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ABSTRACT
A single parameter representation of local stress range, initial crack size and material yield strength is proposed for describing the intensity of the fatigue loading of a structural component. A logarithmic plot of single parameter fatigue life results provides a single straight line description of fatigue life behavior over a broad range of material, configuration and loading conditions. Expressions for calculating the local stress range at the failure site are outlined, including effects of vessel and stress concentrator configuration, applied and overstrain residual stresses, and pressure applied to hole and crack surfaces.

The single parameter approach was used in a comparison of fatigue life results from 41 full size cyclic hydraulic pressure tests of cannon pressure vessels with twelve combinations of material strength, failure location, and applied and residual stresses. A log plot of mean results of the twelve data groups is well represented by a single straight line with a negative slope reasonably close to that predicted by fracture mechanics analysis. A significant outlier from the straight line trend of the data is a useful indicator of cracking due to other than conventional mechanical fatigue. Two examples of an outlier from the trend of cannon pressure vessel data were confirmed by metallography to be caused by environmental cracking. A third outlier was related to preexisting initial cracks due to aggressive machining.

The effect of material yield strength on fatigue behavior can be simply and well represented using the single parameter approach. The correlation of a logarithmic straight line fit to the twelve sets of cannon pressure vessel results increased noticeably when the effect of material strength was included in the single parameter representation.
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INTRODUCTION

The extensive testing of large caliber high strength steel cannon pressure vessels by Davidson et al. (1977) provides a baseline of fatigue lifetime information that would be difficult to match today. This work included significant variation in residual stresses and material strength and some known differences in initial crack size at the vessel inner radius, all of which have important effects on fatigue life. The experimental life results were assessed in terms of fracture mechanics, with emphasis on the range of stress intensity factor, $\Delta K$, and fatigue life calculations as a function of $\Delta K$. In the past two decades, additional life testing of cannon pressure vessels has been performed, with emphasis on fatigue failures that occur away from the vessel inner radius at various types of stress concentration. Analysis to understand and describe these types of fatigue failure has been actively pursued.

Audino (1993) described a series of hydraulic pressure fatigue life tests in overstrained cannon tubes with failure locations both at the inner radius and at a notch in the outer radius. Underwood and Parker (1995) compared life results from overstrained tubes containing erosion grooves at the inner radius with calculations using fracture mechanics. Underwood and coworkers (1995) analyzed several series of fatigue life tests of cannon tubes with various types of through-wall holes and different amounts of overstrain. Parker and coworkers (1996) performed fracture mechanics and fatigue life analyses for overstrained cannon tubes with axially oriented holes and compared the analytical predictions with life tests.

Recent work by Parker and Underwood (1997) has proposed a simple new method for representing fatigue life results by accounting for two fundamentally important control variables for fatigue life — local stress range and initial crack size — in a single parameter. Available methods for fatigue life assessment are often very complex or they do not include both of these control variables. The objective of the work here is to use this single parameter approach to describe the aforementioned fatigue lifetime results and thereby demonstrate its advantages and limitations in fatigue life analysis. The single parameter approach will be briefly summarized and then used to describe the cannon pressure vessel results in a derivative of the conventional stress range versus life presentation. By including all the appropriate applied and residual stresses and the stress concentration in an expression for the local stress range, and by adding initial crack size and material strength information, the new single parameter approach to fatigue life assessment is obtained. Critical comparisons of this single parameter approach with the large body of cannon pressure vessel lifetime results should show whether or not the approach has broad utility in representing fatigue life of pressure vessels.

ANALYSIS

The general types of fatigue cracking of cannon pressure vessels considered here are shown schematically in Figure 1, along with some of the nomenclature. The single parameter fatigue life analysis (Parker and Underwood, 1997) used to assess fatigue life for these various configurations is summarized, followed by the description of expressions for the local stress range at the site of fatigue cracking.

\[
\text{Fatigue Life Assessment of Steel Pressure Vessels}
\]

**Fig. 1 — Some Types of Fatigue Cracking with Pressure Vessels**

**Single Parameter Fatigue Life Analysis**

The Paris (1963) law describes a significant portion of the fatigue crack growth behavior, $da/dN$, of most metals:

\[
da/dN = C (\Delta K)^m
\]

where $\Delta K$ is the positive range of stress intensity factor and $C$ and $m$ are experimental constants. For steels $m$ is often about 3 (Parker and Underwood, 1997). A general expression for $\Delta K$ is:

\[
\Delta K = \Delta \sigma (2a_i)^{1/2}
\]

where $\Delta \sigma$ includes the constant, often near 1, relating to crack configuration and size. Combining Eq. (1) and (2) and integrating over the range from the initial crack size, $a_i$, to the critical crack size, $a_c$, gives:

\[
N = \left[1/(C \pi^{m/2} (1 - m/2) (\Delta \sigma)^m) \right] \left[ a_c^{(1 - m/2)} - a_i^{(1 - m/2)} \right]
\]

which is the basis of the work by Maddox (1971) relating the Paris law to the conventional log $\Delta \sigma$ versus log $N$ fatigue life presentation. Recognizing that the second term is constant for a given $a_i$ and that typically $a_c \gg a_i$, and taking logs leads to:

\[
\log (\Delta \sigma) = (-1/m) \log N + (1/m - 1/2) \log a_i - (1/m) \log ((m/2 - 1) C \pi^{m/2})
\]

