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The test specimen thickness (TST) effect on the fracture toughness $J_c$ was considered.

The TST effect on $J_c$ and bounded behavior of $J_c$ was observed with the non-standard 3PB specimen.

A large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA reproduced the behaviors observed in the experiments.

The $(4\delta, \sigma_{22c})$ failure criterion effectively explained the TST effect.

The mechanical nature of the TST effect on $J_c$ was demonstrated.
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Abstract

This paper considered the test specimen thickness (TST) effect on the fracture toughness of a material \(J_c\) in the transition temperature region for 3 point bending (3PB) specimens. Fracture toughness tests and elastic-plastic finite element analyses (FEA) with non-standard test specimens, which are non-standard because the specimen thickness-to-width ratio \(B/W\) was varied in the range of 0.25 to 1.5, were conducted. Based on these tests and the FEA results, it was demonstrated that the “planar” \((4 \delta_t, \sigma_{22c})\) failure criterion—which states that cleavage fracture after significant plastic deformation occurs when the crack opening stress \(\sigma_{22}\) at a distance from the crack-tip that is equal to 4 times the crack-tip opening displacement \(\delta_t\) exceeds a critical value \(\sigma_{22c}\)—was verified to effectively explain the TST effect. This \((4 \delta_t, \sigma_{22c})\) criterion also successfully predicted the tendency of \(J_c\) to saturate to some bounding value for \(B/W=1.0\). This tendency was similar to that of the \(T_{33}\)-stress, which is the out-of-plane elastic crack-tip constraint parameter. Because the \((4 \delta_t, \sigma_{22c})\) criterion could predict the TST effect on \(J_c\) and because the criterion could predict the bounded behavior of \(J_c\) for large \(B/W\), the TST effect was concluded to be mainly mechanical in nature, which the weakest link model fails to predict. The mechanical cause of the TST effect on \(J_c\) was considered to be an out-of-plane crack-tip constraint, and one of its measures of magnitude is the \(T_{33}\)-stress.
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1. Introduction

One of the difficulties in determining the cleavage fracture toughness \( J_c \) of a material over the ductile-to-brittle transition (DBT) temperature region, which is important in the assessment of aging steel structures and reactor pressure vessels, is that test specimen thickness (TST) has an effect on \( J_c \), even though standardized test specimens are used [1]. The two most physically logical effects, in general, are the statistically weakest link size effect and the loss of crack-tip constraint, that is, the effect caused by the loss of stress triaxiality [2]. The weakest link size effect should affect only brittle fracture, whereas the loss of constraint should affect both ductile and brittle fracture. Both criteria lead to increasing toughness with decreasing TST. Another point of view is that the former criterion considers the TST effect on \( J_c \) to be a material issue and the latter to be a mechanical issue.

This effect of TST on \( J_c \), described as \( J_c \propto B^{-1/2} (B \equiv \text{TST}) \) by Wallin [2], was reproduced by Dodds et al. [3] based on the weakest link model. ASTM E1921 [4] has adopted parts of this criterion, and it seems to be widely accepted. However, as Dodds et al. [3] admit, “fracture toughness does not decrease indefinitely with thickness.”

The crack-tip constraint approach to the TST effect on \( J_c \) assumes that the effect is a result of the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint. Guo [5, 6] proposed a parameter \( T_z = \sigma_{33}/(\sigma_{11}+\sigma_{22}) \) to measure the magnitude of the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint, and has been extensively working with co-workers to express the crack-tip stress field with a stress intensity factor (SIF) \( K_0 \) or \( J_{T1} - T_z \) [6-13]. Niemitz et al. [14] instead applied a \( J-Q-T_3 \) approach to explain the difference in \( J_c \). Whether explicitly expressed or not, Gao [15], Wang et al. [16-20], and Fernández-Sáez and Fernández-Canteli et al. [21] have focused their attention on the out-of-plane T-stress, \( T_{33} \), as a measure of the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint. Based on this general methodology to express the magnitude of the 3D (including out-of-plane) crack-tip constraint, one of the authors [22] assumed that the TST effect on \( J_c \) was mechanical in nature and conducted fracture toughness tests and elastic-plastic finite element analyses (FEA) with non-standard compact-tension (CT) test specimens, using specimen thickness-to-width ratios, \( B/W \), of 0.25, 0.4 and 0.5. The planar configuration was identical for the three cases and it complied with ASTM E399 [23] for \( W = 25 \) mm (these three types of test specimens are designated as non-standard test specimens). The key idea of this non-standard CT specimen was that the normalized planar parameter, \( \beta_1 = (T_{11})^{1/2}/K (a = \text{crack depth}) \), is kept nearly constant, but the out-of-plane parameter, \( \beta_{33} = (T_{33})^{1/2}/K \), significantly changes for \( B/W \). They successfully correlated the TST effect with a mechanical parameter as \( J_c \propto |T_{33}|^{1/2} \) for 0.55% carbon steel JIS S55C in the DBT temperature region. The result was accepted as evidence that the TST effect on \( J_c \) is mechanical in nature, and the TST effect can be quantitatively described by some failure criterion independent of the specimen structure.

In this paper, as an extension of our previous work [22], the TST effect on \( J_c \) for a non-standard 3 point bending (3PB) specimen was studied to show that this effect is mechanical in nature. For this
purpose, fracture toughness tests with non-standard 3PB specimens were conducted for 0.55% carbon steel JIS S55C, and the TST effect was reproduced by running a large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA. Finally, it was demonstrated that the “planar” failure criterion proposed by Dodds et al. [24], i.e., that the “crack opening stress $\sigma_{22c}$ together with the distance from the crack-tip which equals 4 times the crack-tip opening displacement $\delta_t$,” effectively explained the TST effect.

2. Fracture Toughness Test

2.1. Design of the non-standard 3PB specimens

It is well known that the widely accepted ASTM E1921 [4] (or E399 [23]) standard 3PB specimen (Fig. 1(a)) has a proportionally specified configuration based on its width $W$; i.e., the standard thickness-to-width ratio $B/W$ is specified as 0.5 and the target crack depth-to-width ratio $a/W$ is specified as 0.5. Under this specification, the normalized planar $T$-stress $\beta_{11}$ evaluated at the specimen mid-plane is approximately constant for $W$ and, thus, for $B$. The starting point of our research was the recognition that if $\beta_{11}$ represents the magnitude of the crack-tip constraint, then the TST effect on $J_c$ observed for the standard 3PB specimens is independent of the crack-tip constraint. The volume of the specimen changes in proportion to $B^3$. When viewed in this manner, the explanation of the TST effect on $J_c$ by the weakest link model, not by the loss of crack-tip constraint, is logical.

$$\beta_{kk} = T_{kk} \sqrt{\pi a} / K_1 (k=1\text{or}3)$$

where

$$\sigma_{11} \sigma_{22} \sigma_{33} \tau_{12} \tau_{23} \tau_{31} = \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \left(1 - \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2}\right) & 0 & 0 \\ \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \left(1 + \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2}\right) & 0 & 0 \\ 2\nu \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} T_{11} \\ 0 \\ T_{33} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

(1)

$$T_{33} = E\varepsilon_{33} + \nu T_{11}$$

(2)

The key idea in the design of the non-standard 3PB specimens for different $B$s was to design the planar configuration to be in accordance with the ASTM E1921 (i.e., $W = \text{const.}$) but to change $B/W$ to realize specimens with different thickness. With this design, it was expected that $\beta_{11}$ would remain approximately constant but, because $|\sigma_{33}|$ in Eq. (2) decreases with increasing $B$, there would be a significant change in $\beta_{33}$ at the specimen mid-plane where the cleavage fracture initiates. Here, $E$ and $\nu$ in Eq. (2) are the material’s Young’s modulus and Poisson’s ratio, respectively.
If $\beta_{33}$ represents the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint and the TST effect on $J_c$ (TST effect) is observed for this non-standard 3PB specimen, then the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint might be a candidate to explain the TST effect. If $J_c$ shows a saturation tendency with increasing $B$ for this non-standard 3PB specimen and $\beta_{33}$ also shows a similar tendency for an identical $B$, then the TST effect is likely to be dominated by the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint.

