

# **UNCLASSIFIED**

# AD NUMBER

## ADB112326

# NEW LIMITATION CHANGE

## TO

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

# FROM

Distribution limited to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Critical Technology; Oct 86. Other requests must be referred to Commander, Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, PA 18974-5000.

# AUTHORITY

NAWC ltr., 24 May 96

# THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED



REPORT NO. NADC-87042-60



1 8 1987

025

17





# CERTIFICATION TESTING METHODOLOGY FOR COMPOSITE STRUCTURE

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

Volume II—Methodology Development

R.S. Whitehead, H.P. Kan, R. Cordero, E.S. Saether

Northrop Corporation Aircraft Division One Northrope Avenue Hawthorne, CA 90250

**OCTOBER 1986** 

**FINAL REPORT** 

Contract No. N62269-84-C-0243

Distribution limited to U.S. Government agencies and their contractors; Critical Technology. Other requests for this document shall be referred to COMNAVAIRDEVCEN.

Prepared for NAVAL AIR DEVELOPMENT CENTER Department of the Navy Warminster, PA 18974-5000 and Federal Aviation Administration Technical Center U.S. Department of Transportation Atlantic City, NJ 08405

· ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM NADC-87042-60 NOTICES REPORT NUMBERING SYSTEM - The numbering of technical project reports issued by the Naval Air Development Center is arranged for specific identification purposes. Each number consists of the Center acronym, the calendar year in which the number was assigned, the sequence number of the report within the specific calendar year, and the official 2-digit correspondence code of the Command Office or the Functional Department responsible for the report. For example: Report No. NADC-86015-70 indicates the fifteenth Center report for the year 1986 and prepared by the Systems and Software Technology Department. The numerical codes are as follows: CODE OFFICE OR DEPARTMENT 00 Commander, Naval Air Development Center 01 Technical Director, Naval Air Development Center 02 Comptroller 05 **Computer Department** 07 10 Planning Assessment Resources Department Anti-Submarine Warfare Systems Department 20 30 Tactical Air Systems Dupartment **Battle Force Systems Department** 40 **Communication & Navigation Technology Department** Mission Avionics Technology Department Air Vehicle & Crew Systems Technology Department 50 60 Systems & Software Technology Department 70 80 Engineering Support Group

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

PRODUCT ENDORSEMENT – The discussion or instructions concerning commercial products herein do not constitute an endorsement by the Government nor do they convey or imply the license or right to use such products.

#### DISCLAIMER

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) position. In addition, the term "certification," as used in this report, does not in any way refer to the compliance process established in Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

	GE	M = b	5/12.32	6		
		REPORT DOCU	MENTATION	PAGE		
1a, REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	1		1b. RESTRICTIVE	MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHO	RITY		3. DISTRIBUTION	AVAILABILITY	OF REPORT	
	C. COLERN		Distribution	limited to U. nlv: Critical	S. Governmen Technology:	t Agencies / October 190
20. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWINGRADIN			other request COMNAVAIRDEVC	s for this do EN	ocument must	be referred
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPO	ORT NUMBE	ER(S)	5. MONITORING	ORGANIZATION	N REPORT NUM	IBER(S)
			NADC-075	42-00	DOT/PRA/	CI -00/ 39
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZ	ATION	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF M	ONITORING OR	GANIZATION	
Aircraft Division			Naval Air	Developme	nt Center	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Cod	e)		76. ADDRESS (Cit	ty, State, and 2	ZIP Code)	
Hawthorne, CA 90250			Warminster	. PA 189	74	
• • • • • • • • •						<u> </u>
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMEN	T INSTRUMENT	IDENTIFICATIO	N NUMBER
Naval Air Development Ce	enter	6043	Contract	N62269-84	-C-0243	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code	)		10. SOURCE OF	FUNDING NUM	BERS	
Warminster, PA 18974			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	WORK
					1	
Whitchead, R.S., Kan, H. 13a. TYPE OF REPORT	P., Con 36. TIME C FROM <u>3</u>	rdero, R. and Sa OVERED /84 TO <u>12/8</u> 5	aether, E.S. 14. DATE OF REPO 1986, Oct	DRT (Year, Mor Lober	nth, Day) 15. I	PAGE COUNT
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)         Whitchead, R.S., Kan, H.         13a. TYPE OF REPORT         11         15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         The position. In addition, the term "c         Title 14, Code of Federal Regulat         17.         COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP         01       03         11       04         4. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse in	P., Con 3b. TIME C FROM <u>3</u> ne findings ertification ions. GROUP f necessary	rdero, R. and Sa OVERED /84 TO 12/85 in this report are not n," as used in this repo 18. SUBJECT TERMS Certification Composite Mate	aether, E.S. 14. DATE OF REPC 1986, Oct to be construed as ort, does not in any (Continue on reverse erials number)	DRT (Year, Mor ober an Official Fe way refer to se if necessary Aircraft Fatigue	nth, Day) 15. I deral Aviation the compliance and identify by Structure	PAGE COUNT Administrati process esta y block numb 28
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)         Whitehead, R.S., Kan, H.         13a. TYPE OF REPORT         11         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         position. In addition, the term "c         Title 14, Code of Federal Regulat         17.         COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP         01       03         11       04         NABSTRACT (Continue on reverse in         This research developed         The existing composite         to determine the influe         to use the composite da         Various approaches to o         The approaches evaluate         ultimate strength appro         and disadvantages of ea         fully discussed. (Ke., Note)	P., Con 3b. TIME C FROM <u>3</u> ne findings ertification ions. GROUP f necessary d a cer static. ence of ata sca composi ed are: bach app	rdero, R. and Sa OVERED <u>/84</u> TO <u>12/85</u> in this report are not n," as used in this report <b>18.</b> SUBJECT TERMS Certification Composite Mate and identify by block tification test strength and fa test parameters tter in structures constants te structures te s	aether, E.S. 14. DATE OF REPO 1986, Oct to be construed as ort, does not in any (Continue on reverse erials number) ing methodolo atigue life of s on the scat ral certification r approach, I ctrum approac ine the minin	DRT (Year, Mor cober an Official Fe way refer to se if necessary Aircraft Fatigue ogy for co lata are a tter of co ation are are analy load enhan ch. The c mum life a	and identify by and identify by structure mposite st analyzed st analyzed st arecommender tically ev accement fac apability, and/or stree	PAGE COUNT Administrat process esta y block numbers at ist ican ita. Gui ed. valuated. ctor appr , advanta ength are
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)         Whitehead, R.S., Kan, H.         13a. TYPE OF REPORT         11         13a. TYPE OF REPORT         11         15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         position. In addition, the term "c         Title 14, Code of Federal Regulat         17.         COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP         SUB-01         03         11       04         4. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse in         This research developed         The existing composite         to determine the influe         to use the composite da         Various approaches to d         The approaches evaluate         ultimate strength appro         and disadvantages of ea         fully discussed. (Keg 16         20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF         DUNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED         22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUE         E. KAUTZ	P., Con 3b. TIME C FROM <u>3</u> be findings ertification ions. GROUP f necessary d a cer static ence of ata sca composi ed are: bach app ABSTRACT SAME AS UAL	rdero, R. and Sa OVERED <u>/84</u> TO 12/85 in this report are not n," as used in this report 18. SUBJECT TERMS Certification Composite Mate and identify by block tification test strength and fa test parameters tter in structures te structures constants scatter factor d change in spe- roach to determ RPT. DIIC USERS	Aether, E.S. 14. DATE OF REPC 1986, Oct to be construed as ort, does not in any (Continue on rever erials number) ing methodolo atigue life of s on the scat ral certification r approach, I ctrum approac ine the minin 21. ABSTRACT SI UNCLAS 225. TELEPHONE (215) 441.	DRT (Year, Mor ober an Official Fe way refer to se if necessary Aircraft Fatigue ogy for co lata are a tter of co ation are are analy load enhan ch. The co mum life a	and identify by and identify by structure mposite st analyzed st analyzed st analyzed st analyzed st analyzed st arecommende stically ev acement fac apability, and/or stree Structure	PAGE COUNT Administratic process esta y block numbers at ist ican ita. Gui ed. valuated. tor appr advanta ength are
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)         Whitehead, R.S., Kan, H.         13a. TYPE OF REPORT         Final         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         The position. In addition, the term "c         Title 14, Code of Federal Regulat         17.         COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP         SUB-01         03         11       04         ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse in         This research developed         The existing composite         to determine the influe         to use the composite data         Various approaches to data         Various approaches to data         Various approaches evaluate         ultimate strength appro         and disadvantages of ea         fully discussed. (Kangular)         20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF         DUNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED         22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUE         E. KAUTZ         DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR	P., Co 3b. TIME C FROM <u>3</u> The findings ertification ions. GROUP f necessary d a cer static ence of ata sca composi ed are: bach app ABSTRACT SAME AS UAL 83 A	rdero, R. and Sa OVERED <u>/84</u> TO 12/85 in this report are not n," as used in this report 18. SUBJECT TERMS Certification Composite Mate and identify by block tification test strength and fa test parameters tter in structures con- scatter factor d change in spe- roach to determ PR edition may be used u	Aether, E.S. 14. DATE OF REPC 1986, Oct to be construed as sort, does not in any (Continue on reverse erials number) ing methodolo atigue life of s on the scat ral certification r approach, I ctrum approac ine the minin 21. ABSTRACT SI UNCLAS 22b. TELEPHONE (215) 441- until exhausted.	DRT (Year, Mor ober an Official Fe way refer to se if necessary Aircraft Fatigue ogy for co lata are a tter of co atter of co atter of co atter analy load enhan ch. The co mum life a CURITY CLASS SSIFIED (Include Area C -1561	and identify by structure and identify by Structure mposite st analyzed st mosite da recommende tically ev cement fac apability, and/or stre SIFICATION Code) 22c OFF 6043	PAGE COUNT Administrati process esta y block numb es ructures atistica ita. Gui ed. valuated. ctor appr , advanta ength are

#### UNCLASSIFIED

#### SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

#### 19. Abstract

1889 S

A methodology for certification testing of composite structures is developed and a detailed description of the methodology is presented. Test data interpretation methodology is also developed. The methodology is demonstrated on existing composite structures.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

1.5

Based on the results of this investigation, composite structure certification testing procedure and requirements are recommended.

Volume I of this report discusses the scatter analysis methods and results of static strength and fatigue life data analysis. Details of the certification approach evaluation, methodology development and demonstrations are given in Volume II. Volume II also contains the recommended certification testing procedure.



Acces	ston For
NITS	GRANI 🔲
DT.C.	тав
Unana	owneed 🗍
Justi	fication
By	
Distr	firstion/
Avat	lability Codes
	Avail and/or
Dist	Spec bal
1	
11,0	
	i,
·	La realization de la companyation de la company

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

CHNICAL LIBRARY

#### PREFACE

This report was prepared by the Northrop Corporation, Aircraft Division, Hawthorne, California, covering work performed under U.S. Navy Contract N62269-C-0243 between March 1984 and December 1985. The contract was administerd by the Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania. Mr. Ed Kautz was the Navy Project Engineer. Partial finding of this effort was provided by the Federal Aviation Administration Technical Center, Atlantic City International Airport, NJ. Mr. L. M. Neri acted as the FAA Technical Manager.

The work was performed in the Northrop's Strength and Life Assurance Research Department under the overall supervision of Dr. R. S. Whitehead. The following Northrop personnel were the major contributors to the program.

> Program Manager Principal Investigator Data Analysis

Documentation

Dr. R. S. Whitehead Dr. H. P. Kan R. Cordero E. Saether J. Gibo C. Gatewood

R. Cordero



#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### SECTION

のためため、たちの

PAGE

1	INTRO	DUCTIO	N AND BACKGROUND	l
2	CERT	IFICATIO	ON APPROACH EVALUATION	11
	2.1	Scatter	r Factor Approach	11
		2.1.1	Static Strength Evaluation	13
		2.1.2	Fatigue Life Evaluation	16
		2.1.3	Assessment of the Navy Certification Approach	26
			2.1.3.1 Static Strength	26
			2.1.3.2 Fatigue Strength	35
		2.1.4	Example Reliability Calculations	35
			2.1.4.1 Static Strength Reliability.	36
			2.1.4.2 Fatigue Life Reliability	37
	2.2	Load Er	nhancement Factor Approach	41
	2.3	Ultimat	te Strength Approach	53
	2.4	Change	in Spectrum Approach	75
	2.5	Summary Evalua	y of Certification Approach tion	84
3	METH	ODOLOGY	DEVELOPMENT	87
	3.1	Concep Variab	t of Structural Response ility (SRV)	87
	3.2	Struct	ural Response Variability Data	98
		3.2.1	Determination of Structural Response Variability	98
		3.2.2	Structural Response Variability Analysis Results	102
	3.3	Usage '	Variation	123

N Managanan kanan kana TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

5.42

. . 7

1

#### NADC-87042-60

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION					PAGE
4	METH	ODOLOGY	DEMONSTR	ATION	133
	4.1	Compos	ite Wing/	Fuselage Program Data Base	133
	4.2	Wing C	omponent	(WCC-1) Data Evaluation	139
		4.2.1	WCC-1 St	atic Test Data Evaluation	139
		4.2.2	WCC-1 Fa	tigue Test Data Evaluation	147
			4.2.2.1	Load Enhancement Factor Approach	147
			4.2.2.2	Ultimate Strength Approach	149
			4.2.2.3	Residual Strength Approach	153
	4.3	Wing S	pecimens	Test Data Evaluation Summary.	156
	4.4	Fusela	ge Compon	ent FCC-1 Data Evaluation	161
		4.4.1	FCC-1 St	atic Test Data Evaluation	164
		4.4.2	FCC-1 Fa	tigue Test Data Evaluation	164
	4.5	Fusela	ge Specim	en Test Data Evaluation	174
5	RECO	MMENDED	CERTIFIC	ATION TESTING PROCEDURE	179
	5.1	Testin	g Require	ments	179
		5.1.1	Design A	llowables	179
			5.1.1.1	Static Design Allowables	179
			5.1.1.2	Fatigue Design Allowables	186
		5.1.2	Design D	evelopment Testing	190
			5.1.2.1	Static Tests	194
			5.1.2.2	Fatigue Tests	195
			5.1.2.3	Mixed Composite/Metal Structures	198

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

1. ket

#### NADC-87042-60

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION							<u>PAGE</u>
		5.1.3	Full-Sca	le Testing		••••	199
			5.1.3.1	Full-Scale	Static Te	st	199
			5.1.3.2	Full-Scale	Durabilit	y Test	200
	5.2	Test R	esult Int	erpretation.	• • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • •	201
6	SUM	MARY AND	CONCLUSI	ONS		••••	205
	6.1	Summar	7 • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • •	205
	6.2	Conclu	sions	• • • • • • • • • • • •		• • • • • • • • •	205
REFER	ENCES	5				• • • • • • • • •	207
APPEN	DIX	COMPUTE	R PROGRAM	S		• • • • • • • • •	209
	A.1	Program	m "WEIBUL	L"		• • • • • • • • •	209
	A.2	Program	n "WEIBJN	T"			218
	A.3	Program	n "LOAD".			• • • • • • • • •	232
	<b>A.4</b>	Program	"ALLOW"	• • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • •	236
	A.5	Program	ns "BSRV"	and "CSRV".			241.



#### NADC-87042-60

#### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

	FIGURE		PAGE
	1.	Differences Between Metals and Composites	2
	2.	Comparison of Static Notch Sensitivity Between Composites and Metals	3
	3.	Typical Fatigue Behavior of Graphite/Epoxy Composites	4
	4.	Comparison of Metal and Composite Fatigue Behavior Under Spectrum Loading	6
	5.	Influence of Weibull Shape Parameter on Demon- strated Reliability of Design Limit Load for Failure at Design Ultimate Load	14
	6.	Influence of Mean Static Failure Load on Demonstrated Reliability at Design Limit Load	15
	7.	Influence of Sample Size on B-basis Static Strength	17
	8.	Influence of Maximum Operating Load to Mean Static Failure Load Ratio on Static Strength Reliability	18
	9.	Influence of Environmental Knockdown Factor on Static Strength Reliability	19
	10.	Influence of Fatigue Life Shape Parameter on Reliability Demonstrated by a Two-Lifetime Fatigue Test	21
	11.	Influence of Mean Test Lifetime on the Reli- ability Achieved at One Lifetime	22
	12.	Influence of Sample Size on B-basis Fatigue Life to Mean Fatigue Life Ratio	23
	13.	Influence of Fatigue Life Scatter on B-basis Fatigue Life to Mean Fatigue Life Ratio	24
-	14.	Influence of Required Fatigue Life to Mean Test Life Ratio on Fatigue Reliability	25
	15.	F/A-18A and AV-8B Load-Strain Assessment Concept.	27
	16.	Schematic of the Calculation of Design Allowable Strain Level (Reference 1)	27
		vii	

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

## FIGURE

## PAGE

17	<ul> <li>Influence of Nonlinear Load-Strain Response on the F/A-18A and AV-8B Load-Strain Assessment</li> </ul>	
	Concept	30
18	. Material Selection Criterion	32
19	. Influence of Temperature and Moisture on Material Operational Limits	33
20	. Temperature Spectrum for Mach 2 Fighter Aircraft in Reference 5	39
21	. Load-Factor Temperature Relationship for Mach 2 Fighter Aircraft in Reference 5	40
22	. Schematic of Load Enhancement Factor Approach for Composites	43
23	. Influence of Residual Strength Scatter $\alpha_R$ on Load Enhancement Factor (One Lifetime Fatigue Test)	47
24	. Influence of Residual Strength Scatter $\alpha_{\rm R}$ on Load Enhancement Factor (Two Lifetime Fatigue Test)	49
25	. Influence of Test Duration on B-Basis Load Enhancement Factors	50
26	. Influence of Test Duration on A-Basis Load Enhancement Factors	51
27	. Comparison of Load Enhancement Factors Calculated by the Sendeckyj Analysis with Theoretical	50
	Values	52
28	. Composite Fatigue Life Threshold Approach	54
29	. Influence of Loading Mode on the B-Basis to Mean Life Fatigue Threshold Ratio, $\sigma_e^B/\sigma_e^M$	56
30	Influence of Loading Mode on the B-Basis to Mean Life Fatigue Threshold Ratio, $\sigma_e^B/\sigma_e^M$	58
31	. Distribution of B-Basis to Mean Fatigue Life Thresholds for Navy Data	59



#### NADC-87()42-60

#### LIST OF ILUSTRATIONS

	FIGURE		PAGE
-	32.	Distribution of B-Basis to Mean Fatigue Life Thresholds for Baseline Data	60
-	33.	Comparison of Navy and Baseline B-Basis to Mean- Fatigue Life Threshold Distributions	61
	34.	Distribution of B-Basis to Mean Fatigue Life Thresholds for Combined Data	62
•	35.	Influence of Fatique Loading Mode on Normalized Fatigue Threshold for Intermediate Load Transfer Specimens in Reference 16	64
	36.	Influence of Fatigue Loading Mode on Normalized Fatigue Threshold for High Load Transfer Speci- mens in Reference 16	65
	37.	Influence of Fatigue Loading Mode on Normalized Fatigue Threshold for Complex Specimens in Reference 16	66
	38.	Influence of Fatigue Loading Mode on Normalized Fatigue Threshold for all Specimens in Reference 16	68
	39.	Influence of Joint Geometry, Lay-up and Spectrum Type on Normalized Fatigue Thresholds	70
	40.	Statistical Fatigue Threshold for Upper Wing Skin Spectrum Loading	72
	41.	Influence of Spectrum Type on Static Overload Requirement for B-Basis Fatigue Reliability	74
	42.	Schematic Summary of Mixed Structure Testing Problems (A. Someroff NAVAIR, October 1981)	76
u	43.	Comparison of Composite and Metallic Fatigue Spectrum Fatigue Behavior for a Wing Spectrum	77
-	44.	Influence of Spectrum Type on Predicted Composite and Metal Fatigue Life	78
-	45.	Comparison of F-18 Fatigue Spectra	79
	46.	Influence of Overloads on Composite Fatigue Life for an F-18 Upper Wing Root Spectrum	80
		ix	

### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

**TECHNICAL LIBRARY** 

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### <u>FIGURE</u>

0

Ņ

#### PAGE

47.	Influence of Spectrum Type and Overloads on Composite Fatigue Life	82
48.	Influence of Overloads on Composite and Metal Fatigue Life	83
49.	Equivalent Composite Load Enhancement Factors for an F-18 Upper Wing Spectrum	85
50.	Schematic of "Hot-Spot" Failure in Relation to the Scatter in Strength and Structural Response for a Static Test	88
51.	Influence of SRV on B-Basis Design Allowables, $\alpha_{\rm S}$ =20.0	91
52.	Influence of SRV on A-Basis Design Allowables, $\alpha_{\rm S}$ =20.0	92
53.	Influence of Static Strength Variability on the B-Basis Design Allowable at Mean and Modal SRV	93
54.	Influence of Static Strength Variability on the A-Basis Design Allowable at Mean and Modal SRV	94
55.	Influence of Structural Response Variability on the B-Basis Structural Reliability	96
56.	Influence of Structural Response Variability on the A-Basis Structural Reliability	97
57.	Building Block Approach for the Wing Structure in the Composite Wing/Fuselage Program (Reference 5)	99
58.	Typical Applied Load Strain Response from a WS-1 Subcomponent Test (Reference 5)	101
59.	WS-1 Lower Skin ETW Load-Strain Response	104
60.	WS-1 Upper Skin ETW Load-Strain Response	104
61.	WCC-l Upper Skin Load-Strain Response at Wing Station 48 (Gage Number 25) for Load Case 130	105
62.	WCC-1 Upper Skin Load-Strain Response at Wing Station 48 (Gage Number 30) for Load Case 130	105

Sec. XVV



.

#### NADC-87042-60

#### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURE		PAGE
63.	WCC-1 Upper Skin Load-Strain Response at Wing Station 48 (Gage Number 32) for Load Case !30	106
64.	WCC-1 Upper Skin Load-Strain Response at Wing Station 48 (Gage Number 40) for Load Case 130	106
65.	Influence of Specimen Complexity Level on RTA Structural Response Variability	107
66.	Influence of Specimen Complexity Level on ETW Structural Response Variability	107
67.	Influence of Specimen Complexity Level on Combined RTA and ETW Structural Response Variability	108
68.	Influence of Environment on Structural Response Variability	108
69.	WCC-l Design Ultimate Load Lower Skin Strain Distribution at Wing Station 43 for Load Case 130	110
70.	WCC-1 Design Ultimate load Lower Skin Strain Distribution at Wing Station 85 for Load Case 130	110
71.	WCC-1 Design Ultimate Load Upper Skin Strain Distribution at Wing Station 48 for Load Case 130	111
72.	WCC-1 Load-Strain Response for Logd Case 100	115
73.	WCC-l Load-Strain Response for Load Case 110	116
74.	WCC-1 Load-Strain Response for Load Case 130	117
75.	WCC-1 Load-Strain Response for Load Case 102	118
76.	WCC-1 Load-Strain Response for Load Case 201	119
77.	Influence of Loading Case on Structural Response Variability	120
78.	Distribution of Structural Response Variability for Combined RTD + ETW Load-Strain Data	122
79.	Comparison of Usage Severity Change for Composites and Metals	124

695

## TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60

#### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

#### FIGURE

U V

CONTRACTOR NO

#### PAGE

80.	Methodology for Incorporating Usage Variation into Fatigue Life Reliability Calculations	126
81.	Influence of Usage Variation on Fatigue Reliability ( <sup>0</sup> a/ <sup>0</sup> u=0.8)	128
82.	Change of Reliability with Usage Variation	129
83.	Effects of Usage Variation on the B-Basis Life	131
84.	Effect of Usage Variation on the B-Basis Fatigue Life Factor	132
85.	Building Block Approach for the Fuselage Structure in Reference 5	136
86.	Fatigue Test Schemes Used in Reference 5	138
87.	Wing Component with Load Introduction Structure (Reference 5)	140
88.	WCC-1 Test Set-up (Reference 5)	141
89.	WCC-1 Static Strength Reliability Distributions	145
90.	WCC-1 Fatigue Reliability Distribution Determined by the Load Enhancement Factor Approach	150
91.	WCC-1 Fatigue Reliability Distribution Determined by the Ultimate Strength Approach	154
92.	WCC-1 Fatigue Reliability Distribution Determined by the Residual Strength Approach	157
93.	Fuselage Component (FCC-1)	162
94.	FCC-1 Loading	163
95.	FCC-1 Static Strength Reliability Distributions	167
96.	FCC-1 Fatigue ReliabilityLoad Enhancement Factor Approach	171
97.	FCC-1 Fatigue ReliabilityUltimate Strength Approach	172



#### NADC-87042-60

#### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURE		PAGE
98.	Determination of Design Allowables Over a Range of Temperature	185
99.	Influence of SRV on the A- and B-Basis Knockdown Factor	187
100	Fatigue Allowable Approaches	189

xiii

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTT

## LIST OF TABLES

## TABLE

.

ς,

40

Ţ	Summary of the Statistical Analysis of the B-Basis to Mean Fatigue Life Threshold Ratio Values	63
2	Influence of Test Variables on Normalized Fatigue Thresholds Under Spectrum Loading	69
3	Static Failure Load Requirements for No Fatigue Tast of a (48/48/4) Laminate in a RTD Environment	73
4	Influence of SRV on Knockdown Factors, n = 1	95
5	Summary of Strain Gage Data Available from the Composite Wing/Fuselage Program (Reference 5)	100
6	Structural Response Variability Analysis Results	103
7	Comparison of WCC-l Load-Strain and Strain Distribution Structural Response Variability	112
8	Summary of WCC-1 Ultimate Static Load Cases	113
9	Wing Component (WCC-1) Tests in Reference 5	114
10	Influence of Loading Case on Load-Strain Structural Response Variability	114
11	Summary of Wing Test Matrix from Reference 5	135
12	Summary of Fuselage Test Matrix from Reference 5.	137
13	Summary of Wing Component (WCC-1) Static Design Ultimate Loads	142
14	Summary of Wing Component (WCC-1) Failure Loads	143
15	Summary of WCC-1 Static Strength Reliability and Allowable Operating Loads	146
16	Summary of WCC-1 Fatigue Test Loads	148
17	Summary of WCC-1 RTA One Lifetime Fatigue Reliability	151
18	Summary of WCC-l Environmental One Lifetime Fatique Realiability	152

.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

#### LIST OF TABLES

#### TABLE

19	Summary of Static Strength Reliabilities and Allowable Operating Loads for Wing Test Specimens	158
20	Summary of One Lifetime Fatigue Reliabilities for Wing Test Specimens	160
21	Summary of Fuselage Component (FCC-1) Static Ultimate Design Loads	165
22	Summary of FCC-1 Failure Loads	166
23	Summary of FCC-1 Static Reliability	168
24	Summary of FCC-1 Fatigue Loads	169
25	Summary of FCC-1 RTA Fatigue Reliability at One Lifetime	170
26	Summary of FCC-l Environmental Fatigue Reliability at One Lifetime	173
27	Summary of Static Strength Reliabilities and Allowable Operating Loads for Fuselage Test Specimens	175
28	Summary of One Lifetime Fatigue Reliabilities for Fuselage Test Specimens	177
29	Design Allowable to Mean Strength Ratio for the Recommended Sample Size	181
30	Lamina Static Strength Allowable Test Matrix	183
31	Laminate Static Strength Allowable Test Matrix	184
32	Recommended Fatigue Allowable Test Matrix	191
33	Typical Load Factors	192
A-1	Values of $\chi^2(2n)/2n$ at F=0.95	242
A-2	Values of $\Gamma(1 + 1/\alpha)$	243
<b>A-</b> 3	Relation Between Weibull Shape Parameter ( $\alpha$ ) and Coefficient of Variation (CV)	244

5

#### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

RTD	Room Temperature Dry
RTW	Room Temperature Wet
etw	Elevated Temperature Wet
(x/y/z)	(%0 <sup>0</sup> /% <u>+</u> 45 <sup>0</sup> /%90 <sup>0</sup> )
NO L/T	No Load Transfer Specimen
INT L/T	Intermediate Load Transfer Specimen
HIGH L/T	High Load Transfer Specimen
COMPLEX	Complex Specimen
c.v.	Coefficient of Variation
DLL	Design Limit Load
DUL	Design Ultimate Load
SRV	Structural Response Variability
MSL	Maximum Spectrum Load
MLE	Maximum Likelihood Estimates
MOL	Material Operating Limit

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

.....

#### LIST OF SYMBOLS

ではないない。

R	Reliability
	also used as stress ratio (minimum stress/maximum stress)
x	Sample mean
n	Sample size
$\chi^2_{\gamma}$ (2n)	Chi-square distribution with 2n degrees-of-freedom at $\gamma$ percentage point
α	Weibull shape parameter
â	MLE of Weibull shape parameter
β	Weibull scale parameter
	MLE of Weibull scale parameter
β́	95% confident Weibull scale parameter
p	Probability of survival
N <sub>A</sub> , N <sub>B</sub>	A- and B-basis allowables
x	Required load or life
k	Environmental knockdown factor
150% E	Highest measured strain at 150% DLL
ε <sup>E</sup> D	Design allowable strain in worse case environmental
$\epsilon_{\rm D}^{\rm RT}$	Design allowable strain under room temperature ambient conditions
P <sub>FP</sub>	Predicted room temperature ambient failure load
P <sub>FR</sub>	Required room temperature ambient failure load
σ <sup>M</sup> e	Mean equivalent static strength from the Sendeckyj analysis
σ <sup>B</sup> e	B-Basis equivalent static strength from the Sendeckyj analysis
N	Test duration
F	Load enhancement factor
σ	Stress level
Г(Х)	Gamma functions



Subscripts	S	Static strength
	L	Fatigue life
	R	Residual strength
	F	Failure
	TH	Threshold

Superscripts	C	composite
	m	metal
	в	B-Basis
	M	mean

B DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60

#### SECTION 1

#### INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The application of composite materials to primary aircraft structures requires proven certification procedures to demonstrate their structural integrity. The development of certification procedures for primary composite structures must inherent differences recognize the between metals and These differences are summarized in Figure 1. composites. Composite load-strain response is different from metals in that it is essentially linear to failure. Because of their linear elastic behavior, composites are extremely statically notch sensitive to stress concentrations such as fastener holes. Figure 2 presents typical data which show that composites are statically notch sensitive under both tension and compression loading. For both loading modes, notch sensitivity increases as hole diameter increases. By contrast, the static holed strength of metals is essentially notch insensitive and follows the net section strength reduction line.

Metallic materials are extremely fatigue sensitive to stress concentrations, which are the primary source of fatigue cracking in aircraft structures. In contrast, composites are almost fatigue insensitive to stress concentrations such as fastener holes. Figure 3 presents typical data which show the influence of loaded and unloaded fastener holes on composite fatique life. It can be seen that compression static strength is very sensitive to the various fastener hole geometries. However, the maximum compression fatigue strain required for a life of  $10^7$ R-ratio of -1.7 cycles at an is approximately constant at 4000  $\mu$ in/in for all specimen geometries. These data show that, at low cycle lives, fatigue behavior is controlled by the static strength, while at high cycle lives fatigue behavior is controlled by the net section stress level.

CONDITION		COMPOSITE BEHAVIOR RELATIVE TO METALS
LOAD-STRAIN RELATIONS	HIP	MORE LINEAR STRAIN TO FAILURE
	STATIC	<b>GREATER SENSITIVITY</b>
	FATIGUE	LESS SENSITIVITY
TRANSVERSE PROPERTIES		WEAKER
MECHANICAL PROPERTIES	VARIABILITY	HIGHER
SENSITIVITY TO AIRCRAFT HYGROTHERMAL ENVIRO	r vment	GREATER
DAMAGE GROWTH MECHA	NISM	IN-PLANE DELAMINATION INSTEAD OF THROUGH- THICKNESS CRACKS

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN METALS AND COMPOSITES. • -FIGURE

## NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

W.





FIGURE 2. COMPARISON OF STATIC NOTCH SENSITIVITY BETWEEN COMPOSITES AND METALS.

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60



ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRAR

Figure 4 presents a comparison of metal and composite fatigue behavior under fighter aircraft wing spectrum loading. The comparison is made for an unloaded fastener hole specimen with a Youngs Modulus of approximately 10,000 ksi. The data are plotted for each material's most sensitive fatigue loading mode, which is tension dominated (lower wing skin) for metals and compression dominated (upper wing skin) for composites. Figure 4 shows that composite fatigue properties are markedly superior to metal fatigue properties.

The transverse properties of metallic and composite structures also differ significantly. Because they are isotropic, metallic transverse (thru-thickness) properties are similar to their in-plane properties. However, since composites are laminates manufactured from individual plies, their transverse out-of-plane properties are controlled by interlaminar strength which is considerably weaker than in-plane strength. Typical room temperature/ambient interlaminar strengths for composites are 12 ksi for interlaminar shear and 3 ksi for interlaminar tension. These are low compared to an unnotched in-plane strength of 75 ksi for a typical wing skin laminate. Because of their anisotropic heterogeneous characteristics, composites exhibit significantly higher scatter than metals in both static and fatigue properties. This variability must be accounted for in the design and certification of composites structures.

Composites, which exhibit matrix controlled failure modes (e.g., compression), are sensitive to the aircraft hygrothermal environment. In particular, the effects of temperature and moisture have a synergistic effect. Therefore, the strength degradation of composites in hot/wet environments controls their maximum service temperature application.

Fatigue damage growth mechanisms differ considerably between metals and composites. In metals, fatigue cracks initiate at stress concentrations and generally grow to through-thethickness cracks under tension dominated loading. In composites, it has been demonstrated that the most common damage growth mechanism is interlainar separation, known as



ECHNICAL LIBRARY

NADC-87042-60

TTAEROSPACE.COM

ΡΕΑΚ SPECTRUM STRAIN μΙΝ/ΙΝ

6

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

delamination. Therefore, damage growth is an in-plane phenomenon. Prior to delamination growth, matrix cracking and fiber breakage usually occurs. The analogy with metals is that the latter would correspond to crack initiation, while the former would correspond to crack growth. Because delamination growth is the dominant growth mechanism in composites, they are most sensitive to compression dominated fatigue loading. A second composite fatigue failure mode has been observed in fastener holes subject to high bearing stresses. Fatigue failure can occur by hole wearout rather than delamination induced laminate failure. In this failure mode, the hole gradually elongates leading to a bearing failure.

The special properties of composites (fatigue notch insensitivity, weak transverse properties, matrix dominated failures, high failure variability, hygrothermal sensitivity and delamination fatigue growth mechanism) must be addressed in structural design and certification. It is emphasized that these properties do not negate the weight efficiency of composite structures, just that different parameters (from metals) are important in composite design and certification.

Current practice is to carry out an extensive design development test effort to:

1. Establish environmental and scatter knockdown for Strength critical failure modes, and

2. Validate critical design features.

These tests are conducted at the coupon, element and subcomponent levels. Following these tests, certification culminates in room temperature ambient full-scale static and fatigue tests. Usually, only one article is available for each test.

In order to have confidence in the certification compliance of full scale tests, it is imperative to be able to quantitatively interpret the test data generated. This is achieved by using the design development data not only in their traditional role in design development but also in the interpretation of full-scale test data.

NGAZAZAZKAWA XAUMARANDARA MANANANA

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

Current certification practices do not provide an overall testing methodology for the planning and quantitative interpretation of design development and full-scale test data.

The objective of this program is to develop a certification testing methodology for composite aircraft structures. Specifically, the methodology will account for the effects on strength, life, and the scatter in strength and life of variation in structural configuration and complexity, stress or strain level, mixed composite-metal structure and fatigue spectrum shape. Test requirements and procedures for interpreting test results will be defined for the certification of future composite aircraft structure.

The program is composed of four tasks:

• TASK I - SCATTER ANALYSIS

- TASK II CERTIFICATION APPROACH DEVELOPMENT/EVALUATION
- TASK III METHODOLOGY DEVELOPMENT
- TASK IV METHODOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

During Task I, existing composite static strength and fatigue life data were analyzed statistically to determine the influence of different test parameters on the scatter of composite data. The test variables included were: laminate lay-up, specimen type, loading mode, failure mode and test environment for both the static and fatigue data; in addition, stress level, stress ratio, spectrum variation and spectrum shape are investigated for fatigue data. The effects of each variable on static strength and fatigue life data scatter were established by performing statistical tests of significance. As a result of this task, guidelines to use the composite data scatter in structural certification will be recommended and these guidelines will be applied in the subsequent tasks of the program.

In Task II, various approaches to composite structure certification were analytically evaluated. The approaches evaluated were:

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

- 1. Scatter factor approach
- 2. Load enhancement factor approach
- 3. Ultimate strength approach
- 4. Change in spectrum approach

The capability, advantages and disadvantages of each approach to determine minimum (B-basis) and mean life and/or strength were fully evaluated. Effects of these approaches on the certification procedure of composite-metal mixed structure were also investigated. The conclusions of this evaluation will then be used in the methodology development.

