

A DAMAGE MECHANICS TOOL FOR LAMINATE DELAMINATION

L. Daudeville, P. Ladevèze

*Laboratoire de Mécanique et Technologie, ENS de Cachan / CNRS / Univ. P. et M. Curie
61 avenue du Président Wilson, 94235 Cachan Cedex, France*

ABSTRACT

A simplified method based upon Damage Mechanics for the delamination analysis of carbon-resin composites is presented. In the neighbourhood of a laminate structure quasi-straight edge, damage is taken concentrated on the interface between layers. The Finite Element code EDA, acting as a post-processor of an elastic laminate shell computation, allows the onset and propagation forecast of delamination. First numerical simulations of delamination are given and compared with experimental results from literature.

INTRODUCTION

The degradation modes of carbon-resin laminates (T300-914 for instance) can be split into two classes. On the one hand, intralaminar damages : transverse matrix cracking, fibre-matrix debonding, fibre ruptures. On the other hand, delamination, i.e degradation of the link between layers. Laminate structures being thin (plates or shells), the stress state far away from the edge zones (free edges, zones of force application) is a plane stress state, whereas the stress state can be three-dimensional in the edge zones. Thus, delamination, phenomenon of layer debonding due to possible stresses that are normal to the shell surface, occurs principally in the edge zones of laminate structures.

Numerical rupture simulation of a laminate structure, taking into account all the progressive degradation phenomena, leads to a time dependant three-dimensional non-linear problem. Nowadays, Finite Element calculations under a classical laminate theory and combined with stress criteria¹, are generally used for the rupture forecast far away from the edge zones. Such an approach can be discussed because such criteria cannot well describe the different damage phenomena.

For the delamination analysis, more especially for the onset forecast of a free edge crack, computation methods of elastic edge effects²⁻⁴ are generally used as post-processors of an elastic laminate shell computation. They are associated to criteria based upon the average of normal stresses along a characteristic distance from the free edge⁵. Progressive degradations are not yet taken into account. In add, delamination does not always occur where stresses are maxima and the intrinsic feature of the distance from the free edge can be discussed when geometry and stacking sequence vary. Linear Fracture Mechanics, i.e computation of an energy release rate G and its comparison with a critic value G_c , is generally used for crack propagation study⁶⁻⁸. Nevertheless, Fracture Mechanics cannot be used for crack onset study.

Progressive degradation modelling allows to know accurately the structure behaviour until rupture : that is Damage Mechanics of Composites⁹⁻¹¹.

Numerical methods based upon Damage Mechanics proposed by LADEVEZE¹¹, acting as post-processors of an elastic laminate shell computation have been developed for the forecast - (i) of rupture far away from the edge - (ii) of rupture in the vicinity of a circular hole - (iii) of delamination near a quasi-straight edge.

The (iii) method is presented. The general ideas of that computational tool had been first presented in¹². We present now the development and the first results of this simplified method that allows the forecast of delamination onset and its propagation on a short distance. Damage phenomena are taken concentrated on the interfaces between the layers. The edge is quasi-straight thus the initial three-dimensional problem becomes a two-dimensional one set into a band perpendicular to the edge.

The laminate is modelled as a stacking of homogeneous elastic layers connected by elastic with damage interfaces. The interface is a two-dimensional entity which ensures stress and displacement transfers between layers. The degradation effect is taken into account through the relative variations of the

interface elastic moduli. An interface with damage has also been used recently by SCHELLEKENS¹³ for delamination simulation of a laminate under tension. The interface modelling of previous author is principally based upon numerical considerations. The interface modelling we propose has already been presented. In the previous presentation¹⁴, for the particular example of a DCB beam, a link has been established between Damage Mechanics of the interface and Fracture Mechanics giving a mechanical interpretation to that modelling. Note that the crack length was considered large compared with the beam thickness. In the present paper, the numerical simulation of the DCB test is performed with no initial crack.

Finite Element method is used. Due to damage, the structure may present a critical state. A RIKS¹⁵⁻¹⁶ method, in which crack opening displacement is controlled, allows to pass such a limit point.

