



AS2070: Aerospace Structural Mechanics

Module 3: Introduction to Fatigue and Failure (V3)

Instructor: Nidish Narayanaa Balaji

Department of Aerospace Engineering, IIT Madras

April 6, 2026

Table of Contents

Also see <https://www.fracturemechanics.org/>


- 1 Introduction
 - Structure of Materials
 - Understanding the Stress-Strain Curve
 - Failure Mechanisms
 - Fracture
 - Fatigue
 - Energy Release Rate
 - Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics
 - Modes of Fracture
- 2 Introduction to Failure
 - Maximum Shear Stress Theory
 - Distortion Energy Theory
 - Maximum Normal Stress Theory
- 3 Introduction to Fatigue
 - The Parameters of Fatigue Testing
 - Miner's Rule
 - The deHavilland Comet
- 4 Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics
 - Griffith's Analysis and Energy Release Rate
 - A Primer on 2D Elasticity
 - Classical Solutions
 - The Michell Solution
 - Plate with a Hole
 - Notch Crack
 - Crack Propagation and the Paris Law




Chapters 1,4
in Gdoutos (2005)




Chapters 1,7,9
in Suresh (1998)



Chapters 1-3
in Kumar (2009)




Chapter 3,5,6
in Jr and
Rethwisch (2012)



Chapter 15
in Megson (2013)

1.1. Structure of Materials


Introduction




Types of crystal structures in metals Sparky (2013)

1.1. Structure of Materials

Introduction




Types of crystal structures in metals Sparky (2013)



Crystal and Grain Structures New Technique Provides Detailed Views of Metals' Crystal Structure (2016). "Polycrystallinity"

1.1. Structure of Materials

Introduction



Types of crystal structures in metals Sparky (2013)

1.2. Understanding the Stress-Strain Curve

Introduction

The Uniaxial Tensile Test




Figure from Rajendran 2011

1.2. Understanding the Stress-Strain Curve

Introduction

Terminology

- ➊ Proportionality Limit;
- ➋ Elastic Limit;
- ➌ Yield Point;
- ➍ Ultimate Strength;
- ➎ Fracture Point;
- ➏ Elongation at Failure;

Ductile Fracture




Figure from Rajendran 2011




Figure from Connor 2020

1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fracture

1. Introduction

“Griffith Theory” of brittle fracture

- Theoretical fracture stress $\sim \frac{E}{5} - \frac{E}{30}$
(steel $\sim \frac{E}{1000}$)
- Fracture occurs when
 $E_{strain} = E_{surface}$
- Crack propagates when
 $\frac{dE_{strain}}{dL} = \frac{dE_{surface}}{dL}$


1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fracture

1. Introduction

“Griffith Theory” of brittle fracture

- Theoretical fracture stress $\sim \frac{E}{5} - \frac{E}{30}$
(steel $\sim \frac{E}{1000}$)
- Fracture occurs when
 $E_{strain} = E_{surface}$
- Crack propagates when
 $\frac{dE_{strain}}{dL} = \frac{dE_{surface}}{dL}$

Ductile Fracture



Ductile Fracture Rajendran 2011


1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fracture

1. Introduction

“Griffith Theory” of brittle fracture

- Theoretical fracture stress $\sim \frac{E}{5} - \frac{E}{30}$
(steel $\sim \frac{E}{1000}$)
- Fracture occurs when
 $E_{strain} = E_{surface}$
- Crack propagates when
 $\frac{dE_{strain}}{dL} = \frac{dE_{surface}}{dL}$

Ductile Fracture



Ductile Fracture Rajendran 2011


Sr. No	Brittle Fracture	Ductile Fracture
1.	It occurs with no or little plastic deformation.	It occurs with large plastic deformation.
2.	The rate of propagation of the crack is fast.	The rate of propagation of the crack is slow.
3.	It occurs suddenly without any warning.	It occurs slowly.
4.	The fractured surface is flat.	The fractured surface has rough contour and the shape is similar to cup and cone arrangement.
5.	The fractured surface appears shiny.	The fractured surface is dull when viewed with naked eye and the surface has dimpled appearance when viewed with scanning electron microscope.
6.	It occurs where micro crack is larger.	It occurs in localised region where the deformation is larger.

Ductile vs Brittle Fracture Rajendran 2011

1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fatigue

1. Introduction

..over 90% of mechanical failures are caused because of metal fatigue *What Is Metal Fatigue?*
2021...



The De Havilland Comet The deHavilland Comet Disaster 2019 [lecture]


1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fatigue

1. Introduction

..over 90% of mechanical failures are caused because of metal fatigue *What Is Metal Fatigue?*
2021...



A more recent example (2021 United Airlines Boeing 777) [DCA21FA085.Aspx](#) 2024. [\[video\]](#)



The De Havilland Comet [The deHavilland Comet Disaster 2019 \[lecture\]](#)

1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fatigue

1. Introduction

..over 90% of mechanical failures are caused because of metal fatigue *What Is Metal Fatigue?* 2021...



Fatigue Crack Propagation: Beech Marks





Figure from *Fatigue Physics 2024*




deHavilland Comet Disaster
[structure](#)

A more recent example
777) *DCA21FAug08.Asp* 2024. [video](#)


1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fatigue

1. Introduction

..over 90% of mechanical failures are caused because of metal fatigue *What Is Metal Fatigue?*
2021...



Fatigue variables Megson 2013




The De Havilland Comet The deHavilland Comet Disaster 2019 [lecture]


1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fatigue

1. Introduction


..over 90% of mechanical failures are caused because of metal fatigue *What Is Metal Fatigue?* 2021...



Fatigue variables Meason 2013



The S-n Diagram Megson 2013





The De Havilland Comet The deHavilland Comet Disaster 2019 [lecture]

1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fatigue

1. Introduction

..over 90% of mechanical failures are caused because of metal fatigue *What Is Metal Fatigue?* 2021...

S-N Curves for Common Metals (Jr and Rethwisch 2012)




Comet Disaster

1.3. Failure Mechanisms: Fatigue


1. Introduction

..over 90% of mechanical failures are caused because of metal fatigue *What Is Metal Fatigue?* 2021...

S-N Curves for Common Metals (Jr and Rethwisch 2012)




Homework: Watch [this video on Fatigue testing.](#)



Comet Disaster

1.4. Energy Release Rate: Griffith's Analysis

Introduction




Simplistic picture of the introduction of a crack in a stretched specimen (Figure from sec 2.5 in Kumar 2009)

- Because of the crack, we assume $\sigma \approx 0$ in the triangles.
- Corresponding energy loss:

$$E_R = V_{\Delta} \times \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2E} \right) = \frac{2a^2 \lambda t \sigma^2}{E}.$$

1.4. Energy Release Rate: Griffith's Analysis

Introduction



Simplistic picture of the introduction of a crack in a stretched specimen (Figure from sec 2.5 in Kumar 2009)

- Because of the crack, we assume $\sigma \approx 0$ in the triangles.
- Corresponding energy loss:


$$E_R = V_{\Delta} \times \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2E} \right) = \frac{2a^2 \lambda t \sigma^2}{E}.$$

- For thin plates, $\lambda = \frac{\pi}{2}$. So,

$$E_R = \frac{\pi a^2 t \sigma^2}{E}.$$

- The “creation” of a surface takes energy. We write this as,


$$E_S = 2(2at)\gamma = 4at\gamma.$$



(Figure from Kumar 2009)

1.4. Energy Release Rate: Griffith's Analysis

Introduction



Simplistic picture of specimen (Figure from Kumar 2009)

- Because of the triangular crack tip

- Corresponding energy loss:

$$E_R = V_{\Delta} \times \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2E} \right) = \frac{2a^2 \lambda t \sigma^2}{E}.$$

Food For Thought


- What would a “safe size” of crack be, for a given loading condition? *Hint: Think incrementally*

- For thin plates, $\lambda = \frac{\pi}{2}$. So,

$$E_R = \frac{\pi a^2 t \sigma^2}{E}.$$

- The “creation” of a surface takes energy. We write this as,


$$E_S = 2(2at)\gamma = 4at\gamma.$$



(Figure from Kumar 2009)

1.4. Energy Release Rate: Griffith's Analysis

Introduction



Simplistic picture of specimen (Figure from Griffith 1920)

- Because of the triangular crack tip opening
- Corresponding energy loss:

$$E_R = V_{\Delta} \times \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2E} \right) = \frac{2a^2 \lambda t \sigma^2}{E}.$$

Food For Thought


- What would a “safe size” of crack be, for a given loading condition? *Hint: Think incrementally*
- What type of an experiment would be necessary to confirm this mathematical framework?

