Assessment of failure and cohesive zone length in co-consolidated hybrid C/PEKK butt joint
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Abstract

The failure mechanisms and the cohesive zone length (CZL) during fracture of a recently developed butt jointed thermoplastic composite are evaluated in this paper. The laminated skin and the web were made of AS4/PEKK. The butt joint (filler) was injection molded from 20% short AS4 filled PEKK. The skin and web were co-consolidated together with the filler to form a hybrid butt joint structure. The crack initiation and propagation in the filler and the delamination at the skin-filler interface were captured using a high-speed camera. It was found from the experimental observations that the crack initiated in the filler and then propagated towards the skin-filler interface in less than 33 μs under three-point bending. A numerical model was developed using the finite element method in ABAQUS to predict the failure and CZL. The crack initiation and progression in the filler was predicted using the Virtual Crack Closure Techniques (VCCT) and the delamination at the skin-filler interface was modelled using the cohesive surfaces. The predicted stiffness of the specimen, the location of crack initiation and propagation as well as the force drop during delamination were in good agreement with experiments. The development of CZL was critically assessed and it was found that the CZL increases during mix mode delamination. The effect of interface strength and critical energy release rate on the CZL was investigated in the parameter analysis.

1. Introduction

High performance thermoplastic composites (TPCs) such as carbon fiber/poly(ether ether ketone) (C/PEEK) and carbon fiber/poly(ether ketone ketone) (C/PEKK) are preferred in aerospace and aircraft industries to boost the weight-to-strength ratio of composite structures. In particular, thermoplastic stiffened composites are currently being developed for primary aircraft components such as fuselage and torsion box at airplane tail. The application of TPCs has also been gradually increasing in the automotive industries owing to their high toughness, high damage tolerance and recyclability. The TPCs are manufactured using various techniques such as stamp forming, laser assisted tape placement (LATP), welding, injection molding, co-consolidation in an autoclave, over-molding, etc. The TPCs have still been under development with novel material compositions and manufacturing techniques. There is a need for material characterization and better understanding of the processing conditions as well as mechanical performance [1–5]. The storage and loss moduli of a unidirectional carbon/PEEK specimens were determined in [1] in order to characterize the intra-ply shear behavior. The fracture toughness of a carbon/PPS (polyphenylene sulfide) was determined using the proposed mandrel peel test in [3] and the results were compared with the double cantilevered beam (DCB) tests. The randomly oriented strand/PEEK composites were characterized in [5] using a thermomechanical and dynamic mechanical analyzer to correlate the expansion and shrinkage of the composite with the process induced defects. The manufacturing process has a direct influence on the material properties of the final product such as fracture toughness, degree of cure, degree of crystallinity, elastic modulus and strength. To illustrate, Mode-I fracture toughness was found to be 60–80% higher for the LATP processed specimens than for the autoclave processed specimens in [6]. This is due to the fact that lower cooling rate in autoclave process yields in higher crystallinity level in the semi-crystalline PEEK polymer as compared with higher cooling rates in the LATP; and the higher the crystallinity level, the lower the fracture toughness [7,8]. It was concluded in [8] that the plastic deformation of the fast-cooled PEEK arising from high ductility was responsible for the improved interlaminar fracture toughness. On the other hand, an increase in the crystallinity results in an increase in the elastic modulus and tensile/compressive strength of the PEEK [9]. Approximately 40% increase in tensile strength and 30% increase in tensile modulus were found in [9] as the crystallinity of PEEK 150P increased from 16% to 39%.
The failure mechanisms of fiber reinforced polymer composites (FRPCs) are rather complex due to their anisotropic material behavior at different scales (micro, meso and macro). There have been several experimental and numerical studies reported in the literature to characterize the failure mechanisms of FRPCs under various loading scenarios. In [10], the progressive delamination failure was simulated using a decohesion element coupled with a cohesive zone model (CZM) for C/PEEK laminates. The model predictions were compared with dedicated experiments based on DCB, end-notch flexure (ENF) and mixed-mode bending (MMB). The CZM model was used in [11] to simulate the debond strengths of skin-stiffener specimens made of graphite/epoxy loaded in tension and in three-point bending. The stiffness of the specimen, the location of crack initiation and debond loads were found to agree with published experimental data. In [12], the progressive failure analysis was conducted for AS4/PEEK laminates subjected to in-plane tensile and out-of-plane transverse low-velocity impact loading. It was concluded that the proposed elastoplastic damage model resulted in a more accurate predictions of the failure loads for AS4/PEEK laminates. A CZM was applied to simulate the delamination failure. The CZM was also applied in [13] to simulate the delamination failure mode of a carbon/epoxy pressure vessel. The pin loaded composite laminates were studied in [14,15] using the CZM with dedicated experiments. The delamination onset was determined based on the specific angle at which the maximum average shear stress occurred at the ply interface in a cross-ply [0°/90°], laminate in [16]. The failure analysis of T-shaped skin-stiffener composites was particularly studied in [16–21] under pull-off loading and the delamination failure mode was determined experimentally and numerically. In [16] it was shown that the failure initiated in the vertical stiffener due to Mode-I splitting cracks and Mode-I/II pin traction loads controlled the ultimate strength of the T-joint. It was postulated in [19] that the failure mode of a T-joint made of T700/bismaleimide resin changed due to the decrease in the filler/filling ratio and this was yielded in a reduction in the maximum tensile load. The post-damage resistance and energy absorption of a composite T-joints reinforced with through-thickness metallic arrow-pins were significantly increased in [20]. The debonding at the interface between bonded skin-stiffener structure made of graphite/epoxy was simulated in [22] using the virtual crack closure technique (VCCT) [23–26] in ABAQUS. The predicted total strain energy release rate using the shell/3D model was found to agree well with the solid/3D model. Damage mechanisms of a bonded skin-stiffener structure made of glass/epoxy under monotonic tensile load was simulated in [27] using the VCCT and the predicted matrix cracking and delamination were verified with the experiments. It was shown that most of the delaminations took place at the interface of [0°/45°] as well as [90°/45°] layers. In [28], an extended finite element method (XFEM) was simultaneously used with the CZM to simulate the failure behavior of carbon/epoxy samples under open-hole tension loading. The XFEM was utilized to simulate the brittle matrix cracking at the intralaminar level and the CZM was used for predicting the delamination at the interlaminar level. The implemented modelling framework was found to be robust and accurate. The XFEM was also coupled with CZM in [29] to determine the Mode-I failure parameters, i.e. the critical strain energy release rate and the strength of unidirectional carbon/epoxy composite laminate using an experimental-numerical methodology. Only a 2.91% error was found in the critical strain energy release rate obtained from XFEM and corrected beam theory in [29]. In [30], intralaminar non-linear behavior and fracture toughness under shear loading of an AS4/PEEK cross-ply composite were investigated. The fracture toughness of the laminate and the matrix was found to be 576.62 N/mm and 34.58 N/mm, respectively.