Numerical simulations of delamination, computed with the post-processor E.D.A. (Edge Damage Analysis), are given in the framework of : - a D.C.B. beam : study of onset and propagation of delamination - a specimen under tension : study of delamination onset near the free edge. The proposed numerical simulations allow a comparison with experimental results from literature for the identification and the checking of the modelling .

A. DELAMINATION ANALYSIS BY DAMAGE MECHANICS

I. LAMINATE MODELLING

The laminate is modelled as a stacking : $\begin{cases} \text{of homogeneous layers} \\ \text{of interfaces connecting layers} \end{cases}$ (see fig. 1)

All damage phenomena are taken concentrated on the interface. The principal features of the interface are :

- *its behaviour is assumed orthotropic* : the influence of the adjacent layers on the interface damage behaviour is taken into account through the fibre direction bisectors that are supposed to be the directions of orthotropy. The constitutive law links the normal stresses to the jump of displacement between layers, its expression in elasticity is :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{13} \\ \sigma_{23} \\ \sigma_{33} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} k_1^0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_2^0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_3^0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} [u_1] \\ [u_2] \\ [u_3] \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\begin{cases} [\mathbf{U}] = \mathbf{U}^+ - \mathbf{U}^- = [u_1]\mathbf{N}_1 + [u_2]\mathbf{N}_2 + [u_3]\mathbf{N}_3 \\ \text{jump of displacement between the + and - layers} \end{cases}$

Note the particular cases : $\begin{cases} k_1^0 = k_2^0 = k_3^0 = 0 \text{ complete debonding between layers} \\ k_1^0 = k_2^0 = k_3^0 = 8 \text{ perfect bonding} \end{cases}$

- *damage is unilateral in the 3 direction* : for the normal to the shell direction (mode I) there is no damage under compression

- *relative variations of stiffness are the damage indicators* : three internal variables d_i are associated to the three stiffness moduli k_i^0

- *the interface behaviour is assumed to be elastic with damage* : that is a first, an inelastic behaviour can also be introduced¹⁷.

The thermodynamical potential is the strain energy :

$$E_D = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\langle -\sigma_{33} \rangle_+^2}{k_3^0} + \frac{\langle \sigma_{33} \rangle_+^2}{k_3^0(1-d_3)} + \frac{\sigma_{31}^2}{k_1^0(1-d_1)} + \frac{\sigma_{32}^2}{k_2^0(1-d_2)} \right] \quad \langle \cdot \rangle_+ \text{ denotes the positive part}$$

The variables Y_{di} , that are similar to the energy release rate introduced in Fracture Mechanics, are

conjugated to d_i : $Y_{di} = \frac{\partial E_D}{\partial d_i}$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{d1} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma_{31}^2}{k_1^0 (1-d_1)^2} & ; & & Y_{d2} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma_{32}^2}{k_2^0 (1-d_2)^2} & ; & & Y_{d3} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle \sigma_{33} \rangle_+^2}{k_3^0 (1-d_3)^2} \\ &\text{Mode 1} & & & \text{Mode 2} & & & & \text{Mode 3 + Mode I} \end{aligned}$$

Note that modes 1, 2 and 3, are here relative to the axes of orthotropy, contrarily to the Fracture Mechanics classical appellation that refers to crack opening directions.

A first choice for the damage evolution law :

The evolution of the three damage variables is linked because the same micro-cracks participate to damage. Damage evolution is assumed to be governed by :

$$\underline{Y} = \sup_{\wedge \tau=t} (Y_{d3} + \gamma_1 Y_{d1} + \gamma_2 Y_{d2}) \quad \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \text{ coupling factors}$$

Damage evolution law is :

$$\begin{cases} d_3 = w(\underline{Y}) \text{ if } d_3 < 1 \\ d_3 = 1 \text{ otherwise} \\ d_1 = \gamma_1 w(\underline{Y}) \text{ if } d_1 < 1 \text{ and } d_3 < 1 \\ d_1 = 1 \text{ otherwise} \\ d_2 = \gamma_2 w(\underline{Y}) \text{ if } d_2 < 1 \text{ and } d_3 < 1 \\ d_2 = 1 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{with } w(\underline{Y}) = \frac{\langle \underline{Y} - Y_0 \rangle_+^n}{(Y_c - Y_0)^n}$$

Y_0 (threshold energy), Y_c (critical energy), n : characteristic parameters of the damage evolution law of the interface.

