An approximation in closed form for the integral of Oore-Burns for cracks similar to a star domain

Paolo Livieri[1], Fausto Segala[2]

[1]Dept of Engineering, University of Ferrara, via Saragat 1, 44122, Ferrara, Italy, paolo.livieri@unife.it

[2]Dept of Physics, University of Ferrara, via Saragat 1, 44122, Ferrara, Italy, fausto.segala@unife.it

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we give an explicit new formulation for the three-dimensional mode I weight function of Oore-Burns in the case where the crack border agrees with a star domain. Analysis in the complex field allows us to establish the asymptotic behaviour of the Riemann sums of the Oore-Burns integral in terms of the Fourier expansion of the crack border. The new approach gives remarkable accuracy in the computation of the Oore-Burns integral with the advantage of reducing the size of the mesh.

Furthermore, the asymptotic behaviour of the SIF at the tip of an elliptical crack subjected to uniform tensile stress is carefully evaluated. The obtained analytical equation shows that the error of the Oore-Burns integral tends to zero when the ratio between the ellipse axes tends to zero as further confirmation of its goodness of fit.

KEYWORDS

stress intensity factor, 3D weigh function, fracture mechanics

NOMENCLATURE

δ	size of mesh over crack
Ω	crack shape
$\partial\Omega$	crack border
Q	point of Ω
Q'	point of crack border
Δ	distance between Q and $\partial\Omega$
K_I	mode I stress intensity factor

k_I	mode I stress intensity factor for a dimensionless domain
K_{Irw}	mode I stress intensity factor from Irwin's equation
K_{I2}	Taylor expansion up to second order of K_I for an ellipse
$\bar{x}, \bar{y}$	actual Cartesian coordinate system
x, y	dimensionless Cartesian coordinate system
u, v	auxiliary dimensionless coordinate system
$\bar{a}, \bar{b}$	actual semi-axis of an elliptical crack
a,b	dimensionless semi-axis of an elliptical crack
e	eccentricity of ellipse
K(e)	elliptical integral of first kind
E(e)	elliptical integral of second kind
σ_n	nominal tensile stress in $\bar{x}, \bar{y}$ actual Cartesian coordinate system
σ	nominal tensile stress in x, y dimensionless Cartesian coordinate system

1. INTRODUCTION

The advantages of the use of weight functions for the assessment of stress intensity factors (SIF) are well known in the literature, especially when many loads act on the component. For each geometry we have to estimate the correct weight function related to the location where the crack nucleates and then propagates under fatigue loading. For a correct evaluation of the SIF the proper weight function should be calculated, however accurate results can be obtained by generalising the weight function derived from the displacement function of Petroski and Achenbach[1,2]. On the basis of the procedure developed by Glinka and Shen[1], by means of FE analysis, we can obtain the parameter that appears as unknown in the generalised weight function proposed by Sha and Yang[2]. Applications to semi-elliptical cracks[3,4,5] or corner cracks[6] are present in the literature and show the efficiency in the evaluation of the SIF with error in the order of a few percent with respect to the FE results.

For a crack with an irregular shape, the calculation of the SIF is more complex and requires more effort. In fact, in order to evaluate the fatigue limit for materials with small notches or defects under mode I loading, Murakami and Endo[7] considered an average value of the SIF obtained from convex flaws. Murakami[8] suggested a shape factor, referred to as the square root of the area, about 0.5 for an engineering estimation of the maximum SIF for an arbitrarily 3D internal crack or 0.65 for an arbitrarily 3D surface crack[9].

Some analytical weight functions available in the literature are able to relate the SIF at each point of an embedded planar two-dimensional crack subjected to mode I loading[10,11,12,13,14] or under mixed mode loading[15,16] . The Oore-Burns[12] weight function displays a simple analytic form and gives an exact result in the special cases of penny shaped cracks or tunnel cracks. Furthermore, this weight function can be used for surface cracks after the introduction of proper coefficients inferred from classical analysis of a surface elliptical crack such as Normal-Rauj equations (see for instance refinements[17,18]). Obviously, the effect of vertex singularities is not taken into account because accurate studies are needed[19,20]. By means of the Oore-Burns weight an engineering answer will be given without being too time consuming[17,18]. In this way, for example, the SED can be evaluated along the front crack for the evaluation of the fatigue safety factor[21,22,23]. Despite its very compact analytical expression, the numerical evaluation of the Oore-Burns integral (hereinafter, OB integral), is very difficult, due to the singular nature of the weight function and special integration techniques are required as indicated by Desjardins et al.[24] and S. R. Montenegro et al.[25].

For the special case of ellipse cracks, the authors obtained a careful closed-form representation of the O-integral along elliptic cracks under general pressure from previous papers. More precisely, they found a closed expression of the second order Taylor expansion of the stress intensity factors with respect to deviation of the ellipse from the disk for a generic tensile stress over the crack[26]. The deviation of an ellipse from the disk is quantitatively described by the parameter $\varepsilon = 1 - b/a$, where a and b are the major and minor semi-axis, respectively. The exact evaluation of the O-integral by means of an explicit quadrature formula with a polar integration grid was also considered by the authors in reference [27]. Our approach drastically reduces the computational time to evaluate the O-integral since a very coarse mesh is sufficient without loss of accuracy. This was made possible by theoretical evaluation of the coefficient of $\delta^{1/2}$ in the deviation between the integral and its Riemann sum (δ is the size of the mesh over the crack).

We will show that the convergence is extremely fast (tables 2,3). The aim of this paper is to permanently optimoze the previous algorithm and to extend it to a general equation for irregular inner cracks like to a star domain (and hence every convex crack). The equation is derived from the Oore-Burns weight function by means of complex analysis. The coefficient of $\delta^{1/2}$ in the expansion of the Riemann sum of Oore-Burns was evaluated with an accuracy never previously achieved and this is new with respect to our previous papers, in particular reference [27]. Furthermore, in the case of elliptical cracks under uniform tensile loading, the gap between the Oore-Burns integral and the Irwin analytic solution is discussed. Finally, a comparison of the stress intensity factors between the proposed equations and those taken from the literature will show the validity of the solution.

