### CompTest 2023

# Full Field Data Fusion (FFDF) to characterise subsurface defects in composite structures

Janice Dulieu-Barton

Irene Jimenez Fortunato, Rafael Ruiz Iglesias, Emily Leung, Geir Olafsson, Ole Thybo Thomsen



Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council



CERTIFICATION FOR DESIGN: RESHAPING THE TESTING PYRAMID





### CERTEST Programme Grant



Overall aim is to be able to evaluate damage in composite substructure to provide an in-situ measure of subsurface damage in large scale tests











### Overview

- Introduce thermoelastic stress analysis (briefly)
- Combining TSA with DIC and application to CFRP
- Identifying non-adiabatic behaviour
- Revealing sub-surface defects
- Quantifying damage
- Progressing up the scale: application to sandwich structures... aerostructure....multiaxial tests









### Thermoelastic stress analysis (TSA)



Assumes no heat transfer

Temperature change occurs adiabatically

Cyclic loading reduces diffusion

Lock-in notch filter

$$\Delta T = -\frac{1}{\rho C_p} T_0 (\alpha_1 \Delta \sigma_1 + \alpha_2 \Delta \sigma_2)$$

$$T(x, y, t) = T_0 + 0.5 \Delta T(x, y) \cos(2\pi f_0 t + \phi)$$







### Combining TSA and DIC during cyclic loading



- Triggering image capture avoids interrupting the cyclic loading
- BUT Precise camera triggering is required.
- Use the TSA lock-in processing to remove the need for triggering – notch filters DIC strains same as TSA







Optics and Lasers in Engineering

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/optlaseng

CrossMark

The use of a lock-in amplifier to apply digital image correlation to cyclically loaded components

R.K. Fruehmann<sup>a</sup>, J.M. Dulieu-Barton<sup>a</sup>, S. Quinn<sup>a</sup>, J.P. Tyler<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Southampton, Faculty of Engineering and the Environment, SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom <sup>b</sup> Enabling Process Technologies Ltd., Bristol BS20 8ET, United Kingdom



### Typical composite laminate



Simultaneous use of full-

### Heat transfer in each laminate type

 $\Delta T$  calculated from material properties for a constant strain

Δ <i>Τ</i> (K)	0	90	45/-45	resin	laminate
GFRP	0.1028	0.1014	0.0758	0.1180	0.1029
CFRP	0.0155	0.1186	0.0178	0.1438	0.0676

$$\dot{T} = \frac{T_0}{\rho C_{\varepsilon}} \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial T} \dot{\varepsilon}_{ij} - \frac{\dot{Q}}{\rho C_{\varepsilon}}$$

Thermal conductivity, k, is low

Little change in  $\Delta T$  between plies

#### Adiabatic conditions

 $\Delta T$  is the same in +45 and -45 ply – adiabatic conditions









$$\dot{Q} = k\nabla^2 T$$

Thermal conductivity, k, high

Step changes in  $\Delta T$  at ply interfaces

Non adiabatic behaviour at low frequencies

Laminate is homogenised/smeared value

Is  $\Delta T$  occurring adiabatically – conduct tests at different loading frequencies

### Heat transfer in undamaged CFRP laminates



<sup>b</sup> Bristol Composites Institute, University of Bristol, UK



**Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council** 

CERTIFICATION

FOR DESIGN:





### Heat transfer in CFRP undamaged laminates



### Full-field data fusion



Opportunity to identify subsurface

damage by subtracting surface ply

### Test specimens and loading



Layup	Loading scenario	FPF
[0,90] <sub>35</sub>	Tension Loading	541 MPa



\*Tension mode  $\rightarrow$  uniform strain state through the laminate thickness