In the following, an elastic FEA for the non-standard 3PB specimen with $W = 25$ mm (Fig. 3) was run for various $B/W$s to determine $B$ such that $\beta_{33}$ at the specimen mid-plane saturated. The typical FEA model used in elastic analysis of the 3PB specimen is shown in Fig. 4. The crack length $a$ was prescribed as $a/W = 0.5$ for all cases. One-quarter of the structure was analyzed, making use of symmetry (Fig. 4 (a)). Twenty-node hexahedral meshes were used. For all cases, the crack-tip was modeled by singular elements, whose size was $\Delta l$, and twenty equivalent rows of meshes were spaced inside the crack tube with radius $R_a = 0.4$ mm (Fig. 4 (b)). The details for the generated mesh are summarized in Table 1. The Young’s modulus, $E = 206$ GPa, and Poisson’s ratio, $\nu = 0.3$, were used in all cases. WARP3D [25] was used as the FEA solver.

The SIF was evaluated by applying the domain integral method [26] to the FEA results. $T_{11}$ was obtained by applying the domain integral [26] and interaction integral [27] methods to the FEA results. These methods for calculating various $T_{11}$ solutions have been used widely in the past [12, 18-20]. $T_{33}$ was evaluated from Eq. (2). The results at the specimen mid-plane are summarized in the normalized form as $K/K_0$, $\beta_k = T_{kk}(\pi a)^{1/2}/K_0$ ($k = 1$, 3) in Fig. 5, in which $K_0$ is the nominal SIF calculated from the following equation in ASTM E1921 [4], corresponding to the load used for the calculation.

$$K = \frac{PS}{BW^{1/2}} f \left( \frac{a}{W} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Here, $S = 4W$ is the support span, and $f$ is a function of $a/W$ that is given in the standard. Attention was focused upon the values at the mid-plane because the cleavage fracture is expected to initiate at the specimen mid-plane.

According to Fig. 5, the mid-plane $K$ was not affected by $B/W$, as expected, and was close to the nominal 2D SIF $K_0$. The normalized $T_{11}$, where $\beta_{11} = T_{11}(\pi a)^{1/2}/K_0$, was positive, showing negligible dependence on $B/W$. The in-plane parameters at the specimen thickness center showed a slight dependence on $B/W$, as expected.

The dotted line represents $v\beta_{11}$, which denotes the case for $B/W \rightarrow \infty$ and $\beta_{33} \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $T_{33} \rightarrow vT_{11}$ calculated from Eq. (2). The normalized $T_{33}$, where $\beta_{33} = T_{33}(\pi a)^{1/2}/K_0$, showed a strong dependence on $B/W$. $\beta_{33}$ was negative for $B/W < 1.5$, very close to 0 for $B/W = 1.5$, positive for $B/W > 1.5$ and approached $v\beta_{11}$ with increasing $B/W$. Because a negative T-stress corresponds to a loss in crack-tip constraint [28], it appears that $T_{33}$ represents the well-known tendency for a larger out-of-plane crack-tip constraint to be expected for thick test specimens. If $\beta_{33}$ represents the
out-of-plane crack-tip constraint and if $J_c$ has some bounding value for $B$ due to the bounding nature of the crack-tip constraint for large $B$, deviation from the relationship $J_c \propto B^{-1/2}$ was expected to be observed for the non-standard 3PB specimen of $B/W \geq 1.5$. Because the magnitude of the positive T-stress is known to be insensitive to the crack-tip constraint [28] and because the load capacity of the testing machines is limited, fracture toughness tests for non-standard 3PB specimens with $B/W = 0.25, 0.5, 1.0$ and $1.5$ were conducted.

2.2. Fracture toughness tests with the non-standard 3PB specimens

2.2.1. Material

The tested material was 0.55% carbon steel JIS S55C, which is known to be in the transition temperature region at room temperature. From the Charpy test results shown in Fig. 6, the fracture toughness test temperature was chosen to be 20 °C. The material was quenched at 850 °C and tempered at 650 °C. Chemical composition and mechanical properties of the heat-treated specimens are summarized in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. Two tensile tests were conducted in accordance with JIS Z2241 [29]. The loading rates of the tensile tests were 10 MPa/sec below 0.2% strain and 30 %/min (measured at the gage length) above 0.2%, which satisfies the JIS Z2241 [29] requirements of 3-30 MPa/sec below 0.2% strain and 20-50% /min (measured at the gage length) above 0.2%. The tensile test temperature was 20 °C.

2.2.2. Test specimens

As described in 2.1, the planar test specimen configurations were designed in accordance with ASTM E1921 [4] for width $W = 25$ mm, i.e., $W$ was prescribed to be 25 mm for all specimens. In addition to the standard ASTM thickness-to-width ratio, $B/W = 0.5$, specimens with $B/W = 0.25$, 1.0, and 1.5 were prepared. After inserting a fatigue crack into the specimen, the crack length $a$ satisfied ASTM’s requirement of $a/W = 0.45-0.55$; the crack length was in the range of 0.49 to 0.51. Fatigue precrack was inserted at 20 °C with loads corresponding to $K_{max} = 20$ and $19$ MPam$^{1/2}$ for the 1st and 2nd stages, respectively, which satisfied the requirement of the standard 25 and 20 MPam$^{1/2}$. Fatigue crack growth was monitored by clip gage. Five tests were conducted for each test specimen geometry.

2.2.3. Test results

The fracture toughness test was conducted in accordance with ASTM E1921 [4]. The loading rate was controlled to be 1.1 MPam$^{1/2}$/s, which is very small compared to the specification of $\leq 2.0$ MPam$^{1/2}$/s. The test specimen temperature was maintained to be in the range of 20 ± 1 °C for 30/(25/B) minutes for $B/W = 1.0$ and 1.5, according to the standard. The hold time for the other cases of $B/W = 0.25$ and 0.5 was 30 minutes, which is longer than the standard hold time.
Typical fracture surfaces observed at the mid-plane for specimens of $B/W = 0.25, 0.5$ and 1.0 are shown in Fig. 8. It is clearly seen from Fig. 8 that cleavage fracture after plastic deformation was observed for all specimens with different $B/W$s. Although not shown in this manuscript, a similar fractograph was observed for the case of $B/W = 1.5$. The difference observed in these three $B/W$s was that the distance between the fatigue precrack and the river pattern decreased as $B/W$ increased, corresponding to a decrease in the plastic zone.

Test results are summarized in Table 4 and Fig. 9. $K_c$ in the table was obtained from Eq. (3) and is the SIF $K$ corresponding to the maximum load, $P_c$. $J_c$ in the table is the fracture toughness in terms of the SIF, defined as $K_{Jc} = [EJ_c(1-\nu^2)]^{1/2}$, as specified in ASTM E1921 [4]. $\mu$ and $\Sigma$ are the average and standard deviation of each value, respectively. $2\Sigma/\mu$ % is a reference value intended to represent the magnitude of data scatter.

