of the Meibull distribution. This is the volume effect of the Lundberg-Palmgren formula, which is believed to be in good agreement with existing ball bearing fatigue data.

We have now shown that the Lundberg-Palmgren formula is compatible with the fatigue failure model developed above under the restrictions on the two functions  $\Gamma$  and F embedded in Equation (6.9) above.

### SECTION VII

## MACROSCOPIC STRESS CALCULATION FOR THE HIGHLY STRESSED VOLUESS IN A HEATZIAN CONTACT

In rolling contact, there exists a "reversing shear stress" (1) which has long been regarded as the best criterion of rolling contact fatigue strength; usually on the ground that its range of variation is always equal to or greater than that of the maximum shear stress and that there is some evidence suggesting that total amplitude of shear stress correlates with life (1,29, 43). This assumption was used by Lundberg and Palmgrer. (1) who stated that most subsurface fatigue cracks are generated at a depth equal to that of the reversing shear (at the central circumferential plane). Later, Greesert (20), is testing toroids of various curvatures, found that the reversing shear range gives good correlation with fatigue life. In available literature, the shear stress has been determined only for the central circumferential plane of a rolling element on which the maximum shear range is equal to that of orthogonal shear stress  $(T_{yz})$ . Since the fatigue life is closely related to the highly stressed yolume, it is necessary to know the volume of material subject to a certain level of shear range for F given applied Hertzian load. The determination of this volume requires a knowledge of the stress distribution under a Hertzian logd.

A computation of (reversing) shear stress range in a Hertxian elliptical stress field has been performed. Previous workers have studied the maximum alternating shear stress on the center plane of a contact  $x = 0_{\sigma}$  (see Figure 3). At x = 0, the shear stress is maximum in a plane at a known distance below the surface and parallel to the XY plane. As shown below, the alternating shear stress for other planes,  $(x \neq 0)$  is maximum on planes inclined to the XY- plane, and therefore is not orthogonal.

The computation presented here is a generalization of Lundbarg's solution which was confined to a contral circumferential plane only. The present solution provides a means to determine the stressed volume at various stress levels, considering the shear range as the critical stress.

The basic mathematical formulation for the subsurface stresses at all locations in a Hertzian stress field is presented in Appendix I. These formulas were developed by Lundberg and Sjövall in 1951 (34).



The current computation involves the determination, for say point is a cross section (perpendicular to rolling direction) of theraage of maximum shear stress ( $\tau_R$ ) acting is the direction of rolling at a certain value of y (where y is the distance from the central plane of symmetry in the direction of rolling) but on any plane inclined to the surface (with an angle  $\alpha_L$ ). The determination of the values of y and  $\Theta_L$ , at which  $\tau_{\Theta}$  is maximum, requires an iterative maximization process.

The following stress analysis was conducted:

a) Based on the equilibrium of stresses acting on a subsurface element shown in Figure 3, the shear stress acting on an arbitrarily inclined plane can be expressed as the combination of two orthogonal shear stresses  $\tau_{zv}$  and  $\tau_{xv}$  i.e.

$$\tau_{\theta} = \tau_{zy} \cos\theta + \tau_{xy} \sin\theta$$
 (7.1)

where  $\tau_{zy}$  and  $\tau_{xy}$  can be computed from formulae available in (34) for given values of x, y, z and a/b (the ratio of major axis and minor axis of a contact ellipse).

Since both  $\tau_{xy}$  and  $\tau_{zy}$  are odd functions of y,  $\tau_{\theta}$  is also an odd function of y. Both  $\tau_{xy}$  and  $\tau_{zy}$  vanish when y = 0. Furthermore, since  $\tau_{xy} = 0$  for all y when x = 0, the amplitude of  $\tau_{\theta}$  is equal to that of  $\tau_{zy}$  at the central plane in the direction of rolling (where x = 0). This justifies Lundberg's analysis (1) of setting the amplitude of  $\tau_{zy}$  equal to the maximum shear amplitude for x = 0.

b) For given values of x and z the maximum value of  $\tau_{\theta}$  can be found by setting:

$$\frac{\partial \tau_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} = \tau_{xy} \cdot \cos \theta - \tau_{yz} \cdot \sin \theta = 0 \qquad (7.2)$$

and

THEOREM CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRA

und Standardhurzhänligten Alber

ti anceantra

SICER MANUAL

conversion. See specific transmissibilitier

$$\frac{\partial \tau_{\theta}}{\partial y} = \frac{d}{dy} \left( \tau_{Zy} \right) \cos \theta + \frac{d}{dy} \left( \tau_{Xy} \right) \cdot \sin \theta = 0 \qquad (7.3)$$

These two differential equations can be reduced to:

 $\frac{d}{dy}(\tau_{xy}^2 \div \tau_{zy}^2) = 0$ 



annah initiation and the ana data



-

· · · · ·

ł

2

2

÷

ij





which implies that when  $\tau_{2y}^2 + \tau_{xy}^2$  is maximum,  $\tau_{R}$  is also a maximum. Therefore, a value of  $y_1$ , corresponding to maximum  $\tau_{2y}^2 + \tau_{2y}^2$  can be found from the stress calculation and using the values of  $\tau_{xy}$  and  $\tau_{zy}$  at  $y = y_1$ , the value  $0 = \Theta_1$  for which  $\tau_{\Theta}$  is maximum, can be derived from Equation (7.2)

$$\tan \theta_1 = (\tau_{xy} / \tau_{zy})_{y=y_1}$$
 (7.4)

The maximum shear range TR is equal to:

$$2(r_0)_{max.} = 2(r_0)_{y=y_1}$$

1.0.

aleadada decar ana?

Using the values of  $\theta_1$  and  $y_1$  thus obtained, the maximum value of  $\tau_{\Theta}$  can be obtained from Equation (7.1) after substitution.

Using a digital computer, numerical computation has been made for values of  $\tau_{xy}$ ,  $\tau_{zy}$  and  $\tau_{q}$  (in terms of the maximum contact pressure  $p_0$ ) as functions of y/a and Q.

Figure 4 plots, from these computations, the variation of  $\tau_{\rm g}$  as a function of x and z for a contact with a/b = 10. The variation of  $\Theta_{\rm l}$  as a function of x and z is shown by dotted curves in Figure 4.

At x = a, all of the  $\tau_R$  and  $\Theta_1$  curves very nearly intersect. This indicates that at x/a = 1.0 the maximum stress range is equal to  $0.04p_0$  independent of depth z for the z values shown in Figure 4. Further, the plane on which the maximum occurs is defined by  $\Theta_1 = 35^0$  independent of z. steringen frei Mittel aussche Gestammensteringen bevond die Artering in Arterine House auf die Arterine Gestamm

Figure 5 shows the variation of  $\tau_{yz}$  and  $\tau_{xy}$  with y at a fixed location in the ring cross section, i.e. at x = 8b and z = 0.6b. Figure 4 shows that for a given depth  $z_{0}$  the shear stress range  $\tau_{R}$  beaches a maximum at x = 0 and decreases monotonically with x.

Using the method described above, the contours of equal shear range on a ring cross-section for a given major axis / minor axis ratio (characterizing the contact ellipse) can be drawn, based on the values of shear range computed for a large number of grid points equally spaced in the highly stressed zone of a ring cross section.

Figure 6 shows contours of equal shear range for the eccentricity ratio s/b=10 representing a typical ball-race contact of





ł

\_\_\_\_ - 22

Ì/3

-

80

ł

Ċ. denote valuat of TR/pmax 0. 0 Numberie on the contours 0.6 0.6 · 7.6 Contours of Equal Shear Range T<sub>R</sub> in a Hertzian \$ 0 N O 0.80 = 7.5) 0.10 8N.0 وتواكيتها فالها الموالي وسابعه المسابر المسابر المستحق فمنته 040 10 A B \$ \$ \$ 0 Elliptical Contact (a/b (N) (N) () 2 **2** 2 ¢. 0 0.0-.0 Figure 8. 0 ค о еч Ċ, -1.0 d's freed zeenolenemid

-

ē

\$

5

a deep groove ball bearing. These contours are drawn based on a 500 grid point system in a quadrant of the x-z plane containing the major axis of the contact ellipse. It is noticed that the shear range along x = 0 is very close to that in a contact of two isfinitely long cylinders.

A limiting case for  $s/b = \infty$  has been deduced from formulas in (34) which corresponds to an infinitely marrow contact ellipse (see Appendix II.) In this case, the stress distribution in the central circumferential plane (x = 0) is identical to the plane strein solution for a Herzian two-dimensional contact. Using the results of the limiting case, it is possible to plot the values of shear range on a plane with coordinates x/a and z/b.

Figure 7 shows the contours of equal shear range for a/b = 69i.e. an infinitely narrow contact ellipse with its major axis lying on the X-axis, perpendicular to the direction of rolling. By comparison with Figure 6. It is seen that the contours of equal shear range for the two cases are nearly identical except that in the case a/b = 60, the level of  $\tau_R$  lies slightly deeper under the surface than for a/b = 10.

Contours of equal shear range  $\tau_{\rm E}$  for the case a/b = 7.5 have also been obtained and these are shown in Figure 0.

Figure 9 plots the area S expressed as multiples of ab and eaclosed by contours of equal  $\tau_R$  as a function of  $\tau_R/P_{max}$ for values of a/b = 7.5, 10, and =. The points where these curves intersect the abscisse correspond to the maximum values of  $\tau_{\rm R}$  throughout the stressed region, i.e. 2 70. It is noted that the curves lie very close to each other. The three curves coincide even more closely if one plots S/az<sub>0</sub> vs  $T_{\rm E}/2T_0$ , by multiplying the vertical coordinate of Figure 9 by b/zo and the horizontal coordinate by  $P_{\text{Hax}}$ , where  $z_0$  is the depth of the point below the surface which is subject to the maximum shear stress range 27. [he values of  $b/z_0$  and  $p_0/T_0$  as functions of a/b are obtained from (34) and are tabulated in Table 3. Figure 10 is a plot of  $S/az_0$  vs  $r_{\rm E}/2r_0$  and above that the curves having parameters a/b = 7.5, 10 and m nearly coincide. This means that the stressed area S at any given 7, value is proportional to the product of a and z is the depth location coordinate of 7. This approximate relationship appears to be valid for 7.5 : a/b < = ; a range encompassing the usual dimensions of a ball-raceway contact ellipse, including line contact. This finding supports Lundberg-Palagree's analysis (1) in which the stressed area in the ring cross-section is assued to be proportional to aza.