The fully developed cohesive zone length (CZL) is defined as the distance from the crack tip to the location of the maximum cohesive traction, i.e. irreversible damage onset where the cohesive forces acting on the crack plane. The progressive failure and CZL were studied in [31] for a bonded laminated DCB specimen and it was found that the small cohesive stiffness was the cause for a very small CZL obtained numerically, as compared to the theoretically obtained CZL. Recent studies [32,33] showed that a fine discretization is needed to accurately capture the stress distribution and energy dissipation at the cohesive surfaces. It was shown in [32] that minimum of two or three elements need to be present at the numerical cohesive zone for an accurate load displacement analysis under Mode-I. On the other hand, more than 3 elements, i.e. approximately 3, 5 and 8 elements, used at the cohesive zone for Mode-II gave accurate results in [32] because the CZL in Mode-II load case (in-plane shear mode) is in general larger than the CZL in Mode-I (opening mode). This is due to the fact that the CZL depends on the material properties such as elastic modulus, fracture toughness and interface strength of the cohesive layer and usually the fracture toughness and interface strength are higher in Mode-II than in Mode-I. The CZL for Mode-I (LCZL) and Mode-II (LCZLr) are estimated using the following formulae which are based on an approximation of the CZL in slender beams [34,33]:

\[
L_{CZL,I} = \frac{M_{cr} G_{IC} E_f}{r r_c}
\]

(1)

\[
L_{CZL,II} = \frac{M_{cr} G_{IC} E_f}{r^2 r_c}
\]

(2)

where \(E_f\) is the equivalent elastic modulus, the critical energy release rate, the interface strength, the dimensionless constant and the exponent constant, respectively. In a recent study [35], \(r\) was found to be between 0.8 and 0.9 for a relatively softer ballistic composite (Dyneema HB26) with thick bending arms under Mode-I.

Although there has been several studies carried out to analyze and simulate the mechanical performance of composite structures, a critical assessment of the failure behavior and CZL in hybrid butt jointed TPCs needs to be addressed to develop future’s high damage tolerant composites. In this paper, the failure and fracture behavior of a recently developed co-consolidated hybrid C/PEEK skin-stiffener structure was investigated experimentally and numerically. The laminated skin and web made of AS4/PEEK prepregs were co-consolidated together with an injection molded butt joint (filler) made of short fiber reinforced AS4/PEEK. Two different layup sequences were considered. The mechanical response of the hybrid structure was evaluated under three point bending (3PB) loading. The crack initiation and propagation in the filler as well as delamination initiation and progression at the skin-filler interface were captured using a high speed camera. A quasi-static model was developed to predict the force-displacement response and the fracture behavior using the finite element method (FEM). The CZM was employed simultaneously with the XFEM in ABAQUS. The evolution of the CZL at the filler-skin interface was critically assessed during loading. In addition, the effect of interface strength and critical strain energy release rate on the CZL were evaluated. The material properties needed for the FEM were characterized experimentally for the filler. The thermal residual stresses were also taken into consideration.

