Some applications of Burzyński yield condition in metal plasticity
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\begin{abstract}

The classical $J_2$ plasticity theory is widely used to describe the plastic response of metallic materials. However, this theory does not provide satisfactory predictions for materials which exhibit pressure sensitive yielding or plastic dilatancy. Another difficulty is the difference between the values of yield stresses in tension and compression for isotropic materials, the so-called strength differential effect (SD), leading to the asymmetry of the elastic range. The Burzyński yield condition, proposed in 1928, can be used to overcome some of these problems. In this paper an implicit integration of the elastoplastic constitutive equations for the paraboloid case of Burzyński’s yield condition is formulated. Also, the tangent operator consistent with the integration algorithm was developed and is presented. The proposed model was implemented in a commercial Finite Element code and different kinds of tests reported in the literature were simulated. The comparison between the numerical and experimental results shows that the plasticity theory with the paraboloid case of Burzyński’s yield condition describes adequately the strength differential effect, which is present in many kinds of materials significant for recent applications.

\end{abstract}

1. Introduction

The analysis of complex structural components, their design optimization and structural reliability assessment require the use of proper and accurate constitutive models to describe a material behaviour. To date, an overwhelming majority of structural analyses employ the classical $J_2$ plasticity theory to describe the plastic response of metallic alloys. This theory assumes that hydrostatic stress has no effect on plastic flow and the material is incompressible in the plastic regime.

However, there are reported in the literature on experimental results for metallic solids under quasi static conditions, which exhibit pressure sensitive yielding and plastic dilatancy and reveal inconsistency of the model based on the Huber-Mises yield condition [1,2]. In particular, this effect can be significant in designing, structural elements or machine parts in which stress concentrations may appear resulting in the increase of the value of the first stress invariant.

Another difficulty to be taken into account is the difference of the values of yield stresses in tension and compression for isotropic materials, the so-called strength differential effect, leading to the asymmetry of the elastic range.

The observed hydrostatic stress effect on the yield behaviour of the investigated metallic materials is commonly described in the literature by means of the adaptation of the criterion known in the soil mechanics in which the linear dependence of the yield limit on hydrostatic stress is assumed. Such a criterion was proposed originally in 1928 by Burzyński [3] and repeated later by other authors, e.g. by Drucker and Prager [4,5]. Recently, this kind of criterion has been used to model the pressure sensitive yielding of metals [6,8]. However, it is known that the criterion represented by a conical failure surface in the space of principal stresses can only roughly approximate real behaviour of a material in the limited range of hydrostatic stress and fails to describe properly the states near to the apex of the failure cone [9].

In this paper the general Burzyński yield condition is reviewed showing that the Huber-Mises, Drucker-Prager and paraboloid Burzyński Torre conditions can be received as particular cases of this more general model.

Then, an implicit integration of the elastoplastic constitutive equations for the paraboloid Burzyński yield condition is formulated. Also, the tangent operator consistent with the integration algorithm was developed and is presented. The proposed model was implemented in the Finite Element code ABAQUS through the user subroutine UMAT. This is a new contribution, which can find wide applications in practical analysis of complex states of stress in plasticity as well as viscoplasticity of metals and metal matrix composites [10]. In the latter paper an identical paraboloid yield criterion was considered. The authors related it with the names of Mises and Schleicher [11] for a more detailed discussion of the historical background of the development of the paraboloid failure criteria. However, Zhang et al. [10] do not provide an integration algorithm of the developed equations of plasticity with the
paraboloid yield condition or an implementation into a finite element code. Therefore, the results presented in our paper are important and relevant for recent applications.