82

Table	III
-------	-----

VARIATION OF 20/b AND 70/Poax. WITH 0/b IN MERTZIAN CONTACT

a/b	5	7.5	10	5
8./b	0.4861	0.4925	0.4963	0.5
7⊕ <sup>∕p</sup> asx	0.2476	0,2480	0.2494	0.2500

į ; i

僵





θ5

A selection of the values to be used in defining the stressed area can be made by setting  $\tau_{\rm R}$  equal to a threshold stress level for plastic deformation for the given material composition and hardness. If selected in this manner,  $\tau_{\rm R}$  is a constant for a given material. For future use, it is more convenient to plot S/az as a function of  $2\tau_{\rm S}/\tau_{\rm R}$  shown as dotted line in Figure 10.

This curve shows that plastically stressed (macroscopic) area exists only for  $2\tau_0/\tau_p > 1$ . The size of the plastically stressed area can be approximated by :

$$S \sim R.2_0 \cdot \left[\frac{2\tau_0 - \tau_R}{\tau_R}\right]^{0.75}$$
 (7.5)

This formula shows that the area enclosed by the contour of equal  $T_{\rm R}$  can be expressed approximately as a function of  $T_{\rm R}$ . It is also of interest to know the average shear range,  $(T_{\rm R})_{\rm ave}$ , in the stressed area, S, enclosed by the contour of equal  $T_{\rm R}$ , Appendix IV gives the details of the computation using Equation (7.5). The result yields the following approximation:

$$\frac{S}{az_0} = -6.45 \left( \frac{(\tau \cdot ave}{\tau_R} \right) + 12.9$$
 (7.6)

where  $(d^{U})^{BA\Theta} \approx addrade$  welligg of a wariwing redaring spear approximation of a maximum redaring spear

S = area enclosed by the closed contour of equal  $\tau_{\rm R}$ a = so: major exis of the contact ellipse  $\tau_{\rm C}$  = maximum reversing shear stress

zo = depth where ro exists

(≣

### SECTION VIII

#### DETERMINATION OF SHEAR STRESS NEAR ASPERITIES

nonancial description of the second of the s

÷.

i

ł

-----

To demonstrate a possible mechanism for the generation of plastic deformation in asperities, an elastic analysis is presented below for the stress distribution in a contacting asperity using an idealized asperity profile. The result of this analysis may enable one to predict the location and severity of a plastic occurrence and take into account the relevant variables such as lubricant film thickness and surface roughness. It should also be noted that in the following analysis the friction at the contact surface is neglected.

Figure 11 shows the distribution of slopes for three is typical, abrasively finished surfaces. From those distributions, it is seen that the typical slope of abrasively finished hard steel surfaces varies widely. For a ground surface, the 95th percentile slope is  $\Theta_{95} = 29^\circ$ ; for a much smoother homed surface, the 95th percentile is  $\Theta_{95} = 3.0^\circ$ , while for the still smoother, lapped surface, it is only  $\Theta_{95} = 0.7^\circ$ . The RMS surface roughness values of these three surface finishes were found to be  $\sigma = 13$ , 1.8 and 0.4 µin, respectively.

Quantitative insight into the plastic occurrences at asporities, as a function of parameters listed above, can be achieved by introducing a simple mathemetical model in which the contact of a single asperity having an idealized profile with an elastic half plane is considered. This model contains no assumption regarding the height distribution of a population of asperities. אייאו אממונו און נווון נווון נווון איניטיעטעטעטע איזיא אינעטעטעטעטיער אווווויען איז איז איז איז איז איז איז איז

Figure 12 shows an idealized two dimensional asperity shape, similar to what one would expect to find on ground, hence, or lapped surfaces, formed by a multitude of cuts by sharp and straight-edged abrasive grains. The apperity is a plane-sided ridge with a curved tip of radius R. The slope angle of the sides is 0 which varies with the process of surface finishing and is accessible to experimental determination (6).

The plane contact problem with the above described profile and a straight-edged half plane can be solved based on Muskhelishvili's method of singular integral equations (36), provided that there exist no sharp curves or corners along the entire profile. The derivation of the solution for this contact problem is given in detail in Appendix III.

87.



erande in

- 1





A sumerical computation of surface pressure was performed and is shown in Figure 12, based on the case a = 2b wherein the width of the contact region is equal to twice the width of the curved base. Computation for other values of a/b is equally feasible.

ā

The surface pressure distribution plotted in Figure 12 Was computed based on a closed form solution derived from (36). However, for the sub-surface stress distribution there is no closed form solution sysilable for computation and a numerical technique is required to obtain the sub-surface stresses.



Figure 13 shows the contours of equal octahedral shear stress in terms of the product of Young's modulus and asperity slope, S'é in the cross section at the plane of the contact depicted in Figure 12. It can be seen that the depth where the maximum value of potchedral shear stress occurs is about 0.55 of the half-width of the asperity contact region on the surface. For a typical asperity contact width on a finely finished surface (1  $\mu$  in. RMS) (6), this depth is of the order of tens to hundreds of microinches. Thus, high shear stresses are indeed generated close to the surface.

and the second second second structure of the second se

erucconstern wornigning his Alfragalia Capagital (Gaglia

iter of the second state of the first of the second state of the second state of the second state of the second

919

The following relationship has been derived for the magnitude of the shear stress blong the axis of a symmetry: (Appendix III )

$$f_{45^{\circ}} = -\frac{E'\theta}{\pi^2} \cdot \frac{s}{b} - g \cdot \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \tan^2(\gamma \cdot \eta - \gamma(\pi/2 - \nu))\right) \quad (8.1)$$
where  $g_{\pm} = z/a$   
 $\gamma = g/(1 + g^2)^{1/2}$   
and  $\nu = \cos^{-1}(b/a)$ 

Figure 14 shows a plot of the maximum value of  $\tau_{450}$ computed from Equation (6.1) against b/s. The maximum value of  $\tau_{45}$ ds seen to be proportional to Q and is a function of the ratio a/b. When b/s  $\rightarrow 0$ , i.e. when the contact area is wide in comparison with the asperity tip width, the following limiting case exists:

$$( \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \eta \end{array} )_{\text{Max}} \xrightarrow{} E' \theta / \eta^{\text{B}}$$

$$( \theta, 2 )$$

$$z = 0.904 \sqrt{ab}$$
 (6.3)

\*<u>The ectabedral shear</u> stress is defined as  $\tau_{0C1} = \sqrt{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^{8} + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_3)^{4} + (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1)^{9}}$  /3, where  $\sigma_1$ ,  $c_3$ ,  $\sigma_3$  are the three principal stresses, whereas the Von Mises yield stress is  $\sigma_D = 3\sqrt{2} \tau_{OC1}/2$  Note that  $\tau_{OC1}$  acts on one of the faces of a regular octabedren with vortices on the axes X. Y and Z.


-



and the contact force is:

÷

ā

activation concreases at the Physical Edition of the

125

P -> E' 6 3/ 7

These relationships imply the following interesting facts when b/a->O, i.e. the elastic deformation of an asperity is large in comparison with its tip width (for example, in the case of a sharply tipped asperity or heavy elastic depression of an asperity). This is the case for low b/o (the minimum EHD film thickness/tomposite surface roughness EHS ratio) values:

l. The maximum shear stress. Tasx , approaches a constant value proportional to the asperity slope angle, but independent of the load.

2. The depth,  $y_{max}$ , of the point at which  $\tau_{gax}$  occurs increases with the 1/2-th power of the semi-width "a" of the asperity contact.

3. The load carried by the individual asperity contact is proportional to the contact width "a" and the angle G. This single asperity model yields, asymptotically, a proportionality between P and a, in agreement with the Archard's postulate (35), which states that in dry contact the real asperity contact area increases linearly with the load.

Of course, there must be cases in which the degree of indentation or a/b is not large. This occurs, generally, when a) there is a thick lubricant film separating the two rough surfaces, i.e. h/ois large or, specifically, when b) the tip radius of the asperity on real surfaces is large in comparison with the asperity spacing S.

The following presents a simple model for asperity interaction for the purpose of relating metr-surface plastic occurrences to the minimum EHD film thickness and surface roughness parameters.

Figure 15 (A) shows the two dimensional contact of a single asperity assumed to be rigid, with an elastic straight edged half plane; the degree of approach of the two bodies is controlled by the RHD minimum film thickness h. For convenience, the vertical distance between the outer line of the asperity profile and the asperity tip is set equal to 30 where o is the RHS value of the asperity profile and is of an acceptable order of magnitude approximation for real profiles. For the hypothetical



Figure 15. A Simple Wodel of Asperity Contact

64 (1)

r B ------

í

ŧ

e

94

.

profile, the assuption is arbitrary because the valleys of the asperit, are not defined.

The vertical distance between the asperity tip and the contact edge & is obtained from the geometry of Figure 15. which is

$$\theta = \theta_0 + (e_0) \tan \theta \tag{AA}$$

 $\delta_{m} = R (1 - c \circ s \varphi)_{a}$ the depth of the asperity tip and where

One may consider a multitude of rough surfaces with asperities of the shape shown in Figure 15 with different values of  $\sigma$  . A reasonable assumption for the degree of their rounding at the tip is that  $\theta_0 = \lambda \sigma$  where  $\lambda$  is a constant. proportional to R, i.e. that the rounding occupies a constant fraction of the asparity beight between tip and profile centerline.