2. Experimental

2.1. Materials

The laminated skin and web were made of unidirectional (UD) AS4/PEEK prepregs from Cytec. The butt joint, i.e. the filler, was the injection molded 20% short AS4 carbon filled PEKK. The laminated skin and web were co-consolidated in an autoclave tooling together with the filler to have the T-shaped joint structure. Two different layups were used for the skin and web using the UD prepregs with 16 layers to investigate the influence of layup orientation at the skin-filler interface on the fracture behavior and global force drop after fracture:

- Layup-1: [0/45°/−45°/90°/45°/0°/−45°/90°]s
2.2. Material characterization of the filler

2.2.1. Tensile properties

The behavior of the butt-jointed skin-stiffener specimen is largely dictated by the filler material. In particular, the properties transverse to the fibers are important for the 3PB studied in this paper. The linear elastic properties of the filler were measured for the 20% filled C/PEKK injection molded dog-bone specimens (total of 6) using Zwick Z100 tensile machine at room temperature. Instron clip-on extensometers were attached to the specimen to measure the mechanical strains in the in-plane directions in order to estimate the mechanical properties. Fig. 2(a) shows the corresponding setup. Such specimens had the most short carbon fibers oriented in the longitudinal direction of the dog-bone specimens, therefore the tensile properties were obtained for the longitudinal direction according to ISO527-2 [36]. The stiffness was evaluated using the stress-strain data which showed a linear relation without a sign of extensive plasticity in the vicinity of the fracture zone. Detailed results are presented in Table 1 obtained from dog-bone specimens. In Table 1, $E$ is the elastic modulus, $\nu$ is the Poisson’s ratio and $X_{\text{tensile}}$ is the tensile strength.

2.2.2. Flexural properties

Due to lack of dog-bone specimens prepared in the transverse direction, the properties in the transverse direction were obtained using short beam specimens cut from injection molded dog-bone specimens in the injection direction (1) and transverse direction (2) as seen in Fig. 2(b, c). Total of 6 specimens from each type were cut with a diamond saw. Due to the limited width of the dog-bones, the length of the specimens was limited to 25 mm. The span length of the 3PB set-up was 19.7 mm and the nominal thickness of the specimens was 3.5 mm. The measurements were performed in two steps, starting with modulus measurements at lower load values, following with a fracture test. The modulus was determined after 3 runs, in order to have the specimen set in the set-up. Results showed that there was hardly any stiffness difference between the second and third run. The modulus was determined between forces of 150 N and 250 N, from a force where the force-displacement showed a linear relation. Due to the relatively short span length compared to the thickness, the influence of shear deflection was also taken into account for evaluating the elasticity modulus. The
standard elasticity modulus evaluation reads for a 3PB loading [37]:

\[ E_s = \frac{L^3}{48E_cI} \]

where \( E_s \) is the elasticity modulus corrected for the set-up compliance, \( L \) is the span length, \( C_c \) is the measured compliance corrected for the set-up compliance, and \( I \) is the second moment of inertia of the beam. Taking the shear deflection into account, \( C_c \) due to bending can be expressed as [37]:

\[ C_c = \frac{L^3}{48E_sI} + \frac{L}{4kAG} \]

where \( k \) is the shear coefficient which is 5/6 for rectangular cross-sections [38] and \( E_s \) is the elasticity modulus corrected for set-up compliance which can be written as:

\[ E_s = \frac{10GAL^3}{48L(10GAC_c-3L)} \]

where \( G \) is the through thickness shear modulus which is estimated as 4 GPa in the present study by considering the transverse shear modulus of a unidirectional ply which is usually in the order of magnitude of 4 GPa as also shown in Table 2. The maximum stress at fracture is calculated as:

\[ X_f(\text{flexural}) = \frac{F_{\text{max}}Lh}{8I} \]

where \( X_f(\text{flexural}) \) is the bending stress at fracture of the filler, \( F_{\text{max}} \) is the force at fracture and \( h \) is the thickness of the beam. Though no high speed recording has been performed in this case, it is assumed that the crack initiates on the tensile side of the beam and leads to the total fracture of the specimen. The results obtained from short beam bending tests are shown in Table 1. In Table 1, \( X_f(\text{flexural}) \) is the flexural strength. It is assumed that the mechanical properties in the two transverse directions, i.e. 2- and 3-directions, are identical for the filler. The fiber orientation at a 2 × 3.7 mm cross section of the 20% short AS4 carbon filled PEKK was checked using an optical microscopy (Keyence VHX-5000 with the VH-Z200UIR/W/T lens) and the results are shown in Fig. 3. It is seen that the fibers are highly oriented in the injection direction, i.e. 1-direction.

