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ABSTRACT
Precise lifetime predictions are essential during product development to meet short development times. For this purpose, high-quality material models are required, which are able to represent the stress occurring in products with high accuracy. In this work, four different hardening models are presented which take into account different flow laws and hardening effects. According to (Dazer, 2016) many designs have to be calculated for the stochastic lifetime predictions. Therefore, evaluation criteria is also calculation time in addition to the accuracy of the approximation. The result is that the stress in the component can be described accurate with a 3-step transition from static to cyclic behavior.
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INTRODUCTION
Most products lifetime is tested with high loads in order to obtain results faster. In case of known accelerating factors these results allow lifetime predictions for field stress (Nelson, 2004). At high load levels, plasticizing is increasing, which influences the fatigue strength due to mechanic hardening or softening. To obtain precise lifetime predictions, simulation models must be able to describe these effects. According to the state of the art (Leutwein, 2007), mostly the purely cyclic behavior is regarded, which leads to inadequate results with cyclical hardening materials.

The elasticity of the material is initially over-estimated, leading to lower plastic strains and to high stresses in the simulation. In addition, stress relaxation and cyclic creeping occur under cyclic load resulting in a time dependent damage behavior (Haibach, 2006). First of all, different material models will be compared in terms of accuracy and computing time. For validation real data is gathered from a brake caliper of the KB-SFN GmbH, made of spheroidal graphite casting iron GJS 600-6 with an applied strain gauge. For the material data samples were taken from the strut of the brake caliper, see fig. 1.

To carry out the stochastic lifetime prediction according to (Dazer, 2016) the material model must be able to represent variance of material characteristics in very low computing time. Therefore a stochastic modeling of the material behavior of the best model is necessary. In order to validate the stochastic material model, lifetime tests were performed with different brake calipers.
DEFINITION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MATERIAL MODELS

Four models are presented and compared in terms of accuracy and calculation time.

- Model 1: cyclic behavior with multilinear kinematic hardening (mkh);
- Model 2: cyclic behavior with nonlinear kh Chaboche model (Lemaitre, 1990);
- Model 3: 3-step mkh;
- Model 4: 2-step mkh & cyclic behavior with nonlinear kinematic hardening.

Model 1 and 3 are based on the Ramberg-Osgood (RO) equation (Ramberg, 1943) with multilinear kinematic hardening behavior, see eq. 1.

\[ \varepsilon_{a,t} = \frac{\sigma}{E} + \left( \frac{\sigma}{K} \right)^{1/n} \]  

(1)

The flow surface remains constant during kinematic hardening. The flow criterion depends on the displacement of the flow surface (Miramontes, 1996). According to Prager rule (Prager, 1955), the Tensor \( X \) describes the current position of the flow surface. The yield strength \( R_e \) remains constant.

\[ f(\sigma, X) = F(\sigma - X) - R_e \]  

(2)

For the description of the stress-strain correlation, the hardening coefficient \( K \) and the hardening exponent \( n \) are required in addition to the young’s modulus. For static cases, they are obtained from tensile tests and for cyclic cases from strain-controlled fatigue strength tests. Model 1 is using cyclically stable behavior from the first load step with a constant flow criterion and hardening rule and therefore represents state of the art. The 3-step hardening model 3 considers the transition from static to cyclic behavior. Thereto, the first load step is calculated with the static first load model \( n \) and \( K \) from tensile test. Casting materials often show a different material behavior when the load is released, which is described by the Bauschinger-Effect (Berns, 2013).

Consequently, the first load release is modeled with the load release behavior \( n' \) and \( K' \). It is assumed that the material is already cyclically hardened with the beginning of the third load step, which is why cyclically stable behavior \( n'' \) and \( K'' \) is modeled from then on. Within a calculation step, the flow criterion remains constant. Between the calculation steps (transition from static to load release and from load release to cyclic data), a discrete change of the flow criterion is conducted. The Young’s modulus increases by 20 GPa from static to cyclic...
behavior, which is also considered in model 3. Table 1 and fig. 2 show the median values and
the median stress-strain correlation of the modeled data. (Leutwein, 2007) used a similar
procedure to determine the influence of autofrettage of cylinders with internal pressure
loading.