2. Background

The stress intensity factors of the mode I loading of a planar crack Ω in a three-dimensional body, can be made by means of the Oore-Burns[12] relationship that agrees with the known results when the crack takes a special configuration such as a disk or a tunnel crack.

Let Ω be an open bounded simply connected subset of the plane and

$$f(Q) = \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{ds}{\left| Q - P(s) \right|^2} \ , \ Q \in \Omega \tag{1}$$

where s is the arch-length on $\partial\Omega$ and P(s) describes $\partial\Omega$. Oore and Burns proposed the following expression for the mode I stress intensity factor at every point $Q' \in \partial\Omega$ when the crack is subjected to a nominal tensile loading σ_n(Q):

$$K_I(Q') = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\sigma_n(Q)\, h(Q)}{\left| Q - Q' \right|^2} d\Omega \ , \qquad Q' \in \partial\Omega \tag{2}$$

where

$$h(Q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{f(Q)}} \qquad (3)$$

Under reasonable conditions on the nominal stress $\sigma_n(Q)$, the integral (2) is convergent (see for instance reference [28]).

3. Approximation formula

From now on, we will assume that the boundary of the crack is locally a graph of a C^1-function. In order to simplify the analytical formulation of K_I, it is convenient to consider a dimensionless domain obtained by means of a linear isotropic dilatation. The actual crack will be distinguished by means of an upper-line bar, so that $\overline{\Omega}$ is the initial crack and Ω is the dimensionless reference domain. We take Ω as a reference domain in such a way that the maximum diameter of Ω is equal to 2. We are able to reconstruct the stress intensity factor K_I for the actual domain $\overline{\Omega}$ (which is a dilation of a domain Ω) from the identity $\overline{\Omega} = \lambda\Omega$. The relation between K_I and the stress intensity factor evaluated for a dimensionless domain k_I is given by:

$$K_I(\overline{Q}', \sigma_n(\overline{Q})) = \sqrt{\lambda}\, k_I(Q', \sigma_n(\lambda Q)) \qquad (4)$$

where the meaning of the notation is clear and σ_n is the nominal tensile stress evaluated without the presence of the crack is the actual domain $\overline{\Omega}$ (see Fig. 1). Note that λ is a scalar quantity that has a physical dimension equal to a length whereas the physical dimension of k_I is a pressure.

We fix an orthogonal Cartesian reference *x,y* of which the origin is for example the centre of mass of Ω. Every point Q' on $\partial\Omega$ will be identified by its distance in terms of arc length from a fixed point Q'_0 on the boundary. We introduce a new orthogonal Cartesian reference (u,v) centred in Q' by following Fig. 2. A point Q can be represented in the forms $x \cdot e_1 + y \cdot e_2$ and $u \cdot k_1 + v \cdot k_2$, where e_1, e_2, k_1, k_2 are the versors of the axes *x,y,u,v*. We considered the polar mesh given by the points

$$Q_{j,k} = k\,\delta\,(k_1 \cos j\delta + k_2 \cos j\delta) \qquad (5)$$

with δ the small submultiple of $\pi/2$ and

$$k \geq 0, \qquad 0 \leq j \leq 2M-1, \qquad M\delta = \pi \tag{6}$$

On the boundary $\partial\Omega$, we introduce a discretisation of size τ=L/[L/δ], where L is the length of $\partial\Omega$ and [] means the integer part. We denote by P_{mjk} the point of $\partial\Omega$ of which the distance (in terms of arc length) from the projection of Qjk on $\partial\Omega$ is m·τ. Obviously, *m* runs on the range

$$0 \leq m \leq \left[\frac{L}{\pi}M\right]-1 \tag{7}$$

By refining techniques developed in previous work[27], we are able to establish an ultimate convergence formula for the integral (2). In order to lighten the notation, we put

$$A_{jk} = \left(\sum \left|Q_{jk} - P_{mjk}\right|^{-2}\right)^{-1/2} \tag{8}$$

where the sum is on the index *m* in its natural range (7),

$$I = \int_0^{\pi} \sqrt{\sin\vartheta}\; d\vartheta \tag{9}$$

$$J = \int_0^{1} \sqrt{\vartheta\, th(\pi\vartheta)}\; d\vartheta \tag{10}$$

$$F = \int_0^{1} \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta}\left(1-\sqrt{th(\pi\vartheta)}\right)}{\sqrt{1-\vartheta^2}} d\vartheta \tag{11}$$

$$H = \int_0^{\infty} \sqrt{\vartheta}\; e^{-2\pi\vartheta} d\vartheta \tag{12}$$

$$C = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi^{3/2}} I\,\zeta(1/2) + \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi^{3/2}}\left[F + \left(\frac{\pi^2}{6}-1\right)\left(\frac{2}{3}-J\right)\right] + \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{3} H \tag{13}$$

In (13), ζ represents the zeta Riemann function. Then the approximation formula is the following

$$k_I(Q') = \left[\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \sum_{jk} \frac{A_{jk}}{k}\sigma(Q_{jk}) + C\;\sigma(Q')\right]\sqrt{\delta} + O(\delta) \tag{14}$$

The sum on the r.h.s. of (14) is on the indexes jk for which $Q_{ik} \in \Omega$. By inserting a numerical value, we obtain

$$C = 0.932854... \tag{15}$$

(see reference[27]). The proof of (14) is based on some proprieties of the ζ zeta function, Riemann sums, the Stone-Waierstrass theorem and the identity

$$\sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{a^2+n^2}=\frac{\pi}{a}\frac{1}{th(\pi a)}, \qquad a\neq 0 \tag{16}$$

In order to greatly save computation time, in our simulations we choose the discretisation on the boundary of Ω in such a way that the starting point is Q' (i.e. fixed) and P_m is the point with the coordinate of $m\tau$. This choice implies a slight correction of the coefficient C in (13). The very delicate analysis is done in the appendix, of which we show that the correction is about $-5.35\cdot 10^{-3}$. More precisely, (14) becomes

$$k_I(Q')\approx\left[\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}\sum_{jk}\frac{A_{jk}}{k}\sigma(Q_{jk})+0.927\ \sigma(Q')\right]\sqrt{\delta} \tag{17}$$