CERTIFICATION FOR DESIGN: RESHAPING THE TESTING PYRAMID



### Sub-surface inspection methodology

### Methodology 1



• Interpolation between full-field maps is required

Engineering and Physical Sciences

**Research Council** 

• Fully adiabatic response from DIC model

#### Methodology 2



- Interpolation bias is avoided
- Assumes that adiabatic conditions are achieved



CERTIFICATION FOR DESIGN: RESHAPING THE TESTING PYRAMID



### Identification of adiabatic behaviour





<u>The frequency for adiabatic behaviour is identified</u> by fusing the TSA data with the surface ply thermoelastic response model from DIC



Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council







### Identification of adiabatic behaviour



×10<sup>-4</sup>

# Subsurface Damage Analysis in CFRP Laminates

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### [0,90]<sub>35</sub>

- After FPF  $\rightarrow$  Regions of  $\Delta T/T_0$  change
- Subsurface defects start to be visible after FPF
- More subsurface features are observed with M1
- M2 shows a decrease of the subsurface response

#### [0,45,-45,0,0,0]<sub>s</sub>

- Subsurface response (±45) is observed in M1
- M2 shows a similar subsurface ΔT/T<sub>0</sub> to M1
- Possible delamination detected using M2!

#### [0,0,0,45,-45,0]<sub>s</sub>

- Subsurface response (±45) is observed in M1
- Wrinkles are observed
- Possible delamination detected using M2!

### Damage Quantification

A thermoelastic theory was defined in [3] for anisotropic materials and a damage parameter was defined using TSA

$$\Delta T = -\frac{T_0}{\rho C_p} \cdot \left(\alpha_x \sigma_x + \alpha_y \sigma_y\right) \xrightarrow{\text{In pure tension: } (\alpha_x \sigma_x + \alpha_y \sigma_y)}_{i.e. \ the \ laminate \ stress} \qquad \Delta T = K_{Undamaged} \cdot \Delta \sigma_x + \alpha_y \sigma_y \qquad \Delta T = K_{Undamaged} \cdot \Delta \sigma_x + \alpha_y \sigma_y \qquad \Delta \sigma_x + \alpha_y \sigma_y = \alpha_y + \alpha_y$$

[3] Zhang D, Sandor B (1990) A thermoelasticity theory for damage in anisotropic materials. Fatigue Fract Eng Mater Struct 13:497–509

![](_page_15_Picture_4.jpeg)

Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council

![](_page_15_Picture_6.jpeg)

Bristol

Composites

Institute

Localised ROIs

### DATA PROCESSING STEPS (TSA & DIC)

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Damage Quantification: Multidirectional laminates

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Damage Quantification: Multidirectional laminates

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

### TSA damage quantification: overview

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Moving up the scale ...defects in sandwich structures

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

Specimen details

21

- Face sheet lay-up: [0]<sub>3</sub>
- Core density : 100 kg/m $^3$
- Debonded region, a: 10 mm, 20 mm, 30 mm

Specimen is loaded in 3-point bending

- Debonded side at interface of bottom face sheet and core
- Front coated mirror is at 45 °
- Support span, L = 230 mm

![](_page_20_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_13.jpeg)

Bristol Composites Institute

### $\Delta T$ from lower face sheet using mirror a =20 mm

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

### $\Delta T$ and phase from lower face sheet using mirror a =30 mm

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Comparison of TSA and DIC $\left(\frac{\Delta T}{T_0}\right)$ a = 30 mm

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_7.jpeg)

### Scaling-up .. Aerostructure C-spar

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_6.jpeg)

### WIP: C-Spar

![](_page_25_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_7.jpeg)

### WIP: Multi-axial loading of WTB substructure

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Conclusions

- A new approach that identifies sub-surface damage based on integrating TSA and DIC has been developed.
- Adiabatic conditions can be identified in CFRP components using the same data fusion approach
- A new means of damage quantification based on TSA was presented but further analysis is required
- Presented some initial results from sandwich structures and plans to upscale to a composite C-spar

![](_page_27_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council

![](_page_28_Picture_2.jpeg)

CERTIFICATION FOR DESIGN: RESHAPING THE TESTING PYRAMID

![](_page_28_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_12.jpeg)

The Alan Turing Institute

Contact email: Janice.barton@bristol.ac.uk