A methodology for certification testing of composite structures was developed in Task III. The methodology was based on the results of the evaluation in Task II and the scatter analysis in Task I. The number and types of tests required at each level (coupon, element, subcomponent, component, and fullscale) of testing were defined. Test data interpretation methodology was also developed. As part of this task, a detailed description of the development methodology will be presented. This description will include detailed instructions for application and utilization of the methodology within the overall developmental process to satisfy design service life requirements for aircraft utilizing composite structures. The description will also include application of the methodology in an aircraft design/development program and determine the effects on service life resulting from usage change of an aircraft after its introduction into the fleet.

In Task IV, the methodology was demonstrated on an existing composite structure. The full-scale wing and fuselage component from the Composite Wing/Fuselage Program (Reference 1) were selected for this demonstration purpose. The results of the tests that have been performed on these demonstration articles were reevaluated using the methodology developed in Task III.

The scatter analysis methods and results of static strength and fatigue life data analysis are discussed in Volume

I. Details of Task II - Certification Approval Development/Evaluation. Task III - Methodology Development and Task IV - Methodology Demonstration are given in Volume II. Recommendations and certification testing requirements are also documented in Volume II. Computer programs to evaluate structure reliability are appended to Volume II.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60

#### SECTION 2

#### CERTIFICATION APPROACH EVALUATION

During Task II of the program detailed evaluation of various certification approaches was conducted. The approaches evaluated were:

- 1. Scatter factor approach,
- 2. Load enhancement factor approach,
- 3. Ultimate strength approach,
- 4. Change in spectrum approach.

Details of this evaluation are discussed in the following para-graphs. In the evaluation, unless specified otherwise, the modal Weibull shape parameters are used. That is  $\alpha = 20.0$  for static strength and  $\alpha = 1.25$  for fatigue life.

#### 2.1 <u>Scatter Factor Approach</u>

Current Navy certification procedures for composite structures are based on the Scatter Factor Approach. The key elements in the full-scale test requirements are based on experience with metal structures. These are: static tests to a minimum of 150 percent design limit load (DLL) and fatigue tests with a severe load spectrum to a minimum of two lifetimes.

The reliability obtained by using these factors can be determined directly from the Weibull distribution function when the scatter parameter ( $\alpha$ ) is known. Then the reliability at 100 percent DLL or at 1.0 lifetime with  $\gamma$  level of confidence is given by

$$R = \exp\left\{-\frac{\chi_{\gamma}^{2}(2n)}{2n}\left[\frac{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha})}{\overline{x}}\right]^{\alpha}\right\}$$
(1)

ECHNICAL LIBRAR

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

Equation (1) can also be used to interpret static and fatigue test data. In these cases the value of  $\overline{x}$  is taken as the average static strength or fatigue life obtained from test.

The ratio of the B-basis static strength (fatigue life) to the mean failure load (fatigue life) is obtained by letting R = 0.9 in equation (1), which can be written as:

$$\frac{\dot{N}_{B}}{\bar{x}} = \frac{1}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}\right)} \left[\frac{-\ln(0.9)}{\chi_{\gamma}^{2}(2n)/2n}\right]^{1/\alpha}$$
(2)

The A-Basis strength or life factor is obtained simply replacing 0.9 by 0.99 in the above equation.

The influence of changes in load and/or life requirements on the reliability of an aircraft structure can be assessed after the design phase of the structure. This reliability can be computed from the mean test data for static strength or fatigue life. The  $\gamma$  level of confidence reliability is given by

$$R = \exp \left\{ -\left[ \frac{X}{\bar{X}} \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}\right) \right]^{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\chi_{\gamma}^{2}(2n)}{2n} \right\}$$
(3)

An environmental knockdown factor is applied in order to provide increased reliability from an ambient full-scale test on an environmentally critical structure. The environmental knockdown factor, k, is applied based on the assumption that the static strength Weibull shape parameter is not significantly affected by the test environments. This assumption is substantiated by the results of Task I data analysis. From this assumption, the  $\gamma$  level confidence reliability can be written as

$$R = \exp \left\{ -\left[ \left( \frac{kx}{\bar{x}} \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha} \right) \right)^{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\chi_{\gamma}^{2}(2n)}{2n} \right] \right\}$$
(4)

### 2.1.1 <u>Static Strength Evaluation</u>

The static factor of 1.5 times limit load is used to safely account for unintentional deviations from service load and scatter in the static strength of a fleet of airframe structures. The degree of safety provided for metallic structures by the 1.5 factor can be calculated accurately, since the scatter in fullscale tests is known. However, there is insufficient data to establish composite full-scale test data scatter.

To evaluate the reliability of a structure at DLL using a 1.5 static factor approach, the value of  $\bar{x}$  in equation (1) is taken as 1.5 That is assuming the mean static failure load is at 1.5 DLL, or at DUL. It is seen from equation (1) that the reliability depends on the sample size, n, and the Weibull shape parameter  $\alpha$ .

Figure 5 shows the 95 percent confidence reliability at DLL as a function of the static strength shape parameter ( $\alpha$ ). The reliability in this figure is computed assuming structural failure at 150 percent of DLL, or at DUL. As can be seen from the figure, at the modal value of  $\alpha = 20.0$ , the 95 percent confidence reliabilities are very high for all sample sizes, and far exceed the B-basis allowables. This indicates that the static factor of 1.5 times limit load provides a very high degree of safety. However, the reliability thus obtained does not account for unintentional deviations from service load, non-ambient service environments and structural response variability. The effects of these factors need to be investigated in order to fully evaluate the degree of safety provided by the 1.5 static factor.

Figure 6 presents the 95 percent reliability at DLL as a function of the mean static failure load (equation (1)). The figure shows that for a single article static test (n = 1) the Bbasic reliability at the DLL can be achieved if the structure failure occurs at 115 percent of DLL. The same reliability can be achieved if the mean static failure load is 111 percent of DI for a sample size of 20. This level of reliability is again determined only by considering the scatter in static strength.

#### TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPAGE.COM

NADC-87042-60



THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60



FIGURE 6. INFLUENCE OF MEAN STATIC FAILURE LOAD ON DEMONSTRATED RELIABILITY AT DESIGN LIMIT LOAD.

መጀመሪ የመቅረመሪያ ምሳም የመስገኛ የመስከም እና የሚሰረው የመስከም የመስከም የመስከም የመስከም የሚሰሩ የሚሰረው የሚሰሩ የሚሰሩ የሚሰሩ የሚሰሩ የሚሰሩ የሚሰሩ የሚሰሩ የመስ


The influence of sample size on the B-basis static strength to the mean failure load ratio  $(\overset{\vee}{N_B}/\bar{x})$  is determined using Equation (2) and shown in Figure 7. This relation is shown for the mean (23.2), modal (20.0) and B-basis (8.8) values of  $\alpha$ . As can be seen in the figure, the B-basis to mean failure ratio increases with sample size. For  $\alpha$ =20.0 (modal value), the value of  $\overset{\vee}{N_B}/\bar{x}$  only slightly increase when the sample size is larger than five.

The maximum operating load for a structure can be determined from the actual test results and a desired level of reliability (Equation (3)). This information is plotted in Figure 8. The figure shows the reliability for  $\alpha = 20.0$ . For Bbasis reliability, the maximum load of the structure should not exceed 0.87 of the static test failure load for a sample size of one. Similarly, for A-basis reliability, the maximum load should remain below 0.77 of the failure load.

The effects of environmental knockdown factor on the resulting reliability is shown in Figure 9 (Equation (4)). The figure shows the reliability at different maximum operating load to mean static failure load ratios  $(X/\bar{x})$ . For a knockdown factor (k) of 1.1 with n = 1, the B-basis reliability maximum operation load is 0.79 of the failure load and the A-basis requires operating below 0.70 of the failure load. These values compare with 0.87 for B-basis and 0.77 for A-basis when no knockdown factor is applied. At k = 1.5 these values become 0.58 and 0.52 for B- and A-basis, respectively.

#### 2.1.2 <u>Fatigue Life Evaluation</u>

The use of a fatigue scatter factor of 2-4 for metallic structures has historically been related to a reliability of approximately 699 in 700. Use of the scatter factors for composites cannot be justified because (from the analysis shown in Volume I), the Weibull shape parameter for composite fatigue life is extremely low (large scatter). The reliability of a twolifetime test is approximately 1 in 4.





SAMPLE SIZE, n

SHERE AND A STOLED

መጨጽ ራሳዊ ለአዋፊ ላ ድራሳ አግጽሳ ፈሳኤስ የብኤስ ዲሳኤስ ላ ኒቲስ ዲሳዲስ



REARKERD STRUE WORLD





ECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPAGE.COM

NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60



95% CONFIDENCE RELIABILITY (R)

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

The reliability of a two-lifetime fatigue test can be computed by letting  $\bar{x} = 2.0$  in equation (1). The values of reliability are plotted as a function of the fatigue life shape parameter for different sample sizes in Figure 10. As can be seen from this figure, the two-lifetime fatigue test provides very low reliability for  $\alpha$ 's commonly found for composites ( $\alpha$  mean = 2.17 and  $\alpha$  modal = 1.25). At the modal value of  $\alpha$ , the reliability for sample size up to 10 is between 0.32 and 0.55 and is far below the B-basis allowable (R = 0.90). This indicates that a two-lifetime fatigue test does not provide the required level of reliability for composite structures. This conclusion is conservative for a two-lifetime fatigue test with no failure, since there is an unknown additional reliability associated with the assumption of failure at two lifetimes.

The influence of mean test fatigue lifetimes on the 95 percent confidence reliability achieved at one lifetime is shown in Figure 11. The figure shows that for a single article fatigue test, a minimum fatigue life of 13.6 lifetimes is required in order to achieve a B-basis reliability. The required mean life for a ten article fatigue test is 8.1 lifetimes.

The B-basis fatigue life to mean life ratio as a function of sample size at  $\alpha = 1.25$  (modal value) and 2.17 (mean value is presented in Figure 12. Figure 12 shows that at the modal value of  $\alpha(1.25)$ , and a sample size of 20, the B-basis to mean life ratio is 0.136. That is, a minimum life factor of 7.35 is required to obtain a B-basis reliability with 20 tests. For a sample size of one the required factor is 13.6. It should be noted that B-basis life reduction factor is very sensitive to the value of  $\alpha$ . For  $\alpha = 2.17$  and a sample size of one, the Bbasis reduction factor is reduced to 4.2 Figure 13 presents details of the influence of  $\alpha$  on fatigue life ratio.

The 95 percent confidence reliability as a function of required fatigue life to mean failure life ratio  $(X/\bar{x})$  is shown in Figure 14 for sample size of 1, 5 and 30. Figure 14 shows that the reliability becomes very low if the required fatigue life is greater than 0.2 of the mean fatigue test life.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60













TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM





HIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60



FIGURE 14. INFLUENCE OF REQUIRED FATIGUE LIFE TO MEAN TEST LIFE RATIO ON FATIGUE RELIABILITY.

ECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

## 2.1.3 Assessment of the Navy Certification Approach

The Navy certification approach to primary composite structures was evolved approximately ten years ago. It has been well documented in References 1 through 4. The Navy composite certification approach was evolved from their extensive metallic certification experience. As such, it relies heavily on the scatter factor approach. An assessment of the Navy certification approach to static strength and fatigue life is discussed below.

2.1.3.1 Static Strength

Two requirements are specified for full-scale structural tests:

- (1) The actual room temperature failure load is required to exceed the 150 percent design limit load (DLL) value by a compensation factor dependent on failure location, failure mode, metal or composite structure, environmental test condition and material variability.
- (2) At 150 percent design limit load, all measured and extrapolated strains must not exceed the allowable strain level for the worst environmental condition.

These requirements are shown schematically in Figure 15 for the case of an environmentally sensitive failure in a composite upper skin. From Figure 15 the requirements above are expressed as

$$\epsilon_{\mathrm{T}}^{150\%} \leq \epsilon_{\mathrm{D}}^{\mathrm{E}}$$
 $P_{\mathrm{FP}} \geq P_{\mathrm{FR}}$ 
 $\frac{P_{\mathrm{FR}}}{P_{\mathrm{150\%}}} \geq \frac{\epsilon_{\mathrm{D}}^{\mathrm{RT}}}{\epsilon_{\mathrm{D}}^{\mathrm{E}}}$ 

The use of this approach for full-scale static test requirements is based on three key assumptions:









FIGURE 16. SCHEMATIC OF THE CALCULATION OF DESIGN ALLOWABLE STRAIN LEVEL (REFERENCE 1)



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

- (1) The variability of composite strength data is independent of environment,
- (2) Load-strain response is linear to structural failure, and,
- (3) Failure modes are correctly predicted; i.e., no unexpected hot spot failure occurs.

The validity and implications of these assumptions for structural reliability are discussed below.

## Composite Static Strength Variability

Design strain allowables for each failure mode and its critical environment are determined by assuming composite strength variability are independent of environment. Figure 16 shows an example of this procedure for an environmentally sensitive failure mode (Reference 1). Initially RTA tests are carried out to determine mean strength and material variability. This permits determination of a room temperature design allowable strain,  $\epsilon_D^{RT}$ . Next, sufficient tests are carried out in the hot/wet environment to establish mean failure strain,  $\epsilon_M^{ETW}$ . Variability in the hot/wet environment is assumed to be the same as in the room temperature ambient environment. The hot/wet e' jign allowable is then obtained as:

 $\epsilon_{\rm D}^{\rm ETW} = \frac{\epsilon_{\rm D}^{\rm RT}}{\epsilon_{\rm Mean}^{\rm RT}} \cdot \epsilon_{\rm Mean}^{\rm ETW}$ 

(5)

This derign allowable,  $\epsilon_D^{\text{ETW}}$ , accounts for environmental sensitivity and inherent material variability, but not structural response variability.

The influence of environment on tension and compression static static static strength data base was analyzed. It was shown that for tension failures static strength variability was higher

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

in ETW environments. In contrast, for the hot/wet sensitive compression failures no influence of environment was observed. However, the work in Task I showed that failure mode more significantly influenced static strength scatter. The work in Reference 5 also showed that failure mode exercised the greatest effect on static strength scatter.

The test data analysis in Task I, therefore, sugges s that the assumption of environmental independence for static strength scatter may not always be strictly correct. However, the requirement specified in the Navy approach, which mandates the determination of strength variability for each failure mode, is a key requirement because of its dominating influence on static strength variability.

In general, it can be concluded that the Navy approach to static strength variability is soundly based, despite evidence of some influence of environment on strength variability.

The soundness or conservatism of the Navy approach can be improved by specifying conservative strength variability knockdown factors for each failure mode. This would tend to take into account any dependence of variability on environment.

#### Linear Load-Strain Response

「「「「ないなまます」」「「「ないない」」「「「ないない」」」「「ないない」」」

The second assumption in the Navy certification approach is that of linear load-strain response. This was justified because previous testing of composite structures consistently showed linear load-strain response. However, work in Reference 5 has shown that nonlinear load-strain response can occur under severe hot/wet test conditions. An example, from Reference 5, of nonlinear upper skin load-strain response in a box beam under 250°F/1.3% moisture conditions is shown in It is discussed in more detail in Section 3 of this Figure 60. report.

Figure 17 shows the implications of nonlinear ETW loadstrain response for the Navy certification approach. The RTA test load-strain response shown fulfills all certification re-

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM



FIGURE 17. INFLUENCE OF NONLINEAR LOAD-STRAIN RESPONSE ON THE F/A-18A AND AV-8B LOAD-STRAIN ASSESSMENT CONCEPT.

NAPATALANA ANA MANARATANA MANARATANA MANARATANA MANARATANA MANARATANA MANARATANA MANARATANA MANARATANA MANARAT

#### IS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

## NADC-87042-60

quirements and demonstrates adequate margin for the environmental compensation factor. The ETW load-strain response plotted in Figure 17 represents a worst case scenario. The nonlinear ETW response causes the ETW strain allowable  $\epsilon_{\rm D}^{\rm E}$  to be exceeded before design ultimate load, which leads to failure at less than design ultimate load. This example shows the potential danger in using RTA tests with environmental compensation factors to demonstrate certification compliance. It is important, therefore, in composite structures to conduct environmental tests on realistic subcomponents in order to avoid the scenario described above. The amount and complexity of the environmental testing will be a function of the aircraft service environment. Alternatively, use of composite materials in their nonlinear load-strain response region should be avoided.

Nonlinear load-strain response in composites is induced in ETW environments by loss of resin mechanical properties. Resin-controlled properties, such as compression strength, are the most sensitive to ETW environments. Strength loss and nonlinear load-strain response occur as the glass transition temperature of the material is approached. Good design practice dictates that composites should not be used in this regime. These problems can, therefore, be avoided by setting the Material Operating Limit (MOL) at a safe margin below the glass transition temperature.

The concept of a Material Operating Limit is discussed in detail in Reference 5 and is shown schematically in Figure 18 for an environmentally sensitive property. The decrease in design allowable strain as temperature increases is shown for a constant moisture level. The glass transition temperature (Tg) of the material coincides with a catastrophic rate of strength loss. In order to operate in a safe regime, the MOL should be reduced below the Tg by a safety factor K. This produces the shaded service operational envelope for the material shown in Figure 18. Figure 19 shows how the MOL varies with moisture level, such that a series of MOL's are produced for various

31



ECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

DESIGN ALLOWABLE STRAIN





MATERIAL OPERATIONAL LIMITS.

FAILURE STRAIN MIN VIN

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

moisture levels. If the service environment (temperature/moisture) of the aircraft falls within the MOL, excessive environmental effects can be avoided. If this procedure is adopted, the assumption of linear load-strain response is soundly based.

## Correct Failure Mode Prediction

Use of an environmental compensation factor in an RT/ambient static test, requires the correct prediction of both RTA and ETW failure modes.

A typical application of this approach, would be a RTA test of a wing structure whole critical failure mode is upper skin failure under ETW conditions. In this application, the load-strain response shown in Figure 15 would represent the RTA upper skin load-strain response. The environmental compensation factor  $\Delta p$  (P<sub>DUL</sub> to P<sub>FR</sub>) represents the strength loss at ETW conditions. Extrapolation of the strain data to P<sub>FP</sub> assumes the correctly predicted upper skin failure mode occurs. If an unanticipated ETW failure mode occurs, it is possible that failure could occur at less than DUL.

This is an important observation because prediction of previous composite full-scale static test failure modes has been inadequate. Examples are given in References 5 through 7. In Reference 5, the predicted RTA failure mode was lower skin failure; however, the observed failure mode was failure of the intermediate spar/lower skin cocured joints. Despite this, the wing box sustained 122 percent of DUL at failure.

Reference 6 reported that the failure mode of a Jaguar aircraft composite wing box was different from that predicted with lower complexity 'evel specimen tests. In Reference 7, the failure modes of the three full-scale structural tests from the ACEE program were reviewed. In all three tests, static failure were induced by unanticipated failure modes. The majority of unexpected failure modes discussed in References 5 through 7 can be attributed to the sensitivity of composites to out-of-plane

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

loading. This is caused by their relatively low interlaminar tension and shear strength. The major sources of secondary loads are those induced directly such as fuel pressure loading and those induced indirectly by eccentricities, irregular shapes, stiffness changes, discontinuities and loading in the postbuckling regime. The lesson learned from these experiences is that composite structures are much more sensitive to secondary load induced hot spots than metals. Therefore, great care should be exercised in understanding and accounting for these loads in the design process.

The conclusion from the above discussion on the Navy assumption of predicted failure mode is as follows. The failure modes of full-scale composite structures cannot currently be predicted with great confidence. Therefore, a certification process which assumes correct prediction of a full-scale structural failure mode must carry some degree of risk.

## 2.1.3.2 Fatigue Strength

The Navy approach to fatigue certification of composite structures is similar to that adopted for metals: that is, a twolifetime RTA fatigue test with a severe design spectrum. This approach has proved successful for identifying fatigue hot spots in metallic structures.

The major problem in certifying composite structures is related to their excellent fatigue resistance. This causes their S-N curves to be relatively flat with significantly higher data scatter. Thus, a two-lifetime test on a composite structure demonstrates a lower reliability than for metal structures.

## 2.1.4 <u>Example Reliability Calculations</u>

In this subsection, a static strength and a fatigue life problem are selected to demonstrate the reliability calculation procedure using the scatter factor approach. Composite structure as well as metal structure are used in both examples. TECHNICAL LIBRARY

## 2.1.4.1 <u>Static Strength Reliability</u>

Determine the requirements necessary to demonstrate Bbasis static strength reliability for an (a) all composite, (b) all metal wing structure of a supersonic fighter aircraft. Assume the following:

- (1) A maximum service temperature of 220°F
- (2) Environmental (ETW) knockdown factor  $k^{C} = 1.2$ ,  $k^{M} = 1.0$
- (3) Static strength variability  $\alpha_{s}^{C} = 20, \alpha_{s}^{m} = 25$
- (4) Maximum operating load,  $X = 1.25 \times DLL = 0.833 \times DUL$
- (5) One full-scale test article, n = 1
- (6) Ignore structural response variability, SRV = 0

## Composite Wing

From Figure 9, for  $k^{C} = 1.2$  and B-basis reliability (95 percent confidence, 90 percent reliability), the maximum operating load (X) to static failure load  $(\bar{x})$  ratio is

$$\frac{X}{\bar{x}} = 0.725$$

Required failure load  $\bar{x} = x/0.725$ 

For  $X = 0.833 \times DUL$ :

 $\tilde{x} = \frac{0.833}{0.725}$  DUL = 1.15 x DUL

Therefore, the static test article must exceed 115 percent DUL to demonstrate B-basis reliability at the maximum operating load of 125 percent DLL.

## <u>Metal Wing</u>

For B-basis reliability, the maximum operating load to static failure load ratio for  $\alpha_{\rm S}^{\rm m}$  = 25 and  $k^{\rm m}$  = 1.0 is calculated to be

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

$$\frac{X}{\bar{x}} = 0.894$$

or the required failure load

$$\mathbf{x} = \frac{\mathbf{X}}{0.894}$$

For  $X = 0.833 \times DUL$ 

$$\bar{x} = \frac{0.833}{0.894}$$
 x DUL = 0.932 x DUL

Therefore, the static strength of the test article must exceed 93 percent of DUL to accommodate B-basis reliability at the maximum operating load of 125 percent DLL.

The calculations above show that, for the example cited, the composite wing would have to achieve a 24 percent higher failure load in order to demonstrate the same structural reliability.

Mixed composite/metal structures pose special certifi-These have been discussed in detail in Refercation problems. In this reference, it was shown that because of their ence 8. lower variability in mechanical properties and lower environmental sensitivity, the metal portion of a mixed structure would fail first in a RTA test. Historically, metal structures have exhibited full-scale test failure loads of approximately 105 percent DUL. Thus, for a mixed structure where a metal failure occurs at 105 percent DUL, the reliability of the composite structure will The proven reliability of the composite structure be unknown. (based on a minimum strength of 105 percent DUL) will be only Thus, certification of both parts of a mixed structure to 0.54. the same reliability may be difficult to achieve.

## 2.1.4.2 Fatigue Life Reliability

Determine the requirements necessary to demonstrate Bbasis fatigue life reliability for an (a) all composite, (b) all metallic wing structure of a supersonic fighter aircraft. Assume the following:

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

- (1) Fatigue life variability  $\alpha_{\rm L}^{\rm C} = 1.25$ ,  $\alpha_{\rm S}^{\rm m} = 7.5$
- (2) One full-scale test article, n = 1
- (3) Ignore structural response variability, SRV = 0.

## Composite Wing

The life factor requirement for B-basis reliability for  $\alpha_{\rm L}^{\rm C} = 1.25$  and n = 1 can be obtained from Figure 11, it is 13.6. Thus, in order to demonstrate B-basis reliability at one lifetime, a successful test to 14 lifetimes must be achieved.

## <u>Metal Wing</u>

State States

たいことである

The life factor for  $\alpha_{L}^{m} = 7.5$  and n = 1 is calculated to be 1.5. Thus, a two-lifetime fatigue test is more than adequate to demonstrate B-basis reliability at one lifetime. Actual reliability for a two-lifetime test is 0.99.

The Navy two-lifetime certification test philosophy for composites demonstrates only 0.32 reliability at one lifetime. However, if actual service usage is less severe than the conservative design spectrum, this reliability will be improved. For example, if the actual service loads are 1.13 times lower than the design spectrum a B-basis reliability at one lifetime will be achieved. Thus, the reliability of Navy aircraft will vary and will depend on the conservatism of the severe design spectrum.

The RTA full-scale fatigue test does not account for any environmental fatigue effects. The influence of environment on composite fatigue life has been comprehensively investigated in Reference 5. The issue of environmental test simulation for a composite certification program was addressed. It was shown that the requirements for environmental simulation were closely related to the aircraft temperature spectrum and the relationship between load factor and temperature.

Typical examples, from Reference 5, of these relationships for a fighter aircraft are shown in Figures 20 and 21, respectively. The Mach 2 class aircraft utilized in Reference 5 had a maximum service temperature of 242°F. This design tempera-

LALFACTALLELITCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDERCHARDE









ture was associated with the most critical static design case. However, the fatigue temperature spectrum shown in Figure 20 shows two interesting features. First, the maximum temperature in the fatigue spectrum is 220°F and, second, the aircraft spends less than 200 hours/lifetime at temperatures above 200°F. This represents approximately only 2.5 percent of the total life. The vast majority of the aircraft life is spent at semi-ambient temperatures.

Figure 21 shows the load factor-temperature relationship of the Reference 5 aircraft. Noticeable features of the relationship are (1) the low number of load factor occurrences above  $200^{\circ}F$ , less than 5 percent of the total, (2) the vast majority of 5g to 9g loads (the most fatigue damaging) occur at semi-ambient temperature,  $100^{\circ}F$  to  $175^{\circ}F$ .

Because of the low cumulative time at high temperatures and the semi-ambient temperatures associated with high load factors, it can be concluded that full-scale RTA testing is satisfactory for fatigue certification of this type of fighter aircraft.

The implications of the load-temperature relationships and the test data generated in Reference 5 for environmental test complexity have been discussed in more comprehensive detail in References 9 through 13.

Since the relationship shown in Figures 20 and 21 are considered to be typical for current fighter aircraft, it can be concluded that the Navy philosophy is a reasonable approach for fighter aircraft. It should be noted, however, that, for aircraft which have significant periods of cumulative time at high temperatures and/or combinations of high load factors and high temperature, RTA tests may not be adequate. ETW subcomponent tests may be required under these circumstances.

## 2.2 Load Enhancement Factor Approach

The objective of this approach is to increase the applied loads in the fatigue certification tests so that the same

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

level of reliability can be achieved with a shorter test duration. A schematic showing this approach is shown in Figure 22 where the fatigue life scatter represented is typical of that observed in composites. At one fatigue lifetime a typical residual strength distribution is shown. If the maximum applied load in the fatigue test ( $P_F$ ) is increased to the mean residual strength at one lifetime ( $P_T$ ), then the B-basis residual strength of the structure would be equivalent to the design maximum fatigue stress.

Thus, a successful fatigue test to one lifetime at applied stress  $P_{\rm F}$  or a fatigue test to  $N_{\rm F}$  lifetimes at applied stress  $P_{\rm F}$  would both demonstrate B-basis reliability. In addition, combinations of the load enhancement and fatigue life factors could also be used to demonstrate B-basis life. In order to use this approach with confidence in a certification methodology, a formal relationship between the load enhancement factor (LEF) and the life factor is required.

The fatigue life factor for a B-Basis reliability at one fatigue lifetime can be derived from the basic Weibull distribution, and is given by

$$N_{F} = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_{L}+1}{\alpha_{L}}\right)}{\left[\frac{-\ln\left(0.9\right)}{\chi_{\gamma}^{2}(2n)/2n}\right]^{1/\alpha_{L}}}$$
(6)

where  $N_{\rm F}$  is the life factor for B-basis reliability at one lifetime.

The residual strength distribution at a certain fatigue lifetime can be described as a two-parameter Weibull distribution, as in the static strength distribution. Let  $\alpha_R$  and  $\beta_R$  be the shape and scale parameters of the residual strength distribution distribution and  $P_T$  be the mean residual strength. then  $P_T$  can be written as

## TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60







$$P_{T} = \beta_{R} \left( \frac{\alpha_{R} + 1}{\alpha_{R}} \right)$$
(7)

and the B-basis residual strength is

$${\stackrel{\vee}{N}}_{R} = \beta_{R} \left[ \frac{-\ln(0.9)}{\chi_{\gamma}^{2}(2n)/2n} \right]^{1/\alpha} R$$
(8)

From Figure 22, the load enhancement factor F is defined as

$$F = \frac{P_{\rm T}}{P_{\rm F}} \tag{9}$$

where  $P_{T}$  is the maximum fatigue test load

 $\mathtt{P}_{\mathbf{F}}$  is the maximum design fatigue load.

Since the load enhancement factor approach provides the same reliability as the life factor approach, the factor F can be written as

$$F = \frac{\mu P_{T}}{N_{R}} = \frac{\mu \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_{R}+1}{\alpha_{R}}\right)}{\left[\frac{-\ln(0.9)}{\chi_{\gamma}^{2}(2n)/2n}\right]^{1}/\alpha_{R}}$$
(10)

where  $\mu$  is a coefficient which requires that the load enhancement factor F = 1.0 when the test duration is N<sub>F</sub>.

The probability of survival, at 95 percent confidence level, for a test duration N is given by



$$p = \exp\left[-\left(\frac{N}{\beta_{\rm L}}\right)^{\alpha_{\rm L}}\right]$$
(11)

where  $\stackrel{\vee}{\beta_L}$  is the 95 percent confidence scale parameter.

For the requirement that one lifetime is the B-basis life, then the 95 percent confidence  $\beta$  is given by

$$\hat{\beta}_{L}^{z} = \frac{1}{\left|-\ln(0.9)\right|^{-1}} / \alpha_{L}$$
(12)

and equation (11) becomes

$$p = \exp\left[\ln(0.9)N^{\alpha}L\right]$$
(13)

The conditions  $N = N_F$ , F = 1.0 are used to determine the coefficient  $\mu$ .

$$\mu = \frac{\left[\frac{-\ln\left(0.9\right)N_{\rm F}^{\rm a}{\rm L}}{\chi^{2}_{\gamma}(2n)/2n}\right]^{1/\alpha}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_{\rm R}+1}{\alpha_{\rm R}}\right)}$$
(14)

or in a more general form

$$\mu = \frac{\left[\frac{\alpha_{H}+1}{-\ln(p)N_{F}L}\right]^{1/\alpha_{R}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_{R}+1}{\alpha_{R}}\right)}$$
(15)

NATE OF STREET, STREET,



In equation (15),  $N_F$  is the life factor with p level of reliability at  $\gamma$  level of confidence at one-lifetime. By substituting equation (7) into equation (15), it can be shown that

$$\mu = \frac{\left[\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_{L}+1}{\alpha_{L}}\right)\right]^{\alpha_{L}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_{R}+1}{\alpha_{R}}\right)}$$
(16)

Therefore, the coefficient  $\mu$  is a function of  $\alpha_{\rm L}$  and  $\alpha_{\rm R}$  and is independent of the life factor or the sample size.

Finally, the general form of the load enhancement factor is obtained from equation (10) and is written as

$$F = \frac{\mu_{\Gamma}\left(\frac{\alpha_{R}+1}{\alpha_{R}}\right)}{\left[\frac{-\ln(p)}{x_{\gamma}^{2}(2n)/2n}\right]^{1/\alpha_{R}}}$$
(17)

with

$$p = \exp \left[ \ln (\mathbf{I}) N^{\alpha} \right]$$
(18)

where l is the required reliability at  $\gamma$  level of confidence ( $\gamma = 0.9$  for B-basis and  $\gamma = 0.99$  for A-basis).

Equation (17) together with equation (16, can be used to determine the load enhancement factor. The factor F is computed for different values of  $\alpha_{\rm R}$ , with a fixed  $\alpha_{\rm L}$ , and different values of test duration N.

Figure 23 shows the influence of residual strength scatter,  $\alpha_{\rm R}$ , on the load enhancement factor (LEF) required to demonstrate B-basis and A-basis reliability for a one lifetime test. The relationship is shown for various test replications,

RASERAMPLADERARABARAMELELANGNALLISERANALANAN SARARAN SARA

ECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

Г







n. For typical residual static strength scatter ( $\alpha_{\rm R} = 20$ ), the A-basis and B-basis LEF's are 1.33 and 1.18, respectively, for a one replicate test (n = 1). Figure 24 shows the same relationship as Figure 23 for a two lifetime test. The extra lifetime of fatigue testing reduces the LEF's for A-basis and B-basis reliability to 1.27 and 1.13, respectively.

It can be seen from Figure 22 that there are three ways to demonstrate B-Basis reliability:

- (a) Load enhancement factor
- (b) Life factor
- (c) Combined load enhancement and life factors

Equations (16) through (18) have been used to develop relationships between load enhancement factor and life factor (test duration). The relationships have been determined for various combinations of  $\alpha_{L}$ ,  $\alpha_{R}$  and n, are shown in Figures 25 and 26. These plots can be used to specify test or design life requirements for composite structures.

The Sendeckyj fatigue data analysis method can also be used to calculate load enhancement factors from experimental fatigue data. The Sendeckyj analysis is described in Reference 14 and summarized in Volume I. This method of analysis was used in Reference 15 to obtain load enhancement factors from experimental data.

The mathematical relationship for LEF's developed in this subsection is also used to check the accuracy of LEF's calculated by the Sendeckyj analysis. This is presented in Figure 27, which shows excellent agreement between the two methods. It can, therefore, be concluded that the Sendeckyj analysis provides good estimates of LEF's from experimental data. This indicates that the assumptions made in the Sendeckyj fatigue analysis method are valid.

48

XVXVXVXXXXVXVXVXVX

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY



<u>አስኢሳአስአር አርሱ በአስኢዮጵሳጵና ኢስ**ደም**ክስአር ለስለስአስአስ</u>አ

(TWO LIFETIME FATIGUE TEST)









# LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR

FIGURE 26. INFLUENCE OF TEST DURATION ON A-BASIS LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTORS.

## NADC-87042-60


ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

#### 2.3 Ultimate Strength Approach

The ultimate strength approach uses an increased static strength margin in conjunction with the fatigue threshold to demonstrate adequate fatigue life. This approach is conservative; however, if it is satisfied no fatigue test is necessary. The concept of a fatigue threshold in composites is shown in Figure 28. This figure shows typical composite fatigue behavior, where a fatigue threshold  $\sigma_{\rm TH}$  exists at a relatively high proportion of the static strength. In order to use the ultimate static strength approach it is necessary to design structure such that the maximum spectrum design load (P<sub>MSL</sub>) is no greater than B-basis fatigue threshold stress  $\sigma_{\rm TH}$ . Thus

(19)

$$P_{MSL} < \sigma_{TH}^{B}$$

The relationship between maximum spectrum load  $(P_{MSL})$  and design ultimate load  $(P_{DUL})$  is a variable which depends on the spectrum type and shape (e.g., wing or tail). Thus we have

$$\frac{P_{MSL}}{P_{DUL}} = X$$

From Figure 28 we can define  $\sigma_{\rm TH}$  and as follows:

$$\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M} / \sigma_{\rm S}^{\rm M} = Y \text{ and } \sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm B} / \sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M} = Z$$
 (21)

or

$$\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm B} = Y Z \sigma_{\rm S}^{\rm M}$$
(22)

From equation (19) the requirement becomes

$$P_{MSL} \leq YZ \sigma_{S}^{M}$$
(23)



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM



FIGURE 28. COMPOSITE FATIGUE LIFE THRESHOLD APPROACH.

ECHNICAL

or

$$P_{\text{DUL}} \leq \frac{YZ}{X} \sigma_{\text{S}}^{\text{M}}$$
(24)

In order to utilize this approach it is necessary to establish the relationship between the B-basis fatigue threshold and mean static strength. This ratio will be a function of the spectrum shape, failure mode and test environment.

The extensive fatigue data base in Reference 16 has been analyzed to determine the relationship between B-Basis fatigue threshold stress  $\sigma_{TH}^B$  and mean fatigue threshold stress  $\sigma_{TH}^M$ . For each S-N data set in Reference 16, the ratio of  $\sigma_{TH}^B/\sigma_{TH}^M$  has been determined using the Sendeckyj analysis. The influence of R-ratio and loading mode on this ratio were determined. In addition, the fatigue data scatter analysis conducted in Volume I is used to increase the  $\sigma_{TH}^B/\sigma_{TH}^M$  data base. The total data base is then used to establish design knockdown factors for the determination of a B-basis fatigue life threshold from a mean fatigue life threshold. The results of this analysis are discussed below.

