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ABSTRACT

The fracture dynamic and crack arrest responses of modified compact tension specimen (M-CT) machined from Homalite-100 and polycarbonate sheets were studied by dynamic photoelasticity, dynamic finite element analysis and streaking photography. In contrast to the results of a previous study involving a mild steel M-CT specimen, substantial dynamic effects were observed during crack propagation in the Homalite-100 and polycarbonate M-CT specimens. Although the crack arrest toughnesses, $K_{IA}$, were within 10 percent of the corresponding static stress intensity factor at crack arrest, their values were about 80 percent and 50 percent of the corresponding fracture toughness, $K_{IC}$, of Homalite-100 and polycarbonate, respectively.

INTRODUCTION

In a recent paper, two of the authors used a dynamic finite element code to compute the dynamic fracture toughness of a fracturing transverse wedge-loaded, modified compact tension (M-CT) specimen machined from AISI 1018 steel [1]. The dynamic finite element code, HONDO [2], was used in its "generation phase" [3] where the crack was driven by the experimentally determined crack motion and the associated dynamic fracture toughness, $K_{ID}$, was calculated. This singular result involving a very ductile material with a notched brittle weld starter crack [4], lead to the conclusion that little difference between the dynamic and static stress intensity factors existed in the particular M-CT specimen analyzed. This result was not only in disagreement with all previously obtained results for different specimen geometries [5] but also contradicted the analytical-experimental results obtained by Hahn et al. [6] for a similar M-CT specimens but with different crack starter. Although a valid plane strain fracture toughness, $K_{IC}$, for the mild steel M-CT specimen analyzed in Reference [2] was not available, the
calculated crack arrest stress intensity factor, $K_{IA}$, of approximately 88 MPa$\sqrt{m}$ (80 ksi $\sqrt{in}$) would have been considerably lower than such fracture toughness and was not consistent with the photoelastic results obtained for Homalite-100 M-CT specimens by T. Kobayashi et al. [7] where $K_{IA}$ was nearly equal to the $K_{IC} = 445$ KPa$\sqrt{m}$ (405 psi $\sqrt{in}$).

Since similar differences between $K_{IC}$ and $K_{IA}$ were observed in dynamic tear (DT) specimens machined from the relatively brittle Homalite-100 and the ductile polycarbonate plates [8,9], it is thought that the influence of ductility could be delineated if comparative fracture dynamic studies were conducted on M-CT specimens machined from Homalite-100 and polycarbonate plates. As a result, a combined experimental-numerical analyses of M-CT specimens machined from Homalite-100 and polycarbonate were conducted and reported in this paper.

The M-CT specimens, as shown in the legend of Figure 1, are full-size models of the dynamic fracture specimen being investigated in a current ASTM E24.03.04 Subcommittee on Dynamic Testing, Dynamic Initiation-Crack Arrest Task Group [10]. The experimental and numerical procedures used in this study were the now popular dynamic photoelasticity [7,8,9] and the dynamic finite element method [8,9] used in its generation phase [3], respectively. In three experiments, crack velocity measurements, which were in the past obtained by discrete crack length measurements and the timing marks from a Lite-Mike, were also obtained from continuous crack length recording using a streaking camera.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES
Dynamic Photoelasticity

The 16-spark gap Cranz-Schardin camera and the associated dynamic photoelasticity system, which was originally developed by Riley and Daily [11], has
been discussed in many previous publications and thus will not be repeated here. Figure 2 shows two typical dynamic photoelastic patterns surrounding a running crack tip in a polycarbonate M-CT specimen. The two polycarbonate M-CT specimens of 6.4 mm (1/4 in.) thickness, which were analyzed by dynamic photoelasticity, were annealed at 160°C overnight to eliminate residual stresses. A starter crack of approximately 2.5 mm (1/4 in.) length was sawed and chiseled from the tip of the machined notch. The blunt starter crack initiated crack propagation at a relatively high crack initiation fracture toughness, $K_{IC}$, and thus propagated the crack nearly through the entire width of the specimen. The average mechanical and optical properties used in photoelastic data reduction as well as in dynamic finite element analyses are identical to those listed in Reference [9].

Errors in $K_{ID}$ Determination

When dynamic photoelasticity is used for fracture dynamic analysis, the transient dynamic isochromatic lobes surrounding the running crack tip must be related to an instantaneous dynamic stress intensity factor. Following the original suggestion by Irwin [12], normally this conversion is made by using either one, two [13,14] or multiple terms [15,16] in the static crack-tip stresses of Williams eigenfunction [17].

