APPLICATION OF STATISTICAL CLEAVAGE CRITERIA
TO FRACTURE CONTROL OF PRESSURE VESSELS

A. PELLISSIER-TANON, J.C. DEVAUX, B. HOUSSEIN

Results of experiments featuring the most important characteristics of situations encountered in pressure vessel integrity analysis, provide a very good qualification of the criterion:

\[ \frac{1}{B} \int_L^L \left( \frac{K_I}{K_I^R} \right)^4 \mathrm{d}L \geq 1 \]

in which the integration is performed on the applied value of \( K_I \) and on the toughness \( K_I^R \), all along the crack front of length \( L \), and for which the curve expressing the reference toughness \( K_I^R \) as a function of temperature is a lower bound to a sufficient number of valid \( K_I \) measurements with specimens of thickness \( B \).

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of margins with respect to fast fracture in the brittle-ductile transition for ferritic steels is currently achieved by linear elastic fracture mechanics analyses in which the computed value of stress intensity factor \( K_I \) is compared to a reference toughness \( K_I^R \), expressed as a function of temperature. The \( K_I^R \) temperature curve is defined in principle in order to be a lower bound to a sufficient set of experimental measurements.

A first problem arose when accumulation of experimental results, and particularly results of tests on a long cracked cylinder under thermal shock loadings \([1]\) set forth initiation of cleavage instable propagation at values of \( K_I \) lower than the lower bounds of previous specimen testing programs. This cast doubt on the validity of the lower bound reference curve approach.
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At the same time, the requirement to increase computation accuracy in nuclear safety assessment [2] led to consider the behaviour of surface cracks under high stress gradients, presenting large variations of $K_I$ along the crack contour. Application of an analysis criterion, in which the value of $K_I$ at each point on the crack front was compared to the $K_I^c$, given by the reference curve for the temperature at that point, led to a much more pessimistic appraisal of the resistance to fracture than previous assessments had done.

Solution of these two problems appeared clearly to be related to an objective account of the finding made in some large experimental programs, involving specimens of different thicknesses, that the lower bounds of toughness obtained at a given temperature decreased with specimen thickness [3] [4].

These results clearly pointed towards a weakest link statistics probabilistic approach of cleavage fracture. Recent works from different countries have firmly established the physical grounds for such an approach and its interest for solving engineering application problems [5] [6] [7] [8].

This paper presents in a first part the mechanical basis of a simple engineering probabilistic cleavage initiation criterion, which brings a practical answer to the two problems expressed above in small scale yielding conditions. A qualification of this criterion is looked for in a second part, by applying it to the interpretation of two different sets of experiments featuring these two problems.
Basic results on probabilistic approach to cleavage fracture

Probabilistic approach to cleavage fracture is discussed in [5][8][9]. The most basic elements are:

- cleavage fracture initiation exhibits a weakest link statistical behaviour, which expresses the probability of no fracture $1-P$ of an aggregate as the product of the probabilities of no fracture $P_i(1-P_i)$ of the elements constituting the aggregate.

- the mean volume $V_0$ or mean characteristic length $3\sqrt{V_0}$ of these elements are of the order of size below which continuum mechanics analysis no longer has a meaning. They are related to the size of the crystallographic microstructural elements.

- the probability of fracture of an element is a function $h \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_u} \right)$ of the mean principal stress $\sigma$ through this element, $\sigma_u$ being a material characteristic, which has been found to be nearly independent of temperature.

- onset of plastic deformation through the element is necessary to initiate cleavage fracture.

Thus, the probability of fracture $P$ obeys the relation:

$$\ln \left( 1 - P \right) = \sum_{V_0 \in V_P} \ln \left[ 1 - h \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_u} \right) \right]$$

in which $V_P$ represents the volume of the plastic zone.