The equivalent static strength distribution determined by the Sendeckyj analysis can be used to calculate the ratio of B-basis fatigue threshold  $\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm B}$  to mean fatigue life  $\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M}$ . The relationship is

$$\frac{\sigma_{\text{TH}}^{\text{B}}}{\sigma_{\text{TH}}^{\text{M}}} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{e}}^{\text{B}}}{\sigma_{\text{e}}^{\text{M}}} = Z$$
(25)

The fatigue data in Reference 16 termed Navy data were analyzed using the Sendeckyj analysis to determine values of the  $\sigma_e^B/\sigma_e^M$  ratio. Figure 29 shows the influence of R-ratio and loading mode on the B-basis/mean life fatigue threshold ratio  $\sigma_e^B/\sigma_e^M$ . It can be seen that R-ratio has a small influence on this life ratio. R = -1 loading snows the lowest B-basis/mean life threshold ratio. However, the influence of R-ratio is



56

in.

. LIBRARY

ECHNICAL

different for the B-basis value of the  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  ratio. Figures 29 and 30 show that the spectrum loading  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  ratios are slightly higher than for constant amplitude loading. The observed differences in the  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  ratio in Figures 29 and 30 are not statistically significant. Thus the values of  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  from the Navy data set were pooled for statistical analysis. The results are presented in Figure 31, which shows that a modal  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  value equal to 0.895 was obtained.

The extensive data base in Reference 15 was also used to determine  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  values through the Sendeckyj analysis. The determined  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  values are also pooled for statistical analysis. The results are presented in Figure 32, which show that the modal value of  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  is equal to 0.905. A comparison of the  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  distributions for the Navy and Baseline data sets is shown in Figure 33. It can be seen that the distributions are similar; however, the Baseline data set exhibits a larger spread in  $\sigma_{e}^{B}/\sigma_{e}^{M}$  values. This was anticipated because the Baseline data set contained a wider range of materials, lay-ups and test conditions.

Figure 34 shows analysis results for the combined  $\sigma_e^B/\sigma_e^M$  data set (Baseline and Navy data pooled). The modal value of  $\sigma_e^B/\sigma_e^M$  is equal to 0.895 for the combined data set. Table 1 summarizes the analysis results for the Navy, Baseline and combined data sets.

Following the philosophy adopted for static strength and fatigue life scatter, the modal value of  $\sigma_e^B/\sigma_e^M$  equal to 0.895 will be used for evaluation of the ultimate strength certification approach.

In order to utilize the ultimate strength approach it is also necessary to determine the ratio of the mean fatigue threshold  $\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M}$  to the mean static strength  $\sigma_{\rm S}^{\rm M}$ . The extensive fatigue data in Reference 16 are used to determine the influence of R-ratio, upper wing skin spectrum loading and specimen geometry on the ratio  $\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M}/\sigma_{\rm S}^{\rm M}$ . Figures 35 through 37 show the influence of R-ratio and spectrum loading on the  $\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M}/\sigma_{\rm S}^{\rm M}$  ratio

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM



LOADING MODE

FIGURE 30. INFLUENCE OF LOADING MODE ON THE B-BASIS TO MEAN LIFE FATIGUE THRESHOLD RATIO,  $\sigma_{a}^{B} / \sigma_{e}^{M}$ .

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM



ľ

DISTRIBUTION OF B-BASIS TO MEAN FATIGUE LIFE THRESHOLDS FOR NAVY DATA. FIGURE 31.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM



AL LIBRARY

ECHNICAL



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM



FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCES (% TOTAL)



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

BBOTT

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

# TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF THE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE B-BASISTO MEAN FATIGUE LIFE THRESHOLD RATIO VALUES.

-

DATA SET	B-BASIS/MEAN FATIGUE LIFE THRESHOLD $\sigma_{e}^{B} / \sigma_{e}^{M}$			
	MEAN	MODAL	B-BASIS	
NAVY	0.890	0.895	0.840	
BASELINE	0.891	0.905	0.838	
COMBINED	0.886	0.895	0.824	



ECHNICAL LIBRARY

NADC-87042-60



INFLUENCE OF FATIGUE LOADING MODE ON NORMALIZED FATIGUE THRESHOLD FOR HIGH LOAD TRANSFER SPECIMENS IN REFERENCE 16. FIGURE 36.





CHNICAL LIBRAR

for three joint types. The data for all three joint types show a similar trend. As R-ratio increases from -1 to  $-\infty$  the threshold ratio increases; however, spectrum fatigue threshold ratios are higher than those determined for constant amplitude loading. Thus, it can be concluded that fatigue testing under constant amplitude loading is conservative relative to upper wing skin spectrum fatigue loading. The data for the three joints are pooled and the results are shown in Figure 38. As expected, the pooled data show the same influences of R-ratio and spectrum loading.

The spectrum fatigue loading data in Reference 16 are analyzed in more detail because of its relevance to certification testing. The influence of joint geometry, lay-up, spectrum loading type and test environment are presented in Table 2 and Figure 39. Twenty-three spectrum loading S-N curves are used in the analysis. The results show that high load transfer specimens had lower normalized fatigue threshold than intermediate load transfer and complex specimens. This is probably due to the different failure mode observed in the high load transfer specimens, which was hole wear. The normalized fatigue threshold for these specimens is based on 0.025 inch hole wear, which probably gives a conservative estimate of the fatigue threshold. Figure 39 also shows that the decreasing laminate stiffners lowers the normalized fatigue threshold value. This reflects the higher fatigue sensitivity of the (16/80/4) lay-up. The influence of spectrum loading type on normalized fatigue thresholds is shown to be negligible in Figure 39. This suggests that composite spectrum fatigue life is dominated by the peak compression load and is relatively independent of load reversal severity. Table 2 shows that the normalized fatigue threshold is higher for the ETW environment relative to the RTD environment. This implies that the fatigue degradation rate relative to static strength is lower in the ETW environment. The overall mean value of the normalized fatigue threshold for spectrum loading is determined to be 0.71. This value and the scatter analyses for  $\sigma_{TH}^B/\sigma_{TH}^M$  (described earlier) and for  $\sigma_{TH}^M/\sigma_{TH}^S$  are used to determine the fatigue threshold



INFLUENCE OF FATIGUE LOADING MODE ON NORMALIZED FATIGUE THRESHOLD FOR ALL SPECIMENS IN REFERENCE 16. FIGURE 38.

NADC-87042-60



٠

4

-

NADC-87042-60

# TABLE 2. INFLUENCE OF TEST VARIABLES ON NORMALIZED FATIGUETHRESHOLDS UNDER SPECTRUM LOADING.

COMPARISON	NORMALIZED FATIGUE THRESHOLD $\sigma^{M}/\sigma^{M}$ TH S	
ROOTTST	0.72	
FOLDTST	0.70	
INT. L/T	0.75	
HIGH L/T	0.59	
COMPLEX	0.80	
(48/48/4)	0.83	
(16/80/4)	0.67	
RTD	0.66	
ETW	0.75	
OVERALL MEAN	0.7 1	



NORMALIZED FATIGUE THRESHOLDS FOR SPECTRUM LOADING.

RERERERERERERERERERERERERERERERERE

## NADC-87042-60

LIBRARY

ECHNICAL

behavior for upper wing spectrum loading. The results are shown in Figure 40. The B-basis fatigue threshold is determined to be 63 percent of the mean static strength. That is, if the maximum spectrum load is set to  $\leq 63$  percent of the mean static strength a B-basis fatigue threshold will be established statistically.

Once  $\sigma_{TH}^{M}$  and  $\sigma_{TH}^{B}$  have been established statistically, as in Figure 40, the static failure load required to guarantee a B-basis fatigue threshold (no fatigue test) is calculated as follows:

No fatigue test is required if:

rar ray frank fran frank frank frank

Static Failure Load =  $\sigma_{S}^{M} \ge \left(\frac{P_{MSL}}{P_{DUL}} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{S}^{M}}{\sigma_{TH}^{M}} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{TH}^{M}}{\sigma_{TH}^{B}}\right) \cdot P_{DUL}$ 

Example calculations for RTD test conditions, a (48/48/4) laminate and F-18 upper wing spectrum, are presented in Table 3. The calculations show that the static failure load requirements for no fatigue test range from 122 percent to 187 percent of design ultimate load.

The influence of spectrum type on the static failure load for B-basis fatigue reliability is shown in Figure 41. These data show that the static failure load requirement ranges from 78 percent to 129 percent DUL. The significant differences in the static overload requirements for the three spectra are caused mainly by the significant differences in their  $P_{\rm MSL}/F_{\rm DUL}$ ratios. These are:

PMSL/PDUL	
0.489	
0.651	
0.814	

It should be noted that the  $\sigma_{TH}^{M}/\sigma_{S}^{M}$  values used for the calculations shown in Figure 41 were typical values. Figure 41 is not, therefore, a design chart.

CARTER AND CARTER CONCERNMENT AND CONTRACTOR CONT

**ENGRUPURGEORIE** 

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM



STATISTICAL FATIGUE THRESHOLD FOR UPPER WING SKIN SPECTRUM LOADING. FIGURE 40.

STATIC FAILURE LOAD REQUIREMENTS FOR NO FATIGUE TEST OF A (48/48/4) LAMINATE IN A RTD ENVIRONMENT. TABLE 3.

		di secondari da secondari de sec
STATIC FAILURE LOAD REQUIREMENT % DUL	122 125 142	123 187 120
	0.885	0.885
Q TH S S M	0.78 0.76 0.67	0.82 0.54 0.84
PDUL	0.84	0.894
SPECIMEN	OPEN HOLE INT. L/T HIGH L/T	OPEN HOLE INT. L/T COMPLEX
SPECTRUM	ROOTTST	FOLDTST

### NADC-87042-60

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

TECHNICAL LIBRARY



FOR B-BASIS FATIGUE RELIZBILITY.

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

#### 2.4 <u>Change in Spectrum Approach</u>

The problem of mixed composite/metal fatigue testing was summarized in October 1981 by Dr. Someroff of NAVAIR. Figure 42 presents his concern, which was that a two lifetime test did not adequately interrogate composite parts for potential hot-This occurred because composites had considerably higher spots. average fatigue lives and exhibit higher life scatter than met-Someroff suggested changing the test spectrum to reduce als. composite fatigue life, while maintaining metal fatigue life constant. The ultimate aim would be to make the B-basis stresslife plots overlap for both materials. In principle, this can be accomplished by adding extra high loads to the fatigue spectrum. These loads could significantly reduce composite fatigue life, but maintain metal fatigue life at a constant value because the increased damage accumulation could be cancelled out by increased retardation effects in the metal parts.

The practical situation for mixed structures is more complex than envisaged by Someroff, as shown in Figure 43. Someroff assumed in Figure 42 that the stress-life curves for metals and composites had approximately the same slope. However, Figure 43 shows that this is not the case. Composites have considerably flatter S-N curves. This makes the change in spectrum approach more difficult to apply. The data in Figure 43 are shown for an F-18 wing root spectrum. For each material, sensitivity to the most critical spectrum is shown; that is, compression dominated for composites and tension dominated for Figure 44 shows that this characteristic difference metals. exists for three widely different spectrum types. The curves shown in Figure 44 are analytical. A comparison of the three spectra is shown in Figure 45. All analytical predictions were made using the methods described in References 17 through 19.

Figure 46 shows the influence of overloads on composite fatigue life for an F-18 wing root spectrum. Spectrum overloads in the range 110-120 percent of the maximum spectrum load were selected, with occurrences of these loads ranging 10 to 100 per



121-25-25-35

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

NADC-87042-60

VEAT LIMIT STREW

SCHEMATIC SUMMARY OF MIXED STRUCTURE TESTING PROBLEMS (A. SOMEROFF NAVAIR, OCTOBER 1981). FIGURE 42.



#### NADC-87042-60





AL LIBRARY

INFLUENCE OF SPECTRUM TYPE ON PREDICTED COMPOSITE

AND METAL FATIGUE LIFE.

FIGURE 44.

TECHNICAL

S N BANK

一般のからいため



LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL



NARAN KARARARANA KARA KARANA KARANA KARANA

AL LIBRARY

TECHNICA



ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRAR

aircraft lifetime. The data in Figure 46 show that overloads significantly reduce fatigue life for a constant maximum spectrum stress level (100 percent) for the allowable maximum spectrum stress level for a constant fatigue lifetime. This effect is observed for all three F-18 spectra type and is summarized in Figure 47. It can be seen that the influence of overloads on composite fatigue life is similar for all three spectrum types.

The overloads shown in Figure 47 are also checked for influence on metallic fatigue life. For all overtheir load/occurrence combinations, metal fatigue life remains within approximately +20 percent of the no overload baseline spectrum life. Thus, it is demonstrated analytically that overloads can be used to significantly reduce composite fatigue life, without significantly changing metal fatigue life. Figure 48 summarizes how overloads change the B-basis stress-life relationships for composites and metals. B-basis stress-life relationships are determined from mean values using the appropriate scatter factors for each material. These are determined from the Task I data analysis (see Volume I). For the metal data in Figure 48, the B-basis overload stress-life relationships is approximately equal to the B-basis baseline stress-life relationship. The Bbasis overload stress-life relationship for composites includes the effects of both overload life sensitivity and increased fatigue life scatter (compared to aluminum). The data in Figure 48 show that the overloads significantly reduce the differences in life between metals and composites. However, the composite stress-life relationship remains very flat relative to the metal Thus, a common B-basis life for both fatique behavior. materials is only established at one stress level (approximately 35 Ksi). At one fatigue lifetime, the allowable composite fatigue stress level is still significantly higher than that for aluminum.

It is, therefore, concluded that overloads can only cause an intersection (not overlap) of composite and metal Bbasis stress-life relationships. This occurs because overloads

81

### TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60



FIGURE 47. INFLUENCE OF SPECTRUM TYPE AND OVERLOADS ON COMPOSITE FATIGUE LIFE.

AL LIBRARY NADC-87042-60

ECHNICAL



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

only reduce composite fatigue life. They do not alter the fatigue damage accumulation mechanisms, and thus cannot increase the slope of the S-N curve.

This observation does not necessarily limit the application of the overload approach to mixed structure fatigue testing. The influences of overloads on composite fatigue life (shown in Figure 46) can be used to calculate equivalent B-basis load enhancement factors. For example, Figure 25 shows that the B-basis LEF for a two lifetime fatigue test with n = 1 is 1.128. This value can be used to determine the number and magnitude of overloads which give a 1.128 times reduction in the allowable 100 percent stress level at two lifetimes. Thus, the overloads can be used to determine an equivalent test to the full load enhancement approach (all loads) for composites, without changing metal Thus, the disadvantage of the full LEF approach fatique life. (Section 2.2) for mixed structure is overcome. Figure 49 summarizes the number and level of spectrum overloads required to demonstrate equivalent test severity to the full load enhancement For the example discussed above, B-basis composite approach. reliability for a two lifetime test can be achieved by using approximately ten 120 percent overloads/lifetime or approximately thirty-five 115 percent overloads/lifetime.

Thus, the change in spectrum approach can be used to provide demonstration of B-basis reliability for both composite and metals in a mixed structure without causing over severe metallic test. This significantly reduces the problems of mixed structure fatigue testing. It should be noted that the number and extent of overloads required will be spectrum type and stress-level dependent. In addition, transport or bomber type spectrum may be less amenable to this approach because of their relatively low number of high loads/lifetime. The promise of this approach should be explored in more detail and verified experimentally.

2.5 <u>Summary of Certification Approach Evaluation</u>

The evaluation of the Navy certification approach has



ì



ECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

shown that, in general, it is soundly based. In particular, it strikes a good balance between the technical requirements of the tests and cost effectiveness. For static testing, the main area of concern is the assumed ability to predict full-scale structure failure modes. Published data on full-scale composite static tests have shown that failure mode predictions are frequently incorrect. For fatigue testing, the two-lifetime fatigue test led to a concern about demonstrated fatigue reliability due to the high fatigue life scatter observed in composites. This is offset somewhat by the severe design spectra used. However, the degree of severity of the design spectra relative to the actual service spectra is uncertain at the time of certification.

Evaluation of the ultimate strength approach has established criteria for omission of a composite fatigue test. The overload requirement is shown to be a function of the fatigue spectrum type. specimen configuration, lay-up and test In general, the ultimate strength approach has environment. significant potential for reducing design development fatigue test requirements for composites.

The evaluation of the enhanced loads approach has shown that it has a sound theoretical basis and can be used with confidence for certification testing. However, some practical limits of this approach may exist. First, for asymmetric spectra, the degree of load enhancement may be limited because of a requirement not to exceed ultimate load. Second, for mixed structure, the enhanced load approach will provide an excessively severe fatigue test for the metal parts.

It is shown that the change in spectrum approach could not be used to overlap composite and metal B-basis stress-life relationships. This cannot be achieved because of the significant differences in the slopes of their stress-life relationships. However, it is shown that overloads can be introduced which permit demonstration of B-basis test reliability for both composite and metal parts in a mixed structure. This is achieved without making the test overly severe for metallic structures.

シストの目的に、シンドンの目的でもようなな

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

#### SECTION 3

REPORT OF COMPANY

#### METHODOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The high cost of full-scale structural test prohibits generation of a sufficient number of data for statistical analy-Thus, for a meaningful interpretation of full scale strucsis. tural tests, a building-block approach is developed for certification testing of composite structures. This approach fully utilizes coupon, element, subcomponent and component level test data so that a limited number of full-scale structural test data can be interpreted statistically. The number of tests decreases from the coupon level to the component level. A relatively large number of tests is required at the coupon level to establish the data scatter and B-basis statistics for different loading modes, failure modes and environments for both static and fatigue tests. A smaller number of tests is required at the element and subcomponent level to determine the failure mode interaction and a sufficient number of component tests to demonstrate the variability in structure response. This information is then used for interpretation of the full-scale structural test data. The number and types of test specimens required for the building block approach are specified in Section 5. The variability in structural response is discussed in the following paragraphs.

#### 3.1 <u>Concept of Structural Response Variability (SRV)</u>

In structural tests, aside from the scatter in the basic material properties, other factors will contribute to the scatter in structural response. The contributing factors (above the coupon level) are structural geometry, design tolerances, manufacturing and material nonuniformity and loading conditions. Because of this scatter in structural response, unexpected "hotspot" failure can occur during static structural tests. Figure 50 shows schematically a potential static "hot-spot" failure in relation to the scatter in material strength and structural response. The shaded area where the two distributions intersect


ł



FIGURE 50. SCHEMATIC OF "HOT-SPOT" FAILURE IN RELATION TO THE SCATTER IN STRENGTH AND IN STRUCTURAL

RESPONSE FOR A STATIC TEST.

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

represents the probability of failure at a certain location of the structure under the applied load  $P_1$ . In order to interpret the data statistically, both the material strength and structural response distributions must be obtained for different locations on the structure. This cannot be achieved from a limited number of full-scale structural tests.

The building block approach requires utilization of coupon level tension and compression static test data to establish the basic material strength distribution and element combination and subcomponent level test data to establish the structural response distribution. The structural reliability or the probability of structural failure (hot-spot failure) is then calculated from these two distributions as follows:

Using a joint probability function to combine the influence of material static strength scatter and the SRV, the probability of survival of a structure under a static load level of  $P_1$  is given by

$$S(P_1) = \int_0^\infty F(P_1) \cdot p(\sigma) d\sigma$$
(26)

where:

 $F(P_1)$  is the survivability of the structure at load level  $P_1$  considering strength scatter only

 $p(\sigma)$  is the probability of occurrence that the actual stress level in the structure is  $\sigma$  due to SRV.

The survivability function  $F(P_1)$  describes the static strength due to material scatter only. Therefore, the Weibull parameters obtained from the static strength data analysis in Task I can be used in Equation (26).

The scatter in structural response is a result of several factors, as discussed earlier. The proportion that each of these factors contribute to the total scatter in structural response is difficult to determine. The use of strain gages to measure structural response gives the combined effects of these

factors. To utilize the strain data in evaluating the scatter in structural response, a combined distribution, such as  $p(\sigma)$  in Equation 26 is necessary.

The form of the distribution function  $p(\sigma)$  can be assumed as a normal distribution or a two-parameter Weibull distribution. Within the range of observed SRV's for static testing, the two distribution yield approximately the same results when used in Equation (26). Numerical integration of Equation (26) has been carried out to evaluate the influence of SRV on the structural reliability. The results of these calculations are shown in Figure 51 through 54.

The influence of SRV on the design allowables depends on the static strength variability, which is characterized by the the static strength distribution Weibull shape parameter  $(\alpha_s)$ , and the sample size. It can be seen from Figures 51 and 52 that additional reduction factors (from the baseline values) on the design allowables are required to accommodate the structural response variability. However, within the range of the SRV values determined in Section 3.2, the additional reduction factor is fairly small. The numerical values of the reduction factors for mean and modal SRV with a single article test are given in Table 4. The B- and A-basis knockdown factors at mean and modal SRV values for various values of  $\alpha_{\rm S}$  are shown in Figures 53 and 54. In comparing these results with the baseline knockdown factors (no SRV), it is seen that the design allowables are dominated by the static strength variability, and that SRV is a secondary consideration.

The influence of structural response variability and the 95 percent reliability (R) for the baseline B- and A-basis design allowables is shown in Figures 55 and 56. The structural reliability decreases as the SRV increases (decreasing  $\alpha_{\rm SRV}$ ). The influence of SRV on reliability does not depend on the sample size but depends on the static strength variability  $\alpha_{\rm S}$ . At high levels of static strength variability (low  $\alpha_{\rm S}$ ), the influence of SRV on reliability, R, is small. However, at low levels of



łı

TECHNICAL LIBRARY



ALTERNAL

FIGURE 52. INFLUENCE OF SRV ON A-BASIS DESIGN ALLOWABLES,  $\alpha_{8}$  = 20.0.

### TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60



INFLUENCE OF STATIC STRENGTH VARIABILITY ON THE B-BASIS DESIGN ALLOWABLE AT MEAN AND MODAL SRV. FIGURE 53.

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

ŝ



INFLUENCE OF STATIC STRENGTH VARIABILITY ON THE A-BASIS DESIGN ALLOWABLE AT MEAN AND MODAL SRV FIGURE 54.

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

### TABLE 4. INFLUENCE OF SRV ON KNOCKDOWN FACTORS, n = 1.

.

	NO SRV	MEAN SRV	MODAL SRV	
a <sub>s</sub>	œ	17.0	19.0	
cv	0	0.071	0.065	
a <sub>m</sub>	B-BASIS	KNOCKDOWN FACTOR		
8.8 (B-BASIS)	0.723	0.711	0.713	
20.0 (MODAL)	0.869	0.842	0.846	
23.2 (MEAN)	0.886	0.855	0.860	
30.0 (UPPER)	0.911	0.874	0.879	
	A-BASIS	KNOCKDOWN	FACTOR	
8.8 (B-BASIS)	0.553	0.544	0.545	
20.0 (MODAL)	0.773	0.746	0.750	
23.2 (MEAN)	0.801	0.775	0.770	
30.0 (UPPER)	0.842	0.803	0.810	

TECHNICAL LIBRARY





Ň

#### NADC-87042-60



INFLUENCE OF STRUCTURAL RESPONSE VARIABILITY ON THE A-BASIS STRUCTURAL RELIABILITY. FIGURE 56.

97



static strength variability (high  $\alpha_s$ ), the reliability decreases significantly as SRV increases. This can be seen in Figure 55. For B-basis reliability (95 percent confidence, 90 percent probability), at  $\alpha_s = 8.8$  the reliability reduces from 0.90 for  $\alpha_{SRV} = \infty$  to 0.863 for  $\alpha_{SRV} = 10.0$ . Whereas for  $\alpha_s = 30.0$ , the reliability reduces to 0.655. Similar results can be observed for A-basis reliability shown in Figure 56.

#### 3.2 <u>Structural Response Variability Data</u>

The extensive test data generated in Reference 5 have been used as a strain gage data source. The building block approach used in Reference 5 for the wing structure is shown in Figure 57. The design development test specimens are characterized by four levels of structural complexity. The fifth level of complexity is assigned to the full-scale wing component. Further details of the wing specimens are discussed in Section 4. Table 5 summarizes the load-strain data available from Reference 5.

#### 3.2.1 Determination of Structural Response Variability

To determine the structural response variability from the strain data, three or more nominally identical specimen tests are required. A typical data set from Reference 5 is shown in Figure 58. Strain data at the critical locations obtained from the structural test are normalized with respect to the mean strain at each load level. The distribution of the normalized strain is then fitted to a normal or Weibull distribution to evaluate the scatter in structural response. It should be noted that only the scatter of the structural response is of interest in this evaluation. The actual magnitude of the strain is not important. The structural response variability is characterized by the coefficient of variation in a normal distribution and by the shape parameter in the Weibull distribution. The combined structural response variability can then be obtained by integrating equation (26) with the given probability distributions.

98



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

1.

1

1000000000

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

BUILDING BLOCK APPROACH FOR THE WING STRUCTURE IN THE 5). COMPOSITE WING/FUSELAGE PROGRAM (REFERENCE 57. FIGURE



## TABLE 5. SUMMARY OF STRAIN GAGE DATA AVAILABLE FROM The composite wing/fuselage program (reference 5).

λ.		NUMBER OF SPECIMENS						
PLEX	SPECIMEN	ST/	TIC	RESIDUAL STATIC STRENGTH				
		RT/AMBIENT	250 <sup>0</sup> F/WET	RT/AMBIENT	250 <sup>0</sup> F/WET			
1	COMPRESSION COUPONS TENSION COUPONS	23 9	23 9	23 9	23 9			
2	WE-2 WEC-1	3 3	3 3	3 6	3 6			
3	WEC-3	3	3	6	6			
4	WS-1 WS-2	2 1	3 2	 1	5 1			
5	WCC-1	1	1	1				





こうかく シンクロー アンド・シング いたい しょうかん しょう かんかい たんかい たんかん ひかん しょうかん かんかん かんかん かんかん 日本 かんかん ない かんかん 日本 かんかん かい

FIGURE 58. TYPICAL APPLIED LOAD STRAIN RESPONSE FROM A WS-1 SUBCOMPONENT TEST (REFERENCE 5).

ሚመስመራ የሚመረግ የሚያስት እንዲሆን የሚያስት እንዲሆን እንዲሆን እንዲሆን እንዲሆን የሚያስት እንዲሆን እንዲሆን እንዲሆን እንዲሆን እንዲሆን እንዲሆን እንዲሆን እንዲሆን እንዲ

#### 3.2.2 Structural Response Variability Analysis Results

The results of the structural response variability analysis are presented in Table 6. The location of the strain gages on each specimen are given in the table.

For analysis purposes, the load-strain data are separated into three categories: RTA, ETW and the combined RTA and ETW data. In each category, static and residual static strength data are pooled. This significantly increased the amount of load-strain data available for analysis. Residual static strength load-strain data are included because these tests showed no fatigue degradation and exhibited no significant losses in static strength after two lifetimes of fatigue loading.

In general, the load-strain response of all specimens was essentially linear to failure. A typical example is presented in Figure 59, which shows the ETW lower skin load-strain response of the WS-1 box beam. Figures 60 through 64 show the upper skin load-strain response of the wing component close to the root rib. These data also show essentially linear loadstrain response. The ETW upper skin load-strain response of the WS-1 box beam presented in Figure 60 shows nonlinear load-strain response and high structural response variability. The nonlinear load-strain response can be attributed to the severe test environment (250°F/1.3% moisture). This is the only load-strain data analyzed in Table 6, which exhibited significant nonlinear loadstrain response. It should be noted that this type of loadstrain response is not accounted for in the Navy scatter factor approach to certification.

The influence of specimen complexity on structural response variability is presented in Table 6 and summarized in Figures 65 through 67. The data show that structural response variability does not increase as specimen complexity increases. This observation holds true for the RTA, ETW and combined RTA/ETW load-strain data sets. In fact, the structural response variability of the wing component (complexity level 5) is less than the overall average for the RTA and combined RTA/ETW data sets.

102

5
<u> </u>
2
ш́
S
S
≻.
Ā
Ż
<
Σ
E
Ę
2
Ā
>
ш
5
ő
ă
S
2
_
A
Ĕ
10
ပ်
2
Ĩ
Ś
ø
ш
2
Ā
H

NSE	C.V.Z	5.1 7.9 3.5 5.5 5.3	1.9	7.0 8.6 12.2	9.0 13.4 7.1 6.6 6.6	8.1	6 8 5 5 7 9 5 7 4 5 5 7 9 5 7 9 5 7 9 5 7 9 5 7 9 5 7 7 9 5 7 7 9 5 7 7 7 7
IN RESPO	+ v. u	39 11 35 10 10 12	6 10	10 10 11	0 00 M 00 00 M M	. m	<b></b>
IN LOAD-STRA	u c.v.z	10.4 10.4 3.6 3.8 3.8 2.6	- 13.7	5.3 4.9 8.5	2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5	6.3	
IABILITY	е 13	19 15 6 8 8 8 8 8	1 4	440	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	7 77	
RUCTURAL VAR	TA C.V.Z	3.4 3.4 3.4 3.1 1.4	1.9 7.0	7.6 9.7 13.8	13.1 10.8 8.9 4.9 11.6 11.6	P. 1	3.9 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0
STI	2 E	20 6 6 6 6 6	<b>ب</b> ب	مومو	~~~~~~~~~	n	~~~~~
	CAGE LOCATION	CAGE SECT TON	UPPER SKIN Spar Web	LOWER SKIN UPPER SKIN SPAR WEB	JUPPER SKIN	RIB WEB	UPPER SKIN
	GAGE NO.	1 1 1 1 1 1	- 14	7Α 8Α 15(€δ)	19 21R1 21R2 23 23 23 22R1 22R1	74 11	22 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 2
	SPECIMEN COMPLEXITY LEVEL		7 7	en e		4	Ś
	FAILURE MODES	NET SECTION AT FASTENER HOLE	FASTENER HOLE SPAR WEB FUEL DRAIN HOLE	. COCURED JOINT . UPPER SKIN	. UPPER SKIN . LOMER SKIN . COCURED JOINT	. RIB WEB	. COCURED JOINT . UPPER SKIN
	SPECIMEN DESCRIPTION	Upper Wing Skin Coupon Lower Wing Skin Coupon Upper Wing Skin Coupon Lower Wing Skin Coupon Lower Wing Skin Coupon Upper Wing Skin Coupon	Upper Wing Skin/Spar Bolted Joint Element Lower Wing Skin/Intermediate Spar Cocured Joint Element	Combination Wing Intermediate Spar/Rib Joint Element Combination	Wing Outboard Fuel Bay Subcomponent	Wing Root Rib Aft Trunnion Subcomponent	Wing Component
	SPECIMEN	4.0-1 4.0-1 4.0-2 4.0-3 4.0-4 4.0-5 4.0-5 4.0-6	WE-2 WEC-1	WEC-3	I-SM	HS-2	WCC-1

# TECHNICAL LIBRARY

NADC-87042-60







FIGURE 60. WS-1 UPPER SKIN ETW LOAD-STRAIN RESPONSE.



NADC-87042-60



UPPER SKIN STRAIN HIN/IN

FIGURE 61. WCC-1 UPPER SKIN LOAD-STRAIN RESPONSE AT WING STATION 48 (GAGE NUMBER 25) FOR LOAD CASE 130.



FIGURE 62. WCC-1 UPPER SKIN LOAD-STRAIN RESPONSE AT WING STATION 48 (GAGE NUMBER 30) FOR LOAD CASE 130.



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM



FIGURE 63. WCC-1 UPPER SKIN LOAD-STRAIN RESPONSE AT WING STATION 48 (GAGE NUMBER 32) FOR LOAD CASE 130.



UPPER SKIN STRAIN HIN/IN

FIGURE 64. WCC-1 UPPER SKIN LOAD-STRAIN RESPONSE AT WING STATION 48 (GAGE NUMBER 40) FOR LOAD CASE 130.

HIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60



.

FIGURE 65. INFLUENCE OF SPECIMEN COM LEXITY LEVEL ON RTA STRUCTURAL RESPONSE VARIABILITY.



FIGURE 66. INFLUENCE OF SPECIMEN COMPLEXITY LEVEL ON ETW STRUCTURAL RESPONSE VARIABILITY.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60



FIGURE 67. INFLUENCE OF SPECIMEN COMPLEXITY LEVEL ON COMBINED RTA AND ETW STRUCTURAL RESPONSE VARIABILITY.



FIGURE 68. INFLUENCE OF ENVIRONMENT ON STRUCTURAL RESPONSE VARIABILITY.

## TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60

The observed differences between the individual structural response variability at each complexity level and the overall mean for all complexity levels are not statistically significant. Consequently, it can be concluded that structural response variability is independent of specimen complexity. This is an encouraging observation for the certification of full-scale structure. It is interesting to note that the scatter in static strength data in Reference 5 was also found to be independent of specimen complexity.

Figure 68 shows the influence of environment on structural response variability. It can be seen that structural response variability is also independent of test environment. The structural response variability of wing component skin strain distributions is shown in Figures 69 through 71. A comparison of structural response variability of the load-strain distributions is shown in Table 7. The results show that the structural response variability in strain distribution is similar to that observed previously for load-strain response.

The WCC-1 structural response variability results presented in Table 6 were determined for static loading ca 130. This is the most critical loading case for the wing. Pr: ~ to the five static and fatigue tests conducted on the wing component specimens in Reference 5, load-strain surveys were conducted to limit load for five critical loading cases. These are shown in Table 8. All the load-strain surveys were conducted u ær RT/ambient conditions. Table 9 summarizes the wing component tests where these RT/Ambient load-strain surveys were conducted prior to test. The influence of loading case on structural response variability are shown in Figures 72 through 76 for a strain gage located on the upper skin close to the root rib.

Table 10 and Figure 77 present a summary of the influence of loading case on structural response variability. The results in Table 10 show that the influence of loading case on structural response variability is similar for all four strain gage locations. In addition, Figure 77 shows that the loading

109





FIGURE 69. WCC-1 DESIGN ULTIMATE LOAD LOWER SKIN STRAIN DISTRIBUTION AT WING STATION 43 FOR LOAD CASE 130.



FIGURE 70. WCC-1 DESIGN ULTIMATE LOAD LOWER SKIN STRAIN DISTRIBUTION AT WING STATION 85 FOR LOAD CASE 130.



ECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60





TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

# TABLE 7. COMPARISON OF WCC-1 LOAD-STRAIN AND STRAIN DISTRIBUTION STRUCTURAL RESPONSE VARIABILITY.

	STRUCTURAL RESPONSE VARIABILITY				
LOCATION	LOAD-STRAIN AVERAGE	STRAIN DISTRIBUTION			
LOWER SKIN WS 48	5.8	6.1			
LOWER SKIN WS 85	4.7	4.2			
UPPER SKIN WS 48	7.5	8.1			

SUMMARY OF WCC-1 ULTIMATE STATIC LOAD CASES. TABLE 8.

LOAD CASE	DESCRIPTION	ŢEMPERATURE °F	S <sub>z</sub> LB	M <sub>x</sub> x 10 <sup>-6</sup> in-lb	M <sub>y</sub> x 10 <sup>-6</sup> IN-LB
100	SYMMETRICAL PULL-UP	146	173.000	2.11	-8.4
110	SYMMETRICAL PULL-UP	182	166,500	11.6	-7.7
130	SYMMETRICAL PULL-UP	242	140,000	10.3	-6.0
201	ROLLING PULL-UP	192	146,000	10.3	-7.4
102	SYMMETRICAL PUSHOVER	145	-57,600	-4.3	+1.8

NOTES:

- (1)  $S_z$  is the shear from the left wing tip to the root rib.
- (2)  $M_X$  is the left-hand wing moment at the root rib.
- (3) M<sub>y</sub> is the wing torsion.



#### TABLE 9. WING COMPONENT (WCC-1) TESTS IN REFERENCE 5.

TEST SERIES	TEST TYPE
1	250°F/WET STATIC
2	RT/AMBIENT STATIC
4	RT/AMBIENT FATIGUE (2 LIFETIMES)
6	BASELINE ENVIRONMENTAL FATIGUE (2 LIFETIMES)
9	REAL TIME FATIQUE (1 LIFETIME)

#### TABLE 10. INFLUENCE OF LOADING CASE ON LOAD-STRAIN STRUCTURAL RESPONSE VARIABILITY.

GAGE		STRUCTURAL VARIABILITY IN LOAD-STRAIN RESPONSE (C.V.%)						
No.	COUNTION	CASE 100	CASE 110	CASE 130	CASE 102	CASE 201	MEAN	
65	LOWER SKIN	6.1	5.4	4.3	14.5	5.4	7.1	
86	LOWER SKIN	7.3	6.8	6.8	7.6	7.9	7.3	
92	LOWER SKIN	6.5	6.8	7.2	7.0	6.9	6.9	
25	UPPER SKIN	6.4	6.2	6.3	6.4	7.1	6.5	
	MEAN	6.6	6.3	6.2	8.9	6.8	7.0	





6 May

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBO

TTAEROSPACE.COM



**LENERAL PRODUCTION CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR** 

X Y

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

A P. S. Barres



TECHNICAL

AL LIBRARY



TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60





TECHNICAL LIBRARY

NADC-87042-60

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

## (%) YTIJIBAIRAV JENOGEJA JARUTOURTE

FIGURE 77. INFLUENCE OF LOADING CASE ON STRUCTURAL RESPONSE VARIABILITY.