II. LINK WITH FRACTURE MECHANICS

Classical tests of Fracture Mechanics¹⁸ allow to obtain the three inter-laminar fracture toughnesses G_{Ic} , G_{IIc} , G_{IIIc} , relatively to the modes I, II and III. G_{Ic} , G_{IIc} , G_{IIIc} are different¹⁹.

Under the assumption : G_c is a constant parameter (there is no R-curve effect), G_c is a characteristic interface parameter. G_c can be interpreted as the necessary work per unit surface for the interface debonding. Then it can be relied (for instance under pure mode I + mode 3) to the characteristic parameters of the interface modelling.

$$G_{Ic} = \int_0^{[u_{3c}]} \sigma_{33} d[u_3] \quad \text{with } [u_{3c}] = [u_3]_{\&d3=1} : \text{ the interface is locally cracked}$$

G_{Ic} is therefore the area under the curve $\sigma_{33} - [u_3]$ (see fig. 2). In pure mode I pure one finds :

$$G_{Ic} = Y_0 + \frac{n}{n+1} (Y_c - Y_0)$$

For the identification under pure modes 2 or 3, one assumes that the crack opening direction coincides with a bisector of adjacent fibre directions. In that case one finds (mode II + mode 1 and mode III + mode 2) :

$$G_{\alpha c} = Y_0 \left(\frac{2}{\gamma_i} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{\gamma_i^{(1/n+1)}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_i^{(n+1)}} \right) (Y_c - Y_0) \text{ with } \begin{cases} \alpha = \text{II, III} \\ i = 1, 2 \end{cases}$$

The above relations allow a first identification of damage evolution law parameters.

Note that delamination modelling through an interface with damage includes the notion of process zone given by some authors, because damage varies continually in the vicinity of the crack tip. The process zone length depends on the structure (the damaged zone at the crack tip is different for DCB beams with layers at 0° and 90°).

B. NUMERICAL STRATEGIES

I. THE BOUNDARY LAYER PROBLEM

1. Problem formulation in elasticity

The laminate shell, of thickness $2h$, occupies the domain $\Omega = \Omega_1 \approx \Omega_2$ (see fig. 3).

When the thickness $2h$ is weak compared with the transverse dimensions, the three-dimensional displacement-stress solution $(\mathbf{U}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ of the elastic problem set on Ω can be written²¹ :

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_P + \mathbf{U}_E \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_P + \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E \end{cases} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} (\mathbf{U}_P, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_P) : \text{Solution of a shell problem} \\ (\mathbf{U}_E, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E) : \text{Solution localised near the edge } \Gamma_2 \end{cases}$$

Notably because of the layer constitutive law discontinuity, the following boundary condition is not respected on the edge Γ_2 :

$$\Delta z \in [-h, h] \boldsymbol{\sigma}_P(z) \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{F}(z) \mathbf{F} \text{ and } \mathbf{n} \text{ denote the force density and the normal}$$

Hence $(\mathbf{U}_E, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E)$ is added to the valid solution far away from the edge Γ_2 $(\mathbf{U}_P, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_P)$ such that $(\mathbf{U}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ satisfies the equations and boundary conditions of the three-dimensional problem. $(\mathbf{U}_E, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E)$ is localised near Γ_2 , thus the edge effect solution $(\mathbf{U}_E, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E)$ can be computed in post-processor of a shell computation set on Ω_2 . If in add, the radius of curvature of the edge Γ_2 is large compared with the thickness, the variations of $(\mathbf{U}_E, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E)$ along the tangent direction (y) are negligible : the problem becomes set into a band B of which the length is in order of the thickness 2h.

