

PERIDYNAMIC STUDIES OF INTERACTIONS BETWEEN STRESS WAVES AND
PROPAGATING CRACKS IN BRITTLE SOLIDS

By

Yenan Wang

A DISSERTATION

Presentation to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Mechanical Engineering & Applied Mechanics

Under the Supervision of Professor Florin Bobaru

Lincoln, Nebraska

November, 2015

ProQuest Number: 3739557

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 3739557

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

PERIDYNAMIC STUDIES OF INTERACTIONS BETWEEN STRESS WAVES AND PROPAGATING CRACKS IN BRITTLE SOLIDS

Yenan Wang, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 2015

Adviser: Florin Bobaru

The dynamic interaction between propagating cracks and stress waves is a complex and challenging problem responsible for the evolution of failure and damage in brittle materials. The peridynamics formulation is used here to study damage and fragmentation induced by impact in a glass plate and intersonic crack propagation in a unidirectional fiber-reinforced composite (FRC). We first show how the peridynamic model is able to explain how cracks form in impact of a thin glass plate. The computational results are compared with those from experiments. Peridynamics captures all of the different types of crack systems seen in experiments, including some fine roughness on the surface of the Hertz cone-crack, when this crack turns and grows transversal through the plate thickness. Understanding how and why various cracks are initiated, and propagate in the brittle material can help us, in the future, understand how to control crack growth and design better protective systems.

In the second part of the thesis, an improved peridynamic model for FRCs is introduced. We test the model against a well-known experiment in which, under mixed-mode impact loading conditions, a crack reaches intersonic propagation speeds and generates a shock wave as it propagates. These characteristics of brittle fracture in unidirectional FRCs are

reproduced by our peridynamic model. Moreover, using a sufficiently small nonlocal region, the model captures the crack propagation speed measured in experiments. We explain why the crack starts propagating long after the first stress wave reaches the tip of the pre-crack. We also provide a critical assessment of other types of peridynamic models for FRCs proposed recently in the literature. In FRCs, the micro-structure and anisotropy lead to complicated stress/strain states that are further influenced by interactions between elastic waves and propagating cracks. We verify these models for wave propagation examples and then use them to model fracture and damage evolution and provide guidance on which models should be used and why.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank many people for their support and guidance. I would like to thank my adviser Dr. Florin Bobaru for all his support, for his patience. He not only gave me lots of help of my research, also he let me know the top level of this research area, and lots of excellent researchers in this area.

I would also like to thank Dr. Ruqiang Feng, Dr. Joseph Turner, Dr. Petronela Radu and Dr. Chian-Fong Yen serving on my committee. Dr. Ruqiang Feng and Dr. Chian-Fong Yen, I would like to thank you for being the readers for my dissertation.

I gratefully acknowledge the financial support offered through research grants and contracts with ARL (project coordinator Dr. Chian-Fong Yen), ARO (program manager Dr. Asher Rubinstein), and AFOSR MURI Center for Material Failure Prediction through Peridynamics (Dr. David Stargel, Dr. Ali Sayir, and Dr. Fariba Fahroo). I would also thank Dr. Jian Yu and Dr. Chian-Fong Yen (both from the Army Research Laboratory) for performing the experiment described in Chapter 2.

Thanks to my parents, they always support me and encourage me anywhere and anytime.

I also need to thanks for my master advisor (Professor Shang Xinchun from University of Science and Technology Beijing), he is my first teacher in Mechanics. Thanks for my colleges from my lab (like Ziguang Chen and the other people) and other professors' labs (Ping Hu, Christopher Kube), they are always very patience with my questions, and very generous with their suggestions.

Thanks for my friends I knew here during the last few years. They made my life happier,
and filled with good memories.

PREVIEW

Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	18
1.1 Literature review	18
1.1.1 Literature review of intersonic crack propagation in composite materials	18
1.1.2 Literature review of intersonic crack propagation in composite materials	19
1.3 Thesis outline	21
Chapter 2	23
Evolution of impact-generated fracture and fragment in a thin glass plate	23
2.1 Introduction	23
2.2 Brief Introduction to Bond-based Peridynamics	26
2.3 Details of experimental setup and computational model	29
2.4 Evolution of Damage	38
2.4.1 Ring or band cracks near the impact point	41
2.4.2 The growth of the Hertzian-cone crack	48
2.4.3 Fine roughness on a crack surface	53
2.4.4 The evolution of radial cracks	57
2.4.5 Cracks parallel to the sides of the plate	63