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.CON

ECHNICAL LIBRAR

case has little influence on structural response variability. Some increased variability is observed for the pushover (downbending) load case 102. This is probably due to the low values of strain recorded at limit load. However, none of the five loading cases exhibited values of structural response variability that were significantly different from the overall mean value of 7.0 percent. This overall value is very similar to the overall mean value of /.1 percent determined for all specimens in Table 6.

An interesting observation can be made from the loadstrain data in Figures 72 through 76. The scatter trend in the data is the same for all loading cases. That is, Test Series 1 gives the lowest strain at design limit load, while Test Series 2 and 4 give the highest strains at design limit load. This observation was true for all four strain gage locations that are analyzed.

Since the structural response variability was found to be independent of structural complexity, environment and loading case, all data in Table 6 are pooled. The pooled data are analyzed using a normal distribution and the resultant scatter distribution is shown in Figure 78. The following values of structural response variability are determined:

> $(SRV)_{MEAN} = 7.1$ % or  $(\alpha_{SRV})_{MEAN} = 17.36$  $(SRV)_{MODAL} = 6.5$ % or  $(\alpha_{SRV})_{MODAL} = 19.02$  $(SRV)_{B-BASIS} = 9.5$ % or  $(\alpha_{SRV})_{B-BASIS} = 12.81$

Following the philosophy adopted for static strength and fatigue life scatter values, the modal structural response variability of 6.5 percent will be used for incorporation in the certification testing methodology.

#### Summary

A comprehensive analysis of a large load-strain data base has been conducted. A total of 360 separate load-strain plots containing in excess of 3000 individual data points are

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

#### NADC-87042-60



analyzed. A novel analysis technique permitted the determination of structural response variability from the load-strain data for the first time. The following conclusions can be made from the study.

- A statistical analysis methodology is developed to determine structural response variability from load-strain data.
- Structural response variability is shown to be independent of specimen complexity, test environment and static loading cases.
- The structural response variability of load-strain and strain distributions is approximately equal.
- The mean and modal values of structural response variability are 7.1 and 6.5 percent, respectively.

#### 3.3 <u>Usage Variation</u>

The differences between the fatigue response of metallic and composite materials were discussed in Section 2. It was concluded that current graphite-epoxy systems have a significantly superior fatigue response, as shown in Figure 43. This causes a different response to usage changes for the two mate the Consider, for example, a usage change, which is more concere als. than the design spectrum, and leads to an effective increase in operating stress level relative to the design stress level. Figure 79 summarizes the change in fatigue life as a function of this type of increased usage severity  $(\sigma_{\rm u}/\sigma_{\rm D})$ . It can be seen that increased usage severity causes a gradual reduction in metal In contrast, increased usage severity design fatique life. initially has no effect on composite design fatigue life. Further increase in usage severity eventually causes very rapid reductions in composite design fatigue life. This behavior is caused by the flat S-N behavior of composites. The design stress level is significantly below the composite fatigue limit (defined as a very long life) such that increased usage severity does not initially change the design life. When severe usage changes


FIGURE 79. COMPARISON OF USAGE SEVERITY CHANGE FOR COMPOSITES AND METALS.

124

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

cause the operating stress level to intersect the composite S-N curve rapid life changes occur.

The maximum spectrum load in the actual service environment often deviates from the design load. The maximum load in a fatigue spectrum is a random variable in nature, and its probalistic distribution can be described by a distribution function. This distribution function in onjunction with the fatigue life distribution and the fatigue wear-out law can be used to assess the influence of usage change on structural reliability. One approach is to assume the forms of the distribution function for the service load variation and the fatigue life distribution, together with an assumed wear-out equation to form a joint probability function. This is illustrated in Figure 80. These functions are selected and given below:

(1) The composite fatigue life scatter is described by a Weibull distribution with probability of survival given by

$$P_{L} = \exp \left[-\left(\frac{x}{\beta_{\tau}}\right)^{\alpha}L\right]$$
(27)

(2) The stress-life relationship can be described by the wearout equation from Sendeckyj analysis

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_{\rm u}}{\sigma_{\rm a}}\right)^{1/S} + C - 1 = CN \tag{28}$$

where

 $\sigma_{u}$  is the static strength

<sup>o</sup>a is the maximum applied stress

- C, S are wear-out parameters
- N is the fatigue life at stress level  $\sigma_a$
- (3) Two types of service load variation distribution,  $f(\sigma)$ , are assumed
  - a. Normal distribution with mean  $\bar{x} = \sigma_a$  and standard deviations
  - b. Weibull distribution with shape and scale parameters  $\alpha_u$  and  $\beta_u$  so that  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \sigma_a$





- FATIGUE LIFE SCATTER, p
   (σ)
- STRESS-LIFE RELATION (S-N CURVE)
- JOINT PROBABILITY FUNCTION

$$\mathbf{p}_{\mathsf{s}} = \int_{\mathsf{o}}^{\infty} \mathbf{p}_{\mathsf{t}}(\sigma) f(\sigma) d\sigma$$

METHODOLOGY FOR INCORPORATING USAGE VARIATION INTO FATIGUE LIFE RELIABILITY CALCULATIONS. FIGURE 80.

ECHNICA

LIBRARY

TECHNICAL

or

or 
$$\beta_{\rm u} = \frac{\sigma_{\rm a}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_{\rm u}+1}{\alpha_{\rm u}}\right)}$$
 (29)

The joint probability of survival for the structure is then given by

$$P_{s} = \int_{0}^{\infty} P_{0}(\sigma) f(\sigma) d\sigma$$
(30)

where  $f(\sigma)$  is the probability density function of the service load distribution. The function  $p_L(\sigma)$  is the probability of survival at stress level  $\sigma$ . Numerical integrations are conducted to evaluate the influence of usage change on fatigue reliability.

The parameters used in the numerical evaluation are given below:

- 1. Fatigue life variability,  $a_{\rm L} = 1.25$
- 2. Design applied stress level,  $\sigma_a = 0.8 \sigma_u$
- 3. Wear-out equation parameters, S = 0.0625 and C = 0.03544
- 4. Usage change variability,  $a_u = 10$  to 26

The influence of the usage variation on the structural life reliability is shown in Figure 81. The 95 percent confidence reliability with no usage variation is assumed to be 0.90 (Bbasis). This figure shows that the fatigue reliability is significantly reduced due to usage variation. For a sample size of n = 1, the reliability reduces to 0.68 for  $\alpha_u$  of 16. The results using a normal distribution to describe the usage variation are also shown in the figure for n = 20. As can be seen from the figure, the selection of distribution function has a very small effect on the resulting reliability. The 95 percent confidence reliability plotted against the coefficient of variation of usage change is shown in Figure 82.

a a shara a shara a shara a shara a shara a shaka s

ECHNICAL LIBRARY



## TECHNICAL LIBRARY

## NADC-87042-60



CHANGE OF RELIABILITY WITH USAGE VARIATION. FIGURE 82.

12.15

13.32

1 AA

NADC-87042-60

ECHNICAL LIBRAR`

The influence of usage variation on the B-basis fatigue life is shown in Figure 83. The figure shows that the B-basis fatigue life is significantly reduced by usage variation. For a sample size of n = 1, the B-basis life is computed to be 133 hours when usage variation is not considered. The B-basis life becomes 54 hours for  $\alpha_u = 26$  and is reduced to 17 hours when  $\alpha_u = 10$ . The mean life to B-basis life ratio (life factor) is show: in Figure 84. This figure shows that the life factor is increased significantly as the usage variation increases (decreasing  $\alpha_u$ ). The life factor for n = 1 with no usage variation is 13.55. It becomes 18 when  $\alpha_u = 26$  and increased to 38.3 as  $\alpha_u = 12$ .

It should be noted that the methodology developed for usage variation effects can also be used to determine the effects of structural response variability on the fatigue life reliability. In this case, the probability density function  $f(\sigma)$  in Equation 27 is replaced by the density function for SRV and the analysis procedure is identical. This analysis technique is used for methodology demonstration discussed in Section 4.





ECHNICAL LIBRARY

NADC-87042-60

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

FIGURE 84. EFFECTS OF USAGE VARIATION ON B-BASIS FATIGUE LIFE FACTOR.

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

いたちのないない

## SECTION 4

## METHODOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

The full scale wing and fuselage components from the Composite Wing/Fuselage Program (Reference 5) are selected as the primary demonstration articles. An extensive design development and full scale test data base was generated in this program. These data are reevaluated using the methodology developed in Sections 2 and 3. Static and fatigue margins of safety and reliabilities are established from this evaluation. Results of this evaluation are summarized in this section. Evaluations of the wing component (WCC-1) and fuselage component (FCC-1) are discussed in full detail.

## 4.1 <u>Composite Wing/Fuselage Program Data Base</u>

Figure 57 summarizes the wing test specimens used in Reference 5. This figure also shows the building block approach used for design development testing. The design development testing is characterized by four levels of complexity. The fifth level of complexity is assigned to the full-scale component.

The wing skin coupon specimens represent the first complexity level in the building block approach and simulate single tension and compression failure modes. The second complexity level in the building block approach contains specimens WE-2 and WEC-1. Each of these specimens has two potential failure modes. WE-2 is an upper skin/rear spar mechanical joint designed to check the influence of load transfer on compression strength. Potential failure modes for this specimen are laminate failure or bearing failure at a fastener hole. The WEC-1 specimen is a lower skin/intermediate spar cocured joint designed to check spar web strength in the presence of a fuel drain hole and the cocured bonded joint under combined shear, fuel pressure and chordwise loading. Potential failure modes are web failure at the fuel drain hole and bondline failure in the cocured joint. The third complexity level in the building block approach is

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

represented by WEC-3, which is an intermediate spar/pylon rib transfer joint, and is designed to check load transfer from the discontinuous spar into the rib and back to the spar. This specimen combines the potential failure modes of the wing coupons and WEC-1, i.e., upper and lower skin failure at a rib attachment fastener hold, spar web failure and intermediate spar/lower skin failure in the cocured joint. The fourth and final level of complexity in the torsion box design development testing is represented by the wing subcomponent WS-1 which is a three bay box beam and WS-2 which represents the highly loaded root rib/aft trunnion area. All of the failure modes of the wing coupons, WE-2, WE-1 and WEC-3 are represented in the WS-1 specimen. addition, an upper skin access hole provides a further potential The fifth level of complexity is the wing compofailure mode. nent WCC-1 which is fully representative of the actual wing structure.

Table 11 summarizes the test matrix for the wing specimens. Two static tests were conducted under RT/ambient and 250°F/wet conditions, where wet was defined as end-of-lifetime moisture level. A similar building block approach was used for the fuselage structure. Figure 85 summarizes the fuselage test specimens. The test matrix for the fuselage specimens is shown in Table 12.

 Five fatigue test schemes were also used; these are summarized in Figure 86. All fatigue tests were conducted to two lifetimes followed by a residual static strength test. Test series 4 was a conventional RT/ambient accelerated fatigue test. Test series 6, 10 and 11 were accelerated environmental fatigue tests of varying complexity. All specimens in these test series were moisture conditioned prior to fatigue testing. Test series 12 was the least complex of the three test schemes with a constant temperature of 145°F imposed along with the accelerated flight loads. Test series 11 was the next most complex scheme with thermal spikes to 250°F and 218°F added to the 145°F baseline temperature profile. Test series 6 was the most complex

TABLE 11. SUMMARY OF WING TEST MATRIX FROM REFERENCE 5.

	STA	TIC TESTS	RTA	FA1	FIGUE TESTS (T	WO LIFETIMES)	
SPECIMEN TYPE	RTA (T82)	250'F/WET (T81)	(TS4)	BASELNE (T36)	ALTERNATE No. 1 (TS11)	ALTERNATE No. 2 (T812)	REAL FLIGHT TIME (TS10)
WC-1	10	10	10	10	~	ę	ł
WC-2	¢	60	g	Ø	1	I	I
WC-3	10	10	10	10	ņ	Q	1
WC-4	Ø	e	ຕ	Ø	1	I	I
WC-5	0	n	n	ŋ	ł	1	I
WC-8	ø	Ø	n	ŋ	ო	ę	1
WE-1	Q	ŋ	ო	Q	١	1	í
WE-2	ຕ	g	n	e	I	1	i
WEC-1	Ø	e	n	¢	ę	+	8
WEC-2	e	ę	n	n	ł	I	1
WEC-3	ø	n	e	ო	N	-	N
WS-1	ß	e	e	¢	N	-	8
WS-2	-	8	I	-	1	1	١
WCC-1	<b></b>	-	-	*-	I	1	-

## NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM





NUMBER AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDR

## SUMMARY OF FUSELAGE TEST MATRIX FROM REFERENCE 5. TABLE 12.

÷. • •

· · · ·

	STAT	IC TESTS	FA	TIGUE TEST	S (TWO LIFE'	TIMES)
SPECIMEN			RTA	Ĩ	<b>VVIRONMENT</b>	AL
ТҮРЕ	RTA (TS 2)	250 F/WET (TS 1)	(TS 4)	BASELINE (TS 6)	ALTERNATE No. 1 (TS11)	ALTERNATE No. 2 (TS 12)
FE-1	Ø	ø	ø	ß	ø	ø
FEC-2	ŋ	ę	ŋ	Ø	1	I
FEC-3	Ø	Q	g	8	1	1
FEC-4	N	Ø	Ø	ę	1	ł
FCC-1	₽"	1	-	1	I	I

## NADC-87042-60

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY





ECHNICAL LIBRARY

accelerated environmental test scheme with thermal cycles ranging from -20 to  $250^{\circ}$ F. In addition, the complexity of test series 6 was increased by reconditioning test specimens during testing to replace moisture lost during thermal cycling. Test series 10 was a real flight time fatigue test, where flight loads and the associated temperature were applied to the actual rates seen by an aircraft. In addition, the moisture history of the test specimens was carefully simulated to match that seen in a 20 year service life.

Residual static strength tests after environmental fatigue loading (Test series 6, 10, 11 and 12) were conducted under the same  $250^{\circ}$ F/wet conditions as test series 1.

All testing shown in Table 11 is complete except for the real flight test on the Wing Component (WCC-1, Test Series 10). This test is in progress and has reached approximately one lifetime.

## 4.2 <u>Wing Component (WCC-1) Data Evaluation</u>

A detailed discussion of the wing component test results is given in Reference 20. The wing component with load introduction structure is shown in Figure 87 and the WCC-1 test set-up is shown in Figure 88. The most critical static design ultimate loads are shown in Table 13. A total of two static and two fatigue wing components were tested. The results are presented in Table 14. The static strength and fatigue life reliabilities of the component are determined based on the actual test data shown in Table 14. The results are discussed in the following paragraphs.

## 4.2.1 WCC-1 Static Test Data Evaluation

The static strength reliability is evaluated using the two-parameter Weibull distribution. The 95% confidence reliability of the component at DUL and DLL and the A- and B-basis static load are determined using the modal Weibull shape parameter  $\alpha_{\rm S}$  = 20.0, for composite static data scatter (see Volume I). The effects of the structural response variation (SRV) are also





# FIGURE 87. WING COMPONENT WITH LOAD INTRODUCTION STRUCTURE (REFERENCE 5)





## FIGURE 88. WCC-1 TEST SET-UP (REFERENCE 5).

SUMMARY OF WING COMPONENT (WCC-1) STATIC DESIGN ULTIMATE LOADS. TABLE 13.

CONDITION	LOAD FACTOR Nz	TEMPERATURE °F	BENDING MOMENT IN-LB	TORQUE IN-LB	VERTICAL SHEAR LBS
130 *	9.75 Supersonic Pull-up	242	10.37×10 <sup>6</sup>	6.01×10°	146,400
100	11 Subsonic Pull-up	145	11.70×10 <sup>6</sup>	6.25×10 <sup>6</sup>	172,500

\* CASE 130 IS CRITICAL STATIC DESIGN CONDITION

TABLE 14. SUMMARY OF WING COMPONENT (WCC-1) FAILURE LOADS.

TEST SERIES	TEST CONDITION	FAILURE LOAD % DUL	FAILURE MODE
2	RTA STATIC	122	SUBSTRUCTURE
ł	250°F/WET STATIC	126	UPPER SKIN
4	TWO LIFETIME RTA FATIGUE + RTA RSS	118	SUBSTRUCTURE
ω	TWO LIFETIME ACCELERATED ENVIRONMENTAL. FATIGUE + 250°F/WET RSS	124	UPPER SKIN

NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY



accounted for in the reliability evaluation. The overall mean SRV ( $\alpha_{SRV} = 17.0$ ) is used in determining the reliability. The numerical procedure is illustrated below for the RTA data.

Mean Failure Load $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  = 1.22 DULSample Size $\mathbf{n}$  = 1Strength Shape Parameter $\alpha_{s}$  = 20.0SRV Shape Parameter $\alpha_{SRV}$  = 17.0

Scale Parameter

 $\hat{\beta} = \bar{x}/\Gamma(1+\frac{1}{\alpha_{s}}) = 1.22/0.9735 = 1.253$ 95% Confidence Scale Parameter  $\hat{\beta} = \hat{\beta}/[\chi^{2}_{0.95} (2n)/2n]^{1/\alpha_{s}}$   $= 1.253/(5.991/2)^{0.05}$  = 1.186

The reliability at any load level is then evaluated by numerical integration of Equation (26). The probability function  $p(\sigma)$  is assumed to be a two-parameter Weibull distribution with a shape parameter of 17.0.

The reliability at the  $250^{\circ}$ F/wet environment is evaluated by two different methods. The first method is a direct assessment from the ETW test data and the second method uses the RTA test data and an environmental knockdown factor (k) determined from design allowable data. For the direct method, the average failure of 1.26DUL is used in the evaluation. An environmental knockdown factor of k = 1.30 is used in the indirect method.

The 95% static strength distributions are presented in Figure 89. Static strength reliabilities and allowable operating loads are given in Table 15. The RTA static strength reliability of 0.94 is better than B-basis at DUL and higher than A-Basis at DLL. ETW static strength reliability is similar to RTA reliability at DUL and DLL when calculated directly from the ETW test data. Table 15 shows that ETW static strength reliability calculated indirectly from the RTA test data are lower than those

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

.

10 C 10

10101



FIGURE 89. WCC-1 STATIC STRENGTH RELIABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS.

SUMMARY OF WCC-1 STATIC STRENGTH RELIABILITY AND ALLOWABLE OPERATING LOADS. TABLE 15.

	RELIAI	віцту	ALLOWABL	.E (% DUL)
NOLION	DLL	DUL	B-BASIS	A-BASIS
RTA	1.000	0.938	103	91
ETW (MEAN DATA)	1.000	0.966	106	94
ETW (RTA KNOCKDOWN) (k = 1.30)	0.996	0.107	67	70

146

NADC-87042-60

ECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

calculated directly from ETW data. This indicates that the environmental knockdown factor approach produces a conservative estimate of the wing component ETW static strength reliability. This occurs because RTA and ETW static strengths of the wing component are similar. This was caused by a change in failure mode at ETW test conditions, which was attributed to a difference in the most critical static design case for the two test environments.

Table 15 shows that the A-basis RTA and ETW allowable operating loads are 91% DUL and 94% DUL, respectively. This compares with a maximum service load of 87% DUL. It can be concluded, therefore, that the static component tests verified the component design to a high level of confidence for the required in-service loading.

## 4.2.2 WCC-1 Fatigue Test Data Evaluation

Table 16 summarizes the WCC-1 fatigue test loads. Test enhancement load factor for both RTA and ETW tests was 1.025.

Three methods are used for the fatigue data evaluation. These methods are the load enhancement factor approach, the ultimate strength approach and the residual strength approach. The theoretical background of these approaches was discussed in Section 2. The numerical procedure for the three methods are given below.

## 4.2.2.1 Load Enhancement Factor Approach

The load enhancement factor approach was discussed in Section 2.2. The one lifetime fatigue reliability, without SRV, is obtained from Equations (16), (17) and (18), and is given by:

$$\ell = EXP \left\{ -\frac{\chi^2(2n)/2n}{P_L^{\alpha R}} \left[ \frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha_L})}{N} \right]^{\alpha_L} \right\}$$
(31)

With SRV, Equation (31) together with the SRV distribution function are used in Equation (26). Results are obtained by carrying out the numerical integration of Equation (26).

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

M LOAD	PTEST/PDES MSL MSL	1.025	1.025
NUM SPECTRU	PDES MSL LBS	118,000	118,000
MAXIN	P <sup>TEST</sup> MSL LBS	115,100	115,100
	TEST	RTA (TS4)	ETW (TS6)

MAXIMUM SPECTRUM LOAD = 82% DUL

TABLE 16. SUMMARY OF WCC-1 FATIGUE TEST LOADS.

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

The values of various parameters use in the WCC-1 fatigue evaluation are given below:

αι	=	1.25	$\Gamma (1 + 1/a_l) =$	0.93138
a R	=	20.0	$\Gamma(1 + 1/a_R) =$	0.97350
asrv	Ŧ	17.0	$\Gamma$ (1 + 1/ $\alpha_{srv}$ )	= <b>0.969</b> 30
N = 2	2.0	LIFETIME		

 $P_1 = 1.025$ 

n = 1  $\chi^2_{0.95}$  (2n)/2n = 2.9955

The one lifetime fatigue reliability is plotted against the load enhancement factor (PL) and is shown in Figure 90. At  $P_{\rm L}$  = 1.025 the 95% confidence reliability at one lifetime is 0.493. The ETW fatigue reliability, obtained from indirect method using k = 1.30, is 0.091. The relatively low reliability is because of the low load factor used in the test. As shown in Figure 90, a minimum load factor of 1.18 is required in order to achieve the B-basis reliability. The required load factor for the A-basis reliability is 1.39. The reliability provided by the test data and the required A- and B-basis factors are summarized in Tables 17 and 18. Table 17 summarizes the RTA fatigue reliability and Table 18 shows the ETW reliability. The ETW fatigue reliabilities are calculated from both the direct method and the indirect method using environmental knockdown factor.

## 4.2.2.2 Ultimate Strength Approach

The fatigue reliability determined by the ultimate strength approach is given by

$$R = EXP \left\{ -\left[ \frac{X}{F} \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \right]^{\alpha} \frac{\chi^{2} (2n)}{2n} \right\}$$
(32)

where F is the static failure load

 $\alpha$  is the static strength scatter parameter

x is the constant determined from the threshold stress



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

NADC-87042-60

ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE RELIABILITY

WCC-1 FATIGUE RELIABILITY DISTRIBUTION DETERMINED BY THE LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR APPROACH. FIGURE 80.

ł

D FACTOR	A-BASIS	1.39 P <sub>MSL</sub>	1.70 DUL	1.22 DUL
REQUIRE	B-BASIS	1.18 P <sub>MSL</sub>	1.45 DUL	1.21 DUL
ONE LIFETIME	FATIGUE RELIABILITY	0.493	0.380	0.693
		LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR	ULTIMATE STRENGTH	RESIDUAL STRENGTH

TABLE 17. SUMMARY OF WCC-1 RTA ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE RELIABILITY.

NADC-87042-60

ECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM SUMMARY OF WCC-1 ENVIRONMENTAL ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE RELIABILITY. TABLE 18.

APPROACH	DATA	ONE LIFETIME	REQUIRE	D FACTOR
	BASE	FATIGUE RELIABILITY	<b>B-BASIS</b>	A-BASIS
LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR	ETW RTA	0.493 0.091	1.18 P <sub>MSL</sub> 1.31 P <sub>MSL</sub>	1.39 P <sub>MSL</sub> 1.54 P <sub>MSL</sub>
ULTIMATE STRENGTH	ETW RTA	0.521 0.041	1.45 DUL 1.61 DUL	1.70 DUL 1.88 DUL
RESIDUAL STRENGTH	ETW RTA	0.823 0.482	1.25 DUL 1.34 DUL	1.26 DUL 1.35 DUL

NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM ECHNICAL LIBRARY

The value of x is determined by solving equation (32) for  $F = F_1$  and R = 0.9, where

$$F_{1} = \frac{P_{MSL}}{P_{DUL}} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{S}^{M}}{\sigma_{TH}^{M}} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{TH}^{M}}{\sigma_{TH}^{B}}$$
(33)

The definitions and values of  $\sigma_{\rm S}^{\rm M}/\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M}$  and  $\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M}/\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm B}$  were given in Section 2. In the present data evaluation, the modal values,  $\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M}/\sigma_{\rm S}^{\rm M} = 0.71$  and  $\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm B}/\sigma_{\rm TH}^{\rm M} = 0.895$  are used.

The results of WCC-1 component fatigue reliability evaluation are summarized in Tables 17 and 18. The one lifetime fatigue reliability is plotted against static strength and shown in Figure 91. Based on the RTD static test failure load of .22 DUL, the one lifetime fatigue reliability is 0.380. The required static failure load is 1.45 DUL in order to achieve the B-basis fatigue reliability at one lifetime.

## 4.2.2.3 <u>Residual Strength Approach</u>

The residual strength approach is an application of the Sendeckyj's fitting model (Reference 14). The original model proposed by Sendeckyj required static strength, fatigue life and residual strength data. However, the available data only includes static and residual strength data, the fatigue reliability can only be approximately evaluated. In the Sendeckyj mode, the wear-out equation is given by

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{e}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{a}} \left[ \left( \sigma_{\mathbf{r}} / \sigma_{\mathbf{a}} \right)^{1/S} + NC \right]^{S}$$
(34)

where,  $\sigma_e$  is the equivalent static strength

 $\sigma_a$  is the maximum applied stress

 $\sigma_{r}$  is the residual strength

N is the test duration

S and C are fitting constants.







FIGURE 91. WCC-1 FATIGUE RELIABILITY DISTRIBUTION DETERMINED BY THE ULTIMATE STRENGTH APPROACH.

VXVVI

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

As was discussed in Volume I, it can be shown that the fatigue life can be approximately described by a two-parameter Weibull distribution, with shape parameter  $\alpha_L$ . Let  $\alpha_e$  be the shape parameter of the equivalent strength distribution. Theoretically,  $\alpha_e$  should be equal to the static strength scatter parameter  $\alpha_s$ . The relation of  $\alpha_L$  and  $\alpha_e$  can be approximately given by

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{L}} = \mathbf{S}\alpha_{\mathbf{e}} = \mathbf{S}\alpha_{\mathbf{S}}$$
(35)

Using the modal values of  $\alpha_{\rm L} = 1.25$  and  $\alpha_{\rm S} = 20.0$ , the value of S is then 0.0625. From the static and residual strength data, the value of the other fitting constant C can be obtained by solving equation (34). The fatigue life reliability is then computed by first estimating the fatigue life and then substituting it into the Weibull distribution. The following example cutlines the numerical procedure

Static strength	$\sigma_n = 1.31 \text{ DUL}$
Residual strength	$\sigma_r = 1.25 \text{ DUL}$
Test duration	N = 2.0
Applied stress	$\sigma_{a} = 1.075 \times 0.87 = 0.934 \text{ DUL}$

From equation (34)

$$1.31 = 0.934 \left[ \left( \frac{1.25}{0.934} \right)^{1/0.0625} + 2C \right]^{0.0625}$$

Estimate mean fatigue life at  $\sigma_a$  = 0.87 DUL

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_{u}}{\sigma_{a}}\right)^{1/S} = \left(\frac{\sigma_{r}}{\sigma_{a}}\right)^{1/S} + NC$$

At fatigue failure,  $N = \overline{N}_F$ ,  $\sigma_r = \sigma_a$ , then

$$\bar{N}_{F} = \frac{\left(\frac{1.31}{0.87}\right)^{1/0.0625} - 1}{59.176} = 11.78 \text{ LT}$$



AL LIBRARY

$$\hat{\beta} = N_F / \Gamma (1 + \frac{1}{\alpha_L}) = 11.78/0.93138 = 12.65 LT$$

TECHNICAL

$$\dot{\beta} = \hat{\beta} / [\chi(2n)/2n]^{1/\alpha} = 12.65/(2.995)^{1/1.25} = 5.26 \text{ LT}$$

The 95% confidence reliability at one lifetime under the maximum spectrum load is

 $R = EXP[-(1.0/5.26)^{1.25}] = 0.882$ 

The reliability including SRV effects is computed by numerical integration of an expression similar to equation (26).

The results of fatigue reliability evaluation are summarized in Tables 17 and 18. The one lifetime fatigue reliability is shown as a function of the residual strength in Figure 92. The RTA one lifetime fatigue reliability obtained from the test data is 0.693 and the required residual strength for the Bbasis fatigue reliability is 1.21 DUL.

## 4.3 Wing Specimens Test Data Evaluation Summary

All the wing specimens test data are evaluated for static and fatigue reliability in the same manner as for the WCCl component. This section summarizes the results of these evaluations.

Table 19 summarizes the static strength reliabilities and maximum allowable operating loads for all the wing test specimens.

Table 19 shows that under RTA conditions, average test failure loads ranged from 122% DUL to 244% DUL. Static strength reliabilities calculated at RTA conditions exceed A-basis at DLL for all the test specimens. In addition, B-basis allowable operating loads exceed DUL and A-basis allowable operating loads exceed 90% DUL for all test specimens. Thus, it can be concluded that very high RTA static reliability has been demonstrated for the composite wing structure.

n a state a state exception of the state of the

AL LIBRARY

TECHNICAL

- 2.-



SUMMARY OF STATIC STRENGTH RELIABILITIES AND ALLOWABLE OPERATING LOADS FOR WING TEST SPECIMENS. TABLE 19.

SPECIMEN	FAILUR	E LOAD	ST,	ATIC RE	LIABIL	ITΥ	ALLOW	ABLE OP (%D	ERATING	LOAD
1.D.	2 ¢		R	r A	El	* M -	R	¥.	í.	*
	RTA	ETW	סרר	DUL	DLL	DUL	B-BASIS	A-BASIS	B-BASIS	A-BASIS
WE-1	244	76	1.000	1.000	0.863	0.005	208	185	88	58
W E - 2	173	123	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.961	149	132	105	83
WEC-1	186	160	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	158	141	137	122
WEC-2	197	130	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.981	166	147	109	87
WEC-3	128	128	1.000	0.675	1.000	0.978	108	88	109	88
WS-1	131	102	1.000	0.985	0.999	0.362	111	<b>8</b> 6	85	75
WS-2	187	180	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	164	145	150	133
WCC-1	122	126	1.000	0.938	1.000	0.976	103	91	106	94

NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

\* 250°F/WET CONDITIONS

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

Table 19 shows that under 250°F/wet test conditions all test specimens except WE-1, had average failure loads that exceed DUL. Failure loads were in the range of 102% DUL to 180% DUL. Average failure load for specimen WE-1 was 76% DUL. 250°F/wet static strength reliabilities for WE-1 are 0.863 at DLL and 0.005 at DUL. These low reliabilities are simply a reflection of the low average failure load (76% DUL) of specimen WE-1. However, it should be noted that the temperature associated with the WE-1 the critical static design case is 192°. Therefore. reliabilities calculated from the 250°F/wet test data are conser-The static strength reliability at 192°F was recalcuvative. lated from the 250°F/wet test data using the environmental knock-The resultant reliabilities at DLL and DUL down factor (k). increased to 1.000 and 0.498, respectively. For the remaining wing test specimens, the 250°F/wet static strength reliability exceeded A-basis at DLL. The static strength reliabilities at DUL exceeded B-basis for all remaining specimens except WS-1 low 250°F/wet static strength reliability (0.362).The calculated for WS-1 can be attributed to the mixed failure modes observed in the 250°F/wet static tests. Average failure load for all tests was 116% DUL, however, two failure modes were observed, these were, upper skin failure and intermediate spar/lower skin cocured joint failure. The average failure load for upper skin failure was 123% DUL, while the average failure load for intermediate spar/lower skin failure was 102% DUL. Since mixed failure modes were observed, the static strength reliability was calculated using the failure load which gave the lowest static strength. Thus, an average failure load of 102% DUL was used for the reliability calculations. This resulted in a low static strength reliability at DUL. However, it should be noted that Table 19 does show that the A-basis allowable operating load exceeds DLL.

Table 20 summarizes the one lifetime fatigue reliabilities for all wing test specimens. The fatigue reliabilities calculated using the load enhancement approach assume that fatigue failures occurred after two lifetimes. However, the major-
SUMMARY OF ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE RELIABILITIES FOR WING TEST SPECIMENS. TABLE 20.

SPECIMEN	FATIGUE TI	EST LOAD		FATIG	NE RELIA	BILITY AT	r 1 LT	
	ENHANCEME	NT FACTOR		RTA			ETW	
	RTA	ETW	LEF	NS	RSS	LEF	ອ ດ	RSS
WE-1	1.87	0.58	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
WE-2	1.55	1.10	0.999	0.898	1.000	0.797	0.001	0.976
WEC-1	1.53	1.32	0.998	0.996	1.000	0.871	0.957	0.993
WEC-2	1.66	1.10	0.998	0.895	1.000	0.764	0.532	0.814
WEC-3	0.94	0.94	0.245	0.060	1.000	0.282	0.069	0,484
W S-1	1.08	0.96	0.827	0.775	0.868	0.132	0.055	0.775
WS-2	1	1.00	1	0.462	1	0.400	0.969	0.462
WCC-1	1.03	1.03	0.493	0.380	0.693	0.483	0.521	0.832

DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE ECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

= ULTIMATE STRENGTH APPROACH SU

RSS = RESIDUAL STRENGTH APPROACH

LEF = LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR APPROACH

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ity of the wing specimen fatigue tests were run-outs at two fatigue lifetimes, which were subsequently residual static strength tested. Thus, the fatigue reliabilities calculated by the load enhancement approach are conservative. Fatigue reliabilities calculated using the ultimate strength approach are estimates based on static failure loads. The fatigue reliabilities calculated using the residual strength approach provide the best estimates of one lifetime fatigue reliabilities because it accounts for the specimen residual strength after two lifetimes of fatigue loading.

The fatigue reliabilities calculated using the residual strength approach, which are presented in Table 20, show signifi-The reason for this scatter in calculated fatigue cant scatter. reliability is the variation in test load enhancement factors For RTA tests, test load enhancement used in fatigue tests. factors ranged from 0.94 to 1.87 and for environmental tests, test load enhancement factors ranged from 0.58 to 1.32. These variations in test load enhancement factors were caused by variations in static test failure load as a function of DUL for each of the test specimens. Because of the higher scatter in composite fatigue test data, it is necessary to increase test load severity in order to demonstrate adequate fatigue reliability in a two lifetime fatigue test.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the results of the wing test data evaluation.

- (1) A high degree of static strength reliability has been demonstrated by the wing test data.
- (2) One lifetime fatigue reliabilities demonstrated by the wing test data were inadequate because insufficient test load severity was used for the two lifetime fatigue tests.

## 4.4 <u>Fuselage Component FCC-1 Data Evaluation</u>

The FCC-1 fuseLage component is shown in Figure 93 and the loading of the component is shown in Figure 94. The criti-



TECHNICAL LIBRARY







715 6 1 1 1

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

cal static design conditions is given in Table 21. A total of two static and one fatigue components were tested. The results are presented in Table 22.

## 4.4.1 FCC-1 Static Test Data Evaluation

The 95% confidence static strength reliability distributions are presented in Figure 95. Static strength reliabilities and allowable operating loads are summarized in Table 23. As can be expected, the RTA static strength reliability at DUL is very low (0.340), because of the low RTA static failure load (102% DUL). As a result, the static strength reliability at the design environment (242°F/wet) determined from knockdown of RTA data is also low. This reliability is 0.882 at DLL and 0.006 at DUL (Table 23). The reliability determined from the RTA test result is over-conservative. This is because the failure load of 102% DUL does not represent the total structure The test failure was fixture failure as indicated in strength. Table 22. The static strength determined from the 250°F/wet test data exceeded A-basis as shown in Table 23.

## 4.4.2 FCC-1 Fatigue Test Data Evaluation

FCC-1 fatigue test loads is summarized in Table 24. The test load enhancement factor was 1.34. Only a RTA fatigue test was conducted.

Table 25 shows the one lifetime RTA fatigue reliability determined from the three analytical approaches. The low fatigue reliability (0.001) obtained from the ultimate strength approach, reflects the low RTA static failure load. This value is not accurate because of the test fixture failure during test. The load enhancement factor approach gives a reliability of 0.983 and the residual strength approach gives a fatigue reliability of 1.000. The reliability distributions are shown in Figures 96 and 97.