Finally, rearranging Eq. (4) leads to:

\[
\log (\Delta \sigma \times a_i^{(1 - m/2)}) = (-1/m) \log N - (1/m) \log ((m/2 - 1) C \pi^{m/2})
\]

which can be recognized as a straight line on log coordinates with slope $(-1/m)$ and intercept...
Local Stress Range for Control of Fatigue Cracking

An expression for the local positive stress range, $\Delta \sigma$, that includes the important stresses for all the types of fatigue cracking considered here is as follows:

$$\Delta \sigma = k_{ld} \sigma_b + k_{lw} \sigma_w - \sigma_t + P_{hbr} + P_{crk}$$

(6)

The first two terms represent the stresses that often have the primary control of fatigue cracking in a pressure vessel, the applied and residual (due to overstrain) hoop direction stresses at the crack initiation site, $\sigma_b$ and $\sigma_w$, sometimes multiplied by stress concentration factors, $k_{ld}$ and $k_{lw}$, if a stress raiser is present. The third term accounts for the indirect effect of the compressive radial direction stress, $\sigma_t$, that, in a few cases here with a notch present, effectively adds to the tensile hoop stress at certain locations around the notch. For example at the crack locations in the internal and external notch radii shown in Fig. 1, the tensile hoop stress is increased by the (negative) value of the compressive radial stress at these locations. Near the vessel inner radius this effect of radial stress effectively adding to the hoop stress is significant. The last two terms in Eq. 6 account for the additional effect of pressure in the hole or in the crack. Pressure in a hole produces a tensile hoop stress at the hole inner radius with magnitude of about the value of pressure applied to the vessel. Pressure in the crack produces the equivalent of a tensile stress oriented normal to the crack plane that is also equal in magnitude to the applied pressure. So these two additional pressure effects, which add to the stresses in the vessel wall, can have significant control over fatigue life.

The expression used to calculate stress concentration factor at a notch is as follows, from Roark and Young (1975):

$$k_c = 1 + 2c/b$$

(7)

where $c$ is the depth of a semielliptically shaped notch and $b$ is the half-width of the notch.

The local positive stress range at the site of fatigue cracking is calculated by elastic superposition of the terms in Eqs. (6) and (7) and is used in the single parameter presentation of fatigue life results as discussed in relation to Eq. (5), that is, a plot of $\Delta \sigma \times a^{(1/2 - 1/m)}$ versus $N$. These results are presented in the following section, with emphasis on the effects of overstrain residual stress, initial crack size, stress concentration, and material yield strength on the single parameter representation of fatigue lifetime.
concentration factor at the rifling radius was included in the Eq. (6) calculations of $\Delta \sigma$ by setting $k_\alpha = 1.7$, so that the applied stresses were increased by this factor. No increase in the residual stresses was made, that is, $k_\sigma = 1.0$, based on the belief that any potential increase in the residual stress at the rifling radius would have been relieved by the machining of the rifling or by yielding at the root radius of the rifling. Expressions for the applied and residual stresses in the vessel, $\sigma_0$ and $\sigma_\sigma$, were obtained from Roark and Young (1975) and Hill (1950), respectively. The $\sigma_0$ and $\sigma_\sigma$ terms do not apply to bore cracks so were not used.

The results in Fig. 2 are logical in some respects. The fired cannon tubes have generally lower lives than the unfired, and the overstrained cannon tubes have generally higher lives than those with no overstrain. However, the overall trend is a significant variation in fatigue life while stress range is relatively constant. This suggests that another important variable that controls fatigue life should be considered, such as the different initial crack sizes. Table 1 lists the variations in initial crack size that are known to have been present in these tubes. Unfired tubes have naturally occurring inclusions or surface roughness corresponding to about 0.01 mm deep initial cracks, whereas fired tubes typically have 0.1 mm deep heat check cracks. The group b fired tubes were found to have unusually deep heat check cracks of about 0.5 mm, and metallurgical tests showed that one group b tube had an even deeper initial crack, discussed later.