In order to validate the discussed constitutive model of plasticity with the paraboloid case of Burzyński’s yield condition, the tensile test on notched tensile specimens of the 2024 T3 aluminum alloy performed earlier by Wilson [6] were simulated. The computations were compared with the experimental data and the results of numerical calculations made with the application of the Drucker Prager yield condition presented in [6]. Also, the experimental data obtained by Iyer and Lissendien [12] for the polycrystalline nickel base alloy Inconel 718, which reveals the strength differential effect, were applied. Numerical simulations of experimental tests of a thin walled tube subjected to tension combined with torsion, as well as a thin walled tube subjected to compression combined with torsion, were performed. Such non proportional loading paths containing corners provide a rigorous test of a plasticity model. The comparison of the results of computations with experimental data shows that the application of the plasticity theory with the Burzyński case of the paraboloid yield condition is more consistent with experiment than the classical plasticity theory with the Huber Mises yield condition.

2. The Burzyński yield condition

The study of the literature of the subject shows that the original results of Burzyński presented in his doctoral thesis and in his further papers [3,13] are of fundamental significance and remain important also for recent studies of models of solids with asymmetric behaviour of the elastic range. It concerns soils and rocks (e.g. applications in modelling of interaction of a cutting tool with geological settings [14]), as well as modern mate rials (e.g. polymers [15], composites and porous solids [16,17].

The concept of the Burzyński yield condition was presented in detail and compared with several later independent propositions by Zyczkowski [18,19] as well as Skrzypek [20] and Jirásek et al. [21]. The yield criterion proposed by Huber, Mises and Hencky [22,24] for isotropic solids characterized with equal values of yield stresses in tension and compression was well established and confirmed experimentally in the twentieth century. The open question remained, however, in the subject of yield criteria for isotropic materials revealing different values of yield stresses in tension and compression, the so called strength differential (SD) effect.

Yield conditions with plastic behaviour depending on hydro static pressure may be described by equations of rotationally symmetric surfaces in the space of principal stresses with the symmetry axis: \( \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma_3 \). Their general form is: \( f(\sigma_m, \sigma_e) = 0 \) where \( \sigma_m \) is the hydrostatic stress and \( \sigma_e \) corresponds to the effective stress.

\[
\sigma_m = \frac{1}{3} \sigma : 1, \quad \sigma_e = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3} \sigma' : \sigma'}, \quad \sigma' = \sigma - \sigma_m : 1
\]  

with \( \sigma \) the Cauchy stress tensor, \( \sigma' \) the stress deviator, and 1 the unit second order tensor.

The Burzyński’s formulation in the general form \( f(\sigma_m, \sigma_e) = 0 \) is presented as a three parameter condition, having physical foundations in an energy based criterion [3,11,13]:

\[
A \sigma_m^2 + B \sigma_m^2 + C \sigma_m = 1 \quad \text{0}
\]  

Burzyński evaluated the parameters \( A \), \( B \), and \( C \) using uniaxial tension (to obtain the yield stress \( \sigma_1^* \)), uniaxial compression (to obtain \( \sigma_3^* \)) and simple shear tests (\( \tau_0^* \)) resulting in the following [19]:

\[
\sigma_1 \sigma_1^* \left( \frac{3 \tau_0^*}{\tau_0^*} \right)^2 + \left( 9 \frac{3 \sigma_3^* \sigma_3^*}{(\tau_0^*)^2} \right) \sigma_m^2 + 3(\sigma_3^*)^2 \sigma_m + \sigma_3^* \sigma_3^* = 0
\]

(3)

In order to account for isotropic hardening \( \sigma_1^*, \sigma_3^* \) and \( \tau_0^* \) are as summed to be dependent on the effective plastic deformation \( \varepsilon_e \). This equation describes in the space of principal stresses a hyperboloid (if \( 3(\tau_0^*)^2 < \sigma_3^* \sigma_3^* \)), or an ellipsoid (if \( 3(\tau_0^*)^2 > \sigma_3^* \sigma_3^* \)). To reduce the number of independent parameters to two, some particular cases of the relation between \( \tau_0^*/\sqrt{3} \) with \( \sigma_1^* \) and \( \sigma_3^* \) are analysed [19].

