LA-UR- 02-5313

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Title: Evaluation of a Semi-Implicit Numerical Algorithm for a Rate-Dependent Ductile Failure Model

Author(s): Marvin A. Zocher, X-7 Quihai K. Zuo, T-3 Thomas A. Mason, MST-8

Submitted to: Shock Waves in Condensed Matter St. Petersburg, Russia September 1-6, 2002



Los Alamos National Laboratory, an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer, is operate the University of California for the U.S. Department of Energy under contract W-7405-ENG-36. By acceptance of this article, the publisher recognizes that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution, or to allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes. Los Alamos National Laboratory requests that the publisher identify this article as work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy. Los Alamos National Laboratory strongly supports academic freedom and a researcher's right to publish; as an institution, however, the Laboratory does not endorse the viewpoint of a publication or guarantee its technical correctness.

Form 836 (8/00)



Evaluation of a Semi-Implicit Numerical Algorithm for a Rate-Dependent Ductile Failure Model

Marvin A. Zocher, Quihai K. Zuo, Thomas A. Mason Los Alamos National Laboratory

Shock Waves in Condensed Matter Saint Petersburg, Russia Sep 1-6, 2002

Outline

- History of the TEPLA model
- Current Version of the model
- Results

TEPLA History - 1 Motivation

• A survey conducted in the mid-80's revealed that the mathematical descriptions of ductile fracture tended to apply to either tensile tests or spall tests.



• The objective behind the development of the TEPLA was then a unification of these disparate phenomena into a single model.

TEPLA History - 2 Johnson, J.N., and Addessio, F.L., "Tensile Plasticity and Ductile Fracture", J. of Appl. Phys., Vol. 64, No. 12, 1988, pp. 6699-6712





STRESS (kbar)

EXPERIMENT S24

DATA MONOTONE VAN LEER

 $F(s_{ij}, p, Y, \phi) = 4\tau^2 - Y^2 \left[1 + \phi^2 - 2\phi \cosh \delta \right]$

Coupled Shear/Porosity Failure Criterion $\gamma_f = \gamma_0 + \Delta \gamma \exp\left[a\left(\frac{p}{2\tau}\right)\right] \qquad \left(\frac{\phi}{\phi_f}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma_f}\right)^2 = 1$

Coupled Evolution Rules for:

Deviator $d\tau = \frac{3\mu}{4\tau} \left(s_{ij} de_{ij} - s_{ij} de_{ij}^p \right)$ Porosity $d\phi = (1 - \phi) d\epsilon_{kk}^p$ Pressure $dp = -(1 - \phi) B_s d \ln v + \rho \Gamma_s T ds + [(1 + \Gamma_s)p - (1 - \phi) B_s] d \ln(1 - \phi)$

TEPLA History - 3

Addessio, F.L., Johnson, J.N., and Maudlin, P.J., "The Effect of Void Growth on Taylor Cylinder Impact Experiments," J. of Appl. Phys., Vol. 73, No. 11, 1993, pp. 7288-7297



Updating the plastic strain rate Three methods investigated (associative flow, return, hybrid)

Strain Softening

Problem: Softening leads to a change in the set of governing equations for the dynamic IBVP from hyperbolic to elliptic and the problem becomes ill-posed.

Manifestation (Simo 1989)

- The strains localize to a narrow band (set of measure zero)
- Classical local dissipation becomes meaningless since no dissipation can take place in a localized set of zero Borel measure
- Numerical simulation of softening materials exhibit a totally spurious mesh dependency
- For elastic and rate independent materials, the governing equations exhibit a local loss of ellipticity which precludes wave propagation

Possible Fixes (Simo 1989)

- Mesh dependent modulus H^h
- Nonlocal methods (higher-order spatial derivatives)
- Viscoplasticity (Higher order temporal derivatives)

TEPLA History - 4 Addessio, F.L., and Johnson, J.N., "Rate-Dependent Ductile Failure Model,", J. of Appl. Phys., Vol. 74, No. 3, 1993, pp. 1640-1648

Gurson Flow Surface

 $au = \sqrt{rac{3}{2}s_{ij}s_{ij}}$ $\delta = -rac{3}{2}rac{p}{\overline{V}}$

$$F(s_{ij}, p, Y, \phi) = \tau^2 - Y^2 \left[1 + (q\phi)^2 - 2q\phi \cosh \delta \right]$$



Coupled Shear/Porosity Failure Criterion $\gamma_f = \gamma_0 + \Delta \gamma \exp\left[a\left(\frac{p}{2\tau}\right)_f\right] \qquad \left(\frac{\phi}{\phi_f}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma_f}\right)^2 = 1$

