This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Acanfora, M.; Gallo, P.; Razavi, S. M.J.; Ayatollahi, M. R.; Berto, F.

Numerical Evaluation of T-stress under Mixed Mode Loading Through the Use of Coarse Meshes

Published in:
Physical Mesomechanics

DOI:
[10.1134/S1029959918020054](https://doi.org/10.1134/S1029959918020054)

Published: 01/03/2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Published under the following license:
CC BY-NC-ND

Please cite the original version:
Acanfora, M., Gallo, P., Razavi, S. M. J., Ayatollahi, M. R., & Berto, F. (2018). Numerical Evaluation of T-stress under Mixed Mode Loading Through the Use of Coarse Meshes. *Physical Mesomechanics*, 21(2), 124-134. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1029959918020054>

Numerical evaluation of T-stress under mixed mode loading through the use of coarse meshes

M. Acanfora^a, P. Gallo^{a,*}, S.M.J. Razavi^b, M.R. Ayatollahi^c, F. Berto^{b*}

^a Aalto University, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Marine Technology, Puumiehenkuja 5A, 02150 Espoo, Finland.

^b Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Richard Birkelands vei 2b, 7491, Trondheim, Norway.

^c Department of Mechanical Engineering, Iran University of Science and Technology, Narmak, 16846, Tehran, Iran.

*Corresponding author: filippo.berto@ntnu.no

Abstract

The present paper investigates the employment of coarse meshes in evaluating the T-stress with the displacement method. Several Finite Element analyses have been carried out with different mesh refinements and accuracies. Mode I and mixed mode I/II loadings have been considered in finite element analyses. Under mode I loading, SEN and DEN geometries have been considered, while plate with central crack has been considered for mixed mode loading condition. The analyses are compared with the results by the well known stress based approach, and showed that the displacement method permits the evaluation of the T-stress with the employment of coarse meshes. By the way, several precautions must be taken when dealing with coarse and very coarse meshes, as underlined in the main conclusions.

1. Introduction

Failure of cracked components is governed by the stresses in the vicinity of the crack tip. Under small scale-yielding condition, single parameter is used to characterize the crack-tip stress and as fracture criterion. McClintock [1] clearly showed that a single parameter might not suffice to characterize the near-crack tip states under large scale yielding condition, when the stress triaxiality level is low. Example is given when considering non-hardening material under fully plastic condition, since the near-tip fields depend on the configuration. In such cases, several researchers have tried to develop new approaches, with the introduction of a second parameter to characterize the crack-tip condition [2–8]. The importance of the two-parameter approaches in linear elastic fracture mechanics analysis is increasingly being recognized for fracture assessments in engineering applications. One of such theories is the T-stress approach, in which the elastic T-stress [9] is taken into account in the description of the near-tip field. Analytical and experimental studies have shown that T-stress can be used as a measure of constraint for contained yielding, see for example [10] and [11]. Despite its significance, few methods are available for calculating T-stress in case of mixed mode loading. Those methods that do exist are either restricted to simple geometries or need complex numerical analysis. An extensive review of analytical methods used for evaluating the T-stress is reported by Sherry et al. [12], while the integral equation method for multiple cracks with T-stress has been addressed by Chen [13].

Larsson and Carlsson [14] computed T-stress as the average difference between the σ_x for a specimen and the corresponding value obtained from the Boundary Layer (BL) approach where σ_x was obtained from the elastic–plastic finite element method. This analysis was carried out for Mode I only.

Leevers and Radon [15] used a variational technique based on the theorem of minimum potential energy to estimate the T-stress for mode I. A similar approach was previously applied by [16] for mixed mode I and II. Knesl [17] also attempted to determine the T-stress, according to the same

technique in mode I. He used special types of element called crack-tip hybrid elements developed through a Hellinger-Reissner principle.

Using the properties of path independent integrals, Cardew et al. [18] and later Kfoury [19], suggested a method to obtain the T-stress under mode I loading. The method is based on an unpublished theorem proposed by Eshelby. Fett [20] proposed a closed form approximation for T for a mode I rectangular cracked specimen under tension and bending. Maleski et al. [21] has determined a modified stress difference method to calculate the T-stress, with extrapolation method, for Mode I.

Limited number of contributions regard instead the mixed mode. Path independent integrals were employed by Olsen [22] and Sladek et al. [23], to compute the T-stress for mixed mode loading using the boundary element technique. Seed and Nowell [24], to determine T for mixed modes I and II, represented a crack as a continuous distribution of edge dislocations. Distributed dislocation method were employed to derive the singular equations, which were solved numerically to find stress intensity factors.

The majority of the above mentioned methods for obtaining T-stress are confined to simple geometry and loading configurations (mode I loading). The remaining methods instead require extensive calculations, mostly not implemented in finite element codes.