Froe Equation (8.5) one obtains, using  $\delta_{\mathbf{B}} = \lambda \sigma$ 

$$\mathbf{R} = \lambda \sigma \cdot (1 - \cos \theta)^{-1} \tag{8.6}$$

$$b = \lambda \cdot c \cdot s \ln \Theta \cdot (1 - c \Theta s \Theta)^{-1}$$
(8.7)

The deformed profile of the clastic half plane in contact with the rigid asperity is given by the following formula (4)

$$\nabla (\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{a}^{a} \sqrt{\mathbf{x}^{2}} - \frac{1}{a^{2}} \int_{a}^{a} \frac{f'(t)}{(t-\mathbf{x})\sqrt{a^{2}}} \frac{dt}{dt}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{a}^{a} \frac{f'(\mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{a^{2}-b^{2}}} \int_{a}^{a} \frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{t-\mathbf{x}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{a}^{a} \frac{f'(\mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{a^{2}-b^{2}}} \int_{a}^{a} \frac{t-\mathbf{x}}{t-\mathbf{x}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{a}^{a} \frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{a^{2}-b^{2}}} \int_{a}^{a} \frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{t-\mathbf{x}}$$

wie

are manufactured and a substantia (CONDACTION CONTROL AND A CONTROL AND AN AND A CONTROL AND AND A CONTRACTOR O

÷۲ ्या स्ट्रा

b < |t| < a= b/2,

0 Y  $\forall (x)/a = a/R \cdot f(x/a, b/a)$ 

The above foraula can be integrated after expanding the integrand  $\sqrt{a^2 - x^2}/(t-x)$  into an ascending power series in a/x. The computed dimensionless deformation outside the contact region is plotted against x/e in Figure 16 using the ratio b/e as the parameter.

(8,9)

A THE MARKED AND A COMPANY AND A COMPANY



35 (2011) 10 (20

<u>r.</u>,

•

Ę

Ð

ء i

Figure 16. Variation of Surface Deformation Outside the Contact Zone of the Simple Asperity Nodel



In case of a real asperity contact between two steel serieces, the asserity is not rigid. It has the same elastic properties as the half plane. In addition, both surfaces bave Asperities. For (39), a convenient approximation of the comteet phenomena is arrived at by considering one surface biving a roughness profile equal to the composite of the two actual (37) shews surface roughnesses, while the other surface is flat. how the composite roughness can be calculated for undeformed asperities (among other formulas, one finds  $\sigma^2 = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2$ as quoted before). Assuming that the same composite forming procedure is acceptable for deformation calculations. Figure 15 (A) represents an aspe ity of the composite roughness. โล order to calculate deflection, this composite asperity must be considered elastic and the smooth half plane rigid. Assueing low slopes and large redii for the asperity, the deflections shows in Figure 15 for the elastic half-plane will still apply pat mast boy po modenrog seberately trom the undeformed asperity profile. In order to be able to do so, horizontal reference lines must be established on the deformed half plage (the estire surface of the infinite half plase is contact is, strictly speaking, deformed and the magnifude of the deflection does not converge). A reasonable refereace liss is the herizental line drawn through two symperical palats on the profile at a distance of S/a from the line of symmetry of the asperity, where S is the asperity spacing. Defermation of the surface beyond these points is then to be seglected. For a symmetrical asperity profile, the profile points at a distance of S/a from the asperity tip lie on the profile destarling. The use of these points as a deformation reference implies that all saperity deflection occurs in the portion from the centerline to the tip.

With these reference points established, one obtains the deformed shape of the asperity by subtracting the shaded area from its andeformed shape. (See Figure 15 (B).)

The average EHD file thickness, h. between two rough surfaces has been defined (37) as the distance between their profile centerlines. If the composite roughness profile is used, then h is the distance between its conterline and the smooth reference surface. By this definition one obtains from Figure 10:

h+8 +v(S/2) =30

(0,10)

where 3c is the undeformed asperity height from the profile centerline to the tip.

In dimensionless form, this equation can be written by means of Equations (0.4) and (0.7) as

22.2

. . . . .

$$\frac{h}{G} = 3 - \frac{\delta}{\sigma} - \frac{v(S/2)}{\sigma}$$

$$= 3 - \frac{h}{\sigma} - \frac{(n-h)}{\tan \theta} - \frac{v(S/2)}{\sigma} - \frac{v(S/2)}{\sigma}$$

$$= 3 - \lambda - \lambda (a/b-1) \cdot (1 + \cos\theta) / \cos\theta - \frac{v(S/2)}{\sigma} \quad (a.11)$$

-----

The known function v(x) in Equation (8,9) can be rearranged in the following form:

$$\frac{\Psi}{\sigma} \cdot \left(\frac{\sigma}{R}\right) \left(\frac{b}{a}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{B}{b}\right) = \left(\frac{L}{b}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{b}{R}\right) \cdot f \left(\frac{X}{b}, \frac{b}{a}, \frac{b}{a}\right)$$
(6.12)

By moans of Equations (8.5) and (8.6) one has

$$v(S/2)/\sigma = \lambda(1+cos9) \cdot \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{2} f\left(\frac{S}{ab}, \frac{b}{a}, \frac{b}{a}\right)$$
 (8.13)

For given values of  $\lambda,\theta$  and  $\sigma$ , one can determine  $h/\sigma$  as a function of a/b (or vice-verse) by using Equat ins (8.11) and (8.13).

Computation of h/ $\sigma$  has also been performed for the case that  $a/b \leq l$ , i.e. the region of contact of the asperity falls within the curved tip without touching the straight sides of the asperity profile. This case occurs only when h/ $\sigma$  is thelatively large but less than 3. (It is noted that in the present model, there is no asperity contact for h/ $\sigma \geq 3$ ).

Figures 17, 18 and 19 plot, for the ground, hence and lapped surface finishes discussed above, a/b as a function of  $h/\tau$ . The parameter for each curve is the relative tip width, which is a function of the tip radius R.

The curves show the general trend that b/s decreases with decreasing h/s .Since "h" is a constant, decreasing b/s means increasing the contact width "s", Since the maximum shell stress increases with increasing "s" (or decreasing b/s), one cise rule that for a given asperity profile the maximum these stress in the asperity increases with decreasing b/c.

98

աններեն անդանաններությունները հետությունները հետություններում անդանաններում են հետություններում են հետություննե





99

/=

З



ASYMPTOTIC VALUE = 3.6 x 10<sup>6</sup> P91



It is also shown in Figures 17 - 19 that for a given  $h/\sigma$ value, decreasing values of  $\lambda$  or E (sharper tipped asperities) correspond to increasing a/b or the contact width 'a' and shear stress  $T_{MAX}$ . However, it is recalled that for large values of 'a' ( or  $b/s \Rightarrow 0$ ).  $T_{MAX}$  will reach an asymptotic value independent of b. The relationship between b/aand  $T_{MAX}$  for the three surface finishes discussed here is plotted in Figure 20, which permits the scaling of the ordinees of Figures 17-19 in terms of  $T_{MAX}$ , in addition to b/a. This has been done by showing a nonlinear ordinate scale on these plotts.

From the above results based on a simple plane asperity interaction model, it is possible to relate the maximum near surface shear stress to three parameters explicitly given for a given lubrication condition and surface finish, namely  $h/\sigma$ . O and  $B/\sigma$  where h = minimum film thickness,  $\sigma =$  combined surface roughness (rms),  $\Theta =$  asperity slope lngle and B = asperity tip radius.

It can be seen from Figure 17 that for ground surfaces with a typical asperity slope angle  $\Theta = 29^{\circ}$ , the maximum shear stress level is quite high, i.e. at  $h/\sigma = 2$  and  $\lambda = 0.5$ , the maximum shear stress is  $\sim 10^{\circ}$  psi which is considerably higher than the magnitude of maximum Mertzian shear stress usual in rolling contacts. It is expected that plastic flow will occur causing a "blunting" of the seperity tip. For a smoother surface finish, e.g., a honed surface with  $\Theta = 3.8^{\circ}$  and  $\sigma = 1.0$  µin., it can be seen from Figure 10 that the maximum shear stress is considerably lower than that of a ground surface. For example, at  $h/\sigma = 2$  and h = 0.5, the maximum shear stress  $\sim 1.5 \times 10^{50}$ psi, which is of the same order of magnitude of maximum Hertzian shear stress. Thus severe plastic deformation is not expected in the separity.

It is seen (by using Figure 19) that still lower maximum shear stress will occur in happed surface, e.g. at  $h/\sigma = 2.0$ , the maximum shear stress in this case is only 3 x  $10^4$  psi (which is lower than the yield strength of hard steel) and no plastic deformation (or surface distress) should occur.



Į,

timen diministration of the material of the

1000

÷

\*





Alstronumer. Assemmentation



## SECTION IX

والمعاولات المتعادية المتعادية المتركية

## DETERMINATION OF SHEAR STRESS BENEATH A FURROW

A two dimensional, exploratory enalysis of the contact stress of bodies containing an idealized surface micro-defect as shown in Figure 21 has been conducted.

175

. \*\*

The operation of the contract of the contract

The defect in Figure 21 is a two dimensional "depression", i.e. infinitely long and Figure 21 shows its cross-section, the rims of which are formed by two radii, tangential to the surrounding (original) surface at points 2c apart. The Hertz area is 2a wide where a > c, and the contact does not extend closer to the bottom of the defect but rather, there is a free surface of width 2b in the defect, whereby c > b > c, i.e. the free surface at the bottom of the defect is free, its shape is irrelevant provided that it is sufficiently depressed not to contact the opposite body.

In addition, the profile is assumed smooth, having redii of curvature at all points considerably greater than the characteristic dimensions of the defect. The contact region consists of two pertions due to the presence of the open cavity, covering the cross-sectional co-ordinates b < x < a and -a < x < -bwhere the values of a and b (<c) are determined by the defect guometry parameters, i.e. r and c, and by the load.

This contact problem can be solved by applying the Huskhelishviii theory of complex variables to the mixed boundary value problem of an elastic hulf plane with multi-contact zones (36).

In rolling elements, the surface defects are small such that the characteristic dimensions, c and r, of the defects are of a smaller order than the linear dimensions of the rolling elements. Therefore, it is justified to consider a limiting case wherein c/R = 0 and r/R = 0. Using this assumption, the problem reduces to the compression of two straight-edged bodies, one of which contains a shallow surface defect, as shown in Figure 22. Frictional traction on the surface is neglected. The contact pressure at the interface when the defect is absent is assumed to be  $p_{0}$ . In the presence of a defect, the contact pressure at points removed from the defect is expected to approach asymptotically the undistorted value  $p_0$  as x approaches infinity.



