Fracture analysis in 2D plane strain problems for composite materials containing hard inclusions and voids using an extended consecutive-interpolation quadrilateral element
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Abstract. This paper investigates fracture mechanics in particle-reinforced composites by using the extended finite element method enhanced by the consecutive-interpolation quadrilateral element. These composite materials have discontinuous boundaries such as cracks, voids and hard inclusions. The extended consecutive-interpolation quadrilateral element (XCQ4) is employed to model these boundaries in two-dimensional linear elastic deformation problems. XQC4 combines the enrichment functions in the traditional extended finite element method with the consecutive interpolation on a 4-node quadrilateral element. This element uses both nodal values and averaged nodal gradients as interpolated conditions. In fracture analysis, the stress intensity factors (SIFs) are important parameters that must be defined. In this study, the values of SIFs at the crack tips are evaluated with the help of the interaction integrals approach. The critical angle for crack growth direction is based on the maximum circumferential tensile stress criterion. The obtained numerical results are compared with other reliable results showing high accuracy and convergence rate of the XCQ4 element.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Particle-reinforced composites are materials that combine hard particles with other matrix materials. They have better mechanical properties than traditional materials. In the fracture analysis of cracks in particle-reinforced composites, there are discontinuous interface material boundaries and the presence of defects such as cracks, voids, and holes. These boundaries are hard to simulate with the conventional finite element method since it needs a lot of meshing
effort and requires high computational costs. Therefore, an extended algorithm has been
developed to address crack-related issues.

The extended finite element method (XFEM) was first introduced in [1, 2]. The improved
XFEM in the fact that the discontinuity and singularity induced by the crack are effectively
treated as the mesh is completely independent of the crack geometry, and more interestingly the
re-meshing in crack propagation is no longer required. XFEM method does not attempt to
directly model cracks as geometric discontinuities. Instead, mathematical functions namely
enrichments based on the partition of unity principle are used to capture the effect of
displacement jump across crack surfaces and stress singularity in the vicinity of the crack tip.
The method is then widely used in fracture analysis [3 - 5].

Since the conventional 4-node quadrilateral element can produce the discontinuous nodal
gradient, Bui et al. [6] have succeeded in establishing a consecutive-interpolation 4-node
quadrilateral element (CQ4), based on the idea of [7, 8]. The basic functions of CQ4 are built
with the twice-interpolation procedure to obtain functions of continuous form and have higher-
order polynomials without increasing the total number of degrees of freedom. The stress field
becomes continuous without complicated treatment, the calculation results have significantly
increased convergence compared with the traditional finite element method. This consecutive-
interpolation concept is then applied in the 3D solid structure analysis [9 - 11].

For simulating fracture problems, the concept of XFEM has been incorporated into a
consecutive-interpolation procedure to form the XCQ4 element [12 - 14]. The method is then
used for analyzing crack in homogeneous plates [15], crack on the interface of bimaterial plates
[16] and cracked functionally graded material (FGM) plates [17]. Compared with the standard
extended 4-node quadrilateral element (XQ4), the new XCQ4 is primarily distinguished by the
employment of nodal gradients into interpolation due to the consecutive-interpolation procedure
(CIP). The approximation functions for the consecutive-interpolation quadrilateral element are
extended to involve known enrichment functions.

This paper investigates the fracture behavior and the crack growth of cracked plates with
discontinuous interfaces such as inclusions and voids by using the XCQ4 element. Cracked
plates including hard inclusions and voids are already studied by the traditional XFEM in [18]
but are not examined in the XCQ4 approach so far. And due to the authors’ best knowledge, the
crack propagation in the cracked plate with the combination of multiple inclusions and voids has
not been reported, even by using the traditional XFEM. This is an important type of problem that
needs attention because it involves investigating the mechanical properties of particle-reinforced
composite structures. The accuracy and performance of the XCQ4 element are demonstrated
through many numerical examples of 2D plane strain problems. The obtained results are
compared with available numerical results showing good agreement. Moreover, the examples
also show that the mechanical behavior becomes better when mixing hard particles compared
with homogeneous material.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. The consecutive-interpolation 4-node quadrilateral element (CQ4)

To begin with the concept of consecutive-interpolation procedure, let an arbitrary point \( x = (x, y) \)
located inside a four-node \( (i, j, k \text{ and } m) \) quadrilateral element (see Figure 1). Denoting \( S_i, S_j, S_k \)
and \( S_m \), in that order, are neighbor elements that share the same node \( i, j, k \text{ and } m \). The
supporting nodes for the point \( x \) in this CQ4 element involve all nodes of \( S_i, S_j, S_k \) and \( S_m \) elements.

