MSL
ACADEMIC ENDEAVORS

Cleveland State University

EngagedScholarship@CSU

Civil and Environmental Engineering Faculty Publications

Civil and Environmental Engineering

12-8-2003

C-Ring Strength of Advanced Monolithic Ceramics

A. A. Wereszczak
U.S. Army Research Laboratory

R. J. Caspe
U.S. Army Research Laboratory

J. J. Swab
U.S. Army Research Laboratory

S. F. Duffy
Connecticut Reserve Technologies

E. H. Baker
Connecticut Reserve Technologies

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/encee_facpub

Part of the Civil and Environmental Engineering Commons

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

C-RING STRENGTH OF ADVANCED MONOLITHIC CERAMICS

A.!A.!Wereszczak,[1] R. J. Caspe,[2] and J. J. Swab
Metals and Ceramics Research Branch
U. S. Army Research Laboratory
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005

S. F. Duffy and E. H. Baker
Connecticut Reserve Technologies
Cleveland, OH 44114

ABSTRACT

Alumina, silicon carbide, silicon nitride, and zirconia are common candidate ceramics for load-bearing tubular components. To help facilitate design and reliability modeling with each ceramic, Weibull strength distributions were determined with each material using a diametrally compressed c-ring specimen in accordance with ASTM C1323. The investigated silicon nitride and zirconia were found to exhibit higher uncensored characteristic strengths than the alumina and silicon carbide. The occurrence of chamfer-located fracture initiation was problematic, and hindered the ability to generate valid design data in some of these ceramics. Fractography and stress modeling results suggest that some aspects of ASTM!C1323 should be revised to further minimize the frequency of chamfer-located failure initiation in c-ring test specimens.

I. INTRODUCTION

Confident strength-size-scaling and probabilistic design of internally pressurized tubular ceramic components can result when censored Weibull strength distribution data are available for input. Therefore, a goal of a structural ceramic component designer is to have access to censored strength data that are the result of the exploitation of all possible strength-limiting flaws that may be active in the service life of the component.

---

[1] Now with the Structural Ceramic Group, Metals and Ceramics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6068.

[2] Undergraduate student, Department of Ceramic and Materials Engineering, Rutgers University, Piscataway,!NJ!!08854.

Report Documentation Page

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE **2003**	2. REPORT TYPE **N/A**	3. DATES COVERED **-**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE **C-Ring Strength of Advanced Monolithic Ceramics**	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
	5b. GRANT NUMBER
	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
	5e. TASK NUMBER
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **Oak Ridge National Laboratory Bethel Valley Rd PO Box 2008 Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6063**	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT **UU**	18. NUMBER OF PAGES **8**	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**			

Hoop stresses result from internal pressurization of tubes, so a goal of the present study was to determine strength distributions that were limited by flaws located on the outside diameter for four different ceramics. This was accomplished by diametrally compressing alumina (Al_2O_3), silicon carbide (SiC), silicon nitride (Si_3N_4), and zirconia (ZrO_2) c-ring specimens to failure. The results from these tests, as well as those from analyses performed to supplement the strength testing, are described.

II. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

C-ring specimens were machined from 33mm O.D. x 24mm I.D. x 100mm long tubes of four monolithic ceramics: 99.5% Al_2O_3 (AD995, CoorsTek, Golden,!CO); a pressureless sintered SiC (Enhanced Hexoloy SA, Saint-Gobain Advanced Ceramics Corp., Niagara!Falls,!NY); a reaction-bonded and sintered Si_3N_4 (Ceralloy!147-31N, Ceradyne, Inc., Costa Mesa, CA); and a ceria-doped TZP ZrO_2 (Ce-TZP, CoorsTek, Golden, CO). Circumferential machining and a minimum surface finish of 0.8μm on the outer diameter of all tubes were requested of each vendor. C-ring specimens having a 8mm width, longitudinal 45° chamfers to a distance of 0.15mm, and a slot height of 5.7mm were prepared by a commercial machine company (Chand Kare Technical Ceramics, Worcester, MA) per ASTM!C1323 [1].

