EXPERIMENTAL VALIDATION OF THE ENHANCED BEAM-THEORY MODEL OF THE MIXED-MODE BENDING TEST
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Abstract. We present the results of an experimental campaign on a set of specimens manufactured from a typical carbon/epoxy unidirectional laminate. Preliminary tests are performed to evaluate the elastic properties of the base laminate. Then, double cantilever beam (DCB) and end-notched flexure (ENF) tests are conducted to assess the delamination toughness in pure fracture modes I and II, respectively, and evaluate the elastic interface constants. Afterwards, mixed-mode bending (MMB) tests are carried out with three values of the lever-arm length. The outcomes of the preliminary and pure fracture mode tests are used as an input to a previously developed enhanced beam theory (EBT) model of the MMB test. Lastly, theoretical predictions and experimental results are compared.
1 INTRODUCTION

Composite materials are subject to a variety of damage phenomena at both the microscopic and macroscopic scales. Analysis of delamination failure is usually conducted through energetic principles derived in the context of Fracture Mechanics [1]. Several testing procedures are used to measure delamination toughness of composite laminates [2]. For pure fracture modes I and II, the double cantilever beam (DCB) [3] and end-notched flexure (ENF) [4] tests are used, respectively. For I/II mixed-mode fracture, the mixed-mode bending (MMB) test has been standardised by ASTM for unidirectional laminates. Assuming linear behaviour, the MMB test can be considered as the superposition of the DCB and ENF tests [5].

We have developed an enhanced beam theory (EBT) model of the MMB test, whereby the specimen is considered as an assemblage of two identical sublaminates, modelled as laminated Timoshenko beams. The sublaminates are partly connected by a linearly elastic–brittle interface, transmitting both normal and shear stresses. In previous works, an explicit solution of this problem – with analytical expressions for the specimen compliance, energy release rate, and mode mixity – has been obtained. This solution yields, as special cases, the solutions for the DCB and ENF tests [6, 7]. Based on the latter, an experimental compliance calibration strategy has been proposed to evaluate the constants of the elastic interface [8]. Recently, the model has been applied to predict also the response of the MMB test under cyclic loads by introducing a fracture mode-dependent fatigue growth law [9].

Here, we present the results of an experimental campaign on a set of carbon/epoxy unidirectional laminated specimens. Preliminary tests are performed to evaluate the elastic properties of the base laminate. Then, DCB and ENF tests are conducted to assess the delamination toughness in pure fracture modes I and II, respectively, and evaluate the elastic interface constants. Afterwards, MMB tests are carried out with three values of the lever-arm length. The outcomes of the preliminary and pure fracture mode tests are used as an input to the EBT model of the MMB test. Lastly, theoretical predictions and experimental results are compared.

2 ENHANCED BEAM THEORY MODEL OF THE MMB TEST

2.1 Mechanical model

In the MMB test, a laminated specimen with a delamination of length $a$ is simply supported and loaded through a rigid lever (Fig. 1a). We denote with $L = 2t$, $B$, and $H$ the length, width, and thickness of the specimen, respectively. The delamination divides the specimen into two sublaminates, each of thickness $h = H/2$. The load applied by the testing machine, $P$, is transferred to the specimen as a combination of an upward load, $P_u$, and a downward load, $P_d$, respectively applied at the delaminated end and mid-span cross sections. The lever-arm length, $c$, can be adjusted to vary the intensities of $P_u$ and $P_d$, thus imposing a desired ratio, $G_I/G_{II}$, of the energy release rates associated to fracture modes I and II. Global reference $x$- and $z$-axes are aligned with the specimen longitudinal and transverse directions, respectively.