The approximation equation at point \( x \) is written as

\[
\hat{u}(x) = \sum_{l=1}^{n_s} \hat{N}_i(x) u_l = \hat{N}(x)u
\]

(1)

In equation 1, the consecutive-interpolation shape function \( \hat{N}_j \) is determined by [12]

\[
\hat{N}_j = \phi_{i,x} N_{i,x}^{e} + \phi_{i,y} N_{i,y}^{e} + \phi_{j,x} N_{j,x}^{e} + \phi_{j,y} N_{j,y}^{e} + \phi_{k,x} N_{k,x}^{e} + \phi_{k,y} N_{k,y}^{e} + \phi_{m,x} N_{m,x}^{e} + \phi_{m,y} N_{m,y}^{e}
\]

(2)

in which \( N_{i,l}^{e} \) is the shape function with respect to node \( i \), and \( n_s \) is the total number of the supporting nodes in regard to the point \( x \).

---

**Figure 1.** Illustration of CQ4 element and its supporting node in 2-D domain.

According to [12] and [13], the formulation of the average derivative of the shape functions at node \( i \) is given as the following expression

\[
\tilde{N}_{i,x}^{e} = \sum_{e \in S_i} (\omega_{e} N_{i,x}^{e}) \quad \tilde{N}_{i,y}^{e} = \sum_{e \in S_i} (\omega_{e} N_{i,y}^{e})
\]

(3)

where the term \( N_{i,l}^{e} \) is the derivative computed in element \( e \), and \( \omega_{e} \) is the weight function of element \( e \in S_i \), which is defined as

\[
\omega_{e} = \frac{\Delta_{e}}{\sum_{e' \in S_i} \Delta_{e'}}
\]

(4)

in which \( \Delta_{e} \) is area of the element \( e \).

In equation 2, the functions \( \phi_{i,x} \), \( \phi_{i,y} \), and \( \phi_{j} \), forming the polynomial basis associated with node \( i \) must satisfy the following conditions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\phi_{i}(x_i) & = \delta_{i}, \quad \phi_{i,x}(x_i) = 0, \quad \phi_{i,y}(x_i) = 0 \\
\phi_{j}(x_j) & = 0, \quad \phi_{j,x}(x_j) = \delta_{j}, \quad \phi_{j,y}(x_j) = 0 \\
\phi_{k}(x_k) & = 0, \quad \phi_{k,x}(x_k) = 0, \quad \phi_{k,y}(x_k) = \delta_{k} \\
\phi_{m}(x_m) & = 0, \quad \phi_{m,x}(x_m) = 0, \quad \phi_{m,y}(x_m) = \delta_{m}
\end{align*}
\]

(5)

where \( l \) is any one of the indices \( i, j, k, \) and \( m \), and
The polynomial basis functions \( \phi_i, \phi_{il}, \phi_{ij} \) for the quadrilateral element are given as

\[
\phi_i = N_i + N_j^2N_j + N_k^2N_k - N_i^2N_j + N_j^2N_k - N_iN_jN_k - N_iN_kN_j
\]

\[
\phi_{il} = -(x_i - x_j)(N_j^2N_j + bN_iN_jN_k + bN_iN_kN_j)
\]

\[
\phi_{ij} = -(x_i - x_j)(N_j^2N_j + bN_iN_jN_k + bN_iN_kN_j)
\]

\[
\phi_{ij} = -(y_i - y_j)(N_i^2N_i + bN_jN_iN_k + bN_jN_kN_i)
\]

\[
\phi_{ij} = -(y_i - y_j)(N_i^2N_i + bN_jN_iN_k + bN_jN_kN_i)
\]

with \( b = 1/2 \) and the functions \( \phi_j, \phi_{jr}, \phi_{jr}, \phi_{jr}, \phi_{kr}, \phi_{kr}, \phi_{mr}, \phi_{mr} \) can be also calculated in the same manner by a circulatory permutation of indices \( i, j, k, \) and \( m \). In addition, \( N_i, N_j, N_k \) and \( N_m \) are the Lagrange basis function.

### 2.2. The extended consecutive-interpolation 4-node quadrilateral element (XCQ4)

Figure 2 shows the typical discontinuities often occur in particle composite. Based on the XFEM approach, the XCQ4 approximation of the displacement field is written as follows

\[
u^h(x) = \tilde{u}(x) + \tilde{u}^{cvo}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \tilde{N}_j(x) u_j + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \tilde{N}_k(x) \tilde{\psi}^j(x) a^j
\]

where the first term on the right-hand side is the familiar approximation by CQ4 (see equation 1), \( np \) is the number of discontinuous conditions (crack, inclusion, void) that occur for an element containing \( x, m \) is the number of enriched nodes in each \( np \), \( \tilde{\psi} \) is the enrichment function in each condition \( np \).