In this context the development of a unified finite element technique for calculating T-stress is envisaged. An interesting contribution to the topic has been provided by Ayatollahi et al. [25] that presented a novel technique for evaluating T-stress for Mode I and II, involving finite element analyses. In detail, the direct use of finite element analysis for calculating T was deeply investigated. The conclusion showed that, under mode I loading, more reliable results with less mesh refinement were achieved if crack flank nodal displacements were used. Moreover, methods for the calculation of

the T-stress for any mixed mode I/II loading were proposed, without the need to evaluate the stress intensity factors.

In this paper the method presented in [25] is briefly recalled and applied by assuming different mesh refinements. This study aims to disclose novel outcomes concerning the reliability of the results by using coarse to fine meshes for mode I and for mixed mode loading. First, an introduction on the T-stress concept based on the fundamental equations of Williams [9] is provided; subsequently, the method developed in [25] is briefly described; later analysis of the method by using coarse and fine meshes is carried out and the new outcomes are discussed.

2. Fundamental concepts of T-stress

In 1939, Westergaard [26] studied the biaxial stress field for internal cracks in pressurized cylinders. The outcomes of the research demonstrated that it was possible to state the stresses and the shearing stress in the x and y – directions as follows:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \sigma_{xx} \\ \sigma_{yy} \\ \tau_{xy} \end{Bmatrix} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \begin{Bmatrix} 1 - \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \\ 1 + \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

For Mode I cracks, the boundary condition $\tau_{xy} = 0$ along the x-axis is automatically satisfied from the above equation. Westergaard equations, which were originally developed for a biaxial stress field, were subsequently applied for uniaxial loading. However, they produce a σ_{xx} component at the boundary edges along the crack axis for a purely uniaxial load. To satisfy the boundary condition also under uniaxial loading, Irwin [27] suggested the use of a transverse component of stress, namely the T-stress. This was consolidated later by Williams [9]. Infact, he showed that the crack-tip stress fields in an isotropic elastic material can be expressed as an infinite power series, where the leading term exhibits a

singularity $r^{-1/2}$, the second term is constant with r , the third term is proportional to $r^{1/2}$, and so on. Although the third and higher terms in the Williams solution vanish at the crack tip, the second (uniform) term remains finite. This second term can have a profound effect on the plastic zone shape and the stresses deep inside the plastic zone [28].

In general, near the crack tip of an isotropic elastic material, where only the first two terms of Williams solution are considered, stresses can be written as follow:

for mode I

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{xx} &= \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \left[1 - \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right] + T + O(r^{1/2}) \\ \sigma_{yy} &= \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \left[1 + \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right] + O(r^{1/2}) \\ \tau_{xy} &= \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \left[\sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right] + O(r^{1/2})\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

for mode II

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{xx} &= \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \left[2 + \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right] + O(r^{1/2}) \\ \sigma_{yy} &= \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \left[\cos \frac{\theta}{2} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right] + O(r^{1/2}) \\ \tau_{xy} &= \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \left[1 - \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right] + O(r^{1/2})\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

where K_I and K_{II} are the mode I and mode II stress intensity factors (SIF) respectively, and r , θ , x and y are co-ordinates in conventional polar and Cartesian systems (with the crack tip assumed as the origin).

The term T represents a uniform stress in the x direction, parallel to the crack tip. It is only due to a symmetric component of loading and vanishes for pure mode II. When $T=0$, small-scale yielding can be assumed and the plastic zone is a negligible fraction of the crack length as well as of the entire body.

The stress intensity factors are, in these conditions, able to uniquely characterize the near-tip fields.

To normalize the effect of T relative to the stress intensity factor in mode I, a dimensionless parameter called the biaxiality ratio B is used, as introduced and defined by [15]:

$$B = \frac{T\sqrt{\pi a}}{K_I} \quad (4)$$

where a is the crack length. For a through-thickness crack in an infinite plate subject to a remote normal stress, $B = -1$. Thus a remote stress σ induces a T-stress of $-\sigma$ in the x direction.

The biaxiality parameter B can be extended to mixed mode if K_I is replaced by an effective stress intensity factor K_{eff} :

$$K_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{K_I^2 + K_{II}^2} \quad (5)$$

During the past decades, several numerical methods have been developed for estimating the T-stress, such as the weight function technique and the stress difference method. The weight function, or Green function approach [29] was based on an analytical representation of the elastic stress on isotropic material. This method for evaluating T-stress results easy to implement with quite accurate results. The stress difference method [30], instead, evaluates the T-stress by subtracting the stresses σ_{xx} and σ_{yy} calculated close to the crack tip. The method is easy to define and to apply, with a good accuracy.

However the applicability of the above mentioned techniques, not implemented in finite element codes, is limited to simple geometry and loading configurations. Ayatollahi et al. [25] provided a novel technique for evaluating T-stress for Mode I and II, involving a unified finite element analysis.

3. Finite element method for the evaluation of T-stress: the Ayatollahi's approach

3.1 Mode I and mixed mode formulation

In this section, fundamentals of the theoretical method developed by Ayatollahi et al. [25] are briefly recalled.