In the enhanced beam theory model [6, 7], the specimen is regarded as an assemblage of sublaminates. Accordingly, let $A_1$, $C_1$, and $D_1$ be the sublamine extensional, shear, and bending stiffnesses, respectively [10]. For unidirectional laminated specimens, $A_1 = E_xh$, $C_1 = 5G_{zx}h/6$, and $D_1 = E_xh^3/12$, where $E_x$ and $G_{zx}$ are the longitudinal Young’s modulus and transverse shear modulus, respectively. The sublaminates are partly connected by an elastic–brittle interface. Let $k_z$ and $k_x$ be the elastic constants of the distributed springs, respectively acting along the normal and tangential directions with respect to the interface plane (Fig. 1b). The mathematical formulation of the problem and its detailed solution are available in the cited references [6, 7]. Here, only the final useful expressions are recalled.
2.2 Compliance

For linearly elastic load-deflection response, the compliance of a test specimen is defined as $C = \delta/P$, where $P$ is the applied load and $\delta$ is the displacement of the load application point [2]. The compliance of the MMB test specimen turns out to be

$$C_{\text{MMB}} = \left(\frac{3c - x}{4\ell}\right)^2 C_{\text{DCB}} + \left(\frac{c + x}{\ell}\right)^2 C_{\text{ENF}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

where, according to our model,

$$C_{\text{DCB}} = \frac{2a^3}{3BD_i} + \frac{2a}{BC_i} + \frac{2}{\lambda_1\lambda_2 BD_i} \left[ (\hat{\lambda}_1 + \hat{\lambda}_2) a^2 + 2a + \frac{1}{\lambda_1} + \frac{1}{\lambda_2} \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)$$

and
\[ C_{\text{ENF}} = \frac{1}{24B} \frac{A_h h^2}{A_h h^2 + 4D_i} \left( \frac{a^3}{D_i} + \frac{8\ell^3}{A_h h^2} \right) + \frac{\ell}{4BC_i} + \frac{1}{8BD_i} \frac{A_h h^2}{A_h h^2 + 4D_i} \lambda_i a^2 + a + 2\ell - 2 \frac{4a}{\lambda_i} \exp \lambda_i (\ell - a) \]  

(3)

are the compliances of the DCB and ENF test specimens, respectively [7]. Furthermore,

\[ \lambda_1 = \sqrt{\frac{k_z}{C_i} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{2 C_i^2}{k_z D_i}} \right)}, \quad \lambda_2 = \sqrt{\frac{k_z}{C_i} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{2 C_i^2}{k_z D_i}} \right)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_5 = \sqrt{2k_z \left( \frac{1}{A_i} + \frac{h^2}{4D_i} \right)} \]  

(4)

are the roots of the characteristic equations of the governing differential problem [6].

Eqs. (2) and (3) show that both \( C_{\text{DCB}} \) and \( C_{\text{ENF}} \) are the sums of three contributions, respectively depending on the sublaminate bending stiffness (Euler-Bernoulli beam theory), the transverse shear deformability (Timoshenko’s beam theory), and the elastic interface. Both \( C_{\text{DCB}} \) and \( C_{\text{ENF}} \) are expressed by cubic polynomials of the delamination length, \( a \), except for an exponential term (negligible in most cases) appearing in the expressions for \( C_{\text{ENF}} \). Thus, the EBT model provides a rationale for some semi-empirical relationships of the literature [11]. Furthermore, since \( C_{\text{DCB}} \) depends on \( k_z \) (through \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \)) and \( C_{\text{ENF}} \) depends on \( k_x \) (through \( \lambda_5 \)), Eqs. (2) and (3) offer a basis to evaluate the elastic interface constants from experimental results of DCB and ENF tests [8].

### 2.3 Energy release rate

Under I/II mixed-mode fracture conditions, the energy release rate can be written as \( G = G_I + G_{II} \), where \( G_I \) and \( G_{II} \) are the contributions related to fracture modes I and II, respectively. For the MMB test specimen,

\[ G_I = \frac{P_I^2}{2B} \frac{dC_{\text{DCB}}}{da} \quad \text{and} \quad G_{II} = \frac{P_{II}^2}{2B} \frac{dC_{\text{ENF}}}{da}, \]  

(5)

where

\[ P_I = \frac{3c - \ell}{4\ell} P \quad \text{and} \quad P_{II} = \frac{c + \ell}{\ell} P \]  