The environmental fatigue reliability is shown in Table 26. Because only RTA fatigue test was conducted, the fatigue reliability is evaluated based only on RTA test data. At

TRUNNION LOAD LBS	76800
P <sub>3</sub>	-6480
P <sub>2</sub> LBS	-16370
P1 LBS	3410
TEMPERATURE °F	242
LOAD FACTOR N <sub>z</sub>	9.75
CONDITION	120 *

\* CASE 120 IS CRITICAL STATIC DESIGN CONDITION

SUMMARY OF FUSELAGE COMPONENT (FEC-1) STATIC ULTIMATE DESIGN LOADS. **TABLE 21.**  NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

FAILURE MODE **TEST FIXTURE** FUSELAGE SIDE PANEL FAILURE FAILURE LOAD % DUL 102 145 145 **TWO LIFETIME RTA FATIGUE TEST CONDITION** 250°F/WET STATIC RTA STATIC + RTA RSS TEST SERIES N 4

TABLE 22. SUMMARY OF FCC-1 FAILURE LOADS.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

166

edistration of the second s

ECHNICAL LIBRARY



SUMMARY OF FCC-1 STATIC RELIABILITY. TABLE 23.

NOLLIGNOU	RELIAI	вігіту	ALLOWAB	LE % DUL
	סרר	DUL	B-BASIS	A-BASIS
RTA	666.0	0.340	86	92
ETW 250°F - DATA	1.000	0.998	122	108
242°F – KNOCKDOWN	1.000	1.000	1 4 <sup>2</sup> 2	126
RT – KNOCKDOWN	1.000	1.000	184	163
ETW RTA KNOCKDOWN 242°F	0.882	0.006	99	26

## NADC-87042-60

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

MENT PROVIDED BY THE



-

NADC-87042-60

TABLE 24. SUMMARY OF FCC-1 FATIGUE LOADS.

	MAXIN	UM SPECT	RUM LOAD
TEST	P <sup>TEST</sup> MSL LBS	P <sup>DES</sup> MSL LBS	PMSL /PMSL
RTA (TS4)	84400	63000	1.34

# MAXIMUM SPECTRUM LOAD = 82% DUL

SUMMARY OF FCC-1 RTA FATIGUE RELIABILITY AT ONE LIFETIME. TABLE 25.

APROACH	ONE LIFETIME	REQUIRED	) FACTOR
	FATIGUE RELIABILITY	B-BASIS	A-BASIS
LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR	0.983	1.18 P <sub>MSL</sub>	1.39 PMSL
ULTIMATE STRENGTH	0.001	1.47 DUL	1.70 DUL
RESIDUAL STRENGTH	1.000	0.82 DUL	0.82 DUL

# NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM



ECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

FIGURE 96. FCC-1 FATIGUE RELIABILITY ·· LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR APPROACH.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY





TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

242°F/wet condition, the one lifetime fatigue reliability is 0.516, 0.000 and 1.000 from the load factor, ultimate strength and residual strength, respectively, based on RTA data. Based on the ETW static test data, the fatigue reliability at 242° is 0.989 as determined from the ultimate strength epproach.

## 4.5 <u>Fuselage Specimen Test Data Evaluation Summary</u>

Table 27 summarizes the static strength reliabilities and allowable operating loads for all the fuselage test specimens.

Table 27 shows that the average RTA static failure loads ranged from 102% DUL to 286% DUL. Static strength reliabilities calculated at RTA conditions exceed A-Basis at DLL for all the test specimens, except FEC-4. The low strength reliability of FEC-4 specimen is a reflection of the high data scatter associated with the particular failure mode (stiffener disbond) of The static strength reliability at DUL this specimen type. exceeds B-Basis for specimens FEC-1, FEC-2 and FEC-3. The reliability at DUL for FEC-4 specimens is 0.402. This is also because of the high strength data scatter of the stiffener disbond failure mode observed in these specimens. The reliability of the FCC-1 specimen at DUL is 0.340; this is because of the low failure load (102% DUL) of the specimen. However, as was pointed out earlier, the failure was test fixture failure and thus did not The RTA static represent the actual strength of the specimen. strength reliability at DUL calculated from the 250°F/wet data was 1.000. The B-Basis RIA allowable operating loads for all fuselage specimens exceed DLL. The A-Basis RTA allowable operating loads for all specimens, except FEC-4, also exceed DLL.

Table 27 shows that under 250°F/wet test conditions, all test specimens except FEC-4 had average failure loads exceed DUL. The average failure load ranged from 125% DUL to 359% DUL. The average failure load for specimen FEC-4 was 86% DUL. Except for specimen FEC-4, the 250°F/wet static strength reliabilities at DLL all exceed A-Basis and they all exceed B-Basis at DUL. The 250°F/wet reliability for specimen FEC-4 is 0.703 at DLL and

「日本のない」

SUMMARY OF STATIC STRENGTH RELIABILITIES AND ALLOWABLE OPERATING LOADS FOR FUSELAGE TEST SPECIMENS. TABLE 27.

(

SPECIMEN	FAILUR	E LOAD	31,	ATIC RE	:LIABILI	τY	ALLOW	ABLE OP (%D	ERATING	LOAD
		0L	E	<	Ш	* M.	L R	Υ.	L L	* M
	RTA	ETW	סרר	DUL	DLL	DUL	B-BASIS	A-BASIS	B-BASIS	A-BASIS
FE-1	286	216	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	245	217	185	164
FEC-2 FEC-2 FC-3	125 281 110	125 359 86	1.000 0.995 0.902	0.972 0.977 0.402	1.000 0.998 0.703	0.974 0.987 0.067	107 146 67	95 81 44	108 170 53	2 2 2 2 2 8 8 2 8
FCC-1	102	145	0.999	0.340	1.000	0.998	88	76	122	108

\* 260°F/WET CONDITIONS

NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

0.067 at DUL. The ETW B-basis allowable exceed DLL for all specimens with the exception of FEC-4. The ETW B-basis allowable for FEC-4 specimens is 53% DUL and A-basis is 35% DUL.

From the results of the static data evaluation, it can be concluded that the composite fuselage structures in Reference 5 demonstrated very high RTA and ETW static reliability for the typical in-plane composite failures. For specimens that out-of-plane structural exhibited failure modes, such as specimens FEC-3 and FEC-4, the static strength scatter is higher and the test data of Reference 5 demonstrated B-basis reliability at DLL under RTA conditions.

Table 28 summarizes the one lifetime fatigue reliabilities for all fuselage test specimens. The fatique reliabilities calculated using the load enhancement approach assume that fatigue failures occurred after two lifetimes. However, all of the fuselage specimen fatigue tests were run-outs at the two fatigue lifetimes, which were subsequently residual static strength tested. Thus, the fatigue reliabilities calculated by the load enhancement approach are conservative. Fatigue reliabilities calculated using the ultimate strength approach are estimates based on static failure loads. The fatigue reliabilities calculated using the residual strength approach provide the best estimates of one lifetime fatigue reliabilities because it accounts for the specimen residual strength after two lifetimes of fatigue loading.

The fatigue reliabilities calculated using the residual strength approach exceed B-basis for all specimens. As shown in Table 28, the one lifetime fatigue reliability for all specimens, except FEC-4, exceed B-basis using all three approaches. The low fatigue reliability of FEC-4 calculated using load enhancement factor (LEF) approach is a reflection of the low LEF (1.08 at RTA and 0.94 at ETW) used in the test. The low fatigue reliability for FEC-4 calculated using the ultimate strength approach is because of the low average strength and high scatter. The low fatigue reliability for FCC-1 calculated using the ultimate SUMMARY OF ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE RELIABILITIES FOR FUSELAGE TEST SPECIMENS. TABLE 28.

SPECIMEN	FATIQUE T	EST LOAD		FATIG	NE RELIA	BILITY A1	r 1 LT	
	ENHANCEME	INT FACTOR		RTA			ETW	
	RTA	ETW	LEF	NS	RSS	LEF	SN	RSS
FE-1	2.81	2.13	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
FEC-2	1.50	1.50	0.998	0.994	1.000	0.998	0.994	1.000
FEC-3	2.38	2.38	0.974	0.996	0.993	0.870	0.989	0.979
FEC-4	1.08	0.84	0.578	0.826	0.941	0.319	0.508	1.000
FCC-1	1.34	1	0.983	0.001	1.000	l I	0.903	1

177

LEF = LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR APPROACH US = ULTIMATE STRENGTH APPROACH RSS = RESIDUAL STRENGTH APPROACH

un han ing nangang nangang nangang nangang nangang nangang nangang nangang tangan tangan tangan tangan tangan t

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

strength approach is simply a reflection of the fixture failure of the test.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the fuselage data evaluation:

- A high degree of static strength reliability has been demonstrated by the fuselage test data with typical composite in-plane failures.
- 2. Static strength reliability for structures with out-of-plane failures may be inadequate because of the high strength scatter.
- 3. One lifetime fatigue reliabilities demonstrated by the fuselage test data were adequate.

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

## SECTION 5

## CERTIFICATION TESTING RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5.1 <u>Testing Requirements</u>

123 C 20

10000 S

Specific certification testing requirements are detailed in the following paragraphs. The design allowable tests are coupon level tests. The results of these tests are used to establish allowable strengths. Test variables at this level should include loading mode (tension, compression, shear) and environment (temperature, moisture). The design development testing should be planned based on the building block approach. Structural element, element combinations and subcomponents are tested to verify the design concepts. Sufficient number of tests should be conducted to identify different failure modes. The worst case environment should be included in the test plan. Full-scale tests are used to verify the overall reliability of the structure and to idenfiy any unanticipated hot spots. Separate tests should be conducted for static strength and fatique life.

## 5.1.1 <u>Design Allowables</u>

The purpose of design allowable tests is to evaluate the material scatter and to establish strength and life parameters for structure design. Because composites are environmental sensitive, design allowables should be obtained for the entire range of the environmental service envelope of an aircraft. Statistical analysis methods must be used to compute the design allowables. Sufficient number of tests are required to sustain the specific level of confidence of the allowables. Key elements of test planning and data analysis are discussed below.

## 5.1.1.1 Static Design Allowables

Static design allowables include static tension, compression and shear strengths of composite materials. The Weibull distribution is recommended to describe the test data variation. The maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) method discussed in Sec-

179

tion 2 of Volume I is recommended for computation of the Weibull parameters. The shape and scale parameters ( $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ) are estimated by solving equations (5) and (6) and the A- or B-Basis allowables are computed from equation (9) in Volume I. The computer program WEIBULL in the Appendix is written for the computation of design allowables from test data.

From the extensive data analysis, documented in Volume I, the modal value of  $\alpha = 20.0$  is recommended for determination of the static strength allowables for typical graphite/epoxy composites. Based on this value of  $\alpha$ , with 15 data points, the B-basis to mean strength ratio is 0.901 and the A-basis to mean strength ratio is 0.801. For a sample size of 30, the B-basis and A-basis knockdown factors are 0.905 and 0.805, respectively. The influence of sample size on the B-basis static strength was shown in Figure 7. It can be seen from the figure that for typical graphite/epoxy composites,  $\alpha = 20.0$ , the B-basis knockdown factor exceeds 0.85 for any sample size. Therefore, for typical graphite/epoxy composites, a knockdown factor of 0.8 times mean strength (as sometimes used in the industry) is a conservative approach to determination of B-basis allowable. Figure 7 also indicates that for the Weibull shape parameter of  $\alpha < 10.0$ , the knockdown factor of 0.8 becomes an unconservative estimate of the B-basis allowable.

In planning a design allowable testing, it is important that sufficient number of tests be conducted to generate meaningful statistical parameters. In general, the number of specimens required depends on the scatter of the data. The higher the data scatter, the larger number of specimens are required. Based on the scatter analysis performed in Task I, the number of specimens recommended for B-basis allowables is 15 and for A-basis is 30. This is because within the range of  $\alpha$  for typical composites ( $\alpha$ =20 - 30) the B-basis knockdown factor remains approximately constant for sample size greater than 15. The A-Basis knockdown factor stabilizes for sample sizes larger than 30. The B- and Abasis knockdown factors at these recommended samples sizes for typical  $\alpha$  values are provided in Table 29.



rt ter

## NADC-87042-60

## TABLE 29. DESIGN ALLOWABLE TO MEAN STRENGTH RATIO FOR THE RECOMMENDED SAMPLE SIZE.

			•
a	B-BASIS	A-BASIS	
u	n =15	n=30	
10.0	0.808	0.645	
12.0	0.838	0.695	
14.0	0.860	0.733	
16.0	0.877	0.762	
18.0	0.890	0.786	
20.0	0.901	0.805	MODAL a
22.0	0.909	0.821	
24.0	0.917	0.835	
26.0	0.923	0.847	
28.0	0.928	0.857	
30.0	0.933	0.886	

AL LIBRARY

IECHNICAL

The design allowable tests should be planned to develop the strength to temperature envelope relationship for the full range of the service temperature of aircraft. The moisture level for the test specimens should be either end-of-lifetime level or the maximum level in the design lifetime, which ever is higher. The tests should also provide data for each failure mode. Tension, compression and shear strengths test should be conducted at each environment. The design allowable tests should be conducted at both lamina and laminate levels. The purpose of the lamina test is to establish the mechanical properties such as Young's moduli, shear modulus and Poisson ratio. These tests should include longitudinal and transverse tension and compression and shear tests. At the laminate level, two laminates representing the practical fiber dominated and matrix dominated lay-ups should be selected. The test specimens should include unnotched specimens to determine the laminate design strain. Other tests such as open and filled holes, bearing and bolt bearing by-pass should also be included.

Typical design allowable test matrices are shown in Tables 30 and 31. These tables show that design allowables will be obtained directly from the test data for the key test environments. For the secondary test conditions, the allowables can be computed using the statistical parameters established from the key tests.

The results of the design allowable tests should be analyzed individually for each key test condition. The design allowables are recommended to be generated using the worst scatter parameter (lowest  $\alpha$ ) among all the tests. This procedure is shown schematically in Figure 98.

An alternate approach for determining design allowables is to use the pooling technique discussed in Section 2 of Volume I. The joint Weibull analysis can be used to pool the test data. The joint Weibull shape parameter is then used to compute the allowables. The computation procedure is automated in the computer program WEIBJNT given in the Appendix. The results obtained from the joint Weibull analysis are less conservative



ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

## TABLE 30. LAMINA STATIC STRENGTH ALLOWABLE TEST MATRIX.

TEST	TEN	SION	COMPR	ESSION	SHEAR
CONDITION	0°	90°	<b>0</b> °	90°	± <b>45</b> °
LTD	15(30)	15(30)	6	6	6
RTW	15(30)	15(30)	15(30)	15(30)	15(30)
ETW-1	6	6	Ġ	Ĝ	6
ETW-2	6	6	6	6	6
ETW-3	6	6	6	15(30)	15(30)

NUMBERS IN ( ) ARE FOR A-BASIS ALLOWABLES. ETW-3 IS THE WORST CASE ENVIRONMENT.

	1			1	TEST	ENVIRON		
TEST TYPE	LOADING	MODE	LAMINATE	LTW	RTW	ETW-1	ETW-2	ETW-3
	TENSI	0N	FD MD	5 6	6	-	-	6 6
UNNOTCHED	COMPRE	SSION	FD MD		6 0	-	6 6	6
	TENS	ION	FD MD	15(30) 6	¥5(30) 15(30)	6	6	6 6
OPEN HOLE	COMPRE	SSION	FD	-	6	_	6	-
FILLED HOLE	COMPRE	SSION	FD	6	15(30)	6	6	15(30
BEARING	TENS		FD	6	6	6	6	6 15(30
			FD	15(30)	15(30)	-	-	-
	TENSION	20% LT	MD	15(30)	15(30)		-	-
		30% LT	FD MD	15(30) 15(30)	15(30) 15(30)	-	-	
BOLT		50% LT	FD MD	15(30) 15(30)	15(30) 15(30)	-	-	
BEARING By-pass	3	20% LT	FD MD		15(30) 15(30)			15(30 15(30
	COM -	305 17	FD	-	15(30)	-		15(30
	PRESSION	JUN LI	MD	-	15(30)		-	16(10
		50% LT	FD MD	-	15(30) 15(30)	- -	-	15(30



NADC-87042-60



TEMPERATURE

FIGURE 98. DETERMINATION OF DESIGN ALLOWABLES OVER A RANGE OF TEMPERATURE.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

than those obtained from the worst case scatter analysis method. However, because the inherent assumption in the analysis that the scatter parameter in each data group is approximately equal, this method must be applied with care. A significance test of the equality of  $\alpha$ 's is recommended prior to the application of the joint Weibull analysis. The method of statistical significant test was discussed in Section 2 of Volume I.

The modal value of Weibull shape parameter was determined based on a large amount of static test data over various test parameters. The value of  $\alpha(20.0)$  is recommended to be used in computing the design allowables whenever the  $\alpha$  value obtained from the allowable tests is higher than 20. When the value of  $\alpha$ for the test data is below 20, worst case  $\alpha$  should be used.

It is also recommended that the structural response variation (SRV), discussed in Section 3, is incorporated in the computation of design allowables. This can be accomplished by including equation (26) in the design allowable computation. The computer program BSRV or CSRV given in the Appendix can be used for such computations. The incorporation of SRV in the allowable computation will pose an additional penalty to the However, within the range of typical SRV observed in strength. Reference 5, the A- and B-basis knockdown factors are reduced only by a small amount. For a sample size of 15 with the average SRV ( $\alpha_{SRV} = 17.0$ ), the B-basis knockdown factor is reduced from 0.901 to 0.872 for static strength  $\alpha$  of 20.0. For the B-basis value of SRV ( $\alpha_{SRV}$  = 13.0) the knockdown factor reduced from 0.901 to 0.858. With a sample size of 30, the A-basis knockdown factor is reduced from 0.805 to 0.777 when  $\alpha_{SRV}$  = 17.0 and to The A- and B-basis knockdown factors for 0.762 when  $\alpha_{SRV} = 13.0$ . n = 1 at various values of  $\alpha_{SRV}$  are shown in Figure 99.

#### 5.1.1.2 Fatigue Design Allowables

The fatigue design allowables may be determined by the load factor approach, life factor approch or the ultimate strength approach. The individual or joint Weibull analyses are recommended for computation of design allowables. These approaches for fatigue allowable determination are schematically

## NADC-87042-60



TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

shown in Figure 100. Both the load factor approach and the life factor approach require the computation of design fatigue stress level for B- or A-basis fatigue life at one lifetime. For these approaches the joint Weibull analysis is used to define the B- or The fatigue allowable strength is A-basis stress-life curve. then defined as the stress level on the B- or A-basis curve at one fatigue lifetime. The ultimate strength approach is a more conservative approach. In this approach, the fatigue allowable strength is defined as the B- or A-basis stress level below which no fatigue failure will occur. The value  $\sigma_{TH}^{B}$  shown in Figure 100 is the B-Basis fatigue allowable strength. Although the ultimate strength approach is more conservative, it is recommended that this approach be used to define the fatigue allowable. This is because the flatness of the S-N curve for typical composites, and the high scatter observed in fatigue test data. The value of  $\sigma_{TH}^{D}$ or  $\sigma_{TH}^{A}$  is more clearly defined as compared to  $\sigma_{F}^{B}$  or  $\sigma_{F}^{A}$ . Furthermore, for typical fighter aircraft fatigue load spectra the penalty imposed by this approach is negligible.

The data analysis in Task I have shown that the fatigue life scatter has a modal  $\alpha$  factor of 1.25 for typical graphite/epoxy composites. This indicates that fatigue life scatter for composites is considerably higher than that of aluminum. The modal value of  $\alpha$  for aluminum under spectrum loading is 7.5. The B-basis to mean life ratio for composites with a sample size of 15 is 0.131 as compared to 0.750 for aluminum.

Ň

In planning the fatigue allowable tests, the main consideration is the test environment. The test environment depends on the relationship between the load/temperature spectrum and the MOL. The recommended approach is to use simple conservative constant temperature tests with a constant moisture level. The stress levels used in the fatigue tests should be selected so that the  $\sigma_{\rm TH}$  can be established. For typical graphite/epoxy composites under typical fighter aircraft spectra, the threshold stress level would be approximately 60% of the mean static strength. This would require a minimum of four stress levels for each test condition. From these considerations, using the same



STRESS LEVEL

FATIGUE LIFE

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

number of specimens required for the static allowable tests (15 for B-basis and 30 for A-basis) a large test matrix would result. However, as discussed in Volume I, the fatigue life scatter does not depend on the stress level for a given test condition. Therefore, the pooling techniques for statistical data analysis are justified. The number of tests at each test condition can therefore be reduced. The recommended number of tests for each test condition is 6 for B-basis and 10 for A-basis. A typical test matrix is shown in Table 32.

It is recommended that all fatigue tests are tested until fatigue failure occurs, except at the lowest stress level. At this stress level, because the fatigue threshold is approached, long life is expected. To reduce the test time, fatigue tests may be censored at a specified lifetime. Based on a life scatter of  $\alpha = 1.25$ , the test should last for a minimum of 8 lifetimes for B-basis tests and 50 lifetimes for A-basis.

As in the calculation of static strength allowables, it is recommended that SRV be incorporated in the fatigue allowable computations. Because of the large scatter observed in the fatigue life data, the life factor would be impractical for this The penalty on the load factor imposed by incorporation purpose. small. The load factor approach of SRV is is therefore recommended. Typical load enhancement factors required for graphite/epoxy composites ( $\alpha_s=20.0$  and  $\alpha_L=1.25$ ) are shown in It can be seen from the table that for the average Table 33. value of SRV ( $\alpha_{SRV}$ =17.0) the required load factor is increased by approximately 5% for a B-basis allowables. The increase is approximately 10% for A-basis allowables. It may be noted that because of high scatter in fatigue life for composites, B-basis allowable is the most appropriate statistic for fatigue design. This is also consistent with the approach adopted for metal structures, where the average fatigue property with a safety factor of two or four is used for fatigue design.

## 5.1.2 <u>Design Development Testing</u>

A building block approach to design development testing is essential for the certification of composite structures. This

RECOMMENDED FATIGUE ALLOWABLE TEST MATRIX. TABLE 32.

N	M	HOLE	S	2	S	ŝ
MPRESSIC	ET	NO HOLE	6(10)	6(10)	6(10)	6(10)
00	RTA	NO HOLE	6(10)	6(10)	6(10)	6(10)
	M	HOLE	Ŋ	S	2	S
TENSION	ET	NO HOLE	6(10)	6(10)	6(10)	6(10)
	RTA	NO HOLE	6(10)	6(10)	6(10)	6(10)
STRESS	LEVEL		σ1	0 <sub>2</sub>	0 <sub>3</sub>	σ <b>4</b>

NOTE: Stress Levels are the Maximum Spectrum Stress.

Numbers in ( ) are the Required Number of Specimens for A-Basis Allowable, Other Numbers are for B-Basis Allowable.

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY



## TABLE 33. TYPICAL LOAD FACTORS.

FATIGUE LIFE (Spectrum Lifetimes)	REQUIRED LOAD FACTOR					
	NO SRV		$a_{SRV} = 17.0$ (Mean SRV)		<sup>a</sup> SRV = 13.0 (B-Basis SRV)	
	A	В	A	В	A	В
0.60	1.338	1.197	1.466	1.257	1.556	1.291
0.75	1.305	1.167	1.430	1.226	1.517	1.258
1.00	1.282	1.146	1.404	1.204	1.490	1.236
1.50	1.250	1.117	1.369	1.174	1.453	1.205
2.00	1.227	1.097	1.344	1.153	1.427	1.183
2.50	1.210	1.082	1.326	1.137	1.407	1.167
3.00	1,197	1.070	1.311	1.124	1.391	1.154
3.50	1.185	1.060	1.298	1.113	1.378	1.143
4.00	1.175	1.051	1.287	1.104	1.367	1.133
4.50	1.167	1.043	1.278	1.096	1.357	1.125
5.00	1.159	1.036	1.269	1.089	1.348	1.118
	1		1		1	1

• • • • •

94 Y

NOTE: A for A-Basis with n = 10

B for B-Basis with n = 6

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

is because of the inherent sensitivity of the composite structure to out-of-plane loads and their multiplicity of potential failure modes. Details of the building block approach are discussed in Reference 13 and 21. The essence of the building block approach for composites is as follows. First, use the design/analysis of the aircraft structure to select critical areas for test verifi-Second, determine the most strength-critical failure cation. mode for each design feature. Third, select the test environment which will produce the strength critical failure mode. Special attention should be given to matrix sensitive failure modes (such as compression and bondline) and potential stress "hot spots" caused by out-of-plane loads. Following selection of the critical failure modes, a series of specimens is designed, each one to simulate a single failure mode. The specimens will generally be low complexity specimens. However, the crux of the building approach is to also design test specimens which simulate progressive design complexity. In this way, multiple potential failure modes are simulated.

This building block method to design development testing provides a step-by-step approach to composite design development testing which has several advantages.

- The influence of the environment on individual failure mode is determined.
- The interaction of failure modes is established from the known behavior of individual failure modes.
- Scale-up effect is determined from data on smaller scale specimens.
- "Hot spots" induced in complex structure can be analyzed relative to the known behavior of smaller specimens.

Several factors determine the test complexity of composite design development tests. These are: structural geometry complexity, hygrothermal environment simulation, fatigue load spectrum simulation and mixed composite/metal structure.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

The levels of complexity in the design development testing should be functions of the design feature being validated and the predicted failure mode. Special attention should be given to correct failure mode simulation since failure modes are frequently dependent on the test environment. In particular, the influence of complex loading on the local stress at a given design feature must be evaluated. In composites, out-of-plane stresses can be detrimental to structural integrity and, therefore, require careful evaluation.

The sensitivity of composite matrix dominated failure modes to the aircraft hygrothermal environment makes environmental test simulation a key issue. Environmental test simulation should be considered separately for static and fatigue testing. However, the static test philosophy will form an integral part of the overall certification philosophy. The static and fatigue testings are discussed in the following paragraphs.

## 5.1.2.1 Static Tests

The philosophy for design development testing should be that the test environment used is the one that produces the failure mode which gives the lowest static strength. That is the worst case environment, or the temperature associated with most critical load should be used.

The extent of the static test effort will be different from aircraft to aircraft and also from component to component. The number of replicates for each test should be sufficient to identify the critical failure mode and provide a reasonable estimate of the mean strength of the element. The test effort should be concentrated on the most critical design feature of the structure. The number of replicates should be increased for the critical design features. A cost trade-off is usually involved in deciding the levels of complexity and the number of replicates.

If mixed failure modes are observed in a certain specimen type, more tests are required to establish the worst failure mode and the associated mean strength. An example of



mixed failure mode in the design development testing of Reference 5 was discussed in Section 4.3. Two failure modes were observed in the Wing Outboard Fuel Bay Subcomponent (WS-1) tests under 250°F/wet condition. The observed failure modes were upper skin failure and intermediate spar/lower skin cocured joint failure. For WS-1 the intermediate spar/lower skin cocured joint failure mode gave the lower failure load. Thus, the mean strength associated with this failure mode would need to be established.

An example of the building block approach for specimen complexity was given in Figure 57, which shows the approach used for the wing structure in Reference 5. There, the wing structure was broken down into critical areas. Each critical area was simulated in a test specimen whose complexity is governed by the necessity to simulate the predicted failure mode(s). Particular attention was given to matrix critical failure modes. The following recommendations are made for specimen complexity simulation in design development testing:

- 1. Use the design/analysis of the aircraft structure to select critical areas for test verification.
- Specimen complexity should be controlled by the requirement to simulate the correct (full-scale structure) failure mode(s) in the specimen.
- 3. Special attention should be given to matrix sensitive failure modes, such as compression, bondline and hole wear.
- 4. Potential "hot spots" caused by out-of-plane loads should be carefully evaluated.

## 5.1.2.2 Fatigue Tests

The environmental complexity necessary for fatique design development testing will depend the aircraft on hygrothermal history. Three factors must be considered. These are: structural temperature for each mission profile, the load/temperature relationships for the aircraft, and the moisture content as a function of the aircraft usage and structure thick-In order to obtain these data, it is necessary to derive ness.
TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM NADC-87042-60

the real time load-temperature profiles for each mission in the aircraft's history. These relationships will have a significant influence on the environmental fatigue test requirements.

An example of this approach was given in Reference 5. The aircraft temperature spectrum and load factor/temperature relationships derived from the mission profiles were shown in Figures 20 and 21. These relationships strongly depend on the aircraft type, configuration and mission requirements and must be carefully developed on a case by case basis. The structural material should be selected to meet these mission requirements without exceeding the MOL. If this is accomplished, hot/wet testing would not be required. Material sele tions which lead to significant environmental fatigue test requirements should be a last resort.

In composite materials, no significant load sequence effect on fatigue life has been observed. However, studies on load spectrum variations have shown that composites are extremely sensitive to variation in the number of high loads in the fatigue spectrum. In contrast, truncation of low loads does not significantly affect fatigue life. Therefore, the following recommendations are made for load spectrum simulation in composite fatigue testing:

- 1. High loads in the fatigue spectrum must be carefully simulated.
- 2. Low loads (<30 percent limit load stress) may be truncated to save test time without significantly affecting fatigue life.
- 3. Fatigue testing of mixed metal/composite structure may introduce conflicting requirements and should be evaluated on an individual basis.

As was discussed in Section 4, the use of fatigue test data to verify fatigue life on subcomponents require long test duration because of the high fatigue life scatter observed in composite structures. The load enhancement factor approach or the ultimate strength approach is recommended in planning the

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

fatigue design development testing. In the load enhancement factor (LEF) approach, the B- or A-basis LEF is applied to the design load spectrum. A two lifetime fatigue test plus static residual strength test is recommended. Typical LEF for two lifetime tests is approximately 1.15 for a B-Basis reliability with average SRV considered (see Table 33).

In applying the ultimate strength approach, the maximum spectrum load should be kept below the B- or A-basis fatigue threshold. The fatigue life requirements are verified from the static test results. No fatigue tests are required for this approach. This approach provides a conservative estimate of the fatigue reliability.

An alternate for environmental fatigue tests is to use increased loads at RTA condition to account for the environmental effects. An environmental knockdown factor, as discussed in Section 2.1 together with LEF is applied to the fatigue spectrum for RTA fatigue tests. The environmental knockdown factor can be calculated from the results of the design allowable tests. This approach eliminates the environmental fatigue tests. However, in some cases a high load factor may be required and result in a quasi-static failure at the first appearance of the maximum spectrum load. For example, the environmental knockdown factor obtained in Reference 5 for the 242°F/wet condition was 1.31. The B-Basis two lifetime test LEF at the mean SRV is 1.153. From these values, the resulting load factor is 1.51. Therefore, this approach is feasible only if the maximum design spectrum load is below 0.66 of the mean static strength, otherwise quasi-static failure will occur at the peak fatigue load during the RTA fatigue tests. The fatigue reliability will not be verified when this happens.

00000

1

The number of replicates to be used in the fatigue design development testing should be determined using the same philosophy as in the static tests. A sufficient number must be used to verify the critical failure modes and to reasonably estimate the required fatigue reliability.

197

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM NADC-87042-60

#### 5.1.2.3 <u>Mixed Composite/Metal Structures</u>

An analysis of mixed composite/metallic full-scale testing in Reference 8 has shown that:

- The increased environmental sensitivity and material property variability in composites (compared to metals) can lead to inadequate assurance of the static strength integrity of composite structure.
- Because of the superior fatigue performance of composites, a mixed composite/metal structure fatigue will essentially interrogate only the metal structure. Thus, any potential "hot spots" in the composite structure may not be found.

Because of the potential inadequacy of full-scale tests on mixed composite/metal structure and also the natural reluctance to overdesign metal parts in a full-scale test structure, it will be necessary to validate the composite structure during the design development testing phase. However, the specimen complexity should be adequate to enable the performance of the full-scale structure to be correctly simulated. Validation of the composite structure using subcomponent tests can offer the following advantages:

- The components may be chosen for test purposes to interrogate the composite structure only.
- If environmental test conditions are required it will be easier and cheaper to achieve in a component.
- It may be possible to test more than one replicate and thus increase confidence in the data base.
- The results can be utilized in qualification of the full-scale structure.

In order that component tests achieve their objective, great care must be exercised in getting the boundary conditions correct. In addition, eliminating metal failure modes

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRAR

by overdesign or replacement must be carefully evaluated so that relative effects such as differential thermal expansion are not masked.

It is concluded, therefore, that certification of combined composite/metal structures offer special problems which must be addressed carefully in the design analysis and test phase.

An alternative approach for the certification of mixed structures is the change in spectrum approach, discussed in Section 2.4. The application of this approach involves insertion of overload cycles in the fatigue spectrum in order to reduce the differences in life between metals and composites. The magnitude and frequency of the overload cycles can be determined from life analysis of the metal and composite parts. The introduction of the overload cycles permit demonstration of the B- or A-basis test reliability for both composite and metal parts in a mixed structure. This is achieved without making the test overly severe for metallic structures.

### 5.1.3 <u>Full-Scale Testing</u>

Following successful conclusion of the design development testing program, qualification culminates in fullscale static and durability tests.

### 5.1.3.1 Full-Scale Static Test

The full scale static test is the most crucial qualification test for composite structures for the following reasons. Secondary loads are virtually impossible to eliminate from complex built-up structure. Such loads can be produced by eccentricities, stiffness changes, discontinuities, fuel pressure loading and loading in the post-buckled range. Some of these sources of secondary loads are represented for the first time in the full-scale structural test article. These loads are not a significant design driver in metallic structures. However, the poor interlaminar strength of composites makes them extremely

susceptible to out-of-plane secondary loads. It is very important, therefore, to carefully account for these loads in the design of composite structures. Unfortunately, there is а general state of uncertainty as to the source, magnitude and full-scale effects of secondary loads in complex built-up This has been confirmed by several composite structures. documented examples of unanticipated secondary loads leading to unexpected failure modes in full scale composite structural static tests.

Work in Reference 12 has shown that the RTA static test plays the most significant role in revealing unexpected hot spot failures from secondary out-of-plane loads. A room temperature enviroment is therefore recommended for full scale static test, which should be conducted to failure.

In addition, a detailed correlation in terms of measured load and strain distributions, structural analysis data and environmental effects between the design development and full scale test data will be necessary to provide assurance of composite static strength. Static test environmental degradation must be accounted for separately either by adverse condition testing, by additional test design factors or by correlation with environmental design development test data.

#### 5.1.3.2 Full-Scale Durability Test

Current practice for metallic structures is a two lifetime test using the design load spectrum under RT/ambient test conditions.

The work in Reference 12 and other USAF sponsored programs have shown that composites possess excellent durability. In particular, the extensive data base developed in Reference 12 showed that composite structures, which demonstrated adequate static strength, were fatigue insensitive.

Therefore, it is recommended that no durability full scale test is required for all composite structures or mixed

200

ECHNICAL LIBRAR

composite/metal structures with non-fatigue critical metal parts, provided the design development testing and full scale static test are successful. For mixed structure, with fatigue critical metal parts, a two lifetime ambient test will be required to demonstrate durability validation of the metal parts.

#### 5.2 <u>Test Result Interpretation</u>

The certification testing methodology developed in Section 3 is recommended to be in used test result interpretation. fatique The static strength and life reliabilities should be assessed based on the test data. The procedure for static and fatigue data evaluation was demonstrated in Section 4. This procedure is summarized below.

- 1. Establish baseline reliability parameters: These parameters are determined from the results of the allowable tests or obtained from the existing data base. The parameters include the static and fatique life Weibull scatter parameters  $(\alpha_{s})$ and  $\alpha_{\rm L}$ ), the structural response variability  $(\alpha_{SRV})$  and environmental knockdown factor  $(k_{ENV})$ .
- 2. Determine the static strength reliability: Both the RTA and worst case environment strength reliabilities should be computed at both DLL and DUL. The reliability is computed based on the test failure load. The reliability calculation methods described in Sections 3 and 4 or the computer programs BSRV or CSRV can be used for any composite structures. However, case should be exercised computing in reliabilities for structures with multiple failure modes because work in Reference 5 has shown that these failure modes can exhibit high scatter in static strength. Reliability analysis of these failures should be conducted on a case-by-case basis using experimentally determined scatter factor ( $\alpha_{\rm S}$ ) for the particular failure mode.

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

3. Determine the required test failure load: The required (minimum) test failure load for each test environment for a specified static strength reliability can be determined using the method developed in Section 3 and 4.

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

- 4. Determine the one lifetime fatigue reliability from static strength data: The one lifetime fatigue reliability can be computed using the ultimate strength approach discussed in Section 4 (or computer program BSRV or CSRV). The reliability calculated from this approach is a conservative estimate of the fatigue life reliability. A low reliability based on this approach does not imply that the design feature has poor fatigue strength. It just means that no significant reliability can be inferred from the static strength data. The reliability depends on the maximum spectrum load, the spectrum characteristics, SRV and the static failure load.
- 5. Determine the fatigue life reliability, using the load enhancement factor approach: The load enhancement factor approach was described in Section 2.2 and the application of this approach, accounting for SRV, was demonstrated in Section 4. Where fatigue failure occurred during test, the actual fatigue life is used to directly assess the fatigue reliability. When fatigue test is terminated without fatigue failure, the test duration (e.g. two lifetimes) is used to conservatively estimate the fatigue reliability.
- 6. Determine the fatigue life reliability based on the residual strength approach: In the case that the test LEF is not sufficient and the fatigue test is terminated after a short duration, the fatigue reliability demonstrated by the LEF



approach would usually be low. This is typical for composite structures, because of the high fatigue life scatter. For situations like this, residual static strength test to failure is recommended to provide further information on fatigue reliability. The residual static strength data is then used to determine the fatigue ]'fe reliability. This approach was demonstrated in Section 4.