It is seen from Table 4 that $2\Sigma/\mu$ of $K_{Jc}$ were in the range of 20.7 to 39.9 % for all the specimens. Considering that the guideline for $2\Sigma/\mu$ given in ASTM E1921 for $K_{Jc}$ is $56(1-20/\mu)$ % and was in the range of 45.0 to 49.5 % for the data in Table 4, it was concluded that the scatter in the $K_{Jc}$ data summarized in the table is acceptable. In addition, if the datum for specimen number 1 with $B/W = 0.5$ is excluded, it can be said that a very small scatter in $K_{Jc}$ was realized from the current test data.

One interesting fact was that the change in $K_c$, the SIF for the fracture load $P_c$, with $B/W$ was very small, though a significant change in $J_c$ was observed. The average $K_c$ for each $B/W$ was in the range of 61.1 to 64.0 MPam$^{1/2}$.

From Fig. 9, the TST effect on $J_c$ was clearly observed for the non-standard 3PB specimens. The raw $J_c$ tended to decrease as $B/W$ increased in the range of 0.25 to 1.0 and seemed to saturate to a value around 46 N/mm for $B/W = 1.5$. If the relationship between the average values of $J_c$ and $B/W$ were fitted to $J_c \propto (B/W)^{-n}$, then $n$ was large as 1 in the range of $B/W = 0.25$ to 0.5, decreased to 0.5 in the range of $B/W = 0.5$ to 1.0 and was almost 0 in range of $B/W = 1.0$ to 1.5; it was thus concluded that $J_c$ was bounded for $B/W = 1.5$, on the point of the average of $J_c$.

In summary, by changing $\beta_{33}$ for $B/W$ of the non-standard 3PB, $J_c$ displayed bounded behavior for large $B$ and, thus, deviation from the relationship $J_c \propto B^{-1/2}$ was observed. This result was as expected under the assumptions that $\beta_{33}$ represents the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint and that $J_c$ is affected by this crack-tip constraint.
3. Failure Criterion to Account for the TST Effect on $J_c$

3.1 Reproduction of the experiments with a large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA

First, a large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA for the non-standard 3PB test specimens was conducted to validate the assumption that the TST effect on $J_c$ is mechanical in nature by reproducing the depicted experimental results without assuming the existence of micro-cracks in the material. After the assumption was validated, a failure criterion to explain the TST effect on $J_c$ was proposed.

The FEA model used in the elastic-plastic analysis of the 3PB specimen is fundamentally similar with the model used for the elastic analysis shown in Fig. 4. The width $W$ was 25 mm and the crack length $a$ was 12.5 mm ($a/W = 0.5$) for all the models. One-quarter of the structure was analyzed to make use of the symmetry of the specimen as shown in Fig. 10(a). Twenty node hexahedral meshes were used. To run this large-strain elastic-plastic analysis, an initial blunted notch $\rho$ was inserted at the crack-tip as shown in Fig. 10(b). Twenty rows of meshes were spaced around the notch and inside crack tube $R_s = 0.8$ mm. Equivalent elements were spaced in thickness direction. The details for the generated mesh are summarized in Table 5. In this case, $\rho$ was validated by the relationship between the crack-tip opening displacement $\delta_t$ measured at node A in Fig. 10(b); in particular, $\delta_t/\rho$ was greater than 10. McMeeking and Parks [30] suggested that $\delta_t/\rho$ should be greater than 5 to ensure that the results would not be affected by the initial blunt notch. In addition, the FEA results were considered sufficiently accurate with very refined meshes because the blunted crack tip was always defined by fairly regularly spaced nodes and the region around a crack tip up to a distance of a few crack-tip openings was always composed of elements that were very small compared to $\delta_t$.

WARP3D [25] was used for the large-strain, elastic-plastic analysis. The material behavior was assumed to be governed by the J2–incremental theory of plasticity, the isotropic hardening rule and the Prandtl–Reuss flow theory. The Newton–Raphson iterative method was used for the nonlinear convergence. The Young’s modulus $E = 206$ GPa and Poisson’s ratio $\nu = 0.3$ were used for all cases. Because S55C is a material with yield drop, the total true stress-total true strain curve in the range up to the true fracture stress obtained from the two tensile tests was approximated as a piecewise-linear stress-strain curve, as shown in Fig. 11. Note that WARP3D [25] allows this kind of material modeling.

The maximum load for each $B/W$ was selected as the average fracture load $P_c$ obtained from the experiments, summarized in Table 4. Load $P$ vs. crack-mouth opening displacement $V$ curves (P-V diagrams) obtained from the FEA for each specimen type is compared with the experimental results in Fig. 12. $J$ at the maximum load $P_c$ was obtained from these FEA P-V diagrams in accordance with the ASTM E1921 [4] and designated as $J_{c\text{ FEA}}$. This $J_{c\text{ FEA}}$ was compared with the experimental results in Fig. 13.

It is seen in Fig. 12 that the large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA accurately reproduced the P-V diagrams observed from experiments, though a noticeable discrepancy was shown for the case $B/W$
= 0.25. The source of this discrepancy is examined in the Discussion. Although the fracture load \( P_c \) showed some scatter and the clip gage displacement at fracture also showed scatter, experimental P-V data for all the specimens were close to the curve drawn from the FEA results.

From Fig. 13, it is seen that \( J_{c,\text{FEA}} \) clearly reproduced the TST effect on \( J_c \) observed by the experiments. This was natural, because \( J_{c,\text{FEA}} \) was evaluated from the P-V diagrams that were confirmed to be fairly close to the experimental data. In addition, \( J_{c,\text{FEA}} \) displayed bounded behavior for large \( B \).

In summary, by assuming the average fracture load \( P_c \) for each \( B/W \) of the non-standard 3PB specimens, \( J \) obtained from large strain FEA results at this \( P_c \) reproduced the TST effect on \( J_c \) observed from experiments. Because this large strain FEA did not assume existence of micro-cracks, but \( \beta_{33} \) was designed to be changed with the \( B/W \) of the non-standard 3PB specimens, TST effect on \( J_c \) seemed to be mechanical in nature, under the assumptions that \( \beta_{33} \) is to represent the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint.

3. 2 Failure criterion to explain the TST effect on \( J_c \)

If the TST effect on \( J_c \) is mechanical in nature, it was thought that a failure criterion applicable to large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA results that explains the TST effect on \( J_c \) might exist. The key idea for this criterion was that \( K_c \), which is the SIF calculated from the fracture load \( P_c \) and the specimen size, was slightly dependent on TST, though \( J_c \) was significantly dependent, as shown in Table 4. The hypothesis was that the (in-plane) crack opening stress \( \sigma_{22} \) distribution for each specimen type at the critical load \( P_c \) may be similar, even though \( J_c \) shows noticeable effects from a change in \( B/W \). This is because a change in \( B/W \) causes a negligible change in \( T_{11} \). Thus, the “planar” failure criterion, similar to the one that Dodds et al. [24] applied to explain the \( J_c \)-dependence on the test specimen crack depth (as shown in Fig. 14), might be applied to explain the out-of-plane TST effect on \( J_c \). The critical values of this criterion (4\( \delta \), \( \sigma_{22c} \)), in which \( \delta \) denotes the CTOD (crack-tip opening displacement) and \( \sigma_{22c} \) denotes the crack-opening stress, was evaluated as a first step.