Considering Mode I loading, Eqs. (2) presented in the previous section show that σ_{xx} comprises of the singular term and T, while higher order terms are negligible. This implies that T can be determined along any direction where the singular term of σ_{xx} vanishes or can be set to zero by superposing with a fraction of σ_{yy} . This corresponds to different angular positions around the crack tip, such as when:

$$\theta = -\pi \text{ or } +\pi : T = \sigma_{xx} \quad (6)$$

This approach is very easy and straightforward since it uses only one stress component. By the way, if analytical results are compared with FE analyses, a very refined and accurate mesh is required to obtain good agreement. Alternative solution to this problem is to compute the T-stress using the displacements along the crack faces. Due to traction free boundary conditions along the crack faces, Hooke's law can be written for small strains as

$$\sigma_{xx} = E' \varepsilon_{xx} = \frac{E' du_x}{dx} \quad (7)$$

Where ε_{xx} and u_x are the strain and displacement respectively parallel to the crack and:

$$E' = \begin{cases} E & \text{Plane stress} \\ \frac{E}{1-\nu^2} & \text{Plane strain} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

For the chosen angular position around the crack tip of Eq. (6), the singular term of σ_{xx} in Eq. (2) disappears and Hooke's law becomes:

$$T = \frac{E' du_x}{dx} \quad (9)$$

Recalling that T is constant and replacing the constant slope du_x/dx with $[u_x(x) - u_x(0)]/x$, T can be defined as [25]:

$$T = E'[u_x(x) - u_x(0)]/x \quad (10)$$

where $u_x(0)$ denotes u_x at the crack tip.

This indicates that using either u_x or its slope along the crack faces, T can be determined directly from FE results. This approach permits to obtain the T -stress for Mode I loading with the employment of a coarse mesh since, as well known, the displacements are in general not affected by the mesh refinement.

Different considerations must be done when mixed mode loading is considered instead. In fact, along any radial direction from the crack tip, there is a singular term due to either mode I or mode II or both. For this reason, the singular term σ_{xx} never vanishes, and the method described for Mode I is not therefore suitable for mixed mode I/II loading. However, the T -stress can be found when the symmetric properties of mode I and antisymmetric properties of Mode II for direct stresses are used, without the calculation of stress intensity factors. The stresses in one half of the cracked specimen are added to those of the other half. The mode II stresses vanish and mode I stresses are doubled. As a consequence, again like under Mode I loading, the T -stress can be determined along any direction around the crack tip directly from FE results. The most convenient direction is $\theta=\pm\pi$ since only one component of stress is involved:

$$T = \frac{1}{2} [(\sigma_{xx})_{\theta=-\pi} + (\sigma_{xx})_{\theta=\pi}] \quad (11)$$

Following now similar steps presented for Mode I loading, T under mixed mode loading can be determined employing the displacement method, leading to:

$$T = \frac{1}{2x} E' [u_x(x, -\pi) + u_x(x, \pi)] \quad (12)$$

Since the path independent integral J for mixed mode loading is usually available from the FE analysis, the biaxiality ratio B for mixed mode conditions is:

$$B = T \sqrt{\frac{\pi a}{J E'}} \quad (13)$$

Where $K_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{J E'}$

Equation (13) together with Eq. (12) or (11) can be used to determine B without having to calculate separately K_I and K_{II} , and directly from FE analysis.

The method developed by [25] was verified to several test cases by using ABAQUS. Finite element results for T were obtained for two different mode I cracked specimens: a single edge notched (SEN) and a double edge notched (DEN). For the SEN specimen the crack length “a” to width W ratio was 0.4 and for the DEN specimen a/W was 0.2. Both the stress and the displacement methods were used to determine T for distances x behind the crack tip and along the crack face. For identical meshes the stress method did not provide a constant value for T/σ_{nom} , where σ_{nom} is the uniform far field tensile stress. For mixed mode conditions, T was calculated for an inclined edge crack in a large square plate, by applying stress and displacement methods as well. It was found that both the stress and displacement methods gave results that compare well with the analytical results from [24].

The outcomes of [25] are based on applications carried out for the same accurate mesh refinement. A study on the effects of the mesh refinement is provided in the present paper instead, concerning the accuracy of the displacement methods. The results obtained for Mode I loading and Mode I/II loading are presented considering SEN, DEN specimens and centrally cracked plate.

4 Evaluation of T-stress with coarse meshes under mode I loading

4.1 Geometry and loads

In order to investigate the effect of the mesh refinement on the T-stress evaluation, and to study the sensitivity to this aspect of the displacement method as introduced in [25], several FE analysis have been carried out. The single edge notched (SEN) and double edge notched (DEN) specimens which are investigated for the T-stress evaluation under mode I are shown in Fig. 1a-b, respectively. Three different mesh types are modeled. The first applied mesh is a fine and detailed mesh. The second mesh is a coarse mesh, intended to be less complex and heavy than the previous one. The third and last modeled mesh is a very coarse mesh: this is done to observe how the accuracy of the results modifies, by drastically reducing the mesh refinement.