Figure 22. Schematic Representation of Contacting Bodies Containing Surface Defects (Limiting Case K今日) ÷





taurana vaandiataadii suloodalaadii halbaqaadii marvannoonin meen sudaaniid. sent

، بندر النور 75

ø

Figure 23. Variation of  $\omega$  ( = c/b, or defect width/distance between two contact edges) with C<sub>0</sub>

1. COMPUTATION OF CONTACT PRESSURE NEAR A SURFACE DEFECT

. . . .

A closed form solution has been derived in Appendix IV for this limiting case. The expression for the contact pressure is as follows:

$$p(x) = (E'/2\pi^{B}r) \left[ I(x) - I(-x) \right]$$
 (9.1)

apele

₩TΞ

$$I(x) = (x-c) \cdot \log \left| \frac{(x-b) \cdot \eta - \sqrt{x^2 - b^2}}{(x-b) \cdot \eta + \sqrt{x^2 - b^2}} \right|$$

and 
$$E' = \left[ (1 - v_1^{B}) / \pi E_1 + (1 - v_2^{B}) / \pi E_0 \right]^{-1}$$
 the reduced Young's modulus

(For steels,  $E' = 51.8 \, lb/ln^8$ )

$$\eta = \tan \left( 0.5 \cdot \cos^2 \frac{h}{c} \right)$$

The value of b is determined from the following formula:

$$\log \left(\sqrt{e^{\theta}-1} + \theta\right) \sqrt{\omega^{\theta}-1}/\theta = C_{0}$$
(9.2)

Where e= c/b

and  $C_{a} \approx \pi^{a} p_{a} r/c E'$ , a dimensionless parameter.

Figure 23 plots the relationship between the and  $C_0$ . Since  $C_0$  cas be computed from the known veriables period x/c, it is possible to obtain b = c/to where the solution for a given value of  $C_0$  from Figure 23.

A sumerical example has been computed for the distribution of contact pressure on the surface, assuming o/b = 1.20, corresponding to  $C_0 = 0.069$ . The values can be obtained by satting (1) r/o = 1.6 and  $p_0 = 2x10^5$  pai or (2) r/o = 0.9 and  $p_0 = 4 \times 10^5$  pais. Figure 24 plots the dimensionless pressure  $P/P_0$  as a function of x. The results show that there is a pressure rise in the vicinity of the defect edge, resching a value of 3.06, i.e. there is a signifloast concentration of pressure at the defect edge.



1 / P



.



Figure 25 shows the distance  $x_0$  of the pressure peak arising as a result of the defect as measured from the defect center and the magnitude of the maximum contact pressure in terms of  $p_0$ plotted as a function of c/b. The result shows the high pressure peaks occur within the area of radius v. Based on Figures 24 and 25, Figure 26 plots the variation of  $P_{max}$  as a function of r/c for steel, using four values of  $p_0$ , i.e., 1 x 10<sup>5</sup>, 2 x 10<sup>5</sup>, 3 x 10<sup>5</sup> and 4 x 10<sup>5</sup> psi as parameters. It can be readily seen that the maximum contact pressure increases with decreasing values of r/c.

It can be seen from Figure 26 that all the curves approach constant values of  $p_{max}./p_0(>2.5)$  when r/c is greater than 2. It can be concluded that for all values of r relatively small compared with the rolling element size and  $p_0 < 4 \ge 10^5$  psi, we have  $p_{max}./p_c^{>2.5}$ .





# 2. SUBSURFACE STRESS DISTRIBUTION IN THE VICINITY OF A SURFACE DEFECT

It is of interest to know the stresses existing near the high pressure peak at  $x \neq 0$ . The sub-surface stress distribution can be computed using a numerical integration technique based on the solution for the stress field on a half plane under a concentrated normal load. The numerical method requires that the region of surface loading be finite in width along the X exis. This can be erranged by resolving the surface pressure into one component witch occupies a finite width and a uniform pressure acting on the surface of the entire half plane as shown in Figure 27.

Figure 20 plots the contours of equal von Mises yield stress  $\sigma_D$  for a typical surface defect with parameters c/b = 1.2corresponding to r/c = 0.9 for  $p_0 = 4 \times 10^5$  psi or r/c = 1.0for  $p_0 = 2 \times 10^5$  psi in steel. It can be seen that the maximum value of  $\tau_{OC}$  (or octahedral shear stress occurs under the location of maximum surface pressure. Thus  $(\sigma_D)_{Max}$ , is about 1.36  $p_0$ which is considerably higher than 0.7  $p_0$  occurring at the axis of symmetry (x = 0) shown in Figure 20. Furthermore, as shown in Figure 20, the depth of  $(\sigma_D)_{max}$  is ~ 0.13 c which is considerably smaller than 0.9 c which occurs along x = 0.

In the above defect originated stress analysis, the determining parameters are found to be the ratio of defect width 2c and corner radius r and the undisturbed surface pressure  $p_0$ . The degree of stress concentration at the shoulder increases with increasing defect width and decreasing defect shoulder radius. Although subsurface maximum shear stress has not been computed for a wide range of  $\frac{1}{2}$  values, an example has been computed, corresponding to a typical realistic defect size. The result shews that the contact pressure reaches a peak value of 3.1 times  $p_0$  whereas the maximum value of the quantity giving the von-misses yield criterion is 1.3  $p_0$  (compared with 0.32  $p_0$  in the Hertzian contact) It is expected that significant plastic deformation will occur at the defect shoulder.

Surface plastic deformation has been observed at asperities (on ground and at times on honed surfaces) at low h/c values, and at many surface defect shoulders. It is believed that this is due to the high shear stress predicted above for both of these surface failure origination points. In the case of severe asperity interaction the plastic deformation occurs at the tip causing a decrease of asperity slope. In the case of surface



ու 34237147, 2014 sour «որուները։ Նենել ննենքները)։ Սունիոնը Աննունին նունին նուները ներեները ու ոն են մարդունը

--

のまた、Andrease and an and a first and a second a

Þ

z

.

....



đ.

101

للكرامين ومنابع مسترمين والمرابع

•



:

7

. , i

1

ł

e Ş ;



**AR** 

¢

defects, sharp corner radii (compared with defect width) have been observed in new surfaces. After many cycles of rolling, it has been observed by surface tracing that the corner radius increases considerably as a result of "rounding off".

publikes but to the first first

11.11.1

It is plausible to assume that the surface profile of asperities and defect shoulders stabilizes, i.e. the plastic deformation ceases to grow after a certain number of strass cycles. This is a kind of "shakedown" process on the microscopic scale. Eldredge and Tabor (30) and Johnson (32) in studying macroscopic shakedown of ball tracks have concluded that after a certain shakedown is reached the material will behave elastically. Τn spite of the large difference in scale, the basic mechanism involving shakedown in bearing rolling tracks ; d/or asperity tips (or defect shoulders) can be similar. Using this argument i: may be assumed that the asperity tip and defect shoulder will behave elastically after a stabilized surface is achieved. Based on Figures 17 - 19 and 25 it is seen that a run-in asperity (or defect surface) having acquired a smaller asperity slope (or a larger defect corner radius; suffers a lower degree of stress concentration than when it is new. From this fact it can be said that surface plastic deformation flows in the direction required to reduce the degree of stress concentration. In hard steel, work hardening is high and the amount of deformation at "snakedown" will be limited. It is possible that the run-in shape of asperity tips and defect shoulders will continue to have some stress concentration.

113/110

## APPENDIXI

## FORMULAS FOR STRESSES IN A HERTZIAN STRESS FIELD

The stresses at an arbitrary point below the surface of a bearing ring induced by contact of a ball or roller are computed under the assumption that areas of the ring and rolling body are large enough compared to the size of the contacting area that the contacting bodies may be considered infinite in extent.

In the vicinity of the contact the surfaces are assumed to be describable by second degree polynomials.

All of the stresses concerned are referred to a rectangular Cartesian coordinate system with the xy-plane fixed on the i oundary surface of the semi-infinite body with the z-axis directed into the body. The xz and yz planes coincide with the symmetry planes of the contact ellipse, the equation of which is,

$$\frac{x^2}{a} + \frac{y^2}{b^2} = 1$$
 (A1-1)

where a is the major semi-axis lying on the x-axis and b the minor semi-axis lying on the y axis.

The stresses are given by (34).

$$\frac{\sigma_{\rm x}}{\sigma_{\rm o}} = Q \left(\frac{L X}{A^2 + L^2}\right)^2 + (1 - 2\nu) N_{\rm x} - 2(1 - \nu) \frac{Z M_{\rm x}}{L} + 2\nu \frac{Z M_{\rm z}}{L}$$
(A1-2)

$$\frac{\sigma_y}{\sigma_0} = Q \left(\frac{LY}{1+L^2}\right)^2 + (1-2\nu) N_y - 2(1-\nu) \frac{ZM}{L} + 2\nu \frac{ZM_z}{L}$$
(A1-3)

$$\frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma_o} = Q\left(\frac{Z}{L}\right)^2 \tag{A1-4}$$

$$\frac{T_{xy}}{\sigma_0} = Q\left(-\frac{LX}{A^2 + L^2}\right)\left(\frac{LY}{1+L^2}\right) - (1-2\nu) N$$
 (A1-5)

$$\frac{{}^{1}xz}{{}^{7}o} = Q \frac{ZX}{A^{2} + L^{2}}$$
(A1-6)

$$\frac{1}{3} \frac{y_z}{y_z} = Q \frac{ZY}{1+L^2}$$
 (A1-7)

in which,

$$A = \frac{a}{b}, X = \frac{x}{b}, Y = \frac{y}{b}, Z = \frac{z}{b}$$
(A1-8a)