### 2.2.3. Coefficient of thermal expansion (CTE)

The CTEs in the injection and transverse to the injection direction were measured using a Mettler Thermo Mechanical Analyzer (TMA). A TMA measures dimensional changes of a specimen as a function of temperature, using a well-controlled temperature chamber and an LVDT (Linear Variable Displacement transducer) to measure the dimension change. Total of 4 specimens in the longitudinal and transverse direction were cut from injection molded specimens as for the bending tests. The nominal length was 8 mm, with a thickness of 3.4 mm, and a width between 3 and 4 mm. Most tests were performed at a rate of 1 K/min to start with, and later at 4 K/min, in a range between 30 °C and 120 °C. The TMA tests of a single specimen at these two rates did not give any significant difference. The obtained CTEs are listed in Table 1 in the longitudinal and transverse directions, i.e. \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \), respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Material properties of a UD AS4/PEKK layer [42,43].</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( E_l ) [GPa]</td>
<td>( E_s ) [GPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. Mechanical testing

The mechanical response of the hybrid butt jointed composite was observed under 3PB test conditions. The 3PB was selected because it is easy to apply and allows an impact test application under non quasi-static conditions. The side surfaces of each specimen were then manually ground in water. A local curvature in the skin and neighborhood of the filler was observed due to the process induced residual thermal and shrinkage stresses [39,40]. Because of that, the thickness of the skin was also found to be varying throughout the stiffened panel. In this work, three specimens taken from different places along the butt jointed panel were presented. The nominal thickness of the specimens was 2.32 mm and the nominal radius of the filler was 6 mm. The quasi-static 3PB tests were carried out using a 10 kN capacity Zwick uniaxial tensile system with a loading rate of 1 mm/min and a 1 kN Zwick force cell. A photo of the 3PB setup is shown in Fig. 4. The nominal roller diameters were 10 mm. The initiation and growth of the crack as well as the post delamination behavior was captured using a high speed camera (Photron Fastcam SA4 with 30,000 frames per second) during the 3PB tests. For this purpose, the camera was focused on the full width of the filler, in the region of its interaction with the skin.

3. FEM model

The 3PB test was simulated using a two-dimensional (2D) quasi-static analysis in ABAQUS since the width of the specimen is relatively small as compared with the cross sectional dimensions. A schematic view of the model with the enmeshment is depicted in Fig. 5. A total of 11,502 4 node bilinear quadrilateral plane strain elements (CPE4) available in ABAQUS are used as in [33]. The web was connected to the filler using the tie constraint interface contact defined in ABAQUS. A cohesive surface was defined at the skin-filler interface using a traction separation law to simulate the delamination and predict the CZL. The element size at the cohesive surface was determined as 0.1 mm based on a mesh sensitivity analysis from which stable and converged results were obtained as compared with the measurements. The VCCT was implemented to predict the crack initiation and growth in the filler. Since the crack initiated only from one curved part of the filler according to the experiments, only half of the filler domain was included in the VCCT as seen in Fig. 5 (right). The support and loading pins were modelled using rigid analytic surfaces since the pins had much higher...
mixed-mode progressive delamination proposed in [10,11]. The normal and shear stresses are related to the normal and shear separations across the cohesive interface, i.e. skin-filler interface. The uncoupled elastic behavior can be written as:

$$\mathbf{t} = \begin{bmatrix} t_n \\ t_t \\ t_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{nn} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & K_{tt} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & K_{tt} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta_n \\ \delta_t \\ \delta_t \end{bmatrix}$$

(7)

where \(t\) is the nominal traction stress vector consisting of three components \(t_n\) (in the normal direction to the cohesive surface), \(t_t\) (in the first shear direction) and \(t_t\) (in the second shear direction). The corresponding separations at the interface are denoted by \(\delta_n\), \(\delta_t\) and \(\delta_t\). It is seen in Eq. (7) that the contact stiffness components \((K_{nn}, K_{tt}\) and \(K_{tt}\) are not coupled, i.e. pure normal or tangential separations will not contribute to the cohesive forces in the other directions. The damage initiation, which is the beginning of the degradation of the cohesive surface, was defined based on the linear elastic relation in Eq. (7). The process of degradation begins when the contact stresses and/or contact separations satisfy certain damage initiation criteria. For this, a quadratic stress criterion was considered as described in Eq. (8).