The SEN specimen is defined to match the same non-dimensional properties of the samples used in [25], where the ratio a/W is 0.4. It is realized by assuming the crack length $a=20$ mm and the width $W=100$ mm. The height of the specimen $2H$ is set equal to 200 mm so that the uniform far field tensile stress σ_{nom} is applied far enough from the crack. Due to symmetry, only one half of the SEN is considered.

The DEN specimen [25] presents a ratio a/W of 0.2, and it is obtained by keeping $W=100$ mm and by reducing the crack length to $a=20$ mm. Also in this case $2H=200$ mm. Due to symmetry, only one quarter of the DEN specimens is modeled. Uniform far field tensile stress σ_{nom} equal to 100 MPa is applied. The geometries and loading conditions are modeled and analyzed by means of the FE code ANSYS and Solid 8 node 183 element is used. The analyses have been carried out under linear elastic and plane strain conditions. Young's modulus $E=206$ GPa and $\nu = 0.3$ are assumed.

Fig. 1. a) Single edge notched (SEN) and b) double edge notched (DEN) specimens

4.2 Fine mesh

Very fine mesh is first analyzed for the SEN and DEN specimens. The mesh is realized by regularly distributed elements. The number of elements becomes very high around the crack tip: the smallest element size approached the order of 10^{-6} , and the number of elements used for meshing the DEN model was about 18000. Example is given in Fig. 2 only for the DEN specimen, for the sake of brevity. A fine mesh refinement gives more accurate results to the detriment of computational time, power and lead-time. The difficulties become more evident when complex geometries are involved.

Firstly, the stress method is applied along the direction $\theta=0$. According to this method, the T-stress is evaluated as:

$$T = \sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{yy}$$

The stress method is also applied assuming $\theta=\pi$ for the upper face of the specimen and T-stress is then evaluated according to Eq. (6).

Fig. 2. Example of fine mesh for DEN specimen and detail of crack tip;

(a) fine mesh, (b) coarse mesh, (c) very coarse mesh.

The final case is the application of the displacement method for $\theta=\pi$: T-stress is evaluated according to Eq. (10).

A comparison of the results for the fine mesh case, by applying the three different techniques, is presented in Fig. 3 for the SEN specimen and in Fig. 4 for the DEN specimen for mode I. The obtained T-stress divided by the nominal stress σ_{nom} is plotted as function of the distance from the crack tip divided by the crack length x/a .

For the SEN specimen (see Fig. 3) it is possible to observe, for all the three applied techniques, a poor dispersion of the results that are within the range -0.54 : -0.57 for the analyzed range of distances from the crack tip. It is possible to observe the same behavior also for the DEN specimen results (see Fig. 4) that remain within the range -0.50 : -0.56 for the analyzed range of distances from the crack tip. These

are in agreement with [25] where the results for T/σ_{nom} calculated from the displacement method for the SEN and DEN specimens were found equal to -0.55 and -0.506 respectively, for fine mesh.

These outcomes for the SEN and DEN specimen, confirm that the displacement method gives reliable and accurate results, compared to the stress method, although this one is more known and applied.

It is also possible to observe that, for the SEN specimen, the curve obtained by the displacement method, except for some fluctuations of the results, shows a constant behavior (see Fig. 3).

The displacement method results for the DEN specimen, show an almost constant behavior with a variation of T/σ_{nom} of less than 0.01 .

The stress method, instead, for $\theta=0$ shows an increasing trend while, for $\theta=\pi$, it has a decreasing trend for both the SEN and DEN specimen (see Fig. 3 and Fig. 4) with larger variation of the T/σ_{nom} results.

Fig. 3. T-stress results for SEN specimen by using a fine mesh: stress method for $\theta=0$ and $\theta=\pi$; displacement method for $\theta=\pi$.

Fig. 4. T-stress results for DEN specimen by using a fine mesh: stress method for $\theta=0$ and $\theta=\pi$; displacement method for $\theta=\pi$.

4.3 Coarse mesh

The second mesh type, realized for the SEN and DEN specimens, is a coarse mesh. This coarse mesh refinement is assumed aiming to check if a reliable estimation of the T-stress is possible without a detailed fine mesh. Clearly, a fine mesh is more complex and requires more computational power and time, thus reducing the number of analysis in the same time frame.

The coarse mesh has a reduced number of elements that are less dense around the crack tip than the fine mesh modeling, and the smallest element size is reduced to the order of 10^{-1} . The number of elements used for meshing the DEN model was about 4000. Also in this case the mesh elements are regularly distributed, increasing around the crack tip.

The displacement method is based on nodal displacements that are not influenced by the mesh definition, making this technique suited for any type of mesh. The same is not true for the stress evaluation. Thus, for coarse meshes, the stress method is disregarded.