Remark 1

In terms of dimensional consistency, by calling δ_r, δ_θ, δ_s the size of the partitions on $R^2 x\partial\Omega$, equation (17) is written as follows

$$k_I(Q')\approx\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}\frac{\delta_\vartheta}{\sqrt{\delta_s}}\sum\frac{A_{jk}}{k}\sigma(Q_{jk})+\left(0.889\sqrt{\delta_r}+0.038\frac{\delta_s^{3/2}}{\delta_r}\right)\ \sigma(Q') \tag{18}$$

4. TEST ON THE UNITARY DISK

We test equation (17) on the unit disk of Fig. 3, in the case of uniform tensile stress σ. The fixed starting point on $\partial\Omega$ is $P_o=e_1$, that is $P_m=\cos(m\delta)\cdot e_1+\sin(m\delta)\cdot e_2$. The condition $Q_{jk}\in\Omega$ becomes

$$1\leq j\leq M-1, \qquad 1\leq k<\frac{2}{\delta}\sin(j\delta) \tag{19}$$

and from (7)

$$0\leq m\leq 2M-1 \tag{20}$$

Table 1 shows the accuracy of Eq. (17) in the prediction of the stress intensity factor. The theoretical value is equal to 1.275… as evaluated by Irwin[29] under uniform nominal stress σ. The theoretical expectation is completely satisfied also with a rough mesh. The value of *C* reported in Table 1 is the value obtained by means of the Richardson extrapolation from the result of the only Riemann sum. When the mesh is very accurate (M=6400) the numerical prediction of C agrees with the theoretical one reported in Eq. (17). This is confirmation that this work permanently improves every other study on the subject.

5. Unitary elliptical cracks

In this section, we assume Ω is a dimensionless ellipse contour $\frac{x^2}{a^2}+\frac{y^2}{b^2}\le 1$ with $0<b\le a=1$. The natural description of ∂Ω is given in terms of the angle θ related to Cartesian coordinates x,y by x=a·cos θ, y = b sin θ (see Fig. 4). By Q' we mean the point (a·cos α) e_1 + (b·sin α) e_2. In this case, the link between x,y and u,v is given by:

$$u=\frac{1}{g}\left(-a\sin\alpha\, x+b\cos\alpha\, y+\frac{a^2e^2}{2}\sin 2\alpha\right) \tag{21}$$

$$v=\frac{1}{g}\left(-b\cos\alpha\, x-a\sin\alpha\, y+ab\right) \tag{22}$$

$$x=\frac{1}{g}\left(-a\sin\alpha\, u-b\cos\alpha\, v+a\,g\cos 2\alpha\right) \tag{23}$$

$$y=\frac{1}{g}\left(b\cos\alpha\, u-a\sin\alpha\, v+b\,g\sin\alpha\right) \tag{24}$$

where $e=\sqrt{1-\frac{b^2}{a^2}}$ is the eccentricity of the ellipse and

$$g=g(\alpha)=a\sqrt{1-e^2\cos^2\alpha} \tag{25}$$

For fixed e, denoted by $E(\varphi)$ the complete elliptic integral of the second kind. Moreover let

$$\vartheta_m=E^{-1}\left(m\delta+E\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)\right)-\frac{\pi}{2} \tag{26}$$

$$P_m=a\cos(\alpha+\vartheta_m)\,e_1+b\sin(\alpha+\vartheta_m)\,e_2 \tag{27}$$

$$C_{jk}=\left(\sum_{0}^{2N-1}\left|Q_{jk}-P_m\right|^{-2}\right)^{-1/2} \tag{28}$$

by applying (17) it follows

$$k_I \approx \left[\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \sum \frac{C_{jk}}{k} \sigma(Q_{jk}) + 0.927\ \sigma(Q') \right] \sqrt{\delta} \tag{29}$$

Tables 2 and 3 show that the approximation (29) is absolutely confirmed. Obviously, when the *b/a* decreases the percent error increases due to the nature of the O-integral[12,24,30].

We may speed up equation (29) (at least by a factor of 10) by choosing the mesh on $\partial\Omega$ in terms of the angle ϑ, rather than are length *s*. The reason is to avoid the amplitude function E^{-1} which slows down the program heavily. Therefore, let

$$P_m = a\cos(\alpha + m\,\delta)\, e_1 + b\sin(\alpha + m\,\delta)\, e_2 \tag{30}$$

$$C^*_{jk} = \left(\sum_0^{2M-1} \left| Q_{jk} - P_m \right|^{-2} \sqrt{1 - e^2\cos^2(\alpha + m\delta)} \right)^{-1/2} \tag{31}$$

$$E = 0.889 + 0.038\ (1 - e^2\cos^2\alpha)^{3/4} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{1 - e^2\cos^2\alpha}} \right) \tag{32}$$

The equation (29) is amended as follows

$$k_I = \left[\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \sum \frac{C^*_{jk}}{k} \sigma(Q_{jk}) + E\,(1 - e^2\, G\cos^2\alpha)\,\sigma(Q') \right] \sqrt{\delta} + O(\delta) \tag{33}$$

where G=G(α, e) is a bounded function and $0 \le e^2 G \le 0.02$. By reading Q_{ik} and P_m in the reference (u,v), we have Q_{jk} given by (5) and

$$\begin{aligned} P_m = &\frac{a}{\sqrt{1 - e^2\cos^2(\alpha)}} \left[\sin(m\delta) - e^2\cos\alpha\left(\sin(\alpha + m\delta) - \sin(\alpha)\right) \right] k_1 + \\ &\frac{b}{\sqrt{1 - e^2\cos^2(\alpha)}} \left[1 - \cos(m\delta) \right] k_2 \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