![Stress-strain correlation of modeled material data](image)

**Fig. 2 - Stress-strain correlation of modeled material data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>model</th>
<th>static data</th>
<th>load release data</th>
<th>cyclic data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>model 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model 3</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The integration into the FEM software Ansys is accomplished with 20 pairs of values of stress
and plastic strain. For model 3, each load case is calculated with the corresponding material
data. The elastic components are integrated separately with an isotropic behavior, which is
defined by the Young’s modulus and the Poisson’s ratio. The yield strength is used for
separation between elastic and elastic-plastic behavior, because theoretically the first plastic
deformation in the component occurs at this point. Accordingly, the pairs of values have to
begin at the yield strength and an associated plastic strain of $\varepsilon_{pl} = 0$. GJS600-6 is a material
without a pronounced yield strength, why an approximate solution is used for the
determination. If the deviation between the purely elastic $\varepsilon_{el}$ and the elastic-plastic $\varepsilon_{pl}$ behavior
exceeds the limit of $\Delta \varepsilon_{crit} = 0.07 \%$ for the initial load or $\Delta \varepsilon_{crit} = 0.02 \%$ for the first load
release and the cyclic load, the approx. yield strength $R'_e$ is defined at the corresponding
stress of $\Delta \varepsilon_{crit}$, see eq. 3 and fig. 3. The limit value $\Delta \varepsilon_{crit}$ was empirically adjusted to the real
data and tends to the conservative side to avoid too small plastic strains.

The stresses for the pairs of values are divided with a constant step size between approx. yield
strength $R'_e$ and tensile strength $R_m$. A conversion from technical to true values according to
eq. 4 and eq. 5 is necessary (Zahavi, 1996), because in tests the change of cross section is not
considered.
Stresses result in:

\[ \sigma = \sigma \left(1 + \frac{\sigma}{E} \right) + \left(\frac{\sigma}{K}\right)^{1/n} \]  

The corresponding strains are calculated on the basis of the plastic part of the RO equation 1 in combination with the conversion in eq. 5.

\[ \varepsilon_{plas} = \ln \left(1 + \left(\frac{\sigma}{K}\right)^{1/n}\right) \]  

Table 2 shows the median of the first calculated pairs of values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>static data</th>
<th>load release data</th>
<th>cyclic data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma ) [MPa]</td>
<td>( \varepsilon ) [%]</td>
<td>( \sigma' ) [MPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>316.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340.35</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>342.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366.08</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>367.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391.86</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>393.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417.71</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>419.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443.65</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>445.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469.73</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>471.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496.04</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>497.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522.65</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>523.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549.70</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>576.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obvious differences, especially between static and cyclic behavior, are evident. The approx.
and the 0.2 % yield strength are distinctly increased. But the release behavior doesn’t follow
the static behavior either. Calculating the yield strength $R_e'$, the following flow laws result,
based on eq. 2:

$$f(\sigma, X)_{\text{static}} = F(\sigma - X) - 314$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)
$$f(\sigma, X)_{\text{relief}} = F(\sigma - X) - 316$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)
$$f(\sigma, X)_{\text{cyclic}} = F(\sigma - X) - 410.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

Models 2 and 4 are based on a nonlinear kinematic Chaboche model (Lemaitre, 1990), which
maps cyclic creeping and stress relaxation by a nonlinear evolution of the flow criterion.
Because it is a kinematic model, the flow surface moves with plastic deformation in the stress
plane without changing the flow surface. However, there is a limitation, which restricts the
displacement of the flow surface (Miramontes, 1996). The displacement of the flow surface is
described with the kinematic hardening variable (khv) $\alpha$. Eq. 11 shows the change of the khv.
$C$ and $\gamma$ are the material characteristics of the Chaboche material model.