$$\left(\frac{t_n}{t_n}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{t_t}{t_t}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{t_t}{t_t}\right)^2 = 1$$

(8)

where \(t_n\), \(t_t\) and \(t_t\) are the interface strength. It should be noted that \(t_n\) must be positive (in tension) in order to initiate the delamination at the interface. A linear degradation was used for the damage evolution in which the Benzegagh-Kenane (BK) fracture criterion [41,42] was employed to define the mix mode softening of the cohesive surface as seen in Fig. 6. The corresponding expression is written as:

$$G_{mc} = G_{mc} + (G_{mc} - G_{mc}) \left( \frac{G_{II} + G_{III}}{G_{I} + G_{II} + G_{III}} \right)^{\eta}$$

(9)

where \(G_{mc}\) is the critical energy release rate of the mix mode behavior, \(G_{mc}, G_{mc}\) and \(G_{mc}\) are the critical energy release rate of Mode-I, Mode-II and Mode-III, respectively, \(\eta\) is the cohesive property parameter and \(G_{I} + G_{II} + G_{III}\) are the energy release rates of Mode-I, Mode-II and Mode-III, respectively. A schematic representation of the mix mode damage evolution is depicted in Fig. 6(right) where \(G_{mc}\) can be written as:

$$G_{mc} = \frac{t_n \delta_n}{2}$$

(10)

where \(t_n\) is the peak value of the mix mode contact stress and \(\delta_n\) is the corresponding effective complete separation [42]. The linear degradation of the stiffness is shown in Fig. 6(right). If there is an unloading subsequent to damage initiation, it occurs linearly towards the origin of the traction-separation plane. Reloading subsequent to unloading also occurs along the same linear path until the softening envelope (line AB in Fig. 6(right)) is reached.

3.1. Delamination at the skin-filler interface

An uncoupled linear elastic traction separation law was utilized in ABAQUS to simulate the damage initiation and evolution for the cohesive surface. The model is based on the numerical modelling of the stiffness than the composite and the pin deformations were neglected. A mechanical contact formulation was defined at the pin-skin and support-skin interface which allowed any sliding and restricted any penetration of the skin beyond the rigid surfaces.

For Layup-1 and Layup-2, the fiber direction of the 0° ply was oriented in the global x-direction for the skin and in the y-direction for the web. The aligned short fibers were oriented in the z-direction. Two different loading steps were used in the numerical simulations. In the first step, a thermal load was introduced to the hybrid composite structure by applying a temperature gradient \(\Delta T\) in the second load step, a displacement (\(d\)) was applied at the reference point (RP) seen in Fig. 5(left) in the negative y-direction. The details of the considered values for \(\Delta T\) and \(d\) together with the material properties are provided in Section 3.3.

Fig. 4. The 3PB setup of T-joints.

Fig. 5. Schematic view of the geometry in the numerical model (left). The details of the enmeshment and region for the VCCT shown with shaded area (right).
3.2. Crack initiation and propagation in the filler

The XFEM-based cohesive zone approach was employed to simulate the arbitrary crack initiation and propagation in the filler, since the crack propagation was not tied to the element boundaries in the mesh. The VCCT uses the principles of linear elastic fracture mechanics (LEFM) and hence is convenient for applications in which brittle crack propagation takes place. This choice was partly supported by the fact that the filler failed in a brittle way in the butt joint structure during the 3PB tests, without a significant sign of plastic behavior. The crack initiation was defined using the maximum principal stress criterion for the filler material in ABAQUS. Once the principle stress value is equal or higher than the critical principal stress (⁡\( σ_{\text{cr}}^{\text{filler}} \)), than a damage is initiated.

The VCCT is based on the assumption that the strain energy released, when a crack is extended by a certain amount, is the same as the energy required to close the crack by the same amount [23,24]. For instance, the energy released when the crack is extended by Δx from x to x + Δx as seen in Fig. 7 is identical to the energy required to close the crack between location i and is (closure of element E1 and element E2 in Fig. 7). Fig. 7 shows a 3D crack model in which the z-direction is in the out-of-plane direction and the model has a thickness of Δz in the z-direction. The total work required to close the crack along one element, i.e. the crack between element E1 and element E2, can be written as:

\[
\Delta E = \frac{1}{2} \left[ F_{ij}(v_i - v_j) + F_{ij}(u_i - u_j) + F_{ij}(w_i - w_j) \right]
\]

(11)

where \( F_{ij} \) are the forces acting on node j in the x-, y- and z-direction, respectively, \( u_i, v_j, \) and \( w_i, \) are the displacements at node i and similarly \( u_j, v_j, \) and \( w_j, \) are the displacements at node j in the x-, y- and z-direction, respectively. The strain energy release rate \( G \) can be defined as the ratio between the total work (\( \Delta E \)) and the crack surface (\( \Delta \Delta xz \)).

