

AIMS Materials Science, 4(1): xxx-xxx. DOI: 10.3934/matersci.2017.1.xxx Received: 23 October 2016 Accepted: 23 January 2017 Published:

6 http://www.aimspress.com/journal/Materials

8 Research article

7

9 Elastic-plastic defect interaction in (a)symmetrical double edge notched

10 tension specimens

11 Kaveh Samadian *, Stijn Hertelé, and Wim De Waele

Ghent University, Department of Electrical Energy, Metals, Mechanical Construction and Systems
 Soete Laboratory, Technologiepark 903, 9052 Zwijnaarde, Belgium

14 * **Correspondence:** Kaveh.Samadian@Ugent.be; Tel: +32-9331-04-80; Fax: +32-9331-04-90.

15 Abstract: Interaction of defects tends to intensify their crack driving force response compared to the situation where these defects act independently. The interaction between multiple defects is 16 addressed in engineering critical assessment standards like BS7910 and ASME B&PV Section XI. 17 Nonetheless, the accuracy of these rules is open to debate since all of them are based on 18 19 re-characterization procedures which in essence introduce conservativeness. The authors have developed a fully parametric finite element (FE) model able to generate multiple notches in different 20 21 topologies, in order to investigate their interaction effect. An experimental validation study is 22 conducted to verify the FE model in terms of CTOD response and surface strain distribution. To that end, symmetrically and asymmetrically double edge notched tension specimens are tensile tested and 23 their deformation monitored by means of 3D digital image correlation. In this study the CTOD is 24 opted as a local criterion to evaluate the interaction between notches. These results are compared 25 with an evaluation of strain patterns on a specimen's surface, as a global interaction evaluation. 26 Through this comparison a deeper understanding is gained to allow us to develop a novel approach to 27 address flaw interaction. Moreover, the validation of the FE model allows future studies of 28 interaction between other defect types (e.g., semi-elliptical, surface breaking) in plate-like 29 geometries. 30

27

31 **Keywords:** CTOD; interaction; elastic-plastic fracture mechanics; DENT; DIC

32

33 1. Introduction

34 Where two or more adjacent defects are observed in engineering structures such as pressure

vessels or pipelines, an evaluation of their interaction is part of the integrity analysis. Under the influence of an applied load, a small (and acceptable) defect can grow and coalesce with a closely distanced adjacent defect. The interaction between defects in case of stress corrosion cracking, fatigue and severe plastic loading plays a dominant role in fracture behavior [1–4]. It should be taken into consideration that defects may occur in different locations with different shapes, and not necessarily in the same plane. Therefore, a sound identification of defect interaction is far from straightforward.

Defects in thin-walled structures can be categorized as embedded, surface-breaking and 42 through-thickness. Even though various standards and guidelines are slightly different in addressing 43 the adjacent flaws, in general the following steps are considered to assess multiple defects. Defects in 44 different cross sections are checked with alignment and re-characterization criteria. Alignment rules 45 are a set of procedures to convert multiple non co-planar defects into co-planar defects. 46 47 Re-characterization rules convert an embedded defect into a surface defect which is more amenable to analysis. Subsequently, co-planar defects are checked using defect interaction criteria, and if 48 satisfied the defects are combined into a single virtual defect. These interaction criteria can be related 49 to defect length, defect depth and spacing between the defects. It is not necessary to consider further 50 51 interaction of a combined defect with neighboring defects. This assessment approach has been included in codes and standards such as references [5–8]. Although the majority of these documents 52 have been updated in the last decade to address the issue more accurately, some shortcomings are 53 still observed which may result in overly conservative and in some cases non-conservative 54 assessments [9]. 55

Recently there have been some specific studies regarding the interaction of non-aligned defects. 56 Hasegawa et al. [10] studied alignment rules in stainless steel pipes with multiple non-aligned flaws 57 through series of experiments. It was shown that applying the alignment rules based on the 58 proportion of flaw length, as in most Fitness-For-Service codes, gives a conservative assessment. 59 Kamaya et al. [3,11,12] studied the growth behavior of multiple surface cracks under static and 60 fatigue loads with numerical and experimental methods. While early studies focused on Stress 61 Intensity Factor (SIF), in their recent studies Hasegawa et al. [13] Suga et al. [14,15], 62 63 Iwamatsu et al. [16,17] and Miyazaki et al. [18] studied numerically and experimentally the plastic 64 collapse behavior in multi-flawed specimens in quasi static bending tests.