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

#### SECTION 6

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### 6.1 <u>Summary</u>

The results of this research program are summarized below:

- 1. An extensive data analysis has been conducted to establish the static strength and fatigue life data scatter for typical g1\_phite/epoxy composites.
- 2. Various approaches to composite structure certification were analytically evaluated. The capability, advantages and disadvantages of each approach were fully discussed.
- 3. A methodology for certification testing of composite structures has been developed.
- 4. The methodology was demonstrated on an existing composite structure. The static and fatigue reliabilities of the structure were assessed based on test data.
- 5. A detailed certification testing approach was presented. Guidelines for test planning and test data interpretation were recommended.

#### 6.2 <u>Conclusions</u>

The following conclusions may be drawn from the investigation undertaken in this program:

1. The Navy approach to static strength certification is, in general, soundly based. In particular, it strikes a good balance between the technical requirements of the test and cost effectiveness. The main area of concern in this approach is the assumed ability to predict full-scale structure failure mode. Because of the inherent sensitivity of composite structures to out-of-plane

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

secondary loads, a certification process which assumes correct prediction of a full-scale structural failure mode must carry some degree of risk.

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

- 2. The high scatter of composite fatigue life data makes life factor approach for fatigue certification very difficult. A practical approach is to use the load enhancement factor approach. In principle, this is equivalent to the Navy Approach of applying severe spectrum in fatigue tests.
- 3. The incorporation of the structural response variability in the reliability calculations is important in reducing the possibility of "hot spots" failure.
- 4. Environmental sensitivity is a key issue in design of composite structures. This problem can be avoided by careful selection of materials so that the structure only operates within the material operating limit.
- 5. Success of certification testing depends on test planning and soundly based data interpretation method.

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

EX323333

#### REFERENCES

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

- Weinberger, R.A.; Somoroff, A.R.; and Riley, B.L.; "U.S. Navy Certification of Composite Wings for the F-18 and Advanced Harrier Aircraft," Paper No. 77-466 in AIAA Aircraft Composites: The Emerging Methodology for Structural Assurance, San Diego, California (March 1977).
- 2. Murray, J.E., "F-18 Composites Development Tests," N00019-79-C-0044 (January 1981).
- 3. Stenberg, K.V., et al., "YAV-8B Composite Wing Development," Volumes I-III N00019-76-C-0242, 0666 (October 1980).
- 4. Riley, B.L.; Rintoul, R.D. and Roberts, L.A.; "Certification of Composite Structures," presented at the 5th DOD/NASA Conference on Fibrous Composites in Structural Design, New Orleans, Louisiana (January 1981).
- 5. Whitehead, R.S. et al "Composite Wing Fuselage Program," Contract F33615-79-C-3203, Interim Reports 1-11, October 1979 - October 1984.
- 6. Cardrick, A.W., "Proposals for a Common International Approach to Structural Airworthiness Certification," RAE (August 1983).
- 7. Bohon, H.L., et al., "Ground Test Experience With Large Composite Structures For Commercial Transports," NASA TM 84627 (March 1983).
- 8. Guyett, P.R. and Cardrick, A.W., "The Certification of Composite Airframe Structures," Paper No. 830/3 Aeronautical Journal (July 1980), pp. 188-203.
- 9. Whitehead, R.S. and Deo, R.B., "Wing/Fuselage Program Durability Methodology," presented at 6th Mechanics of Composites Review, Dayton, Ohio, November 1980.
- 10. Whitehead, R.S., "A Review of the Rationale for Durability Validation of Composite Structures," proceedings of the 5th DOD/NASA Conference on Fibrous Composites in Structural Design, New Orleans, Louisiana (January 1981).
- 11. Whitehead, R.S. and Eves, J.J., "Durability Certification Data for Composite Structures," presented at the 6th DOD/NASA Conference on Fibrous Composites in Structural Design, New Orleans, Louisiana (January 1983).
- 12. Whitehead, R.S.; Ritchie, G.L. and Mullineaux, J.L.; "Durability of Composites" presented at 9th Mechanics of Composites Review, Dayton, Ohio (October 1983).

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

- <page-header><image><image><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item>

#### NADC-87042-60

#### <u>APPENDIX</u>

#### COMPUTER PROGRAMS

The computer programs used in the data analysis and reliability calculations are documented in this Appendix. The programs are written in FORTRAN language and are suitable to be used on the IBM personal computers. Five programs are included below. The theoretical backgrounds are presented in Section 2 of Volume I and Sections 2 and 3 in this volume. The program listings, input and output descriptions and sample problems are given in the following paragraphs.

#### A.1 <u>Program "WEIBULL"</u>

The program WEIBULL computes the maximum likelihood estimates (MLE) of Weibull shape and scale parameters. The program also computes the mean, standard deviation and coefficient of variation of the data set based on both normal and Weibull distributions. The A- and B-basis allowables are computed based on the MLE Weibull parameters. A  $\chi^2$  goodness-of-fit test is also conducted in the program.

The required input to WEIBULL are:

- 1. A 32-character problem title (INAME)
- 2. Total number of data points (N)
- 3. Number of specimens that failed (NF)
- 4. Data set mode (MODE) MODE  $\leq$  10 for normal operation mode.
- 5. Data value and data point ID

ID = 1 specimen failed  $ID \neq 1$  specimen censored

If N = NF, use ID = 1 for all data points. Maximum number of data points is 60.

6. Number of intervals for goodness-of-fit test (INT).

The programm listing the input and output of a sample problem are given below.



C PROGRAM 'WEIBULL' MLE ESTIMATE OF WEIBULL PARAMETETS FROM DATA DOUBLEPRECISION B, Y, CHL, ALPHA, CHIS, GAMMA1, GAM1, GAM2, ARM1, ARM2, P, S DIMENSION ID(60), FR(60), RK(60), INAME(8) COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101)COMMON/CHI/CHL(15) OPEN(5,FILE='PSI.DAT') READ(5, \*) (B(I), I=1, 101) READ(5,\*) (Y(I),I=1,101) READ(5,\*) (CHL(I),I=1,15) PAL = -ALOG(0.99)PBL = -ALOG(0.90)SUM = 0.0SUD = 0.0KCOT = 0WRITE(\*,20)READ(\*,3) INAME WRITE(\*,10) 10 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE ENTER TOTAL NUMBER OF SPECIMENS') READ(\*,\*) N WRITE(\*,15) 15 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE ENTER NUMBER OF SPECIMEN THAT FAILED') READ(\*,\*) NF 20 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE ENTER DATASET NAME: 32 CHARACTERS') 3 FORMAT(8A4) WRITE(\*,30) 30 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE ENTER MODE CODE', +/2X,'IF MODE.GE.10 HALF SPECIMENS FAILED, N=NF') READ(\*,\*) MODE WRITE(\*,41) 41 FORMAT(2X, 'SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 SPECIMEN FAILED' +/20X,'ID.NE.1 TEST CENSORED') DO 35 J = 1, NWRITE(\*,40) J 40 FORMAT(2X, 'ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN', I3) READ(\*,\*) FR(J), ID(J)**35 CONTINUE** WRITE(\*, 50)50 FORMAT(2X, 'ENTER NUMBER OF INTERVALS FOR GOODNESS TEST') READ(\*,\*) INT T = NN2 = N\*2ALPHA = 10.0WRITE(\*,60) INAME WRITE(\*, 65)DO 70 I=1,N IF(I.EQ.N) GOTO 70 II = I+1DO 71 K = I1, NIF(FR(I), LE, FR(K)) GOTO 71 FRT = FR(I)FR(I) = FR(K)FR(K) = FRTIDT = ID(I)ID(I) = ID(K)ID(K) = IDT

.

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM NADC-87042-60

```
71 CONTINUE
 70 CONTINUE
    FART = ALOG10(FR(1))
     IF(FART.LE.0.5) GOTO 270
     LFA = FART
    RA = 10.0**LFA
    GOTO 271
270 RA = 1.0
271 DO 75 I=1,N
    \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{N} - \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{I}
    RK(I) = \frac{1}{2} / (T+1.0)
     SUM = SUM + FR(I)
     SUD = SUD + FR(I) * FR(I)
    WRITE(*,80) FR(I),RK(I),ID(I)
 75 \text{ FR}(I) = \text{FR}(I)/\text{RA}
    AVE = SUM/T
    VA = (SUD-T*AVE*AVE)/(T-1.0)
    STD = SQRT(VA)
     CV = STD/AVE
     IF(CV.LT.0.030) ALPHA = 75.0
 65 FORMAT (5X, 'ORDERED STRENGTH
                                         ASSIGNED PROBABILITY', 4X, 'CODE')
 80 FORMAT(5X,F12.5,9X,F12.5,12X,I2)
 60 FORMAT(2X, 'WEIBULL ANALYSIS: ',8A4)
    KKT = 0
 85 P = 0.0
    R = 0.0
    S = 0.0
    KCOT = KCOT+1
    IF(KKT.GT.2) GOTO 200
    DO 90 I = 1, N
    ACR = 174.0/ALOG(FR(N))
    IF(ACR.LT.0.0) GOTO 95
    IF(ALPHA.LT.ACR) GOTO 95
    ALPHA = 75.0
    KKT = KKT+1
    GOTO 85
 95 P = P + FR(I) * ALPHA
    S = S+FR(I) **ALPHA*ALOG(FR(I))
    IF(ID(I).NE.1) GOTO 90
    R = R + ALOG(FR(I))
 90 CONTINUE
    IF(MODE.LT.10) GOTO 98
    P = 2.0*P
    S = 2.0 * S
 98 ALPH1 = NF*P/(NF*S-P*R)
    DA = ABS(ALPH1-ALPHA)
    IF(DA.LE.0.0001) GOTO 100
    ALPHA = (ALPHA+ALPH1)/2.0
    IF(KCOT.GT.100) GOTO 100
    GOTO 85
100 \text{ ALR} = 1.0/\text{ALPHA}
    BETA = (P/NF) * ALR
    BETA = BETA * RA
    WRITE(*,105) ALPHA, BETA
    WRITE(*,110) KCOT
```



```
105 FORMAT(2X, 'MAX. LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATE OF WEIBULL PARAMETERS: '
   A/2X, 'SHAPE PARAMETER ALHPA =', F12.5
   B/2X, 'SCALE PARAMETER BETA =', F12.5)
110 FORMAT(5X, 'NUMBER OF ITERATIONS KCOT = ', 15)
    CHSQ = CHIS(N)
115 BETAL = BETA/(CHSQ**ALR)
    ALL = BETAL*PAL**ALR
    BLL = BETAL*PBL**ALR
    WRITE(*,120) BETAL, ALL, BLL
120 FORMAT(2X, '95% CONF. LOWER BETA =', F12.5,
          /2X, 'A-BASIS ALLOWABLE =', F12.5
   Α
                                      =',F12.5)
   В
           /2X, 'B-BASIS ALLOWABLE
    WRITE(*,125) AVE,STD,CV
    ARM1 = 1.0+1.0/ALPHA
    ARM2 = 1.0+2.0/ALPHA
    GAM1 = GAMMA1(ARM1)
    GAM2 = GAMMA1(ARM2)
    XMEAN = BETA*GAM1
    COVS = (GAM2-GAM1*GAM1)/(GAM1*GAM1)
    COV = SQRT(COVS)
    STDW = COV \star XMEAN
130 FORMAT(2X, 'WEIBULL:')
    WRITE(*,130)
    WRITE(*,125) XMEAN, STDW, COV
135 FORMAT(6X, 'STRENGTH VALUE
                                PROBABILITY OF SURVIVAL')
140 FORMAT(2F13.5)
150 FORMAT(4F12,5)
125 FORMAT(2X, 'MEAN STRENGTH FAVE =', F12.5
          /2X, 'STANDARD DEVIATION
                                      =',F12.5
   Α
                                       =',F12.5)
           /2X, 'COEFF. OF VARIATION
   в
    DO 155 M=1,N
155 FR(M) = RA*FR(M)
    DF = FR(N) - FR(1)
    WRITE(*,165)
165 FORMAT(/9X, 'RIGHT END', 5X, 'OBSERVED', 10X, 'EXPECTED', 10X, 'CHI-SQ')
    DIN = DF/INT+0.005
    SUCHI = 0.0
    PENL = EXP(-(FR(1)/BETA) * ALPHA)
    ENRT = FR(1) + DIN
    JK = 1
    RIGHT = FR(N) + 0.5 * DIN
170 \text{ INK} = 0
    DO 175 I = JK,N
    IF(FR(I).GT.ENRT) GOTO 180
175 INK = INK+1
180 JK = JK + INK
    PENR = (ENRT/BETA) * *ALPHA
    PENR = EXP(-PENR)
    EO = (PENL-PENR) *N
    DEO = EO-INK
    CHI = DEO * DEO / EO
    SUCHI = SUCHI+CHI
    WRITE(*,185) ENRT, INK, EO, CHI
185 FORMAT(5X,F12.4,8X,I3,2(9X,F12.5))
    PENL = PENR
```

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

NADC-87042-60

```
ENRT = ENRT+DIN
    IF(RIGHT.GE.ENRT) GOTO 170
    NDOF = INT-3
    WRITE(*,190) NDOF, SUCHI
190 FORMAT (/2X, 'AT ', I3, 'DEGREES OF FREEDOM',
   A/2X, 'THE CHI-SQUARE VALUE FOR GOODNESS OF FIT IS', 2X, F12.5)
    FI = FR(1) - 0.3 * DF
    IF(FI.LE.0.0) FI=0.01*DF
    DD = DF/40.0
    WRITE(*,135)
    DO 195 I=1,65
    XX = FI+(I-1)*DD
    AR = (XX/BETA) * ALPHA
    YY = EXP(-AR)
195 WRITE(*,80) XX,YY
200 CONTINUE
    STOP
    END
    FUNCTION CHIS(N)
    DOUBLEPRECISION CHL, CHIS, BE, CL
    COMMON/CHI/CHL(15)
    AN = N
    BN = 2.0 \star AN
    IF(N.GE.15) GOTO 50
    CHIS = CHL(N)
    GOTO 60
50 BE = 1.0/(9.0*AN)
    CL = 1.0-BE+1.645*SQRT(BE)
    CHIS = CL*CL*CL
60 CONTINUE
   RETURN
   END
   FUNCTION GAMMA1(X)
   DOUBLEPRECISION A, B, X, Y, F, ARG, SLOP, GAMMA1
   COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101)
   ARG = X
   A = 1.0
   IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10
   IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110
   IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110
   IF(ARG.GT.2.C) GOTO 20
   GOTO 30
10 A = A/ARG
   ARG = ARG+1.0
   IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10
   IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110
   GOTO 30
20 \text{ ARG} = \text{ARG-1.0}
   A = \Lambda * ARG
   IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110
   IF(ARG.GT.2.0) GOTO 20
30 DO 40 I=1,101
   IF(B(I).GT.ARG) GOTO 50
40 CONTINUE
50 SLOP = (Y(I)-Y(I-1))/(B(I)-B(I-1))
```

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

F = Y(I-1)+(ARG-B(I-1))\*SLOP GOTO 60 110 F = 1.0 60 GAMMA1 = F\*A RETURN END

PSI.DAT TAB VALUES OF CHI-SQUARE AND GAMMA FUNCTIONS 1.0, 1.01, 1.02, 1.03, 1.04, 1.05, 1.06, 1.07, 1.08, 1.09, 1.1, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.2, 1.21, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 1.25, 1.26, 1.27, 1.28, 1.29, 1.3, 1.31, 1.32, 1.33, 1.34, 1.35, 1.36, 1.37, 1.38, 1.39, 1.4, 1.41, 1.42, 1.43, 1.44, 1.45, 1.46, 1.47, 1.48, 1.49, 1.5, 1.51, 1.52, 1.53, 1.54, 1.55, 1.56, 1.57, 1.58, 1.59, 1.6, 1.61, 1.62, 1.63, 1.64, 1.65, 1.66, 1.67, 1.68, 1.69, 1.7, 1.71, 1.72, 1.73, 1.74, 1.75, 1.76, 1.77, 1.78, 1.79, 1.8, 1.81, 1.82, 1.83, 1.84, 1.85, 1.86, 1.87, 1.88, 1.89, 1.9, 1.91, 1.92, 1.93, 1.94, 1.53, 1.96, 1.97, 1.98, 1.99, 2., 1., .99433, .98884, .98355, .97844, .9735, .96874, .96415, .95973, 2.9955, 2.372, 2.09867, 1.93838, 1.8307, 1.75217, 1.69179, 1.6435, 1.60383, 1.5705, 1.542, 1.51729, 1.49558, 1.47632, 1.4591

CUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPA TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

WEIBULL PLEASE ENTER DATASET NAME: 32 CHARACTERS WEIBULL ANALYSIS: SAMPLE PROBLEM PLEASE ENTER TOTAL NUMBER OF SPECIMENS 10 PLEASE ENTER NUMBER OF SPECIMEN THAT FAILED 10 PLEASE ENTER MODE CODE IF MODE.GE.10 HALF SPECIMENS FAILED, N=NF 0 SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 SPECIMEN FAILED ID.NE.1 TEST CENSORED ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN ٦ 4574.0000000 1 ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 4705.0000000 -1 ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 3 5305.0000000 1 ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 4 5425.0000000 1 ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 5 6631.0000000 1 ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 6 6692.0000000 ٦. ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 7 7109.0000000 1 ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 8 7392.0000000 1 ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN Q 7590.0000000 1 ENTER STRENGTH VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 10 7757.0000000 1 ENTER NUMBER OF INTERVALS FOR GOODNESS TEST 5 WEIBULL ANALYSIS: WEIBULL ANALYSIS: SAMPLE PROBLEM CODE ORDERED STRENGTH ASSIGNED PROBABILITY 4574.00000 .90909 1 4705.00000 .81818 1 5305.00000 .72727 1 5425.00000 .63636 1 .54545 6631.00000 1 6692.00000 .45455 1 7109.00000 .36364 1 7392.00000 .27273 1 .18182 7590.00000 1 7757.00000 .09091 1 MAX. LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATE OF WEIBULL PARAMETERS: SHAPE PARAMETER ALHPA = 6.74585 SCALE PARAMETER BETA = 6793.37500 NUMBER OF ITERATIONS KCOT = 10 95 CONF. LOWER BETA = 6353.67600A-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 3212.69700 B-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 4551.42700 MEAN STRENGTH FAVE = 6318.00000 STANDARD DEVIATION = 1209.80300

KAKAN MATANA MANANA MANANA MANANA MATANA MANANA MANANA MANANA MANANA MANANA MANANA MANANA MANANA MANANA MANANA

	TECHNICAL	LIBRARY	
	NADC-87042-60		
COEFF. OF VARIATION WEIBULL: MEAN STRENGTH FAVE STANDARD DEVIATION	= .19149 $= 6342.53400$ $= 1102.71200$		
COEFF. OF VARIATION	= .17386		
RIGHT END 5210.6050 5847.2100 6483.8150 7120.4200	OBSERVED 2 2 0 3	EXPECTED .86846 1.50956 2.13309 2.28595	CHI-SQ 1.47433 .15934 2.13309 .22305
7757.0250	3	1.66725	1.06536
AT 2DEGREES OF FREE THE CHI-SQUARE VALUE STRENGTH VALUE 3619.10000 3698.67500 3778.25000 3857.82500 3937.40000	EDOM FOR GOODNESS OF PROBABILITY OF .98581 .98359 .98107 .97825 97508	FIT IS SURVIVAL	5.05516
4016.97500 4096.55000 4176.12500 4255.70000 4335.27500 4414.85000	.97153 .96756 .96315 .95826 .95283 .94684		
4494.42500 4574.00000 4653.57500 4733.15000 4812.72500 4892.30000 4971.87500	.94024 .93299 .92504 .91634 .90686 .89655 .88536		
5051.45000 5131.02500 5210.60000 5290.17500 5369.75000 5449.32500	.87326 .86020 .84614 .83106 .81492 .79771		
5528.90000 5608.47500 5688.05000 5767.62500 5847.20000 5926.77500 6006.35000	.77940 .75999 .73947 .71787 .69519 .67147 .64676		
6085.92500 6165.50000 6245.07500 6324.65000 6404.22500 6483.80000 6563.37500	.62112 .59461 .56732 .53936 .51084 .48188 .45263		
6642.95000	.42325		

.

#### THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

# NADC-87042-60

6722.52500
6802.10000
6881,67500
6961.25000
7040.82500
7120.40000
7199.97500
7279.55000
7359.12500
7438.70000
7518.27500
7597.85000
7677.42500
7757.00000
7836.57500
7916.15000
7995.72500
8075.30000
8154.87500
8234.44900
8314.02500
8393.60000
8473.17500
8552.75000
8632.32400
8711.90000

,

. 39388
26460
. 30403
.33587
.30758
28000
.20000
.25329
.22761
.20310
17000
.1/990
.15811
.13784
.11913
10202
.10203
.08656
.07271
.06044
04069
.04900
.04038
.03242
.02570
02011
.02011
.01552
.01180
.00884
00652
.00052
.00473

A.2 Program "WEIBJNT"

The program WEIBJNT is used for joint Weibull analysis of pooled data. The program computes the joint MLE Weibull shape parameter for the pooled data, the scale parameter, A- and Bbasis allowables, mean, standard deviation and coefficient of variation of each individual data set. The program also prints the normalized joint Weibull distribution.

NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

The required input to WEIBJNT are:

1. A 32-character problem title (INAME)

2. Number of data sets (M)

3. Number of data points in the Ith data set (NC(I))

4. Number of specimens failed in the Ith data set (NF(I))

5. Data value and ID for the Jth specimen in the Ith data set (FR(I,J)), ID(I,J))

ID(I,J) = 1 specimen failed  $ID(I,J) \neq 1$  specimen censored

Input item 5 is repeat N(I) times for the N(I) specimens. Input items 3,4 and 5 are repeat M times for M sets of data.

The program listing, the input and output of a sample example are given below:

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

```
PROGRAM 'WEIBJNT' JOINT MLE OF WEIBULL PARAMETERS
С
      DOUBLEPRECISION B, Y, CHL, ALPHA, CHIS, GAMMA1, GAM1, GAM2, ARM1, ARM2
      DIMENSION ID(10,15), FR(10,15), RA(10), INAME(8), P(10), N(10), NF(10)
      DIMENSION F(150), IDN(150), IMN(150)
      COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101)
      COMMON/CHI/CHL(15)
      OPEN(5,FILE='PSI.DAT')
      READ(5, *) (B(I), I=1, 101)
      READ(5, *) (Y(I), I=1, 101)
      READ(5,*) (CHL(I), I=1, 15)
      PAL = -ALOG(0.99)
      PBL = -ALOG(0.90)
      NM = 0
      KCOT = 0
      WRITE(*,20)
   10 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET', I3)
      READ(*,3) INAME
      WRITE(*,501)
      READ(*,*) M
  501 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE ENTER NUMBER OF DATA SETS')
      DO 502 I =1,M
      WRITE(*,10) I
   15 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET', I3)
      READ(*,*) N(I)
      NM = NM+N(I)
      WRITE(*,15) I
   20 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE ENTER A 32-CHARACTER PROBLEM TITLE')
      READ(*,*) NF(I)
    3 FORMAT(8A4)
      WRITE(*,41)
   41 FORMAT(2X, 'SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED')
      DO 35 J = 1, N(I)
      WRITE(*,40) J
   40 FORMAT(2X, 'ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 'I3)
      READ(*,*) FR(I,J),ID(I,J)
   35 CONTINUE
 502 CONTINUE
      WRITE(*,60) INAME
      WRITE(*,503) M
      ALPHA = 10.0
 503 FORMAT(2X, 'TOTAL NUMBER OF DATA SETS M = ', I3)
      DO 505 I=1,M
      WRITE(*,504) I
 504 FORMAT (//2X, 'DATA SET NO.', I3)
      WRITE(*,506) N(I),NF(I)
 506 FORMAT(2X, 'NUMBER OF SPECIMENS = '13 3X. 'NUMBER OF FAILURES', 13)
      SUM = 0.0
      SUD = 0.0
      WRITE(*, 65)
  65 FORMAT(/5X, 'ORDER DATA', 9X, 'ASSD. PROB.', 13X, 'CODE')
      DO 70 J=1, N(I)
      IF(J.EQ.N(I)) GOTO 70
      II = J+1
      DO 71 K=I1,N(I)
      IF(FR(I,J).LE.FR(I,K)) GOTO 71
```

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

#### NADC-87042-60

```
FRT = FR(I,J)
    FR(I,J) = FR(I,K)
    FR(I,K) = FRT
    IDT = ID(I,J)
    ID(I,J) = ID(I,K)
    ID(I,K) = IDT
 71 CONTINUE
 70 CONTINUE
    FART = ALOG10(FR(I, 1))
    IF(FART.LE.0.5) GOTO 270
    LFA = FART
    RA(I) = 10.0**LFA
    GOTO 271
270 \text{ RA(I)} = 1.0
271 DO 75 J=1,N(I)
    A = N(I) - J + 1.0
    RK = A/(N(I)+1.0)
    SUM = SUM + FR(I,J)
    SUD = SUD + FR(I,J) * FR(I,J)
    WRITE(*,80) FR(I,J),RK,ID(I,J)
 75 FR(I,J) = FR(I,J)/RA(I)
    AVE = SUM/N(I)
    VA = (SUD-N(I) * AVE * AVE) / (N(I) - 1.0)
    STD = SQRT(VA)
    CV = STD/AVE
 80 FORMAT(5X,F12.3,9X,F12.5,12X,I2)
 60 FORMAT(///2X, 'JOINT WEIBULL ANALYSIS: ',8A4)
    WRITE(*,125) AVE,STD,CV
505 CONTINUE
 85 \text{ PM} = 0.0
    RM = 0.0
    KCOT = KCOT+1
    DO 510 I=1,M
    P(I) = 0.0
    R = 0.0
    S = 0.0
    DO 90 J=1,N(I)
    T = FR(I,J) * ALPHA
    TL = ALOG(FR(I,J))
    P(I) = P(I) + T
    S = S+T*TL
    IF(ID(I,J).NE.1) GOTO 90
    R = R+TL
 90 CONTINUE
    PM = PM+S/P(I)
    RM = RM + R/NF(I)
510 CONTINUE
    ALPH1 = M/(PM-RM)
    DA = ABS(ALPH1-ALPHA)
    IF(DA.LE.0.0001) GOTO 100
    ALPHA = (ALPHA+ALPH1)/2.0
    IF(KCOT.GT.100) GOTO 100
    GOTO 85
100 \text{ ALPHA} = (\text{ALPHA}+\text{ALPH1})/2.0
    ALR = 1.0/ALPHA
```

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

SUMENT PROVIDED-BY-THE

```
WRITE(*,110) KCOT
    WRITE(*,508) ALPHA
508 FORMAT (5X, 'JOINT MLE WEIBULL ALPHA =', F12.5)
110 FORMAT (5X, 'NUMBER OF ITERATIONS KCOT = ', I5)
    CHSQ = CHIS(NM)
120 FORMAT(2X, 'SCALE PARAMETER BETA =', F13.5
          /2X, '95% CONF. LOWER BETA =', F13.5
   Α
          /2X, 'A-BASIS ALLOWABLE =', F13.5
   Α
          /2X,'B-BASIS ALLOWABLE
                                      =', F13.5)
   В
    ARM1 = 1.0+1.0/ALPHA
    ARM2 = 1.0+2.0/ALPHA
    GAM1 = GAMMA1(ARM1)
    GAM2 = GAMMA1(ARM2)
    COVS = (GAM2-GAM1*GAM1)/(GAM1*GAM1)
    COV = SQRT(COVS)
    IN = 0
    DO 511 I=1,M
    WRITE(*,512) I
512 FORMAT(///2X,'WEIBULL STATISTICS FOR DATA SET', I3)
    BETA = (P(I)/NF(I)) **ALR
    DO 513 J=1, N(I)
    F(IN+J) = FR(I,J)/BETA
    IDN(IN+J) = ID(I,J)
    IMN(IN+J) = I
513 CONTINUE
    BETA = BETA*RA(I)
    BETAL = BETA/(CHSQ**ALR)
    ALL = BETAL*PAL**ALR
    BLL = BETAL*PBL**ALR
    XMEAN = BETA * GAM1
    STDW = COV \star XMEAN
    WRITE(*,120) BETA, BETAL, ALL, BLL
    WRITE(*,125) XMEAN, STDW, COV
125 FORMAT(/2X, 'MEAN STRENGTH
                                  FAVE =', F13.5
          /2X, 'STANDARE DEVIATION =', F13.5
   Α
          /2X, 'COEFF. OF VARIATION
                                        =', F13.5)
   B
    IN = IN+N(I)
511 CONTINUE
    WRITE(*,533)
533 FORMAT(////2X, 'NORMALIZED JOINT WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION',
           /2X, 'NORM. VALUE', 3X, 'GROUP', 4X, 'CODE', 3X, 'ASSD. PROB.', 4X
  Α
            ,'CALC. PROB.')
   B
    DO 530 I = 1,NM
    IF(I.EQ.NM) GOTO 532
    I1 = I+1
    DO 531 J=I1,NM
    IF(F(I), LE, F(J)) GOTO 531
    FRT = F(I)
   F(I) = F(J)
   F(J) = FRT
    IDT = IDN(I)
   IDN(I) = IDN(J)
   IDN(J) = IDT
   IMT = IMN(I)
   IMN(I) = IMN(J)
```

IS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60

```
IMN(J) = IMT
531 CONTINUE
532 \text{ RK} = (\text{NM-I+1.0})/(\text{NM+1.0})
     PRB = EXP(-F(I) * ALPHA)
    WRITE(*,534) F(I), IMN(I), IDN(I), RK, PRB
530 CONTINUE
534 FORMAT(4X, F9.5, 5X, I3, 6X, I2, 4X, F9.5, 4X, F9.5)
     STOP
    END
    FUNCTION CHIS(N)
    DOUBLEPRECISION CHL, CHIS, BE, CL
     COMMON/CHI/CHL(15)
    AN = N
    BN = 2.0 \star AN
     IF(N.GE.15) GOTO 50
    CHIS \approx CHL(N)
    GOTO 60
 50 BE = 1.0/(9.0*AN)
    CL = 1.0-BE+1.645*SQRT(BE)
     CHIS \approx CL*CL*CL
 60 CONTINUE
    RETURN
    END
    FUNCTION GAMMA1(X)
    DOUBLEPRECISION A, B, X, Y, F, ARG, SLOP, GAMMA1
    COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101)
    ARG = X
    A = 1.0
    IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10
    IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110
    IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110
    IF(ARG.GT.2.0) GOTO 20
    GOTO 30
 10 A = A/ARG
    ARG = ARG+1.0
    IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10
    IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110
    GOTO 30
 20 \text{ ARG} = \text{ARG-1.0}
    A = A * ARG
    IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110
    IF(ARG.GT.2.0) GOTO 20
 30 DO 40 I=1,101
    IF(B(I).GT.ARG) GOTO 50
 40 CONTINUE
 50 SLOP = (Y(I) - Y(I-1)) / (B(I) - B(I-1))
    F = Y(I-1) + (ARG-B(I-1)) + SLOP
    GOTO 60
110 F = 1.0
 60 \text{ GAMMA1} = F*A
    RETURN
    END
```

1. 1. 1. N. 1.

والمعلق من الموالي المراجع الم

1. 2. Mar 1. 1.