$$d\alpha = C \, d\varepsilon_p - \gamma \alpha |\varepsilon_p|$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

By integrating the change of the khv the following result is obtained:

$$\alpha = \nu \frac{C}{\gamma} + \left(\alpha_0 - \nu \frac{C}{\gamma}\right) \cdot e^{-(\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_{p0})}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Stress is calculated with:

$$\sigma = \alpha + \nu T$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

Stress is described by equations 12 and 13 and depends on the current plastic strains $\varepsilon_p$ and on
the previous condition $\varepsilon_{p0}$ and $\alpha_0$, while the direction of motion is given by $\nu = \pm 1$.
Analogous $\varepsilon_{p0}$ and $\alpha_0$ are equal to zero in case of first load behavior. Assuming an ideal
adjustment of the khv to the real stress-strain curve, the constant $T$ is set equal to the approx.
yield stress $R_e'$.

$$T = R_e'$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

Finally, eq. 11-14 results in:

$$\sigma = \sum_{n=1}^{j} \alpha_j + \nu K = \sum_{n=1}^{j} \nu \frac{C_j}{Y_j} \cdot \left(1 - e^{-\gamma f(\varepsilon_p)}\right) + \nu R_e'$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

The plastic area of the cyclic stress-strain curve can be divided into three areas, see fig. 4. A
large slope is distinctive for area 1. Area 2 introduces the transition into a nearly flat and
linear curve progression in area 3.
According to (Lemaitre, 1990) a three times fragmented khv \( \alpha \) is thus sufficiently accurate. The model parameters \( C_j \) and \( \gamma_j \) are iteratively adapted to the cyclic stress-strain curve. \( C_1 \) corresponds to the slope of the curve after the yield strength, while \( \gamma_1 \) maps the fading hardening. In area 2 and 3, the transition to the nearly linear part of the curve is defined with \( C_{2,3} \) and \( \gamma_{2,3} \). The khv’s are finally lifted to the corresponding stress level by means of the approximately determined yield strength \( R_{e'} \). Table 3 lists the determined Chaboche model parameters. Similar to models 1 and 3, model 2 uses only the Chaboche material data at the beginning of the calculation. In model 4, hardening is applied in two stages similarly to model 3. The non-linear model is then calculated to estimate the influence of stress relaxation and creeping.

**Table 3 - Chaboche model parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C_1 )</td>
<td>75885.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma_1 )</td>
<td>691.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_2 )</td>
<td>9789.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma_2 )</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_3 )</td>
<td>2058.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma_3 )</td>
<td>9.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_{e'} )</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VERIFICATION AND COMPARISON**

A brake caliper of the KB-SfN GmbH, made of spheroidal graphite iron GJS 600-6 with an applied strain gauge on the strut, was tested with a constant load for comparative values, see fig. 5. Due to the bending of the strut, a 3-axle loading condition is developed. The strain gauge measures the strain in y- and x-direction, to verify the 2-axle surface load condition.
Table 1 shows median strain values of the individual models compared to the real data. During the first 20 load cycles, air pressure is adjusted to apply the nominal load, where significant plastic deformations already occur. The increase of the initial high plastic strains is already fading away in the subsequent 100 load cycles. Between the next 100 and 10,000 load cycles, plastic strain in y-direction only increases by approx. $88 \, \mu m/m$. It can be concluded that the hardening of the material is so strong, that the stress amplitude can be heard almost completely elastically. Cyclic creeping could be responsible for the small increase in plastic strain at high load cycles.