In Fig. 5 the T-stress calculated for the displacement method on the coarse mesh is presented for the SEN and DEN specimen. The obtained results for the SEN specimen show that the T-stress varies significantly getting closer to the crack tip. In particular the ratio T/σ_{nom} shifts rapidly to an almost constant T-stress value of -0.50 to -0.52 for x/a greater than -0.06. For the DEN specimen the coarse mesh results start diverging from a constant value of T/σ_{nom} for x/a greater than -0.08, up to a value of T/σ_{nom} of -0.3.

Fig. 5. T-stress for the SEN and DEN specimens modeled by a coarse mesh; displacement method for $\theta=\pi$

4.4 Very coarse mesh

The last modeled mesh is a very coarse mesh. The main aim is to check the accuracy of the results keeping reducing the mesh refinement. The very coarse mesh is characterized by a sparse distribution of the mesh elements. Mesh elements are by the way regularly distributed, increasing around the crack. The smallest element size at the crack tip is 1 mm. And only 800 elements were used to mesh the DEN model. Also in this case only the displacement method is applied, assuming $\theta=\pi$.

The T-stress calculated for the SEN and the DEN specimens on the very coarse mesh is presented in Fig. 6. The T-stress varies significantly getting closer to the crack tip; this behavior, already observed for the coarse mesh (see Fig. 5), becomes now more evident. For the SEN specimen, T/σ_{nom} remains constant and almost equal to -0.45 for x/a less than -0.06 and then it diverges. The T-stress calculated for the DEN specimen on the very coarse mesh does not show a constant behavior in the observed ranges of x/a .

Fig. 6. T-stress for the SEN and DEN specimens modeled by a very coarse mesh; displacement method for $\theta=\pi$

5 Evaluation of T-stress with coarse meshes under mixed mode I/II loading

5.1 Geometry and loads

In this section the applications for the mixed mode I/II are reported. Plate with central crack is considered. Also in this case the three different mesh refinements are modeled and analyzed. The analysis of the influence of the mesh refinements on the accuracy of the T-stress is conducted only for displacement method. In order to keep a similarity with the analysis of [25], the only known dimension is the angle between σ_{nom} and the crack direction, denoted by β (when $\beta = 0^\circ$ mode II condition applies and when $\beta = 90^\circ$ mode I condition applies). In the following analyses the angle β is set equal to 70° . Since the reference work [25] does not provide any indication about the crack length, the large square plate for the mixed mode I/II is modeled assuming two different crack length defined as $2a= 2\text{mm}$ and $2a= 40\text{mm}$ (see Fig. 7). The width is chosen equal to $2W=200\text{ mm}$ and the height $2H= 200\text{ mm}$.

The T-stress evaluation to mode I/II for the two different crack lengths of the square plates is carried out by applying a uniform far field tensile stress σ_{nom} equal to 100MPa .

The geometries and loading conditions are modeled and analyzed by means of the FE code ANSYS and Solid 8 node 183 element is used. The considered material is linear elastic isotropic having $E=206\text{ GPa}$, and $\nu = 0.3$. Plane strain condition is assumed.

Since it is not possible to apply symmetry constraints to the cracked square plate, the geometry is fully modeled.

Fig. 7. Large square plate for mixed mode I/II loading condition.

5.2 Fine mesh

The mesh is realized by finite regularly distributed elements becoming denser around the crack tip. The size of elements and other conditions to define the mesh as “fine” are the same reported in the section 4.2. For the fine mesh case, three different techniques for evaluating T-Stress are applied.

The first one is the stress method assuming $\theta=0$. According to this method the T-stress is evaluated as:

$$T = (\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{yy})_{\theta=0}$$

The second application is carried out by applying the stress method assuming $\theta=\pi$ at the upper face of the plate and $\theta=-\pi$ at the lower face. This is done in accordance with Eq. (11).

A comparison of the T-stress results by applying the stress method assuming $\theta=0$ and $\theta= \pm\pi$ is presented in Fig. 8 for the square plate with a crack length $2a=2$ mm and in Fig. 9 for the square plate with a crack length $2a=40$ mm.

It is possible to observe, in both cases, how the stress method with $\theta=0$ and $\theta=\pm\pi$ gives almost the same results for the investigated range of distance from the crack tip.

Fig. 8. Flat plate $2a=2\text{mm}$ results; stress method with $\theta=0$ and $\theta=\pm\pi$, fine mesh.

The third and last technique applied to the fine mesh is the displacement method assuming $\theta=\pi$ at the upper face of the plate and $\theta=-\pi$ at the lower face. This is done in accordance with Eq. (12).

Fig. 9. Flat plate $2a=40\text{mm}$ results; stress method with $\theta=0$ and $\theta=\pm\pi$, fine mesh.