The problem (P) to solve becomes : Find $(\mathbf{U}_E, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E)$ /

- (i) $\mathbf{U}_E \quad \mathbf{U} = \{ \mathbf{V} / \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{0} \text{ on } \Gamma_1 \leftrightarrow B \}$
- (ii) $\Delta \mathbf{V} \quad \mathbf{U}, \int_B \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{V}) dS = \int_{\Gamma_2 \leftrightarrow B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{V} ds$
- (iii) $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_E = \mathbf{F} (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{U}_E))$

The force \mathbf{R} applied on the edge $\Gamma_2 \leftrightarrow B$ of the structure is the residue of external forces and of the shell solution : $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{F} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_P \mathbf{n}$

(i) means that $(\mathbf{U}_E, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E)$ is localised and (iii) is the constitutive law.

2. Solving the boundary layer problem in the non-linear case

In the proposed modelling of the laminate, only the interfaces can be damaged due to edge effect normal stresses. The interfaces taking no part in the computation of $(\mathbf{U}_P, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_P)$, it is possible to apply the principle of superimposed stress for the computation of $(\mathbf{U}_E, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_E)$.

The problem (P) to solve becomes a non-linear time dependant problem set into the band B.

We compared the damage states near the free edge obtained by two non-linear computations of a specimen submitted to tension along the \mathbf{x} direction.(see fig. 4).

The first computation C_1 has been carried out by resolution of problem (P). The second one C_2 has been a reference computation because it allows to have the exact three-dimensional solution by searching the displacement under the form proposed by PIPES & PAGANO²⁰.

$$\mathbf{U}(x,y,z) : \begin{cases} u(y,z) + \varepsilon x \\ v(y,z) \\ w(y,z) \end{cases}$$

C_1 and C_2 results are rigorously equal. That confirms it is possible to apply the principle of superimposed stress in that particular case where non-linearities are taken concentrated on interfaces.

II. A RIKS LIKE METHOD

Due to damage on interfaces, a instability point may appear. That critical point cannot be passed with a NEWTON method that pilots the computation in term of 'force' (see fig. 5). A RIKS like method¹⁵⁻¹⁶ allows to control the computation and pass such a limit point.

Current step :

$$(S) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{K}_a \delta_i = \lambda_{i+1} \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{U}_i) \\ \lambda_{i+1} = \lambda_i + \delta\lambda_i \\ \text{constraint : } g(\delta\lambda_i) = 0 \end{cases} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{By the NEWTON method} \quad : \quad \delta\lambda_i = 0 \\ \text{By the RIKS method the load factor is released, it is then} \\ \text{necessary to impose a constraint} \quad : \quad g(\delta\lambda_i) = 0 \end{array}$$

RIKS¹⁵, CRISFIELD¹⁶ propose a constraint $g(\delta\lambda_i) = 0$ that concerns the norm of the global vector δ_i . Such a global constraint may lead to a non-convergence when damage localises. To ensure a good convergence we propose to use of a local constraint that considers only the more significant degrees of freedom in the increase of damage.

Note α the closer node of the Gauss point where the increase of damage has been the more important at the initial step (β is the node located on the same interface but on the adjacent layer). n (1, 2 or 3) is the mode of principal damage (see fig. 6).

The local constraint consists in imposing a constant value for the jump of displacement between α and β along the n direction.

$$(d_i)_n^\alpha - (d_i)_n^\beta = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i=1$$

III. A METHOD FOR A LARGE NUMBER OF LAYERS

The operator \mathbf{K}_a (see (S)) can be the tangent structural stiffness matrix \mathbf{K}_T or the secant one \mathbf{K}_E (i-e computed through an elastic with damage behaviour). Solving (S) can be carried out with the direct CROUT method. In the case of a large number of layers, that method may be expensive because of \mathbf{K}_a matrix size. We propose then to use the conjugate gradient method with use of a conditioner.

In that case we choose : $\mathbf{K}_a = \mathbf{K}_E$

In the iterative RIKS algorithm, the linear systems to solve can be written under the form :

$$\mathbf{K}_E \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{R} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{K}_E = \mathbf{K}_{\text{cou}} + \mathbf{K}_{\text{int}}$$

\mathbf{K}_{cou} and \mathbf{K}_{int} are respectively the contributions of layers (\mathbf{K}_{cou} is a constant matrix) and of interfaces (\mathbf{K}_{int} is a non-constant matrix because the interfaces can damage). The conjugate gradient method consists in a series of iterating resolutions of :

$$\mathbf{K}_{\text{cou}} \mathbf{Z}_{n+1} = \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{K}_E \mathbf{X}_n$$

The matrix \mathbf{K}_{cou} (conditioner) being diagonal by units, the resolution is parallel on each layer.

C. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS OF DELAMINATION

I. IDENTIFICATION OF MODEL PARAMETERS

The characteristic parameters of the interface modelling are : k_1^0 , k_2^0 , k_3^0 , Y_0 , Y_c , n , γ_1 , γ_2

The interface can be considered as a rich resin zone of weak thickness e_I compared with the layer thickness e_C . By this analogy and by considering that $\frac{e_I}{e_C} \ll 1$, the interface constitutive law can be expressed as :

$$(1) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{13} \\ \sigma_{23} \\ \sigma_{33} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} k_1^0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_2^0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_3^0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} [u_1] \\ [u_2] \\ [u_3] \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} k_1^0 = \frac{2G_{13}}{e_I} \\ k_2^0 = \frac{2G_{23}}{e_I} \\ k_3^0 = \frac{E_3}{e_I} \end{cases} \quad \begin{array}{l} G_{13}, G_{23}, E_3 : \text{ elastic moduli of} \\ \text{the rich resin zone, they can be} \\ \text{chosen equal to the homogenised} \\ \text{layer moduli.} \end{array}$$

The identification of the other parameters can be carried out by the use of classical Fracture Mechanics tests²¹ results for the mode I (specimen DCB see fig. 7), the mode II (specimen ENF) and the mode III (specimen SCB). The use of toughness values issued from literature¹⁹ is difficult because those values can present, for the same material (for instance T300-5208), an important divergence. For the following simulations, we identified the parameters by comparison with experimental results.

II. THE DOUBLE CANTILEVER BEAM (DCB)

We have simulated the DCB test with the EDA program for a comparison with the experimental results²³ (the simulation of the DCB test is not a boundary layer problem).

The studied structure is constituted of 48 layers of thickness $e_C = 0.1375$ mm and of T300 fibres with a M10 resin. The numerical simulation has been carried out with no initial crack, whereas the experimental specimen had an initial crack of 28.5 mm. The authors²³ found $G_{Ic} = 450$ J/m² and the

following elastic moduli (the elastic moduli relative to the normal direction 3 are supposed to be equal to those in the transverse direction 2).

Erreur ! **Erreur !**

We have chosen k_3^0 by the relationship (1) :

$$e_I = \frac{e_C}{5} \qquad k_3^0 = 3.27 \cdot 10^8 \text{ MPa/m}$$

Y_0 , Y_c , n values satisfy the relationship :

$$(2) \quad G_{Ic} = Y_0 + \frac{n}{n+1} (Y_c - Y_0)$$

In view of numerical results, one finds :

- the numerical simulation allows to find quite well the experimental results since the crack length (simulation) reaches the experimental initial crack length

- Y_0 , Y_c , n values have a few influence on the (F,U) curve (see fig. 8), at the condition these values satisfy the relationship (2)

- by the knowledge of the load F associated to the crack length a , it is possible to compute the critical energy release rate G_{Ic} (by the area method¹⁸). One finds the experimental value of G_{Ic} and one verifies that the critical energy release rate is independent of the crack length (see fig. 9). This result has been verified experimentally²³ and theoretically established¹⁴ for an initial crack which is large compared with the thickness $2h$. The important point, is the numerical simulation allows to find this result even if the crack length is short.

III. DELAMINATION NEAR THE FREE EDGE OF A SPECIMEN UNDER TENSION OR COMPRESSION

We compared our simulations of delamination near the free edge of a specimen under tension or compression (see fig. 4) with first experimental results^{5,24} for mode I delamination (on the mid-plane interface) of a T300-5208 material (see tab. 1). Then, we also compared our results with experimental ones²⁵ for mixed mode of delamination of a T300-1034C (see tab. 2). The authors^{5,25} propose the same elastic moduli for both materials T300-5208 and T300-1034C.

Erreur ! **Erreur !**

We have chosen the interface stiffnesses by the relationship (1) and $e_I = \frac{e_C}{5}$.

