

NASA/TM—2006-214090



Assessments of Fracture Toughness of Monolithic Ceramics—SEPB Versus SEVNB Methods

Sung R. Choi
University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio

John P. Gyekenyesi
Glenn Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio

The NASA STI Program Office . . . in Profile

Since its founding, NASA has been dedicated to the advancement of aeronautics and space science. The NASA Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Program Office plays a key part in helping NASA maintain this important role.

The NASA STI Program Office is operated by Langley Research Center, the Lead Center for NASA's scientific and technical information. The NASA STI Program Office provides access to the NASA STI Database, the largest collection of aeronautical and space science STI in the world. The Program Office is also NASA's institutional mechanism for disseminating the results of its research and development activities. These results are published by NASA in the NASA STI Report Series, which includes the following report types:

- **TECHNICAL PUBLICATION.** Reports of completed research or a major significant phase of research that present the results of NASA programs and include extensive data or theoretical analysis. Includes compilations of significant scientific and technical data and information deemed to be of continuing reference value. NASA's counterpart of peer-reviewed formal professional papers but has less stringent limitations on manuscript length and extent of graphic presentations.
- **TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM.** Scientific and technical findings that are preliminary or of specialized interest, e.g., quick release reports, working papers, and bibliographies that contain minimal annotation. Does not contain extensive analysis.
- **CONTRACTOR REPORT.** Scientific and technical findings by NASA-sponsored contractors and grantees.

- **CONFERENCE PUBLICATION.** Collected papers from scientific and technical conferences, symposia, seminars, or other meetings sponsored or cosponsored by NASA.
- **SPECIAL PUBLICATION.** Scientific, technical, or historical information from NASA programs, projects, and missions, often concerned with subjects having substantial public interest.
- **TECHNICAL TRANSLATION.** English-language translations of foreign scientific and technical material pertinent to NASA's mission.

Specialized services that complement the STI Program Office's diverse offerings include creating custom thesauri, building customized databases, organizing and publishing research results . . . even providing videos.

For more information about the NASA STI Program Office, see the following:

- Access the NASA STI Program Home Page at <http://www.sti.nasa.gov>
- E-mail your question via the Internet to help@sti.nasa.gov
- Fax your question to the NASA Access Help Desk at 301-621-0134
- Telephone the NASA Access Help Desk at 301-621-0390
- Write to:
NASA Access Help Desk
NASA Center for AeroSpace Information
7121 Standard Drive
Hanover, MD 21076

NASA/TM—2006-214090



Assessments of Fracture Toughness of Monolithic Ceramics—SEPB Versus SEVNB Methods

Sung R. Choi
University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio

John P. Gyekenyesi
Glenn Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio

Prepared for the
11th International Conference on Fracture
cosponsored by ICF, ESIS, and ASTM
Turin, Italy, March 20–25, 2005

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Glenn Research Center

January 2006

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Ralph Pawlik for experimental work. This work was supported by various programs including Higher Operating Temperature Propulsion Components (HOTPC) and Ultra-Efficient Engine Technology (UEET), NASA Glenn Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio.

This report is a formal draft or working paper, intended to solicit comments and ideas from a technical peer group.

Trade names or manufacturers' names are used in this report for identification only. This usage does not constitute an official endorsement, either expressed or implied, by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Available from

NASA Center for Aerospace Information
7121 Standard Drive
Hanover, MD 21076

National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22100

Available electronically at <http://gltrs.grc.nasa.gov>

Assessments of Fracture Toughness of Monolithic Ceramics—SEPB Versus SEVNB Methods

Sung R. Choi
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

John P. Gyekenyesi
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Cleveland, Ohio 44135

Abstract

Fracture toughness of a total of 13 advanced monolithic ceramics including silicon nitrides, silicon carbide, aluminas, and glass ceramic was determined at ambient temperature by using both single edge precracked beam (SEPB) and single edge v-notched beam (SEVNB) methods. Relatively good agreement in fracture toughness between the two methods was observed for advanced ceramics with flat R-curves; whereas, poor agreement in fracture toughness was seen for materials with rising R-curves. The discrepancy in fracture toughness between the two methods was due to stable crack growth with crack closure forces acting in the wake region of cracks even in SEVNB test specimens. The effect of discrepancy in fracture toughness was analyzed in terms of microstructural feature (grain size and shape), toughening exponent in R-curve, and stable crack growth determined using back-face strain gaging.