In Fig. 10 and 11 the comparisons of the results for the three different techniques, respectively for the square plate with $2a=2\text{ mm}$ and with $2a=40\text{ mm}$, are shown. T-stress results for the displacement method remain generally close to the stress method results and diverges only in the vicinity of the crack tip. In particular from Fig. 10 for $2a=2\text{mm}$, the three applied techniques provide the same value of the T-stress in the range x/a between $-0.81 : -0.1$ and only after $x/a = -0.1$ the displacement method starts diverging. Also for the square plate with $2a=40\text{ mm}$ (see Fig. 11) the three techniques show almost the same T-stress results in the range x/a between $-0.1 : -0.05$ with a limited variation of T/σ_{nom} .

Is it possible to conclude that the displacement method gives reliable results also for the square plate under mixed mode I/II. The method provides a good assessment of the T-stress also in case of a large crack length, comparable to the plate width.

Fig. 10. Flat plate $2a=2$ mm results; stress method with $\theta=0$ and $\theta=\pm\pi$, and displacement method $\theta=\pm\pi$, fine mesh.

Fig. 11. Flat plate $2a=40$ mm results; stress method with $\theta=0$ and $\theta=\pm\pi$, and displacement method $\theta=\pm\pi$, fine mesh.

5.3 Coarse mesh

The second mesh type, realized for the square plate with $2a=2$ mm and $2a=40$ mm, is the coarse mesh. The coarse mesh has regularly distributed elements, increasing around the crack tip but with a reduced number of elements compared to the fine mesh modeling. See section 4.3 for element size.

The stress method for coarser mesh is disregarded and only the displacement method is considered.

The displacement method assuming $\theta=\pi$ at the upper face of the plate and $\theta=-\pi$ at the lower face is applied. The T-stress results obtained for the square plate with the crack lengths $2a=2$ mm and $2a=40$

mm modeled by a coarse mesh are shown respectively in Fig. 12 and in Fig. 13. In both cases the T-stress results remain almost constant and diverge only in the vicinity of the crack tip.

Fig. 12. Flat plate $2a=2$ mm results; displacement method $\theta=\pm\pi$, coarse mesh.

Fig. 13. Flat plate $2a=40$ mm results; displacement method $\theta=\pm\pi$, coarse mesh.

5.4 Very coarse mesh

The very coarse mesh is characterized by a sparse distribution of the mesh elements (regularly distributed, increasing around the crack tip as described in section 4.4). The main aim is to check the accuracy of the results by applying the displacement method with $\theta=\pm\pi$ keeping reducing the mesh refinement. The T-stress results obtained for the square plate with the crack lengths $2a=2$ mm and $2a=40$ mm modeled by very coarse mesh are shown respectively in Fig. 14 and in Fig. 15. Also for the very coarse mesh, the T-stress results, for both the crack lengths, remain almost constant and diverge only in the vicinity of the crack tip. The displacement method applied to the very coarse mesh seems to provide a reliable T-stress estimation even with a very light and easy mesh type.

Fig. 14. Flat plate $2a=2$ mm results; displacement method $\theta=\pm\pi$, very coarse mesh.

Fig. 15. Flat plate $2a=40$ mm results; displacement method $\theta=\pm\pi$, very coarse mesh.

6 Synthesis of the results and discussion

6.1 Mode I loading

A comparison between the three mesh refinement results is reported, for the mode I loading in Fig. 16 for the SEN specimen and in Fig. 17 for the DEN specimen.

For both cases, it is possible to observe that the outcomes of the fine mesh, by the application of different methods, remain uniform and characterized by an almost constant value of the T-stress, in the investigated range of distance from the crack tip. It has been already discussed that the displacement and the stress method, applied to the fine mesh, show a fine agreement with the results obtained by the reference work [25]. Considering the coarse mesh, for the SEN specimen (see Fig. 16) coarse and fine mesh results differ of 0.03. The discrepancy of the two methods remains limited to this value in a range of x/a between -0.1 : -0.06. It becomes more evident in the vicinity of the crack tip. It is also evident that the coarser is the mesh refinement, the smaller are the T-stress results. In particular the very coarse mesh curve differs of 0.06 from the coarse mesh and 0.11 from the fine mesh, in the same range x/a . All these errors, expect for the very coarse mesh are by the way acceptable and the coarse mesh can be employed for the T-stress evaluation.

A more evident discrepancy in the outcomes of the coarser mesh refinements is also observed comparing the DEN specimen results (see Fig. 17). The coarse mesh provides T-stress values that, in the range x/a between -0.18 : -0.08, differ from the fine mesh of 0.05. Also in this case the calculated values of the T-stress reduce by decreasing the mesh refinement with a difference of 0.17 with the fine mesh results and 0.12 with the coarse mesh.

All these considerations for the mode I loading, for the SEN and DEN specimens, denote that there is a limit in reducing the mesh refinement: under this limit, the T-stress results could become inaccurate.

Fig. 16. Comparison of the results for the SEN specimen: displacement method with different mesh refinements; stress method with fine mesh.

Fig. 17. Comparison of the results for the DEN specimen: displacement method with different mesh refinements; stress method with fine mesh.