**Figure 2.** Discontinuous boundaries in a particle composite material includes defects such as cracks, voids, and hard inclusions.

The discrete system of linear equilibrium equation under small strain condition can be expressed as

\[
Ku^h = F
\]

where \( u^h \) contains the normal displacements \( u \) and the enriched degrees of freedom \( a \).
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\[ \mathbf{u}' = \{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}\}^T \]  

(12)

\[ \mathbf{K} \text{ is the global stiffness matrix and } \mathbf{F} \text{ is the external load vector, for enriched elements, the elementary stiffness matrix is obtained as} \]

\[ \mathbf{K}'_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}'_{ij}^{uu} & \mathbf{K}'_{ij}^{ua} \\ \mathbf{K}'_{ij}^{au} & \mathbf{K}'_{ij}^{aa} \end{bmatrix} ; \quad \mathbf{F}'_i = \mathbf{F}'_i \]

(13)

in which \( \mathbf{K}'_{ij}^{uu}, \mathbf{K}'_{ij}^{ua}, \mathbf{K}'_{ij}^{au}, \) and \( \mathbf{K}'_{ij}^{aa} \) are defined as

\[ \mathbf{K}'_{ij}^{rs} = \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{B}'_i DB'_{j}) d\Omega \quad r, s = u, a \]

(14)

The \( \mathbf{B} \)-operator is the matrix of the derivatives of shape functions and is expressed as

\[ \mathbf{B}_i^u = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{N}_{i,x} & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{N}_{i,y} \\ \hat{N}_{i,y} & \hat{N}_{i,x} \end{bmatrix} ; \quad \mathbf{B}_i^a = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\psi}(x)\hat{N}_{i,x} + \hat{\psi}(x)\hat{\psi}(x)\hat{N}_{i,y} & 0 \\ \hat{\psi}(x)\hat{N}_{i,y} + \hat{\psi}(x)\hat{\psi}(x)\hat{N}_{i,x} & \hat{\psi}(x)\hat{N}_{i,x} + \hat{\psi}(x)\hat{\psi}(x)\hat{N}_{i,y} \end{bmatrix} \]

(15)

and \( \mathbf{D} \) is the material matrix, for the plane strain state

\[ \mathbf{D} = \frac{E}{(1+\nu)(1-2\nu)} \begin{bmatrix} 1-\nu & \nu & 0 \\ \nu & 1-\nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (1-2\nu)/2 \end{bmatrix} \]

(16)

The enrichment functions \( \hat{\psi}(x) \) of the XCQ4 for cracks, hard inclusions, and voids in the composite material are shown below.

2.2.1. XCQ4 approximation for cracks

![Figure 3. Support domains of XCQ4 and XQ4, and their enriched nodes.](image)

The support domains of a Heaviside enriched node for a continuous element \( e \) and a crack-tip enriched node \( i \) are schematically shown in Figure 3. It can be recognized that the support domain with respect to an enriched node would result in the continuity of the nodal derivatives [7]. However, due to the discontinuity, the \( C^0 \)-continuity at nodes is expected. One alternative option is to improve the computation of the average nodal gradient for enriched nodes as [8].
\[ \bar{N}^{(l)}_{i,j} = N^{(l)[\text{el}]}_{i,j}, \, \bar{N}^{(l)}_{i,j} = N^{(l)[\text{el}]}_{i,j} \]  

For the split nodes, enrichment functions \( \psi(x) \) is the Heaviside function \( H(x) \). The Heaviside function is used in elements which have their support completely cut by the crack \[15\]

\[
H(x) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{for } f(x) > 0 \\
-1, & \text{for } f(x) < 0
\end{cases}
\]

\( f(x) \) is the sign distance function.