C-ring specimens were strength tested using an electromechanical test frame (Instron!1127, Canton, MA). A displacement rate of 0.5 mm/min was used to compressively and diametrally load the c-ring specimens to failure. Paper shims were used between the upper and lower contact locations to minimize the likelihood of contact-induced fracture. The geometry and failure loads were used to calculate the hoop or OD tangential failure stress ($\sigma_{\theta max}$) for each specimen according to the strength of materials solution in ASTM!1323![1]:

$$\sigma_{\theta\,max} = \frac{PR}{btr_o}\left[\frac{r_o - r_a}{r_a - R}\right] \tag{1}$$

where P is the failure load, r_o is the outer c-ring radius, r_i is the inner c-ring radius, r_a is the average of r_o and r_i, b is width, t is thickness or r_o-r_i, and $R = (r_o-r_i)/\ln(r_o/r_i)$.

Additional analyses were performed to assist in the interpretation of the strength results. Failure locations for all specimens were identified using optical fractography according to ASTM C1322 [2]. Also, the effective area and effective volume of the investigated c-ring were determined using finite element analysis (FEA) [3] and CARES [4], and compared with those stemming from Eq. 1 [5].

III. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The location-censored Weibull strength-distributions for the AD995 Al_2O_3, Enhanced Hexoloy SA SiC, Ceralloy 147-31N Si_3N_4, and Ce-TZP ZrO_2 are shown in Figs. 1-4. Uncensored two-parameter (characteristic strength and Weibull modulus) distribution values are also indicated on each graph. Although they show that the Si_3N_4 and ZrO_2 were qualitatively the strongest of the four sets, their usefulness is quite limited (if not outright misleading) for design purposes because they represent the combination of two or more strength limiting flaw types.

The recommended chamfer geometry in ASTM!C1323 did not satisfactorily work with all the investigated monolithic ceramics. The chamfering procedure worked satisfactorily for the AD995 Al_2O_3 and Ce-TZP ZrO_2 because there was a relative equal blend of both chamfer-located failures and surface-located failures. This is a useful circumstance for design and guidance of any future c-ring machining of tubes made from these ceramics. However, chamfer-located failures dominated the fracture of the Hexoloy SA SiC and Ceralloy!147-31N Si_3N_4 c-rings as they were undersized (~0.08-0.13 mm versus 0.15mm ASTM C1323 recommendation). Consequently, the strength potential of both these ceramics was not exploited by these c-ring tests and sufficient design data was not generated for either ceramic. If future c-ring tests were to be performed with these ceramics, then the chamfer machining (e.g., alternative chamfer geometry, etc.) procedure would need to be changed so as to promote surface-located failure initiation.

The higher frequency of chamfer-located failures may have been a consequence of unanticipated higher stresses existing there [5]. The FEA-predicted higher stresses (compared to the idealized strength of materials solution of Eq. 1) near the chamfer/edges shown in Fig. 5 is consistent with the general observation that there was a relatively high fraction of chamfer failures than surface failures in all the materials with the exception of the AD995 Al_2O_3. Additionally, chamfer-located failures in Enhanced Hexoloy SA SiC and Ceralloy 147-31N Si_3N_4 had their mirror plane perfectly aligned with machining grooves present on one *side* of the c-ring (not observed with the AD995 Al_2O_3 and Ce-TZP ZrO_2). These observations suggest that finer-grit and less aggressive machining should be prescribed for the machining of the *sides* of the c-rings for Enhanced Hexoloy SA SiC and Ceralloy!147-31N Si_3N_4.