With the relation:

\[
\tau_0^*/\sqrt{3} = 2 \sigma_1^*/\sigma_1^* + \sigma_3^*/\sigma_3^* = 0
\]  

(4)

Eq. (3) turns into the formula of a circular cone (Burzyński Drucker Prager cone):

\[
\sigma_e + \frac{3}{\sigma_1^*} \frac{\sigma_1^*}{\sigma_1^*} = \frac{2}{\sigma_3^*} \frac{\sigma_3^*}{\sigma_3^*} = 0
\]  

(5)

while with \( \tau_0^*/\sqrt{3} = \sigma_1^*/\sigma_1^* \) the relation in Eq. (3) transforms into the equation of a paraboloid, called by Zyczkowski the Burzyński Torre paraboloid yield condition [19,25]:

\[
\sigma_1^* + 3(\sigma_1^* \sigma_1^* - \sigma_3^*) \sigma_3^* = \sigma_3^* \sigma_3^* = 0
\]  

(6)

Introducing the relation between uniaxial compression and uniaxial tension yield stresses \( \sigma_1^* \) and \( \sigma_3^* \), Eq. (6) can be written as:

\[
\sigma_1^* + 3(k \ 1) \sigma_m \sigma_1^* - (\sigma_1^* )^2 = 0
\]  

(7)

after solving with respect to \( \sigma_1^* \) and extracting the positive root, this equation takes the form:

\[
\frac{1}{2k} \left( 3k \ 1 \right) \sigma_m + \sqrt{9(k \ 1)^2 \sigma_m + 4k \sigma_1^*} \right) = \sigma_1^* = 0
\]  

(8)

Further, if \( \sigma_1^* \), \( \sigma_3^* \), \( \sigma_1^* \), and \( \tau_0^*/\sqrt{3} \), the Huber Mises circular cylinder is obtained.

The relevant limit curves of the Burzyński model in the plane \( \sigma_m \), \( \sigma_e \) are shown in Fig. 1.

Unlike yield formulations such as the Huber Mises and Drucker Prager criteria or others, having mostly an empirical character, the Burzyński model has not been implemented into a commercial finite element code. In this article, the Burzyński paraboloid model is analysed and used for the first time in the algorithm of integration of the plasticity equations with the paraboloid yield condition and implemented in the Finite Element program ABAQUS.

3. Integration of the plastic equations with the Burzyński–Torre paraboloid yield condition

Within the finite element method the integration process is local in space and occurs at quadrature points of the finite elements. The incremental integration of the constitutive model is a strain driven process in which the total strain tensor increment at each quadrature point is given at a certain time and both the stress and the state variables should be updated.

For structural metals elastic strains are usually very small compared to unity or to plastic strains. For hypo elastic materials and with this restriction, the rate of deformation tensor \( \dot{\varepsilon} \), can be decomposed as the sum of an elastic \( \dot{\varepsilon}^p \) and a plastic part \( \dot{\varepsilon}^p \) into the form:

\[
\dot{\varepsilon} = \dot{\varepsilon}^p + \dot{\varepsilon}^p
\]  

(9)

and the stress rate, in terms of the elastic deformation rate tensor is:

\[
\dot{\sigma} \cdot C : (\dot{\varepsilon}^p + \dot{\varepsilon}^p)
\]  

(10)
In the above equation \( \mathbf{C} \) is the tensor of isotropic elastic moduli:
\[
\mathbf{C} = 2G\mathbf{I} + K\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I} \tag{11}
\]
where \( G = E/2(1 + \nu) \) and \( K = E/3(1 - 2\nu) \) are elastic constant, and \( E \) and \( \nu \) are Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio respectively. Also \( \mathbf{I} \) is the unit second order tensor and \( \mathbf{I} \) is the unit deviatoric fourth order tensor. The plastic part of the rate of deformation tensor has a direction normal to the flow potential, i.e:
\[
\dot{\mathbf{e}}^p = \lambda \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{e}} \tag{12}
\]
with \( \lambda \) being the plastic proportionality factor, and \( \Phi \) the Burzyński Torre paraboloid yield surface:
\[
\Phi(\sigma_m, \sigma_x, \sigma_y^p) = \frac{1}{2K} \left\{ 3(k + 1)\sigma_m + \sqrt{9(k + 1)^2\sigma_m^2 + 4k\sigma_x^2} \right\} \sigma_y^p \tag{13}
\]