The distribution of the crack opening stress \( \sigma_{22} (\theta = 0) \) at the specimen mid-plane ahead of the crack-tip with the fracture load \( P_c \) for all \( B/W \)s are shown in Fig. 15. \( \sigma_{YS} \) in the figure is the true yield stress. \( \sigma_{22} (\theta = 0) \) for all \( B/W \)s showed a similar tendency; specifically, \( \sigma_{22} \) attained a maximum value approximately equal to 5\( \sigma_{YS} \) at approximately 2\( \delta \). This maximum was comparable with that for a material with a hardening component of 5 at plane-strain, approximately equal to 5\( \sigma_{YS} \) [31].

The (4\( \delta \), \( \sigma_{22c} \)) corresponding to the mid-plane \( J_{c,\text{FEA}} \) for each \( B/W \) calculated in 3.1 is summarized in Table 6. It is seen from Table 6 that the critical stress \( \sigma_{22c} \) at 4\( \delta \) on the crack plane (\( \theta = 0 \)) was very close for all \( B/W \)s in an engineering sense, though \( J_{c,\text{FEA}} \) for each \( B/W \) showed significant variation. The \( J_{c,\text{FEA}} \) at the mid-plane of the specimen was focused upon because cleavage fracture initiated at the specimen mid-plane. Because the \( \sigma_{22c} \) values for all the \( B/W \)s were very close
at the fracture load for each $P_c$ and $J_{c, FEA}$ at $P_c$, it was concluded that the $(4\delta, \sigma_{22c})$ criterion successfully explained the TST effect on $J_c$.

In summary, the “planar” failure criterion $(4\delta, \sigma_{22c})$, which was applied to explain the crack depth dependence on $J_c$ by Dodds et al. [24], successfully reproduced the TST effect on $J_c$ that is observed in fracture toughness tests, under the assumption that the TST effect on $J_c$ is mechanical in nature.
4. Discussion

In this work, the TST effect on $J_c$ observed for 0.55% carbon steel S55C in the transition temperature range was reproduced by large-strain FEA results. Neither the micro-crack density distribution nor the weakest link model was assumed to apply to the material, as Dodds et al. did to deduce the relationship $J_c \propto B^{-1/2}$ [3]. The idea to change the crack-tip volume proportionally to the specimen thickness is common for non-standard specimens and the Dodds et al. framework. In addition, the “planar” failure criterion successfully explained the TST effect. Thus, it seems that the mechanical nature of the TST effect on $J_c$ cannot be denied. At least, the bounded behavior of $J_c$ with increasing $B$ seems to be dominated by the mechanical nature. One of the candidates for this mechanical cause is the change in the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint. The only assumption applied in this study was that the fracture initiates at the specimen mid-plane.

In Fig. 12 (a), a noticeable discrepancy was shown for the P-V diagram of $B/W = 0.25$ obtained from both the experiments and FEA. The FEA was performed by assuming the crack length to be uniform in thickness direction and set as $a/W = 0.5$ (Fig. 10 (a)). However, after the fatigue pre-crack procedure, the crack length was, in fact, distributed along the thickness direction, especially for $B/W = 0.25$, as shown in Fig. 16 and Table 7. Thus, a large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA was performed for a case of $B/W = 0.25$, reflecting the fatigue crack length distribution for specimen id 4 as shown in Fig. 17.

The P-V diagram was compared with both the experiment and previous FEA results as shown in Fig. 18. It is seen from Fig. 18 that the P-V diagram from the FEA with a distributed length is closer to the experimental results. $J_{c, FEA}$ obtained from the current P-V diagram increased to 90.3 N/mm, which corresponds to a 21.4 % increase from the uniform crack model 74.4 N/mm. This $J_{c, FEA}$ for specimen id 4 became comparable to the minimum 93.4 N/mm of the experimental value, but is still smaller than the experimental result of 125.0 N/mm. Therefore, through-thickness crack length distribution was one noticeable source of discrepancy between $J_{c, FEA}$ and $J_c$ for relatively thin specimens.

There might be an opinion that the quantity of the micro-cracks might have contributed in the discrepancy still remaining between $J_{c, FEA}$ and $J_c$ for this $B/W$. However, this discrepancy between $J_{c, FEA}$ and $J_c$ here is due to the discrepancy of P-V diagrams for FEA and experiments as shown in Fig. 18. Though not numerically verified, it seems difficult that the micro-crack density significantly affects a gross deformation, such as the P-V diagram. Therefore, the calculated $J$ value from the P-V diagram seems also not to be significantly affected by micro-cracks.
5. Conclusions
This study investigated the TST effect on the fracture toughness $J_c$ of a material in the transition temperature region for 3PB specimens. Fracture toughness tests and elastic-plastic FEA on non-standard test specimens, with thickness-to-width ratios $B/W$ of 0.25, 0.5, 1.0 and 1.5, were conducted for 0.55% carbon steel. The conclusions are as follows.

- The TST effect on $J_c$ and bounded behavior of $J_c$ for increasing specimen $B/W$ was observed with the non-standard 3PB specimen, as intended.
- Large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA reproduced the behavior observed in the experiments.
- The $(4\delta, \sigma_{22})$ criterion effectively explained the TST effect and the bounded behavior of $J_c$.
- The bounded behavior of $J_c$ for increasing $B$ seems to be dominated by mechanical causes. One of the candidates for this mechanical cause is the change in out-of-plane crack-tip constraint.
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**Nomenclature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>Specimen thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>Young’s modulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J$</td>
<td>$J$-integral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_c$, $J_{c \text{ average}}$</td>
<td>Fracture toughness and its average from experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_{c \text{ FEA}}$</td>
<td>$J$ obtained for fracture load $P_c$ by FEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_I$</td>
<td>Local mode-I stress intensity factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{Jc}$</td>
<td>Fracture toughness ($K_{Jc} = \frac{EJ_c}{(1-\nu^2)}^{1/2}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_c$</td>
<td>SIF corresponding to fracture load $P_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>Maximum SIF in fatigue precracking procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_0$</td>
<td>Nominal SIF for elastic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$, $P_c$</td>
<td>Applied and fracture load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$</td>
<td>Crack tube radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>Support span for 3PB specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{11}$, $T_{33}$</td>
<td>T-stresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_g$</td>
<td>Crack-mouth opening displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W$</td>
<td>Specimen width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>Crack length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Exponent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$, $\theta$</td>
<td>In-plane polar coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_j$</td>
<td>Crack-tip local coordinates ($j = 1, 2, 3$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta l$</td>
<td>Singular element size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma$</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{11}$, $\beta_{33}$</td>
<td>Normalized T-stresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>Crack-tip opening displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon_{ij}$</td>
<td>Strain components ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>Average value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>Poisson’s ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>Initial blunt notch radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{ij}$</td>
<td>Stress components ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{22c}$</td>
<td>Critical crack opening stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{00}$</td>
<td>Tensile strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\text{YS}}, \sigma_{\text{YS0}}$</td>
<td>True and nominal yield stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Summary of the generated mesh for elastic analysis

