

Subject Index

A

Aluminum alloys

- Alloy 2024-T351, 8, 11
 - analysis, 135
 - center-cracked tension specimen, 117, 118, 121–122
 - crack growth, 152
 - effective K_R -curves and, 87, 90–91
 - fracture analysis, 20–29, 57–59, 63
 - predicted results, 46–51, 60–61
 - instability predictions, 108
 - stress-strain tensile properties, 119–120
- Alloy 7075-T651, 8, 11, 76
 - crack growth, 152–153, 155, 156–157, 164–165
 - effective K_R -curves and, 87, 89–90
 - fracture analysis, 15–20, 54–57, 63
 - predicted results, 42–46
 - stress, maximum, 106
- American Society of Mechanical Engineers Section III, Appendix G, 126
- ASTM Committee E-24 Task Group E24.06.02, 7–8
 - experimental and predictive round robin, 11, 62, 76, 106–108
 - methods used, 10, 34–41
 - participants, 9
 - predictions, 122

ASTM Standards

- E 4, 129, 131, 142
- E 8–82, 12, 129, 131
- E 399, 13, 35, 64, 70, 129, 131, 142, 144, 152
- E 561–81, 39, 40, 84, 85, 99, 142, 144–145
 - laboratory test procedure, 100–104
- E 616, 129, 131, 142
- E 813–81, 117, 120, 129, 130, 131

B

- Baseline compact specimen fracture data, 64–68
- Boundary-correction factor, 82

C

- Compact specimens
 - effective K_R -curves, 87–88, 89, 91–92
 - fracture analysis, 12–13
 - aluminum alloy, 15–19, 23–27, 42–43, 46
 - baseline fracture data, 64–68
 - crack growth, 147–148
 - stainless steel, 29–33, 51
- Compliance, 100
 - methods, 103
- Conversion factor on nominal stress, 82–83
- Crack drive, 108, 109, 110
 - crack growth and, 141–143, 148, 155, 165

- Crack-driving force, 153
 - Crack-driving force curves, 38–39, 81, 85, 87
 - Crack extension
 - defined, 100
 - effective, 25, 26–27, 30–31
 - force, 101–102
 - measurements, 68
 - physical, 17, 18, 25, 26–27, 32
 - Crack-front singularity parameter, 94
 - Crack fronts, fatigue, 16, 23–25
 - Crack growth, 101
 - crack drive and, 141–143, 148, 155, 165
 - criterion, 92–94
 - instability prediction, 139
 - resistance, 144, 153
 - stable, prediction of, 139
 - Crack instability (*see* Instability prediction)
 - Crack length, 103
 - measurement, 102
 - Crack size
 - effective, 100, 102
 - fixed, 124–125
 - Crack tension specimens, fracture analysis
 - center (CCT), 106
 - compact, 106
 - middle, 8, 13
 - aluminum, 19, 28–29, 43, 49
 - crack growth, 148, 160–161
 - effective K_R -curves, 88–90, 92
 - stainless steel, 33–34, 51–54
 - single-edged notched bending (SENB), 106
 - three-hole (THT), 8, 13
 - aluminum, 19–20, 29, 43–46, 49–51
 - effective K_R -curves, 88–90, 92
 - stainless steel, 34, 54
 - stress-intensity factors, 63–64, 65
 - Cracked body behavior, 129
 - Crack-tip-opening-angle criterion, 40
 - Crack-tip-opening-displacement fracture criterion, 40, 46
 - crack drive and, 142–144, 149, 151–153
 - equations, 158–161
 - finite-element analysis with, 92–94
 - plastic zone size and, 164–165
 - plasticity and, 140, 141
 - results, 49, 51, 54, 57, 59, 62–63
- ## D
- Deformation plasticity failure assessment diagram, 9, 34, 36–37, 114
 - analysis of method, 76–78
 - curve generation, 115–116
 - fixed crack size for, 124–125
 - limitations, 124–126
 - results, 49, 51, 57, 62
 - Ductile fracture, theory, 9, 34, 37–38, 54, 79
 - Dugdale model, 9, 34, 38
 - analysis of method, 79–83
 - predicting crack growth, 140, 141–144, 149, 151, 158–161
 - results, 49, 54, 59, 63
- ## E
- Elastic-plastic analysis, 132
 - Elastic-plastic crack-tip field conditions, 99
 - Elastic-plastic deformation, 106
 - EPRI Handbook*, 136
 - Equivalent energy fracture analysis, 9, 34, 35, 49, 70–72
- ## F
- Failure Assessment Diagram (*see* R-6 diagram)
 - Failure loads
 - aluminum alloys, 17, 19–20, 21, 25–29
 - data, 68