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{-3P}{2\pi ab}$$
(A1-8b)

and P is the total load

L is the largest positive root of the following equation

$$\frac{\chi^2}{\Lambda^2 + L^2} + \frac{\chi^2}{1 + L^2} + \frac{\chi^2}{L^2} = 1$$
 (A1-8c)

$$Q = \frac{Z}{L} \cdot \frac{A}{\sqrt{(A^2 + L^2)(1 + L^2)}} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\frac{LX}{A^2 + L^2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{LY}{1 + L^2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{Z}{L}\right)^2}$$
(A1-8d)

$$\vec{\Phi} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A^2 - 1}} \arctan \left[ \frac{\frac{Y\sqrt{A^2 - 1}}{1 + L^2 + \frac{Z}{L}} \sqrt{(A^2 + L^2)(1 + L^2)}}{(A^2 + L^2)(1 + L^2)} \right]$$
(A1-8e)

$$\Psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A^2 - 1}} \quad \text{arctanh} \quad \left[ \frac{\chi \sqrt{A^2 - 1}}{A^2 + L^2 + \frac{Z}{L} \sqrt{(A^2 + L^2)(1 + L^2)}} \right]$$
(A1-8f)

$$N = \frac{A}{A^2 - 1} \left( X \bar{\varphi} - Y \Psi \right)$$
 (A1-8g)

$$N_{X} = \frac{A}{A^{2} - 1} \left( 1 - \frac{Z}{L} \sqrt{\frac{1 + L^{2}}{A^{2} + L^{2}}} - Y \bar{\Psi} - X \Psi \right)$$
(A1-8h)

$$N_{Y} = \frac{A}{A^{2}-1} \left( \frac{Z}{L} \sqrt{\frac{A^{2}+L^{2}}{1+L^{2}}} - 1 + Y\bar{\Phi} + X\bar{\Psi} \right)$$
(A1-81)

$$M_{\chi} = \frac{L (F - E)}{\Lambda^2 - 1}$$
(A1-8j)

$$M_{y} = \frac{L(A^{2} E - F)}{A^{2} - 1} - \sqrt{\frac{L^{2} A}{(A^{2} + L^{2})(1 + L^{2})}}$$
(A1-8k)

$$M_{z} = A \sqrt{\frac{1+L^{2}}{A^{2}+L^{2}}} - LE$$
(A1-81)

where F and E are the ordinary elliptic integrals of the first and second kind, respectively, with modulus  $k = \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{A^2}}$  and argument  $\theta = \arctan \frac{A}{L}$ ;  $\nu$  is

Poisson's ratio, assumed to be 0.3 in all of the numerical calculations.

ידי הוא אינוסה המפורמים המקורות המונים המינוס הממונים היו מעוענים (מעוענים) אינוס המונים היו אינוט המינוס המינים היו אינוע המינים היו אינוע היו אינוע המינים היו אינוע היו אינ

For points in the contact, i.e. Z = 0, the largest positive root L is zero. It follows from equation (A1-8c) that

$$\lim_{Z \to 0} \frac{Z}{L} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{X^2}{A^2}} = \frac{Y^2}{A^2}$$
(A1-9)

Using this relation, the stress formulas can easily be obtained from equations (A1-2) through (A1-7) as follows:

$$\frac{\sigma_{\rm x}}{\sigma_{\rm 0}} = (1-2\nu) \, {\rm N}_{\rm x} + 2\nu \sqrt{1 - \frac{{\rm x}^2}{{\rm A}^2} - {\rm y}^2}$$
(A1-10)
$$\frac{\sigma_{\rm y}}{\sigma_{\rm 0}} = (1-2\nu) \, {\rm N}_{\rm y} + 2\nu \sqrt{1 - \frac{{\rm x}^2}{{\rm A}^2} - {\rm y}^2}$$
(A1-11)

$$\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_0} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{\chi^2}{\Lambda^2} - \chi^2}$$
(A1-12)

$$\frac{T_{xy}}{G_0} = -(1 - 2\nu) N$$
 (A1-13)

$$T_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Z}} = 0 \tag{A1-14}$$

$$T_{yz} = 0$$
 (A1-15)

where 
$$N_{x} = \frac{A}{A^{2}-1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{A} \sqrt{1 - \frac{x^{2}}{A^{2}}} - Y^{2} - Y \phi - x \psi \right)$$
 (A1-16a)

$$N_{y} = \frac{A}{A^{2} - 1} \left( A \sqrt{1 - \frac{x^{2}}{A^{2}}} - Y^{2} - 1 + Y \phi + X \psi \right)$$
(A1-16b)

$$N = \frac{A}{A^2 - 1} \qquad (X \phi - Y \psi) \qquad (A1 - 16c)$$

$$\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A^2 - 1}} \arctan \left[ \frac{\frac{y \sqrt{A^2 - 1}}{1 + A \sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{A^2}} - \frac{y^2}{2}}}{\frac{1}{A^2 - 1}} \right]$$
(A1-16d)  

$$\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A^2 - 1}} \arctan \left[ \frac{\frac{x \sqrt{A^2 - 1}}{A^2 + A \sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{A^2}} - \frac{y^2}{2}}}{\frac{1}{A^2 + A \sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{A^2}} - \frac{y^2}{2}}} \right]$$
(A1-16e)

(A1-16e)

i

A, X and Y are as defined in equations (A1-8a).

15

# APPENDIX II

an shiran waa uu na uu na ta babba waana na ahaana ahaana waa ahaana waa ahaana waa ahaana waa ahaana waa ahaa

# FORMULAS FOR STRESSES CORRESPONDING TO AN INFINITELY NARROW CONTACT ELLIPSE IN A HERTZIAN STRESS FIELD

In the limiting case,  $A \rightarrow \odot$  or  $A^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ , the formulas in Appendix I must be modified before they can be used in numerical calculations. The following approximations must be made in deriving the stress formulas.

It is proper that, before working on the stress formulas, attention be directed to the modifications of equations (A1-8). Designating

$$\mathbf{X}' = \frac{\mathbf{X}}{\mathbf{A}} = \frac{\mathbf{X}}{\mathbf{a}}$$

Equation (A1-8c) becomes

$$X'^{2} \div \frac{Y^{2}}{1+L^{2}} \div \frac{Z^{2}}{L^{2}} = 1$$
 (A2-1)

Thus L is the largest positive root satisfying equation (A2-1). Since

$$\lim_{A \to \infty} \frac{A}{\sqrt{A^2 + L^2}} = 1$$

it is evident that

4

$$Q = \frac{Z}{L} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+L^2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\frac{LY}{1+L^2}\right)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{Z}{L}\right)^2}$$

Eliminating Y by means of equation (A2-1), this can further be reduced to

$$Q = \frac{Z}{L} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{1 + L^2}}{L^2 (1 - X'^2) + \left(\frac{Z}{L}\right)^2}$$
(A2-2a)

As  $A \rightarrow \infty$ , both  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  approach zero. Thus

$$N \doteq \frac{X}{A} \phi = X' \phi = 0$$
 (A2-2b)

$$N_{\rm X} \doteq -\frac{X}{A} \psi = -X' \psi = 0 \tag{A2-2c}$$

$$N_{y} \doteq \frac{Z}{L} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + L^{2}}} + \frac{X}{A} \psi = \frac{1}{L} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + L^{2}}}$$
(A2-2d)

For the elliptic integrals the modulus k will approach unity while the argument  $\beta$  will be close to  $\pi/2$ . Therefore, it can be seen that (40)

$$\lim_{A \to \infty} \frac{F(\beta/k)}{A^2} = \lim_{k' \to 0} k'^2 F(\beta/k) \le \lim_{k' \to 0} k'^2 K$$
$$= \lim_{k' \to 0} k'^2 \ln \frac{4}{k'}$$
$$= -\lim_{k' \to 0} k'^2 \ln k'^2 = 0$$

and  $\lim_{A\to\infty} E \doteq 1$ , where  $k' = \sqrt{1-k^2}$ .

It then follows

$$M_{\chi} = 0 \tag{A2-2e}$$

$$M_{y} = L - \frac{L^{2}}{\sqrt{1 + L^{2}}}$$
 (A2-2f)

$$M_{z} = \sqrt{1 + L^{2}} - L$$
 (A2-2g)

Thus the stress formulas can be obtained directly from equations (A1-2) through (A1-7). These are

$$\frac{\sigma_{\rm x}}{\sigma_{\rm o}} = \frac{2\nu Z}{L} M_{\rm z} \tag{A2-3}$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{y}}{\sigma_{0}} = Q\left(\frac{LY}{1+L^{2}}\right)^{2} + (1-2\nu)N_{y} - 2(1-\nu)\frac{ZM}{L} + 2\nu\frac{ZM}{L}$$
(A2-4)

$$\frac{\sigma_z}{\sigma_0} = Q\left(\frac{z}{L}\right)^2 \tag{A2-5}$$

$$T_{xy} = 0 \tag{A2-6}$$

 $T_{XZ} = 0$  (A2-7)

$$\frac{T_{yz}}{\sigma_0} = Q \frac{ZY}{1 + L^2}$$
 (A2-8)

in which  $r_0 = -\frac{2p}{\pi b}$  and p is the load per unit length of the contact.

For points located in the contact zone, the largest positive root L is zero, and, from equation (A2-1) one has, in the limit,

$$\lim_{Z \to 0} \frac{Z}{L} = \sqrt{1 - X'^2 - Y_{\perp}^2}$$

$$\lim_{L \to 0} (A2-9)$$

The stress formulas follow directly from equations (A2-3) through (A2-8) by means of equation (A2-2). They are

$$\frac{\sigma_{\rm x}}{\sigma_{\rm o}} = 2 \nu \sqrt{1 - {\rm x'}^2 - {\rm y}^2}$$
(A2-10)

$$\frac{\sigma_y}{\sigma_0} = \sqrt{1 - X'^2 - Y^2}$$
 (A2-11)

123

A A DAVID A DAVID A DAVID A DAVID A DAVID

$$\frac{\sigma_{z}}{\sigma_{0}} = \sqrt{1 - \chi'^{2} - \chi^{2}}$$
(A2-12)  

$$T_{\chi y} = 0$$
(A2-13)  

$$T_{\chi z} = 0$$
(A2-14)  

$$T_{yz} = 0$$
(A2-15)

NAME TO AN A DESCRIPTION OF A DESCRIPTIO

;

a

į

124

····.;

27

ł

\_\_\_; . . . .