2.4.5.1 Crack G (lower parallel crack)	68
2.4.5.2 Crack E (top parallel crack)	71
2.4.5.3 Crack F (right parallel crack)	71
2.4.5.4 Crack H (left parallel crack)	74
2.5 Conclusions	78
Chapter 3	79
Peridynamic model for dynamic fracture in an asymmetrically loaded unidirectional fiber-reinforced composite	79
3.1 Modeling of fiber-reinforced composite failure	79
3.2 Peridynamic model for fiber-reinforced composites	81
3.2.1 Brief review of previous peridynamic model for FRCs	81
3.2.2 The improved peridynamic composite model	85
3.2.3 Recovery of isotropic material response	89
3.2.4 Verification of the iH-model for elastic wave propagation along longitudinal and transverse directions	90
3.2.5 Quasi-static test	91
3.2.6 Peridynamic damage models for FRCs	93
3.3 Problem setup	93
3.3.1 Simulation setup	94
3.3.2 The effective stress from impact velocity	97

3.4 Numerical Convergence.....	102
3.5 Numerical results.....	105
3.5.1 The crack initiation.....	105
3.5.2 The intersonic crack propagation	111
3.5.3 Shock waves behind the crack tip	116
3.6 Conclusion.....	119
Chapter 4.....	122
On peridynamic models for fiber-reinforced composites: wave propagation and dynamic fracture	122
4.2.1 The H-model.....	126
4.2.2 The improved H-model (iH-model)	128
4.2.3 The O-model.....	128
4.2.4 The G-model.....	130
4.2.5 The Y-model.....	134
4.2.6 Summary of peridynamic FCR models (Elasticity)	137
4.3 Damage in Peridynamic FRC models	138
4.3.1 Damage in iH-model (H-model).....	139
4.3.2 Damage in G-model.....	140
4.3.3 Damage in Y-model.....	141
4.3.3 Damage in O-model.....	142

4.4 Intersonic crack propagation simulation from different PD FRC model	143
4.4.1 iH-model	143
4.4.2 Y-model	144
4.4.2 G-model	146
4.5 Conclusion	148
Chapter 5 Future Work	150

PREVIEW

List of TABLES

Table 2.1. The parallel cracks (E and G) generation times and times at which different waves arrive at the locations where damage is observed. The waves that generate these parallel cracks are highlight in red.....	67
Table 2.2. The parallel cracks (F and H) generation times and times at which different waves arrive at the locations where damage is observed. The waves that generate these parallel cracks are highlight in red.....	67

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. The horizon region for a point \mathbf{x} in a peridynamic model and the peridynamic bond between material points \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}	26
Figure 2.2. Experimental results (conducted at ARL by Dr. Jian Yu and Dr. C.F. Yen). Photographs (taken at UNL) of the strike and back face of the glass plate.	31
Figure 2.3. Experiment setup for the impact on a two-plate system.....	32
Figure 2.4. Damage maps for $\delta = 4\text{mm}$ at $99\mu\text{s}$ from the time of impact. Strike face (left), back face (right), and cross-section through the impact point (bottom).	34
Figure 2.5. Damage maps for $\delta = 2\text{mm}$ at $99\mu\text{s}$. Strike face (left), back face (right), and cross-section through the impact point (bottom).	35
Figure 0.6. Damage index maps for the nodes on the impact surface (top row) and the back surface (bottom row) of the glass plate, at the following times, respectively, from the time of impact: $3.95\mu\text{s}$, $7.25\mu\text{s}$, $15.5\mu\text{s}$, $30.35\mu\text{s}$, $99\mu\text{s}$	40
Figure 2.7. Damage and node velocity of cross section in the glass plate, from the time of impact: $2.71\mu\text{s}$, $3.54\mu\text{s}$, $6.84\mu\text{s}$, $11.23\mu\text{s}$, $14.54\mu\text{s}$, $99\mu\text{s}$	41
Figure 2.8. Point load on a plate, showing the propagation of the different elastic waves (redrawn from Bowden and Field (1964)).	42
Figure 2.9. Left: The forming of first damage band by wave reinforcement; Right: The forming of second damage band by wave reinforcement. Re-drawn from Bowden and Field (1964).....	43
Figure 2.10. The radius of the first and second damage rings/cracks plotted against glass plate thickness (from (Bowden & Field, 1964)). The lines are from the analytical	