- For thin plates, $\lambda = \frac{\pi}{2}$. So,

$$E_R = \frac{\pi a^2 t \sigma^2}{E}.$$

- The “creation” of a surface takes energy. We write this as,

$$E_S = 2(2at)\gamma = 4at\gamma.$$



(Figure from Kumar 2009)

1.5. Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics


Introduction

(Ref: Sec. 8.4.2 in Sadd 2009)


Consider the following two cases.

Question: Where will the point of peak stress occur? And which will have higher maximum stress?

Case 1



Case 2



1.5. Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics


Introduction

(Ref: Sec. 8.4.2 in Sadd 2009)


Consider the following two cases.

Question: Where will the point of peak stress occur? And which will have higher maximum stress?

Case 1



Case 2



Analytical Solution

$$\sigma_r = T\left(1 - \frac{r_2^2}{r^2}\right), \quad \sigma_\theta = T\left(1 + \frac{r_2^2}{r^2}\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{\sigma_{\max} = 2T}$$

1.5. Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics


Introduction

(Ref: Sec. 8.4.2 in Sadd 2009)


Consider the following two cases.

Question: Where will the point of peak stress occur? And which will have higher maximum stress?

Case 1



Case 2



Analytical Solution

$$\sigma_r = T\left(1 - \frac{r_1^2}{r^2}\right), \quad \sigma_\theta = T\left(1 + \frac{r_1^2}{r^2}\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \sigma_{\max} = 2T$$

Analytical Solution

$$\sigma_r = T\left(1 - \frac{r_1^2}{r^2}\right) + (\cdot) \cos(2\theta), \quad \sigma_\theta = \dots$$

$$\Rightarrow \sigma_{\max} = 3T$$

1.5. Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics


Introduction

(Ref: Sec. 8.4.2 in Sadd 2009)



Consider the following two cases.

Question: Where will the point of peak stress occur? And which will have higher maximum stress?

Case 1



Case 3



Analytical Solution

$$\sigma_r = T\left(1 - \frac{r_1^2}{r^2}\right), \quad \sigma_\theta = T\left(1 + \frac{r_1^2}{r^2}\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \sigma_{\max} = 2T$$


$$\sigma_{\max} = 4T$$

$$\sigma_r = T\left(1 - \frac{r_1^2}{r^2}\right) + (\cdot) \cos(2\theta), \quad \sigma_\theta = \dots$$

$$\Rightarrow \sigma_{\max} = 3T$$

1.6. Modes of Fracture

Introduction



2. Introduction to Failure

Necessary Reading: Secs. 5-3 to 5-9
in Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015

- Elasticity only deals with the **reversible deformation** behavior. But real materials undergo yielding, necking, and eventually failure under large loads.
- Since there is permanent loss during the yield process (irreversibility), we will have to abandon **non-dissipativity** and modify the stress-strain relationship.

An Approach for a Failure Theory...

- **Conduct** controlled experiments in the lab
- **Observe** characteristics of failure
- **Propose generalizations** and test with further experimentation



Failed mild steel specimens (under uni-axial tension)

2. Introduction to Failure

- A first observation is that materials can be classified as brittle or ductile based on whether they undergo a plastic yield before failure.
- Generally, a material is said to be
 - **Ductile** if strain at failure is greater than 5%,
 - **Brittle** if strain at failure is lesser than 5%.
- For **Ductile Materials** the commonly applicable theories are
 - **Maximum Shear Stress Theory (MSS)**: Failure occurs when the maximum shear stress reaches a threshold. (aka **Tresca theory**)
 - **Distortion Energy Theory (DE)**: Failure occurs when the distortional strain energy reaches a threshold.
 - **Ductile Coulomb-Mohr (DCM) Theory**: The shear stress threshold for failure grows linearly with straight stress. *Proposed to account for tensile and compressive strengths being different*
- For **Brittle Materials** the applicable theories are
 - **Maximum Normal Stress Theory (MNS)**: Failure occurs when the normal stress reaches a threshold.
 - **Brittle Columb-Mohr (BCM) Theory**: Same idea as in DCM, to account for different tensile and compressive strengths.
- We will only bother ourselves with MSS, DE, and MNS here.

2.1. Maximum Shear Stress Theory

Introduction to Failure

- For ductile materials, failure in a uniaxial tensile test almost always involves a plane at 45° from the direction of loading.
- From the Mohr circle relationships for the uniaxial case at yielding point ($\sigma_1 = S_y, \sigma_2 = 0$) we have,

$$\sigma_n = \frac{S_y}{2} + \frac{S_y}{2} \cos 2\theta, \quad \tau_s = -\frac{S_y}{2} \sin 2\theta.$$

- We empirically observe that the $\theta = 45^\circ$ also corresponds to the plane where the shear traction component is maximum!

We **hypothesize** that

...yielding begins whenever the maximum shear stress in any element equals or exceeds the maximum shear stress in a tension-test specimen of the same material when that specimen begins to yield.



Failed mild steel specimens (under uni-axial tension) ◀ ◻ ▶

2.1. Maximum Shear Stress Theory

Introduction to Failure

- For ductile materials, failure in a uniaxial tensile test almost always involves a plane at 45° from the direction of loading.
- From the Mohr circle relationships for the uniaxial case at yielding point ($\sigma_1 = S_y, \sigma_2 = 0$) we have,

$$\sigma_n = \frac{S_y}{2} + \frac{S_y}{2} \cos 2\theta, \quad \tau_s = -\frac{S_y}{2} \sin 2\theta.$$

- We empirically observe that the $\theta = 45^\circ$ also corresponds to the plane where the shear traction component is maximum!

We **hypothesize** that

...yielding begins whenever the maximum shear stress in any element equals or exceeds the maximum shear stress in a tension-test specimen of the same material when that specimen begins to yield.

Note: Critical shear stress is $S_{sy} = S_y/2 = 0.5S_y$



Failed mild steel specimens (under uni-axial tension) ◀ ◻ ▶

2.1. Maximum Shear Stress Theory

Introduction to Failure

- For ductile materials, failure in a uniaxial tensile test almost always involves a plane at 45° from the direction of loading.
- From the Mohr circle relationships for the uniaxial case at yielding point ($\sigma_1 = S_y, \sigma_2 = 0$) we have,

$$\sigma_n = \frac{S_y}{2} + \frac{S_y}{2} \cos 2\theta, \quad \tau_s = -\frac{S_y}{2} \sin 2\theta.$$

- We empirically observe that the $\theta = 45^\circ$ also corresponds to the plane where the shear traction component is maximum!**


We **hypothesize** that

...yielding begins whenever the maximum shear stress in any element equals or exceeds the maximum shear stress in a tension-test specimen of the same material when that specimen begins to yield.