Coupled Evolution Rules for:

Deviator
$$\check{s}_{ij} = 2G\left(\dot{e}_{ij} - \dot{e}_{ij}^p\right)$$

Porosity $\dot{\phi} = (1 - \phi)\dot{\epsilon}_{kk}^p$
Pressure $\dot{P} = \Gamma_s s_{ij}\dot{e}_{ij} - B\dot{\epsilon}_{kk}^p + \alpha\dot{\epsilon}_{kk}^p$

TEPLA History - 5

Viscoplasticity









Current TEPLA Model

Gurson Flow Surface

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} s_{ij} s_{ij}} \\ \delta &= -q_2 \frac{3}{2} \frac{p}{\overline{Y}} \\ F(s_{ij}, p, Y, \phi) &= \left(\frac{\tau}{\overline{Y}}\right)^2 - \left[1 + q_3 \phi^2 - 2q_1 \phi \cosh \delta\right] \end{aligned}$$



Coupled Shear/Porosity Failure Criterion

$$\epsilon_{f} = \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{\phi}{\phi_{f}}\right)^{2} \left[D_{1} + D_{2} \exp\left(D_{3}\frac{P}{Y}\right)\right]}$$

Coupled Evolution Rules for:

Deviator $\dot{s}_{ij} = 2G\left(\dot{e}_{ij} - \dot{e}_{ij}^{p}\right) - s_{ik}W_{kj} + W_{ik}s_{kj}$ Porosity $\dot{\phi} = (1 - \phi)\dot{\epsilon}_{kk}^{p}$ Pressure $\dot{P} = \Gamma_{s}s_{ij}\dot{e}_{ij} - B\dot{\epsilon}_{kk}^{p} + \alpha\dot{\epsilon}_{kk}^{p}$

Implicit Algorithm - 1

1. Solve for the trial state

$$s_{ij}^{t} = s_{ij}^{n} + 2G\dot{e}_{ij}\Delta t + \dot{r}_{ij}\Delta t \qquad P^{t} = P^{n} - B\dot{\epsilon}_{kk}\Delta t \qquad \phi^{t} = \phi^{n}$$

2. Solve for the equilibrium state

Implicit time integration leads to four coupled nonlinear equations which must be solved simultaneously:

$$C = \left(1 + \frac{6G}{Y}\frac{\lambda}{Y}\right)\frac{\overline{\tau}}{Y} - \frac{\tau^{t}}{Y} = 0$$
$$D = \overline{\delta} + \frac{3}{2}q_{2}\frac{\lambda}{Y_{f}}\left[3\frac{q_{1}q_{2}}{Y_{f}}\alpha\overline{\phi}\sinh\overline{\delta} + 2\Gamma_{s}\left(\frac{\overline{\tau}}{Y}\right)^{2}\right] - \delta^{t} = 0$$
$$E = \overline{\phi} - \phi^{t} - 3(1 - \overline{\phi})q_{1}q_{2}\frac{\lambda}{Y_{f}}\overline{\phi}\sinh\overline{\delta} = 0$$
$$F = \overline{F} = \left(\frac{\overline{\tau}}{Y}\right)^{2} - \left(1 + q_{3}\overline{\phi}^{2} - 2q_{1}\overline{\phi}\cosh\overline{\delta}\right) = 0$$

Which must be solved simultaneously for independent variables: $\frac{\overline{\tau}}{\overline{Y}}$, $\overline{\delta}$, $\overline{\phi}$, $\frac{\lambda}{\overline{Y}}$.

Implicit Algorithm - 2

3. Solve for the final state

$$s_{ij}^{n+1} = \frac{\frac{\xi}{\Delta t} + \frac{\overline{\tau}}{\tau^t}}{\frac{\xi}{\Delta t} + 1} \ s_{ij}^t$$

$$P^{n+1} = \frac{P^t + \frac{\alpha \Delta t}{\tau_r} \overline{P} + \frac{\Gamma_s}{3G} \left(\tau^t - \tau^{n+1}\right) \tau^{n+1}}{1 + \frac{\alpha \Delta t}{\tau_r}}$$

$$\phi^{n+1} = \frac{\phi^n + \dot{\epsilon}_{kk}^p \Delta t}{1 + \dot{\epsilon}_{kk}^p \Delta t}$$

Flyer Plate Experiment











Copper Results









Tantalum Results – 1







Tantalum Results – 2







Tantalum Results – 3







Conclusions

- Few results shown Much more needed for validation
- Time step problem overcome yes Quantification needed
- 1d, 2d, 3d nuances
- Parameter set for variety of materials