relationship based on elastic wave propagation generated by point-impact, while the empty circles are data from experimental measurements in (Bowden & Field, 1964).....	44
Figure 2.11. The top view of first and second damage bands ($4.125\mu\text{s}$). Only nodes with damage on the strike face are shown. The black-line circles are those computed based on the analytical formulas from Bowden and Filed (1964).	46
Figure 2.12. Damage map on top of a thicker plate (50mm) and the apparent second ring-crack is shown by a red-line circle drawn on top of the graph.	47
Figure 2.13. The cross section of 50mm thick glass impact (X-Z plane view)	47
Figure 2.14. The cone crack propagation speed in time in the XZ plane.	49
Figure 2.15. Damage maps for the cross section through the point of impact showing the	51
Figure 2.16. The cone crack tip reaches point C at $6.84\mu\text{s}$; point D at $14.54\mu\text{s}$; this damage map picture of cross section is taken at $99.0\mu\text{s}$ from the time of impact.	52
Figure 2.17. Left: damage map form simulation results seen on the back face of glass plate at $99\mu\text{s}$; Right: photograph of the glass back face near the impact location.....	54
Figure 2.18. Computed damage map for the cross section through the impact point at $99\mu\text{s}$	54
Figure 2.19. Top left: the bottom of glass; top right: glass fragments from the region near the impact location; bottom left: the roughness of glass chip on the face corresponding to the surface of the end of the Hertz-cone crack; bottom right: the side of the glass chip corresponding to the back side of the plate.....	56
Figure 2.20 Nodes taken from the location outside the second damage ring (which forms around $3.82\mu\text{s}$), Left: the top view of strike face; Right: zoom-in around a radial crack to	

be investigated; bottom: the cross section of glass plate around the region to be investigated. Only node with some non-zero damage are shown in these figures.	60
Figure 2.21 The radial crack speed	61
Figure 2.22 Relative bond elongation along hoop direction for a bond in the observation area in Fig. 2.20, that is normal to the radial crack direction and is cut by the radial crack.	62
Figure 2.23 (a) Bond relative elongation along the radial direction (the longitudinal wave direction); (b) Bond relative elongation through the sample thickness direction. The nodes selected are in the observation area shown in Fig. 2.20.	63
Figure 2.24 150m/s impact sample (the location of parallel cracks are highlighted with red windows).....	65
Figure 2.25 Top view of damage plot (showing only the nodes with non-zero damage) (a) crack F at 11.1 μ s, (b) Crack G at 12.75 μ s, (c) Crack E at 13.03 μ s and (d) Crack H 15.5 μ s	66
Figure 2.26 Left: lower parallel crack (crack G) (top view damage plot, the none damage nodes are blanked in order to better visualize the initial parallel crack G) and view from the Y-Z cross section(the cross section we choose is the same cross section with the impact location).	68
Figure 2.27 The out-of-plane nodal velocity vectors for node in the 3rd layer from the top surface (see nodes in figure 2.26). The color of the nodal velocity vectors represents nodal damage, while vertical red line is at the location of longitudinal wave front, the green line is shear wave front, and the blue line is surface wave front. In (a), snap-shot at 12.61 μ s; in (b) snap-shot at 12.75 μ s, showing the initiation of damage for Crack G.	70

Figure 2.28: Left: Crack E generated at $13.16\mu\text{s}$ (blanking the non-damage nodes), Right: the cross section of Crack E through the impact point location.	71
Figure 2.29: Left: Crack F generated at location shown at $11.1\mu\text{s}$ (blanking the non-damage nodes), Right: the damage map for the cross section of Crack F through the impact point location.....	72
Figure 2.30: The out-of-plane nodal velocity vectors for nodes in the 3rd layer from the top surface and bottom of glass. In (a), snap-shot at $10.96\mu\text{s}$; in (b) snap-shot at $11.10\mu\text{s}$ showing the initiation of damage for Crack F.	73
Figure 2.31: Top Left: Crack H generated at location shown at $15.5\mu\text{s}$ (blanking the non-damage nodes), Top Right: the cross section of Crack H through the impact point location at $15.36\mu\text{s}$; Bottom: cross section of Crack H at $15.5\mu\text{s}$	75
Figure 2.32: The out-of-plane nodal velocity vectors for nodes in the 3rd layer from the top surface and 3rd layer from bottom surface of glass. In (a), snap-shot at $16.23\mu\text{s}$; in (b) snap-shot at $16.32\mu\text{s}$; in (c) snap-shot at $16.50\mu\text{s}$, showing the initiation of damage for Crack F.....	77
Figure 3.1. Bond stiffness in the H-model for constant micromodulus (Hu, Ha, & Bobaru, 2011)	83
Figure 3.2. The rotation of coordinate	86
Figure 3.3. Sketch for iH-model, the red line (left) stand for the fiber bonds and the blue disk stands for the matrix bonds.	88
Figure 3.4. Elastic wave along the fiber direction	90
Figure 3.5. m-convergence of iH-model two direction wave speed (measured by wave front) and their relative error.....	91