Putting:

$$\ln \left[ 1 - h \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_u} \right) \right] = H \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_u} \right)$$

gives:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
P = 1 - \frac{\int_{V_P} H \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_u} \right) dV}{V_0} \\
F_{cr} \cdot r_0 > 3\sqrt{V_0}
\end{array} \right. \quad (2)$$

and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
P = 0 \\
F_{cr} \cdot r_0 < 3\sqrt{V_0}
\end{array} \right. \quad (2)'$$

in which $r_0$ is the extension of the part of the plastic zone in which the principal stresses are the largest ahead of the crack tip.
MUDRY, PINEAU and DEVAUX have established and checked a particular expression of (2), recalling the WEIBULL cleavage statistics:

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{P} &= 1 - \bar{x} \bar{p} \left( \frac{\gamma_{\infty}}{\sigma_u} \right)^m \\
\bar{V}_{P} &= \left[ \int_{V_P} \int_{A_P} \frac{4}{m} \frac{1}{V_o} \right]^m
\end{align*}
\]

Relations for small scale yielding conditions

The plastic zone is contained in a limited volume extending along the crack front, according to figure 1. At each point M of the crack front, marked by its curvilinear coordinate \( \theta \) the cross section of the plastic zone in a plane normal to the crack front is called \( S_0 \). Equation (2) can be expressed as:

\[
\ln (1 - P) = \int_\ell \int_{S_0} \frac{1}{V_o} \mathcal{H} \left( \frac{\Sigma}{\sigma_u} \right) d\Sigma d\ell \quad (4)
\]

In small scale yielding, the geometrical distribution of stresses in \( S_0 \) follows the pattern a of geometrical affinity, with center at the crack tip, and which is such that:

- for two loading cases \( K^{(1)}_\Sigma \) and \( K^{(2)}_\Sigma \) the same value of stress tensor \( \Sigma_{ij} \), is found at same polar coordinate \( \theta \) and at two radial coordinates \( V^{(1)}_0 \) and \( V^{(2)}_0 \) such that:

\[
\frac{V^{(1)}_0}{V^{(2)}_0} = \left( \frac{K^{(1)}_\Sigma}{K^{(2)}_\Sigma} \right)^\frac{2}{3}
\]

- and the plastic zone cross section elements \( dS_1 \) and \( dS_2 \) which are to be associated with the maximum principal stress \( \Sigma \), are such that:

\[
\frac{dS_1}{dS_2} = \left( \frac{K^{(1)}_\Sigma}{K^{(2)}_\Sigma} \right)^4 \left( \frac{\Sigma^{(1)}_\Sigma}{\Sigma^{(2)}_\Sigma} \right)^4
\]

\( \Sigma_\Sigma \) is the yield stress at the temperature \( T \) at the crack tip; it is assumed that the strain hardening exponent remains constant in the temperature interval \( T_1 - T_2 \).

These properties imply that:

\[
\int_{S_0} \mathcal{H} \left( \frac{\Sigma}{\sigma_u} \right) d\Sigma = - \alpha \left( \frac{K^{(1)}_\Sigma}{\Sigma_\Sigma} \right)^4
\]

with \( \alpha \) being a material characteristic independent of temperature.

And:

\[
\ln (1 - P) = - \int_\ell \alpha \left( \frac{K^{(1)}_\Sigma}{\Sigma_\Sigma} \right)^4 d\ell
\]
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Correlation to material testing results

If a large enough number of valid $K_{IC}$ measurements (which imply small scale yielding) have been made on specimens of the same thickness $B$, the tests can be fitted to relation (6), in order to obtain the value of $\alpha$.

MUDRY [7] gives direct expressions of $\alpha$ for 15MNID6 (A508c13) forgings, resulting from the elastoplastic computation of the specimens.

If the number of specimens is not large enough, an approximate value of $\alpha$ can be established by correlating the median value of $K_{IC}$ to $P = 0.5$ or the lower bound value to $P = 1/N$ (N being the number of specimens tested).