1. Introduction

There are several methods to determine fracture toughness of brittle materials such as glasses, glass ceramics, and advanced monolithic ceramics. These includes indentation techniques such as indentation fracture (IF) (ref. 1), indentation strength (IS) (ref. 2), surface crack in flexure (SCF) (ref. 3), chevron notch technique (ref. 3), single edge precracked beam (SEPB) technique (ref. 3), and single edge v-notched beam (SEVNB) technique (ref. 4). Both indentation fracture (IF) and indentation strength (IS) methods are based on the empirical calibration constants to determine fracture toughness; hence, they are less rigorous theoretically from a fracture-mechanics perspective than the other methods.

The SEVNB technique (ref. 4) has been introduced recently, in which a final sharp v-notch with its radius ranging from 10 to 20 μm was introduced by polishing a pre-notched section with razor blade in conjunction with diamond paste. This technique has shown to be in good agreement with other techniques. A previous round robin on fracture toughness (ref. 4) was dedicated to use the SEVNB method to determine fracture toughness of five




Figure 1.—A typical example of a sharp v-notch produced in a SEVNB silicon nitride test specimen.

different ceramic materials. It was shown that certain ceramics exhibited significant difference in fracture toughness between the SEVNB and SEPB methods: the SEVNB estimated lower fracture toughness than the SEPB. The plausible reason for this discrepancy was presumed to be attributed to R-curve behavior of the materials.

This study, as motivated from the previous round robin, determined fracture toughness of a total of 13 advanced ceramics using both SEVNB and SEPB methods. The difference in fracture toughness between the two methods was carefully analyzed based on R-curve estimations and back-face strain measurements. The effect of major microstructural feature - grain size and its shape - was also taken into account.

2. Experimental Techniques

Flexure test specimens typically measuring $b = 3.0$ mm, $W = 4.0$ mm, and L (length) = 25 or 50 mm, were used in fracture toughness testing at room temperature in air. In the SEVNB method, a razor blade with diamond paste with grain size of $1\ \mu\text{m}$ was used to generate a final sharp notch with a root radius ranging from 10 to $20\ \mu\text{m}$ by tapering a saw notch (ref. 4). The final notch depth thus produced ranged from 1.0 to 2.0 mm. A typical example of a SEVNB test specimen thus v-notched is presented in figure 1. In the SEPB method (ref. 3), a starting indent crack was placed at the center of the 3.0 mm side of each test specimen. The indented test specimen was then placed onto a specially designed precracking fixture and then loaded via a test frame until the indent crack popped-in to form a sharp through-the-thickness precrack (refs. 3 and 5). The precrack size was typically around 2 mm.

A four-point flexure fixture with 20 (or 10) mm-inner and 40 (or 20) mm-outer spans was used to determine fracture load. A test rate of 0.5 mm/min was used via an electromechanical test frame (Model 8562, Instron) with a load cell with a capacity of 1000 N. Crack sizes were optically determined from fracture surfaces of tested specimens. Typically, five test specimens were used for each material in each test method. Fracture toughness was calculated based on the formula by Srawley and Gross (ref. 6). Load versus back-face strain curves were also determined for some ceramics to better understand stable crack propagation. R-curve of each material was estimated using an indentation technique (ref. 7). A total of 13 advanced ceramics and glass ceramic were used: seven silicon nitrides (NC132, AS800 ('94), SN282, N3208, AS800 ('99), NCX34, and NKK), one silicon carbide (α -SiC; Hexoloy), four aluminas (AD998 (Coors), AD998 (VAMAS) (ref. 4), AD999 (VAMAS) (ref. 4), and 96% alumina), and one glass ceramic (Pyroceram 9606). Many properties of these materials including strength and slow crack growth at elevated temperatures have been evaluated previously by the authors and others (refs. 8 and 13). Some properties such as density, elastic modulus and flexure strength at ambient temperature, together with fracture toughness values by SEPB and SEVNB methods determined in this work, are summarized in table 1.