# TECHNICAL LIBRARY

## NADC-87042-60

PSI.DAT TAB VALUES OF CHI-SQUARE AND GAMMA FUNCTIONS	
1.0, 1.01, 1.02, 1.03, 1.04, 1.05, 1.06, 1.07, 1.08, 1.0	)9, 1.1, 1.11,
1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.2, 1.2	21, 1.22, 1.23,
1.24, 1.25, 1.26, 1.27, 1.28, 1.29, 1.3, 1.31, 1.32, 1.3	33, 1.34, 1.35,
1.36, 1.37, 1.38, 1.39, 1.4, 1.41, 1.42, 1.43, 1.44, 1.4	15, 1.46, 1.47,
1.48, 1.49, 1.5, 1.51, 1.52, 1.53, 1.54, 1.55, 1.56, 1.5	57, <b>1.58</b> , 1.59,
1.6, 1.61, 1.62, 1.63, 1.64, 1.65, 1.66, 1.67, 1.68, 1.6	59, 1.7, 1.71,
1.72, 1.73, 1.74, 1.75, 1.76, 1.77, 1.78, 1.79, 1.8, 1.8	31, 1.82, 1.83,
1.84, 1.85, 1.86, 1.87, 1.88, 1.89, 1.9, 1.91, 1.92, 1.9	3, 1.94, 1.95,
1.96, 1.97, 1.98, 1.99, 2.,	
1., .99433, .98884, .98355, .97844, .9735, .96874, .	96415, .95973,
2.9955, 2.372, 2.09867, 1.93838, 1.8307, 1.75217, 1.691	.79, 1.6435,
1,60383 1 5705 1 542 1 51720 1 A6558 1 A7632 1 A56	1

᠗ᡷ᠌᠗ᡷ᠗ᢣᡚᢣᢓᢣᠻ**ᡰᡲᡛᡛᡲ**ᢓᢄᢣᢓᠵᡬᢣᡭ᠘ᡬᠺᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡭᡩᡛᡛᡛᡛᠹᠺᠺᡊᡃ᠑᠘ᢗᠺᢗᡬᠺᡘᡬᡘᡘᡘᡘ᠖ᡬᢗᡘᡭ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ

ŶΧ

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

WEIBJNT PLEASE ENTER A 32-CHARACTER PROBLEM TITLE JOINT WEIBULL ANALYSIS SAMPLE PLEASE ENTER NUMBER OF DATA SETS PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET 1 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET 1 5 SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN ٦ 673.0000000 ٦. ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 704.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 718.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 1334.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 5 1511.0000000 1 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET 2 5 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET 2 SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 1 181104.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 192966.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 3 222450.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 248974.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 5 440585.0000000 ר PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET 3 5 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET 3 5 SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 1 1652870.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 1922982.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 3 2530135.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2793310.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 5 2986175.0000000 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET 4 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 1 95914.0000000 ٦. ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 167338.0000000 ٦ ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 3 399000.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 440228.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 5 499495.0000000 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET 5 5 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET 5 SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 1 4000.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 7934.0000000 ٦ ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 3 8000.0000000 ٦. ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 10703.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 5 24000.0000000 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET 6 5 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET 6 5 SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 1 16747.0000000 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 18707.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 3 21822.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 116786.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 172710.0000000 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET - 7 5 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET 7 5 SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN ٦. 20204.0000000 ٦ ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 20440.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 3 26376.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 44875.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 5 65151.0000000 1

225

SPECIAL CONTRACTOR OF THE SPECIAL CONTRACTOR

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET 8 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET 8 2 SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN ٦ 1124317.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 1865990.0000000 1 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF SPECIMENS IN DATA SET 9 -5 PLEASE ENTER NO. OF FAILURES IN DATA SET 9 5 SPECIMEN ID CODE: ID=1 FAILURE, ID.NE.1 CENSORED ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 1 1851.0000000 ٦ ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 2 2581.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 3 3298.0000000 ٦ ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 5376.0000000 1 ENTER DATA VALUE AND ID FOR SPECIMEN 5 7530.0000000 1

JOINT WEIBULL ANALYSIS: JOINT WEIBULL ANALYSIS SAMPLE TOTAL NUMBER OF DATA SETS M = 9

DATA SET NO. 1 NUMBER OF SPECIMENS = 5 NUMBER OF FAILURES 5

01	RDER DATA	ASSD.	PROB.	CODE
	673.000		.83333	1
	704.000		.66667	1
	718.000		.50000	1
	1334.000		.33333	1
	1511.000		.16667	1
* * *				

MEAN STRENGTHFAVE =988.00000STANDARE DEVIATION =401.87870COEFF. OF VARIATION =.40676

DATA SET NO. 2 NUMBER OF SPECIMENS = 5 NUMBER OF FAILURES 5

CODE ORDER DATA ASSD. PROB. 181104.000 .83333 1 1 192966.000 ,66667 .50000 222450.000 1 .33333 248974.000 1 440585.000 .16667 1

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE

MEAN STRENGTH FAVE = 257215.80000 STANDARE DEVIATION = 105855.90000 COEFF. OF VARIATION = .41155 DATA SET NO. 3 NUMBER OF SPECIMENS = 5 NUMBER OF FAILURES 5 ORDER DATA CODE ASSD. PROB. 1652870.000 .83333 1 1922982.000 1 .66667 2530135.000 .50000 1 ,33333 2793310.000 1 2986175.000 .16667 1 MEAN STRENGTH F. VE =2377095.00000 STANDARE DEVIATION = 569726.90000 COEFF. OF VARIATION = ,23967 DATA SET NO. 4 NUMBER OF SPECIMENS = 5 NUMBER OF FAILURES 5 ORDER DATA ASSD. PROB. CODE 95914.000 .83333 1 167338.000 1 .66667 399000.000 .50000 1 440228.000 .33333 1 499495.000 1 .16667 MEAN STRENGTH FAVE = 320395.00000 STANDARE DEVIATION= 177787.60000COEFF. OF VARIATION= .55490 DATA SET NO. 5 NUMBER OF SPECIMENS = 5 NUMBER OF FAILURES 5 ASSD. PROB. ORDER DATA CODE 4000.000 .83333 1 7934.000 .66667 1 8000.000 .50000 1 10703.000 .33333 1 24000.000 1 .13667 MEAN STRENGTH FAVE = 10927.40000 STANDARE DEVIATION = 7688.66400 COEFF. OF VARIATION = .70361 DATA SET NO. 6 NUMBER OF SPECIMENS = 5 NUMBER OF FAILURES 5 ORDER DATA ASSD. PROB. CODE

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM NADC-87042-60

16747.000 18707.000 21822.000 116786.000 172710.000	.83333 .66667 .50000 .33333 .16667	1 1 1 . 1 1
MEAN STRENGTH FAVE STANDARE DEVIATION COEFF. OF VARIATION	= 69354.40000 = 71631.28000 = 1.03283	
DATA SET NO. 7 NUMBER OF SPECIMENS =	5 NUMBER OF FAILURES	5
ORDER DATA 20204.000 20440.000 26376.000 44875.000 65151.000	ASSD. PROB. .83333 .66667 .50000 .33333 .16667	CODE 1 1 1 1
MEAN STRENGTH FAVE STANDARE DEVIATION COEFF. OF VARIATION	= 35409.20000 = 19436.12000 = .54890	
DATA SET NO. 8 NUMBER OF SPECIMENS =	2 NUMBER OF FAILURES	2
ORDER DATA 1124317.000 1865990.000	ASSD. PROB. .66667 .33333	CODE 1 1
MEAN STRENGTH FAVE STANDARE DEVIATION COEFF. OF VARIATION	=1495154.00000 = 524442.00000 = .35076	
DATA SET NO. 9 NUMBER OF SPECIMENS =	5 NUMBER OF FAILURES	5
ORDER DATA 1851.000 2581.000 3298.000 5376.000 7530.000	ASSD. PROB. .83333 .66667 .50000 .33333 .16667	CODE 1 1 1 1
MEAN STRENGTH FAVE = STANDARE DEVIATION COEFF. OF VARIATION NUMBER OF ITERATIONS JOINT MLE WEIBULL AN	= 4127.20000 = 2312.89600 = .56040 S KCOT = 11 LPHA = 2.19728	

10.000

0.404.03

HIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

WEIBULL STATISTICS FOR	DATA	SET	1
SCALE PARAMETER BETA =	106	3.570	000
95% CONF. LOWER BETA =	95	5.112	270
A-BASIS ALLOWABLE =	11	.7.715	500
B-BASIS ALLOWABLE =	34	2.979	40
MEAN STRENGTH FAVE =	<b>=</b> 9	41.92	2400
STANDARE DEVIATION	m	452.4	5610
COEFF. OF VARIATION	22	.4	8035
WEIBULL STATISTICS FOR	DATA	SET	2

 SCALE PARAMETER BETA = 277660.40000

 95% CONF. LOWER BETA = 249346.00000

 A-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 30731.19000

 B-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 89539.72000

 MEAN STRENGTH FAVE = 245902.80000

 STANDARE DEVIATION = 118120.20000

 COEFF. OF VARIATION = .48035

WEIBULL STATISTICS FOR DATA SET 3 SCALE PARAMETER BETA =2441181.00000 95% CONF. LOWER BETA =2192241.00000 A-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 270187.50000 B-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 787230.10000

MEAN	STRE	NGTH	FAVE	=2161	969.00000
STAND	ARE	DEVIA	<b>FION</b>	=103	8509.00000
COEFF	. OF	VARI	ATION	=	.48035

WEIBULL STATISTICS FOR DATA SET 4 SCALE PARAMETER BETA = 363389.80000 95% CONF. LOWER BETA = 326333.10000 A-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 40219.63000 B-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 117185.70000

MEAN	STREN	IGTH	FAVE	=	321826.8	30000
STAND	ARE I	DEVIATI	ON	Ξ	= 154590.	50000
COEFF	. OF	VARIAI	ION	=	-	48035

WEIBULL STATISTICS FOR DATA SET 5 SCALE PARAMETER BETA = 13299.10000 95% CONF. LOWER BETA = 11942.92000 A-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 1471.93100 B-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 4288.68300

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTT AERO

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

UMENT PROVIDED BY THE

MEAN S	TRENGTH	FAVE	±	11778.00000
STANDA	RE DEVIA	TION	=	56 <b>57.60000</b>
COEFF.	OF VARI	ATION	72	.48035

WEIBULL STATISTICS FOR DATA SET 6 SCALE PARAMETER BETA = 98244.48000 95% CONF. LOWER BETA = 88225.99000 A-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 10873.61000 B-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 31681.80000

MEAN S	STRE	NGTH	FAVE	=	87007.71000
STAND	ARE	DEVIA	TION	=	41794.42000
COEFF	. OF	VARI	ATION	-	.48035

WEIBULL STATISTICS FO	DR	DATA SET 7
SCALE PARAMETER BETA	=	40220.67000
95% CONF. LOWER BETA	<b>3</b>	36119.16000
A-BASIS ALLOWABLE	=	4451.58500
B-BASIS ALLOWABLE	Ħ	12970.33000

MEAN	STRE	NGTH	FAVE	=	35620.41000
STANI	ARE	DEVIA	TION	=	17110.37000
COEFI	F. OF	' VARI	ATION	×	.48035

WEIBULL STATISTICS FOR DATA SET 8 SCALE PARAMETER BETA =1549015.00000 95% CONF. LOWER BETA =1391054.00000 A-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 171443.50000 B-BASIS ALLOWABLE = 499525.10000

 MEAN STRENGTH
 FAVE
 =1371845.00000

 STANDARE DEVIATION
 =
 658970.00000

 COEFF. OF VARIATION
 =
 .48035

WEIBULL STATISTICS FOR	DATA SET 9
SCALE PARAMETER BETA =	4707.17900
95% CONF. LOWER BETA =	4227.16400
A-BASIS ALLOWABLE =	520.98610
B-BASIS ALLOWABLE =	1517.96800
MEAN STRENGTH FAVE =	= 4168.79200
STANDARE DEVIATION	= 2002.49200
COEFF. OF VARIATION	48035

\_. \_ . \_ . \_ . \_ . \_ . \_ . \_ .

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NORMALIZED JO	NINT WEIB	ULL DIST	TRIBUTION	
NORM. VALUE	GROUP	CODE	ASSD. PROB.	CALC. PROB.
.17046	6	1	.97674	.97971
.19041	6	1	.95349	.97420
.22212	6	1	.93023	.96400
.26394	4	1	.90698	.94784
.30077	5	1	.88372	.93111
.39323	9	l	.86047	.87930
.46049	4	1	.83721	.83363
.50233	7	l	.81395	.80229
.50820	7	1	.79070	.79773
.54831	9	1	.76744	.76565
.59658	5	1	.74419	.72511
.60154	5	1	.72093	.72084
.63277	1	l	.69767	.69362
.65225	2	· 1	.67442	.67636
.65578	7	1	.65116	.67321
.66192	1	1	.62791	.66772
.67508	1	1	.60465	.65590
.67708	3	1	.58140	.65410
.69497	2	1	.55814	.63793
.70063	9	1	.53488	.63279
.72583	8	1	.51163	.60984
.78773	3	1	.48837	.55323
.80116	2	l	.46512	.54097
.80479	5	1	.44186	.53766
.89669	2	1	.41860	.45524
1.03644	3	1	.39535	.33898
1.09799	4	1	.37209	.29287
1.11572	7	1	.34884	.28027
1.14209	9	l	.32558	.26211
1.14425	3	1	.30233	.26065
1.18873	6	1	.27907	.23175
1.20463	8	1	.25581	.22192
1.21145	4	1	.23256	.21779
1.22325	3	1	.20930	.21076
1.25427	1	1	.18605	.19300
1.37454	4	1	.16279	.13375
1.42069	1	1	.13953	.11497
1.58678	2	1	.11628	.06342
1.59968	9	1	.09302	.06036
1.61984	7	1	.06977	.05581
1.75796	6	1	.04651	.03161
1.80463	5	1	.02326	.02576



A.3 Program "LOAD"

This program computes the Load Enhancement Factor by given strength and life scatter parameter, sample size and fatigue test duration. The required input are

- 1. Residual strength Weibull shape parameter (ALPR)
- 2. Fatigue life Weibull shape parameter (ALPL)
- 3. Sample size (N)
- 4. Fatigue test duration (T)

The program listing, input and output of a sample problem are given below:
ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

IMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

C LOAD.FOR COMPUTES LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR BASED ON WEIBULL COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101) COMMON/CHI/CHL(15) OPEN(5, FILE='PSI.DAT') READ(5,\*) (B(I), I=1,101) READ(5,\*) (Y(I), I=1,101) READ(5,\*) (CHL(I), I=1,15) PAL = -ALOG(0.99) $PBL \approx -ALOG(0.90)$ WRITE(\*,1)1 FORMAT(2X,'THIS PROGRAM COMPUTES THE LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR' A/2X, 'THE REQUIRED INPUT ARE STRENTH AND LIFE WEIBULL ALPHA, ' B/2X, 'SAMPLE SIZE AND FATIGUE TEST DURATION' C/2X, 'PLEASE INPUT STRENGTH ALPHA') READ(\*,\*) ALPR ALPRI = 1.0/ALPRWRITE(\*, 2)2 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA') READ(\*,\*) ALPL ALPLI - 1.0/ALPL WRITE(\*,3)3 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE INPUT SAMPLE SIZE') READ(\*,\*) N AN = NWRITE(\*,4)4 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE INPUT TEST DURATION') READ(\*,\*) T RALP = ALPL/ALPRARGR = 1.0+ALPRIARGL = 1.0 + ALPLIGR = GAMMA1(ARGR)GL = GAMMA1(ARGL)CHSQ = CHIS(N)AM = (GL\*\*RALP)/GRAA = PAL\*(T\*\*ALPL)AB = PBL\*(T\*\*ALPL)BA = (AA/CHSQ)\*\*ALPRI BB = (AB/CHSQ)\*\*ALPRI FA = AM\*GR/BAFB = AM\*GR/BBTA = GL/((PAL/CHSQ)\*\*ALPLI)TB = GL/((PBL/CHSQ)\*\*ALPLI)WRITE(\*,5) ALPR, ALPL, N WRITE(\*,6) TA,TB WRITE(\*,7) T,FA,FB 5 FORMAT(2X, 'STRENGTH ALPHA = ', F9.5 /2X, 'LIFE ALPHA = ', F9.5 Α /2X, 'SAMPLE SIZE = ', I5) В 6 FORMAT(2X, 'A-BASIS LIFE FACTOR =', F9.5 Α /2X, 'B-BASIS LIFE FACTOR =', F9.5) 7 FORMAT(2X, 'TEST DURATION =', F7.4 /2X, 'A-BASIS LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR =', F9.5 Α /2X, 'B-BASIS LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR =', F9.5) В STOP END

ECHNICAL LIBRARY

#### NADC-87042-60

FUNCTION CHIS(N) COMMON/CHI/CHL(15) AN ∞ N BN = 2.0\*AN IF(N.GE.15) GOTO 50 CHIS = CHL(N)GOTO 60 50 B = 1.0/(9.0\*AN) $CL = 1.0-B+1.645 \times SQRT(B)$ CHIS = CL\*CL\*CL 60 CONTINUE RETURN END FUNCTION GAMMA1(X) COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101)ARG = XA = 1.0IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10 IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110 IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110 IF(ARG.GT.2.0) GOTO 20 GOTO 30 10 A = A/ARGARG = ARG+1.0IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10 IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110 GOTO 30 20 ARG = ARG-1.0A = A \* ARGIF(ARG.GT.2.0) GOTO 20 IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110 30 DO 40 I-1,101 IF(B(I).GT.ARG) GOTO 50 **40 CONTINUE** 50 SLOP = (Y(I) - Y(I-1))/(B(I) - B(I-1))F = Y(I-1)+(ARG-B(I-1))\*SLOPGOTO 60 110 F = 1.060 GAMMA1 = F\*ARETURN END PSI.DAT TAB VALUES OF CHI-SQUARE AND GAMMA FUNCTIONS 1.01, 1.02, 1.03, 1.04, 1.05, 1.06, 1.07, 1.08, 1.09, 1.1, 1.0, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.2, 1.21, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 1.25, 1.26, 1.27, 1.28, 1.29, 1.3, 1.31, 1.32, 1.33, 1.34, 1.35, 1.36, 1.37, 1.38, 1.39, 1.4, 1.41, 1.42, 1.43, 1.44, 1.45, 1.46, 1.47, 1.48, 1.49, 1.5, 1.51, 1.52, 1.53, 1.54, 1.55, 1.56, 1.57, 1.58, 1.59, 1.48, 1.49, 1.5, 1.51, 1.52, 1.53, 1.54, 1.55, 1.56, 1.57, 1.58, 1.6, 1.61, 1.62, 1.63, 1.64, 1.65, 1.66, 1.67, 1.68, 1.69, 1.7, 1.71, 1.72, 1.73, 1.74, 1.75, 1.76, 1.77, 1.78, 1.79, 1.8, 1.81, 1.82, 1.83, 1.84, 1.85, 1.86, 1.87, 1.88, 1.89, 1.9, 1.91, 1.92, 1.93, 1.94, 1.95, 1.96, 1.97, 1.98, 1.99, 2., .99433, .98884, .98355, .97844, .9735, .96874, .96415, .95973, l., 2.9955, 2.372, 2.09867, 1.93838, 1.8307, 1.75217, 1.69179, 1.6435, 1.60383, 1.5705, 1.542, 1.51729, 1.49558, 1.47632, 1.4591

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

LOAD THIS PROGRAM COMPUTES THE LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR THE REQUIRED INPUT ARE STRENTH AND LIFE WEIBULL ALPHA, SAMPLE SIZE AND FATIGUE TEST DURATION PLEASE INPUT STRENGTH ALPHA 20.0000000 PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA 1.2500000 PLEASE INPUT SAMPLE SIZE 5 PLEASE INPUT TEST DURATION 2.0000000 STRENGTH ALPHA = 20.00000. .... LIFE ALPHA = 1.25000 SAMPLE SIZE = 5 A-MASLE LIFE FACTOR = 59.90686 B-BACIN LIFE FACTOR = 9.14278 TEST PRATION = 2.0000 A-BASIS LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR = 1.23674 B-BASIS LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR = 1.09965



# A.4 Program "ALLOW"

This program computes the A- and B-basis allowables by either given the Weibull shape parameter ( $\alpha$ ) or the coefficient of variation (CV) and the sample size.

The program listing and the results of two sample problems are given below. The first example uses  $\alpha = 20.0$  and n = 5. The second example uses CV = 0.065 and n = 5.



```
C ALLOW.FOR COMPUTES A AND B BASIS ALLOWABLES BASED ON WEIBULL
      COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101)
      COMMON/CHI/CHL(15)
      OPEN(5, FILE-'PSI.DAT')
      READ(5,*) (B(I), I-1, 101)
      READ(5,*) (Y(I), I=1,101)
      READ(5,*) (CHL(I), I=1,15)
      PAL = -ALOG(0.99)
      PBL = -ALOG(0.90)
      WRITE(*,1)
      WRITE(*, 101)
      WRITE(*,102)
      WRITE(*, 103)
      WRITE(*,104)
      WRITE(*,105)
    1 FORMAT(2X, 'THIS PROGRAM COMPUTES THE A- AND B-BASIS ALLOWABLES')
  101 FORMAT(2X, 'THE REQUIRED INPUT ARE COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OR')
  102 FORMAT(2X, 'WEIBULL SHAPE PARAMETER, ALPHA AND SAMPLE SIZE')
  103 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE ENTER CASE CONTROL ID')
  104 FORMAT(2X,'IF ALPHA IS GIVEN ENTER "O" AND HIT RETURN')
  105 FORMAT(2X,'IF CV IS GIVEN ENTER ANY INTEGER AND HIT RETURN')
      READ(*,*) ID
      WRITE(*,4)
      READ(*,*) N
      IF(ID.EQ.0) GOTO 20
      WRITE(*,2)
    2 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE INPUT COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION: CV')
      READ(*.*) CV
      DT = 0.0001
      AL1 = (1.0/CV) * 1.07
   10 \text{ ARG1} = 1.0+1.0/\text{AL1}
      ARG2 = 1.0+2.0/AL1
      GM1 = GAMMA1(AKG1)
      GM2 = GAMMA1(ARG2)
      SG = GM2-GM1*GM1
     SG = SQRT(SG)
     CV1 = SG/GM1
     DC = (CV - CV1)/CV
     DC = ABS(DC)
     IF(DC.LT.DT) ALPHA - AL1
     IF(DC.LT.DT) GOTO 30
     AL1 - AL1*CV1/CV
     GOTO 10
  20 WRITE(*, 3)
   3 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE INPUT ALPHA')
     READ(*,*) ALPHA
  30 \text{ ARG} = 1.0+1.0/\text{ALPHA}
     GM = GAMMA1(ARG)
     ALPI = 1.0/ALPHA
   4 FORMAT(2X, 'PLEASE INPUT SAMPLE SIZE N')
     AN = N
     BET = 1.0/GM
     CHSQ = CHIS(N)
     ALLA = ((PAL/CHSQ)**ALPI)*BET
     ALLB = ((PBL/CHSQ)**ALPI)*BET
```

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM NADC-87042-60

WRITE(\*,5) ALPHA WRITE(\*,106) BET WRITE(\*,107) ALLA WRITE(\*,108) ALLB 5 FORMAT(2X, 'ALPHA - ', F9.5) 106 FORMAT(2X, 'BETA - ', F9.5) 107 FORMAT(2X, 'A-ALLOWABLE = ', F9.5) 108 FORMAT(2X, 'B-ALLOWABLE = ', F9.5) STOP END FUNCTION CHIS(N) COMMON/CHI/CHL(15) AN = NBN =2.0\*AN IF(N.GE.15) GOTO 50 CHIS - CHL(N)GOTO 60 50 B = 1.0/(9.0\*AN) $CL = 1.0-B+1.645 \times SQRT(B)$ CHIS - CL\*CL\*CL **60 CONTINUE** RETURN END FUNCTION GAMMA1(X) COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101) ARG = XA = 1.0IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10 IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110 IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110 IF(ARG.GT.2.0) GOTO 20 GOTO 30 10 A = A/ARGARG = ARG+1.0IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10 IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110 GOTO 30 20 ARG = ARG-1.0A = A\*ARGIF(ARG.GT.2.0) GOTO 20 IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110 30 DO 40 I-1,101 IF(B(I).GT,ARG) GOTO 50 40 CONTINUE 50 SLOP = (Y(I) - Y(I-1))/(B(I) - B(I-1))F = Y(I-1)+(ARG-B(I-1))\*SLOPGOTO 60 110 F = 1.060 GAMMA1 = F\*ARETURN END

NYALIYA SA KA KAKAMANA KAWANA K

# TECHNICAL LIBRARY

# NADC-87042-60

PSI.DAT TAB VALUES OF CHI-SQUARE AND GAMMA FUNCTIONS											
1.0,	1.01,	1.02,	1.03,	1.04,	1.05,	1.06,	1.07,	1.08,	1.09,	1.1,	1.11,
1.12,	1.13,	1.14,	1.15,	1.16,	1.17,	1.18,	1.19,	1.2,	1.21,	1.22,	1.23,
1.24,	1.25,	1.26,	1.27,	1.28,	1.29,	1.3,	1.31,	1.32,	1.33,	1.34,	1.35,
1.36,	1.37,	1.38,	1.39,	1.4,	1.41,	1.42,	1.43,	1.44,	1.45,	1.46,	1.47,
1.48,	1.49,	1.5,	1.51,	1.52,	1.53,	1.54,	1.55,	1.56,	1.57,	1.58,	1.59,
1.6,	1.61,	1.62,	1.63,	1.64,	1.65,	1.66,	1.67,	1.68,	1.69,	1.7,	1.71,
1.72,	1.73,	1.74,	1.75,	1.76,	1.77,	1.78,	1.79,	1.8,	1.81,	1.82,	1.83,
1.84,	1.85,	1.86,	1.87,	1.88,	1.89,	1.9,	1.91,	1.92,	1.93,	1.94,	1.95,
1.96,	1.97,	1.98,	1.99,	2.,							
1.,	.99	433, .	98884,	.98355	5, .978	344, .9	9735,	.96874	4, .964	115, .9	95973,
2.9955	5, 2.3	72, 2	.09867	, 1.938	338, 1	8307,	1.75	217, 1.	.69179,	, 1,643	35,
1.6038	B3, 1.	5705,	1.542,	1.51	729, 1	49558	, 1.47	632, 1	.4591		

239

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTT

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

ALLOW THIS PROGRAM COMPUTES THE A- AND B-BASIS ALLOWABLES THE REQUIRED INPUT ARE COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OR WEIBULL SHAPE PARAMETER, ALPHA AND SAMPLE SIZE PLEASE ENTER CASE CONTROL ID IF ALPHA IS GIVEN ENTER "O" AND HIT RETURN IF CV IS GIVEN ENTER ANY INTEGER AND HIT RETURN 0 PLEASE INPUT SAMPLE SIZE N 5 PLEASE INPUT ALPHA 20.0000000 ALPHA = 20.00000BETA = 1.02722A-ALLOWABLE = .79185 B-ALLOWABLE = .89057

MENT PROVIDED BY THE

ALLOW

THIS PROGRAM COMPUTES THE A- AND B-BASIS ALLOWABLES THE REQUIRED INPUT ARE COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OR WEIBULL SHAPE PARAMETER, ALPHA AND SAMPLE SIZE PLEASE ENTER CASE CONTROL ID IF ALPHA IS GIVEN ENTER "O" AND HIT RETURN IF CV IS GIVEN ENTER ANY INTEGER AND HIT RETURN 1 PLEASE INPUT SAMPLE SIZE N 5 PLEASE INPUT COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION: CV 6.50000E-002 ALPHA  $\approx$  19.01858 BETA = 1.02852A-ALLOWABLE = .78227 B-ALLOWABLE = .88515



#### A.5 Programs "BSRV" and "CSRV"

These two programs compute the structural static and fatigue reliability, taken into consideration of the structural response variability (SRV). The programs are similar, except in their input. BSRV require more input and shorter computation time. Both programs have seven cases of reliability computations. These cases and their corresponding input are discussed below.

- Case 1: Compute static reliability at a specified load level. The required input are:
  - 1. Static strength  $\alpha_s$  (ALM)
  - 2. SRV  $\alpha_{SRV}$  (ALS)
  - 3. Gamma function value for ALS (GAS) for BSRV Number of specimen (N) for CSRV
  - 4.  $\dot{\beta}$ , 95% confidence lower limit of static strength  $\beta$ (BET) for BSRV

Mean static strength (XB) for CSRV

5. Applied load level (AK)

In using BSRV the parameters GAS and BET must be precomputed using the following equations

 $\hat{\beta} = \overline{x}/\Gamma(1+1/\alpha_s)$  $\hat{\beta} = \hat{\beta}/[x^2(2n)/2n]^{1/\alpha_s}$ 

The values of  $\chi^2$  are given in Table A-1 and values of  $\Gamma$  are given in Table A-2. The relation between CV and are given in Table A-3. Example runs for Case 1 static reliability are given below.



# TABLE A-1. VALUES OF $\chi^2(2n)/2n$ AT F = 0.95

n	<sup>X</sup> .95(2n)/2n
l	2.99550
2	2.37200
3	2.09867
4	1.93838
5	1.83070
6	1.75217
7	1.69179
8	1.64350
9	1.60383
10	1.57050
11	1.54200
12	1.51729
13	1.49558
14	1.47632
15	1.45910
16	1.44344
17	1.42935
18	1.41653
19	1.40474
20	1.39388
22	1.37450
25	1.35004
30	1.31800
40	1.27349
50	1.24342

242

BEARTARUM

UTH UNK AND ALSO

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

1

.

TABLE A-2. VALUES OF  $\Gamma(1+\frac{1}{\alpha})$ 

a	$\Gamma(1+\frac{1}{\alpha})$	a	$\Gamma(1+\frac{1}{\alpha})$
0.1	3,628,800	10.0	0.95135
0.125	40,320	11.0	0.95509
0.15	2593.6	12.0	0.95831
0.18	318.1225	13.0	0.96109
0.20	120.0	14.0	0.96352
0.25	24.0	15.0	0.96568
0.30	9.26067	16.0	0.96759
0.40	3.32336	17.0	0.96930
0.50	2.0	18.0	0.97086
0.75	1.19066	19.0	0.97225
1.00	1.00000	20.0	0.97350
		22.0	0.97575
1.25	0.93138	23.2	0.97691
1.50	0.90276	24.0	0.97762
1.75	0.89062	25.0	0.97844
2.00	0.88623	26.0	0.97923
2.17	0.88560	27.5	0.98030
2.25	0.88573	30.0	0.98185
2.50	0.88726	32.5	0.98316
2.75	0.88986	35.0	0.98431
3.00	0.89299	37.5	0.98531
3.50	0.89976	40.0	0.98620
4.00	0.90640	45.0	0.98766
4.50	0.91259	50.0	0.98884
5.00	0.91817	60.0	0.99067
5.50	0.92321	70.0	0.99198
6.00	0.92773	80.0	0.99296
6.50	0.93179	90.0	0.99372
7.00	0.93545	100.0	0.99433
7.50	0.93876		
8.00	0.94176		
ა.80	0.94601		
9.00	0.94697		

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

			and the second
a	cv	α	CV
0.1	429.83	10.0	0.12032
0.125	113.44	11.0	0.10992
0.15	47.036	12.0	0.10107
0.18	22.731	13.0	0.09364
0.20	15.843	14.0	0.08737
0.25	8.3066	15.0	0.08168
0.30	5.4076	16.0	0.07682
0.40	3.1408	17.0	0.07252
0.50	2.2361	18.0	0.06838
0.75	1.3528	19.0	0.06506
1.00	1.0000	20.0	0.06204
		21.0	0.05906
1.25	0.80501	22.0	0.05620
1.50	0.67896	23.0	0.05393
1.75	0.58975	23.2	0.05351
2.00	0.52271	24.0	0.05188
2.17	0.48579	25.0	0.04991
2.50	0.42791	26.0	0.04797
3.00	0.36342	27.0	0.04608
3.50	0.31642	28.0	0.04426
4.00	0.28056	29.0	0.04269
4.50	0.25208	30.0	0.04146
5.00	0.22904	32.0	0.03911
6.00	0.19373	34.0	0.03689
7.00	0.16796	36.0	0.03475
7.50	0.15751	38.0	0.03271
8.00	0.14823	40.0	0.03075
8.80	0.13561	45.0	0.02797
9.00	0.13290	50.0	0.02549
		2	

# TABLE A-3 RELATION BETWEEN WEIBULL SHAPE PARAMETER ( $\alpha$ ) AND COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION (CV)

Note  $CV = \frac{\sqrt{\Gamma(1+2/\alpha) - \Gamma^2(1+1/\alpha)}}{\Gamma(1+1/\alpha)}$ 

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

BSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 1 CASE 1, STATIC REL. WITH SRV PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH ALPHA 20.000000 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA 17.0000000 PLEASE INPUT SRV GAMMA 9.693000E-001 PLEASE INPUT LOWER STRENGTH BETA 1.0280000 PLEASE INPUT LOAD LEVEL 1.1500000 AT LOAD LEVEL OF 1.150 THE STRUCTURAL RELIABILITY IS .0771640 CSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 1 CASE 1, STATIC REL. WITH SRV PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH ALPHA 20.000000 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA 17.0000000 PLEASE INPUT NUMBER OF SPECIMENS 5 PLEASE INPUT MEAN STATIC STRENGTH 1.0000000 PLEASE INPUT LOAD LEVEL 1.1500000 AT LOAD LEVEL OF 1.150 THE STRUCTURAL RELIABILITY IS .0468499

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

IENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPAL

#### NADC-87042-60

- Cases 2 and 3: These two cases compute the fatigue reliability at one lifetime using the ultimate strength approach. Case 2 performs computation with general input parameters and Case 3 uses some fixed parameter values that are frequently encountered. The required input are:
  - 1. Static strength  $\alpha_s$  and Gamma value (ALM,GAM) GAM is not required in CSRV ALM = 20.0 and GAM = 0.9735 in Case 3. These values are not required for Case 3.
  - 2. SRV  $\alpha_{SRV}$  and Gamma value (ALS,GAS) GAS not required in CSRV
  - 3. Fatigue spectrum characteristic parameter (CON)  $CON = \frac{\sigma_{S}^{M}}{\sigma_{TH}^{M}} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{TH}^{M}}{\sigma_{TH}^{B}}$

In Case 3 CON is fixed at 1.57369

4. Chi-square value (CHI) for BSRV Sample size (N) for CSRV

Not required in Case 3. (Fixed values of CHI = 2.9955 or N = 1)

5. Normalized maximum spectrum load (AM =  $P_{MSL}/P_{DUL}$ ) and static failure load F for Case 2.

For Case 3 these input become AM, FMIN and FMAX where FMIN is the minimum failure load and FMAX is the maximum failure load. The reliability is computed from FMIN to FMAX at an interval of 0.05.

Example runs for cases 2 and 3 are given below.

S DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

#### NADC-87042-60

BSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 2 CASE 2, FATIGUE REL. ULT WITH SRV PLEASE INPUT STATIC ALPHA AND GAMMA 20.0000000 9.735000E-001 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA AND GAMMA 17.0000000 9.693000E-001 PLEASE INPUT SPECTRUM CHARACT. CONST. PLEASE INPUT CHI SQUARE VALUE 2.9955000 PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM LOAD AND STATIC FAILURE LOAD 9.60000E-001 1.2200000 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.220 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .0035912 CSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 2 CASE 2, FATIGUE REL. ULT WITH SRV PLEASE INPUT STATIC ALPHA 20.000000 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA 17.000000 PLEASE INPUT SPECTRUM CHARACT. CONST. 1.5737000 PLEASE INPUT NUMBER OF SPECIMENS 1 PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM LOAD AND STATIC FAILURE LOAD 9.600000E-001 1.2200000 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.220 .0035912 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

BSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 3 CASE 3, FATIGUE REL. ULT WITH SRV FIXED CON=1.5736879 STRENGTH ALPHA=20.0, GAMMA=0.9735 SINGLE ARTICLE, CHI=2.9955 REL. COMPUTED AT 0.05 INTERVAL PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA AND GAMMA 17.0000000 9.693000E-001 PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM LOAD MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM STRENGTH 1.2000000 1.5000000 9.60000E-001 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.200 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .0012483 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.250 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .0128437 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.300 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .0579314 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.350 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .1544490 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.400 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .2933223 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.450 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .4467351 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.500 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .5888761

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

DOUMENT PROVIDED BY THE

CSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 3 CASE 3, FATIGUE REL. ULT WITH SRV FIXED CON=1.5736879 STRENGTH ALPHA=20.0, GAMMA=0.9735 SINGLE ARTICLE, CHI=2.9955 REL. COMPUTED AT 0.05 INTERVAL PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA 17.0000000 PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM LOAD MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM STRENGTH 9.60000E-001 1.2000000 1.5000000 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.200 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .0012483 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.250 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .0128437 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.300 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .0579316 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.350 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .1544490 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.400 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .2933227 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.450 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .4467355 AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD 1.500 THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS .5888761

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

- Case 4 and 5: These two cases compute the fatigue reliability at one lifetime using the load enhancement factor approach. Case 4 uses the general input and Case 5 computes the reliability at certain fixed parameters.
  - 1. Gamma value associated with static strength (GAM) for BSRV Static strength  $\alpha_s$  (ALM) for CSRV Not required for Case 5 ( $\alpha_s = 20.0$ )

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

- 2. Fatigue life  $\alpha_L$  and Gamma Value. (AL,GAL) for BSRV GAL not required for CSRV For Case 5 AL = 1.25 and GAL = 0.93139
- 3. Chi-square value (CHI) for BSRV Sample size (N) for CSRV For Case 5 N = 3, CHI = 2.09867
- 4. Fatigue test duration (DN) For Case 5 DN = 2.0
- 5. SRV  $\alpha_{SRV}$  and Gamma values (ALS,GAS) GAS not required for CSRV
- 6. Residual strength  $\alpha_{\rm R}$
- 7. Load enhancement factor (PL).

Sample runs for these two cases are given below.

PROVIDED BY THE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

BSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV Δ CASE 4 FATIGUE REL. LEF WITH SRV PLEASE INPUT STRENGTH GAMMA 9.735000E-001 PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA AND GAMMA 1.2500000 9.313800E-001 PLEASE INPUT CHI SQUARE VALUE 2.0986700 PLEASE INPUT FATIGUE TEST DURATION 2.0000000 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA AND GAMMA 17.0000000 9.693000E-001 PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA 20.000000 PLEASE INPUT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR 1.1600000 AT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR = 1.160 THE ONE LIFETIME REL. IS .8960821 CSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 4 CASE 4 FATIGUE REL. LEF WITH SRV PLEASE INPUT STRENGTH ALPHA 20.000000 PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA 1.2500000 PLEASE INPUT NUMBER OF SPECIMENS 3 PLEASE INPUT FATIGUE TEST DURATION 2.0000000 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA 17.0000000 PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA 20.000000 PLEASE INPUT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR 1.1600000 AT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR = 1.160 THE ONE LIFETIME REL. IS .8960822

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE

BSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 5 CASE 5 FATIGUE REL. LEF WITH SRV FIXED STATIC STRENGTH ALPHA =20.0 FATIGUE LIFE ALPHA = 1.25TEST DURATION = 2.0 LIFETIME SAMPLE SIZE = 3, CHI=2.09867PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA AND GAMMA 17.0000000 9.693000E-001 PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA 20.000000 PLEASE INPUT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR 1.1600000 AT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR = 1.160 THE ONE LIFETIME REL. IS .8960821 CSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV -5 CASE 5 FATIGUE REL. LEF WITH SRV FIXED STATIC STRENGTH ALPHA =20.0 FATIGUE LIFE ALPHA = 1.25TEST DURATION = 2.0 LIFETIME

SAMPLE SIZE = 3, CHI=2.09867 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA 17.0000000 PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA 20.0000000 PLEASE INPUT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR 1.1600000 AT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR = 1.160 THE ONE LIFETIME REL. IS .8960822

252

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

- Case 6 and 7: These two cases compute the one lifetime fatigue reliability using the residual strength approach. Case 6 is for general computations and Case 7 is for reliability computations with certain fixed variables. The required input are:
  - 1. Residual strength  $\alpha_R$  (ALPR) Fixed at  $\alpha_R$  = 20.0 in Case 7.