Errors involved in using the above static near-field state of stress were later assessed by Kobayashi and Mall [18] who used the dynamic counterpart [19] of Williams stress function to show that overestimations of 10 percent or more in dynamic stress intensity factor were possible at a relative slow crack velocity, $\dot{a}$, of 15 percent of the dilatational wave velocity, i.e. $0.15c_1$, and that such error increased with the use of larger dynamic isochromatic lobes. Reference [18] also showed that stress waves propagating in the vicinity of the crack tip could distort the dynamic isochromatic lobes and could induce additional errors in
dynamic stress intensity factor determination. Such stress waves could be a visible rectangular pulse as recorded photoelastically by Wade and Kobayashi [20] or an innocuous ramp pulse which is about to impact the propagating crack tip.

As a result of possible compounded errors involved in the use of static stress field to characterize a dynamic phenomena and from the not-so-apparent stress wave interactions with the propagating crack tip, the authors have used the smallest visible isochromatic lobe, preferably within 2.5 mm (0.1 in.) distance from the moving crack tip, to extract the dynamic stress intensity factor at higher crack velocities. Such size restriction on the permissible isochromatic lobe unfortunately taxes the experimental accuracies in determining the size of the isochromatic lobe as well as the instantaneous location of the crack tip. This limited resolution in $K_{ID}$ determination via dynamic photoelasticity, which is estimated to be at the best ±5 percent, is akin to the corresponding limitation in dynamic finite element analysis when used for dynamic fracture analysis.

Crack Velocity Measurements

In a previous paper [18], the authors discussed the experimental errors involved in measuring the crack tip motion and the need to smooth the raw data to confine the experimental scatter in the $K_{ID}$ versus $a$ relation of Reference [21]. Recent numerical experimentation [22] using an upgraded fracture mechanics subroutine in a dynamic finite element code showed that slight perturbations in the crack tip motion, which resulted in mild oscillations in the crack tip velocities, could generate significant oscillations in the calculated $K_{ID}$.

In order to determine the existence or lack of existence of crack velocity variation during dynamic crack propagation, crack velocities were measured in two Homalite-100 (thickness 9.5 mm) and one polycarbonate M-CT specimens (thickness 6.4 mm) using a Beckman Whitely Model 318 streaking camera.
Figure 3 shows schematically the experimental setup as well as a typical streaking photograph of a fracturing polycarbonate M-CT specimen. Simultaneous dynamic photoelastic recording was not possible because the stray light from the light source for the streaking camera interfered with the Crane-Shardin camera system. The apparent high initial crack velocity from the streaking photograph of Figure 3 is due to the lack of an adequate pre-triggering system for the light source. The estimated crack velocity at the onset of rapid crack propagation was thus extrapolated from the steady state crack velocity as marked in the streaking photography of Figure 3.

Figures 4 and 5 show typical crack velocity relations generated from the crack position versus time relations obtained by the streaking photographs. The crack velocities in the two Homalite-100 and one polycarbonate M-CT specimens exhibited little change during much of the crack propagation.

DYNAMIC FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS

The dynamic finite element code which was initially [2] introduced for dynamic fracture analysis in the "generation mode" has undergone substantial changes in the past four years. An improved crack tip release mechanism for rapid crack propagation has been developed and an updated plane stress algorithm for computing dissipation energy at the crack tip has been incorporated. After many numerical experimentations, a linearly varying crack tip nodal release force was found to adequately simulate a more gradual transition of the crack tip movement to its adjacent node [23]. An additional improvement made for this study is an iteration algorithm during each built-in time increment of HONDO [2] to match the applied nodal force with the nodal force calculated from the incremental change in nodal velocity in this explicit dynamic finite element code. Typically, satisfactory convergence of this iteration scheme, as shown
in Figure 6, is obtained on the average within three iterations and thus the computational efficiency of HONDO is still preserved with the added ability to prescribe known nodal force at each time increment.

The dynamic finite element code with the updated fracture mechanic package was used in its generation mode to calculate the dynamic fracture toughness, $K_{ID}$. Figure 1 shows a typical finite element breakdown of a M-CT specimen used in this study. The prescribed crack tip motions used in these series of generation calculations were obtained either from the streaking photographs of two Homalite-100 and one polycarbonate M-CT specimens or from the discrete crack tip recordings from the sixteen photographs of two polycarbonate M-CT specimens. Also the past practice [8,9] of using dynamic elastic modulus in stress wave propagation was discarded and the static elastic modulus was used throughout all static and dynamic numerical analyses. This procedure follows the conclusion of Schirrer [24] who concluded that the variations in elastic modulus did not affect the stress distribution appreciably but did change the strain distribution around the propagating crack tip. Static mechanical properties of Homalite-100 and polycarbonate specimens were obtained from References [8,9], respectively.