Because of the high computing time, model 2 and 4 are cancelled after 300 cycles. The strains of the state of the art models 1 and 2 are too small due to the high initial material strength and thus do not give reliable data. The strains of model 1 and 3 remain the same, because the flow criterion is only changed twice discretely, and a new plasticizing doesn’t occur after load step 1. Nevertheless model 3 is providing sufficiently high accuracies at a significantly lower computation time without the consideration of stress relaxation and creeping. Only during the first 20 load cycles the calculated strain is too high. This can be explained by adjustment of the pressure at the beginning of the test and therefore the allegedly smaller load. The real creep strain on the caliper can be approached very well with the two-stage hardening and the
subsequent non-linear material behavior in model 4. On the other hand, there is the enormous computing time since many load steps have to be calculated. Because the low creep strains are also not decisive for fatigue strength, they can be neglected for a damage calculation of materials with very pronounced hardening during the first load cycles.

In order to support this thesis, a damage calculation based on (Smith, 1970) is carried out according to eq. 16 for median values.

$$P_{SWT} = \sqrt{\sigma_0 \cdot \varepsilon_t \cdot E}$$

$$\chi = \frac{1}{\sigma_{max}} \cdot \frac{da}{dx}$$

The damage calculations in fig. 6 show that only model 2 is able to represent a transient transition of hardening which is finished after 20 cycles. Hardening of all other models is finished after max. 3 cycles. In addition to the damage values, stress gradient effects in notches according to eq. 17 have to be considered for lifetime predictions (Siebel, 1955).

Fig. 6 - Damage calculation for the different material models

Fig. 7 shows damage and stress gradients of model 2 for different notch intensities based on eq. 16 and 17. Convergence already occurs very early too and this effect is reinforced with increasing notch intensity $K_i$. The amount of damage increases accordingly with increasing notch intensity. In addition the settling process is completed more quickly. This can be explained by the material behavior as follows:

Fig. 7 - Damage and related stress gradient for different notch intensities
With increasing stress and thus increasing strain level, the increase in thekhv $\alpha$ is flatter over the strain. This results in a large hardening at the beginning and an even faster stabilization of the material can be expected. Notches develop support effects that are included in the lifetime calculations by means of the related stress gradient (Siebel, 1955). Fig. 7 shows the course of the stress gradient at constant load amplitude. A settle process is identifiable, too.

Furthermore, the magnitude of the related stress gradient increases while the settling time decreases with increasing notch intensity. With a small notch effect, the course of the related stress gradient can change, because it does not only dependent on the notch shape, but also on the type of stress. The course of the stress gradient thus behaves very similar to the damage values. As a result, the error using model 3 decreases with increasing notch intensity. For a notch intensity of $K_t = 1.8$, the damage rate already stabilizes after approx. 6 load cycles and the gradient after approx. 50 load cycles. However, these observations are only based on simulation data so far and have to be verified with a detailed measurement.

With these investigations, it can be demonstrated, that time-dependent settling processes as well as cyclic creeping and stress relaxation can be neglected for fast hardening materials. The 3-step hardening model describes the 2-axle surface load condition in the caliper with sufficient accuracy and a low computation time.

STOCHASTIC MATERIAL MODELING AND LIFETIME CALCULATION

In case of casting iron materials in particular, fluctuating production processes and different chemical compositions of the castings sometimes result in considerable variance of the mechanical properties (Trubitz, 2004). For example, the copper content is essential for the shaping of the elongation at break. In order to take this variance into account for a lifetime calculation, Dazer (Dazer, 2016) proposed a stochastic lifetime calculation process, in which scattering of the input variables is considered.

The 3-step material model must therefore be capable of mapping the real scattering of the mechanical properties, which means that the stress-strain relationship has to be changed. Therefore, suitable scattering ranges of the parameters of the RO-equation have to be determined. In the first step, the variance of the respective 0.2 % - yield strength and the tensile strength of the material batches is used.

Fig. 8 shows the variance ranges of material properties for initial loading. All of them follow a Weibull distribution. The elastic part is completely defined by the variance of the Young’s modulus. For the elastic-plastic range, the 0.2 % - yield strength and the tensile strength provide two supporting points of the Ramberg-Osgood equation. The 0.2 % - yield strength is always assigned to a plastic strain of $\varepsilon = 0.2 \%$, see eq. 18, while the tensile strength is assigned to the uniform elongation $\varepsilon_u$, see eq. 19.