We clarify the condition $Q_{jk} \in \Omega$ in the sum on the r.h.s. of (33). By (23), (24) the request is equivalent to

$$1 \le j \le M - 1 \tag{35}$$

$$1 \le k < \frac{4}{\delta} \frac{\left(a^2\sin^2\alpha + b^2\ \cos^2\alpha\right)^{3/2} ab\sin(j\delta)}{2a^2b^2\cos^2(j\delta) + 2(a^4\sin^2\alpha + b^4\cos(\alpha))\sin^2(j\delta) - ab(a^2 - b^2)\sin(2\alpha)\sin(2j\delta)} \tag{36}$$

We may speed up (29) and (33) by a standard extrapolation argument. The conclusion is

$$k_I(Q') = 2S\left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right) - S(\delta) + (\sqrt{2}-1)E\sigma(Q')\sqrt{\delta} + O(\delta^{3/2}) \tag{37}$$

where S(δ) represents the Riemann sum

$$S(\delta) = \frac{\sqrt{2\delta}}{\pi}\sum\frac{C_{jk}}{k}\sigma(Q_{jk}) \tag{38}$$

Tables 4 reports a comparison with Irwin's exact solution and Eq. (33) as function of the *a/b* ratio. The difference between the results obtained in Tables 3 and 4 is very small. Furthermore, the same table reports the calculation of the approximation K_{I2} of K_I obtained by means of a second order approximation of the Oore-Burns integral proposed in explicit form in reference[26]. The conclusion is that equation (29) has an essentially theoretical value. The equations that are really useful from an operational point of view are (33) and (37).

Now we conclude this section with the analysis of the accuracy in the O-integral prediction in the classic case of an elliptical crack under uniform tensile loading.

As is well known, when *b* tends toward zero the SIF at the notch tip radius tends to have a gap between the classical Irwin solution. In fact, for *b/a* equal to 0.2 Oore and Burns obtained a percent error around 17%, whereas Desjardins et al[24], by means of an optimozed numerical solution, calculated a value of 18.4%. Eq. (33) gives a value of 17.5% with M=3200. Montenegro et al.[25], under the hypothesis that the error depends on the ellipse aspect ratio and on the local crack front curvature, introduced the corrective function f_c for the Oore-Burns integral. On the other hand, in a previous paper[30] the authors showed that when an elliptical crack is assumed under uniform tensile loading, the O-integral gives a first order approximation of SIF along the whole crack front, very close to the first order approximation of K_{Irw} Irwin's exact solution. In particular, when the eccentricity *e* of the ellipse tends to zero, the principal contribution $\frac{e^2}{20\sqrt{\pi}}$ to the discrepancy is very small. However, the Irwin's theoretical equation at the notch tip gives a value of the SIF that tends to zero when b/a→0. So that, a more realistic comparison between the O-integral and the Irwin equation should be made on the basis of a weighted error of the type: $(K_I - K_{Irw})/K_{Irw,\max}$ where $K_{Irw,max}$ is the maximum value of SIF for the crack with ratio b/a.

In order to evaluate the weighted error, we conclude this section by examining the asymptotic behaviour of the Oore-Burns integral when $b/a \to 0$. For simplicity, it was assumed a=1. For uniform pressure $\sigma = 1$, the well-known result of Irwin is given by

$$I(\alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi b}}{E(e)} \left(\sin^2 \alpha + b^2 \cos^2 \alpha \right)^{1/4} \tag{39}$$

Therefore, for fixed $\alpha \in]0, \pi/2[$, one has

$$I(\alpha) \approx \sqrt{\pi \sin \alpha b}\, , b \to 0 \tag{40}$$

and

$$I(0) \approx \sqrt{\pi\, b}\, , b \to 0 \tag{41}$$

In view to find the behaviour of the Oore-Burns integral for $b \to 0$, we need a preliminary estimate. By referring to Fig. 5, we put

$$\Delta = \text{distance}(Q, \partial\Omega) \tag{42}$$

$$Q^* = \textit{projection} \quad \textit{of } Q \textit{ on } \partial\Omega \tag{43}$$

Then, by Carnot

$$\left|Q - P(s)\right|^2 = \Delta^2 + \left|Q^* - P(s)\right|^2 - 2\Delta \left|Q^* - P(s)\right| \cos(\omega) \tag{44}$$

On convex sets, $\omega < \pi/2$. We consider Q* the origin on $\partial\Omega$, and so in terms of arc length, the coordinate of –Q* is -L≡L, 2L being the length of the ellipse. By taking into account $\left|Q^* - P(s)\right| \le s$, from (44) it follows that

$$\left|Q - P(s)\right|^2 = \Delta^2 + s^2 \tag{45}$$

and then

$$f(Q) \ge \frac{\pi}{\Delta} (1 - \frac{b}{\pi}) \tag{46}$$

$$h(Q) \le \frac{\sqrt{\Delta}}{\sqrt{\pi}} (1 + O(b)) \approx \frac{\sqrt{\Delta}}{\sqrt{\pi}}, b \to 0 \tag{47}$$

When $\alpha \neq 0$, we consider for example $\alpha = \pi/2$. Then, by Fig. 6, the asymptotic behaviour of Oore-Burns is given by the model

$$k_I = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2b}}\int_X \frac{\sqrt{y}\sqrt{2b-y}}{x^2+y^2}\,dx\,dy = \sqrt{\pi b} + O(b^{3/2}) \tag{48}$$

In a similar way, it is not difficult to verify that for $\alpha \neq 0$, the asymptotic behaviour of Irwin and Oore-Burns agrees. The problem is for $\alpha = 0$. By putting $c = \frac{1}{2b^2}$, the model for Oore-Burns is given by

$$k_I = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}\int_Y \frac{h}{x^2+y^2}\,dx\,dy \tag{49}$$

where Y is the set in Fig. 7a.