RESULTS

The dynamic fracture toughness, $K_{ID}$, during crack propagation and arrest in one Homalite-100 and one polycarbonate M-CT specimen are shown in Figures 4 and 5, respectively. $K_{ID}$ results in these figures were generated numerically from the crack tip motion obtained from streaking photography. Also shown in these two figures are the corresponding static stress intensity factors obtained by static finite element analysis. The static $K_I$ results differ with those reported in Reference [1], due to difference in modelling the
applied load in the M-CT specimen, and is in agreement with the corresponding results obtained from compliance calibration [10]. $K_{ID}$ in Homalite-100 and polycarbonate M-CT specimens, both precipitously drop and continue to remain at nearly constant $K_{ID}$ thereafter. The higher static $K_I$ with respect to the dynamic $K_{ID}$ is an indication that much of the released energy during crack propagation in these specimens is dissipated through kinetic energy without being returned to the crack tip for dissipation through fracture energy.

The results of the Homalite-100 M-CT specimen in Figure 4 is in qualitative agreement with the dynamic photoelastic results obtained for a slightly larger Homalite-100 M-CT specimen (of 12.7 mm thickness) in Reference [21]. The low crack arrest toughness, $K_{IA} \approx 0.25 \text{ MPa}\sqrt{\text{m}}$ (227 psi\(\sqrt{\text{in}}\)) was approximately equal to the minimum dynamic fracture toughness $K_{IM}$ in Figure 13 of Reference [8] and is 55 percent of the fracture toughness, $K_{IC} \approx 0.42 \text{ MPa}\sqrt{\text{m}}$ (380 psi\(\sqrt{\text{in}}\)). The crack arrest stress intensity factor of $K_{IA} \approx 1.65 \text{ MPa}\sqrt{\text{m}}$ (1500 ksi\(\sqrt{\text{in}}\)) for the polycarbonate M-CT specimen in Figure 5 is nearly one half of the pop-in fracture toughness of $K_{IC} = 3.4 \text{ MPa}\sqrt{\text{m}}$ (3.1 ksi\(\sqrt{\text{in}}\)).

Figures 7 and 8 show the $K_{ID}$ versus $a$ relations obtained by dynamic photoelasticity for two polycarbonate M-CT specimens. Also shown are the $K_{ID}$ generated numerically using the measured crack velocities shown in Figure 9. As discussed in Reference [22], slight irregularities in crack velocity variations with crack extension contributed to the modest differences in computed and experimentally determined dynamic fracture toughness. Considering the idealized elasto-dynamic model used in the dynamic finite element analysis, the agreements between the experimental and numerical results are good.
DISCUSSIONS

The differences between the static and the dynamic stress intensity factors, as shown in Figures 4, 5, 7 and 8 are substantial and do not exhibit the quasi-static response observed in the AISI 1018 M-CT specimen of Reference [1]. The Homalite-100 M-CT specimens in Reference [7] and in this paper, the polycarbonate M-CT specimens of this paper and A533B M-CT specimens of Reference [6] all exhibit a characteristic decrease in \( K_{ID} \) followed by a relatively stationary \( K_{ID} \) for almost 3/4 of the crack extension prior to crack arrest. The \( K_{ID} \) in the mild steel specimen of Reference [1], on the other hand decreased nearly monotonically and closely followed the corresponding static stress intensity factor. This discrepancy between the bulk \( K_{ID} \) data and the singular data of Reference [1] could be attributed in part to the highly localized brittle weld starter crack used in the latter. The artificially low \( K_{IQ} \), possibly lower than the \( K_{IC} \) of mild steel, of brittle weld crack starter initiated crack propagation under unrealistic low static fracture toughness and was followed by a quasi-static crack propagation. Since the purpose of developing this M-CT specimen is for dynamic testing [10], it can be concluded that the AISI-1018 M-CT specimen with a brittle weld starter crack did not fulfill its intended use.