Now the matrix \( \mathbf{B}^* \) for the split nodes (in Eq. \((15)\)) has the following form

\[
\mathbf{B}^{\text{spl}}_i = \begin{bmatrix}
\left( \bar{N}_i \left[ H(x) - H(x_i) \right] \right)_{x} & 0 \\
0 & \left( \bar{N}_i \left[ H(x) - H(x_i) \right] \right)_{y}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[\text{(19)}\]

For the tip nodes, enrichment functions \( \psi(x) \) is the function \( F_{\alpha}(x) \). Crack tip enrichment functions embed the crack tip singularity into the enriched element

\[
\{F_{\alpha}(r, \theta)\}_{a=4} = \left\{ \sqrt{r} \sin \frac{\theta}{2}, \sqrt{r} \cos \frac{\theta}{2}, \sqrt{r} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta, \sqrt{r} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta \right\}
\]

\[\text{(20)}\]

The near crack tip enriched \( \mathbf{B}^* \) matrix in equation 15 now has the form

\[
\mathbf{B}^{\text{tip}}_i = \begin{bmatrix}
\left( \bar{N}_i \left[ F_{\alpha} (x) - F_{\alpha_i} (x) \right] \right)_{x} & 0 \\
0 & \left( \bar{N}_i \left[ F_{\alpha} (x) - F_{\alpha_i} (x) \right] \right)_{y}
\end{bmatrix}_{\alpha=1,2,3,4}
\]

\[\text{(21)}\]

\[
\mathbf{B}^{\text{tip}}_i = \left[ \mathbf{B}^{\text{tip}1}_i \mathbf{B}^{\text{tip}2}_i \mathbf{B}^{\text{tip}3}_i \mathbf{B}^{\text{tip}4}_i \right]
\]

\[\text{(22)}\]

2.2.2. XCQ4 approximation for inclusions

As stated in the first section, this study aims to examine cracked plates with inclusions and voids inside. To model the discontinuity due to the appearance of hard inclusions in an extended concept, an appropriate enrichment function must be used. The enrichment function for inclusion \[16, 19\] is defined as follows

\[
\chi(x) = \sum_i \bar{N}_i (x) f_i(x) - \left| \sum_i \bar{N}_i (x) f_i(x) \right|
\]

\[\text{(23)}\]

where \( f_i(x) \) is distance function of node \( i \) can be defined as

\[
f(x) = \|x - x_i\| - r_i
\]

\[\text{(24)}\]

in which \( x_i \) and \( r_i \) are center and radius of the inclusion.

The entries of the \( \mathbf{B}^* \) matrix for inclusions

902
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\[ \mathbf{B}_i^{\text{inc}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{N}_{i,x} \chi(x_i) + \hat{N}_{i,y} \chi(x_i) & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{N}_{i,x} \chi(x_i) + \hat{N}_{i,y} \chi(x_i) \end{bmatrix} \]

where the derivative of \( \chi(x) \) with respect to \( x \) and \( y \) are computed as

\[ \chi(x) = \sum_i \frac{\partial \hat{N}_i(x)}{\partial x} f_i(x) - \sum_i \frac{\partial \hat{N}_i(x)}{\partial y} f_i(x) \]

\[ \chi(y) = \sum_i \frac{\partial \hat{N}_i(x)}{\partial y} f_i(x) - \sum_i \frac{\partial \hat{N}_i(x)}{\partial x} f_i(x) \]

### 2.2.3. XCQ4 approximation for voids

Besides inclusion, void is also a feature that the study concerns. According to \([20, 21]\) void enrichment function is used in elements which contain void boundary

\[ V(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } f(x) > 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } f(x) < 0 \end{cases} \]

Now the matrix \( \mathbf{B}^v \) for voids has the following form

\[ \mathbf{B}_i^{\text{hole}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{N}_{i,x} [V(x) - V(x_i)] & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{N}_{i,y} [V(x) - V(x_i)] \end{bmatrix} \]

### 2.4. Stress intensity factors calculation

In the interaction integral approach, two states of a cracked body are considered: the actual state \#1 (\( \sigma_{ij}^{(1)}, \epsilon_{ij}^{(1)}, u_i^{(1)} \)) and the auxiliary state \#2 (\( \sigma_{ij}^{(2)}, \epsilon_{ij}^{(2)}, u_i^{(2)} \)). The relation between the interaction integral and the mixed-mode stress intensity factors (SIFs) is as follows

\[ M^{(1,2)} = \frac{2}{E} \left( K_i^{(1)} K_i^{(2)} + K_h^{(1)} K_h^{(2)} \right) \]

where \( E^* = \frac{E}{1 - v^2} \) is the effective Young’s modulus for the plane strain state.