In a first time, we have identified under mode I (T300-5208) the parameters Y_c , Y_0 and n with the ($\pm 45, 0, 90$)s laminate. In a second time, we have identified the parameters γ_1 and γ_2 under mixed mode (T300-1034C) such that the results are quite good. So, we assumed that both T300-5208 and T300-1034C damage behaviours were close.

The calculated strain (ϵ_{cal}) in the tables corresponds to the maximum of strain of the strain-crack length curve (see fig. 10).

CONCLUSION

The analysis of delamination near an edge of a laminate structure by Damage Mechanics has been presented. The basic assumptions of this method - the edge is quasi-straight - damage is taken concentrated on interfaces between layers - lead to a simplified method for the delamination onset and propagation forecast. The identification of characteristic parameters of the interface modelling can be carried out by use of classical Fracture Mechanics tests. The Finite Element program EDA is independent of Finite Element codes, it acts as a post-processor of an elastic laminate shell computation. Note there is no mesh dependency because the treated problem is plane and damage is concentrated on interfaces. The first comparisons of numerical simulations with experimental results are quite good.

REFERENCES

- 1 TSAI S.W.& WU E., A General Theory of Strength for Anisotropic Materials, *Journal of Composite Materials*, **5** (1971) 58-80
- 2 ENGRAND D., A Boundary Layer Approach to the Calculation of Transverse Stresses along the Free Edges of a Symmetric Laminated Plate of Arbitrary Width under in Plane Loading, *Composite Structures*, (1981) 247-261
- 3 DUMONTET H., Study of a Boundary Layer Problem in Elastic Composite Materials, *M²AN*, **20** (1986) 265-286
- 4 BAR-YOSEPH P., On the Accuracy of Interlaminar Stress Calculation in Laminated Plates, *Comp. Meth. in Applied Mech. and Eng.*, **36** (1983) 309-329
- 5 KIM R.Y.& SONI S.R., Experimental and Analytical Studies on the Onset of Delamination in Laminated Composites, *Journal of Composite Materials*, **18** (1984) 70-76
- 6 WANG A.S.D., Fracture Analysis of Interlaminar Cracking, *Interlaminar Response of Composite Materials*, Composite Material Series, PAGANO N.J. (Ed), Elsevier Science Publishers, **5** (1989) 69-109
- 7 WANG A.S.D., SLOMANIA M. & BUCINELL R.B., Delamination Crack Growth in Composite Laminates, *Delamination and Debonding of Materials*, JOHNSON W.S. (Ed.), ASTM STP 876 (1985) 135-167
- 8 O'BRIEN T.K., Characterisation of Delamination Onset and Growth in a Composite Laminate, *Damage in Composite Materials*, REIFSNIDER K.L. (Ed.), ASTM-STP 775 (1982) 140-167
- 9 TALREJA R., Damage Development in Composites : Mechanisms and Modelling, *Journal of Strain Analysis*, **24** (1989) 215-222