- 2. Fatigue life <sup>Q</sup><sub>L</sub> and associated Gamma value (AL,GAL) GAL not required for CSRV Fixed at AL = 1.25 and GAL = 0.93138 in Case 7.
- 3. Fatigue test duration (AN) AN = 2.0 in Case 7.
- 4. Static failure strength (SIGU)
- 5. Residual strength (SIGR)
- 6. Maximum applied stress in fatigue test (SIGA)
- 7. Maximum design spectrum load (PM)
- 8. SRV  $\alpha_{SRV}$  and associated Gamma value (ALS,GAS) GAS not required for CSRV.
- 9. Chi-square value (CHI) for BSRV Sample size (N) for CSRV

Sample runs for Cases 6 and 7 are given below. The program listings follow the sample examples

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

BSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 6 CASE 6, FATIGUE REL. RES WITH SRV PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA 20.0000000 PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA AND GAMMA 1.2500000 9.313800E-001 PLEASE INPUT FATIGUE TEST DURATION 2.0000000 PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH 1.2500000 PLEASE INPUT RESIDUAL STRENGTH 1.1800000 PLEASE INPUT TEST APPLIED STRESS 9.60000E-001 PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS 9.20000E-001 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA AND GAMMA 17.0000000 9.693000E-001 PLEASE INPUT CHI SQUARE VALUE 2.3720000 AT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS = .920 THE ONE LIFETIME REL. = .7135201

ᡭᠣᡲᢄᠱᡭᢄᠱᡗᡬᡧᡬᠧᡬᡶᡘᠸᡬ᠕ᡬᢄ᠕᠘ᡷ᠘ᢣᡘ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕᠘ᢣ᠘ᢣᡘ᠕ᡩᡘ᠕᠘ᡩᡚᢣᡚᢣᠿᢣᠿᢣᠿᢣᠿᢣᠿᢣᠿᢣᠿᢣᠿᢣ᠕ᢣᠺᡧᠺ᠕ᡔᡘ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕ᡬ᠕

IMENT PROVIDED BY THE

1000 C 1000

መንሸመደግሞች እስለ እግዜ እለዚህ እስለ አስት እስለ እና እስለ እንዲሆኑ እስለ እንዲሆኑ እስለ እንዲሆኑ እስለ እንዲሆኑ እስለ እንዲሆኑ እንዲሆኑ እስለ እንዲሆኑ እስለ እንዲ

#### NADC-87042-60

CSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE J--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LE" APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RL STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 6 CASE 6, FATIGUE REL. RES WITH SRV PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA 20.000000 PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA 1.2500000 PLEASE INPUT GATIGUE TEST DURATION 2.0000000 PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH 1.2500000 PLEASE INPUT RESIDUAL STRENGTH 1.1800000 PLEASE INPUT TEST APPLIED STRESS 9.60000E-001 PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS 9.20000E-001 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA 17.0000000 PLEASE INPUT NUMBER OF SPECIMENS 2 AT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS = .920 THE ONE LIFETIME REL. = .7135199

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPAC TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

BSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 7 CASE 7, FATIGUE REL. RES WITH SRV FIXED RES. STRENGTH ALPHA =20.0 LIFE ALPHA = 1.25PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH 1.2500000 PLEASE INPUT RESIDUAL STRENGTH 1.1800000 PLEASE INPUT TEST APPLIED STRESS 9.80000E-001 PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS 9.60000E-001 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA AND GAMMA 17.0000000 9.693000E-001 PLEASE INPUT CHI SQUARE VALUE 2.3720000 AT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS = .960 THE ONE LIFETIME REL. = .5190697

いたかであるというでものでいた。

TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

CSRV PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV 7 CASE 7, FATIGUE REL. RES WITH SRV FIXED RES. STRENGTH ALPHA =20.0 LIFE ALPHA = 1.25PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH 1.2500000 PLEASE INPUT RESIDUAL STRENGTH 1.1800000 PLEASE INPUT TEST APPLIED STRESS 9.80000E-001 PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS 9.60000E-001 PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA 17.0000000 PLEASE INPUT NUMBER OF SPECIMENS 2 AT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS = .960 THE ONE LIFETIME REL. = .6190694

の日本のようの日本の日本ののである

シントによったの

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

T PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AER

### NADC-87042-60

C PROGRAM 'BSRV' STRUCTURAL RELIABILITY COMPUTATIONS--DETAILED INPUT DOUBLEPRECISION TEST, PS, SUM, P1, P2, FM, X, DX, DX2, X1, X2, DFI, FME SUM = 0.0TEST = 0.000001X = 0.0DX = 0.001DX2 = 0.0005AL9 = -ALOG(0.9)WRITE(\*,101) 101 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER', A/3X, 'CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV', B/3X, 'CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV', C/3X, 'CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV', D/3X, 'CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV', E/3X, 'CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV' F/3X, 'CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV' G/3X, 'CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV') READ(\*,\*) ICASE K = 010 IF(ICASE.EQ.1) GOTO 20 IF(ICASE.EQ.2.OR.ICASE.EQ.3) GOTO 30 IF(ICASE.EQ.4.OR.ICASE.EQ.5) GOTO 40 IF(ICASE.EQ.6.OR.ICASE.EQ.7) GOTO 50 20 IF(K.NE.0) GOTO 21 WRITE(\*,1) WRITE(\*,102) READ(\*,\*) ALM WRITE(\*,103) READ(\*,\*) ALS WRITE(\*,104) READ(\*,\*) GAS WRITE(\*,105) READ(\*,\*) BET WRITE(\*,106) READ(\*,\*) AK 102 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH ALPHA') 103 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA') 104 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SRV GAMMA') 105 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT LOWER STRENGTH BETA') 106 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT LOAD LEVEL') AT = AK/GASDELTX = 1.0IF(BET.GE.2.0) DELTX=2.0 IF(AK.GE.2.0) DELTX=2.0 GOTO 90 21 WRITE(\*,201) AK,SUM 1 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 1, STATIC REL. WITH SRV') 201 FORMAT(3X, 'AT LOAD LEVEL OF', F8.3, +/3X, 'THE STRUCTURAL RELIABILITY IS', F10.7) GOTO 99 30 IF(K.NE.0) GOTO 31 DELTX = 2.0IF(ICASE.EQ.3) GOTO 35 WRITE(\*,3) WRITE(\*,107)

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AERO TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

```
READ(*,*) ALM, GAM
    WRITE(*,108)
    READ(*,*) ALS,GAS
    WRITE(*,109)
    READ(*,*) CON
    WRITE(*,110)
    READ(*,*) CHI
    WRITE(*,111)
    READ(*,*) AM, F
107 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT STATIC ALPHA AND GAMMA')
108 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA AND GAMMA')
109 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SPECTRUM CHARACT. CONST.')
110 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT CHI SQUARE VALUE')
111 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM LOAD',
   +/5X, 'AND STATIC FAILURE LOAD')
    GOTO 36
 35 \text{ WRITE}(*, 4)
    DFI = 0.05
    CON = 1.5736879
    CHI = 2.9955
    ALM = 20.0
    GAM = 0.9735
    WRITE(*,108)
    READ(*,*) ALS,GAS
    WRITE(*,112)
    READ(*,*) AM, FMIN, FMAX
112 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM LOAD',
   +/3X, 'MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM STRENGTH')
    F = FMIN
 36 Fl = AM*CON
    FX = ((AL9/CHI) ** (1.0/ALM)) *F1/GAM
 32 FG = F/GAS
    AT = FG/(CHI * * (1.0/ALS))
    GOTO 90
31 WRITE(*,202) F,SUM
202 FORMAT(3X, 'AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD ', F8.3,
   +/3X, 'THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS', F10.7)
  3 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 2, FATIGUE REL. ULT WITH SRV')
  4 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 3, FATIGUE REL. ULT WITH SRV',
  +/3X, 'FIXED CON=1.5736879',
  +/3X, 'STRENGTH ALPHA=20.0, GAMMA=0.9735',
  +/3X, 'SINGLE ARTICLE, CHI=2.9955',
  +/3X, 'REL. COMPUTED AT 0.05 INTERVAL')
   IF(ICASE.EQ.2) GOTO 99
   F = F+DFI
   X = 0.0
   SUM = 0.0
    IF(F.LT.FMAX) GOTO 32
   GOTO 99
40 IF(K.NE.0) GOTO 41
   DELTX = 2.0
   IF(ICASE.EQ.5) GOTO 45
   WRITE(*, 5)
   WRITE(*,113)
   READ(*,*) GAM
```

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPACE TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

NADC-87042-60

```
WRITE(*,114)
    READ(*,*) AL,GAL
    WRITE(*,115)
    READ(*,*) CHI
    WRITE(*,116)
    READ(*,*) DN
113 FORMAT (3X, 'PLEASE INPUT STRENGTH GAMMA')
114 FORMAT (3X, 'PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA AND GAMMA')
115 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT CHI SQUARE VALUE')
116 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT FATIGUE TEST DURATION')
    GOTO 46
 45 WRITE(*,6)
    GAM = 0.9735
    GAL = 0.93138
    CHI = 2.09867
    DN = 2.0
    AL = 1.25
 46 WRITE(*,117)
    READ(*,*) ALS, GAS
    WRITE(*,118)
    READ(*,*) ALPR
    WRITE(*,119)
    READ(*,*) PL
117 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA AND GAMMA')
118 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA')
119 FORMAT (3X, 'PLEASE INPUT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR')
    ARG = CHI*((GAL/DN)**AL)
    AT = PL/GAS
    GOTO 90
 41 WRITE(*,203) PL,SUM
203 FORMAT(3X, 'AT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR = ', F8.3,
   +/3X, 'THE ONE LIFETIME REL. IS ', F10.7)
  5 FORMAT (3X, 'CASE 4 FATIGUE REL. LEF WITH SRV')
  6 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 5 FATIGUE REL. LEF WITH SRV',
   +/3X, 'FIXED STATIC STRENGTH ALPHA =20.0',
   +/3X, 'FATIGUE LIFE ALPHA = 1.25',
   +/3X, 'TEST DURATION = 2.0 LIFETIME'
   +/3X, 'SAMPLE SIZE = 3, CHI=2.09867')
    GOTO 99
 50 IF(K.NE.0) GOTO 51
    DELTX = 1.0
    X = 0.05 - DX2
    IF(ICASE.EQ.7) GOTO 55
    WRITE(*,7)
    WRITE(*,120)
    READ(*,*) ALPR
    WRITE(*,121)
    READ(*,*) AL,GAL
    WRITE(*,122)
    READ(*,*) AN
120 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA')
121 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA AND GAMMA')
122 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT FATIGUE TEST DURATION')
    GOTO 56
 55 WRITE(*,8)
```

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

```
ALPR = 20.0
    AL = 1.25
    GAL = 0.93138
    AN = 2.0
 56 WRITE(*,123)
    READ(*,*) SIGU
    WRITE(*,124)
    READ(*,*) SIGR
    WRITE(*,125)
    READ(*,*) SIGA
    WRITE(*,126)
    READ(*,*) PM
    WRITE(*,127)
    READ(*,*) ALS,GAS
    WRITE(*,128)
    READ(*,*) CHI
123 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH')
124 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT RESIDUAL STRENGTH')
125 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT TEST APPLIED STRESS')
126 FORMAT (3X, 'PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS')
127 FORMAT (3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA AND GAMMA')
128 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT CHI SQUARE VALUE')
    CH = CHI * * (1.0/AL)
    S1 = ALPR/AL
    C = ((SIGU/SIGA) * *S1 - (SIGR/SIGA) * *S1) / AN
    AT = PM/GAS
    IF(SIGU.LT.DELTX) DELTX = 0.9*SIGU
    GOTO 90
 51 WRITE(*,204) PM,SUM
204 FORMAT(3X, 'AT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS =', F8.3,
   +/3X, 'THE ONE LIFETIME REL. = ', F10.7)
  7 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 6, FATIGUE REL. RES WITH SRV')
  8 FORMAT (3X, 'CASE 7, FATIGUE REL. RES WITH SRV',
   +/3X, 'FIXED RES. STRENGTH ALPHA =20.0',
   +/3X, 'LIFE ALPHA = 1.25')
    GOTO 99
 90 X = X+DX
    X1 = X - DX2
    X2 = X+DX2
    Pl = EXP(-(X1/AT) **ALS)
    J = EXP(-(X2/AT) **ALS)
    lr'(ICASE.EQ.2.OR.ICASE.EQ.3) GOTO 91
    IF(ICASE.EQ.4.OR.ICASE.EQ.5) GOTO 92
    IF(ICASE.EQ.6.OR.ICASE.EQ.7) GOTO 93
    FME = (X/BET) * *ALM
    IF(FME.GT.40.) GOTO 190
    FM = EXP(-FME)
    GOTO 95
190 \text{ FM} = 0.0
    GOTO 95
 91 FME = ((FX*GAM/X)**ALM)*CHI
    IF(FME.GT.40.) GOTO 191
    FM = EXP(-FME)
    GOTO 95
191 \text{ FM} = 0.0
```

# ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

GOTO 95 92 FME = ARG/(X\*\*ALPR) IF(FME.GT.40.) GOTO 192 FM = EXP(-FME)GOTO 95 192 FM = 0.0GOTO 95 93 F = ((SIGU/X) \* \* S1 - 1.0)/CBN = F/GALBU = BN/CHFME = (1.0/BU) \* \*ALIF(FME.GT.40.) GOTO 193 FM = EXP(-FME)GOTO 95 193 FM = 0.095 PS = FM\*(P1-P2)SUM = SUM + PSIF(X.LE.DELTX) GOTO 90 IF(PS.GT.TEST) GOTO 90 K = K+1GOTO 10 99 STOP END

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AEROSPAGE

```
C PROGRAM 'CSRV' STRUCTURAL RELIABILITY COMPUTATIONS--SHORT INPUT
      DOUBLEPRECISION TEST, PS, SUM, P1, F2, FM, X, DX, DX2, X1, X2, DFI, FME
      COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101)
      COMMON/CHI/CHL(15)
      OPEN(5, FILE='PSI.DAT')
      READ(5,*) (B(I),I=1,101)
      READ(5,*) (Y(I),I=1,101)
      READ(5,*) (CHL(I), I=1, 15)
      SUM = 0.0
      TEST = 0.0000001
      X = 0.0
      DX = 0.001
      DX2 = 0.0005
      AL9 = -ALOG(0.9)
      WRITE(*,101)
  101 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT ANALYSIS CASE NUMBER',
     A/3X, 'CASE 1--STATIC RELIABILITY WITY SRV',
     B/3X, 'CASE 2--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV',
     C/3X, 'CASE 3--FATIGUE REL., ULT. STRENGTH WITH SRV',
     D/3X, 'CASE 4--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV'
E/3X, 'CASE 5--FATIGUE REL., LEF APPROACH WITH SRV'
     F/3X, 'CASE 6--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV'
     G/3X, 'CASE 7--FATIGUE REL., RES. STRENGTH WITH SRV')
      READ(*,*) ICASE
      \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{0}
   10 IF(ICASE.EQ.1) GOTO 20
      IF(ICASE.EQ.2.OR.ICASE.EQ.3) GOTO 30
      IF(ICASE.EQ.4.OR.ICASE.EQ.5) GOTO 40
      IF(ICASE, EQ.6.OR.ICASE.EQ.7) GOTO 50
   20 IF(K.NE.0) GOTO 21
      WRITE(*,1)
      WRITE(*,102)
      READ(*,*) ALM
      WRITE(*,103)
      READ(*,*) ALS
      WRITE(*,104)
      READ(*,*) N
      WRITE(*,105)
      READ(*,*) XB
      WRITE(*,106)
      READ(*,*) AK
  102 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH ALPHA')
 103 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA')
 104 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT NUMBER OF SPECIMENS')
 105 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT MEAN STATIC STRENGTH ')
 106 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT LOAD LEVEL')
      ARG = 1.0 + 1.0 / ALM
      GAM = GAMMA(ARG)
      CHI = CHIS(N)
      BET = XB/GAM
      BET = BET/(CHI**(1.0/ALM))
      ARG = 1.0 + 1.0 / ALS
      GAS = GAMMA(ARG)
      AT = AK/GAS
      DELTX = 1.0
```

nende mei keinen het de kunster die de kant de

a banda menyerika menyerika nenyerika nenyerika nenyeri yana dan dan dan dan dan banda menyerika menyerika meny

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

```
IF(BET.GE.2.0) DELTX = 2.0
    IF(AK.GE.2.0) DELTX = 2.0
    GOTO 90
 21 WRITE(*,201) AK,SUM
  1 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 1, STATIC REL. WITH SRV')
201 FORMAT (3X, 'AT LOAD LEVEL OF', F8.3,
   +/3X, 'THE STRUCTURAL RELIABILITY IS', F10.7)
    GOTO 99
 30 IF(K.NE.0) GOTO 31
    DELTX = 2.0
    IF(ICASE.EQ.3) GOTO 35
    WRITE(*,3)
    WRITE(*,107)
    READ(*,*) ALM
    WRITE(*,108)
    READ(*,*) ALS
    WRITE(*,109)
    READ(*,*) CON
    WRITE(*,110)
    READ(*,*) N
    WRITE(*,111)
    READ(*,*) AM, F
107 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT STATIC ALPHA')
108 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA')
109 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SPECTRUM CHARACT. CONST.')
110 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT NUMBER OF SPECIMENS')
111 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM LOAD',
   +/5X, 'AND STATIC FAILURE LOAD')
    CHI = CHIS(N)
    ARG = 1.0+1.0/ALM
    GAM = GAMMA(ARG)
    ARG = 1.0 + 1.0 / ALS
    GAS = GAMMA(ARG)
    GOTO 36
 35 WRITE(*,4)
    DFI = 0.05
    CON = 1.5736879
    CHI = 2.9955
    ALM = 20.0
    GAM = 0.9735
    WRITE(*,108)
    READ(*,*) ALS
    WRITE(*,112)
    READ(*,*) AM, FMIN, FMAX
112 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM LOAD',
   +/3X, 'MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM STRENGTH')
    ARG = 1.0 + 1.0 / ALS
    GAS = GAMMA(ARG)
    F = FMIN
 36 F1 = AM*CON
    FX = ((AL9/CHI) ** (1.0/ALM)) *F1/GAM
32 FG = F/GAS
    \lambda T = FG/(CHI**(1.0/ALS))
    COTO 90
31 WRITE(*,202) F,SUM
```

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

```
202 FORMAT(3X, 'AT STATIC FAILURE LOAD ', F8.3,
   +/3X, 'THE ONE LIFETIME FATIGUE REL. IS', F10.7)
  3 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 2, FATIGUE REL. ULT WITH SRV')
  4 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 3, FATIGUE REL. ULT WITH SRV',
   +/3X, 'FIXED CON=1.5736879',
   +/3X, 'STRENGTH ALPHA=20.0, GAMMA=0.9735',
   +/3X,'SINGLE ARTICLE, CHI=2.9955',
   +/3X, 'REL. COMPUTED AT 0.05 INTERVAL')
    IF(ICASE.EQ.2) GOTO 99
    F = F + DFI
    X = 0.0
    SUM = 0.0
    IF(F.LT.FMAX) GOTO 32
    GOTO 99
 40 IF(K.NE.0) GOTO 41
    DELTX = 2.0
    IF(ICASE.EQ.5) GOTO 45
    WRITE(*,5)
    WRITE(*,113)
    READ(*,*) ALM
    WRITE(*,114)
    READ(*,*) AL
    WRITE(*,115)
    READ(*,*) N
    WRITE(*,116)
    READ(*,*) DN
113 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT STRENGTH ALPHA')
114 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA')
115 FORMAT (3X, 'PLEASE INPUT NUMBER OF SPECIMENS')
116 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT FATIGUE TEST DURATION')
    ARG = 1.0 + 1.0 / ALM
    GAM = GAMMA(ARG)
    ARG = 1.0+1.0/AL
    GAL = GAMMA(ARG)
    CHI = CHIS(N)
    GOTC 46
 45 WRITE(*,6)
    GAM = 0.9735
    GAL = 0.93138
    CHI = 2.09867
    DN = 2.0
    AL = 1.25
 46 WRITE(*,117)
    READ(*,*) ALS
    WRITE(*,118)
    READ(*,*) ALPR
    WRITE(*,119)
    READ(*,*) PL
117 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA')
118 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA')
119 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR')
    ARG = 1.0 + 1.0 / ALS
    GAS = GAMMA(ARG)
    ARG = CHI*((GAL/DN)**AL)
    AT = PL/GAS
```

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

THIS DOCUMENT PROVIDED BY THE ABBOTT AERO

```
GOTO 90
 41 WRITE(*,203) PL,SUM
203 FORMAT(3X, 'AT LOAD ENHANCEMENT FACTOR = ', F8.3,
   +/3X, 'THE ONE LIFETIME REL. IS ', F10.7)
  5 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 4 FATIGUE REL. LEF WITH SRV')
  6 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 5 FATIGUE REL. LEF WITH SRV',
   +/3X, 'FIXED STATIC STRENGTH ALPHA =20.0',
   +/3X, 'FATIGUE LIFE ALPHA = 1.25',
   +/3X, 'TEST DURATION = 2.0 LIFETIME',
   +/3X, 'SAMPLE SIZE = 3, CHI=2.09867')
    GOTO 99
 50 IF(K.NE.0) GOTO 51
    DELTX = 1.0
    X = 0.05 - DX2
    IF(ICASE.EQ.7) GOTO 55
    WRITE(*,7)
    WRITE(*,120)
    READ(*,*) ALPR
    WRITE(*,121)
    READ(*,*) AL
    WRITE(*,122)
    READ(*,*) AN
120 FORMAT (3X, 'PLEASE INPUT RES. STRENGTH ALPHA')
121 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT LIFE ALPHA')
122 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT GATIGUE TEST DURATION')
    ARG = 1.0 + 1.0 / AL
    GAL = GAMMA(ARG)
    GOTO 56
 55 WRITE(*, 8)
    ALPR = 20.0
    AL = 1.25
    GAL = 0.93138
    AN = 2.0
 56 WRITE(*,123)
    READ(*,*) SIGU
    WRITE(*,124)
    READ(*,*) SIGR
    WRITE(*,125)
    READ(*,*) SIGA
    WRITE(*,126)
    READ(*,*) PM
    WRITE(*,127)
    READ(*,*) ALS
    WRITE(*,128)
    READ(*,*) N
123 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT STATIC STRENGTH')
124 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT RESIDUAL STRENGTH')
125 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT TEST APPLIED STRESS')
126 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS')
127 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT SRV ALPHA')
128 FORMAT(3X, 'PLEASE INPUT NUMBER OF SPECIMENS')
    ARG = 1.0 + 1.0 / ALS
    GAS = GAMMA(ARG)
    CHI = CHIS(N)
    CH = CHI * * (1.0/AL)
```

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

```
S1 = ALPR/AL
     C = ((SIGU/SIGA) **S1-(SIGR/SIGA) **S1)/AN
     AT = PM/GAS
     IF(SIGU.LT.DELTX) DELTX = 0.9*SIGU
     GOTO 90
 51 WRITE(*,204) PM,SUM
204 FORMAT(3X, 'AT MAX. SPECTRUM STRESS =', F8.3,
    +/3X, 'THE ONE LIFETIME REL. = ', F10.7)
  7 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 6, FATIGUE REL. RES WITH SRV')
8 FORMAT(3X, 'CASE 7, FATIGUE REL. RES WITH SRV',
    +/3X, 'FIXED RES. STRENGTH ALPHA =20.0',
    +/3X, 'LIFE ALPHA = 1.25')
    GOTO 99
 90 X = X+DX
    X1 = X - DX2
    X2 = X+DX2
    Pl = EXP(-(X1/AT) **ALS)
    P2 = EXP(-(X2/AT) **ALS)
     IF(ICASE.EQ.2.OR.ICASE.EQ.3) GOTO 91
    IF(ICASE.EQ.4.OR.ICASE.EQ.5) GOTO 92
     IF(ICASE.EQ.6.OR.ICASE.EQ.7) GOTO 93
    FME = (X/BET) **ALM
    IF(FME.GT.40.) GOTO190
    FM = EXP(-FME)
    GOTO 95
190 \text{ FM} = 0.0
    GOTO 95
 91 FME = ((FX*GAM/X)**ALM)*CHI
    IF(FME.GT.40.) GOTO 191
    FM = EXP(-FME)
    GOTO 95
191 \text{ FM} = 0.0
    GOTO 95
 92 FME = ARG/(X**ALPR)
    IF(FME.GT.40.) GOTO 192
    FM = EXP(-FME)
    GOTO 95
192 \text{ FM} = 0.0
    GOTO 95
 93 F = ((SIGU/X) * S1-1.0)/C
    BN = F/GAL
    BU = BN/CH
    FME = (1.0/BU) **AL
    IF(FME.GT.40.) GOTO 193
    FM = EXP(-FME)
    GOTO 95
193 \text{ FM} = 0.0
95 PS = FM*(P1-P2)
    SUM = SUM + PS
    IF(X.LE.DELTX) GOTO 90
    IF(PS.GT.TEST) GOTO 90
    K = K+1
    GOTO 10
99 STOP
    END
```

めいかんしょう いちがん ひろてん ひと ひとのとかけ ためたんかん ひろう

85 N N N

LECHNICAL LIBRARY

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

```
FUNCTION CHIS(N)
        COMMON/CHI/CHL(15)
        AN = N
        BN = 2.0 \star AN
        IF(N.GE.15) GOTO 50
        CHIS = CHL(N)
        GOTO 60
     50 B = 1.0/(9.0*AN)
        CL = 1.0-B+1.645*SQRT(B)
        CHIS = CL*CL*CL
     60 CONTINUE
        RETURN
        END
        FUNCTION GAMMA(X)
        COMMON/GMA/B(101), Y(101)
        ARG = X
        A = 1.0
        IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10
        IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110
        IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110
        IF(ARG.GT.2.0) GOTO 20
        GOTO 30
    10 A = A/ARG
        ARG = ARG+1.0
        IF(ARG.LT.1.0) GOTO 10
        IF(ARG.EQ.1.0) GOTO 110
        GOTO 30
    20 \text{ ARG} = \text{ARG-1.0}
        A = A \star ARG
        IF(ARG.GT.2.0) GOTO 20
        IF(ARG.EQ.2.0) GOTO 110
    30 DO 40 I=1,101
        IF(B(I).GT.ARG) GOTO 50
    40 CONTINUE
    50 SLOP = (Y(I)-Y(I-1))/(B(I)-B(I-1))
        F = Y(I-1) + (ARG-B(I-1)) + SLOP
        GOTO 60
   110 F = 1.0
    60 \text{ GAMMA} = F*A
       RETURN
       END
PSI.DAT TAB VALUES OF CHI-SQUARE AND GAMMA FUNCTIONS
1.0, 1.01, 1.02, 1.03, 1.04, 1.05, 1.06, 1.07, 1.08, 1.09, 1.1,
                                                                        1.11,
1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.2, 1.21, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 1.25, 1.26, 1.27, 1.28, 1.29, 1.3, 1.31, 1.32, 1.33, 1.34, 1.35,
1.36, 1.37, 1.38, 1.39, 1.4,
                                 1.41, 1.42, 1.43, 1.44, 1.45, 1.46, 1.47,
1.48, 1.49, 1.5, 1.51, 1.52, 1.53, 1.54, 1.55, 1.56, 1.57, 1.58, 1.59,
      1.61, 1.62, 1.63, 1.64, 1.65, 1.66, 1.67, 1.68, 1.69, 1.7,
1.6,
                                                                         1.71,
1.72, 1.73, 1.74, 1.75, 1.76, 1.77, 1.78, 1.79, 1.8, 1.81, 1.82, 1.83,
1.84, 1.85, 1.86, 1.87, 1.88, 1.89, 1.9, 1.91, 1.92, 1.93, 1.94, 1.95,
1.96, 1.97, 1.98, 1.99, 2.,
         .99433, .98884, .98355, .97844, .9735, .96874, .96415, .95973,
1.,
2.9955, 2.372, 2.09867, 1.93838, 1.8307, 1.75217, 1.69179, 1.6435,
1.60383, 1.5705, 1.542, 1.51729, 1.49558, 1.47632, 1.4591
```
# NADC-87042-60

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

## GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES (continued)

NO. OF

	COPIES
NAVSHIPRANDCEN, Annapolis, MD 21402	_
(Attn: H. Edelstein, Code 2870).	. 1
NRL, Washington, D.C. 20375	
(Attn: Dr. I. Wolock, Code 6122; Dr. C. I. Chang)	2
and Dr. R. Badaliance).	, 3
NSWC, WHITE OAK LABORATORY, Silver Spring, MD 20910	,
(Attn: Dr. J. Goir, Materials Evaluation Branch, Code K-54).	י <u>ג</u>
$(Atth: Dr. J. M. Augr), \qquad , \qquad$	, <b>L</b>
(Atta: A Kuchar Codo 432/A: V Bajanakse Code 11328M).	2
ONT 800 N Owincy Street Arlington VA 22217	2
(Attn: Cdr. D. Brown OCNR-212).	. 1
PLASTEC. Picatinny Arsenal. Dover, NJ 07801	-
(Attn: H. Pebly).	. 1
(Attn: Librarian, Code DRDAR-SCM-0, Bldg, 351-N),	. 1
ARMY MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY, Watertown, MA 02172-0001.	. 1
(Attn: D. Oplinger, SLCMT-MS).	. 1
U. S. ARMY APPLIED TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY, USARTL, (AVRADCOM),	
Ft. Eustis, VA 23604	
(Attn: J. Waller; T. Mazza).	, 2
U. S. ARMY AIR MOBILITY R&D LABORATORY, Ft. Eustis, VA 23604	
(Attn: H. Reddick)	. 1
U. S. ARMY R&T LABORATORY (AVRADCOM), Ames Research Center,	
Moffet Field, CA 94035	
(Attn: F. Immen, DAVDL-AS-MS 207-5).	, 1
U. S. NAVAL ACADEMY, Annapolis, MD 21402	
(Attn: Dr. R. D. Jamison, Mechanical Engineering Department)	) 1
DAVID TAYLOR NAVAL SHIP RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER,	
Annapolis, MD 21402	•
(Attn: E. T. Camponeschi, Code 2844; R. Crane, Code 2844).	2
DAVID TAYLOR NAVAL SHIP R&D CENTER	
Bethesda, MD 20084	T
(Attn: A. Macander, Code 1/20	, <b>1</b>
NAVAIDDEVCEN Harminstor PA 18974	
(Attn. Code 8131).	્ર
(Attn: Code $0912$ ).	. 2
	-

#### NADC-87042-60

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

## GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

AFWAL, WPAFB, OH 45433						
(Attn: FIBEC, Dr. G. Sendeckyj).	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: FIB/L. Kelly, W. Goesch, C.	Ramsey	7).	•	•	•	3
(Attn: FIBCA)	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: FIBE/Mr. D. Smith)	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: MLBM/Dr. J. Whitney, M. Kni	ght).	•	•	•	•	2
(Attn: MLB/F. Cherry)	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: MBC/Reinhart)	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: AFWAL/MLSE/S. Fecheck).	•	•	•	•	•	1
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, Bldg. 410, B	olling	Air Fo	orce Ba	se,		
Washington, D.C. 20332						
(Attn: Dr. M. Salkind, Dr. Amos).	•	•	•	•	•	2
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTI	C), B10	ig. #5,	Camer	on		
Station, Alexandria, VA 22314						
(Attn: Administrator)	•	•	•	•	•	2
FAA, Washington, D.C. 20591					·	
(Attn: J. R. Soderquist, AW 103).	•	•	•	•	•	1
FAA, Technical Center, Atlantic City, NJ	08405					
(Attn: L. Neri, Code ACT-330; M. C	aiafa,	Code A	LCT-330	).	•	2
NASA Headquarters, Washington, D.C. 2054	6					
(Attn: Airframes Branch, FS-120).	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: OAST/RM Dr. D. Mulville).	•	•	•	•	•	1
NASA, George C. Marshall Space Flight Cen	ter, Hu	ints vi ]	lle, AL	35812	2	
(Attn: E. E. Engler, S&E-ASTN-ES.	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: R. Schwinghamer, S&E-ASTN-M	).	•	•	•	•	1
NASA, Langley Research Center, Hampton, V	A 2336	55				
(Attn: Dr. J. R. Davidson, MS 188E	; Dr	J. Stai	nes, M	IS 190;		
Dr. M. Mikulus, H. Bohan, and Dr.	Ċ. P. H	lakens	hip, M	IS 189M	I) •	5
NASA, Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, O	н 441:	35	•			
(Attn: Dr. C. Chamis, MS 49-6; M.	Hershbe	erg, MS	6 49-6)	•	•	2
NAVAIRSYSCOM, Washington, D.C. 20361						
(Attn: AIR-00D4),	•	•	•	• -		1
(Attn: AIR-530)	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: AIR-5302D)	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: AIR-5302)	•	•	•	•		1
(Attn: AIR-5302F)	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: AIR-53032D)	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: AIR-931B)	•	•	•	•	•	1
NAVPGSCHL, Monterey, CA 95940						
(Attn: Prof. R. Ball, Prof. M. H.	Bank, I	Prof. H	Chal	lenger	• )	3
NAVSEASYSCOM, Washington, D.C. 20360	, -				,	
(Attn: C. Zannis, Sea 05R25).	•	•	•	•	•	1
NAVSEC, Arlington, VA 20360						
(Attn: NSEC-6101E)		•	•	•	•	1
······································	-	•				-

NO. OF COPIES

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

#### NADC-87042-60

PROVIDED BY THE

\_\_\_\_\_

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

## NON-GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES (continued)

		NO. OF COPIES
MCDONNELL-DOUGLAS CORP., St. Louis, MO 63166		
(Attn: K. Stenberg, R. Garrett, R. Riley, J. Doerr)	•	4
MCDONNELL-DOUGLAS CORP., Long Beach, CA 90846		
(Attn: J. Palmer)		1
MCDONNELL-DOUGLAS HELICOPTER CO., Culver City, CA 90230		
(Attn: J.K.Sen, Trailer 2002)	•	1
NORTHROP AIRCRAFT CORP., One Northrop Ave., Hawthorne, CA 90250		
(Attn: Dr. M. Ratwani, B. Butler and R. Whitehead))	٠	1
ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL, Columbus, OH 43216		
(Attn: M. Schweiger)	•	3.
ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL, Los Angeles, CA 90009		
(Attn: Dr. Lackman)	•	1
(Attn: W. O'Brien)	•	1
ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL, Tulsa, OK 74151		
(Attn: F. Kaufman).	•	1
SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT, Stratford, CT 06622		
(Attn: S. Garbo)	•	1
TELEDYNE RYAN AERONAUTICAL CO., San Diego, CA 92138		
(Attn: R. Long)	٠	1

# TECHNICAL LIBRARY ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM NADC-87042-60

## DISTRIBUTION LIST NON-GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

# NO. OF COPIES

-----

-----

ALCOA DEFENSE SYSTEMS CORP.,	16761 Via	delCamp	o Cour	t,			
San Diego, CA 9212/							
(Attn: D. Myers).	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
AVCO, Specialty Materials Div	., 2 Indu	istrial A	venue,				
Lowell, MA 01851							
(Attn: William F. Gran	t). ,	•	•	•	•	•	1
BEECH AIRCRAFT CORP., 4130 Li	nden Aven	ue, Dayt	on OH	45432			
(Attn: M. B. Goetz).	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
BELL HELICOPTER CO., Fort Wor	th, TX 7	6101					
(Attn: M. K. Stevenson	)	•	•	•	•	•	1
BOEING CO., P.O. Box 3707, Se	attle, WA	98124					
(Attn: J. McCarty, J.	Ouinliven	, and Dr	. R. J	une).	•	•	3
BOEING CO., Vertol Division,	P. O. Box	16858.	Philad	elphia.	PA	19142	
(Attn: R. L. Pinckney)	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: D. Hart).					•		1
(Attn: C. Albrecht).		•	-			•	ī
BOEING CO. Wichits KS 6727	7-7730	·	•	•	•	•	-
(Attn: I. Avery)	/ //30						1
(Attn: B. Woner)	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	 Kondall	Sauaro	Cambri	• 4 co MA	· 02	•	-
(Atta: Dr Bing Tong D	TO 76 TO	Square,	Camori	uge, m	02	142	r
CENERAL DYNAMICS / CONVAIR Son	13 70, 13	A 02130	•	•	•	•••	T
GENERAL DINAMICS/CONVAIR, San	Diego, C	A 92130					ч
(Attn: D. K. Dunbar).	• •		•	•	•	•	T
GENERAL DINAMICS, Fort Worth	Division,	Р.О. ВО	x /48,				
Fort Worth, TX 76101							-
(Attn: J. A. Fant).	• •	- •	•	•	٠	•	1
(Attn: Composite Struc	tures Eng	; Dept.)	٠	•	•	•	1
GENERAL ELECTRIC CO., Philade	lphia, PA	19101					
(Attn: A. Garber, C. Z	weben).	•	•	•	•	•	2
GRUMMAN CORPORATION, South Oy	ster Bay	Rd., Bet	hpage,	NY 117	14		
(Attn: R. Hadcock).	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: S. Dastin).	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
LOCKHEED-CALIFORNIA CO., Burb	ank, CA	91510					
(Attn: E. K. Walker).	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: A. Vaughn).	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
(Attn: A. James).	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
LOCKHEED-MISSILE & SPACE CO.,	1111 Loc	kheed Wa	y, Sun	nyvale,	CA	94086	
(Attn: J. A. Bailie).		•	•	•	•	•	1
LOCKHEED-CALIFORNIA CO., Rye	Canyon Re	search L	aborat	orv.			
Burbank, CA 91520	<b>,</b>			,,			
(Attn: D. E. Pettit).		•					1
LTV AEROSPACE & DEFENSE CO.	Vought Mi	ssile Å	Advanc	ed Prog	rram '	Div.	*
P.O. Box 225907 Dallac	TX 752	65-0003			,- uu .	,	
(Attn: R. Knight).	, ,						1
<pre></pre>	· ·	•	-	-	-	-	-

,



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER AIRCRAFT DIVISION

ABBOTTAEROSPACE.COM

TECHNICAL LIBRARY

B112 288 \$ B112 326

5510 874000R74/Ser 10016 24 May 96

From: Commanding Officer, Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Warminster

Subj: CHANGE OF DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Ref: (a) NADC Report No. NADC-87042-60, Volumes I and II Subj: Certification Testing Methodology for Composite Structures

1. With the concurrence of the FAA Technical Center, Atlantic City, N.J., the other agency for which reference (a) was prepared, the distribution statement for the report is changed to: Distribution Statement A - Distribution Unlimited - Approved for Public Release.

BRUCE H. HEATH, JR. By direction

Distribution: List attached

B112 288 \$ B112 326

Completed 1-10-00 3.W