Note: Critical shear stress is $S_{sy} = S_y/2 = 0.5S_y$

Observe that the failure theory is **INTEGRALLY** tied down to a very specific experiment (uniaxial stress test) that you must conduct.

If you're not prepared/able to do this test at least once, the theory is useless.



Failed mild steel specimens (under uni-axial tension) ◀ ◻ ▶

2.1. Maximum Shear Stress Theory: Application to Bi-Axial Loading

Introduction to Failure

- For a general case, all of σ_1 , σ_2 and σ_3 are non-zero.
- The maximum shear stress that can be achieved (among all possible planes) is $\tau_{\max} = \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_2}{2}$. MSS predicts that failure will happen when $\tau_{\max} \geq 0.5S_y$, i.e.,

$$\boxed{|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2| \geq S_y}, \boxed{|\sigma_1 - \sigma_3| \geq S_y}, \boxed{|\sigma_2 - \sigma_3| \geq S_y}.$$

Note that for the 2D case we will take $\sigma_3 = 0$.

- We've got the “non-yield region” in the σ_1, σ_2 space to be:

$$\{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mid |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2| < S_y, |\sigma_1| < S_y, |\sigma_2| < S_y\}$$

- **So given a general state of stress $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$, we must first estimate the principal stresses and check if they fall within the above to check if it would fail according to the MSS/Tresca theory.**

2.1. Maximum Shear Stress Theory: Application to Bi-Axial Loading

Introduction to Failure


Graphical Depiction of the Non-Yield Region from MSS

- For a ge
- The max
- $\tau_{\max} = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)$

) is
i.e.,

Note that

- We've got
- So give
- stresses
- accordi



Principal
d fail

2.2. Distortion Energy Theory

Introduction to Failure

- We **hypothesize here** that shape change energy is what leads to failure, **NOT isotropic volume change**.
- So we “remove” the volume change energy from the overall energy and require that the remaining energy (which we will call as “distortional” since this only represents shape change) does not exceed the energy contained in a uniaxial test context.

Formally we hypothesize that

yielding occurs when the distortion strain energy per unit volume reaches or exceeds the distortion strain energy per unit volume for yield in simple tension or compression of the same material.

2.2. Distortion Energy Theory

Introduction to Failure

- The total energy for a general state of stress in an isotropic material is given by:

$$\mathcal{U} = \frac{1}{2E_Y} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 & \sigma_2 & \sigma_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\nu & -\nu \\ -\nu & 1 & -\nu \\ -\nu & -\nu & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ \sigma_2 \\ \sigma_3 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2E_Y} (\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 + \sigma_3^2 - 2\nu(\sigma_1\sigma_2 + \sigma_1\sigma_3 + \sigma_2\sigma_3))$$

- The work done by the “hydrostatic pressure” is written by replacing each σ_i by $\sigma_{av} = \frac{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3}{3}$:

$$\mathcal{U}_v = \frac{3(1-2\nu)}{2E_Y} \sigma_{av}^2 = \frac{1-2\nu}{6E_Y} (\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 + \sigma_3^2 + 2(\sigma_1\sigma_2 + \sigma_1\sigma_3 + \sigma_2\sigma_3)).$$

\mathcal{U}_v is interpreted as energy that only goes into volume change.

- The shape change/distortional energy is the “remaining energy” after taking \mathcal{U}_v out of \mathcal{U} :

$$\mathcal{U}_d = \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{U}_v = \frac{1+\nu}{E_Y} \left(\frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)^2 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_3)^2}{2} \right).$$

- A uniaxial tensile test specimen fails when the state of stress is $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3) = (S_y, 0, 0)$. The corresponding distortional energy is written as

$$\mathcal{U}_{d,y} = \frac{1+\nu}{E_Y} S_y^2 \implies \boxed{\mathcal{U}_d < \mathcal{U}_{d,y}} \text{ to avoid yielding.}$$

2.2. Distortion Energy Theory

Introduction to Failure

Take a Second to Interpret!

- Mathematical Summary:

$$\sqrt{\frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)^2 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_3)^2}{2}} < S_y$$

- An alternative interpretation of this theory comes from the fact that the shear stress magnitude on an octahedral plane (plane with normal $\hat{n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} [1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$) is the same as the LHS above.
- Sometimes referred to as the **Maximum Octahedral Stress Theory**, this states that failure happens due to shear on an octahedral plane. It is mathematically identical to DE.
- It is interesting to note that the epistemology of failure is actually not our concern here - we are merely interested in putting our uniaxial tensile testing data to good use in a way that captures the uniaxial tensile test itself as just a sub-case !

$$U_{d,y} = \frac{1+\nu}{E_Y} S_y^2 \implies \boxed{U_d < U_{d,y}} \text{ to avoid yielding.}$$

2.2. Distortion Energy Theory

Introduction to Failure

- For the plane stress situation ($\sigma_1 \neq 0, \sigma_2 \neq 0, \sigma_3 = 0$), the non-yield region is given by

$$\{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mid \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2}{2} \leq S_y^2\},$$

which defines a rotated ellipse in 2D.

- For a state of “pure shear” of magnitude τ , the principal stresses are $\sigma_1 = \tau, \sigma_2 = -\tau$. Here, the criterion becomes,

$$3\tau^2 \leq S_y^2 \implies S_{sy} = \frac{S_y}{\sqrt{3}} = 0.577S_y.$$

2.2. Distortion Energy Theory

Introduction to Failure


Graphical Depiction of the Non-Yield Region from DE & MSS

- For the p

is given by

which de

- For a sta
- Here, the



2.2. Distortion Energy Theory

Introduction to Failure


Graphical Depiction of the Non-Yield Region from DE & MSS

- For the p

is given by

which de

- For a sta
- Here, the

 $\tau, \sigma_2 = -\tau.$

2.2. Distortion Energy Theory

Introduction to Failure

- For the plane stress situation ($\sigma_1 \neq 0, \sigma_2 \neq 0, \sigma_3 = 0$), the non-yield region is given by

$$\{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mid \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2}{2} \leq S_y^2\},$$

which defines a rotated ellipse in 2D.

- For a state of “pure shear” of magnitude τ , the principal stresses are $\sigma_1 = \tau, \sigma_2 = -\tau$. Here, the criterion becomes,

$$3\tau^2 \leq S_y^2 \implies S_{sy} = \frac{S_y}{\sqrt{3}} = 0.577S_y.$$

What about **Plane Strain**? Will there be any difference?


2.3. Maximum Normal Stress Theory

Introduction to Failure

We hypothesize that


yielding occurs when the **maximum normal stress** in any element equals or exceeds the maximum normal stress in a tension-test specimen of the same material when that specimen begins to yield.

- The hypothesis follows in the same vein as the previous two theories - following experimental experience with brittle material fracture which happens, on tensile test specimens, on a plane perpendicular to the direction of loading.



3. Introduction to Fatigue


- It is sometimes the case that components in machinery fail even though no part of them has ever experienced stresses that violated any of the above failure theory envelopes!
- This is known as **Fatigue**, and pertains to failure under repetitive stress cycles.
- Remind yourself that we are **NOT** very much concerned with the epistemology (they “why”) of this phenomenon: We have observed this, and we want to use this knowledge in design. This will be our approach.
- Plotting the **stress-amplitude-to-failure** against the **number-of-cycles-to-failure** leads to the famous “Strength-Cycles/S-n Curve” of fatigue.



(Figure 15.1 from Megson 2013)

Figure 6-1


Fatigue failure of a bolt due to repeated unidirectional bending. The failure started at the thread root at A, propagated across most of the cross section shown by the beach marks at B, before final fast fracture at C. (From ASM Handbook, Vol. 12: Fractography, 2nd printing, 1992, ASM International, Materials Park, OH 44073-0002, fig 50, p. 120. Reprinted by permission of ASM International[®], www.asminternational.org.)