TABLE 1.—PROPERTIES AND FRACTURE TOUGHNESS OF CERAMIC MATERIAL USED IN THIS WORK

Material ^a	Density (g/cm ³)	Elastic modulus, E (GPa)	Flexure strength ^c (MPa)	Fracture toughness, K_{Ic} (MPa m ^{1/2})	
				By SEPB	By SEVNB
NC132 Si ₃ N ₄ (ref. 8)	3.20	315	1018(35)	4.6(0.4)	4.3(0.1)
α -SiC (Hexoloy) (ref. 8)	3.13	415	335(35)	2.4(0.1)	2.5(0.1)
AS800 Si ₃ N ₄ ('94) (ref. 8)	3.27	308	778(39)	7.2(0.2)	6.5(0.3)
SN282 Si ₃ N ₄ (refs. 9 and 10)	3.32	304	595(64)	5.5(0.2)	4.5(0.2)
AD998 Al ₂ O ₃ (ref. 8)	3.85	372	303(7)	4.6(0.4)	3.4(0.1)
N3208 Si ₃ N ₄ ^b (ref. 4)	3.19	297	951(74)	5.3(0.1)	5.2(0.3)
Glass ceramic (Pyroceram) (ref. 11)	2.59	122	303(7)	2.3(0.1)	2.4(0.1)
AD998 Al ₂ O ₃ (VAMAS) ^b (ref. 4)	3.86	386	342	4.4(0.1)	3.6(0.1)
AS800 Si ₃ N ₄ ('99) (ref. 9 and 10)	3.27	309	775(45)	8.1(0.3)	6.7(0.1)
NCX34 Si ₃ N ₄ (ref. 8)	3.37	296	805(50)	6.9(0.6)	4.3(0.2)
NKK Si ₃ N ₄ (ref. 12)	3.26	307	774(38)	10.2(0.7)	7.4
96% Al ₂ O ₃ (ref. 8)	3.67	309	344(15)	3.4(0.1)	3.1(0.1)
AD999 Al ₂ O ₃ (VAMAS) ^b (ref. 4)	3.97	386	350	3.5(0.2)	3.6(0.2)

^a NC132, Norton Advanced Ceramics, Northboro, MA; α -SiC (Hexoloy), Saint-Gobain Advanced Ceramics, Niagara Falls, NY; AS800; Honeywell, Torrance, CA; SN282, Kyocera, Vancouver, WA; AD998, Coors, Golden, CO; N3208, Bayer-CFI, Germany; Pyroceram 9606, Corning, Corning, NY; AD998 (VAMAS) and AD999 (VAMAS), Metoxit, Switzerland; NCX34, Norton, Worcester, MA; NKK, NKK Corp., Japan; 96% Al₂O₃, General Electrical Ceramics, Laurens, SC.

^b Materials and their strength and density data from the VAMAS report (ref. 4).

^c Strength determined at ambient temperature in four-point flexure typically with 20 to 40 mm spans. The numbers in parentheses indicate ± 1.0 standard deviation.