6.2 Mixed mode I/II loading

A comparison between the different mesh refinement results is reported in Fig. 18 for a crack length of $2a=2$ mm and in Fig. 19 for crack length of $2a=40$ mm. For both the analyzed geometries, the fine mesh applications by stress and displacement methods, provide good and reliable results of the T-stress. From the comparison between the different mesh refinements it is possible to observe that for mixed mode I/II the displacement method, applied to the coarse and to the very coarse meshes, still provides reliable results. For the crack length $2a=2$ mm (see Fig. 18), the coarse mesh results and the

very coarse mesh results differ of less than 0.1 from the fine mesh results in the range of x/a between -0.81 : -0.31. Moreover all the results, far from the crack tip, converge to the same value of the T-stress. For the crack length $2a=40$ mm, (see Fig. 19) , the comparison of results shows a good agreement of the T-stress evaluation by using coarse and very coarse mesh. In particular in the range of x/a between -0.09 : -0.03, there are differences of less than 0.05 with the T-stress obtained by using a fine mesh. The convergence of the results in the same T-stress value far from the crack tip is observed also for this case.

In Fig. 18 and Fig. 19, the results for the very coarse and regular mesh are introduced and compared with the others. It is quite evident how the differences in T-stress values increase although the behavior is similar to the coarse and very coarse mesh curves. The regular type of elements used for the same refinement modifies the T-stress outcomes. These results are still characterized by small differences with the others far from the crack tip.

Generally it is possible to conclude that for the mixed mode I/II the mesh refinement does not affect the accuracy of the T-stress far from the crack tip but in case of the very coarse mesh, the type of mesh elements used for the same mesh refinement can influence the accuracy of the T-stress results.

Fig. 18. Comparison of the results for the square plate with $2a= 2\text{mm}$: displacement method with different mesh refinements; stress method with fine mesh.

Fig. 19. Comparison of the results for the square plate with $2a = 40$ mm: displacement method with different mesh refinements; stress method with fine mesh.

7 Conclusion

In this paper the method presented in [25] for evaluating the T-stress is applied by assuming different mesh refinements. The final aim is to investigate the reliability of that approach depending on different mesh refinements for mode I and for mixed mode loading. From the analyses, it emerges that despite the stress method is more known and applied, also the displacement method gives good and reliable results for evaluating the T-stress.

The main outcomes are summarized below:

- All the models showed that discrepancy between T-stress values becomes more evident close to the crack tip. This is mainly due to the localized high stresses;
- Under mode I loading, reasonable errors are obtained for a coarse mesh and the T-stress can be evaluated using coarse mesh;
- For very coarse mesh and Mode I loading, discrepancy on the T-stress evaluation becomes evident. There is a lower limit on the mesh refinement over which the T-stress values are not reliable;
- For the mixed mode I/II the mesh refinement does not reduce the accuracy of the T-stress result far from the crack tip and the method provides a good assessment of the T-stress also in case of a large crack length, comparable to the plate width;
- When fine meshes are employed, the T-stress presents a very reduced scatter and good results are obtained for all the geometries; the results from displacement and stress method are comparable diverging only in the proximity of the crack tip;

In conclusion the displacement method permits the evaluation of the T-stress with the employment of coarse meshes. By the way, several precautions must be taken when dealing with coarse and very coarse meshes, as underlined in the main points above.

REFERENCES

- [1] F.A. McClintock, Plasticity Aspect of Fracture, in: H. Liebowitz (Ed.), *Fract. An Adv. Treatise*, Vol. III, Academic Press, New York, 1971: pp. 47–225.
- [2] N.P. O’Dowd, C.F. Shih, Family of crack-tip fields characterized by a triaxiality parameter—I. Structure of fields, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*. 39 (1991) 989–1015. doi:10.1016/0022-5096(91)90049-T.
- [3] N.P. O’Dowd, C.F. Shih, Family of crack-tip fields characterized by a triaxiality parameter—II. Fracture applications, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*. 40 (1992) 939–963. doi:10.1016/0022-5096(92)90057-9.
- [4] C. Shih, N. O’Dowd, M. Kirk, A Framework for Quantifying Crack Tip Constraint, in: *Constraint Eff. Fract.*, ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, 1992: pp. 2–2–19. doi:10.1520/STP18020S.
- [5] C.F. Shih, N.P. O’Dowd, A fracture mechanics approach based on a toughness locus, in: *TWI/EWI/IS Int. Conf. Shallow Crack Fract. Mech. Tests Appl.*, Elsevier, Cambridge, UK, 1992. doi:10.1533/9780857093226.1.12.
- [6] M.R. Ayatollahi, S.M.J. Razavi, M. Rashidi Moghaddam, F. Berto, Mode I Fracture Analysis of Polymethylmetacrylate Using Modified Energy-Based Models, *Phys. Mesomech.* 18 (2015) 326–336. doi:10.1134/S1029959915040050.
- [7] M.R. Ayatollahi, M. Rashidi Moghaddam, S.M.J. Razavi, F. Berto, Geometry effects on fracture trajectory of PMMA samples under pure mode-I loading, *Eng. Fract. Mech.* 163 (2016) 449–461. doi:10.1016/j.engfracmech.2016.05.014.
- [8] M. Rashidi Moghaddam, M.R. Ayatollahi, S.M.J. Razavi, F. Berto, Mode II Brittle Fracture Assessment Using an Energy Based Criterion, *Phys. Mesomech.* (2017) In Press.
- [9] M.L. Williams, On the Stress Distribution at the Base of a Stationary Crack, *J. Appl. Mech.* 24 (1957) 109–114. doi:10.1115/1.3640470.
- [10] J. Hancock, W. Reuter, D. Parks, *Constraint and Toughness Parameterized by T*, ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, 1993. doi:10.1520/STP18021S.
- [11] J.D.G. Sumpter, An Experimental Investigation of the T Stress Approach, *ASTM STP* 1171. (1993) 492–502. doi:10.1520/STP18042S.
- [12] A.H. Sherry, C.C. France, M.R. Goldthorpe, Compendium of T-stress solutions for two and three dimensional cracked geometries, *Fatigue Fract. Eng. Mater. Struct.* 18 (1995) 141–155. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2695.1995.tb00148.x.
- [13] Y.Z. Chen, Integral Equation Methods for Multiple Crack Problems and Related Topics, *Appl. Mech. Rev.* 60 (2007) 172. doi:10.1115/1.2750671.
- [14] S.G. Larsson†, A.J. Carlsson, Influence of non-singular stress terms and specimen geometry on small-scale yielding at crack tips in elastic-plastic materials, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*. 21 (1973) 263–277.