![Fig. 6. Mix mode damage evolution (left) and the linear softening law (right).](image)

The components of the strain energy release rate (\( G_I, G_{II} \) and \( G_{III} \)) for Mode-I, Mode-II and Mode-III can be calculated as [26]:

\[
\begin{align*}
G_I &= \frac{1}{2\Delta x\Delta z} \left[ F_{ij}(v_i - v_j) \right] \\
G_{II} &= \frac{1}{2\Delta x\Delta z} \left[ F_{ij}(u_i - u_j) \right] \\
G_{III} &= \frac{1}{2\Delta x\Delta z} \left[ F_{ij}(w_i - w_j) \right]
\end{align*}
\]

(12)

The BK law defined in Eq. (9) was used for the linear damage evolution in the filler.

3.3. Model parameters

The material properties of the 0° layer in the skin and web were taken from [42,43] and given in Table 2. Note that the subscript 1 refers to the longitudinal direction.

The parameters used in the traction separation law defined at the cohesive surface between the skin and filler were taken from [42] in which the mix mode cohesive properties were provided for an AS4/PEEK using the BK criterion over a wide range of mode ratio. Since the interface parameters for PEKK composites are still missing in the literature for mix mode delamination, the material input for AS4/PEEK in [42] was considered as the mix mode behavior is also the case in the present work. The corresponding values are given in Table 3. The values for the penalty stiffness (\( K_{\text{pen}} \)) and \( K_u \) in Eq. (7)) at the cohesive surface were taken as 10^4 N/mm^3 [42] in order not to affect the overall stiffness of the structure during thermal loading and applied displacement.

Experimentally obtained parameters presented in Table 1 were used for the filler in the numerical model. Since there was only flexural bending strength (see Table 1) data available in the transverse direction and the transverse strength was unknown for the filler, a parametric study was performed based on the damage initiation criteria defined in the filler (see Section 3.2). The values of the critical maximum principle stress \( \sigma_{\text{max}}^{\text{filler}} \) used in the parametric analysis were determined by considering the following facts:

- the tensile strength of pure PEKK is 102 MPa [44] and according to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Parameters used in the traction separation law for the cohesive surface between filler and skin [42].</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( G_{Ic} ) [N/mm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[ \text{[45], the transverse tensile strength of short fiber reinforced PA6 was found to be approximately 50\% higher than the tensile strength of pure PA6;} \]

\[ \bullet \text{the tensile strength is generally lower than the flexural strength \( \left( \chi_{\text{flexural}} = 191 \text{ MPa} \).} \]

Hence, \( \sigma_{\text{filler}} \) of the filler was varied from 120 MPa to 160 MPa with 10 MPa increments in the FEM model. The same fracture energy values listed in Table 3 were used for the damage evolution in the filler.

As aforementioned, a thermal load was imposed by applying a temperature gradient (\( \Delta T \)) to the butt jointed composite. Since the PEKK is a semi-crystalline thermoplastic, there is hardly residual stresses built up until the stress free temperature which is the crystallization peak temperature [39,46,47]. The crystalline phases have the load bearing capability below crystallization peak temperature and the residual stresses can be built up during cooling due to the mismatch in the thermal shrinkage behavior between the matrix and the fiber reinforcement. However, the elastic modulus exhibits a sharp drop in the vicinity of the glass transition temperature \([48]\). Hence, \( \Delta T \) was taken as \( 20 - 159 = -139 \degree \text{C} \) in the thermal loading simulation.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Failure behavior