The bore failure results are replotted in Fig. 3 by using the single parameter discussed earlier to account for the differences in initial crack size. The stress range has been modified to include $a^{1/3}$, which, for $m = 3$, becomes $a^{1/3}$. Values of $a$, in meters, were used to calculate ($\Delta \sigma \times a^{1/3}$). Note that the single parameter plotting of the results shows a somewhat more consistent trend toward an increase in life with a decrease in $\Delta \sigma \times a^{1/3}$. Also it is easier to see in this plot that the fired tube results include considerably more variation than the unfired tube results. This is caused by the variation in the number and type of cannon firings performed before the hydraulic pressure cycles. The overall trend of the results follows the arbitrary line with slope = -1/3, but with the variation noted above.

Fatigue Failure at a Stress Concentrator

Results from another group of 17 cannon pressure vessels, each with fatigue failure at a significant stress concentrator, are shown in Table 2 and Fig. 4. Various notch and through-wall hole configurations of the types shown in Fig. 1 were tested. The through-wall holes were 2 mm in diameter oriented at 30 degrees to the vessel axis to allow exit of the cannon combustion gasses. The Eq. (6) calculations for the vessels with holes included the $k_\alpha$ $\sigma_n$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/Number of Vessels</th>
<th>Yield Strength MPa</th>
<th>Inner Radius mm</th>
<th>Outer Radius mm</th>
<th>Applied Pressure MPa</th>
<th>Stress Range MPa</th>
<th>Fatigue Life cycles</th>
<th>Initial Crack mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THROUGH-HOLE; $k_\alpha = 3.00$</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h 2</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>5,535</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 2</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>45,025</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL NOTCH; $k_\alpha = 3.26$</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>14,560</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j 3</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>11,605</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-WALL NOTCH; $k_\alpha = 4.26$</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>5,501</td>
<td>&gt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 2</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 3 - Effect of Bore Stress Range and Initial Crack Size on Life](image-url)

![Fig. 4 - Effect of Nominal Stress Range, Stress Concentration and Initial Crack Size on Fatigue Life](image-url)
\( p_{\text{meq}} \) and \( p_{\text{int}} \) terms; the other two terms do not affect \( \Delta \sigma \). The calculations for external and mid-wall notches included the \( k_{\text{g}} \), \( \sigma_0 \), and \( c_8 \) terms; the calculations with internal notches included all terms in Eq. (6), including effects of overstrain residual stresses. The values of \( k_{\text{g}} \) for the through-wall holes and the array of twenty four semicircular mid-wall notches were based on the known value of 3, with a reduction in the case of the mid-wall notches because of their close spacing. The values of \( k_{\text{g}} \) for the external and internal notches were from Eq. (7).

The results in Fig. 4 for failure at a stress concentrator show a similar trend to the Fig. 3 results for failure at the bore. As in Fig. 3, there is a consistent trend toward an increase in life with a decrease in \( \Delta \sigma \times a^{1/3} \), and the results are in approximate agreement with the same line with slope = -1/3 shown earlier.

**Significant Variation in Initial Crack Size**

![Graph](image)

Fig. 5 - Effect of Significant Variations in Initial Crack Size on Life

Two of the cannon pressure vessel fatigue life results discussed thus far included a known significant variation in initial crack size, one of the type \( b \) vessels in Table 1 and one of the type \( j \) vessels in Table 2. In addition to these, another significant variation from conventional mechanical fatigue cracking has recently been described by Troiano and coworkers (1997). These variations from the norm are considered in Table 3 and Fig. 5.

The table shows the different types of failure and levels of stress range of the three examples, and it compares \( a \) and \( N \) for both the typical fatigue failures and the atypical failures. Fig. 5 shows a \( (\Delta \sigma \times a^{1/3}) \) versus \( N \) plot of the comparison. As mentioned earlier, any effects of crack shape are not included in the comparison.

The bore crack test with variation in \( a \) showed intergranular failure on the fracture surface, typical evidence of environmental fracture. If the 9.4 mm crack present at failure had been

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Failure</th>
<th>Stress Range MPA</th>
<th>Fatigue Failure a mm</th>
<th>a=50 mm n cycles</th>
<th>a=50 mm cause</th>
<th>a=50 mm n cycles</th>
<th>a=50 mm cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bore crack</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external notch</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>11,960</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5,501</td>
<td>machining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal notch</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The external notch test with variation in \( a \) also included a metallographic study that showed a 0.05 mm deep initial crack due to an aggressive machining process, compared with the expected value of 0.01 mm in unaffected material. Note in Fig. 5 that the use of the deeper crack based on metallographic results is in good agreement with the -1/3 slope trend of the data.

The last example of the effect of a significant variation in \( a \) on fatigue life provides the most striking results. Data from a 100 cycle life test reported by Troiano et al is plotted in Fig. 5, with \( (\Delta \sigma \times a^{1/3}) \) determined using \( a = 0.5 \) mm, the largest value that could be expected for normal cannon conditions. However this plotted point is nearly three orders of magnitude away from the trend of the data. Even when the \( a \) value at the end of the test was used, \( a = 50 \) mm, the agreement is still poor. This is a clear indication that the cracking process that occurred with this vessel is nothing close to conventional mechanical fatigue, which adds to the indications of atypical failure reported by Troiano et al.