-----

ð

÷

. . å ANG I'D PLLL

ծ մինքուն, ոն ներ կանում նույնը նուրդը ուներինը ուներելու նունեներին ներերելու է։ Երենը հաղությո

a district on the set. The set of states

÷

#### APPENDIX III

## PLANE CONTACT OF ASPERITIES

The governing equation relating the contact pressure p(x) in the region -a < x < a to a symmetrical surface profile designated by f(x), is given by (36).

$$\frac{2}{E'}\int_{-R}^{R} \frac{p(\pi)}{x-t} dt = -f'(\pi)$$
 (A3-1)

where  $E' = \left[ (1 - \nu_1^2) / \pi E_1 + (1 - \nu_2^2) / \pi E_2 \right]^{-1}$ 

$$f'(x) = df(x)/dx$$

eline of the standard and the standard of the standard and the standard of the

Equation (A3-1) shows that the plane contact problem of two bodies having modulit  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ , respectively, is equivalent to that in which one of the solids is rigid  $(E \rightarrow \infty)$  and the other has a reduced Young's modulus,  $E'(1-\nu^2)/\pi$ , provided that f(x) remains the same.

The above singular integral equation can be integrated for p(x). For the special case that  $p(\pm a) = 0$ , i.e. the contact pressure is zero at the contact edges (this is valid if the profile does not have a sharp corner or ridge at the edges), the contact pressure is given by (36)

$$p(\pi) = \frac{E'}{2\pi} \sqrt[4]{2-\pi} \int_{-a}^{a} \frac{f'(t) dt}{\sqrt{a^2 - t^2} (t-\pi)}$$
(A3-2)

For the particular profile depicted in Figure 12, one has

$$f'(t) = t/R \text{ for } |t| < b$$
; (A3-3)  
=  $b/R \text{ for } a > |t| > b$ 

Eulestituting equation (A3-3) into equation (A3-2) and carrying out the integration, the pressure distribution is obtained as follows:

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{E'}{2\pi R} \left[ 2\sqrt{a^2 - \mathbf{x}^2} \, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}) \log \left( \frac{\sin \left(\frac{\beta_0 + \alpha}{2}\right)}{\cos \left(\frac{\beta_0 - \alpha}{2}\right)} \right) - (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) \log \left( \frac{\cos \left(\frac{\beta_0 + \alpha}{2}\right)}{\sin \left(\frac{\beta_0 - \alpha}{2}\right)} \right) \right]$$
(A3-4)

where

s a creat ar no contrologica da anticipation da anticipation da anticipation da anticipation da anticipation de

Ē

Pulling Schullung

$$\beta_0 = \sin \frac{-1}{a} \frac{b}{a}, \ \alpha = \sin \frac{-1}{a} \frac{x}{a}.$$

0

The force acting between the single asperity and the half plane is given by

$$P = \frac{E'}{2\pi} \int_{-a}^{a} \frac{t f'(t) dt}{\sqrt{a^2 - t^2}} = \frac{E' a^2}{2\pi R} (\beta_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\beta_0)$$
(A3-5)

For small values of the approach between two bodies, i.e.  $\frac{b}{a}$  very small,

$$\mathbf{p} \cong \mathbf{E}' \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \mathbf{a}^2 / 2 \pi \mathbf{R} \tag{A3-6}$$

For a symmetrical profile f(x) with respect to the z-axis (or the contact center), the subsurface stress distribution at x = 0, or the centerline of contact, is given by (36)

$$\sigma_{z} = \sigma_{y} = 4\pi \operatorname{Im} \Phi^{\prime} (\zeta) \tag{A3-7}$$

$$\Gamma_{xx} = -22 \operatorname{Re} \bar{\Phi}^{\dagger} (\zeta) \tag{A3-6}$$

where  $\sigma_x$ ,  $\sigma_z \approx$  normal stresses acting in x and z direction, respectively

T<sub>x z</sub> = orthogonal shear stress

 $\zeta = x + 1z$ , a complex number

Im, Re 2 imaginary and real parts of a complex number

$$\bar{g}(\zeta) = \frac{E'}{4\pi^2} \sqrt{a^2 - \zeta^2} \int_{-a}^{a} \frac{f'(t) dt}{a^2 - t^2(t-\zeta)}$$
(A3-6)

and a prime denotes differentiation with respect to C.

Substituting equations (A3-3) and (A3-9) into equation (A3-7) and performing the integration, one obtains

$$T_{450} \Big|_{X=0} = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_z - \sigma_X) \\ = -\frac{E' \theta}{\pi^2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\pi}{2} - \tan^{-1} (\gamma \tan \nu) - \gamma (\frac{\pi}{2} - \nu) \Big]$$
(A3-10)

Whore

The second se

-

ł

,

.....

$$\begin{aligned} & \upsilon = \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{b}{a} \right) \\ & \gamma = \left( \frac{a}{b} \right) / \left[ \frac{1}{2} + \left( \frac{a}{b} \right)^2 \right] \frac{1}{2} \\ & \xi = \frac{a}{a} / a \end{aligned}$$



lillin.

į

[ 2



# APPENINX IV

# COMPRESSION OF A HALF PLANE CONTAINING AN IDEALIZED SURFACE DEFECT

As depicted in Figure 22, the helf plane is straight edged except at the depression. The line of symmetry of the profile is chosen as the y-axis whereas the edge of the half plane is chosen as the x-axis. The corner radii of the depression, assumed to be identical, are denoted by r. The approach of the two bodies is assumed to be normal to the surface of the half plane. Thus at infinity there is an uniform compression  $p_0$  throughout the bodies. The contact region occupies the boundary of the half plane except at the center of the depression or |x| < b.

Using the same notations as in Appendix  $\Pi$ , the governing integral equation, similar to equation (A3-1) in form except for the limit of the integral, is given below

$$\frac{2}{E'}\left[\int_{-\infty}^{-b} + \int_{b}^{\infty}\right]\frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{t}} d\mathbf{t} = -\mathbf{f}'(\mathbf{x})$$
(A4-1)

The derivative of the profile expression f(x) with respect to x for the present problem is given by:

and a second of the second second

$$f'(x) = 0 \implies |x| > c$$
  

$$f'(x) = (c-x)/r \qquad b < x < c$$
  

$$= (-c-x)/r \qquad -c < x < -b \qquad (A4-2)$$

According to (36) the complex potential in this problem, for the case  $p(\pm b) \neq 0$ , can be given as follows:

$$\Phi(z) = \frac{E'}{4\pi^2} \sqrt{\zeta^2 - b^2} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{-b} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \right] \frac{f'(t) dt}{\sqrt{t^2 - b^2} (t - \zeta)} ; \qquad (A4-3)$$

The contact pressure in the contact region is given by (36).

Comparison Contraction of the second

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{E}'}{2\pi^2} \sqrt{\mathbf{x}^2 - \mathbf{b}^2} \left[ \int_{-\Theta}^{-\mathbf{b}} + \int_{-\Theta}^{\Theta} \right] \frac{\mathbf{f}'(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{t}^2 - \mathbf{b}^2} (\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{x})}$$
(A4-4)
Substituting equation (A4-2) into equation (A4-4) and rearranging the terms, yields:

킠

-327

7

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{E'}{2\pi^2} \sqrt{x^2 - b^2} \cdot \frac{x}{r} \int_{-b}^{0} \frac{(c-t) dt}{\sqrt{t^2 - b^2} (t^2 - x^2)}$$

$$= \frac{E'}{2\pi^2 r} \left[ I(\mathbf{x}) - I(-\mathbf{x}) \right]$$

$$\text{where } I(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{x} - c) \log \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{x} - b)\eta - \sqrt{x^2 - b^2}}{(\mathbf{x} - b)\eta + \sqrt{x^2 - b^2}} \right]$$

$$\eta = \tan \left[ 0.5 \cos^{-1} \frac{b}{c} c_{0} \right]$$
(A4-5)

In the above solution, the quantity b is unknown and has to be determined from the magnitude of the undisturbed pressure  $p_0$ , or the pressure at  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , equation (A4-5) can be reduced to the following form

$$P_{o} = \frac{E'}{\pi} \frac{c}{r} \left[ \log \left( \sqrt{\frac{c^{2}}{b^{2}}} - 1 + \frac{c}{b} \right) - \sqrt{\frac{c^{2}}{b^{2}}} - 1 + \frac{b}{c} \right] \quad (A4-6)$$

Since  $p_0$ , c, r and E' are known constants, it is possible to solve for b which is required in equation (A4-5). The determination of c/b can be made by using Figure 23 plotting c/b against the dimensional quantity  $C_0 = \pi^2 p_0 r/c E'$ .

#### APPENDIX V

# AVERAGE SHEAR HANGE IN THE STRESSED AREA, S. ENCLOSED BY A CONTOUR OF EQUAL SHEAR RANGE, $T_{\rm B}$ , IN A HERTZIAN ELLIPTICAL CONTACT

The relationship between the area, 5, enclosed by a contour of equal shear range T and Tis given in equation (7-5) of Section VII as follows:

S= сцг	$\int \frac{2\mathrm{T}}{-1}$	$\frac{2}{T}$

TELEVISION (TELEVISION)

LTTL I

(A5-1)

in which a = the major axis of the contact ellipse,  $z_0 =$  the depth corresponding to maximum reversing shear stress  $T_0$  and c= constant.

From (A4-1) 
$$T = 2T_0 (caz_0)^{4/3} \left[ 8^{4/3} + (caz_0)^{4/3} \right]^{-1}$$
 (A5-2)

For a specific stressed area 5 bounded by a contour of equal shear range the average shear stress becomes

$$(T_{\rm R})_{\rm av.} = \frac{1}{5} \int_{0}^{6} T_{\rm ds} = \frac{2 T_{\rm o}}{5} \int_{0}^{8} \frac{(caz_{\rm o})^{-4/3}}{5^{4/3} + (caz_{\rm o})^{-4/3}} \, dS$$

$$= \frac{2 T_{\rm o}}{5} \frac{caz_{\rm o}}{5} \int_{0}^{3/caz_{\rm o}} \frac{dW}{W^{4/3} + 1}, \qquad (A5-3)$$

. 1.