3. Results and Discussion

Typical fracture surfaces of both SEPB and SEVNB silicon nitride specimens are shown in figure 2. Precracked or notched region is evident for each specimen. Note that the precrack front of the SEPB specimen is curved, which represents a unique feature of a pop-in event from a micro-indentation crack to form a precrack. A summary of fracture toughness of a total of 13 advanced ceramics used in this work by both SEVNB and SEPB methods is presented in figure 3 and table 1 as well. The figure compares the values of fracture toughness for each test material. As can be seen, agreement in fracture toughness between the two methods was good at lower fracture toughness, but poor at higher fracture toughness with a deviation becoming significant. This deviation can be seen more readily in terms of microstructural features -grain size and its shape- of test materials. Figure 4 depicts K_{Ic} ratio $[(K_{Ic} \text{ by SEVNB})/(K_{Ic} \text{ by SEPB})]$ with respect to a range of grain size. Fine grained ceramics and glass ceramic, such as α -SiC, AD999 alumina, NC132 and N3208 silicon nitrides, and Pyroceram, exhibited little difference in fracture toughness with K_{Ic} ratio close to unity. By contrast, coarse grained and elongated grained ceramics exhibited consistently lower K_{Ic} ratio ranging from 0.6 to 0.9 with an average of about 0.8. This indicates clearly that the two methods are in good agreement for fine-grained materials but in poor agreement with coarse or elongated grained materials.

It has been known that increase in fracture toughness for coarse or elongated grain-structured ceramics was due to mechanisms such as grain pullouts, grain bridging, and/or crack deflection, thereby generating crack closure stresses in the wake region of a crack. It has been also observed by the authors for a long time that these coarse and elongated grained ceramics revealed rising R-curve behavior with its degree depending on material.




Figure 2.—Typical fracture surfaces of silicon nitride specimens showing a precracked region by SEPB method (a) and a notched region by SEVNB method (b).




Figure 3.—Fracture toughness determined by SEVNB and SEPB methods for various ceramics.




Figure 4.— K_{Ic} ratio (=SEVNB/SEPB) with respect to range of grain sizes for various ceramics.




Figure 5.—A typical example of indent crack propagation in coarse grained NKK silicon nitride. A tortuous crack path with interactions such as grain bridging and pullout is noted.




Figure 6.—Crack growth resistance curves of some brittle materials, determined by indent techniques.

A typical example showing a microstructural feature of a coarse and elongated grained NKK silicon nitride associated with tortuous indent crack propagation is shown in figure 5 (ref. 12). Based on the authors' experience, this material exhibited the highest value of fracture toughness ($K_{Ic} = 10.2 \pm 0.7 \text{ MPa m}^{1/2}$) of monolithic ceramic materials and a rising R-curve as well (ref. 12). Typical examples of R-curves of some materials evaluated by the indentation technique (ref. 7), are shown in figure 6. Note that fine-grained NC132 silicon

nitride (grain size $<1 \mu\text{m}$) and soda-lime glass showed flat R-curve behavior; whereas, coarse-grained AD998 alumina (grain size $>10 \mu\text{m}$) and elongated grained NKK and AS800 silicon nitrides (elongated grain size $>20 \mu\text{m}$) exhibited significant rising R-curves. The degree and size of grain elongation were greater in NKK than in AS800. The R-curve in figure 6 was formulated using the following expression (ref. 7)

$$K_R = k[a]^m \quad (1)$$

where K_R is crack growth resistance, a is crack size (crack extension), k is a parameter, and m is toughening exponent. With the estimated m parameter for each test material, K_{Ic} ratio was plotted as a function of m , as shown in figure 7. A clear trend can be seen from the figure such that K_{Ic} ratio remained close to unity for lower m values ($m < 0.02$) but decreased

appreciably (or dropped) at higher m values ($m = 0.1$ to 0.14), giving rise to a following approximation

$$K_{Ic/SEVNB} / K_{Ic/SEPB} \approx -1.9 m + 1 \quad (2)$$

This, although not based on theoretical consideration, implies that the toughening exponent m could be an important parameter to quantify the degree of discrepancy in fracture toughness between the SEVNB and SEPB methods.




Figure 7.— K_{Ic} ratio as a function of toughening exponent (m) for various ceramics.




Figure 8.—Typical examples of applied load-versus-strain curves, determined by back-face strain gaging.