- 10 ALLEN D.H., GROVES S.E. & HARRIS C.E., A Cumulative Damage Model for Continuous Fibre Composite Laminates with Matrix Cracking and Interply Delaminations, *Composite Materials : Testing and Design*, WITHCOMB J.D. (Ed.), ASTM-STP 972 (1988) 57-80
- 11 LADEVEZE P., ALLIX O. & DAUDEVILLE L., Mesomodelling of Damage for Laminate Composites : Application to Delamination, IUTAM Symposium on Inelastic Deformation of Composites Materials, Troy, DVORAK G.J. (Ed.), Springer-Verlag (1990) 607-622
- 12 ALLIX O., DAUDEVILLE L. & LADEVEZE P., Delamination and Damage Mechanics, Mechanics and Mechanism of Damage in Composites and Multi-Materials, Baptiste D. (Ed.), ESIS Publication 11, LONDON, (1991) 32-41
- 13 SCHELLEKENS J.C.J. & DE BORST R., Numerical Simulation of Free Edge Delamination in Graphite Epoxy Specimen under Uniaxial Extension, Sixth International Conf. on Composite Structures ICCS6, Paisley, MARSHALL I.H. (Ed.), Elsevier Science Publishers (1991) 647-657
- 14 ALLIX O. & LADEVEZE P., Interlaminar Interface Modelling for the Prediction of Delamination, *Composite Structures*, **22** (1992) 235-242
- 15 RIKS E., An Incremental Approach to the Solution of Snapping and Buckling problems, *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, **15** (1979) 524-551
- 16 CRISFIELD M.A., An Arc-length Method Including Line Searches and Accelerations, *Int.Journal for Num.Methods in Eng*, **19** (1983) 1269-1289
- 17 CORIGLIANO A., Formulation, Identification and Use of Interface Models in the Numerical Analysis of Composite Delamination, Submitted to *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 1992
- 18 WHITNEY J.M., Experimental Characterisation of Delamination Fracture, Interlaminar Response of Composite Materials, Composite Material Series, PAGANO N.J. (Ed), Elsevier Science Publishers, 5 (1989) 161-250
- 19 SELA N. & ISHAI O., Interlaminar Fracture Toughness and Toughening of Laminated Composite Materials : A Review, *Composites* , **20** (1989) 423-435
- 20 NESA A., ABISROR A. & BUNSELL A.R., On Cracking in a Unidirectional Glass-Epoxy Composite : Toughness and Damage Mechanisms
- 21 FREDRICHS K.O. & DRESSLER R.F., A Boundary Layer Theory for Elastic Plates, *Comm. on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, **14** (1961) 1-33
- 22 PIPES R.B. & PAGANO N.J., Interlaminar Stresses in Composite Laminates under Axial Extension, *Journal of Composite Materials*, **4** (1970) 538-548
- 23 LAKSIMI A., BENZEGGAGH M.L., JING G., HECINI M. & ROELANDT J.M., Mode I Interlaminar Fracture of Symmetrical Cross-ply Composites, *Composites Science and Technology*, **41** (1991) 147-164
- 24 RODINI B.T. & EISENMAN J.R., An analytical and Experimental Investigation of Edge Delamination in Composite Laminates, Proc. 4th Conf. Fibrous Comp. San Diego, Lenoe & Oplinger & Burke (Ed.), (1978) 441-457
- 25 KIM R.Y. & SONY S.R., Delamination of Composite Laminates Stimulated by Interlaminar Shear, ASTM-STP 893, (1986) 286-307




fig. 1. interface




fig. 2. interface elastic with damage behaviour (mode I traction)




fig. 3. boundary layer




Fig. 4 . specimen under tension




fig. 5. RIKS like method




fig. 6. concerned nodes by the local constraint




fig. 7. DCB test

fig. 8. F - U curve

fig. 9. G_{Ic} - a curve

Mode I delamination^{5,23}		
Laminate	ϵ_{exp}	ϵ_{cal}
($\pm 45, 0, 90$)s	0.53	0.53
($\pm 45_2, 0_2, 90_2$)s	0.45	0.38
($\pm 45_3, 0_3, 90_3$)s	0.36	0.32
(0, $\pm 45, 90$)s	0.66	0.61
(45,0,-45,90)s	0.54	0.57
($\pm 30, 90$)s	0.39	0.43
($\pm 30_2, 90_2$)s	0.36	0.39

Tab. 1. Mode I delamination

Mixed mode delamination²⁵			
Laminate	interface	ϵ_{exp}	ϵ_{cal}
($\pm 45, 90, 0$)s	90,0	0.71	0.77
($90_4, \pm 30_4$)	30,-30	-0.27	-0.28
($90_4, \pm 15_4$)	15,-15	-0.34	-0.36
($0_2, \pm 30_2$)s	30,-30	-0.54	-0.65
($0_4, \pm 30_4$)s	30,-30	-0.35	-0.4
($0_4, \pm 30_4$)s	30,-30	0.85	0.73
($0_2, \pm 15_2$)s	15,-15	-0.51	-0.6
($0_4, \pm 15_4$)s	15,-15	-0.35	-0.45
($0_4, \pm 15_4$)s	15,-15	0.57	0.5

Tab. 2. Mixed mode delamination

fig. 10. ϵ -a curve for a (0, $\pm 45, 90$)s laminate: delamination on the mid-plane interface