\(W = 25\) mm, \(R_s = 0.4\) mm, \(a/W = 0.5\), \(\Delta l/a = 0.0016\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B/W</th>
<th>0.25</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>1.8</th>
<th>1.9</th>
<th>2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nodes</td>
<td>154197</td>
<td>203157</td>
<td>252117</td>
<td>301077</td>
<td>350037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements</td>
<td>35520</td>
<td>47360</td>
<td>59200</td>
<td>71040</td>
<td>82880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Chemical compositions of the test specimens in weight %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Si</th>
<th>Mn</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Cu</th>
<th>Ni</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>Fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specified</td>
<td>0.52~0.58</td>
<td>0.15~0.35</td>
<td>0.60~0.90</td>
<td>≤0.030</td>
<td>≤0.035</td>
<td>≤0.30</td>
<td>≤0.20</td>
<td>≤0.20</td>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Mechanical properties of the test specimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yield Stress $\sigma_{YS}$ MPa</th>
<th>Tensile Strength $\sigma_{B0}$ MPa</th>
<th>Elongation %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>393, 394</td>
<td>703, 710</td>
<td>24.0, 23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 Fracture toughness test results for S55C
(3PB, \(W = 25\) mm, \(20^\circ\)C; \(\mu\): average, \(\Sigma\): standard deviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(B/W)</th>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>(\mu)</th>
<th>(\Sigma)</th>
<th>2(\mu)/(\Sigma)%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>a/W</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P_c) kN</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(K_c) MPa m(^{1/2})</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J_c) N/mm</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>152.9</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>197.9</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(K_J) MPa m(^{1/2})</td>
<td>145.4</td>
<td>186.1</td>
<td>155.4</td>
<td>168.2</td>
<td>211.6</td>
<td>173.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>a/W</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P_c) kN</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(K_c) MPa m(^{1/2})</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J_c) N/mm</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(K_J) MPa m(^{1/2})</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>126.4</td>
<td>123.8</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>a/W</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P_c) kN</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(K_c) MPa m(^{1/2})</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J_c) N/mm</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(K_J) MPa m(^{1/2})</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>a/W</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P_c) kN</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(K_c) MPa m(^{1/2})</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J_c) N/mm</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(K_J) MPa m(^{1/2})</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 Summary of the generated mesh for the elastic-plastic analysis

\((W = 25 \text{ mm}, R_s = 0.8 \text{ mm}, a/W = 0.5)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(B/W)</th>
<th>(\rho \text{ mm})</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>(N_{\text{theta}})</th>
<th>radial bias</th>
<th>nodes</th>
<th>elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73876</td>
<td>15555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138146</td>
<td>31110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>213652</td>
<td>49620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>316632</td>
<td>74430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 Characteristic distance $4\delta_t$ and crack opening stress $\sigma_{22c}$ at the fracture load $P_c$
(S55C, 3PB, $W = 25$ mm, $a/W = 0.5$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$B/W$</th>
<th>0.25</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K_c$ MPa $m^{1/2}$</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_{c, FEA}$ N/mm</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4\delta_t$ mm</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{22c}$ MPa</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>1490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 Distributed crack length for $B/W = 0.25$ (specimen id 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$a_2$</th>
<th>$a_3$</th>
<th>$a_4$</th>
<th>$a_5$</th>
<th>$a_6$</th>
<th>$a_7$</th>
<th>$a_8$</th>
<th>$a_9$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract
This paper considered the test specimen thickness (TST) effect on the fracture toughness of a material $J_c$ in the transition temperature region for 3 point bending (3PB) specimens. Fracture toughness tests and elastic-plastic finite element analyses (FEA) with non-standard test specimens, which are non-standard because the specimen thickness-to-width ratio $B/W$ was varied in the range of 0.25 to 1.5, were conducted. Based on these tests and the FEA results, it was demonstrated that the “planar” ($4 \delta_t, \sigma_{22c}$) failure criterion—which states that cleavage fracture after significant plastic deformation occurs when the crack opening stress $\sigma_{22}$ at a distance from the crack-tip that is equal to 4 times the crack-tip opening displacement $\delta_t$ exceeds a critical value $\sigma_{22c}$—was verified to effectively explain the TST effect. This ($4 \delta_t, \sigma_{22c}$) criterion also successfully predicted the tendency of $J_c$ to saturate to some bounding value for $B/W=1.0$. This tendency was similar to that of the $T_{33}$-stress, which is the out-of-plane elastic crack-tip constraint parameter. Because the ($4 \delta_t, \sigma_{22c}$) criterion could predict the TST effect on $J_c$ and because the criterion could predict the bounded behavior of $J_c$ for large $B/W$, the TST effect was concluded to be mainly mechanical in nature, which the weakest link model fails to predict. The mechanical cause of the TST effect on $J_c$ was considered to be an out-of-plane crack-tip constraint, and one of its measures of magnitude is the $T_{33}$-stress.
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1. Introduction

One of the difficulties in determining the cleavage fracture toughness $J_c$ of a material over the ductile-to-brittle transition (DBT) temperature region, which is important in the assessment of aging steel structures and reactor pressure vessels, is that test specimen thickness (TST) has an effect on $J_c$, even though standardized test specimens are used [1]. The two most physically logical effects, in general, are the statistically weakest link size effect and the loss of crack-tip constraint, that is, the effect caused by the loss of stress triaxiality [2]. The weakest link size effect should affect only brittle fracture, whereas the loss of constraint should affect both ductile and brittle fracture. Both criteria lead to increasing toughness with decreasing TST. Another point of view is that the former criterion considers the TST effect on $J_c$ to be a material issue and the latter to be a mechanical issue.

This effect of TST on $J_c$, described as $J_c \propto B^{-1/2}$ ($B \equiv$ TST) by Wallin [2], was reproduced by Dodds et al. [3] based on the weakest link model. ASTM E1921 [4] has adopted parts of this criterion, and it seems to be widely accepted. However, as Dodds et al. [3] admit, “fracture toughness does not decrease indefinitely with thickness.”

The crack-tip constraint approach to the TST effect on $J_c$ assumes that the effect is a result of the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint. Guo [5, 6] proposed a parameter $T_z = \sigma_{33}/(\sigma_{11}+\sigma_{22})$ to measure the magnitude of the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint, and has been extensively working with co-workers to express the crack-tip stress field with a stress intensity factor (SIF) $K$ or $J$, $T_z$-[6-13]. Niemitz et al. [14] instead applied a $J$-$Q$-$T_z$ approach to explain the difference in $J_c$. Whether explicitly expressed or not, Gao [15], Wang et al. [16-20], and Fernández-Canteli et al. [21] have focused their attention on the out-of-plane $T$-stress, $T_{33}$, as a measure of the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint. Based on this general methodology to express the magnitude of the 3D (including out-of-plane) crack-tip constraint, one of the authors [22] assumed that the TST effect on $J_c$ was mechanical in nature and conducted fracture toughness tests and elastic-plastic finite element analyses (FEA) with non-standard compact tension (CT) test specimens, using specimen thickness-to-width ratios, $B/W$, of 0.25, 0.4 and 0.5. The planar configuration was identical for the three cases and it complied with ASTM E399 [23] for $W = 25$ mm (these three types of test specimens are designated as non-standard test specimens). The key idea of this non-standard CT specimen was that the normalized planar parameter, $\beta_{11} = (\pi a)^{1/2} T_{11}/K$ ($a =$ crack depth), is kept nearly constant, but the out-of-plane parameter, $\beta_{33} = (\pi a)^{1/2} T_{33}/K$, significantly changes for $B/W$. They successfully correlated the TST effect with a mechanical parameter as $J_c \propto |T_{33}|^{1/2}$ for 0.55% carbon steel JIS S55C in the DBT temperature region. The result was accepted as evidence that the TST effect on $J_c$ is mechanical in nature, and the TST effect can be quantitatively described by some failure criterion independent of the specimen structure.