J-integral and crack tip opening displacement (CTOD) have been suggested to evaluate the 65 fracture behavior of ductile material [19]. Nonetheless, few researchers used either CTOD or 66 J-integral to evaluate defect interaction. Chang and Kotousov [20] studied the relation of plastic zone 67 size and CTOD for two collinear cracks analytically. Zhang et al. [21] studied fracture response of a 68 pipeline containing two coplanar defects subject to axial straining and internal pressure using 69 CTOD-strain diagrams through 3D finite element simulations. De Waele et al. [22] and De Waele [23] 70 studied flaw interaction behavior for ductile material and highlighted the inconsistency and over 71 conservativism of codes in assessing flaw interaction. They proposed a new criterion based on defect 72 length limit ensuring remote yielding which allows less conservative assessments. Tang et al. [4] 73 proposed a novel flaw interaction rule for pipelines in a strain based design context using the CTOD 74 as a crack driving force measure. They studied the effect of defect interaction on pipe tensile capacity 75 76 through both numerical and experimental testing.

While the Fitness-For-Service codes were developed based on linear elastic fracture mechanics(LEFM) there are few researches that study flaw interaction considering elastic-plastic behavior

3

through both numerical and experimental studies. Flaw interaction can be evaluated in different ways; 79 there is an obvious effect on the local response at the defect tip (e.g., crack driving force) which is 80 used in most of the present FFS guidelines. Further, flaw interaction may be reflected in the global 81 deformation behavior of the component. The objective of this study is to verify the applicability of 82 local and global behavior studies for interaction through both numerical and experimental analysis in 83 84 an elastic-plastic framework. With this fundamental perspective in mind, the present work focuses on the effect of out-of-plane distance between notches in symmetrically Double Edge Notched Tensile 85 (DENT) specimens. Experimental tests are supported by full-field strain measurements aiming to 86 visualize the global deformation behavior. The experiments were designed to gain a basic 87 understanding of strain patterns between the adjacent flaws as well as to measure the crack mouth 88 opening displacement (CMOD) and CTOD locally at each notch. The test results are used to validate 89 a generic finite element model, which has a higher potential to perform parametric studies. Different 90 91 methods are explored to evaluate defect interaction.

92 2. Materials and Method

93 2.1. Specimens and Material

In this work, three specimens having a cross section of 30 mm by 15 mm have been tested, each 94 having different notch out-of-plane distances S while having the same notch depth, Figure 1. The 95 notch distances are 0 mm (symmetrical DENT), 30 mm and 45 mm (asymmetrical DENT). The 96 notches were applied by fine saw-cutting, producing an initial notch tip radius equal to 0.075 mm. 97 Fatigue pre-cracking is not applied since this may complicate the control of the initial crack depth 98 99 and according to previous studies this is not required in materials with sufficient ductility [24,25]. In single edge notched tensile (SENT) test procedures 10W is typically suggested for minimum daylight 100 length, while in DENT specimens an out-of-plane distance between the flaws should be considered. 101 102 Therefore, to have a constant length in all specimens, 14W is selected for daylight length. Table 1 shows an overview of the specimens' dimensions. The specimens have been extracted from API-5L 103 X70 pipeline steel. The specimens are oriented in the L-T direction with respect to the pipe axis 104 (refer to ASTM 1823 [26]). The material 0.2% proof stress is 479 MPa, its tensile strength is 105 625 MPa and its uniform elongation is equal to 8.0% (as measured using full-thickness prismatic 106 specimens oriented longitudinally to the DENT specimen). 107



108



Figure 1. Schematic view of an asymmetrical DENT test specimen.

Specimen	Width	Thickness	Total	Daylight	Out-of-plane	Notch No.1	Notch No.2
	(2W)	(B)	length (L)	length (H)	notch Distance (S)	depth (a ₁)	depth (a ₂)
DENT0	30 mm	15 mm	300 mm	210 mm	0 mm	6 mm	6 mm
DENT30	30 mm	15 mm	300 mm	210 mm	30 mm	6 mm	6 mm
DENT45	30 mm	15 mm	300 mm	210 mm	45 mm	6 mm	6 mm

 Table 1. Specimens' dimensions.

111 2.2. Test Procedure

The specimens were clamped using hydraulic grips and loaded in constant displacement rate mode (0.02 mm/sec). The DENT tests were conducted beyond the maximum force in the load-displacement curve and, in order to reach to a sufficient crack extension, till the force dropped back to 80% of its maximum.

In an attempt to capture full field surface deformation and strain during the test, all specimenswere analyzed by means of 3D digital image correlation (DIC).