Criterion for structural analysis

When a lower bound reference toughness curve is available, which is considered to be safe when tests are performed with specimens of width equal or smaller than the value $B$, it is possible to express the cleavage fracture criterion in a simple engineering manner, which is the following:

The aim is to ensure that the probability of fracture $P$ in the analyzed structure be not larger than the probability $P^R$ to obtain an experimental value of $K_{IC}$ below the value $K_{IC}^R$ on the reference curve, when making measurements with specimens of width $B$. $P^R$ is assumed to be independent of temperature, and equation (6) becomes, for the reference toughness:

$$\ln \left(1 - P^R \right) = \mathcal{B} \alpha \left( \frac{K_{IC}^R}{\sqrt{\mathcal{D}(\Gamma)}} \right)^4$$

(7)

Replacing $\left( \frac{\mathcal{D}(\Gamma)}{\mathcal{D}(\Gamma)} \right)^4$ by its value from (7) in equation (6), for the analyzed case gives:

$$\ln \left(1 - P \right) = \ln \left(1 - P^R \right) \mathcal{B} \int \left( \frac{K_{ICT}}{K_{IC}^R} \right)^4 d\ell$$

(8)

And the condition, stated above, to have $P$ not larger than $P^R$ reduces to:

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{B}} \int \left( \frac{K_{ICT}}{K_{IC}^R} \right)^4 d\ell \leq 1$$

(9)
EXPERIMENTS WITH LARGE VARIATIONS OF $K_I$ ALONG THE CRACK FRONT

The experimental program comprises bend specimens with fatigue precracked semi-elliptical cracks and prismatic bars taken in the same 15 MNDO forging, according to figure 2, which have been broken at several temperatures in the transition region.

The values of $K_I$ at edge $K_{Ib}$ and deepest point $K_{If}$ computed at fracture for the bend specimens are compared with the $K_I$ at fracture on the prismatic bars, called $K_{IP}$, in figure 3. Some averaging must be clearly taken into account to express a fracture criterion, and the experimental averaged ratios $K_{If}/K_{Ib}$ and $K_{IP}/K_{Ib}$ for the mean values and for the lower bounds are given in Table 1.

The values computed for $K_I$ along the front of the semielliptical cracks of the bend specimens can accurately be expressed according to a parabolic expression of the elliptical angle $\phi$.

$$K_I(\phi) = K_{If} + (K_{Ib} - K_{If}) \left(2 \phi / \pi \right)^2.$$  

Hence, for the same probability of fracture, equation (6) leads to the following relation between $K_{IP}$, $K_{If}$ and $K_{Ib}$:

$$K_{IP}^2 B = \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \left[ K_{If} \left(K_{Ib} - K_{If} \right) \left(2 \phi / \pi \right)^2 \right] \left(1 + \frac{a}{2} \frac{\omega^2}{\pi} \phi \right)^2 \phi \, \mathrm{d}\phi.$$  

For the range of shape and size of the semielliptical cracks in the bend plates, $K_{If}/K_{Ib} = 1.77$, and the interpretation of the above equation leads to:

$$K_{If}/K_{Ib} = 1.15 \quad ; \quad K_{If}/K_{IP} = 0.65.$$  

The very good agreement with the experimental values shown in Table 1 supports the validity of the probabilistic cleavage criterion (Table 1 is given on page 11).

BEHAVIOUR OF A ONE METER LONG CYLINDER UNDER LIQUID NITROGEN THERMAL SHOCK

Results of thermal shock experiment

Experimental results on the behaviour of a 1 m long 16 MNDO (A580Cl3) cylinder during liquid nitrogen thermal shock is presented in [11] together with a preliminary interpretation with two-dimensional analysis. The test cylinder is described on figure 4. An initial 17 mm deep straight front longitudinal crack was produced by charging hydrogen in an electron beam fusion bead. Three successive initiation and arrest events took place during cooling. The crack front shapes after each arrest are shown on figure 5. Temperatures were measured along the four radial plugs shown at figure 4.
Stress intensity factors have been computed by loading the cylinder with the mean of the temperature distributions given by the plugs at each initiation and arrest, under the following assumptions:

1) Infinite straight crack in infinite cylinder, weight function method for maximum depth at all initiation and arrest events.

2) Straight crack in finite cylinder, finite element method, for maximum depth (88 mm) at second initiation.

3) Curved crack front matching crack contour at second initiation, finite element method, at second initiation.