\( M \) is the interaction integral, which can be computed as

\[ M^{(1,2)} = \int_A \left[ -W^{(1,2)} \delta_{ij} + \sigma_{ij}^{(1)} \frac{\partial u_{ij}^{(2)}}{\partial x_j} + \sigma_{ij}^{(2)} \frac{\partial u_{ij}^{(1)}}{\partial x_j} \right] \frac{\partial q}{\partial x_j} dA \]

in which \( q(x) \) is the weight function which has the value of 1 on the open set containing the crack tip and 0 on the outer prescribed contour (the red curve in Figure 4).
By choosing \( K_{I}^{(2)} = 1, \ K_{II}^{(2)} = 0 \) for mode I and \( K_{I}^{(2)} = 0, \ K_{II}^{(2)} = 1 \) for mode II, the corresponding SIFs are obtained

\[
K_{I}^{(1)} = \frac{E^*}{2} M^{(1, \text{Model})} ; \quad K_{II}^{(1)} = \frac{E^*}{2} M^{(1, \text{Model})}
\]  

(31)

It is noted that by incorporating CIP into the approximation, the support domain for the element belonging to \( J \)-domain in terms of the XCQ4 (denoted by the blue dash line) is larger than that of the standard XQ4.

Figure 4. \( J \)-integral domain in XCQ4.

2.5. Crack growth simulation

To model crack growth in this paper, the maximum circumferential tensile stress criterion is adopted. The critical angle \( \theta_c \) (see Figure 5) of the propagation direction is defined from the SIFs of the mixed-mode problem [22]

\[
\theta_c = 2 \arctan \left( \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 + 8 \left( \frac{K_{II}}{K_{I}} \right)^2}}{4 \left( \frac{K_{II}}{K_{I}} \right)} \right)
\]  

(32)

The procedure to simulate crack propagation in the XCQ4 approach is similar to the procedure of the traditional XFEM and can be found in [23].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. A rectangular plate containing an edge crack

A rectangular plate containing an edge crack is considered for the validation study (see Figure 6). The dimension of the rectangular plate is 72 mm × 36 mm. The plate is fixed on the bottom
Fracture analysis in 2D plane strain problems for composite materials containing hard ... edge and subjected to tensile stress $\sigma = 1.1$ N/mm$^2$ on the top edge [24]. Various crack lengths are considered with the ratios $a/W = 0.3, 0.4, 0.5$ and 0.6. The material properties of polycarbonate are given as: $E = 2.50$ GPa and $\nu = 0.38$.

Firstly, the obtained results from XCQ4 are compared with XQ4 and the analytical solution [25]. The analytical results of $K_I$ can be calculated as

$$K_I = \left[1.12 - 0.231\left(\frac{a}{W}\right) + 10.55\left(\frac{a}{W}\right)^2 - 21.72\left(\frac{a}{W}\right)^3 + 30.39\left(\frac{a}{W}\right)^4\right]\sigma\pi a$$

(32)

Table 1. The values of $K_I$ in different methods and mesh sizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>10x20</th>
<th>15x30</th>
<th>20x40</th>
<th>25x50</th>
<th>30x60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>33.0533</td>
<td>34.4073</td>
<td>35.0227</td>
<td>35.3687</td>
<td>35.5886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>33.5438</td>
<td>35.0235</td>
<td>35.7183</td>
<td>36.1154</td>
<td>36.3718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Rectangular plate containing an edge crack: (a) Geometry, boundary conditions and loadings, (b) The mesh used in XCQ4 and XFEM, (c) The mesh used in FEM.

Figure 7. Convergence of $K_I$ with respect to the number of nodes.

The $a/W$ ratio is assumed to be 0.6 in this case. The values of $K_I$ computed with various meshing models using both XCQ4 and XQ4 approaches are provided in Table 1, together with
the analytical solution. Figure 7 further demonstrates the convergence of $K_I$ evaluated by XCQ4 and XQ4 elements with respect to number of nodes. The numerical results of mode-I SIF quickly approach the analytical solution. However, it can be seen that the XCQ4 has higher accuracy than the conventional XQ4.

The distribution of normal stress component $\sigma_y$ obtained by both XCQ4 and XQ4 elements is shown in Figure 8. It can be seen that by using XCQ4, the stress $\sigma_y$ varies smoothly across element edges, while that by XQ4 is non-physically discontinuous. Therefore, the XCQ4 element is better in the context of providing a smoother stress field.