In this paper, as an extension of our previous work [22], the TST effect on $J_c$ for a non-standard 3 point bending (3PB) specimen was studied to show that this effect is mechanical in nature. For this
purpose, fracture toughness tests with non-standard 3PB specimens were conducted for 0.55% carbon steel JIS S55C, and the TST effect was reproduced by running a large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA. Finally, it was demonstrated that the “planar” failure criterion proposed by Dodds et al. [24], i.e., that the “crack opening stress $\sigma_{22c}$ together with the distance from the crack-tip which equals 4 times the crack-tip opening displacement $\delta_c$,” effectively explained the TST effect.

2. Fracture Toughness Test

2.1. Design of the non-standard 3PB specimens

It is well known that the widely accepted ASTM E1921 [4] (or E399 [23]) standard 3PB specimen (Fig. 1(a)) has a proportionally specified configuration based on its width $W$; i.e., the standard thickness-to-width ratio $B/W$ is specified as 0.5 and the target crack depth-to-width ratio $a/W$ is specified as 0.5. Under this specification, the normalized planar T-stress $\beta_{11}$ evaluated at the specimen mid-plane is approximately constant for $W$ and, thus, for $B$. The starting point of our research was the recognition that if $\beta_{11}$ represents the magnitude of the crack-tip constraint, then the TST effect on $J_c$ observed for the standard 3PB specimens is independent of the crack-tip constraint. The volume of the specimen changes in proportion to $B^3$. When viewed in this manner, the explanation of the TST effect on $J_c$ by the weakest link model, not by the loss of crack-tip constraint, is logical.

The key idea in the design of the non-standard 3PB specimens for different $B$s was to design the planar configuration to be in accordance with the ASTM E1921 (i.e., $W = \text{const.}$) but to change $B/W$ to realize specimens with different thickness. With this design, it was expected that $\beta_{11}$ would remain approximately constant but, because $|\varepsilon_{33}|$ in Eq. (2) decreases with increasing $B$, there would be a
significant change in $\beta_{33}$ at the specimen mid-plane where the cleavage fracture initiates. Here, $E$ and $\nu$ in Eq. (2) are the material’s Young’s modulus and Poisson’s ratio, respectively.

If $\beta_{33}$ represents the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint and the TST effect on $J_c$ (TST effect) is observed for this non-standard 3PB specimen, then the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint might be a candidate to explain the TST effect. If $J_c$ shows a saturation tendency with increasing $B$ for this non-standard 3PB specimen and $\beta_{33}$ also shows a similar tendency for an identical $B$, then the TST effect is likely to be dominated by the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint.

In the following, an elastic FEA for the non-standard 3PB specimen with $W = 25$ mm (Fig. 3) was run for various $B/W$s to determine $B$ such that $\beta_{33}$ at the specimen mid-plane saturated. The typical FEA model used in elastic analysis of the 3PB specimen is shown in Fig. 4. The crack length $a$ was prescribed as $a/W = 0.5$ for all cases. One-quarter of the structure was analyzed, making use of symmetry (Fig. 4 (a)). Twenty-node hexahedral meshes were used. For all cases, the crack-tip was modeled by singular elements, whose size was $\Delta l$, and twenty equivalent rows of meshes were spaced inside the crack tube with radius $R_s = 0.4$ mm (Fig. 4 (b)). The details for the generated mesh are summarized in Table 1. The Young’s modulus, $E = 206$ GPa, and Poisson’s ratio, $\nu = 0.3$, were used in all cases. WARP3D [25] was used as the FEA solver.

The SIF was evaluated by applying the domain integral method [26] to the FEA results. $T_{11}$ was obtained by applying the domain integral [26] and interaction integral [27] methods to the FEA results. These methods for calculating various $T_{kk}$ solutions have been used widely in the past [12, 18-20]. $T_{33}$ was evaluated from Eq. (2). The results at the specimen mid-plane are summarized in the normalized form as $K/K_0 = \beta_{kk}(\pi a)^{1/2}/K_0$ ($k = 1, 3$) in Fig. 5, in which $K_0$ is the nominal SIF calculated from the following equation in ASTM E1921 [4], corresponding to the load used for the calculation.

$$K = \frac{PS}{BW^{3/2}}f\left(\frac{a}{W}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Here, $S = 4W$ is the support span, and $f$ is a function of $a/W$ that is given in the standard. Attention was focused upon the values at the mid-plane because the cleavage fracture is expected to initiate at the specimen mid-plane.

According to Fig. 5, the mid-plane $K$ was not affected by $B/W$, as expected, and was close to the nominal 2D SIF $K_0$. The normalized $T_{11}$, where $\beta_{11} = T_{11}(\pi a)^{1/2}/K_0$ was positive, showing negligible dependence on $B/W$. The in-plane parameters at the specimen thickness center showed a slight dependence on $B/W$, as expected.

The dotted line represents $\nu T_{11}$, which denotes the case for $B/W \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon_{13} \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $T_{33} \rightarrow \nu T_{11}$ calculated from Eq. (2). The normalized $T_{33}$, where $\beta_{33} = T_{33}(\pi a)^{1/2}/K_0$ showed a strong dependence on $B/W$. $\beta_{33}$ was negative for $B/W < 1.5$, very close to 0 for $B/W = 1.5$, positive for $B/W > 1.5$ and approached $\nu T_{11}$ with increasing $B/W$. Because a negative T-stress corresponds to a loss in
crack-tip constraint [28], it appears that $T_{33}$ represents the well-known tendency for a larger out-of-plane crack-tip constraint to be expected for thick test specimens. If $\beta_{33}$ represents the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint and if $J_c$ has some bounding value for $B$ due to the bounding nature of the crack-tip constraint for large $B$, deviation from the relationship $J_c \propto B^{1/2}$ was expected to be observed for the non-standard 3PB specimen of $B/W \geq 1.5$. Because the magnitude of the positive T-stress is known to be insensitive to the crack-tip constraint [28] and because the load capacity of the testing machines is limited, fracture toughness tests for non-standard 3PB specimens with $B/W = 0.25, 0.5, 1.0$ and 1.5 were conducted.

2.2. Fracture toughness tests with the non-standard 3PB specimens

2.2.1. Material

The tested material was 0.55\% carbon steel JIS S55C, which is known to be in the transition temperature region at room temperature. From the Charpy test results shown in Fig. 6, the fracture toughness test temperature was chosen to be 20 °C. The material was quenched at 850 °C and tempered at 650 °C. Chemical composition and mechanical properties of the heat-treated specimens are summarized in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. Two tensile tests were conducted in accordance with JIS Z2241 [29]. The loading rates of the tensile tests were 10 MPa/sec below 0.2\% strain and 30 \%/min (measured at the gage length) above 0.2\%, which satisfies the JIS Z2241 [29] requirements of 3-30 MPa/sec below 0.2\% strain and 20-50\% /min (measured at the gage length) above 0.2\%. The tensile test temperature was 20 °C.