The determination of effective area and effective volume was revisited on account of the stress differences illustrated in Fig. 5, and their idealized [6] representations were found to be non-conservative for structural design, Figs. 6-7. For example, the failure stress of an arbitrary component (S_B) that is limited by surface strength-limiting flaws is represented by

$$S_B = \left[\frac{k_{AA}A_A}{k_{AB}A_B}\right]^{1/m_A} S_A \quad,$$ (2)

where $k_{AA}A_A$ and $k_{AB}A_B$ are effective areas for a test coupon (e.g., c-ring) and component, respectively, m_A is the censored Weibull modulus, and S_A is the characteristic strength of the test coupon. If m_A is taken to be 20 for the investigated c-ring geometry in the present study and $k_{AB}A_B$ is unity, then S_B would be ~ 21% and 24% more than S_A for the CARES and closed form solutions, respectively. The close form solution is non-conservative. The CARES solution in this example is more accurate and representative because the closed form solution does not represent the actual stress state at the c-ring ends while the FEA did.

IV. SUMMARY

The uncensored characteristic strengths of Ceralloy 147-31N Si_3N_4 and Ce-TZP ZrO_2 were higher than AD995 Al_2O_3 and Enhanced Hexoloy SA SiC. Non-adherence (undersizing) of chamfer machining guidelines in ASTM C1323 appears to have promoted higher frequencies of failure initiation at the chamfer/edge. A

chamfer size of 0.15 mm may not be sufficient to minimize the frequency of failure initiation at the chamfer/edge in stronger ceramics. The relatively rough surface finish on the AD995 and Ce-TZP appeared to be associated with higher frequencies of surface failures. That is useful for design; however, potential strength of the materials probably was not sampled. FEA showed higher σ_T existed at the chamfer/edges than that predicted by the strength of materials solution, and that may have contributed to the high frequency of failures located there. The non-constant σ_T in the loaded c-ring geometry manifested itself in lower effective areas and volumes (for the same Weibull modulus) than those predicted from the (constant σ_T) strength of materials solution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

[1]   ASTM!C1323, "Standard Test Method for Ultimate Strength of Advanced Ceramics with Diametrally Compressed C-Ring Specimens at Ambient Temperature," Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Vol. 15.01, American Society for Testing and Materials, West Conshohocken, PA, 2001.

[2]   ASTM!C1322, "Standard Practice for Fractography and Characterization of Fracture Origins in Advanced Ceramics," Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Vol. 15.01, American Society for Testing and Materials, West Conshohocken, PA, 2001.

[3]   ANSYS, Release 5.7, Canonsburg, PA.

[4]   N. N. Nemeth, J. M. Manderscheid, J. P. Gyekenyesi, "Ceramic Analysis and Reliability Evaluation of Structures (CARES)," Users and Programmers Manual, Report TP-2916, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1990.

[5]   S. F. Duffy and E. H. Baker, "Evaluation of Effective Volume & Effective Area for C-Ring Test Specimen," Contract DAAD17-02-P-0503, USARL!Technical Report, *in press*, 2003.

[6]   O. M. Jadaan, D. L. Shelleman, J. C. Conway, Jr., J. J. Mecholsky, Jr., and R.!E. Tressler, "Prediction of the Strength of Ceramic Tubular Components: Part I – Analysis," *ASTM Journal of Testing and Evaluation*, 19 181-91 (1991).

Fig. 1. Location-censored Weibull strength distribution for AD995!Al$_2$O$_3$ C-rings. Failure stress calculated using Eq. 1.


Fig. 2. Location-censored Weibull strength distribution for Enhanced Hexoloy!SA SiC C-rings. Failure stress calculated using Eq. 1.

Fig. 3.   Location-censored Weibull strength distribution for Ceralloy 147-31N
Si$_3$N$_4$ C-rings. Failure stress calculated using Eq. 1.

Fig. 4.   Location-censored Weibull strength distribution for Ce-TZP ZrO$_2$
C-rings. Failure stress calculated using Eq. 1.

Fig. 5.   The FEA solution exhibited a nonuniform stress level across the width of the 8mm c-ring (5% increase from the center to the edges). Additionally, the edge stress was 3% higher than that of the closed form solution.


Fig. 6.   The effective area is greater for the closed form solution (Eq. 1) than the CARES solution for any Weibull modulus.

Fig. 7. The effective volume is greater for the closed form solution (Eq. 1) than the CARES solution for any Weibull modulus.