Typical load versus back-face strain curves of SEVNB test specimens of several ceramics are shown in figure 8 (Note that back-face strain was in compression but was expressed in tension for simplicity). Both fine-grained ceramics such as N3208 silicon nitride and AD998 alumina showed linearity in their load-versus-strain curves. However, the coarse-grained AD998 alumina and the elongated-grained AS800 silicon nitride exhibited nonlinearity at the region close to the final fracture, resulting in stable crack growth prior to instability. This stable crack growth was determined analytically in conjunction with the results of figure 8. The analytical solution was expressed as follows:

$$\alpha = 1 - \left[\frac{dP}{d\varepsilon} \right]^{1/2} f(L_o, L_i, b, W, E) \quad (3)$$

where $\alpha = a/W$ with a and W being crack size and specimen depth, P is applied load, ε is backside strain, and the function f depends on fixture spans, and width and elastic modulus of test specimen.

The crack growth resistance K_R , corresponding to crack size (α) and applied load in the stable crack-growth region, was determined using equation (3) and the results are shown in figure 9. For N3208 and AD999 materials, no or negligible stable crack growth occurred. By contrast, AS800 material exhibited a significant stable crack growth, resulting in a considerable increase in fracture toughness by about 35 percent. Also, AD998 material resulted in fracture-toughness increase by about 25 percent. It is interesting to note from the figure that fracture toughness started from the values determined by the SEVNB method and ended up with the values determined by the SEP method. This indicates that the discrepancy in fracture toughness between the two methods, particularly for coarse and




Figure 9.—Crack growth resistance curves determined by back-face strain gaging based on the results in figure 6.

elongated grained ceramics, is due to the fact that the calculation of K_{Ic} in SEVNB specimens did not consider the stable crack growth in their final crack sizes, which is hardly discernable from fracture surfaces in many cases. Although this extension by stable crack growth is small in the order of a few hundred micrometers and the measurement imposes a great difficulty, the effect on fracture toughness is still significant. Stable crack growth occurring via grain bridging and pullouts together with crack closure stresses acting in the wake region is the most plausible, physical explanation for the discrepancy in fracture toughness between the two methods.

4. Conclusions

The discrepancy in fracture toughness between the SEVNB and SEP methods was attributed to R-curve behavior of ceramic materials, in which stable crack growth through grain pullouts and/or bridging takes place, imposing crack closure forces in the wake region of a propagating crack even for SEVNB specimens. The discrepancy increased for materials with stronger rising R-curve and was quantified with a toughening exponent (m). It is recommended that both SEVNB and SEP methods be used together to evaluate fracture toughness of any materials unknown in microstructural features and/or R-curve behavior. Any appropriate method to monitor stable crack growth in SEVNB specimens is also recommended.