$K_I$ distribution obtained for cases 2 and 3 are presented at figure 6. $K_I$ distribution for case 3 shows a nearly constant value through most of the crack front in center part, the peak near the edge being an artefact related to the finite element meshing. $K_I$ distribution for case 2 is nearly parabolic with a maximum at center and a very small value at edge. A probabilistically equivalent average $K_I$ to case 2 distribution can be defined by relation:

$$
\overline{K_I} = \int_{\ell} K_I^4 \, d\ell
$$

The ratios between the finite cylinder finite element computations and the infinite cylinder straight front weight functions results obtained in the analysis of the second initiation event are applied to the first and third initiation event analysis. The results are presented on table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME AT INITIATION EVENT(S)</th>
<th>169</th>
<th>209</th>
<th>356</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crack front shape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>straight</td>
<td>curved</td>
<td>curved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack depth (mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At deepest point</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_I$ (MPa√m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite cylinder analysis</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite cylinder analysis</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MPa√m)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At deepest point</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at edge point</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average (C)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) : Probabilistic average according to \(10\)
(b) : Mean value at plateau in center part
(c) : \(\overline{T} = \overline{\varepsilon} \int_{\varepsilon} T_d\)
Material characterisation results

Several material characterisation programs have been performed on material cut in the cylinder forging. Two programs are of interest here. A first one comprises six valid $K_{IC}$ tests on 75 mm thick (3 TCT) compact tension specimens in which the starter crack was created by the same electron beam fusion and hydrogen charging method as for the first test cylinder initiation. The second one comprises 6 valid $K_{IC}$ tests on 100 mm thick (4TCT) compact specimens, cut in the cylinder itself, with fatigue crack tip at a location corresponding to the depth 70 mm within the cylinder. Results are presented at table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CT specimen thickness (mm)</th>
<th>Program 1</th>
<th>Program 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test temperature (°C)</th>
<th>- 60</th>
<th>- 10</th>
<th>+ 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of specimens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$K_{IC}$ (MPa $\sqrt{m}$)</th>
<th>maximum</th>
<th>minimum</th>
<th>average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**

Correlations between the cylinder and CT specimens results by the probabilistic cleavage criterion

Thermal shock experiment results on the cracked cylinder of length $l$ can be correlated to the series of test results on CT specimens of width $b$ according to the weakest link statistical model, by considering the cracked cylinder as an aggregate of a number $N = L/B$ of CT specimens put side by side.

Let us now consider a hypothetical cylinder constructed by putting side by side along the crack front material aggregates having the toughness properties of the n CT specimen tested, with therefore a length $nB$. The weakest link statistical model predicts that if this cylinder is loaded uniformly along the crack front at the same temperature as the CT specimens it must break at a value of $K_I$ equal to the lowest toughness, $K_{IC}$ min, measured on the CT specimens. If an actual cylinder of same material and of same length was tested in the same conditions it can be considered that the $K_I$ measured would have a good chance of being close to $K_{IC}$ min.
According to the weakest link statistical model the actual cylinder, as an aggregate of \( N \) specimens, would have for \( K_I = K_{IC \text{ min}} \), a fracture probability \( P^c \) different from the one of the aggregate of the \( n \) CT specimens considered above, which we call \( P^S \).

The probability of fracture \( P^S \) at \( K_{IC \text{ min}} \) is \( 1/n \).

The mean probability at fracture \( \Pi \) of each CT specimen at \( K_{IC \text{ min}} \) is such that:

\[
1 - \Pi = \left( 1 - P^S \right)^n
\]

The probability of fracture \( P^c \) of the cylinder is such that:

\[
1 - P^c = \left( 1 - \Pi \right)^N = \left( 1 - P^S \right)^{\frac{N}{n}}
\]

When \( N \) is larger than \( n \), as it is the case here, \( P^c \) is larger than \( P^S \) and the test cylinder has the greatest chance to undergo cleavage fracture initiation at a value of \( K_I \) lower than \( K_{IC \text{ min}} \).

It is physically sound to consider that the most likely value of \( K_I \) at fracture for the cylinder would correspond to the same overall cleavage initiation probability as the one of the CT specimen test serie at \( K_{IC \text{ min}} \).