(6)

are the loads responsible for fracture modes I and II, respectively. By substituting Eqs. (2) and (3) into (5), we obtain

\[ G_I = \frac{P_I^2}{B^2 D_i} (a + \chi_i h)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad G_{II} = \frac{P_{II}^2}{16B^2 D_i} \frac{A_h h^2}{A_h h^2 + 4D_i} (a + \chi_{II} h)^2, \]  

(7)

where

\[ \chi_i = \frac{1}{h} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_1} + \frac{1}{\lambda_2} \right) = \frac{1}{h} \sqrt{\frac{D_i}{C_i} + \frac{2D_i}{k_z}} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_{II} = \frac{1}{h} \frac{1}{\lambda_5} = \frac{1}{h} \sqrt{2k_z \left( \frac{1}{A_i} + \frac{h^2}{4D_i} \right)} \]  

(8)

are crack length correction parameters [7]. Eqs. (8) can be regarded as a generalisation for multidirectional laminates of the formulas given by the ASTM standard [5] for unidirectional laminated specimens.
2.4 Mode mixity

To characterise the relative contributions of fracture modes I and II, we introduce the mode-mixity angle,

\[ \psi = \arctan \frac{G_{II}}{G_{I}}. \]  

(9)

For the MMB test specimen, by substituting Eqs. (6) and (7) into (9), we obtain

\[ \psi = \arctan \frac{1}{\beta \frac{3c - \ell}{c + \ell} \sqrt{1 + 4D_{II}/(A_h h^2)}}, \]  

(10)

where

\[ \beta = \frac{a + \chi h}{a + \chi h} = \frac{a + 1/\lambda_s + 1/\lambda_s}{a + 1/\lambda_s}. \]  

(11)

Eq. (10) can be solved to obtain the lever-arm length yielding a desired mode mixity,

\[ c = \frac{\beta \sqrt{1 + 4D_{II}/(A_h h^2)} \tan \psi + 1}{3\beta \sqrt{1 + 4D_{II}/(A_h h^2)} \tan \psi - 1}. \]  

(12)

3 EXPERIMENTAL TESTS

To validate the developed theoretical model, we have conducted an experimental campaign on unidirectional laminated specimens obtained from a typical carbon fibre/epoxy matrix composite laminate. First, the elastic properties of the base laminate have been determined through three-point bending tests on specimens with no delamination. By following a procedure similar to that proposed in [12], the following average values have been obtained: longitudinal Young’s modulus \( E_x = 117.7 \) GPa, transverse shear modulus \( G_{xz} = 1.42 \) GPa. Then, various delamination toughness tests have been conducted on a set of 7 delaminated specimens. The overall length of each specimen was 250 mm. This has allowed each specimen to be tested under several testing configurations, e.g. first a DCB test, until the delamination had propagated to a certain length, and then another configuration, e.g. ENF or MMB tests. This is in line with standard testing procedures in fracture modes I and II [3, 4]. Table 1 shows the cross-section sizes and the performed tests of each specimen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen #</th>
<th>Width ( B ) (mm)</th>
<th>Height ( H ) (mm)</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>MMB, ENF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>MMB, ENF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>DCB, MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>DCB, MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>DCB, MMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>DCB, MMB, ENF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>DCB, MMB, ENF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>25.16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Geometry of tested specimens.
Figures 2a and 2b show typical load, $P$, vs. displacement, $\delta$, curves obtained from the DCB and ENF tests, respectively. In order to apply the experimental compliance calibration strategy to evaluate the elastic interface constants, $k_x$ and $k_z$, it is necessary to measure the values of the specimen compliances, $C_{\text{DCB}}$ and $C_{\text{ENF}}$, at different values of delamination length, $a$ [8]. In DCB tests, crack propagation is stable, so that this objective can be achieved simply by correlating the measured values of $P$ and $\delta$ during the crack propagation stage with the corresponding values of $a$. In ENF tests, since crack propagation is generally unstable (for $a < 0.7 \ell$) [13], a different strategy has to be used. In this study, we have conducted the ENF tests by first loading and unloading the specimens within the elastic range of behaviour, i.e. without achieving crack propagation, at several values of the delamination length. The main outcomes of the DCB and ENF tests are summarised in Table 2.