References

1. P. Chantikul, G.R. Anstis, B.R. Lawn, and D.B. Marshall, "A Critical Evaluation of Indentation Techniques for Measuring Fracture Toughness: II. Strength method," *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.*, 64[9] 539–543 (1981).
2. G.R. Anstis, P. Chantikul, B.R. Lawn, and D.B. Marshall, "A Critical Evaluation of Indentation Techniques for Measuring Fracture Toughness: I. Crack Size Measurements," *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.*, 64[9] 533–538 (1981).
3. ASTM C 1421, "Test Methods for Determination of Fracture Toughness of Advanced Ceramics at Ambient Temperature," *Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Vol. 15.01*, ASTM, West Conshohocken, PA (2005).
4. J. Kübler, (a) "Fracture Toughness of Ceramics Using the SEVNB Method: Preliminary Results," *Ceram. Eng. Sci. Proc.*, 18[4] 155–162 (1997); (b) "Fracture Toughness of Ceramics Using the SEVNB Method; Round Robin," VAMAS Report No. 37, EMPA, Swiss Federal Laboratories for Materials Testing & Research, Dübendorf, Switzerland (1999).
5. S.R. Choi, A. Chulya, and J.A. Salem, "Analysis of Precracking Parameters for Ceramic Single-Edge-Precracked-Beam Specimens, pp. 73–88 in *Fracture Mechanics of Ceramics*, Vol. 10, Edited by R.C. Bradt, D.P.H. Hasselman, D. Munz, M. Sakai, and V. Ya. Shevchenko," Plenum Press, New York, NY (1992).
6. J.E. Srawley and B. Gross, "Side-Cracked Plates Subjected to Combined Direct and Bending Forces," pp. 559–579 in *Cracks and Fracture*, ASTM STP 601, American Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia. 1976.
7. R.F. Krause, "Rising Fracture Toughness from the Bending Strength of Indented Alumina Beams," *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.*, 71[5] 338–343 (1988).
8. S.R. Choi, J.M. Pereira, L.A. Janosik, and R.T. Bhatt, "Foreign Object Damage in Flexure Bars of Two Gas-Turbine Grade Silicon Nitrides," *Mat. Sci. Eng.*, A379 411–419 (2004).
9. S.R. Choi, J.M. Pereira, L.A. Janosik, and R.T. Bhatt, "Foreign Object Damage in Disks of Gas-Turbine Grade Silicon Nitrides by Steel Ball projectile at Ambient Temperature," *J. Mater. Sci.*, 39 6173–6182 (2004).
10. S.R. Choi and J.P. Gyekenyesi, "'Ultra'-Fast Fracture Strength of Advanced Structural Ceramics at Elevated Temperatures: An Approach to High-Temperature 'Inert' Strength," pp. 27–46 in *Fracture Mechanics of Ceramics*, Vol. 13, Edited by R.C. Bradt, D. Munz, M. Sakai, V. Ya. Shevchenko, and K. White, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, NY (2002).
11. S.R. Choi and J.P. Gyekenyesi, "Results of Mechanical Testing for Pyroceram™ Glass-Ceramic," NASA/TM—2003-212487, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Glenn Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio (2003).
12. S.R. Choi and J.A. Salem, "Crack Growth Resistance of In Situ-Toughened Silicon Nitride," *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.*, 77[4] 1042–1046 (1994).
13. S.R. Choi, various previous publications not quoted here.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this 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, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (<i>Leave blank</i>)	2. REPORT DATE January 2006	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Technical Memorandum	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Assessments of Fracture Toughness of Monolithic Ceramics—SEPB Versus SEVNB Methods		5. FUNDING NUMBERS WBS-22-714-04-05	
6. AUTHOR(S) Sung R. Choi and John P. Gyekenyesi			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Aeronautics and Space Administration John H. Glenn Research Center at Lewis Field Cleveland, Ohio 44135-3191		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER E-15427	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546-0001		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NASA TM-2006-214090	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for the 11th International Conference on Fracture cosponsored by ICF, ESIS, and ASTM, Turin, Italy, March 20-25, 2005. Sung R. Choi, University of Toledo, 2801 W. Bancroft St., Toledo, Ohio 43606; and John P. Gyekenyesi, NASA Glenn Research Center. Responsible person, Sung R. Choi, organization code RXL, 216-433-8366.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category: 07 Available electronically at http://gltrs.grc.nasa.gov This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, 301-621-0390.		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (<i>Maximum 200 words</i>) Fracture toughness of a total of 13 advanced monolithic ceramics including silicon nitrides, silicon carbide, aluminas, and glass ceramic was determined at ambient temperature by using both single edge precracked beam (SEPB) and single edge v-notched beam (SEVNB) methods. Relatively good agreement in fracture toughness between the two methods was observed for advanced ceramics with flat R-curves; whereas, poor agreement in fracture toughness was seen for materials with rising R-curves. The discrepancy in fracture toughness between the two methods was due to stable crack growth with crack closure forces acting in the wake region of cracks even in SEVNB test specimens. The effect of discrepancy in fracture toughness was analyzed in terms of microstructural feature (grain size and shape), toughening exponent in R-curve, and stable crack growth determined using back-face strain gaging.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS Fracture toughness; Advanced monolithic ceramics; R-curve; SEPB and SEVNB methods		15. NUMBER OF PAGES 16	
		16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