![Figure 8. Comparison of stress distribution $\sigma_y$ (unit: N/mm$^2$) between (a) XQ4 and (b) XCQ4.](image)

Now consider the variation of $K_I$ when the crack length varies. A 30x60 mesh is used for both XCQ4 and XQ4 approaches (Figure 6 (b)). The mesh of the finite element model is adaptive with different crack lengths (Figure 6 (c)), so the total number of nodes is not fixed but ranges from 11513 to 12059 nodes (the Plane183 element is used). The FEM model from now on is conducted by using the ANSYS commercial software. The ANSYS set-up is calibrated in this example for use in subsequent problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$a/W = 0.2$</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>7.1067</td>
<td>10.5870</td>
<td>15.6070</td>
<td>23.3460</td>
<td>36.4780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>7.0753</td>
<td>10.5032</td>
<td>15.3786</td>
<td>22.8981</td>
<td>35.5886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.2684</td>
<td>10.7819</td>
<td>15.7709</td>
<td>23.5246</td>
<td>36.3718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 9. Variation of $K_I$ with respect to $a/W$ for an edge crack plate under tensile loading.](image)
Table 2 and Figure 9 show the variation of $K_I$ with respect to the $a/W$ ratio in different methods. From the figure one can notice that $K_I$ tends to increase as the crack length increases. Furthermore, XCQ4 is observed to be in good agreement with analytical solutions, extended finite element method and the conventional finite element method.

3.2. A rectangular plate containing an edge crack and a single inclusion/void

Figure 10. An edge crack plate with a single inclusion/void under tensile loading.

Figure 10 (a)-(e) shows the geometry of a rectangular plate containing an edge crack and a single inclusion/void. The plate is subjected to a uniform distributed load $\sigma = 1.1 \text{ N/mm}^2$ on the top edge and the bottom edge is fixed. The geometry dimensions are: 72 mm × 36 mm, various crack length ratios are considered $a/W = 0.2, 0.3, 0.4$ and $0.5$. The radius of the circular hard inclusion is 6 mm, and the position of the hard inclusion is shown in Figure 10 (a)-(e). The material properties of polycarbonate are given as: $E = 2.50 \text{ GPa}$ and $v = 0.38$. The hard inclusion is made of AZ61 with the ratio $E_{inclusion}/E = 18$. For the XCQ4 and XQ4 models, the plate is discretized into 30×60 nodes, and for the FEM model used in ANSYS, the total number of nodes is not fixed but ranges from 7589 to 10063 nodes (the Plane183 element is used).

Table 3. The values of $K_I$ in different $a/W$ ratios and methods. The case of a single hard inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$a/W = 0.2$</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (a)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.2388</td>
<td>10.6697</td>
<td>15.7944</td>
<td>23.5950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>6.8809</td>
<td>10.1279</td>
<td>14.7602</td>
<td>22.0228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>7.0068</td>
<td>10.3530</td>
<td>15.1680</td>
<td>22.7620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (b)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.3740</td>
<td>10.6175</td>
<td>15.2286</td>
<td>21.8592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>7.0035</td>
<td>10.0673</td>
<td>14.2187</td>
<td>20.3904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>7.1310</td>
<td>10.2620</td>
<td>14.6040</td>
<td>21.0410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (c)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.6263</td>
<td>10.9425</td>
<td>15.4913</td>
<td>20.4670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>7.2428</td>
<td>10.3724</td>
<td>14.4426</td>
<td>19.5411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>7.3770</td>
<td>10.6250</td>
<td>14.8250</td>
<td>19.4980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (d)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.2446</td>
<td>10.6758</td>
<td>15.7998</td>
<td>23.5979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>6.8809</td>
<td>10.1278</td>
<td>14.7599</td>
<td>22.0219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>6.9987</td>
<td>10.3400</td>
<td>15.1430</td>
<td>22.7280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (e)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.0325</td>
<td>10.7446</td>
<td>16.1860</td>
<td>24.2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>6.6966</td>
<td>10.2002</td>
<td>15.1129</td>
<td>22.5693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>6.8104</td>
<td>10.3950</td>
<td>15.4990</td>
<td>23.3390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of mode-I SIF calculation are presented in Table 3. Similar to the first example, $K_I$ tends to increase as the $a/W$ ratio increases. Compared to the results of the previous example, it is shown that the stress intensity factor is significantly improved when a homogeneous plate material is reinforced with hard inclusion. For example, in the case of $a/W = 0.5$ and the position of the inclusion is as in Figure 10 (c), mode-I SIF decreases by approximately 12%.

In the second case, the void is considered instead of the inclusion. The geometry is illustrated in Figure 10, a circular void of radius $R = 6$ mm replaces the circular hard inclusion. The meshes for XCQ4, XQ4 and ANSYS are set up the same as the first case. The results of mode-I SIF calculation are presented in Table 4. Although the hard inclusion is replaced by the void, $K_I$ still increases as the $a/W$ ratio increases. In contrast to the reinforced material with hard inclusions, the mode-I SIF significantly increases when a void appears. For example, at the crack tip located near the hole (Figure 10 (c) and $a/W = 0.5$), the stress intensity factor increase by up to 30% compared to the homogeneous material.