![Graph](image)

Fig. 6 - Comparison of Mean Life Results

wholly due to environmental cracking, the result shown in the plot is in reasonable agreement with the -1/3 slope trend of the data.
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Variation in Material Yield Strength

It may be useful to consider a summary plot of all the results discussed thus far, keeping in mind that material yield strength, an important control variable for fatigue, has not yet been addressed. Fig. 6 shows such a plot, which can be the basis for addressing yield strength effects. Twelve mean values of $\Delta \sigma \times a_i^{1.6}$ and $N$ are plotted, calculated from each of the twelve types of vessel data listed in Tables 1 and 2, designated $a$ through $l$. The data with atypical $a$, variations discussed above were not included in the mean values. Considering the inherent variations in fatigue life tests, the trend of the summary of results in Fig. 6 is quite consistent. Standard linear regression of $\log (\Delta \sigma \times a_i^{1.6})$ versus $\log N$ produced the line shown, with correlation coefficient $R^2 = 0.81$ and slope $= -0.46$.

The summary results of Fig. 6 are presented in Fig. 7 with a modification in the single parameter to account for the effect of material yield strength. The single parameter representation of local stress range, initial crack size and material yield strength, takes the form:

$$\text{fatigue intensity factor} = \Delta \sigma \times \left( \frac{S_{y\text{res}}}{S_y} \right)^m \times a_i^{1.6}$$

(8)

Eq. (8) is proposed as a parameter that describes the intensity of the fatigue loading of a structural component, including the important effect of material strength as well as the effects of stresses and initial crack at the failure site. The $(S_{y\text{res}} / S_y)$ term effectively increases the stress range for a specimen with yield strength lower than the mean value, $S_y$, and this is consistent with the shorter life expected for a decrease in strength. The $(S_{y\text{res}} / S_y)$ form has the advantage of approaching unity when there is little difference in strength.

Note in Fig. 7 that results for materials with strength most different from the mean strength moved closer to the regression line. This resulted in an increase in $R^2$ from 0.81 to 0.86, but no significant change in the position or slope of the regression line. This supports the inclusion of the material yield strength effect in the concept of fatigue intensity factor as discussed here.

Finally, using Eq. (8) it can be shown that a general form of the material strength effect in the single parameter description of fatigue life is:

$$\text{fatigue intensity factor} = \Delta \sigma \times \left( \frac{S_{y\text{res}}}{S_y} \right)^m \times a_i^{1.6}$$

(9)

The $(S_{y\text{res}} / S_y)$ term can be obtained by assuming that crack growth rate varies directly with the size of the crack-tip plastic zone, so that fatigue life varies inversely with zone size, that is, $N = (S / K)^2$. This $N = S_y^2$ relationship, when included in the log $\sigma$ versus log $N$ form with slope $-1/m$, leads to the $(S_{y\text{res}} / S_y)$ term in Eq. (9). It is interesting to note that for the value of $m$ in Fig. 7, about 2.2, Eq. (9) gives a value for the exponent of the $(S_{y\text{res}} / S_y)$ term of 1.1. This is close to the value of unity used in Eq. (8) to account for material strength.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A single parameter representation of local stress range, initial crack size and material yield strength is proposed for describing the intensity of the fatigue loading of a structural component. Use of this single parameter with logarithmic plots of fatigue lifetime provides a single straight line description of fatigue life behavior over a broad range of material, configuration and loading conditions.

Expressions for calculating the local stress range at the failure site are outlined, including effects of pressure vessel and stress concentrator configuration, applied and overstrain residual stresses, and pressure applied to hole and crack surfaces.

The single parameter approach was used in a comprehensive comparison of fatigue life results from 41 full size hydraulic pressure cycling tests of cannon pressure vessels with twelve combinations of material strength, failure location, and applied and residual stresses. A log plot of mean results of the twelve data groups is well represented by a single straight line with a negative slope reasonably close to that predicted by fracture mechanics analysis.

A significant outlier from a single parameter plot of fatigue lifetime data is a useful indicator of cracking due to other than conventional mechanical fatigue. Two examples of an outlier from the trend of cannon pressure vessel data were confirmed by fractography to be caused by environmental cracking. A third outlier was related to preexisting initial cracks due to aggressive machining.

The effect of material yield strength on fatigue behavior can be simply and well represented using the single parameter approach. The $R^2$ correlation coefficient of a logarithmic straight line fit to the twelve sets of cannon pressure vessel results increased from 0.81 to 0.86 upon inclusion of the effect of material strength.
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