determination of, 82–83, 92
effective K_R -curve and, 83–85
method, 146
plastic-zone corrected, 70
predicted, 34–35, 37–62, 94
stainless steel, 30–34
 V_R -curve and, 163–164
Failure prediction, 8
Finite-element analysis, 9, 34, 51, 54,
57–63
with critical crack-front singularity
parameter, 94
with critical crack-tip-opening dis-
placement criterion, 92–94
Flow strength, effective, 82
Fracture analysis methods, 5
Fracture, brittle, 115
Fracture criterion, two-parameter, 9, 34,
36–37
analysis of method, 73–75
 K -curve and, 80
modified, 75–76
results, 49, 57–63
Fracture process, ductile, 115
Fracture toughness
critical, 71
in equivalent energy method, 72
parameters, 36, 37
plane-strain, 7
plastic-zone corrected, 35, 70
Fracture toughness/stress-intensity fac-
tor ratio, 114
Fracturing, slow-stable, 101

I

Instability, 100
Instability prediction, 114
loads, 115, 118–119
using J , J_M -resistance curve ap-
proach, 128
using K_R -curve approach, 99
limitations, 106
methodology, 104–105

J

J , J_M -resistance curve approach, 128
 J -integral, 115, 116
 J_1 - R curve, 120
limits, 125–126

K

K_R -curve, 80–81
estimated, 83–85
instability prediction using, 99
limit-load criteria and, 85–92
 K_R -curve fracture analysis, 34–35, 39–
40
analysis of method, 79–83
results, 49, 54, 59, 63

L

Least-squares procedure, 161–163
Ligament analysis, 89–92
Limit-load criteria
effective K_R -curve and, 85–92
Linear-elastic fracture mechanics
(LEFM), 7, 9, 34, 37–38, 43,
46
behavior, 76
results, 49, 54–57
stress-intensity factor, 116
Linear elastic methodology, modified,
99
Load-against-crack-extension method,
145–146
Load crack extension, 152
Loading procedure, 102

P

Plastic collapse, 115, 117
Plastic deformation analysis, 100
Plastic Handbook, 115
Plastic solutions, fully, 126
Plastic zone, 100
corrected stress-intensity factor ap-
proach, 69–70

Plastic zone (continued)
 plasticity and, 140
 size, 149, 158–161, 164–165
 Plasticity, 140–141
 Pressurized water reactor, cracked cylinder, 122–123

R

R-6 diagram, 36–37, 76–78
 failure assessment approach, 115
 R-curve, 102, 104
 development, 101, 106
 methodology, 100, 105

S

Steel, stainless
 Type A533B, 76, 121, 124
 Type HY 130, 76
 Type 304, 8, 11
 compact specimens, 29–33, 51
 effective K_R -curve and, 85–87, 91–92
 fracture analysis, 59–62, 63, 66–67

tension specimens, 29, 33–34, 51–54

Stress, nominal, 82
 Stress-intensity factor/fracture toughness ratio, 114
 Stress-intensity factors
 critical, 68–69
 plasticity-corrected, 100
 plastic-zone corrected, 69–70
 three-hole-crack tension specimens, 63–64, 65
 Stress/net section plastic collapse stress ratio, 114
 Structural failure, prediction, 7

T

Tearing modulus methodology, 105
 Toughness, assessing, 7

V

V_R -curve method, 139

Y

Yield solution, small-scale, 164–165