The pictures taken by the high speed camera are depicted in Fig. 8 which show the crack initiation and propagation during 3PB. The sample rate was 33 \( \mu \text{s} \) with a resolution of 640 \( \times \) 376 pixels and the available light was the artificial Cold Halogen. For this purpose, the camera was focused on the full width of the filler, in the region of its interaction with the skin. The fracture initiated in both cases, i.e. Layup-1 and Layup-2, in the filler, a few tenths of millimeters from the filler-skin interface. The crack then grew towards this interface in less than 33 \( \mu \text{s} \). The crack grew further at the filler-skin interface in case of Layup-1, where the fiber orientation of the laminate top layer, parallel to the beam direction, prevented the formation of transverse cracks. In case of the Layup-2 however, post testing micrography (Fig. 9) showed that transverse cracks existed in the top 45\degree layer, as well as a delamination between the 45\degree and the 0\degree layer. The unstable crack growth was also noticed in the force-displacement graph supporting the high speed camera pictures, which show that the butt joint was separated from the main laminate within 1–2 ms. The specimens built up in Layup-1 were obviously stiffer than the one built up with Layup-2 due to the inherent higher bending stiffness layup chosen in Layup-1. The force at which the filler fractured was also higher for the Layup-1 specimens \((730–760 \text{ N}) \) than the Layup-2 \((570–650 \text{ N}) \). As expected, the displacement at fracture was higher for Layup-2 \((2.52–2.68 \text{ mm}) \) than Layup-1 \((2.29–2.49 \text{ mm}) \). The drop in force resulting from the fracture was sudden and of a large amplitude of approximately in the range of 110–150 N. The variation in the measured force and displacement for three different specimens might be due to the fact that the thickness of the skin slightly differed. The fractured structure was able to carry the load with reduced stiffness after unstable fracture which can be seen from Fig. 10. The delamination at the filler-skin interface stopped after the sharp drop in force.

The load-displacement response obtained from the experiments are compared with the ones obtained from numerical simulations in Fig. 10. The numerical findings for the linear elastic behavior agreed well with the experiments for different \( \sigma_{\text{filler}} \) values used in the XFEM defined for the damage initiation in the filler. Among 5 different values,
$\sigma_{\text{max}} = 140$ and $150$ MPa were found to provide closer force and displacement at fracture for Layup-1 and Layup-2 as seen in Fig. 10. The predicted force drop also matched well with the force drop in experiments. The development of the crack in the filler and the delamination at the filler-skin interface obtained from the numerical model are shown in Fig. 11 for Layup-1 with $\sigma_{\text{max}} = 140$ MPa. The cohesive surface damage (CSDMG) distribution is also shown in Fig. 11. CSDMG = 0 refers undamaged material and CSDMG = 1 stands for complete failure (no stiffness in the material) for the cohesive surface. The simulations show similar conclusions with the experimental observations:

- Crack initiation in the filler (Fig. 11(a)).
- Crack growth in the filler and initiation of the delamination at the filler-skin interface (Fig. 11(b)).
- Delamination growth at the filler-skin interface and ending of the delamination after force drop (Fig. 11(c)).

4.2. Cohesive zone length (CZL)

It was found that the traction at the cohesive surface varied during the 3PB loading without any damage as well as during the delamination. Note that similar failure behavior was obtained for Layup-1 and Layup-2, therefore results are presented only for Layup-1 in the following. The predicted traction distributions along the filler-skin interface after thermal loading and at the beginning of damage initiation in the filler are shown in Fig. 12. The position at the filler-skin interface, i.e. $x$-direction, is illustrated in Fig. 13. It is seen from 12 that there was no delamination onset taking place because the interface stresses ($t_0$ and $t_s$) were much lower than the interface strength of the cohesive surface ($t_n = 80$ MPa, $t_s = 100$ MPa). Fig. 13 shows schematically how the traction develops ahead of the crack tip during delamination at the filler-skin interface. The delamination started at position $x_{\text{init}}$, the position of the crack tip was defined as $x_{\text{crack}}$ and the location of the maximum traction was $x_{\text{max}}$. The CZL was defined as $x_{\text{max}} - x_{\text{crack}}$. $x_{\text{init}}$ was found to be approximately 2.45 mm from the simulations. The normal and shear stresses at the cohesive surface were found to vary during delamination due to the nature of mix mode behavior of the filler-skin interface with respect to the loading. When the delamination started, the traction in the normal direction ($t_0$) and shear direction ($t_s$) developed in a way that $t_0$ was more dominant than $t_s$ at the beginning of delamination. During delamination progression and near the end of delamination where it stopped, $t_s$ led the main delamination mode. This can be understood from the development of the ratio of maximum

![Fig. 10. Force-displacement response under 3PB conditions for Layup-1 (top) and Layup-2 (bottom).](image1)

![Fig. 11. The predicted fracture behavior in the filler and at the skin-filler interface with cohesive surface damage (CSDMG) distribution for Layup-1 ($\sigma_{\text{max}} = 140$ MPa). (a) Crack initiation in the filler, (b) crack growth in the filler and delamination initiation at the filler-skin interface and (c) propagation of the delamination at the skin-filler interface.](image2)

![Fig. 12. The interface stress distribution at the filler-skin interface after thermal loading and at damage initiation in the filler ($t_n = 80$ MPa, $t_s = 100$ MPa).](image3)
tension \( |t_x| \) as a function of \( x_{\text{max}} \) as illustrated in Fig. 14. The delamination stopped approximately at \( x = 7.9 \) mm. Fig. 14 shows that Mode-I opening was dominant at the delamination initiation and Mode-II in-plane shear became more effective than Mode-I during the growth of delamination and near the delamination end. The predicted CZL evolution during delamination growth as a function of \( x_{\text{max}} \) is shown in Fig. 15. The CZL increased approximately from 0.45 mm to 0.85 mm where the utilized element size was 0.1 mm in the simulations which was sufficient to capture the CZL accurately, i.e. at least 5 elements in the delamination direction. The increase in the CZL was due to the fact that the CZL is larger in Mode-II than in Mode-I [32].