Beach marks (Figure 6-1 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015)

3. Introduction to Fatigue

- It is sometimes the case that components in machinery fail even though no part of them has ever experienced stresses that violated any of the above failure theory envelopes!




(Figure 6-1 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015)

N cycles

(Figure 15.1 from Megson 2013)


1993-0002, fig. 50, p. 120.
Reprinted by permission
of ASM International®,
www.asminternational.org.)



Beach marks (Figure 6-1 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015)

3. Introduction to Fatigue

- It is sometimes the case that a component has never experienced a stress level that is above the failure theory envelopes!



(Figure 15.1 from Megawick)





Figure 6-6

Fatigue fracture surface of a 200-mm (8-in) diameter piston rod of an alloy steel steam hammer used for forging. This is an example of a fatigue fracture caused by pure tension where surface stress concentrations are absent and a crack may initiate anywhere in the cross section. In this instance, the initial crack formed at a forging flake slightly below center, grew outward symmetrically, and ultimately produced a brittle fracture without warning. (From ASM Handbook, Vol. 12: Fractography, 2nd printing, 1992, ASM International, Materials Park, OH 44073-0002, fig 570, p. 342. Reprinted by permission of ASM International[®], www.asminternational.org.)

(Figure 6-6 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015)

Beech marks (Figure 6-1 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015)

- Even though no part of them is above the failure theory envelopes!



3.1. The Parameters of Fatigue Testing

Introduction to Fatigue

- We characterize fluctuating stress in terms of the max and min stress values σ_{\max} , σ_{\min} or the derived quantities:

$$\text{Midrange Stress } \sigma_m = \frac{\sigma_{\min} + \sigma_{\max}}{2}$$

$$\text{Alternating Stress } \sigma_a = \left| \frac{\sigma_{\max} - \sigma_{\min}}{2} \right|$$

$$\text{Range of Stress } \sigma_r = \sigma_{\max} - \sigma_{\min}$$

$$\text{Steady Stress } \sigma_u$$

- In general, we only plot the alternating stress σ_a versus the cycles to failure in the S-n curve.

Figure 6-10

An S-N diagram plotted from the results of completely reversed axial fatigue tests. Material: UNS G41300 steel, normalized; $S_w = 116$ kpsi; maximum $S_w = 125$ kpsi. (Data from NACA Tech. Note 3866, December 1966.)




Figure 6-10 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015






Figure 6-23 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015

3.1. The Parameters of Fatigue Testing

Introduction to Fatigue

- We characterize fluctuating stress in terms of the max and min stress. A (sometimes) useful parameterization of the S-n curve quantities:

Midrange

Alternating

Range of S

Steady Str

- In general, v the cycles to




Figure 6-10

An S-N diagram plotted the results of completely reversed axial fatigue tests. Material: UNS G41300 steel normalized; $S_u = 116$ kpsi maximum stress; $S_w = 125$ kpsi (Data from NACA Tech. Note 3866, December 19

(Figure from Megson 2013)

$$\sigma_a = S_e \left(1 + \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}} \right), \quad N \propto \frac{1}{\sigma_m}$$

10⁰ 10¹ 10² 10³ 10⁴ 10⁵ 10⁶ 10⁷ 10⁸
Number of stress cycles, N






Figure 6-23 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015

Figure 6-10 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015

3.1. The Parameters of Fatigue Testing

Introduction to Fatigue

- In order to make the results from the S-n curve more practical, I will ask the following question:


For a required life of N cycles, what combinations of midrange (σ_m) and alternating (σ_a) stresses may be deemed safe?

- The Goodman relationship (1890) offers a simple formula for the maximum safe alternating stress σ_a for given mid-range stress σ_m

$$\frac{\sigma_a}{\sigma_{a0}} = 1 - \left(\frac{\sigma_m}{\sigma_{ult}} \right)^m$$

with coefficient m to be determined experimentally.

Here, σ_{a0} is the zero-mean alternating stress level where the system fails after N cycles. σ_{ult} is the ultimate strength of the material.



(Figure 15.2 from Megson 2013)

3.1. The Parameters of Fatigue Testing

Introduction to Fatigue

- In order to make the results from the S-n curve more practical, I will ask the following question:


For a required number of cycles N and alternating stresses (σ_a)

- The Goodman diagram is a very crude heuristic for determining the maximum safe alternating stress σ_a for a given midrange stress σ_m .

with coefficient $r = \sigma_a / \sigma_m$.

Here, σ_{a0} is the maximum safe alternating stress after N cycles.

But please note that Fatigue looks like a **very random phenomenon** in practice. So the Goodman criterion is a very crude heuristic.



So many alternative criteria are in use Figure 6-27 from Budynas, Nisbett, and Shigley 2015

(Figure 15.2 from Megson 2013)

3.2. Miner's Rule

Introduction to Fatigue

- Suppose at an operation level of σ_m, σ_a , the fatigue life is N and the structure undergoes n cycles, Miner's rule posits that $\frac{n}{N}$ is the fraction of life that has been consumed.
- Suppose a structure undergoes multiple stress levels in its loading history, the total fraction of fatigue life that has been consumed is written as

$$\frac{n_1}{N_1} + \frac{n_2}{N_2} + \frac{n_3}{N_3} + \dots$$

- The structure is expected to fail when this sum becomes a constant c which is usually $0.7 < c < 2.2$.
- Also referred to as the **Palmgren-Miner cycle-ratio summation** rule, it is expressed as

$$\sum_i \frac{n_i}{N_i} = D.$$

- D is treated as a “damage index”. When this reaches the value of c (mostly taken as unity), we expect failure.

3.3. The deHavilland Comet

Introduction to Fatigue

No aircraft has contributed more to safety in the jet age than the Comet. The lessons it taught the world of aeronautics live in every jet airliner flying today. – D.D. Dempster, 1959, in The Tale of the Comet




FIG. 7. VIEW FROM INSIDE OF FAILURE AT THE FORWARD ESCAPE HATCH ON THE PORT SIDE—COMET G-ALYU

(Figures from “De Havilland Comet” 2025)

3.3. The deHavilland Comet

Introduction to Fatigue

No aircraft has contributed more to safety in the jet age than the Comet. The lessons it taught the world of aeronautics live in every jet airliner flying today. – D.D. Dempster, 1959, in The Tale of the Comet.




FIG. 12. PHOTOGRAPH OF WRECKAGE AROUND ADF AERIAL WINDOWS—G-ALPR.




FIG. 7. VIEW FROM INSIDE OF FAILURE AT THE FORWARD ESCAPE HATCH ON THE PORT SIDE—COMET G-ALYU

(Figures from "De Havilland Comet" 2025)


3.3. The d Introduction to

No aircraft
taught the
1959 is

DIRECTION OF
PROPAGATION
OF MAIN
CRACKS



FIG. 12. PHOTO



Lessons it
tempster,



TOUCH ON THE

t" 2025)

4.1. Griffith's Analysis and Energy Release Rate

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

- The total energy of a loaded elastic body is written as

$$\Pi = \underbrace{U}_{\text{elastic}} - \underbrace{W}_{\text{external}} .$$

- Griffith's principle:** The energy lost due to the creation of a cracked surface must be equal to the energy required for the creation of the cracked surface.
- Surface energy is usually expressed as $E_S = \mathcal{A}\gamma$.
- This is a general principle agnostic of the exact structure under consideration.


$$G = -\frac{d\Pi}{d\mathcal{A}} = 2\gamma .$$

(note: $2\mathcal{A}$ is the effective total “new” surface area that has been created)

4.1. Griffith's Analysis and Energy Release Rate: Examples

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics


Crack in Stretched Specimen



(Figure from sec 2.5 in Kumar 2009)

- Crack: $\mathcal{A} = 2at$, $\partial \mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{2t} \partial a$
- $\Pi = U = \frac{\sigma^2 t}{2E'} (\mathcal{A}_{tot} - 4\lambda a^2)$.
- $E_S = 2\mathcal{A}\gamma$, $\frac{dE_S}{d\mathcal{A}} = 2\gamma$.
- $G = -\frac{d\Pi}{d\mathcal{A}} = -\frac{1}{2t} \frac{d\Pi}{da} = \frac{\lambda a}{2E'} \sigma^2$.
- $\sigma_{cr} = \sqrt{\frac{E'\gamma}{\lambda a}} = \sqrt{\frac{2E'\gamma}{\pi a}}$.