2.2.2. Test specimens

As described in 2.1, the planar test specimen configurations were designed in accordance with ASTM E1921 [4] for width $W = 25$ mm, i.e., $W$ was prescribed to be 25 mm for all specimens. In addition to the standard ASTM thickness-to-width ratio, $B/W = 0.5$, specimens with $B/W = 0.25, 1.0$, and 1.5 were prepared. After inserting a fatigue crack into the specimen, the crack length $a$ satisfied ASTM’s requirement of $a/W = 0.45-0.55$: the crack length was in the range of 0.49 to 0.51. Fatigue precrack was inserted at 20 °C with loads corresponding to $K_{\text{max}} = 20$ and 19 MPam$^{1/2}$ for the 1st and 2nd stages, respectively, which satisfied the requirement of the standard 25 and 20 MPam$^{1/2}$. Fatigue crack growth was monitored by clip gage. Five tests were conducted for each test specimen geometry.

2.2.3. Test results

The fracture toughness test was conducted in accordance with ASTM E1921 [4]. The loading rate was controlled to be 1.1 MPam$^{1/2}$/s, which is very small compared to the specification of $\leq 2.0$ MPam$^{1/2}$/s. The test specimen temperature was maintained to be in the range of $20 \pm 1 \, ^\circ\text{C}$ for
30/(25/B) minutes for $B/W = 1.0$ and $1.5$, according to the standard. The hold time for the other cases of $B/W = 0.25$ and $0.5$ was $30$ minutes, which is longer than the standard hold time.

Typical fracture surfaces observed at the mid-plane for specimens of $B/W = 0.25$, $0.5$ and $1.0$ are shown in Fig. 8. It is clearly seen from Fig. 8 that cleavage fracture after plastic deformation was observed for all specimens with different $B/W$s. Although not shown in this manuscript, a similar fractograph was observed for the case of $B/W = 1.5$. The difference observed in these three $B/W$s was that the distance between the fatigue precrack and the river pattern decreased as $B/W$ increased, corresponding to a decrease in the plastic zone.

Test results are summarized in Table 4 and Fig. 9. $K_c$ in the table was obtained from Eq. (3) and is the SIF $K$ corresponding to the maximum load, $P_c$. $K_{Jc}$ in the table is the fracture toughness in terms of the SIF, defined as $K_{Jc} = \left[\frac{EJ_c}{(1-\nu^2)}\right]^{1/2}$, as specified in ASTM E1921 [4]. $\mu$ and $\Sigma$ are the average and standard deviation of each value, respectively. $2\Sigma/\mu$ % is a reference value intended to represent the magnitude of data scatter.

It is seen from Table 4 that $2\Sigma/\mu$ of $K_{Jc}$ were in the range of 20.7 to 39.9 % for all the specimens. Considering that the guideline for $2\Sigma/\mu$ given in ASTM E1921 for $K_{Jc}$ is $56(1-20/\mu)$ % and was in the range of 45.0 to 49.5 % for the data in Table 4, it was concluded that the scatter in the $K_{Jc}$ data summarized in the table is acceptable. In addition, if the datum for specimen number 1 with $B/W = 0.5$ is excluded, it can be said that a very small scatter in $K_{Jc}$ was realized from the current test data.

One interesting fact was that the change in $K_c$, the SIF for the fracture load $P_c$, with $B/W$ was very small, though a significant change in $J_{c}$ was observed. The average $K_c$ for each $B/W$ was in the range of 61.1 to $64.0 \text{ MPam}^{1/2}$.

From Fig. 9, the TST effect on $J_{c}$ was clearly observed for the non-standard 3PB specimens. The raw $J_{c}$ tended to decrease as $B/W$ increased in the range of 0.25 to $1.0$ and seemed to saturate to a value around $46 \text{ N/mm}$ for $B/W = 1.5$. If the relationship between the average values of $J_{c}$ and $B/W$ were fitted to $J_{c} \propto (B/W)^{\nu}$, then $\nu$ was large as $1$ in the range of $B/W = 0.25$ to $0.5$, decreased to $0.5$ in the range of $B/W = 0.5$ to $1.0$ and was almost $0$ in range of $B/W = 1.0$ to $1.5$; it was thus concluded that $J_{c}$ was bounded for $B/W = 1.5$, on the point of the average of $J_{c}$.

In summary, by changing $\beta_{33}$ for $B/W$ of the non-standard 3PB, $J_{c}$ displayed bounded behavior for large $B$ and, thus, deviation from the relationship $J_{c} \propto B^{-1/2}$ was observed. This result was as expected under the assumptions that $\beta_{33}$ represents the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint and that $J_{c}$ is affected by this crack-tip constraint.
3. Failure Criterion to Account for the TST Effect on $J_c$

3.1 Reproduction of the experiments with a large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA

First, a large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA for the non-standard 3PB test specimens was conducted to validate the assumption that the TST effect on $J_c$ is mechanical in nature by reproducing the depicted experimental results without assuming the existence of micro-cracks in the material. After the assumption was validated, a failure criterion to explain the TST effect on $J_c$ was proposed.

The FEA model used in the elastic-plastic analysis of the 3PB specimen is fundamentally similar with the model used for the elastic analysis shown in Fig. 4. The width $W$ was 25 mm and the crack length $a$ was 12.5 mm ($a/W = 0.5$) for all the models. One-quarter of the structure was analyzed to make use of the symmetry of the specimen as shown in Fig. 10(a). Twenty node hexahedral meshes were used. To run this large-strain elastic-plastic analysis, an initial blunted notch $\rho$ was inserted at the crack-tip as shown in Fig. 10(b). Twenty rows of meshes were spaced around the notch and inside crack tube $R_c = 0.8$ mm. Equivalent elements were spaced in thickness direction. The details for the generated mesh are summarized in Table 5. In this case, $\rho$ was validated by the relationship between the crack-tip opening displacement $\delta_t$ measured at node A in Fig. 10(b); in particular, $\delta_t/\rho$ was greater than 10. McMeeking and Parks [30] suggested that $\delta_t/\rho$ should be greater than 5 to ensure that the results would not be affected by the initial blunt notch. In addition, the FEA results were considered sufficiently accurate with very refined meshes because the blunted crack tip was always defined by fairly regularly spaced nodes and the region around a crack tip up to a distance of a few crack-tip openings was always composed of elements that were very small compared to $\delta_t$.

WARP3D [25] was used for the large-strain, elastic-plastic analysis. The material behavior was assumed to be governed by the J2–incremental theory of plasticity, the isotropic hardening rule and the Prandtl–Reuss flow theory. The Newton–Raphson iterative method was used for the nonlinear convergence. The Young’s modulus $E = 206$ GPa and Poisson’s ratio $\nu = 0.3$ were used for all cases. Because S55C is a material with yield drop, the total true stress-total true strain curve in the range up to the true fracture stress obtained from the two tensile tests was approximated as a piecewise-linear stress-strain curve, as shown in Fig. 11. Note that WARP3D [25] allows this kind of material modeling.

The maximum load for each $B/W$ was selected as the average fracture load $P_c$ obtained from the experiments, summarized in Table 4. Load $P$ vs. crack-mouth opening displacement $V_c$ curves (P-V diagrams) obtained from the FEA for each specimen type is compared with the experimental results in Fig. 12. $J$ at the maximum load $P_c$ was obtained from these FEA P-V diagrams in accordance with the ASTM E1921 [4] and designated as $J_c$ FEA. This $J_c$ FEA was compared with the experimental results in Fig. 13.

It is seen in Fig. 12 that the large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA accurately reproduced the P-V diagrams observed from experiments, though a noticeable discrepancy was shown for the case $B/W$
8. The source of this discrepancy is examined in the Discussion. Although the fracture load $P_c$ showed some scatter and the clip gage displacement at fracture also showed scatter, experimental P-V data for all the specimens were close to the curve drawn from the FEA results.