### Table 4. The values of $K_I$ in different $a/W$ ratios and methods. The case of a single void.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$a/W = 0.2$</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (a)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.4635</td>
<td>11.4452</td>
<td>17.3346</td>
<td>25.8259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>7.0993</td>
<td>10.8535</td>
<td>16.1621</td>
<td>24.0358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>7.2328</td>
<td>11.1360</td>
<td>16.7080</td>
<td>25.0160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (b)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.0538</td>
<td>11.4693</td>
<td>18.6905</td>
<td>30.7334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>6.7151</td>
<td>10.8974</td>
<td>17.4691</td>
<td>28.6780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>6.8238</td>
<td>11.1360</td>
<td>18.0840</td>
<td>30.1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (c)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>6.3747</td>
<td>10.4669</td>
<td>17.2571</td>
<td>31.3872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>6.1393</td>
<td>10.1600</td>
<td>16.5910</td>
<td>30.8450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>6.1393</td>
<td>10.1600</td>
<td>16.5910</td>
<td>30.8450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (d)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.4512</td>
<td>11.4032</td>
<td>17.2619</td>
<td>25.7456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>7.1108</td>
<td>10.8451</td>
<td>16.1325</td>
<td>23.9991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>7.2066</td>
<td>11.0710</td>
<td>16.5990</td>
<td>24.8880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10 (e)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>8.1038</td>
<td>11.3110</td>
<td>16.2953</td>
<td>24.1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>7.6661</td>
<td>10.7208</td>
<td>15.2289</td>
<td>22.5092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>7.8747</td>
<td>10.9680</td>
<td>15.6280</td>
<td>23.2720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. A rectangular plate containing an edge crack and mixing inclusions and voids

![Figure 11](image) An edge crack plate with a single inclusion/void under tensile loading.
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This example examines a more complex problem where cracks, hard inclusion, and void are included. A rectangular plate containing an edge crack and mixing single hard inclusion and single void under tensile loading is shown in Figure 11. The plate dimension is 72 mm × 36 mm, various crack length ratio $a/W$ is considered. Material properties of the plate and inclusions are considered the same as the previous example. The position of void and inclusion is shown in Figure 11. For the XCQ4 and XQ4 models, the plate is discretized into 30×60 nodes, and for the FEM model used in ANSYS, the total number of nodes is around 8500 nodes (the Plane183 element is used).

Mode I- SIFs are determined by XCQ4 for various crack length ratios $a/W$ as shown in Table 5. It is observed from the table that $K_I$ increases by increasing crack length ratio ($a/W$) for all four cases under tensile loading, maximum $K_I$ is found in the mixing void and hard inclusion (case (b)); and minimum in two hard inclusions (case (a)). In addition, in the case where void and inclusion are on the right side of the plate (case (a)) when replacing inclusion with void (case (b)), the SIF changes significantly. While void and inclusion are on the left side of the plate (case (c) and (d)), this change is very small. This may be because the position of the void in case (b) (bottom) and in case (d) (top) is different.

Table 5. The values of $K_I$ in different $a/W$ ratios. The case of mixing inclusion and void.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$a/W=0.2$</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 11 (a)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.1330</td>
<td>10.4211</td>
<td>15.3572</td>
<td>22.9995</td>
<td>36.3425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>6.8905</td>
<td>10.0920</td>
<td>14.7130</td>
<td>22.1390</td>
<td>35.2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 11 (b)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>7.3640</td>
<td>11.1746</td>
<td>16.8367</td>
<td>25.1457</td>
<td>38.6504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>7.0282</td>
<td>10.6321</td>
<td>15.7459</td>
<td>23.4585</td>
<td>36.0711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>7.1222</td>
<td>10.8480</td>
<td>16.1840</td>
<td>24.2950</td>
<td>37.5710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 11 (c)</td>
<td>XCQ4</td>
<td>6.72784</td>
<td>10.5823</td>
<td>16.1493</td>
<td>24.2227</td>
<td>37.6082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XQ4</td>
<td>6.4143</td>
<td>10.0461</td>
<td>15.0720</td>
<td>22.5795</td>
<td>35.1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>6.5063</td>
<td>10.2190</td>
<td>15.4290</td>
<td>23.3100</td>
<td>36.4890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. A rectangular plate containing an edge crack and mixing two inclusions and two voids

In this example, a rectangular plate containing an edge crack with two inclusions and two voids is investigated (see Figure 12 (a)). The plate dimension is 72 mm × 36 mm. Material properties of the plate and inclusions are considered the same as the previous problems. The position of voids and inclusions is shown in Figure 12 (a). For the XCQ4 and XQ4 models, the plate is discretized into 30×60 nodes, and for the FEM model used in ANSYS, the total number of nodes is around 7600 nodes (the Plane183 element is used).