We divide region Y in four parts, by Fig. 7b. On the region Y_1 and Y_2 , we make use of the estimate

$$\Delta \le x - c\,y^2 \tag{50}$$

while on the region Y_3 and Y_4 we make use of the estimate

$$\Delta \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}\left(\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{c}\;|y|\right) \tag{51}$$

We illustrate, for example, the contribution coming from region Y_2. By (47), (49) and (50) we have to bind the integral

$$k_{Y2} = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi^{3/2}}\int_{R2} \frac{\sqrt{x-cy^2}}{x^2+y^2}\,dx\,dy \tag{52}$$

By changing coordinates $x = \frac{z}{c\tan^2\vartheta}$, $y = \frac{z}{c\tan\vartheta}$, we may compute k_{Y2}. Precisely

$$k_{Y2} = \frac{b\ln 2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \tag{53}$$

By taking the overall contributions into account, the Oore-Burns integral for small *b* is bound by

$$
k_I \leq \frac{b}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left\{ \ln 2 + \int_0^{\pi/4} \left[\begin{array}{l} \dfrac{4 2^{1/4}}{\pi} \sqrt{\cos\vartheta - \sqrt{2}\sin^2\vartheta} + \dfrac{4}{\pi}\dfrac{1}{\tan\vartheta} \arcsin\left(2^{1/4}\sqrt{\cos\vartheta}\tan\vartheta\right) + \\ -\dfrac{8 2^{1/8}}{\pi}\sqrt{\sqrt{\cos\vartheta} - 2^{1/4}\sin\vartheta} - \dfrac{8}{\pi\sqrt{\tan\vartheta}} \arcsin\left(2^{1/8}\cos^{1/4}\vartheta\sqrt{\tan\vartheta} + \dfrac{4}{\sqrt{\tan\vartheta}}\right) \end{array} \right] d\vartheta \right\} \approx
$$

$$
\approx 3.320 b \tag{54}
$$

A much more refined analysis of the function Δ allows us to improve the estimation (54) up to

$$
k_I \leq 2.90\ b \tag{55}
$$

In virtue of (55) the weighted percentage of the error of Oore-Burns with respect to Irwin K_{Irw} (much more significant than a simple percentage) is then bound by

$$
\frac{K_I - K_{Irw}}{K_{Irw,\max}} \leq 0.63\sqrt{b},\ b \to 0 \tag{56}
$$

That is the weighed percentage →0 for b→0. The estimate (56) is presumably optimal and shows an excellent agreement with numerical simulations as reported in Fig. 8. When b~1, weighted percentage error ~ $\frac{\varepsilon}{20}\left(1+\frac{9}{16}\varepsilon\right)$ with $\varepsilon = 1-b$ (see reference[30]).

Finally, in this section we make the comparison between equation (33) and the results of Irwin's equation. By calling I_2 the Taylor expansion of second order of the Irwin stress intensity factor K_{Irw} and K_{I2} the Taylor expansion of the second order of the Oore-Burns integral K_I, from reference[26] we obtain the approximation $K_I \approx K_{Irw} + K_{I2} - I_2$ precisely up to 10^{-3} in the range 0.5≤b≤1. In table 4, the agreement among the results obtained with different equation is satisfactory.

6 STAR DOMAINS

In this section we assume Ω will be a star domain. Therefore we can read its boundary in terms of polar coordinates, i.e. we assume the boundary is discussed by a C^1 function $R = R(\vartheta),\ \vartheta \in [0, 2\pi]$. Of course in this case it is very useful to discretise $\partial\Omega$ in terms of the angle ϑ in order to speed up the numerical procedure. We take Ω dimensionless, by normalisation in such a way that $\max_{[0,2\pi]} \gamma = 1$, where

$$\gamma(\vartheta) = \sqrt{R^2(\vartheta) + R'^2(\vartheta)} \tag{57}$$

A careful analysis of our technique allows us to amend equation (14). Let α be the coordinate of the pole Q'.

$$P_m = R(\alpha + m\,\delta)\left(\cos(\alpha + m\,\delta)\,e_1 + \sin(\alpha + m\,\delta)\,e_2\right) \tag{58}$$

$$B_{jk} = \left(\sum_0^{2N-1} \left|Q_{jk} - P_m\right|^{-2} \gamma(\alpha + m\,\delta)\right)^{-1/2} \tag{59}$$

Hence the approximation becomes

$$k_I(Q') \approx \left[\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \sum_{jk} \frac{B_{jk}}{k} \sigma(Q_{jk}) + D\,\sigma(Q')\right]\sqrt{\delta} \tag{60}$$

and the coefficient D is given by

$$D = 0.889 + 0.038\,\gamma(\alpha)^{\frac{3}{2}} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{\gamma(\alpha)}\right) \tag{61}$$

Yet, the sum on the r.h.s. in (61) is on the index for which $Q_{jk} \in \Omega$. The link between variables (x,y) and (u,v) is given by

$$u = \frac{1}{\gamma}\left[(R'\cos\alpha - R\sin\alpha)x + (R\cos\alpha + R'\sin\alpha)y - R\,R'\right] \tag{62}$$

$$v = \frac{1}{\gamma}\left[-(R\cos\alpha + R'\sin\alpha)x + (R'\cos\alpha - R\sin\alpha)y + R^2\right] \tag{63}$$

With the inverses

$$x = \frac{1}{\gamma}\left[(R'\cos\alpha - R\sin\alpha)u - (R\cos\alpha + R'\sin\alpha)v\right] + R\cos(\alpha) \tag{64}$$

$$y = \frac{1}{\gamma}\left[(R\cos\alpha + R'\sin\alpha)u + (R'\cos\alpha - R\sin\alpha)v\right] + R\sin(\alpha) \tag{65}$$

In the equations (62)-(65) γ, R, R' are computed at α. By putting

$$w = u + iv,\ z = x + iy,\ \lambda = \frac{1}{\gamma}(R + i\,R') \tag{66}$$

We may write (62)-(65) in the very synthetic form

$$w = i\,\lambda\left(R - e^{-i\alpha}\,z\right) \tag{67}$$

$$z = e^{i\alpha}\,(i\overline{\lambda}\,w + R) \tag{68}$$

By taking the Fourier expansion of $R(\vartheta)$, that is

$$R(\vartheta) = \sum_{0}^{\infty}\left(A_r\cos(r\vartheta) + B_r\,\sin(r\vartheta)\right) \tag{69}$$

the condition (x,y)∈Ω becomes

$$|z| < A_0 + \sum_{1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{|z|^n}\left(A_n\,\mathrm{Re}\,(z^n) + B_n\,\mathrm{Im}(z^n)\right) \tag{70}$$