The upper limit of the integral can be determined from equation (A5-1) by means of Figure 10, and therefore the integral can be evaluated using a numerical integration technique.

Using squaiton (A5-3), values of  $\frac{(T_R)_{\text{fiv}}}{T_0}$  have been calculated and plotted in (Figure 32) egainst  $\frac{5}{2}_0$ . It can be shown that for  $\frac{6}{2}_0$  smaller than 4.7, the ourse can be approximated by a straight line expressed as follows:

$$\frac{6}{R} = -6.45 \frac{(T_R)_{ev}}{T_0} + 12.9$$
 (A5-4)

Eolving for  $(T_R)_{av}$  in equation (A5-4), one has

$$(T_{R})_{av.}/T_{0} = 0.155 (12.9 - 5/az_{0})$$
 (A5-5)



#### APPENDIX VI

#### PLAUEDLE DEFECT SEVENITY DISTRIBUTIONS

In what follows we will explore the behavior of the function T necessary for the satisfaction of Equation (6-9) for two plausible choices of F(d).

It may be reasoned that the distribution of defact severity is such that most of the defacts have very small severity and a diminishing proportion have greater severities. That is, the proportion of defacts with severity in the interval  $d_a + \Delta d$  is larger than the proportion in the interval  $d_b + \Delta d$  as long as  $d_a < d_b$ .

The density of the two parameter exponential distribution with unit location parameter to be given below has mode at unity and decreases with increasing variate values and thus satisfies the condition postulated above.

With this law the probability that a randomly selected defect has severity less than a value d is given by

$$Prob\left[d_{1} < d\right] = F(d) = 1 - \exp\left[-\left(\frac{d-1}{d_{0}}\right); d > 1\right]$$
$$= 0; d < 1$$
(A6-1)

The quantity  $d_0$  is a constant parameter of the distribution related to the average severity  $\bar{d}$  by  $d_0 = d - 1$ .  $\bar{d}$  may vary with different materials.

Another distribution that satisfies the above postulated condition is

$$F(d) = 1 - d^{-C}$$
;  $d \ge 1$ ,  $c > 0$   
= 0;  $d < 1$  (A6-2)

where c is a constant parameter.

and a state of the second s

Equation (A6-2) is a form of Pareto's distribution (47), and has been found useful in economic studies. The parameter c is expressible in terms of the average defect severity  $\bar{d}$  as

$$c = \frac{\tilde{d}}{\tilde{d} - 1}$$
 (A6-3)

The distributions of Equations (A6-1) and (A6-2) are shown on Figure 30, plotted for d = 2.0. The corresponding density functions are shown on Figure 31.



A set of the set of th

and definitions

an the second of the second of

andre and a state of the state

, alth tha channailler, and

i i

(



2.0 probability density function of defect sevenity 1.5 PARETO AVERAGE DEFECT SEVERITY 1.0 **ð** = 2.0 antimation and a second strain a second strain and a second strain a s 0.5 EXPONENTIAL 0 0 Ż Ì 3 ê 6 7 8 10 11 5 DEFECT SEVERITY , J Probability Density Function of Defect Severity with  $\vec{d} = 2.0$ Figure 31. ł 2 ø į 135

# 1. BEHAVIOR OF T AS $N \rightarrow N_0$

Using the exponential distribution of Equation (A6-1) as the defect life distribution in Equation (6-1) gives

$$G(N_{\underline{i}}) = \exp \left(\frac{1}{\underline{d}} - \overline{\Gamma}^{-1} - \left(\frac{\underline{B}}{N_{\underline{i}}}\right)\right)$$
(A6-4)

Invoking the requirement of Equation (8-9) gives

$$\lim_{N \to N_0} \exp \left[\frac{1}{d} T^{-1} \left(\frac{B}{N_1}\right)\right] = \beta N_1^k$$
(A6-5)

Taking logarithms,

$$\lim_{N \to N_0} \frac{1}{d_0} r^{-1} \left(\frac{B}{I_0}\right) = \log \frac{1}{\beta N_I^k} = \log \frac{1}{\beta'} \left(\frac{B}{N_I}\right)^k$$
(A6-6)

where

(A6-7)

Thus 
$$\Gamma^{1}$$
 must behave as  $\log \frac{1}{\beta'} \left(\frac{B}{N_{I}}\right)^{kd}$  as  $N \to N_{0} \Rightarrow 0$ .

Teking the inverse

$$\frac{B}{N_{I}} = \Gamma \left( d \right) = \left( \beta' \right)^{1/kd_{0}} e^{d/kd_{0}}$$
(A6-8)

Equation (A6-8) states that as d becomes large,  $\Gamma$  (d) behaves as an exponential function. The result is required only asymptotically and cannot to true over the whole range of d since according to Equation (A6-8)  $\Gamma$  (d) does not approach zero as  $d \rightarrow 1$  as required by Equation (5-12) (d = 1 corresponds to no severity).

Turning to the Pareto distribution of Equation (A6-2) one finds, using Equation (6-9)

$$\left(\overline{T}^{-1}\left(\frac{B}{N_{1}}\right)\right)^{-G} = \beta N_{1}^{k}$$
(A6-9)

which is satisfied if  $\Gamma^{-1}\left(\frac{B}{N}\right)$  is given by

$$\overline{I}^{-1}\left(\frac{B}{N_{I}}\right) = \frac{1}{\beta^{1}} \left(\frac{B}{N_{I}}\right)^{+k/\alpha}$$

where  $\beta' = (B^k \beta)^{1/c}$ 

,∰i e

нысылатын алар таларттар. Ц The function  $\Gamma$  (d) in this case behaves for  $d \rightarrow \varphi$  as

$$\Gamma(d) = (\beta')^{c/k} d^{c/k}$$
 (A6-10)

that is, as a power function in d.

Here again,  $\Gamma$  (d) does not approach zero as  $d \sim 1$  so that Equation (A6-10) cannot be valid over the entire range of d.

## 2. FATIGUE LIFE DISTRIBUTIONS WITH EXPONENTIAL AND PARETO DEFECT SEVERITY DISTRIBUTIONS

With the exponential severity distribution, the Weibull characteristic life  $N^{2}$  of Equation (6-8) becomes, using the expression for g given in Equation (A6-7),

$$N^{\ddagger} = \frac{B}{\left(\beta' \eta V\right)^{1/k}}$$
  
or since  $B = \frac{f_1(A_p)}{\gamma_1}$ 

$$N^* = \frac{f_1 (A_g)}{\gamma_1 (\beta' \eta V)^{1/k}}$$

(A6-11)

are stream a stream of the The stream of the stream of

9

With the Pareto defect severity distribution, the characteristic life becomes

$$N^{\dagger} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} B \\ [\beta']^{-0} \forall V \end{bmatrix}^{1/k}}_{P_{I}} = \frac{\begin{bmatrix} A \\ P \end{bmatrix}}{\gamma_{I} [(\beta')^{-0} \forall V]^{1/k}}$$

=

(A6-2)

Equations (A6-11) and (A6-12) are identical relationships in form; for either of the two assumed defect severity distributions, the characteristic life varies inversely with the stressed volume and the matrix parameter  $\gamma_{_{\rm T}}$ .

### **eeferences**

₽

P

. . . . .

1

E

ANNUT DE BARATE AND DE LE REPERSION DE LE REVERTIE DE LE RE

<u>;</u>

-

1.	Lundberg, G. and Pelegren, A., <u>Dynamic Capacity of</u> <u>Rolling Bearings</u> , Acta Polytechnica Ro. 196 (1947)
2.	Lundberg, G. and Palmgren, A., <u>Dynamic Capacity of</u> <u>Roller Bearings</u> , Acta Polytechnica No. 210 (1952)
3.	<u>Hethod of Evaluating Load Aatings for Ball Bearings</u> , AFBHA Standards Section No. 9.
<b>4</b> ,	Load Aatings for Ball and Roller Bearings, ASA Standard No. B3, 11-1959.
5.	ISO Recommendation 76.
6.	Tallian, T.E., "Rolling Contact Failure Control Through Lubrication", <u>Gonference on Lubrication and Rear</u> , Inst. of Hech. Engrs., London, England, (Paper No. 14), Sept. (1967).
, y 6 a	Hasson, S.S., Hirschberg, H.H., "Fatigue Behavior in Strain Cycling in the Low - and Intermediate - Cycle Bange <sup>H</sup> in <u>Fatigue, an Interdisciplinary Approach</u> , Syracuse University Press, 1964.
0.	Coffin, L.F., "A Study of the Effects of Cyclic Thermal Stresses on a Ductile Netal", Trans. ASNE 76, pp 931-936. Aug. 1954.
<b></b> р,	Horrow, J. D., "Cyclic Plastic Strain Energy and Fatique of Hetals", ASTH STP 378, Am. Soc. Testing Hats., 1965
10,	Frost, N.E., and Dugdale, D.S., "The Propagation of Fatigue Cracks in Sheet Specimens", Journal of Mechanisms of Physical Solids, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1958.
11.	Paris, P. C., <sup>a</sup> The Fracture Nechanisms Approach to Fatigue <sup>a</sup> . <u>Fatigue, an Interdiscipligary Appreach</u> , Syracuse University Press, 1964
12.	Laird, C., "The Influence of Metallurgical Structure on the Mechanisms of Patigue Crack Propagation", in <u>Fatigue Crack</u> <u>Propagation</u> , ASTA Spec. Tech. Publ. No. 415, p.131 (1967).
9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Nood, N.A., "Bocent Observations on Fatigue in Metals". Symposium on Basic Mechanisms of Fatigue, ASTN STP 237, 1958
	139