The plastic part of the macroscopic strain increment and the effective plastic strain increment are related by:
\[
\mathbf{e} = \dot{\mathbf{e}}^p \quad \sigma^p = \tilde{\sigma} \dot{\mathbf{e}}^p \tag{14}
\]
The plastic flow proportionality factor \( \lambda \) can be written as:
\[
\lambda = \frac{\tilde{\sigma}^p \dot{\mathbf{e}}^p}{\mathbf{e}^p} \tag{15}
\]

To complete the formulation, the Kuhn-Tucker loading-unloading conditions are considered:
\[
\lambda \geq 0, \quad \Phi < 0, \quad \dot{\lambda} \Phi = 0 \tag{16}
\]
which means that \( \dot{\lambda} = 0 \) and \( \Phi < 0 \) during elastic loading or unloading and \( \lambda > 0 \) and \( \Phi = 0 \) during plastic loading. The equation \( \dot{\lambda} \Phi = 0 \) represents the consistency condition.

To integrate the set of non-linear equations into a finite element scheme at the level of a material point two different tasks must be accomplished. The first one consists in update stress and state variables driven by the strain increment. The second is related to create a consistent tangent operator to preserve the quadratic convergence of the iterative solution based on Newton's method.

Numerical solutions of Eqs. (10), (12), (14), (16) in order to obtain \( \dot{\mathbf{e}}, \dot{\mathbf{e}}^p, \lambda \) and \( \Phi \), are developed following the fully implicit backward Euler integration using the classical return mapping algorithm [26,27]. The return is performed at time \((n+1)\) with the corresponding updated stress:
\[
\sigma^{(n+1)} = \sigma^{(n+1)} + \mathbf{C} : \Delta \mathbf{e} \tag{17}
\]

with the trial stress given by:
\[
\sigma^{\text{trial}}(n+1) = \sigma^{\text{trial}}(n+1) + \mathbf{C} : \Delta \mathbf{e} \tag{18}
\]

From the yield condition during plastic loading in Eq. (16) we have:
\[
\Phi \left( \mathbf{e}^{(n+1)} + \mathbf{D}^{(n)} \mathbf{e}^{(n+1)} \right) \leq 0 \tag{19}
\]

From the associated flow rule in Eq. (12) and separating hydrostatic and deviatoric components we obtain:
\[
\Delta \mathbf{e} = \Delta \mathbf{e}^p + \Delta \mathbf{e}^\text{pl} \tag{20}
\]
or:
\[
\Delta \mathbf{e}^p = \frac{1}{3} \Delta \mathbf{e}^\text{pl} + \Delta \mathbf{e}^\text{eq} \tag{21}
\]

In the above: \( \mathbf{n}_{(n+1)} = (3\sigma^p/(2\sigma_m))_{(n+1)} \) is the unit vector in the deviatoric space normal to the yield surface, and \( \Delta \mathbf{e}^p \) and \( \Delta \mathbf{e}^\text{eq} \) are variables introduced by Aravas [28] in the following form:
\[
\Delta \mathbf{e}^p = \Delta \mathbf{l} \left( \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{e}} \right)_{(n+1)} = \Delta \mathbf{e}^\text{pl} \tag{22}
\]

and transformed using Eq. (22) to eliminate \( \Delta \mathbf{l} \) into:
\[
\Delta \mathbf{e}^p = \left( \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{e}^\text{pl}} \right)_{(n+1)} \Delta \mathbf{e}^\text{pl} \tag{23}
\]