From Fig. 13, it is seen that $J_{c, FEA}$ clearly reproduced the TST effect on $J_c$ observed by the experiments. This was natural, because $J_{c, FEA}$ was evaluated from the P-V diagrams that were confirmed to be fairly close to the experimental data. In addition, $J_{c, FEA}$ displayed bounded behavior for large $B$.

In summary, by assuming the average fracture load $P_c$ for each $B/W$ of the non-standard 3PB specimens, $J$ obtained from large strain FEA results at this $P_c$ reproduced the TST effect on $J_c$ observed from experiments. Because this large strain FEA did not assume existence of micro-cracks, but $\beta_{33}$ was designed to be changed with the $B/W$ of the non-standard 3PB specimens, TST effect on $J_c$ seemed to be mechanical in nature, under the assumptions that $\beta_{33}$ is to represent the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint.

3.2 Failure criterion to explain the TST effect on $J_c$

If the TST effect on $J_c$ is mechanical in nature, it was thought that a failure criterion applicable to large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA results that explains the TST effect on $J_c$ might exist. The key idea for this criterion was that $K_c$, which is the SIF calculated from the fracture load $P_c$ and the specimen size, was slightly dependent on TST, though $J_c$ was significantly dependent, as shown in Table 4. The hypothesis was that the (in-plane) crack opening stress $\sigma_{22}$, distribution for each specimen type at the critical load $P_c$ may be similar, even though $J_c$ shows noticeable effects from a change in $B/W$. This is because a change in $B/W$ causes a negligible change in $T_{11}$. Thus, the “planar” failure criterion, similar to the one that Dodds et al. [24] applied to explain the $J_c$-dependence on the test specimen crack depth (as shown in Fig. 14), might be applied to explain the out-of-plane TST effect on $J_c$. The critical values of this criterion ($4\delta_c, \sigma_{22c}$), in which $\delta_c$ denotes the CTOD (crack-tip opening displacement) and $\sigma_{22c}$ denotes the crack-opening stress, was evaluated as a first step.

The distribution of the crack opening stress $\sigma_{22} (\theta = 0)$ at the specimen mid-plane ahead of the crack-tip with the fracture load $P_c$ for all $B/W$s are shown in Fig. 15. $\sigma_{YS}$ in the figure is the true yield stress. $\sigma_{22} (\theta = 0)$ for all $B/W$s showed a similar tendency; specifically, $\sigma_{22}$ attained a maximum value approximately equal to $5\sigma_{YS}$ at approximately $2\delta_c$. This maximum was comparable with that for a material with a hardening component of 5 at plane-strain, approximately equal to $5\sigma_{YS}$ [31].

The $(4\delta_c, \sigma_{22c})$ corresponding to the mid-plane $J_{c, FEA}$, for each $B/W$ calculated in 3.1 is summarized in Table 6. It is seen from Table 6 that the critical stress $\sigma_{22c}$ at $4\delta_c$ on the crack plane ($\theta = 0$) was very close for all $B/W$s in an engineering sense, though $J_{c, FEA}$ for each $B/W$ showed significant variation. The $J_{c, FEA}$ at the mid-plane of the specimen was focused upon because cleavage fracture initiated at the specimen mid-plane. Because the $\sigma_{22c}$ values for all the $B/W$s were very close
at the fracture load for each $P_c$ and $J_{c,FEA}$ at $P_c$ reproduced the TST effect on $J_c$, it was concluded that the $(4\delta_t, \sigma_{zzc})$ criterion successfully explained the TST effect on $J_c$.

In summary, the “planar” failure criterion $(4\delta_t, \sigma_{zzc})$, which was applied to explain the crack depth dependence on $J_c$ by Dodds et al. [24], successfully reproduced the TST effect on $J_c$ that is observed in fracture toughness tests, under the assumption that the TST effect on $J_c$ is mechanical in nature.
4. Discussion

In this work, the TST effect on $J_c$ observed for 0.55% carbon steel S55C in the transition temperature range was reproduced by large-strain FEA results. Neither the micro-crack density distribution nor the weakest link model was assumed to apply to the material, as Dodds et al. did to deduce the relationship $J_c \propto B^{-1/2}$ [3]. The idea to change the crack-tip volume proportionally to the specimen thickness is common for non-standard specimens and the Dodds et al. framework. In addition, the “planar” failure criterion successfully explained the TST effect. Thus, it seems that the mechanical nature of the TST effect on $J_c$ cannot be denied. At least, the bounded behavior of $J_c$ with increasing $B$ seems to be dominated by the mechanical nature. One of the candidates for this mechanical cause is the change in the out-of-plane crack-tip constraint. The only assumption applied in this study was that the fracture initiates at the specimen mid-plane.

In Fig. 12 (a), a noticeable discrepancy was shown for the P-V diagram of $B/W = 0.25$ obtained from both the experiments and FEA. The FEA was performed by assuming the crack length to be uniform in thickness direction and set as $a/W = 0.5$ (Fig. 10 (a)). However, after the fatigue pre-crack procedure, the crack length was, in fact, distributed along the thickness direction, especially for $B/W = 0.25$, as shown in Fig. 16 and Table 7. Thus, a large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA was performed for a case of $B/W = 0.25$, reflecting the fatigue crack length distribution for specimen id 4 as shown in Fig. 17.

The P-V diagram was compared with both the experiment and previous FEA results as shown in Fig. 18. It is seen from Fig. 18 that the P-V diagram from the FEA with a distributed length is closer to the experimental results. $J_{c,\text{FEA}}$ obtained from the current P-V diagram increased to 90.3 N/mm, which corresponds to a 21.4% increase from the uniform crack model 74.4 N/mm. This $J_{c,\text{FEA}}$ for specimen id 4 became comparable to the minimum 93.4 N/mm of the experimental value, but is still smaller than the experimental result of 125.0 N/mm. Therefore, through-thickness crack length distribution was one noticeable source of discrepancy between $J_{c,\text{FEA}}$ and $J_c$ for relatively thin specimens.

There might be an opinion that the quantity of the micro-cracks might have contributed in the discrepancy still remaining between $J_{c,\text{FEA}}$ and $J_c$ for this $B/W$. However, this discrepancy between $J_{c,\text{FEA}}$ and $J_c$ here is due to the discrepancy of P-V diagrams for FEA and experiments as shown in Fig. 18. Though not numerically verified, it seems difficult that the micro-crack density significantly affects a gross deformation, such as the P-V diagram. Therefore, the calculated $J$ value from the P-V diagram seems also not to be significantly affected by micro-cracks.
5. Conclusions

This study investigated the TST effect on the fracture toughness $J_c$ of a material in the transition temperature region for 3PB specimens. Fracture toughness tests and elastic-plastic FEA on non-standard test specimens, with thickness-to-width ratios $B/W$ of 0.25, 0.5, 1.0 and 1.5, were conducted for 0.55% carbon steel. The conclusions are as follows.

- The TST effect on $J_c$ and bounded behavior of $J_c$ for increasing specimen $B/W$ was observed with the non-standard 3PB specimen, as intended.
- Large-strain, elastic-plastic FEA reproduced the behavior observed in the experiments.
- The $(4\delta_c, \sigma_{2c})$ criterion effectively explained the TST effect and the bounded behavior of $J_c$.
- The bounded behavior of $J_c$ for increasing $B$ seems to be dominated by mechanical causes. One of the candidates for this mechanical cause is the change in out-of-plane crack-tip constraint.
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