As aforementioned in Section 1, the processing conditions have an effect on the material properties. In order to see the effect of variation in the interface strength \( t^*_t \) and critical energy release rate \( G_{\text{IIc}} \) on the CZL development, a parameter study was carried out. Fig. 16 shows the effect of varying \( t^*_t = 80, 60, 40 \) MPa and \( t^*_f = 100, 75, 50 \) MPa on the CZL development for Layup-1. As expected from Eqs. (1) and (2), the CZL increased for lower interface strength values. The increase in CZL with respect to \( x_{\text{max}} \) becomes higher for lower interface strength values. The range of CZL was approximately 1.1–1.9 mm for \( t^*_f = 40 \) MPa and \( t^*_t = 50 \) MPa; 0.7–1.2 mm for \( t^*_f = 60 \) MPa and \( t^*_t = 75 \) MPa and 0.45–0.85 mm for \( t^*_f = 80 \) MPa and \( t^*_t = 100 \) MPa. Longer CZL in the simulations might result in significant inaccuracies in the numerical results [32]. However, the load-displacement curves were not affected by the change in \( t^*_t \) and \( t^*_f \) in the present study. The effect of \( G_{\text{IIc}} \) and \( G_{\text{Ic}} \) on the CZL is shown in Fig. 17 for different \( t^*_t \) and \( t^*_f \) values. It is seen that the largest CZL range during delamination was obtained for \( G_{\text{IIc}} = 1.938 \) N/mm and \( G_{\text{Ic}} = 3.438 \) N/mm for each interface strength values: approximately 2.75–3 mm for \( t^*_f = 40 \) MPa and \( t^*_t = 50 \) MPa; 1.6–1.8 mm for \( t^*_f = 60 \) MPa and \( t^*_t = 75 \) MPa and 1.1–1.2 mm for \( t^*_f = 80 \) MPa and \( t^*_t = 100 \) MPa. An increase in \( G_{\text{IIc}} \) and \( G_{\text{Ic}} \) resulted in larger CZL with a smaller force drop during delamination, hence a shorter delamination length. The corresponding force-displacement response is shown in Fig. 18. The force drop of approximately 70 N, 110 N and 120 N were obtained for \( G_{\text{IIc}} = 1.938, 0.969 \) and 0.485 N/mm and \( G_{\text{Ic}} = 3.438, 1.719 \) and 0.860 N/mm, respectively. This shows that simulation with too high critical energy release rate used at the cohesive surface was unable to capture the measured force drop and remaining stiffness of the butt joint. It was also found that there was a very small influence of interface strength on the force drop as seen in Fig. 18.

5. Conclusions

The critical assessment of the failure and CZL was presented in this study for a co-consolidated hybrid C/PEKK butt joint. The failure under 3PB conditions was analyzed experimentally and numerically. The unstable crack growth in the short fiber C/PEKK filler and the delamination at the filler-skin interface were captured using a high speed camera. It was found that the crack in the filler grew towards this interface in less than 33 \( \mu \)s and the delamination took place within 1–2 ms. The observed failure behavior was simulated using a coupled XFEM-CZM approach in ABAQUS.
A good agreement between the experimental results and the numerical predictions was obtained for the butt joint. The predicted stiffness of the specimen, the location of crack initiation and propagation as well as force drop during delamination were in good agreement with experimental data by taking the residual thermal stresses into account in the model.

The traction at the cohesive surface was found to vary during delamination due to the nature of the mix mode behavior of the interface. The Mode-I opening was found to be dominant at the beginning of the delamination and Mode-II in-plane shear became more effective during the progression of delamination and near the end of delamination. This yielded in an increase in the CZL due to the fact that the CZL in Mode-II is in general larger than the CZL in Mode-I [32].

A parameter analysis was carried out to investigate the effect of interface strength ($t^c_n$ and $t^c_s$) and critical energy release rate ($G^c_I$ and $G^c_{II}$) on the CZL and force-displacement response of the butt joint. It was found that an increase in $G^c_I$ and $G^c_{II}$ resulted in larger CZL with a smaller force drop during delamination and hence a shorter delamination length. There was hardly any effect of $t^c_n$ and $t^c_s$ on the delamination length and force drop found from the numerical simulations.
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