Figure 3.6. Static tension test along the fiber direction. Nodal displacements along the longitudinal (left) and transverse (right) directions.	92
Figure 3.7. Static tension test perpendicular to the fiber direction. Nodal displacements along longitudinal (left) and transverse (right) directions.	92
Figure 3.8. The Rosakis's experiment setup	94
Figure 3.9. Geometry of fiber reinforced composite specimen in dynamic fracture simulation, the loading conditions, and the square observation window of a size similar to that of the circular area used in the experiments.....	95
Figure 3.10. Damage map around the tip of the pre-notch in specimen ($m=5$).....	96
Figure 3.11. Sketch of steel projectile, steel “plate” and the composite specimen.....	97
Figure 3.12. $x - t$ and $\sigma - v$ diagram.....	99
Figure 3.13. δ convergence for crack propagation speed at 200MPa impact loading amplitude ($\delta = 1\text{mm}, 2\text{mm}$ and 4mm)	104
Figure 3.14. δ convergence for crack propagation speed at 260MPa impact loading amplitude ($\delta = 1\text{mm}, 2\text{mm}$ and 4mm)	104
Figure 3.15. Shear dominated crack tip loading, leading to crack initiation: (a) damage map for the specimen at $15\mu\text{s}$, (b) the nodal velocity magnitude plot at $15\mu\text{s}$	105
Figure 3.16. The velocity angle with the vertical direction ($\alpha = \arctan(v_x/v_y)$).....	107
Figure 3.17. Velocity angle plot at $19.5\mu\text{s}$ and zoom in the crack tip	107
Figure 3.18 the velocity angle plot at $21\mu\text{s}$ and zoom in the crack tip	108
Figure 3.19. Velocity angle plot at $21.5\mu\text{s}$ and zoom in the crack tip (in (a) and (b); the velocity angle plot at $22\mu\text{s}$ and zoom in the crack tip (in (c) and (d))......	109

Figure 3.20 The crack tip is fully loaded by the reflected wave and the crack starts to propagate (a and b); Velocity angle plot (c) at $23.5\mu\text{s}$ and zoom in around the crack tip in (d).	110
Figure 3.21. The damage map and velocity magnitude at $26.5\mu\text{s}$. Crack continues to propagate.	111
Figure 3.22. The crack tip propagation speed (a) and crack tip position (b) computed with PD for 200MPa impact loading amplitude for horizon size equal to 1 mm ($m=5$); Experimental results for the crack tip speed (c) and crack tip position (d) from (Coker & Rosakis, 2001) for 21m/s impact speed.	112
Figure 3.23. The crack tip propagation speed (a) and crack tip position (b) computed with PD for 260MPa impact loading amplitude for horizon size equal to 1 mm ($m=5$); Experimental results for the crack tip speed (c) and crack tip position (d) from (Coker & Rosakis, 2001) for 28m/s impact speed.	114
Figure 3.24. Crack speed versus crack extension for two different asymmetric impact loading amplitudes from the PD simulations (left) and experiments (right).	115
Figure 4.1. m-convergence curves for the H-model along longitudinal and transverse directions. The relative difference from the analytical values of the local model are shown.	127
Figure 4.2. m-convergence curves for the iH-model for the longitudinal and transverse direction wave speeds relative difference between the PD solution and the classical solution.	128
Figure 4.3. Direction of a peridynamic bond in the principal material axes.	131