Bearing in mind the relation \( \mathbf{n}_{(n+1)} = \mathbf{n}^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} \) [29], and introducing the expression of Eq. (21) in Eq. (18), it can be written that:
\[
\sigma^{(n+1)} = \sigma^{\text{trial}}(n+1) + K\Delta \mathbf{e}^p + 2G\Delta \mathbf{e}^\text{eq} \mathbf{n}^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} \tag{24}
\]

with:
\[
\sigma^{\text{trial}}_{(n+1)} = \frac{3\sigma^p}{2\sigma_m} \mathbf{n}^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} \quad \sigma^{\text{trial}}_{(n+1)} = \sigma^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} \quad \sigma^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} = \mathbf{1} \tag{25}
\]

which allows one to obtain, separating Eq. (24) into its deviatoric and hydrostatic components, the following relations:
\[
\sigma^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} = \sigma^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} + K\Delta \mathbf{e}^p \quad \sigma^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} = \sigma^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} + 3G\Delta \mathbf{e}^\text{eq} \tag{25}
\]

From the integration of Eq. (14) we have:
\[
\mathbf{e}^{(n+1)} = \mathbf{e}^{(n+1)} + \frac{3\sigma^p}{2\sigma_m} \mathbf{n}^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} \quad \sigma^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} = \sigma^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} + \frac{3\sigma^p}{2\sigma_m} \mathbf{n}^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} + \sigma^{\text{rad}}_{(n+1)} \tag{26}
\]
After some algebraic transformations on Eqs. (19), (23), (26), the three scalar non linear equations which should be solved to obtain \( \Delta \sigma_p, \Delta \sigma_q, \) and \( \sigma^T \) read:

(a) \( \Phi(\sigma_m, \sigma_e, \sigma^T) \leq 0 \)

(b) \( \Delta \sigma_p \left( \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \sigma_e} \right) \Delta \sigma_q \left( \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \sigma_m} \right) = 0 \) \hfill (27)

(c) \( \Delta K \left( \sigma_m \Delta \epsilon_p + \sigma_e \Delta \epsilon_q \right) / \sigma^T \)

with \( \sigma_T, \sigma^T(\sigma^T), \sigma_m, \sigma^m, K \Delta \epsilon_p \) and \( \sigma_e, \sigma^e, 3 \Delta \epsilon_q, \) and all variables evaluated in \((n + 1)\) and omitted for simplicity. The values of the variables are obtained following an iterative process using the Newton Raphson procedure, with the updated stress at time \((n + 1)\) of the form:

\[ \sigma_{n+1} = \frac{3}{2} \sigma_{n+1}^{\text{trial}} + \sigma_{m(n+1)} \mathbf{1} \] \hfill (28)

4. Consistent tangent operator

To preserve the quadratic rate of asymptotic convergence of the iterative solution based on Newton’s method, a consistent tangent operator \( J \) different in general from the continuum tangent moduli, is proposed by the enforcement of the consistency condition at the end of the step \((n + 1)\) \hfill [26]:

\[ J \left( \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{(n+1)} = \left( \frac{\partial \Delta \sigma}{\partial \Delta \epsilon} \right)_{(n+1)} \] \hfill (29)

Deriving Eq. (10) and omitting the subscript \((n + 1)\) for simplicity, it follows:

\[ \delta \Delta \sigma = (2G + Kc \mathbf{1}) : \delta \delta \epsilon \quad \text{where} \quad Kc = 2G \delta \Delta \epsilon_c \mathbf{1} \quad 2G \delta \Delta \epsilon_q \mathbf{1} \] \hfill (30)

and from Eq. (25):

\[ \delta \sigma_m, \delta \sigma^m, Kc \delta \Delta \epsilon_p, \delta \epsilon, \delta \sigma^e \] \hfill (31)

with \( C_0 \) coefficients known.