- 14. Gresskreats, J.C., "A Critical Review of Hicromechanism in Fatigue" in <u>Patiene. and Isterdisciplinary Approach</u>, Syracuse University Press, 1964.
- 15. Easson, S.S. and Elreaborg, E.E., "Crack Initiation and Propagation in Notched Fatigue Specimens", Proceedings of the First International Conference on Fracture (1965), Vol. 1, pp 479-498.
- 16. Peterson, B.E., "Design Approaches for Low-Cycle Fatigue Problems in Power Apparatus" in <u>Fatigue</u>, an <u>Interdisci</u>-<u>Blinery Approach</u>, Syrecuse University Press, 1964.
- 17. Eartin, J. A. and Eberhardt, A.D., "Identification of Potential Failure Nuclei in Rolling Contact Patigne", ASE Paper No. 67-WA/CF-1.
- 18. Litteaa, H., and Hidner, R., "Propagation of Contect Fatigue from Surface and Sab-surface Origins", Trans. ASHE, Engr. Sopt., 1966, pp. 624-636.
- 19. Esin, A., "The Bicroplastic Strain Energy Criterion Applied to Fatigue", ASBE Paper No. 67-WA/Met-3.
- 20. Gross and Groonert, <u>Basic Information on the American</u> <u>Proportion of Various Enterials in Liquid Estals</u>. U. S. Navy Engrg. Experiment Station Report 9C(4)966051, Hov. 1952.
- 21. Hausen, S.S., <u>Angraal Stress and Low-Cycle Fatigue</u>, Estran E111 Book Co. (1966).
- 22. Tetelaan, A.S., Starly, A.J., Jr., Fracture of Structural Beterlals, John Biley & Sous, Inc. (1967).
- 23. Bridgeas, P.W., <u>Studies is Large Flastic Flow and Fracture</u>, Refraw Sill Book Co., N. Y. (1952)
- 24. Forsyth, P.J.E., "A Two Stage Process of Fatigue Growtk", Foo. Crack Propagation Symp. Crainfield, the College of Aeronautics, (1962).
- 25, Staclatz, G.E. and Dolan, T.J., "Effect of Stress Applitade on Statistical Variability in Patigue Life of 755-76 Altaian Alloy<sup>4</sup>, Trans. ASEE, <u>75</u>, 867 (1953).
- 26. Esses, 5.5., "Fatiges, A Complex Subject Some Simple Approximations", Experimental Sochesics, July, 1965.

140

a na ang na m Na ang 27. Borgese, S., "As Electron Fractographic Study of Spalls Formed is Molling Contact", ASME Paper Ro. 67-WA/CF-3.

**fund**ict

forthe Public of

գիհաշրովիսիութունեիսնենի

station of the sector of the

- 20. Greenert, N.J., "The Toroid Contact Roller Test as Applied to the Study of Bearing Steels", J of Basic Eng. ASHE Trans. 1962, 04, p. 161.
- Johnson, E.L., "Plastic Flow and Residual Stresses in Rolling and Sliding Contact", <u>Patigue in Bolling Contect</u>, Inst. Hech. Engrs., Paper No. 5, 1963.
- 30. Poritsky, N., "Stress and Deflection of Cylindrical Bodies in Contact with Application to Contact of Gears and of Locomotive Wheels", J. App. Noch., Trans ASEE <u>92</u>, 192-201 (1950).
- 31. Smith, J.D. and Liu, C.K., "Stresses Due to Tangential and Normal Load in an Elastic Solid with Application to Some Contact Stress Problems", J. Appl. Hech. 75, 157-185 (1953).
- 32. Hertz, H., "On the Contact of Rigid Elastic Solids and on Hardness", <u>Hiscellaneous Papars</u>, Macmillan and Co., London (1696) pp. 163-103.
- 33. Little, A.D., Inc., Final Report on <u>A Study of Contact</u> <u>Fatigue</u>, (Sponsored by ASME) Jan. 1, 1967
- 34. Lundberg, G. and Sjovall, H., <u>Stress and Deformation in</u> <u>Elastic Contacts</u>, Publication No. 4, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden, 1958.
- 35. Arckard, J.F., "Elastic Deformation and the Laws of Friction", Proc. Roy. Soc. (Londos) A243 (1957).
- 36. Maskhelishvill, N.I., <u>Seve Basic Problems of the Mathematical</u> <u>Theory of Elasticity</u>, P.H. Moordoff, Ltd., p. 479 (1953).
- 37. Tallian, T.E., Chiu, Y.P., Huttenlocher, D.F., Kamenshine, J.A. Sibley, L.B., and Sindlinger, N.E., "Lubricant Films in Bulling Contact of Rough Surfaces", ASLE Trans. <u>7</u>, 2, p. 109 (1964).
- 38. Eldredge, K.R. and Tabor, D., "The Hechenist of Bolling Frietica, I. The Plastic Bauge", Proc. Roy Soc. A229 181 (1955).

- 39. Tallian, T.E., "Discussion to Peper entitled "Yopographs of Solid Surfaces", by J.B.P. Hillianses", to appear in MASA Symposium, <u>Isterdisciplingry Approach to Friction</u> and Hear.
- 40. Dright, H., <u>Isbles of Integrals and Other Eathematical</u> Date, Escuillas Co., Now York, 3rd Ed., 1957.
- 41. Bice, J.B. and Brown, E.J., Biscussion to paper by H. Freudenthal, entitled "Bandom Fatigue Failure of a Hultiple-Lead-Fath Redundant Structure" in Fatigue, an Interdisciplinary Appreach, Syracuse University Press, 1964.

districtly.

randan Yahiyika menaliming Pashkonikin dilikati ningina kuntesh utan menungkungkungkungkan merupakan munuk

- 42. Islies, T.E. "Weibull Distribution of Rolling Contact Fatigue Life and Deviations Therefrom", ASLE Trans. 5. No. 1, 1952, pp. 183-196.
- 43. Hoyar, G.J., <u>A Hogaesics Asalysis of Bolling Elemont</u> <u>Failures</u>, Ph.B. Thesis submitted to Univ. of <u>Illinois</u>, T & AH Boport Ho. 102 (1960).
- 44. Velezi, 2.2., Tellies, T.2. and Sibley, L.B., "Elestehydrodynamic File Effects on the Lond-Life Bohavier of Belling Contacts", ASEE Paper 65-Lab-11.
- 45. Hilzs, 5., <u>Hethestelsel Statisiss</u>, John Hiloy and Bans, 1952, p. 235.
- 46. Epstela, 3., "Bleavats of the Interry of Extreme Values". Techasectrics 2. At. 1, 1960.
- 47, Grabel, E.J., <u>Statistics of Extremes</u>, Columbia Univ. Press, 1953.
- 48. Donses, D., and Whitaker, A.V., "A Numerical Procedure for the Elastohydrodynamic Problems of Belling and Sliding Contact Lubricated by a Newtonion Fluid", END Lubrication Symposium at Loods. Paper Ne. 4. Inst. of Nech. Engrs., London, (1965).
- 49. Horrow, J., "Fatigue Properties of Netals", Unpublished paper presented to the membership of SAE, ISTE Div. 4. November 4. 1965. University of Illinets.

142

Unclassified						
Security Classification	NT CONTROL DATA	D L D				
Security classification of title, body of abstract	ENI CONIKUL DATA	• K G D be entered when th	he overall report is classified)			
1. URIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)		28. REPORT	SECURITY CLASSIFICATION			
SKF Industries, Inc.		Uncla	assified			
Research Laboratory		25. GROUP	26. GROUP			
King of Prussia, Pa. 19406		1				
S. REPORT TITLE						
Development of a Mathematical Mode.	L for Predicting I	TIS OL KOTT	ling bearings			
		0 0				
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dat	••) 7 0	Fire (	-6 22 REUS			
Final Report						
5. AUTHOR(3) (First name, middle initial, iast name)						
I A Montin						
J.A. Martin'						
S. REPORT DATE	74. TOTAL N	O. OF PAGES	TO. NO. OF REFS			
April 1968		160	49			
SE. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	PR. ORIGINAT	OR'S REPORT NU	JMBER(S)			
F30602-67-C-0147	1					
5. PROJECT NO.	AL68	3 <b>PO</b> O3				
5519						
• Task 551902	9b. OTHER R this report	EPORT NO(S) (Any	other numbers that may be assigned			
		(0 m)				
	RADC-TR-	-60-54	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
This dowment is subject to special	armont controls	and on ah +m	nomittal to foreign			
rousenent is subject to special	export controls a	and each tre	ansmittai to loreign			
governments, foreign nationals or re	apresentatives the	ereto may be	e made only with prior			
sphrovar of RADC (EMEAM), GATE, N.I.	. 1344U.					
TI SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSOR	ING MILITARY AC				
	Rome All	Rome Air Development Center (EMEAM)				
	Griffis	$5 \text{ AFB NY } 13^{2}$	440			
IS. ASSTRACT	·····					
Li decomination of molling contro	+ foilumo modor :	c circa ca	d the meriobles offecti			
the life of a rolling contact are	dentified A mot	ts given and	n one variables allecti			
surface crack propagation is prese	nted The life to	follure of	f volume elements in the			
viginity of a defect is formulated	iteu. ine ille to	v <sup>if-</sup> of a mid	rodefect has been defi			
The model is characterized by the	nclusion of bulk	metorial n	erometers defect			
characteristics and perematers of (	nonetry strace	lubrication	and surface tonograph			
A statistical comparison for the li	seometry, stress,	Tubi Icación	and surface topograph			
A Statistical expression for the L.	des summert star	orring pout	y is based on the derec			
The formula. The new model inclusion	ides current stand	iera peering	g life prediction			
formulas as a special case. To as:	sist in interprets	tion of the	e model, the stressed			
volume in a Hertzian elliptical str	ress field has oce	en determin	nd from the computed			
contours of equal reversing shear	stress. A stress	analysis ha	as been conducted on th			
stresses near interacting asperitie	es and around a su	urface defea	et (furrow).			
			( <sub>1</sub>			
			<i>[.</i>			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
DD FORM 1473		Upplessi	fied			
	-		rity Classification			
			ALL STRADULL BUILD			

Unclassified

Security Classification				LINK B		LINKC			
19.	. · · ·	KEY WORDS		ROLE	₩T	ROLE	W 7	ROLE	WT
		<u> </u>							
٦.	Colling Element	Bearings			-				
	My LING Macherie		•				•-		
2.	Life Model								
3.	Bearing Failure	Mechanisms							
	•								
		•							
			· · · ·						
						1			
1			•				1		
				1					
1			· · ·				•		
			•						
1			•						
1									
1									
1									
Generation				Unc	lessif	ied			
				Security Clausification					

-