Table 6 shows the values of $K_I$ determined by XCQ4 for various crack length ratios $a/W$. It is observed that $K_I$ increase with the increase of the crack length ratio ($a/W$) for all cases under tensile loading. The obtained results are very good approximations to the results from the conventional finite element method and the extended finite element method.
3.5. Crack growth in the plate with different loads and defects

In this final example, crack propagation problems are investigated. The plate dimension is 72 mm × 36 mm and the crack length \( a = 10.8 \text{ mm} \) (\( a/W = 0.3 \)). For the propagation simulation, the crack is assumed to grow in every step. 10 steps of propagation are simulated, the crack growth increment for each step \( \Delta a = 2 \text{ mm} \). The material properties of the plate and inclusions are identical to the previous problems. For the XCQ4 model, the plate is discretized into 30×60 nodes.

First, the position of the circular voids and hard circular inclusions is considered in Figure 12. The rectangular plate is fixed at the bottom edge. Three different load cases applied on the top edge are examined: tensile load, shear load and the combination of tensile and shear load. The magnitude of the uniform distributed load \( \sigma = \tau = 1.1 \text{ N/mm}^2 \).

Figure 13 shows the crack growth paths of three different load cases. In the figure, the magenta circle denotes the boundary of the hard inclusions while the black circle represents the boundary of the voids. The crack path in the case of the tensile load is a horizontal line (Figure 13 (a)), this is similar to the case of the homogeneous plate subjected to tensile load. In the two other cases, with the appearance of the shear load, the crack tends to propagate at an incline angle to the bottom edge. However, there is also a slight difference that can be observed in the two crack lines of cases (b) and (c).
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Figure 13. Crack growth paths of three different load cases. (a) tensile load, (b) shear load and (c) combination of tensile and shear loads.

Figure 14. An edge crack plate with different positions of inclusions and voids compared to Figure 14. (a) tensile load, (b) shear load and (c) combination of tensile and shear loads.

Figure 15. Crack growth paths of: (a) tensile load, (b) shear load and (c) combination of tensile and shear.
In the second case to be considered, the positions of the voids and the hard inclusions are interchanged so that the effect of the relative positions of the defects on the crack growth path can be observed. Similar to the first case, three different load cases are examined: tensile load, shear load and the combination of tensile and shear load (see Figure 14). The rectangular plate is also fixed at the bottom edge.

Figure 15 shows the crack growth paths of three different load cases. Different from Figure 13 (a), the crack path in Figure 15 (a) of the tensile load case is slightly upward toward the above circular hole. Meanwhile, in the remaining two cases, the influence of shear force is still strong enough to pull the crack path downward. However, the initial propagation angle is less inclined than the case in Figure 13 (b) and (c), but at the final propagation simulation step this inclined angle suddenly increases. In addition, the crack path in Figure 15 (b) is slightly more inclined than that in Figure 15 (c).

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, the XCQ4 is extended from the CQ4 element and combined with the enrichment functions to model discontinuous boundaries such as cracks, voids, and hard inclusions for the first time. Through many numerical examples, the SIF results obtained by XCQ4 agree well with the analytical and reference results. XCQ4 is shown to have a smoother stress field compared to XFEM due to the continuous gradient computation. With the inherent properties of XFEM, the XCQ4 element is convenient for those discontinuous boundaries without the need of conforming meshing these boundaries. Furthermore, the XCQ4 approach provides better distributions of stress near the crack tip, which is rarely obtained by the standard Q4 elements. This is a promising method for further application to other complex engineering problems.

The example with hard inclusions shows that the mechanical properties have become better when mixing hard particles compared with homogeneous materials and highlights the outstanding advantages of composites. In contrast, the fracture behavior of the plate with voids near the crack is worse. For both cases of discontinuity, $K_I$ increases with the increase in crack length. The crack propagation simulation is also conducted. Different crack path predictions show the influence of the type of loads and the location of defects on the crack propagation path. The analysis provides valuable insights into predicting the structural strength of materials when designing structures containing different types of discontinuities.
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