Bearing in mind the relations:

\[ \delta \sigma^m = K(\delta \epsilon) \mathbf{1} \quad \delta \sigma^e = \frac{3}{2 \sigma^m} \delta \sigma^m \delta \sigma^m : \delta \sigma^m \] \hfill (32)

the consistent tangent operator can be written as:

\[ J = K(1 + KC_{11}) \mathbf{1} + \left( 2G + \frac{6G^2 \Delta \epsilon_c}{\sigma^m} \mathbf{1} \right) \] \hfill (33)

It should be noted that no matrix inversion is necessary in the definition of this operator.

The proposed algorithm was implemented in the commercial Finite Element code ABAQUS/Standard \hfill [30] through a user subrou
tine UMAT.

5. Simulation of tests on notched tensile specimens of 2024 T3 aluminum alloy \hfill [6]

In order to analyse the behaviour of the proposed model and the integration algorithm, different tensile tests performed experimentally by Wilson \hfill [6] were simulated. The material considered is the 2024 T351 aluminum alloy. The true stress true strain material characteristics \((\sigma_T, \epsilon)\) obtained from uniaxial tensile tests \hfill [6] follows the Ramberg Osgood power law hardening relationship:

\[ \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon_0} = \frac{\sigma_T}{\sigma_0} + \mu \left( \frac{\sigma_T}{\sigma_0} \right)^n \] \hfill (34)

where \( \sigma_0 \) is the reference stress (taken as the 0.2% offset of the yield strength), \( \epsilon_0, \sigma_0/\mu \) is the reference strain, and \( \mu \) and \( n \) are the hardening coefficient and hardening exponent respectively. These properties, including the Young Modulus \( E \) and Poisson’s ratio \( \nu \) constants, are listed in Table 1. A compression test was also con
ducted by Wilson \hfill [6], and the resulting \( \sigma_0 \) is given in Table 1.

The geometry and dimension details of the notched round bar specimens are given in Fig. 2, where the nominal diameter is \( d = 12.7 \) mm, the neck diameter is \( t_n = 6.35 \) mm \((dt_n = 0.5)\), and the notch flank angle of the tubes \( \epsilon \) is equal to 45° in all cases. The chosen notch root radii have three different values of \( r = 0.127, 0.254 \) and 0.508 mm.

The experimental tests were simulated with the Finite Element commercial code ABAQUS/Standard \hfill [30]. Due to the symmetry of the model, only a quarter of the specimen needs to be taken into account. The numerical analysis consists of 57000 ax symmetric \( 8 \) node elements with reduced integration, and with a refined mesh near the notched region. The finite element mesh and the detail of the mesh in the notched region for the case of \( r = 0.508 \) mm are shown in Fig. 3.

Figs. 4 6 show the load displacement curves obtained in numerical situation using the Burzynski paraboloid model for different values of the strength differential factor \( k = 1, 1.06, 1.1 \) and 1.2. These results are compared with the experimentally ob
served behaviour of the specimen \hfill [6].

If the behaviour of the material at compression is the same as at tension, the Burzynski Torre paraboloid yield function, with the va
lue of \( k = \sigma_T/\sigma_0 = 1 \), leads to the Huber Mises yield criterion. In all of the analysed specimens, the response of the notched round bar for this value \( k = 1.0 \) overshoots the real response of the material. The same behaviour was obtained by Wilson \hfill [6] for the Huber Mises yield function. Using the constant value of \( k = \sigma_T/\sigma_0 = 407.49/384.05 = 1.06 \) \hfill (Table 1) during the simulation, gives the results which better predict the behaviour of the specimen and the simula
tions match the experimental data when the chosen \( k \) values are in the range of 1.06 and 1.1.