Figure 4.4. m-convergence curves for the G-model: longitudinal and transverse direction wave speeds, showing relative difference compared with the classical model values. ..	133
Figure 4.5. m-convergence curves for the Y-model: longitudinal and transverse direction wave speeds, showing relative differences compared with the classical model.	136
Figure 4.6. The bond stiffness variation with the orientation among three composite models (blue triangles are for the iH-model, red stars are for the G- model, and black disks for the Y-model). The figure on the right is a zoom-in of the central part of the figure on the left.	137
Figure 4.7. Evaluation of fracture energy.	139
Figure 4.8. Solution using the iH-model: the sequence of damage maps showing splitting crack propagation at times 24 μ s (a), 35 μ s (b), 45 μ s (c) and 55 μ s (d) after the impact. Loading case of 200MPa.	144
Figure 4.9. Damage map with the Y-model for 200MPa impact loading at 50 μ s after the impact event.	145
Figure 4.10. Results with the Y-model: damage maps at 23 μ s (a), 30 μ s (b), and 50 μ s (c) from the impact event, for the 260MPa impact loading case.	146
Figure 4.11. Results with the G-model: damage maps at 23 μ s (a), and 50 μ s (b) from the impact event, for the 200MPa impact loading.	148

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Literature review

1.1.1 Literature review of intersonic crack propagation in composite materials

Failure patterns induced by impact on a glass plate are fascinating in their complexity, from a visual point of view. A number of experimental results on silica glass failure from impact are reviewed in (Walley, 2014). Different types of damage have been observed in glass. The Hertzian cone crack that forms is driven by the maximum tensile stress under quasi-static loading (see (Hertz, 1881)); circumferential cracks near the site of impact, sometimes called "band cracks" appear due to reinforcement between the Surface wave, propagating along the material's surface, and longitudinal of shear waves bouncing off of the back side of the impacted plate (see (Bowden & Field, 1964)). The damage front and fragmentation in tempered or untempered glass has been analyzed experimentally in, for example, (Jannotti, Ghatu , & Arun , 2015). Modeling efforts directed at capturing the complex waves and crack interactions that are produced when a glass plate is impacted by a projectile have failed, so far, to fully explain the reasons behind the complex failure patterns. Perhaps one of the most advanced, to date, modeling of failure in brittle ceramic plates from impact is the recent contribution in (Seagraves & Radovitzky, 2015).

1.1.2 Literature review of intersonic crack propagation in composite materials

The term “intersonic crack speed” denotes the crack tip speed which lies between the shear wave speed and longitudinal wave speed of a material. In this section we review the literature on experiments and modeling and simulation of intersonic crack propagation. It has been observed that interfacial crack tip speeds rapidly approached and exceed the shear wave speed of the more compliant material in a composite (Lambros and Rosakis 1995a,b). The loading and bond strength were such as to promote crack growth along the interface between the two dissimilar materials (PMMA-steel and PMMA-aluminum). Composite materials involve preferable crack paths in the form of weak planes of lower fracture toughness (inhomogeneous in terms of their fracture toughness). Inter-sonic crack growth happens in two-phase materials, and unidirectional fiber-reinforced composites are natural candidates for studying maximum permissible speeds of cracks in opening and shear modes.

The analytical value for the critical speed of mode II crack propagation in isotropic materials along a plane of elastic symmetry, at which intersonic crack growth is possible to be $2^{1/2}C_s$ (Broberg, 1999). Broberg developed a cohesive zone model to investigate mode II crack propagation in orthotropic materials.

The first observation of intersonic crack propagation speed in fiber-reinforced composites was presented in (Coker & Rosakis, 2001). For asymmetric impact loading, the experiments revealed highly unstable and intersonic shear-dominated crack growth along the fibers. The crack propagation speed reached a region between the shear wave speed and longitudinal wave speeds of the composite.

In (Yu, Pandolfi, Ortiz, Coker, & Rosakis, 2002), the authors used an anisotropic cohesive model of fracture to simulate the Coker and Rosakis's experiment. Because in this work the cohesive zone method was used, the authors need to pre-define the region where damage may happen. This is one limitation of the cohesive-zone method. The double shock caused by the propagating crack is observed, the shock wave propagation speed is not compared with the experimental results. Moreover, the double shock of the near-tip is suggestive of intermittent frictional interactions between the crack flanks. These intermittent frictions agree with the experimentally observed hot spots. The observed and computed hot-spot structures agree both in geometry and in the magnitude of the temperature elevation. In this study, the shock wave propagation speed is not mentioned.