Figure 10 shows the \( K_{ID} \) versus \( \dot{\alpha} \) relation obtained from the results of Figures 5, 7 and 8. Superposed on this figure is the averaged \( K_{ID} \) versus \( \dot{\alpha} \) relation obtained from polycarbonate dynamic tear (DT) specimens [9]. Not only did the \( K_{ID} \) versus \( \dot{\alpha} \) relation for the M-CT specimen shift slightly towards the lower \( \dot{\alpha} \) but appears to reach a lower maximum crack velocity. The latter result is consistent with the corresponding results for Homalite-100 specimens
[5]. On the other hand, the $K_{ID}$ versus $\alpha$ relation, which was obtained from Figure 4 for the Homalite-100 M-CT specimen, coincided with that for Homalite-100 DT specimens [8]. The slight difference in $K_{ID}$ versus $\alpha$ relations in polycarbonate fracture specimens is in agreement with the results of Kalthoff et al. [25], which are also verified numerically by Hodulak et al. [26].

Figures 11 and 12 show the computed energy partition in a fracturing Homalite-100 and polycarbonate M-CT specimens, respectively. The substantial kinetic energy term in the polycarbonate M-CT specimen in contrast to that in the Homalite-100 specimen and is probably due to the blunt starter crack used in the former. The computed energy for these specimens in Figures 11 and 12 as well as other specimens balance to within 5 percent of total input energy as an indication of the numerical accuracy which can be expected in these analyses.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The $K_{ID}$ variations with crack propagation in the limited number of Homalite-100 and polycarbonate M-CT specimens analyzed are consistent with similar findings by others [6-9].

2. The significant difference in dynamic responses between the mild-steel M-CT specimen with brittle weld starter crack and the Homalite-100 and polycarbonate M-CT specimens requires further investigation.

3. The shift between the $K_{ID}$ versus $\alpha$ relations between Homalite-100 M-CT specimens and DT specimens as well as in polycarbonate specimens could be another indication of the geometry and size dependence of the $K_{ID}$ versus $\alpha$ relation.
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FIGURE 1. TYPICALFINITE ELEMENT BREAKDOWN OF M-CT SPECIMEN.
FIGURE 2. TYPICAL DYNAMIC PHOTOELASTIC FRINGES IN A FRACTURING POLYCARBONATE M-CT SPECIMEN, J280678.
FIGURE 3. STREAKING PHOTOGRAPH OF A PROPAGATING CRACK TIP IN A POLYCARBONATE M-CT SPECIMEN (THICKNESS 6.4mm).
FIGURE 4. CRACK VELOCITY AND STRESS INTENSITY FACTORS OF A FRACTURING HOMALITE-100 M-CT SPECIMEN. S100277 (PRECRAKED)
$K_{1Q} = 2.53 \text{ MPa} \sqrt{\text{m}}$

**Figure 5.** Dynamic fracture toughness and crack velocity of a fracturing polycarbonate M-CT specimen. S100377 (precracked).
FIGURE 6. TYPICAL COMPUTED NODAL FORCE RELEASED.

HOMALITE - 100 M-CT SPECIMEN S100277

POLYCARBONATE M-CT SPECIMEN J020878
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Figure 7. Stress Intensity Factors of a Fracturing Poly-carbonate M-CT Specimen, J-280678.
Figure 8. Stress intensity factors of a fracturing poly-carbonate M-CT specimen, J-020878.
FIGURE 9. CRACK VELOCITIES IN TWO FRACTURING POLYCARBONITE M-CT SPECIMENS.
FIGURE 10. DYNAMIC FRACTURE TOUGHNESS VERSUS CRACK VELOCITY RELATION FOR POLYCARBONATE SPECIMEN.
FIGURE II. ENERGY OF A FRACTURING HOMALITE - 100 M - CT SPECIMEN, S100277.
FIGURE 12. ENERGY OF A FRACTURING POLYCARBONATE M-CT SPECIMEN, J-020878.
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The fracture dynamic and crack arrest responses of modified compact tension specimen (M-CT) machined from Homalite-100 and polycarbonate sheets were studied by dynamic photoelasticity, dynamic finite element analysis and streaking photography. In contrast to the results of a previous study involving a mild steel M-CT specimen, substantial dynamic effects were observed during crack propagation in the Homalite-100 and polycarbonate M-CT specimens. Although the crack arrest toughnesses, \( K_i \), were within...
10 percent of the corresponding static stress intensity factor at crack arrest, their values were about 80 percent and 50 percent of the corresponding fracture toughness, $K_{IC}$, of Homalite-100 and polycarbonate, respectively.