Double Cantilever Beam (DCB)




(Figure 4.14 in Gdoutos 2005)

- $u = CP = \frac{2a^3}{3EI} P$, $C = \frac{2a^3}{3EI}$.
- $U = \frac{Pu}{2} = \frac{CP^2}{2} = \frac{P^2}{3EI} a^3$,
 $W = Pu = CP^2 = \frac{2P^2}{3EI} a^3$,
 $\Pi = -\frac{P^2}{2} C = -\frac{P^2}{3EI} a^3$.
- $\mathcal{A} = aB$, $\partial \mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{B} \partial a$.
- $G = -\frac{d\Pi}{d\mathcal{A}} = \frac{P^2}{2B} \frac{dC}{da} = \frac{P^2 a^2}{EIB} = \frac{12P^2 a^2}{EB^2 h^3}$

4.1. Griffith's Analysis and Energy Release Rate: Examples

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics


Crack in Stre




(Figure from sec

- Crack: $\mathcal{A} = 2at, \dot{\epsilon}$
- $\Pi = U = \frac{\sigma^2 t}{2E'} (\mathcal{A} t_0$
- $E_S = 2\mathcal{A}\gamma, \frac{dE_S}{d\mathcal{A}} =$
- $G = -\frac{d\Pi}{d\mathcal{A}} = -\frac{1}{2t} \dot{\epsilon}$
- $\sigma_{cr} = \sqrt{\frac{E'\gamma}{\lambda a}} = \sqrt{$

Additional Cases to Consider




(Figure 4.23 from Gdoutos (2005))



(Figure 4.20 from Gdoutos (2005))

er Beam (DCB)



(Gdoutos 2005)

$$= \frac{2a^3}{3EI} \cdot$$

$$\frac{P^2}{3EI} a^3,$$

$$\frac{2P^2}{3EI} a^3,$$

$$a^3.$$

$$= \frac{P^2 a^2}{EIB} = \frac{12P^2 a^2}{EB^2 h^3}$$

4.2. A Primer on 2D Elasticity

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

- In 2D, the governing equations of elasticity (let us assume no body loads for simplicity) are written as,

$$\sigma_{x,x} + \tau_{xy,y} = 0, \quad \tau_{xy,x} + \sigma_{y,y} = 0.$$

- If we seek to obtain **solutions expressed directly in the stresses**, 2 equations won't cut it (we have 3 unique stresses $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \tau_{xy}$). So we invoke strain compatibility, which is written as

$$\varepsilon_{x,yy} + \varepsilon_{y,xx} = \gamma_{xy,xy}$$

- This can be expressed in terms of the stresses if we invoke the **stress-strain constitutive relationships**.

4.2. A Primer on 2D Elasticity

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

- In 2D, the governing equations of elasticity (let us assume no body loads for simplicity) are written as,

$$\sigma_{x,x} + \tau_{xy,y} = 0, \quad \tau_{xy,x} + \sigma_{y,y} = 0.$$

- If we seek to obtain **solutions expressed directly in the stresses**, 2 equations won't cut it (we have 3 unique stresses $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \tau_{xy}$). So we invoke **compatibility conditions** written as

$$\varepsilon_{x,yy} + \varepsilon_{y,xx} = \gamma_{xy,xy}$$

Recall: These are conditions that the strains must satisfy in order for them to have been generated by a continuously differentiable displacement field.

- This can be expressed in terms of the stresses if we invoke the **stress-strain constitutive relationships**.

4.2. A Primer on 2D Elasticity

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

Plane Stress

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_x \\ \varepsilon_y \\ \gamma_{xy} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{E} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\nu & 0 \\ -\nu & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2(1+\nu) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_x \\ \sigma_y \\ \tau_{xy} \end{bmatrix}$$

Compatibility

$$\sigma_{x,yy} + \sigma_{y,xx} - \nu(\sigma_{x,xx} + \sigma_{y,yy}) = 2(1+\nu)\tau_{xy,xy}.$$

Plane Strain

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_x \\ \varepsilon_y \\ \gamma_{xy} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1+\nu}{E} \begin{bmatrix} 1-\nu & -\nu & 0 \\ -\nu & 1-\nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_x \\ \sigma_y \\ \tau_{xy} \end{bmatrix}$$

Compatibility

$$(1-\nu)(\sigma_{x,yy} + \sigma_{y,xx}) - \nu(\sigma_{x,xx} + \sigma_{y,yy}) = 2\tau_{xy,xy}.$$

- Making the substitution $\sigma_x = \phi_{,yy}$, $\sigma_y = \phi_{,xx}$, $\tau_{xy} = -\phi_{,xy}$, it is trivial to see that the equilibrium equations are satisfied automatically.
- In both the above cases, the compatibility equation comes out to be:

$$\phi_{,xxxx} + \phi_{,yyyy} + 2\phi_{,xxyy} = (\partial_{xx} + \partial_{yy})^2 \phi = \nabla^4 \phi = 0.$$

- Since the Laplacian when set to zero ($\nabla^2 \phi = 0$) is referred to as the **harmonic equation** (recall complex analyticity), $\nabla^4 \phi = 0$ is referred to as the **bi-harmonic equation**. ϕ is the **Airy Stress Function**.

4.3. Classical Solutions

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

- Restricting ourselves to 2D problems, the governing equations may be written using the Airy's stress formulation as the biharmonic equation

$$\nabla^4 \phi = 0$$

- Let us look at this with cylindrical coordinates ($x = r \cos \theta$, $y = r \sin \theta$).

$$\underline{\nabla} \phi = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{e}_r & \underline{e}_\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{,r} \\ \phi_{,\theta} \\ r \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underline{\underline{\nabla}} \underline{u} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{e}_r & \underline{e}_\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_{r,r} & \frac{u_{r,\theta} - u_\theta}{r} \\ u_{\theta,r} & \frac{u_{\theta,\theta} + u_r}{r} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \underline{e}_r \\ \underline{e}_\theta \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\underline{\underline{\underline{\nabla}}}^2 \phi = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{e}_r & \underline{e}_\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{,rr} & \partial_r \left(\frac{\phi_{,\theta}}{r} \right) \\ \partial_r \left(\frac{\phi_{,\theta}}{r} \right) & \frac{\phi_{,r}}{r} + \frac{\phi_{,\theta\theta}}{r^2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \underline{e}_r \\ \underline{e}_\theta \end{bmatrix}.$$

- The stresses are expressed (to satisfy equilibrium) as

$$\sigma_{rr} = \frac{\phi_{,r}}{r} + \frac{\phi_{,\theta\theta}}{r^2}, \quad \sigma_{\theta\theta} = \phi_{,rr}, \quad \tau_{r\theta} = -\partial_r \left(\frac{\phi_{,\theta}}{r} \right).$$