Pictures were obtained from a system provided by Limess Messtechnic & Software GmbH consisting of two synchronized monochromatic 14 bit cameras with a resolution of 2452 by 2054 pixels (5 Megapixels), and analyzed using the VIC3D software (version 7.2.4) supplied by Correlated Solutions Inc. To facilitate accurate DIC analyses, a layer of thin white elastic paint was applied to the frontal surface shown in Figure 1, and subsequently covered with a random pattern of black speckles. The procedure was optimized to obtain high-contrast speckles with a rough size of 3 by 3 pixels, as advised by [27].

Figure 2a shows the clamped symmetrical DENT specimen with speckle pattern and clip gauge, the DIC setup is schematically shown in Figure 2b.



127

Figure 2. a) Clip gauge position in symmetrical DENT specimen. b) Schematic of the clip gauges and DIC setup.

130 **3. Finite Element Procedure**

In an attempt to investigate stress-strain distributions and local behavior of interacting defects, a
 model containing two through thickness edge notches has been developed by using the finite element

software package ABAQUS[®] version 6.13. In this section, the structure of this model is described. 133 The finite element model is tailored to use an in-house developed full parametric Python script in 134 order to generate various geometries defined by their length (H), width (2W) and thickness (B)135 containing two (or more) notches characterized by their depth to half width ratio (a/W). The notch 136 tips are initially blunted as a previous study showed that notches with 0.075 mm radius (similar to 137 138 the experimental procedure) behave similar to infinitely sharp cracks upon the development of considerable plasticity (i.e., blunting) in ductile material [24]. To comply with the clamped boundary 139 conditions of DENT tests, the modeled specimen is connected to two rigid bodies at both ends. One 140 end is fixed, and the other is translated under displacement control (rotation is restricted). The 141 specimen cross section is 2WB and daylight grip length L equal to 14W. An example view of the 142 model showing a configuration with two asymmetrical notches, as particularly considered for this 143 study, is shown in Figure 3a. 144

Using a parametric Python scripting framework, regular spider web meshes consisting of 145 eight-node linear brick elements with reduced integration scheme (ABAQUS[®] type C3D8R) are 146 generated in the vicinity of the notch tips. The half circle representing a notch tip consists of 40 147 elements each having a radial dimension equal to 5.8 µm (around 8% of the notch radius). Multiple 148 flaws in various locations can be simulated and in total the models contain between 62000 and 64000 149 elements. A mesh convergence study assured a satisfactory numerical accuracy within acceptable 150 computational time. The model is simulated with symmetric boundary conditions in thickness 151 direction for the sake of computational effort and time. In addition, with the aim to obtain realistic 152 deformation patterns in the specimen (including localized necking), a finite strain deformation has 153 been used for all the simulations by applying the NLGEOM option which considers the effect of 154 geometrical non-linearity due to large deformation [28,29]. The stress-strain behavior of the material 155 was implemented on a table with experimentally determined data pairs of stress and the 156 corresponding strain, Figure 3b shows this stress-strain curve. An incremental J2 plasticity scheme is 157 also used which adopts isotropic hardening and the von Mises yield criterion. 158



159

161

Figure 3. a) Finite Element model, b) Experimentally determined stress-strain curve 160 which is used for material properties in FE model.

For modelling the notch, the stationary crack approach is opted in this study. In this approach, 162 ductile tearing is not implemented and the simulated cracks simply blunt out. Therefore, the FE 163 model validity is up to the crack initiation which is assumed to start when maximum force is reached. 164

As a consequence, the agreement between experimental results and model predictions is expected to vanish beyond the point of stable crack initiation. The main output of the FE model is CTOD, which is obtained through calculation of node displacements around the notch tip and reported as a function of remote stress level.

169 **4. Results**

170 4.1. DIC Verification

In the present study, the CTOD value is used as the main criterion to evaluate interaction as well as verifying the FE model. The CTOD value is measured based on the $\delta 5$ definition introduced by GKSS [30] and DIC data are used to extract the displacements around the notch tip according to this definition. In order to verify the DIC measurements, crack opening displacement (COD) has been evaluated since this parameter can be directly measured with clip gauges.