Application of equation (6) to the cylinder and to the CT test series gives:

- for CT specimen serie:
  \[
  \ln \left( 1 - P^S \right) = N \beta \alpha \left( \frac{K_{IC \text{ min}}}{J} \right)^4
  \]

- for cylinder:
  \[
  \ln \left( 1 - P^c \right) = N \beta \alpha \left( \frac{K_I}{J} \right)^4
  \]

For a same crack tip temperature, \( J \) is the same, and the above relations give, for \( P^c = P^S \)

\[
K_I = \left( \frac{\eta}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} K_{IC \text{ min}} \quad (10)
\]

In order to apply equation (10) to predict the thermal shock cylinder behaviour, the experimental results on CT specimens, given at table 2, must be adjusted to the average temperature defined for the initiation events in the cylinder. Results of the first serie of tests with cracked electron beam fused beads are used to predict the first initiation event; results of the second serie of tests with fatigue cracks are used to predict the second and third initiation events. The temperature adjustment for \( K_{IC \text{ min}} \)
is made by fitting around each of the lower bound value of the
two series of tests a lower bound curve segment similar in slope
and curvature to a lower bound curve which had been established
previously for a larger set of test results including measurements
on another forging with same KNIDT as the thermal shock forging
[1] [2].

Table 4 presents all the data relevant to application of
equation (10) to the three initiation events and compares the
$K_I$ obtained to the values deduced from the experiments (taken at
table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGED TEMPERATURE AT INITIATION EVENT ON CYLINDER</th>
<th>-40</th>
<th>-17</th>
<th>-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT Specimen data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of specimens in série : $n$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen width $B$ (mm)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted value of $K_{IC \min}$ (MPa $\sqrt{m}$)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cylinder prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent number of CT specimens $N$</td>
<td>13,3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_I$ predicted by equation (10) (MPa $\sqrt{m}$)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62,5</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cylinder results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_I$ measured (MPa $\sqrt{m}$)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**

The prediction is very close to the measured value for the
first two initiation events which mark the lower bound among the
three initiation events. The measured value for the third one,
which is above the lower bound marked by the first two is logically
larger than the predicted value.

Analysis of the three initiation events could have been per-
formed according to equation (9) if the value $K_{IC}$ had been known
all along the crack front. To obtain $K_{IC}$, it should have been
necessary to establish mathematical expressions for the variation
of temperature with respect to position along the crack front at
the initiation time in the cracked cylinder and also for the lower
bound toughness curve $K_{IC}$.
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Actually, the ratio $g$

$$g = \left( \frac{K_I \text{ predicted}}{K_I \text{ measured}} \right)^4$$

in which $K_I \text{ predicted}$ and $K_I \text{ measured}$ are the values at the bottoms of table 4 has the same physical meaning as the left member of equation (9), and is a very close approximation to its value, which was easier to determine according to the experimental uncertainties.

CONCLUSION

Application of the engineering criterion for cleavage fracture initiation in small scale yielding of equation (9) to the interpretation of two sets of experiments, one with large variation of $K_I$ along the crack front, the other with very large cracks, have led to very good agreements with the experimental findings. In addition to the basis already provided by the general studies on probabilistic approach to cleavage fracture, these results provide a direct qualification of the proposed criterion.
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### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Results</th>
<th>Prediction Probabilistic Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°C)</td>
<td>-196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{1b}$ mean $/ K_{1b}$ mean</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{1b}$ min $/ K_{1b}$ min</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{1f}$ mean $/ K_{1p}$ mean</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{1f}$ min $/ K_{1p}$ min</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 1**

**Figure 2**
$K_{1f}$ (Center-semielliptical crack)  $K_{1b}$ (Edge-semielliptical crack)  $K_{1p}$ (Prismatic specimens - Flat cracks): scatter band and mean value

$K_I$ (MPaV$^{1/2}$)

Scatter band on similar steel - CT specimens

Figure 3

CRACK CONTOURS IN CYLINDER

1 - 1st Initiation at 169 sec. in thermal shock
2 - 1st Arrest, 2nd Initiation at 209 sec
3 - 2nd Arrest, 3rd Initiation at 356 sec
4 - 3rd Arrest

Figure 4
Straight front crack at 88 mm depth

Contour N° 2 of figure 4 (Deepest point 88 mm)

Figure 6

Cross section Containing the crack

Cylinder center

K_1 (MPa√m)

500 mm

Figure 5

Cylinder edge

1380 mm

920 mm

355 mm

355 mm

1000 mm

Thermocouple Plugs

916