4.3. Classical Solutions

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

- R using the

General form of the Airy's Stress Function (Michell Solution, see Barber 2022, Ch. 8-9)

$$\phi = a_0 + a_1 \log r + a_2 r^2 + a_3 r^2 \log r$$

$$(a_4 + a_5 \log r + a_6 r^2 + a_7 r^2 \log r)\theta$$

- L $(a_{11}r + a_{12}r \log r + \frac{a_{13}}{r} + a_{14}r^3 + a_{15}r\theta + a_{16}r\theta \log r) \cos \theta$

$$(b_{11}r + b_{12}r \log r + \frac{b_{13}}{r} + b_{14}r^3 + b_{15}r\theta + b_{16}r\theta \log r) \sin \theta$$

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (a_{n1}r^n + a_{n2}r^{2+n} + a_{n3}r^{-n} + a_{n4}r^{2-n}) \cos n\theta$$

- T $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (b_{n1}r^n + b_{n2}r^{2+n} + b_{n3}r^{-n} + b_{n4}r^{2-n}) \sin n\theta.$

$$\sigma_{rr} = \frac{\phi_{,r}}{r} + \frac{\phi_{,\theta\theta}}{r^2}, \quad \sigma_{\theta\theta} = \phi_{,rr}, \quad \tau_{r\theta} = -\partial_r \left(\frac{\phi_{,\theta}}{r} \right).$$

4.3.1. The Michell Solution: Tabled Expressions

Classical Solutions

Stress Components

ϕ	σ_{rr}	$\sigma_{r\theta}$	$\sigma_{\theta\theta}$
r^2	2	0	2
$r^2 \ln(r)$	$2 \ln(r) + 1$	0	$2 \ln(r) + 3$
$\ln(r)$	$1/r^2$	0	$-1/r^2$
θ	0	$1/r^2$	0
$r^3 \cos \theta$	$2r \cos \theta$	$2r \sin \theta$	$6r \cos \theta$
$r\theta \sin \theta$	$2 \cos \theta / r$	0	0
$r \ln(r) \cos \theta$	$\cos \theta / r$	$\sin \theta / r$	$\cos \theta / r$
$\cos \theta / r$	$-2 \cos \theta / r^3$	$-2 \sin \theta / r^3$	$2 \cos \theta / r^3$
$r^3 \sin \theta$	$2r \sin \theta$	$-2r \cos \theta$	$6r \sin \theta$
$r\theta \cos \theta$	$-2 \sin \theta / r$	0	0
$r \ln(r) \sin \theta$	$\sin \theta / r$	$-\cos \theta / r$	$\sin \theta / r$
$\sin \theta / r$	$-2 \sin \theta / r^3$	$2 \cos \theta / r^3$	$2 \sin \theta / r^3$
$r^{n+2} \cos n\theta$	$-(n+1)(n-2)r^n \cos n\theta$	$n(n+1)r^n \sin n\theta$	$(n+1)(n+2)r^n \cos n\theta$
$r^n \cos n\theta$	$-n(n-1)r^{n-2} \cos n\theta$	$n(n-1)r^{n-2} \sin n\theta$	$n(n-1)r^{n-2} \cos n\theta$
$r^{n+2} \sin n\theta$	$-(n+1)(n-2)r^n \sin n\theta$	$-n(n+1)r^n \cos n\theta$	$(n+1)(n+2)r^n \sin n\theta$
$r^n \sin n\theta$	$-n(n-1)r^{n-2} \sin n\theta$	$-n(n-1)r^{n-2} \cos n\theta$	$n(n-1)r^{n-2} \sin n\theta$

(Table 8.1 from Barber 2022)

We set rigid body motion components to zero for the displacements

Displacement Components

ϕ	$2\mu u_r$	$2\mu u_\theta$
r^2	$(\kappa - 1)r$	0
$r^2 \ln(r)$	$(\kappa - 1)r \ln(r) - r$	$(\kappa + 1)r\theta$
$\ln(r)$	$-1/r$	0
θ	0	$-1/r$
$r^3 \cos \theta$	$(\kappa - 2)r^2 \cos \theta$	$(\kappa + 2)r^2 \sin \theta$
$r\theta \sin \theta$	$\frac{1}{2}[(\kappa - 1)\theta \sin \theta - \cos \theta + (\kappa + 1) \ln(r) \cos \theta]$	$\frac{1}{2}[(\kappa - 1)\theta \cos \theta - \sin \theta - (\kappa + 1) \ln(r) \sin \theta]$
$r \ln(r) \cos \theta$	$\frac{1}{2}[(\kappa + 1)\theta \sin \theta - \cos \theta + (\kappa - 1) \ln(r) \cos \theta]$	$\frac{1}{2}[(\kappa + 1)\theta \cos \theta - \sin \theta - (\kappa - 1) \ln(r) \sin \theta]$
$\cos \theta / r$	$\cos \theta / r^2$	$\sin \theta / r^2$
$r^3 \sin \theta$	$(\kappa - 2)r^2 \sin \theta$	$-(\kappa + 2)r^2 \cos \theta$
$r\theta \cos \theta$	$\frac{1}{2}[(\kappa - 1)\theta \cos \theta + \sin \theta - (\kappa + 1) \ln(r) \sin \theta]$	$\frac{1}{2}[-(\kappa - 1)\theta \sin \theta - \cos \theta - (\kappa + 1) \ln(r) \cos \theta]$
$r \ln(r) \sin \theta$	$\frac{1}{2}[-(\kappa + 1)\theta \cos \theta - \sin \theta + (\kappa - 1) \ln(r) \sin \theta]$	$\frac{1}{2}[(\kappa + 1)\theta \sin \theta + \cos \theta + (\kappa - 1) \ln(r) \cos \theta]$
$\sin \theta / r$	$\sin \theta / r^2$	$-\cos \theta / r^2$
$r^{n+2} \cos n\theta$	$(\kappa - n - 1)r^{n+1} \cos n\theta$	$(\kappa + n + 1)r^{n+1} \sin n\theta$
$r^n \cos n\theta$	$-nr^{n-1} \cos n\theta$	$nr^{n-1} \sin n\theta$
$r^{n+2} \sin n\theta$	$(\kappa - n - 1)r^{n+1} \sin n\theta$	$-(\kappa + n + 1)r^{n+1} \cos n\theta$
$r^n \sin n\theta$	$-nr^{n-1} \sin n\theta$	$-nr^{n-1} \cos n\theta$

(Table 9.1 from Barber 2022)


$$\text{Plane Stress } \kappa = \frac{3-\nu}{1+\nu}$$

$$\text{Plane Strain } \kappa = 3 - 4\nu$$

4.3. Plate with a Hole. Plate With a Hole Under Tension

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics


- Let us now try to use the above table for obtaining the stress distribution around a hole in a tension field.



4.3. Plate with a Hole. Plate With a Hole Under Tension

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics


- Let us now try to use the above table for obtaining the stress distribution around a hole in a tension field.



Displacement Field

$$u_r = \frac{\sigma_0}{2}(\kappa - 1)r - \frac{\sigma_0}{2}r \cos 2\theta$$

$$u_\theta = \frac{\sigma_0}{2}r \sin 2\theta$$



Problem A

The 2D stress field (cartesian) is

$$\underline{\underline{\sigma}}_{cart} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

- Transforming to cylindrical coordinates,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\underline{\sigma}}_{cyl} &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \sigma_0 \begin{bmatrix} \sin^2 \theta & \sin \theta \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \cos \theta & \cos^2 \theta \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

The components can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{rr} &= \sigma_0 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\cos 2\theta}{2} \right), & \sigma_{r\theta} &= \sigma_0 \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2}, \\ \sigma_{\theta\theta} &= \sigma_0 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\cos 2\theta}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

4.3. Plate with a Hole. Plate With a Hole Under Tension

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

- Let us now try to use the above table for obtaining the stress distribution around a hole in a tension field.