For comparison, the theoretical predictions of the EBT model for the performed tests are shown with dashed black lines on the same plots in figure 2. The curves in the linearly elastic range of behaviour are obtained from the model by assuming the average values of $k_x$ and $k_z$. The curves in the crack propagation stage correspond to the fulfilment of the pure mode I and mode II propagation criteria, $G = G_I = G_{lc}$ and $G = G_{II} = G_{lc}$, respectively, with the average delamination toughness values obtained from the tests (Table 2).

![Figure 2: Typical load-displacement curves from (a) DCB and (b) ENF tests.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen #</th>
<th>Normal spring constant $k_z$ (N/mm$^3$)</th>
<th>Mode I delamination toughness $G_{lc}$ (N/m)</th>
<th>Tangential spring constant $k_x$ (N/mm$^3$)</th>
<th>Mode II delamination toughness $G_{lc}$ (N/m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.297×10$^3$</td>
<td>1516.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.287×10$^3$</td>
<td>1567.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.046×10$^4$</td>
<td>604.6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.919×10$^2$</td>
<td>447.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.885×10$^3$</td>
<td>560.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.632×10$^3$</td>
<td>655.8</td>
<td>3.340×10$^3$</td>
<td>1604.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.455×10$^5$</td>
<td>693.6</td>
<td>3.441×10$^3$</td>
<td>1170.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.750×10$^3$</td>
<td>592.2</td>
<td>3.340×10$^3$</td>
<td>1464.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Results of DCB and ENF tests.
Figure 3 shows the load vs. displacement curves obtained from the MMB tests. For comparison, the theoretical predictions of the EBT model are shown with dashed black lines on the same plots. The curves in the linearly elastic range of behaviour are obtained from the model by assuming average values of $k_x$ and $k_z$. The curves in the crack propagation stage are obtained by assuming the following elliptical mixed-mode crack-growth criterion [9]:

$$
\left(\frac{G_I}{G_{lc}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{G_{II}}{G_{Iic}}\right)^2 = 1.
$$

(13)

The latter can be shown to be equivalent to consider $G = G_c$ with the following definition of fracture mode-dependent delamination toughness:

$$
G_c(\psi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\cos^4\psi + \sin^4\psi}}.
$$

(14)

Figure 3: Load-displacement curves from MMB tests with lever-arm length (a) $c = 95$ mm, (b) $c = 83$ mm, and (c) $c = 58$ mm.
Figure 4a shows the values of $G_I$ vs. $G_{II}$ at the onset of delamination growth in the MMB tests, as computed through Eqs. (7) with (6) and (8). The dashed black line represents the corresponding values as computed through the mixed-mode crack-growth criterion Eq. (13). Figure 4b shows the total $G$ at the onset of delamination growth as a function of the mode-mixity angle, $\psi$, as computed from Eq. (9). For comparison, the dashed black line represents the critical energy release rate as given by Eq. (14).

![Figure 4: Critical energy release rate at the onset of delamination growth in MMB tests: (a) mode I vs. mode II contributions; (b) total energy release rate vs. mode-mixity angle.](image)

4 CONCLUSIONS

We have presented the results of an experimental campaign aiming at validating a previously developed analytical solution for an enhanced beam theory model of the MMB test specimen. Preliminary tests have been performed to evaluate the elastic properties of the base material consisting of a typical carbon/epoxy unidirectional laminate. Then, DCB and ENF test have been conducted to assess the delamination toughness in pure fracture modes I and II, respectively. Besides, an experimental compliance calibration procedure has been applied to evaluate the elastic interface constants. Lastly, MMB tests have been conducted with three values of the lever-arm length. Based on the preliminary and pure fracture mode test results, predictions have been made for the MMB tests by using the enhanced beam theory model. A good agreement between the theoretical predictions and experimental results has been obtained.
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