6. Simulation of tests on the Inconel 718 thin-walled tubes subjected to torsion after tension or compression \hfill [12]

The strength differential effect has been also observed by Gil et al. \hfill [31,32] in the aged Inconel 718, a nickel base superalloy used

| Table 1 Material properties for the 2024-T351 aluminum alloy at room temperature. |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-----|-----|-----------|
| \( E \) (MPa)   | \( \nu \) | \( \sigma_0 \) (MPa) | \( n \) | \( \mu \) | \( \sigma_T \) (MPa) |
| 71708           | 0.33  | 384.05 | 15  | 0.86 | 407.49    |
extensively for aeropropulsion structures. The elastic properties of the material are $E = 165$ GPa and $\gamma = 0.297$, and the stress strain responses in uniaxial tension and compression reported by Iyer and Lissenden[12] are presented in Fig. 9. Iyer and Lissenden[12] proposed a set of experiments with non proportional loads to characterize this material. The experiments developed by[12] consist in axial torsional tests of tubular specimens (subjected to an axial force and torque as shown in Fig. 7) with the outer and inner diameters of $D_0 = 21.0$ mm and $D_i = 15.9$ mm respectively, and the length $L_g = 25$ mm. The measured quantities considered were: axial displacement ($\delta$), load ($P$), torque ($T$), and angle of twist ($\theta$). From these quantities, the stresses and strains were calculated as:

$$\sigma_{11} = \frac{4P}{\pi (D_0^2 - D_i^2)} \frac{\epsilon_{11}}{L_g}$$

for tension and compression tests, and

$$\sigma_{12} = \frac{16TD_0}{\pi (D_0^2 - D_i^2)} \frac{\gamma_{12}}{L_g}$$

for torsion tests. The path of biaxial loading applied to the specimens and simulations consists in a uniaxial tension followed by torsion (see Fig. 10a) and a uniaxial compresion followed by torsion (Fig. 10b). These tests were simulated by the FEM with the Burzyński Torre paraboloid model.
The finite element mesh used in the computations in ABAQUS/Standard [30], with a total of 4600 8 node elements, is shown in Fig. 8, and the simulations of the specimen considering the non proportional load paths cases are compared with the experimental results given by [12].

Figs. 11–14 present the comparison between experimental results and simulations for the Burzynski Torre paraboloid model with two different values of the strength differential factor: \( r_CY = r_TY = 1 \): 0 (where the strength differential is not considered) and \( k = 1.1 \) for two non proportional load paths: tension followed by torsion (Figs. 11 and 12) and compression followed by torsion (Figs. 13 and 14).

In Figs. 11 and 12, where the load path applied to the specimen consists in traction torsion tests following the displacement path (axial and radial) shown in Fig. 10a, the obtained curves for both \( k \) values provide good agreement with experimental data. However, in Figs. 13 and 14, a significant discrepancy is shown for the torsion after compression test (Fig. 10b) between the...
experimental data and the results of simulations where the Burzynski model with $k = 1.0$ is used. Note that this case corresponds with the consideration of the non SD effect. Nevertheless, for $k = 1.1$ there is an excellent agreement between the numerical results and the experimental data, highlighting how important considering of the strength differential effect for a correct simulation of the behaviour of the material at such a loading path is.

7. Conclusions

With the plasticity theory based on the Burzynski yield condition, we have simulated tensile tests on notched specimens of the 2024 T3 aluminum alloy [6], as well as tests on the thin walled tubes of Inconel 718 subjected to torsion after tension or compression [12]. The comparison between numerical and experimental results reveals that the application of the plasticity theory with the paraboloid case of the Burzynski yield condition correlates better with experimental data than the results obtained with use of the classical plasticity theory with the Huber Mises yield condition. These observations can lead to more general conclusion that the discussed plasticity model with the paraboloid yield condition makes it possible to describe adequately the strength differential (SD) effect present also in other materials, as. e.g. high strength metals, in particular with nano grains, as well as, in polymers, for example in polycarbonates. The presented analysis creates also a possibility for the formulation of a similar integration scheme in the case of anisotropic materials for instance as in the methodology developed by Oller et al. [33] which is based on the paraboloid isotropic yield criterion as a starting point. The criterion is to be adjusted by certain transformation to the behaviour of an orthotropic material.
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