Displacement Field

$$u_r = \frac{\sigma_0 a^2}{2r} \left(1 - (\kappa + 1 - \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^2) \cos 2\theta \right)$$

$$u_\theta = \frac{\sigma_0 a^2}{2r} \left(\kappa - 1 + \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^2 \right) \sin 2\theta.$$

Problem B

At $r = a$ we want

$$\sigma_{rr} = \sigma_0 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\cos 2\theta}{2} \right), \quad \sigma_{r\theta} = \sigma_0 \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2}.$$

(no hoop component specified)


As $r \rightarrow \infty$, we want $\sigma_{rr}, \sigma_{r\theta}, \sigma_{\theta\theta} \rightarrow 0$ to match the far-field.

- Based on inspection (shown in class), we find the following Airy stress function to be a good starting point: $\phi = A \log r + B\theta + C \cos 2\theta + D \frac{\cos 2\theta}{r^2}$.
- Solving for A, B, C, D based on the B.C.s we get,

$$\sigma_{rr} = -\frac{\sigma_0}{2} \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^2 + 2\sigma_0 \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^2\right) \cos 2\theta,$$


$$\sigma_{\theta\theta} = \frac{\sigma_0}{2} \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^2 + \frac{3\sigma_0}{4} \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^4 \cos 2\theta,$$

$$\sigma_{r\theta} = \sigma_0 \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{a}{r}\right)^2\right) \sin 2\theta$$




4.3. Plate with a Hole. Plate With a Hole Under Tension

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics



4.3.3. Notch Crack

Classical Solutions



- We seek an analytical solution for this problem setting **very close to the crack**.
- While we may intuitively expect stress to be singular at the crack tip, the strain energy has to be finite.
- Suppose $\sigma \sim \mathcal{O}(r^\lambda)$, $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{O}(r^\lambda)$ necessarily.
 - So $\mathcal{U} = \int \int \frac{\sigma \varepsilon}{2} r dr d\theta \sim \mathcal{O}(r^{2\lambda+1})$.
 - For this to be finite, $2\lambda + 1 \geq 0 \implies \lambda \geq -\frac{1}{2}$.
- We list out **the only Airy stress functions** that can show this in the following table (refer sl. 28).

ϕ	σ_{rr}	$\sigma_{r\theta}$	$\sigma_{\theta\theta}$
$r^{n+2} \cos n\theta$	$(..)r^n \cos n\theta$	$(..)r^n \sin n\theta$	$(..)r^n \cos n\theta$
$r^n \cos n\theta$	$(..)r^{n-2} \cos n\theta$	$(..)r^{n-2} \sin n\theta$	$(..)r^{n-2} \cos n\theta$
$r^{n+2} \sin n\theta$	$(..)r^n \sin n\theta$	$(..)r^n \cos n\theta$	$(..)r^n \sin n\theta$
$r^n \sin n\theta$	$(..)r^{n-2} \sin n\theta$	$(..)r^{n-2} \cos n\theta$	$(..)r^{n-2} \sin n\theta$

4.3.3. Singularity Close to Notch Crack

Classical Solutions

- For the Notch crack problem, we posit the Airy stress function


$$\phi = r^{\lambda+1} (A_1 \cos((\lambda - 1)\theta) + A_2 \cos((\lambda + 1)\theta) + B_1 \sin((\lambda - 1)\theta) + B_2 \sin((\lambda + 1)\theta)).$$

4.3.3. Singularity Close to Notch Crack

Classical Solutions

- For the Notch crack problem, we posit the Airy stress function

$$\phi = r^{\lambda+1} (A_1 \cos((\lambda - 1)\theta) + A_2 \cos((\lambda + 1)\theta) + B_1 \sin((\lambda - 1)\theta) + B_2 \sin((\lambda + 1)\theta))$$



4.3.3. Singularity Close to Notch Crack

Classical Solutions

- For the Notch crack problem, we posit the Airy stress function

$$\phi = r^{\lambda+1} (A_1 \cos((\lambda - 1)\theta) + A_2 \cos((\lambda + 1)\theta) + B_1 \sin((\lambda - 1)\theta) + B_2 \sin((\lambda + 1)\theta)).$$

- Applying the boundary conditions (along with $\alpha = \pi$), we get a nonlinear eigenvalue problem that has the following solutions:

λ	Eigenfunction
$\frac{1}{2}$	$A_2 = \frac{A_1}{3}, B_2 = -B_1$
1	$A_2 = -A_1, B_2 = 0 (B_1 = 0)$
$\frac{3}{2}$	$A_2 = -\frac{A_1}{5}, B_2 = -B_1$
\vdots	

- $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ corresponds to the near-field singular stress field, given by

$$\sigma_{rr} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(\frac{5}{4} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{1}{4} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) + \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(-\frac{5}{4} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{3}{4} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right)$$

$$\sigma_{\theta\theta} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(\frac{3}{4} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) + \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(-\frac{3}{4} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{3}{4} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right)$$

$$\sigma_{r\theta} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(\frac{1}{4} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) + \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(\frac{1}{4} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{3}{4} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right)$$

4.3.3. Singularity Close to Notch Crack

Classical Solutions

- For the Notch crack problem, we posit the Airy stress function

$$\phi = r^{\lambda+1} (A_1 \cos((\lambda - 1)\theta) + A_2 \cos((\lambda + 1)\theta) + B_1 \sin((\lambda - 1)\theta) + B_2 \sin((\lambda + 1)\theta)).$$

- Applying the boundary conditions (along with $\alpha = \pi$), we get a nonlinear eigenvalue problem that has the following solutions:

λ | Eigenfunction

Displacement Field

$$2\mu u_r = K_I \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \left((\kappa - \frac{1}{2}) \cos \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) - K_{II} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \left((\kappa - \frac{1}{2}) \sin \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{3}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right)$$

$$2\mu u_\theta = K_I \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \left(-(\kappa + \frac{1}{2}) \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) - K_{II} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \left((\kappa + \frac{1}{2}) \cos \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{3}{2} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right)$$

- $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ corresponds to the near-field singular stress field, given by


$$\sigma_{rr} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(\frac{5}{4} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{1}{4} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) + \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(-\frac{5}{4} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{3}{4} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right)$$

$$\sigma_{\theta\theta} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(\frac{3}{4} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) + \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(-\frac{3}{4} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{3}{4} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right)$$

$$\sigma_{r\theta} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(\frac{1}{4} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) + \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \left(\frac{1}{4} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{3}{4} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right)$$

4.3.3. Singularity Close to Notch Crack


Classical Solutions

Mode 2 Loading (unit K_{II})

4.3.3. Energy Release Rate

Classical Solutions

- Let us think of how much energy will be necessary to “close” a crack.