doi:10.1016/0022-5096(73)90024-0.

- [15] P.S. Leevvers, J.C. Radon, Inherent stress biaxiality in various fracture specimen geometries, *Int. J. Fract.* 19 (1982) 311–325. doi:10.1007/BF00012486.
- [16] P.D. Ewing, J.L. Swedlow, J.G. Williams, Further results on the angled crack problem, *Int. J. Fract.* 12 (1976) 85–93. doi:10.1007/BF00036011.
- [17] Z. Knésl, Evaluation of the elastic T-stress using a hybrid finite element approach, *Int. J. Fract.* 70 (1994) R9–R14. doi:10.1007/BF00018140.
- [18] G.E. Cardew, M.R. Goldthorpe, I.C. Howard, A.P. Kfoury, On the elastic T -term, in: B.A. Bilby, K.J. Miller, J.R. Willis (Eds.), *Fundam. Deform. Fract.*, Cam, Sheffield, 1984: pp. 465–476.
- [19] A.P. Kfoury, Some evaluations of the elastic T-term using Eshelby's method, *Int. J. Fract.* 30 (1986) 301–315. doi:10.1007/BF00019710.
- [20] T. Fett, A Green's function for T-stresses in an edge-cracked rectangular plate, *Eng. Fract. Mech.* 57 (1997) 365–373. doi:10.1016/S0013-7944(97)00034-9.
- [21] M.J. Maleski, M.S. Kirugulige, H. V Tippur, A method for measuring mode I crack tip constraint under static and dynamic loading conditions, *Exp. Mech.* 44 (2004) 522–532. doi:10.1007/BF02427964.
- [22] P.C. Olsen, Determining the stress intensity factors KI, KII and the T-term via the conservation laws using the boundary element method, *Eng. Fract. Mech.* 49 (1994) 49–60. doi:10.1016/0013-7944(94)90110-4.
- [23] J. Sladek, V. Sladek, P. Fedelinski, Contour integrals for mixed-mode crack analysis: effect of nonsingular terms, *Theor. Appl. Fract. Mech.* 27 (1997) 115–127. doi:10.1016/S0167-8442(97)00013-X.
- [24] G. ~M. Seed, D. Nowell, Use of the distributed dislocations method to determine the T-stress, *Fatigue Fract. Eng. Mater. Struct.* 17 (1994) 605–618.
- [25] M.R. Ayatollahi, M.J. Pavier, D.J. Smith, Determination of T-stress from finite element analysis for mode I and mixed mode I/II loading, *Int. J. Fract.* 91 (1998) 283–298. doi:10.1023/A:1007581125618.
- [26] H.M. Westergaard, Bearing pressures and cracks, *J. Appl. Mech.* 61 (1939) A49–A53. doi:/publication/216756690.
- [27] G.R. Irwin, Fracture, in: S. Flügge (Ed.), *Elast. Plast.*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1958: pp. 551–590. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-45887-3_5.
- [28] T.L. Anderson, *Fracture Mechanics: Fundamentals and Applications*, Third Edition, III, Taylor & Francis, 2005.
- [29] H. Bueckner, A novel principle for the computation of stress intensity factors, (1970).
- [30] Y.Y. Yang, Effect of the regular term on the stress field in a joint of dissimilar materials under remote mechanical load, *Arch. Appl. Mech.* 69 (1999) 364–378. doi:10.1007/s004190050227.