In conclusion, by setting

$$w_{jk} = R\delta\, e^{ij\delta} \tag{71}$$

$$z_{jk} = e^{i\alpha}(i\overline{\lambda}w_{jk} + R) \tag{72}$$

From (70-(72) the condition Q_{jk}∈Ω. Can be written as follows

$$|z| < A_0 + \sum_{1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{|z_{jk}|^n}\left(A_n\,\mathrm{Re}\,(z_{jk}^n) + B_n\,\mathrm{Im}(z_{jk}^n)\right) \tag{73}$$

For example, when $R(\vartheta) = \frac{1}{1+a}(1 + a\cos\vartheta)$, 0≤a≤1/2 (limaçon de Pascal), inequality (73) becomes

$$(1+a)\left|z_{jk}\right|^2 - \left|z_{jk}\right| - a\,x_{jk} < 0 \tag{74}$$

where $x_{jk} = \mathrm{Re}\,z_{jk}$.

In the case of the curvan crack, that is in dimensionless form:

$$R(\vartheta) = (1 + a\cos 4\vartheta) \tag{75}$$

with *a* real number, the normalisation in such a way that $\max\limits_{[0,2\pi]}\gamma = 1$, gives the equation of the contour:

$$R(\vartheta) = \lambda'(1 + a\cos 4\vartheta) \tag{76}$$

where λ' is defined as:

$$\lambda' = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{1+a}; & 0 \le a \le \dfrac{1}{15} \\ \dfrac{\sqrt{15}}{4\sqrt{1+15a^2}}; & a \ge \dfrac{1}{15} \end{cases} \tag{77}$$

In general this operation could be made numerically by imposing a rescaling of the dimensionless contour with a λ' scale factor. The SIF of the star domain will be that calculated by means of Eq. (60) dividing by $\sqrt{\lambda'}$.

The condition $Q_{jk} \in \Omega$ is

$$|z_{jk}|^5 - p|z_{jk}|^4 - pa\left(x_{jk}^4 - 6x_{jk}^2 y_{jk}^2 + y_{jk}^4\right) < 0 \tag{78}$$

where $y_{jk} = \operatorname{Im} z_{jk}$

Figs 9 and 10 show a comparison from the results given by Eq. (60) and the results present in the literature[25],[31] for a curvan crack and a half-circle and half $\rho = f(\vartheta) = \frac{A}{\sqrt{1+\left(\frac{A^2}{a^2}-1\right)|\sin\vartheta|}}$ with A/a=1.5. The agreement is around some units percent.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, a very accurate procedure was proposed for the evaluation of the stress intensity factor (SIF) by means of the Oore-Burns weight function. For defects similar to a star domain an explicit algorithm was developed and the equations can be implemented in standard mathematical software. The high accuracy reached allows us to use a course mesh for the computation of the SIF of a crack with a general shape. Detailed analysis of the SIF at the tip of an elliptical crack shows that the O-integral gives maximum errors around ten percent also for a small curvature radius.

APPENDIX

We denote by f_p the Riemann approximation of f, by choosing the projection of Q on $\partial\Omega$ as a starting point. Then, by equation (13) of a previous paper[26] it follows

$$k_I \approx \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}\,\delta \sum_{jk} \frac{h_P(Q_{jk})}{k} + C\,\sqrt{\delta} \tag{A1}$$

where

$$h_p \approx \frac{1}{f_P} \tag{A2}$$

Now let f_F the Riemann approximation of f, by choosing the "pole" Q' as the starting point. By replacing h_F with h_P in A1, we introduce a correction given by

$$correction \approx -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \quad \sum \frac{1}{k}\left(h_F - h_P\right) Q_{jk} \tag{A3}$$

where

$$h_F \approx \frac{1}{f_F} \tag{A4}$$

Our problem is therefore a very precise evaluation of the function h_f-h_b. We need a picture in order to illustrate the situation (see Figs. A1) where:

$$f_P = \sum_{-M}^{M} \frac{\delta}{y^2 + m^2\,\delta^2} \tag{A5}$$

$$f_F = \sum_{-M}^{M} \frac{\delta}{y^2 + (m+\mu)^2\,\delta^2} \tag{A5}$$

where $0 \le \mu \le \frac{1}{2}$ and $M\delta = 1$. By putting $a = \frac{y}{\delta}$, we may write

$$f_P = \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{-M}^{M} \frac{1}{a^2 + m^2} \tag{A7}$$

$$f_F = \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{-M}^{M} \frac{1}{a^2 + (m+\mu)^2} \tag{A8}$$

We consider three sets

$$X = \{(x, y),\ \ a \ge 1\} \tag{A9}$$

$$Y = \{(x, y),\ 0 \le a \le 1, |x| \ge \delta\} \tag{A10}$$

$$Z = \{(x, y),\ 0 \le a \le 1, |x| \le \delta\} \tag{A11}$$

The sets X,Y,Z are illustrated in Fig. A2. We begin by computing the contribution to the sum on the r.h.s. in (A3) coming from the region X. By the equation

$$\sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{a^2 + (m+\mu)^2} = \frac{\pi}{a} \frac{sh(2\pi a)}{ch(2\pi a) - \cos(2\pi\mu)} \tag{A12}$$

and the equation (16), it follows that on the set X

$$f_F \approx f_P - \frac{R}{\delta} \tag{A13}$$

where

$$R = 2\left(\frac{\mu^2}{M^3} + \frac{\pi}{a} \frac{1-\cos(2\pi\mu)}{e^{2\pi a}} \right) \tag{A14}$$

then

$$f_F \approx f_P + \frac{y^{3/4} R}{2\pi^{3/2}} \sqrt{\delta} \tag{A15}$$

This means that the conservation coming from the region X is about

$$\begin{aligned} &- \frac{4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\delta}}{\pi^{3/2}} \sum \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sqrt{jk}\, e^{-2k\pi j\delta} \delta \approx - \frac{4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\delta}}{\pi^{3/2}} \sum \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \int_{1/k}^{1} \sqrt{t}\, e^{-2k\pi t} dt \approx \\ &\approx - \frac{4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\delta}}{\pi^{3/2}} \sum_{2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} \int_{1}^{\infty} \sqrt{u}\, e^{-2\pi u} du \approx 0.00020\sqrt{\delta} \end{aligned} \tag{A16}$$