Contact and friction behind the crack tip are accounted in a finite deformation anisotropic visco-plastic model by finite element method to model dynamic crack propagation in fiber reinforced composites (Dwivedi & Espinosa, 2003). They showed two numerical examples, bimaterial crack extension test, and simulation of Coker and Rosakis experiment on unidirectional fiber-reinforced composite plate. They also use the cohesive zone method, and the damage region needs to be pre-defined. With this visco-plastic and friction model, the intersonic crack propagation in fiber reinforce composites is captured. The question is are visco-plasticity and friction essential in the intersonic crack propagation phenomenon? They do not address this question.

(Huang, Wang, Liu, & Rosakis, 1999) computed the crack propagation speed in composites. They show that shock wave resulting from the crack propagating at a higher speed than shear wave, are seen from the 30m/s and 40m/s impact velocity. The

simulation shows that very high friction in the crack surfaces has an effect on crack propagation. Increased friction reduced the crack speed after initiation, but the maximum crack speed at steady state remains unchanged. Increased friction smears the shock wave and increased its inclination with respect to a vertical direction. The increase in friction coefficient spreads the region of compressive stress over a large area in front of the crack tip.

The generalized interpolation material point method (GIMP) to simulate dynamic crack growth (Daphalapurkar & Lu, 2007), captures intersonic crack speed and the shock wave behind the crack tip. The micro crack ahead the main crack is observed in their simulation. A daughter-crack is formed ahead of the trailing mother-crack-tip. The material failure part of this paper also use the idea of cohesive zone, the potential damage zone needs to be pre-defined. They capture complex stress patterns corresponding to wave travelling over the trailing crack surfaces, which are not exactly comparable with experiment. Their suggestion is that, in the actual experiments, crack surface contact plays a role and it could even influence the shock wave trailing behind the crack tip.

Dynamic crack growth along a polymer composite-Homalite interface is shown in (Coker, Rosakis, & Needleman, 2003). Three experiments (different impact location, impact speed) are presented; the calculations are based on a cohesive surface formulation. In addition, their experimental observation of a mother-daughter crack mechanism allows a subsonic crack to evolve into an intersonic crack.

1.3 Thesis outline

The outline of this thesis is as follows:

- Chapter 2 – We show that the peridynamic model is able to explain how cracks form in impact of a thin glass plate. We will also compare the simulation results with experimental results. We will show the progression of cracking and damage in glass, and how different types of cracks are generated by stress waves.
- Chapter 3 –We develop an improved peridynamic model of fiber-reinforced composites and use it to simulate intersonic crack growth experimentally observed in asymmetrically loaded unidirectional fiber-reinforced composite plates. This peridynamic model is able to capture the splitting crack growth when the specimens is under asymmetric shock loading and the crack speed reaches intersonic values, which is between the shear and longitudinal wave speeds of the composite. The peridynamic results show the formation of a shock wave caused by the crack propagation very similar to that reported in the experiments.
- Chapter 4 – We briefly review the several peridynamic FRC models for a unidirectional fiber-reinforced composite lamina. Dynamic wave propagation is tested with different peridynamic FRC models. We choose these different models to verify which of these reproduces the intersonic crack propagation in FRC. We discuss the effect of these different peridynamic models for a homogenized composite on the crack pattern on FRC.
- Chapter 5 – We present conclusions and future work.

Chapter 2

Evolution of impact-generated fracture and fragment in a thin glass plate

Dynamic crack growth, as the initiation of material failure, remains a challenging problem after more than a century of research. The interaction between stress waves and propagating cracks is difficult to simulate because such interactions often lead to a variety of failure types, including diffuse damage, localized cracks, and fragmentation. Capturing all of this complex behavior is not a simple task. Peridynamics can capture well all of these failure modes. We consider small projectile impact (150m/s) on a thin glass plate with a polycarbonate plate as backup. We discuss how cracks are generated in the thin glass from impact. From the experiment, we observed a variety of types of cracks (e.g. Hertzian cone crack, first and second ring cracks, radial cracks, parallel cracks, boundary cracks and fine roughness on the transverse crack surface). The peridynamic model is capable of capturing the essential features of the physics of failure in a thin glass plate, including very fine details of the structure of cracks, their origin, and evolution.

2.1 Introduction

In the present work, we provide a detailed discussion of the evolution of failure and damage in a thin glass plate impacted by a small projectile. For this purpose we use a simple peridynamic model with a linear-elastic and brittle micro-scale constitutive relation (see (Hu, Wang, Yu, Yen, & Bobaru, 2013), (Bobaru, Ha, & Hu, 2012)). We