4.3.3. Energy Release Rate

Classical Solutions

- Let us think of how much energy will be necessary to “close” a crack.
- We observe that (all quantities in cylindrical):

$$\text{@ } \theta = 0, \quad \underline{\underline{\sigma}} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi x}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2\mu\underline{\underline{u}} = K_I \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} \kappa - 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - K_{II} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \kappa - 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{@ } \theta = \pi, \quad \underline{\underline{\sigma}} = \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2\mu\underline{\underline{u}} = K_I \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -(\kappa + 1) \end{bmatrix} - K_{II} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} \kappa + 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

4.3.3. Energy Release Rate

Classical Solutions

- Let us think of how much energy will be necessary to “close” a crack.
- We observe that (all quantities in cylindrical):

$$\text{@ } \theta = 0, \quad \underline{\underline{\sigma}} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi x}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2\mu \underline{u} = K_I \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} \kappa - 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - K_{II} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \kappa - 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{@ } \theta = \pi, \quad \underline{\underline{\sigma}} = \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad 2\mu \underline{u} = K_I \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -(\kappa + 1) \end{bmatrix} - K_{II} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} \kappa + 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

- For virtual crack closure, the work done can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} W(a) &= 2 \int_0^a \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma_{\theta\theta} \Big|_{\theta=0} (-u_{\theta}) \Big|_{\theta=\pi} + \sigma_{r\theta} \Big|_{\theta=0} (-u_r) \Big|_{\theta=\pi} \right) dx \\ &= \int_0^a \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi x}} K_I \sqrt{\frac{a-x}{2\pi}} \frac{\kappa+1}{2\mu} + \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} K_{II} \sqrt{\frac{a-x}{2\pi}} \frac{\kappa+1}{2\mu} dx \\ &= \frac{K_I^2 + K_{II}^2}{2\pi} \frac{\kappa+1}{2\mu} \int_0^a \sqrt{\frac{a-x}{x}} dx = \frac{K_I^2 + K_{II}^2}{8\mu^2} (\kappa+1)^2 a = \begin{cases} \frac{K_I^2 + K_{II}^2}{E} a & \text{Plane-}\sigma \\ \frac{K_I^2 + K_{II}^2}{E} (1 - \nu^2) a & \text{Plane-}\varepsilon \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- The Griffith Energy Release Rate is the derivative $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{B} \frac{dW}{da}$, which evaluates as

$$G = \frac{1}{B} \begin{cases} \frac{K_I^2}{E} + \frac{K_{II}^2}{E} & \text{Plane Stress} \\ \frac{K_I^2}{E} (1 - \nu^2) + \frac{K_{II}^2}{E} (1 - \nu^2) & \text{Plane Strain} \end{cases}.$$

4.3.3. Stress Intensity Factor

Classical Solutions

- A crack is said to propagate when G exceeds G_{cr} .
- Therefore, under “pure” mode I loading, the *Critical Stress Intensity Factor* ($K_{I,cr}$) is

$$K_{I,cr} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{BG_{cr}E} & \text{Plane Stress} \\ \sqrt{\frac{BG_{cr}E}{1-\nu^2}} & \text{Plane Strain} \end{cases} .$$

- But how do we relate K_I, K_{II} with far-field applied stresses?

4.3.3. Stress Intensity Factor

Classical Solutions

- A crack is said to propagate when G exceeds G_{cr} .
- Therefore, under “pure” mode I loading, the *Critical Stress Intensity Factor* ($K_{I,cr}$) is

$$K_{I,cr} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{BG_{cr}E} & \text{Plane Stress} \\ \sqrt{\frac{BG_{cr}E}{1-\nu^2}} & \text{Plane Strain} \end{cases} .$$

- **But how do we relate K_I, K_{II} with far-field applied stresses?** The answer is very closely tied in to the exact geometry, loading conditions, etc.

4.3.3. Griffith-Inglis Crack Revisited

Classical Solutions

- For the flat crack of length $2a$ (aka the Griffith-Inglis crack), the SIF is related to tensile stresses by

$$K_I = \sigma_0 \sqrt{\pi a}.$$

- Note that this is why we chose $\lambda = \frac{\pi}{2}$ in sl. 7. If we left it in, we'll have to satisfy (plane stress considered here):

$$\frac{4\lambda a}{E} \sigma_0^2 = \frac{2K_I^2}{E} = \frac{2\pi a}{E} \sigma_0^2.$$

4.4. Crack Propagation and the Paris Law

Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics

- **Paris Law:** $\frac{da}{dN} = C(\Delta K)^m$.
- Usually a_f is specified and we are interested in finding how many cycles until a crack of size a_i grows to a_f . This is the “life” of the material.

Values for common engineering materials, from Kumar 2009

Material	C	m
Ferrite-Pearlite (S)	6.8×10^{-12}	3.0
Martensite (S)	1.33×10^{-10}	2.25
Austenite (S)	5.5×10^{-12}	3.25
Cast Iron (S)	5.5×10^{-12}	3.25
Al-Alloy	1.1×10^{-11}	3.89

References I

- [1] Emmanuël Gdoutos. **Fracture Mechanics: An Introduction**, Second Edition. Solid Mechanics and Its Applications 123. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2005. ISBN: 978-1-4020-2863-2 978-1-4020-3153-3. DOI: [10.1007/1-4020-3153-X](https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3153-X) (cit. on pp. **2**, **54**, **55**).
- [2] S. Suresh. **Fatigue of Materials**, 2nd ed. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. ISBN: 978-0-521-57046-6 978-0-521-57847-9 (cit. on p. **2**).
- [3] William D. Callister Jr and David G. Rethwisch. **Fundamentals of Materials Science and Engineering: An Integrated Approach**, John Wiley & Sons, 2012. ISBN: 978-1-118-06160-2 (cit. on pp. **2**, **11–17**).
- [4] Prashant Kumar. **Elements of Fracture Mechanics**, 1st Edition. McGraw-Hill Education, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-07-065696-3. (Visited on 12/15/2024) (cit. on pp. **2**, **18–21**, **26**, **54**, **55**, **79**).
- [5] T. H. G. Megson. **Aircraft Structures for Engineering Students**, Elsevier, 2013. ISBN: 978-0-08-096905-3 (cit. on pp. **2**, **11–17**, **42–48**).
- [6] Sparky. *Sparky's Sword Science: Introduction to Crystal Structure*. Dec. 2013. (Visited on 08/09/2024) (cit. on pp. **3–5**).
- [7] *New Technique Provides Detailed Views of Metals' Crystal Structure*. <https://news.mit.edu/2016/metals-crystal-structure-0706>. July 2016. (Visited on 08/09/2024) (cit. on pp. **3–5**).
- [8] V Rajendran. **Materials Science**, Tata McGraw-Hill Education, 2011. ISBN: 978-1-259-05006-0 (cit. on pp. **6–10**).
- [9] Nick Connor. *What Is Stress-strain Curve - Stress-strain Diagram - Definition*. <https://material-properties.org/what-is-stress-strain-curve-stress-strain-diagram-definition/>. July 2020. (Visited on 08/07/2024) (cit. on pp. **6**, **7**).
- [10] *What Is Metal Fatigue? Metal Fatigue Failure Examples*. Apr. 2021. (Visited on 08/09/2024) (cit. on pp. **11–17**).
- [11] *The deHavilland Comet Disaster*. July 2019. (Visited on 08/09/2024) (cit. on pp. **11–17**).
- [12] *DCA21FA085.Aspx*. <https://www.nts.gov/investigations/Pages/DCA21FA085.aspx>. Aug. 2024. (Visited on 08/09/2024) (cit. on pp. **11–17**).
- [13] *Fatigue Physics*. Aug. 2024. (Visited on 08/09/2024) (cit. on pp. **11–17**).
- [14] Martin H. Sadd. **Elasticity: Theory, Applications, and Numerics**, 2nd ed. Amsterdam ; Boston: Elsevier/AP, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-12-374446-3 (cit. on pp. **22–25**).

References II

- [15] Richard G. Budynas, J. Keith Nisbett, and Joseph Edward Shigley. **Shigley's Mechanical Engineering Design**, Tenth edition. Mcgraw-Hill Series in Mechanical Engineering. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education, 2015. ISBN: 978-0-07-339820-4 (cit. on pp. **27**, **42–48**).
- [16] “De Havilland Comet”. **Wikipedia**, (Apr. 2025). (Visited on 04/08/2025) (cit. on pp. **50–52**).
- [17] J. R. Barber. **Elasticity**, vol. 172. Solid Mechanics and Its Applications. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022. ISBN: 978-3-031-15213-9 978-3-031-15214-6. DOI: **10.1007/978-3-031-15214-6**. (Visited on 12/17/2024) (cit. on pp. **59–61**, **67–72**).