Now we consider the contribution to the correction, due to the set Y. From (A12) it follows for small μ / a

$$f_F \approx \frac{1}{\delta} g_P - \frac{1}{\delta} S \mu^2 \tag{A17}$$

where

$$S = \frac{\pi^3}{a} \frac{1}{th(\pi a)} \frac{1}{sh^2(\pi a)} \tag{A18}$$

$$g_p = \frac{\pi}{a} \frac{1}{th(\pi a)} \tag{A19}$$

$$h_F \approx h_P + \frac{S\mu^2}{2 g_P^{3/2}} \sqrt{\delta} \tag{A20}$$

We take into account that in the region Y, $\mu \approx \frac{1}{2} k\,\vartheta^2$ where $\tan\vartheta = \frac{y}{x}$. Hence the contribution is of the type

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\delta}}{4\pi}\sum k\,\frac{\delta(kj\delta)}{g_P^{3/2}(kj\delta)}(j^4\delta^4)\,\delta \approx -\frac{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\delta}}{4\pi}\sum k\int_0^{1/k}\frac{S(k\,t)}{g_P^{3/2}(k\,t)}t^4\,dt \approx \\
&\approx -\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sqrt{\delta}}{4}\sum_2^\infty \frac{1}{k^4}\int_0^1 \frac{u^{9/2}\sqrt{th(\pi u)}}{sh^2(\pi u)}\,du \approx -0.00031\sqrt{\delta}
\end{aligned}
\tag{A21}
$$

Hence, the only “significant” contribution comes from the set Z. We divide Z in three subregions Z_1,Z_2,Z_3 (see Fig. A3)

$$Z_1 = \left\{(x,y)\in Z,\ 0 \le \sin\frac{y}{x} \le \frac{1}{2}\right\} \tag{A22}$$

$$Z_2 = \left\{(x,y)\in Z,\ \frac{1}{2} \le \sin\frac{y}{x} \le \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right\} \tag{A23}$$

$$Z = \left\{(x,y)\in Z,\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \le \sin\frac{y}{x} \le 1\right\} \tag{A24}$$

On the region Z_1, f_P is given by (A5), while

$$f_F = \sum \frac{\delta}{y^2 + (m\,\delta + x)^2} \tag{A25}$$

with $x \approx \delta\left(1 - \frac{\vartheta^2}{2}\right)$, $y \approx \delta\,\vartheta$, $\tan\vartheta = \frac{y}{x}$. We may write

$$f_P \approx \frac{1}{\delta}\left(\frac{1}{\vartheta^2} + \sum_{m\neq 0}\frac{1}{\vartheta^2 + m^2}\right) \approx \frac{1}{\delta\,\vartheta^2}\left(1 + \frac{\pi^2}{3}\vartheta^2\right) \tag{A26}$$

$$f_F \approx \frac{1}{\delta}\left(\frac{1}{\vartheta^2 + \frac{\vartheta^4}{4}} + \sum_{m\neq 0}\frac{1}{\left(\vartheta^2 + m + \frac{\vartheta^2}{2}\right)^2}\right) \approx \frac{1}{\delta\,\vartheta^2}\left(1 + \left(\frac{\pi^2}{3} - \frac{1}{4}\right)\vartheta^2\right) \tag{A27}$$

From (A26) and (A27) it follows

$$h_F - h_P \approx \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{8}\frac{\vartheta^3}{\left(1 + \pi^2\frac{\vartheta^2}{3}\right)^{3/2}} \tag{A28}$$

By taking into account that on Z, k is fixed and equal to one, the contribution is then given by

$$-\frac{\sqrt{2}\,\sqrt{\delta}}{4\pi}\int_0^{1/2}\frac{\vartheta^3}{\left(1+\pi^2\frac{\vartheta^2}{3}\right)^{3/2}}d\vartheta \approx -0.00094\sqrt{\delta} \tag{A29}$$

In the region Z_3, in virtue of (A12), by putting $\tan\vartheta=\frac{y}{x}$, we make of the approximation

$$f_F \approx f_P - \frac{\pi^3\, ch\pi}{sh^3\,\pi}\frac{\vartheta^2}{\delta} \approx f_P\left(1-\frac{\pi^2}{sh^2\,\pi}\,\vartheta^2\right) \tag{A30}$$

The consequence of (A30) is

$$h_F \approx h_P + \frac{\pi^{3/2}\sqrt{th\,\pi}}{2\,sh^2\,\pi}\,\sqrt{\delta}\;\vartheta^2 \tag{A31}$$

The correction due to the set Z_3 is then given by

$$-\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sqrt{th\pi}}{sh^2\,\pi}\,\sqrt{\delta}\sum(j\,\delta)^2\,\delta \approx -\frac{\sqrt{2}\;\pi^{7/2}\sqrt{th\pi}}{648\,sh^2\,\pi}\,\sqrt{\delta} \approx -0.00090\,\sqrt{\delta} \tag{A32}$$

(note that on Z, k is fixed an equal to the unity). Finally, we conclude, by computing the correction due to the region Z_2. Here, we make use of a numerical procedure. From results, reported in Table A1, it follows the contribution on Z_2:

$$-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\;0.00638\,\sqrt{\delta} \approx -0.00300\,\sqrt{\delta} \tag{A33}$$

Summing up (A16), (A21), (A29),(A31) and (A33) we obtain

$$correction \approx -5.35\cdot 10^{-3}\,\sqrt{\delta} \tag{A34}$$

From (15) and (A34) we deduce the coeffficient C' by choosing Q' as starting point on $\partial\Omega$

$$C' = 0.9275... \tag{A35}$$

REFERENCES

1 Glinka G., Shen G. (1991). Universal features of weight functions for cracks in mode I. Eng. Fract. Mech., 40(6), 1135–46