Using Monte-Carlo sampling with 10,000 iterations the result is a one-dimensional range of variation for supporting point 1 and a two-dimensional range of variation for supporting point 2, because uniform elongation is also scattering. Correlation between tensile strength and 0.2 % yield strength of the measured data is nearly linear and was taken into account. An obvious correlation between tensile strength and uniform elongation could not be demonstrated with the measured data.

Fig. 9 shows the procedure with the associated point clouds of the supporting points as well as the median, the min. and the max. Ramberg-Osgood curve for initial loading. The range of variance for initial release and cyclic data are determined analogously, with the difference that
another stress level is selected for support point 2, because the tensile strength is not directly measurable in strain-controlled fatigue tests. In this case, also a one-dimensional range of variance results for support point 2, since the tension is measured at a defined elongation.

Fig. 8 - Variance of material properties

Fig. 9 - Monte-Carlo procedure for variance determination of RO parameters

\[ \varepsilon_{\text{plas}_1} = \left( \frac{\sigma_1}{K} \right)^{1/n} \Rightarrow 0.002 = \left( \frac{R_{P0.2}}{K} \right)^{1/n} \]  
\[ \varepsilon_{\text{plas}_2} = \left( \frac{\sigma_2}{K} \right)^{1/n} \Rightarrow \varepsilon_G = \left( \frac{R_m}{K} \right)^{1/n} \]

Executing the procedure with 10,000 Monte-Carlo iterations result in the probability functions of the RO parameter of static, release and cyclic data.
With the determined variance of the parameters and the probability functions, it is now possible to represent scattering loading conditions in the caliper like in reality, e.g. by batch fluctuations. The advantage of this method is the enormous flexibility and adaptability of the stochastic model. Due to the integration with pairs of values according to eq. 6 and 7, the new yield strengths, the associated pairs of values for stress and strain and the corresponding flow criteria according to eq. 8-10 are obtained directly in case of changes in the material parameters.

According to (Zahavi, 1996) the level of cyclical hardening is highly depend on the metal production process. The production process again is dependent on many random variables like casting temperature and chemical composition. Therefore it is not possible to demonstrate a generally valid correlation between static, release and cyclic material behavior. For that reason, differently pronounced hardening effects have to be taken into account. Hence, the individual curves (static, release, cyclic data) are modeled independently, which means that a higher static yield strength does not automatically mean an equally higher cyclic yield strength. This makes it possible to map different phenomena of material behavior, such as the following limiting cases:

- Initially weak materials with weak hardening,
- Initially strong materials with strong hardening,
but also:

- Initially weak materials with strong hardening,
- Initially strong materials with weak hardening.

The stochastic lifetime calculations proposed by (Dazer, 2016) can be carried out using the defined material behavior. The results are shown in fig. 10 for different calipers with different notch intensities at the location of failure. The calculations result in an entire mapped virtual Weibull distribution, which approximates the real data with a high accuracy. In addition, the accuracy increases with increasing notch intensity, which can be ascribed to the smaller calculation error from the settling process. Certainly, the error with small notch intensities could also be explained with the smaller sample sizes of the real data.

**SUMMARY**

In the first part of this work was shown, that a very good approximation of the material behavior of cyclically hardening materials can be achieved with a 3-step transition from static to cyclic behavior. For GJS 600, the transient settling process is already finished between 20 and 100 load cycles depending on the notch intensity. Thus the neglected damage-relevant regions are very small. In summary, it can be revealed, that the time-dependent effects and
settling processes for the material description can be neglected for hardening materials with weakly pronounced creeping behavior.

For the stochastic lifetime calculations according to (Dazer, 2016), the 3-stage mkh material model is stochastically described in the second part of this work. This allows mapping of strong and weak hardening behavior with analogous initial conditions, making the model very flexible to use. The empirical validation due to the lifetime calculations of the brake calipers shows that the material model maps the real loading conditions with very high accuracy.
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