2 Sha G.T., Yang C.T. (1986). Weight function of radial cracks emanating from a circular hole in a plate, ASTM. – Philadelphia: 573–600

3 Zheng X.J., Glinka G., Dubey R.N. (1996). Stress intensity factors and weight functions for a corner crack in a finite thickness plate, Eng. Fract. Mech., 54(1), 49–61

4 Fett T. (2000). Failure due to semielliptical surface cracks under arbitrary stress distributions, Fatig. Fract Engng Mater Struct, 23(4), 347–353

5 Zheng X.J., Glinka G., Dubey R.N. (1995). Calculation of stress intensity factors for semielliptical cracks in a thick-wall cylinder, Int J Pres Ves Pip; 62(3), 249–258

6 Salvati E., Livieri P., Tovo R. (2013). Fattori di intensificazione delle tensioni per cricche ad angolo triangolari in corrispondenza di intersezione di fori sollecitate a modo I. Frattura ed Integrità Strutturale; 26, 80–91

7 Murakami Y., Endo M. (1983). Quantitative evaluation of fatigue strength of metals containing various small defects or cracks. Eng. Fract. Mech., 17(1): 1–15

8 Murakami Y. (2002). Metal Fatigue: Effects of small defects and nonmetallic inclusions, 1st Edition Elsevier Science Ltd, New York,

9 Murakami Y., Nemat-Nasser S. (1983). Growth and stability of interacting surface Flaws of arbitrary shape, Eng. Fract. Mech.; 17(3), 193–210

10 Krasowsky A.J., Orynyak I.V., Gienko A.Yu. (1999). Approximate closed form weight function for an elliptical crack in an infinite body, Int. J Fract.; 99, 117–130

11 Orynyak I., Batura A., Oryniak A. (2016). Comparison of two numerical procedures for solution of the integro-differential equation of flat crack problem. Eng. Fract. Mech., 160, 185–198

12 Oore M., Burns D.J. (1980). Estimation of stress intensity factors for embedded irregular cracks subjected to arbitrary normal stress fields. J Press Vess-T ASME, 102, 202–211

13 Al-Falou A.A., Ball R.C. (2000). The 3-D weight functions for a quasi-static planar crack, Int J Solids Struct; 37(37), 5079–5096

14 Saeidi Googarchin H., Ghajar R. (2014) Stress intensity factors calculation for surface crack in cylinders under longitudinal gradient pressure using general point load weight function. Fatig. Fract. Eng. Mater Struct., 37, 184–194

15 Ghajar R., Alizadeh K.J. (2013). Mixed mode stress intensity factors for elliptical subsurface cracks in an elastic half-space subjected to a uniform normal loading. Fatig. Fract. Eng. Mater Struct., 36, 1199–1208

16 Alizadeh K.J., Ghajar R. (2015). Calculation of mixed mode stress intensity factors for an elliptical subsurface crack under arbitrary normal loading Fatig. Fract Engng Mater Struct., 38, 700–713

17 Grueter L., Huget W., Kylla H. (1984). Weight functions and stress intensity magnification factors for elliptical and semi-elliptical cracks under variable normal stress – Part I, Z. Werkstoffrech; 15, 10–17

18 Beghini M., Bertini L., Gentili A. (1997). An explicit weight function for semi-elliptical surface cracks. J Press Vess-T ASME, 119: 216–223

19 He Z., Kotousov A., Berto F.. (2015). Effect of vertex singularities on stress intensities near plate free surfaces Fatig. Fract Engng Mater Struct, 38, 860–869

20 Pook L.P., (2013). A 50-year retrospective review of three-dimensional effects at cracks and sharp notches. Fatigue Fract. Engng. Mater. Struct., 36(8), 699–723

21 Campagnolo A., Meneghetti G., Berto F. (2016). Rapid finite element evaluation of the averaged strain energy density of mixed-mode (I + II) crack tip fields including the T-stress contribution. Fatig. Fract. Engng. Mater. Struct. 39(8), 982–998

22 Lazzarin P., Livieri P., Berto F., Zappalorto M.. (2008) Local strain energy density and fatigue strength of welded joints under uniaxial and multiaxial loading. Eng. Fract. Mech., 75(7), 1875–1889

23 Song W., Liu X., Berto F., Wang P., Fang H. Fatigue failure transition analysis in load-carrying cruciform welded joints based on strain energy density approach. Fatig. Fract Engng Mater Struct, in press

24 Desjardins J.L., Burns D.J., Thompson J.C. (1991). A weight function technique for estimating stress intensity factors for cracks in high pressure, J Press Vess-T ASME; 113: 10–21

25 Montenegro H.L., Cisilino A.P., Otegui J.L. (2008). A weight function method for the assessment of partially closed three-dimensional plane cracks. Eng. Fract. Mech.; 75(15): 4486–4500

26 Livieri P., Segala F. (2015), New weight functions and second order approximation of the Oore-Burns integral for elliptical cracks subject to arbitrary normal stress field. Eng. Fract. Mech., 138: 100–117

27 Livieri P., Segala F. (2014). Sharp evaluation of the Oore-Burns integral for cracks subjected to arbitrary normal stress field, Fatig. Fract Engng Mater Struct, 37: 95–106
28 Ascenzi O., Pareschi L., Segala F. (2002). A precise computation of stress intensity factor on the front of a convex planar crack. Int J Numer Meth Eng, 54: 241–261
29 Irwin G.R. (1962). Crack-extension force for a part-through crack in a plate. J Appl Mech-T ASME: 29(4), 651–654
30 Livieri P., Segala F., Ascenzi O. (2005). Analytic evaluation of the difference between Oore-Burns and Irwin stress intensity factor for elliptical cracks, Acta Mechanica,; 176 (1-2): 95–105
31 Mastrojannis E.N., Keer L.M., Mura T. (1979). Stress intensity factor for a plane crack under normal pressure, Int. J Fract., , 15 (3): 247–258