Clip gauges are mounted on two knifes with 2 mm height above the specimen's edges, whereas 176 the measurable zone for DIC starts around 1 mm away from the specimen edge. Assuming straight 177 notch flanks, two lines at both sides of the notch starting at 4 mm below the edge and ending at 1 mm 178 below the edge (the boundary of measurable zone) are assumed; subsequently, the lines are 179 extrapolated for another 3 mm till the top of the knifes (two dashed red lines in Figure 4). Then 180 assuming that triangles A and B in Figure 4 are equal, U_{+2} (representing COD) can be calculated 181 according to equation 1 and this value is compared with clip gauges' readings. Using the same 182 principles and basic trigonometry, CMOD could be calculated based on the same principles as well 183 (equation 2). 184



185

186

Figure 4. Geometrical assumption used for COD calculation based on DIC measurements.

$$\text{COD} = U_{+2} = 2 \times U_{-1} - U_{-4} \tag{1}$$

CMOD =
$$\frac{4 \times U_{-1} - U_{-4}}{3}$$
 (2)

Figure 5 shows the comparison of U_{+2} calculated based on equation 1 using DIC measurements and the same value measured directly by clip gauges for all specimens. DENT30 and DENT45 shown an almost perfect 1:1 agreement over the entire measurement range. However, In DENT0 a

divergence is noted between both methods with increasing U_{+2} . The same trend was observed in 190 CMOD by Weeks et al. in SENT specimen [31]. This slightly diverging error in DENTO with 191 increasing CMOD can be explained by possible effects of plastic strains around the notches which 192 affect the obtained displacements through DIC (i.e. U₋₁ and U₋₄). 193



195

Figure 5. Plot of clip gauge measured COD vs. COD from DIC: a) DENT0, b) DENT30, 196 c) DENT45. 197

198 4.2. FEM Verification and Analysis

The FE modelling approach needs experimental validation. In this study, the CTOD versus 199 remote stress (load divided by un-notched cross section) response has been opted to verify the model. 200 CTOD and remote stress were chosen because they are unaffected by the compliance of the universal 201 test rig and because both are relevant with respect to a fracture mechanics analysis. Figure 6 shows 202 comparisons between experimental results of CTOD (measured as $\delta 5$ by DIC) versus remote stress 203 204 with stress normalized against yield strength. The developed model uses a stationary crack approach 205 (i.e., crack growth is not accounted for). Therefore, upon ductile crack initiation, the normalized stress in experimental graphs dropped after maximum load point and therefore, since the model is not 206 valid after crack initiation, FEM graphs are stopped that point. As apparent from Figure 6, in all 207

experimental specimens, one flaw eventually opens as reflected in its dominating CTOD. The
satisfactory agreement reported in Figure 5 for initial yielding (i.e., prior to ductile tearing) is
accepted as a first verification of the finite element model.



211







The fracture responses are represented by the CTOD values gained from FE models at 216 normalized remote stress levels from 0.8 to 1.0. The upper graph in Figure 7 ($\sigma/\sigma_v = 1$) is plotted for 217 simulations with out-of-plane distance of 20 mm and more since, for the other configurations, early 218 necking prevented remote normalized stress to reach unity. This graph demonstrates the effect of 219 out-of-plane notch distance on CTOD while the flaw's depth and shape were kept constant. It is 220 assumed that when the CTOD value becomes significantly greater than a reference value there is an 221 interaction. The CTOD of a single edge notched tension specimen with identical thickness, width and 222 the crack depth is assumed as the reference value in this paper. A 10% increase in CTOD is assumed 223 as significant, hence, the critical line corresponds to 110% of the CTOD value of the single edge 224 notched specimen. A similar difference was concluded as a threshold to detect interaction between 225 non-planar flaws in previous research using J-integral [9], and since J and CTOD can be converted to 226 each other, the same threshold is applied in this paper. 227

In Figure 7, the measured CTOD for DENT30 and DENT45 experiments are also reported at four normalized stress levels from 0.8 to 1.0. For DENT0, the experimental CTOD is only reported at normalized stress from 0.80 to 0.95 since this normalized stress value did not reach unity during the experiment.





233

Figure 7. CTOD versus out-of-plane notch distance.

234 *4.3. Strain Patterns*

Notch interaction is not only studied through their local behavior (i.e., CTOD), but also through their global behavior as reflected in the strain patterns. Fagerholt et al. [32] used the effective strain concept, equation 3, to assess the strain patterns. The same procedure is applied in this study.

$$\varepsilon_{eff} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}(\varepsilon_1^2 + \varepsilon_2^2 + \varepsilon_3^2)} = \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}(\varepsilon_1^2 + \varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_2^2)}$$
(3)

where ε_1 , ε_2 , ε_3 are principal logarithmic strains. The second equality is obtained by assuming incompressibility, for which the out-of-plane strain $\varepsilon_3 = -(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2)$. The principal strains ε_1 and ε_2 are obtained by DIC.

In Figure 8, the effective strain patterns of the three specimens are shown at three different stages during the test: 1. at an early stage when the pattern starts to appear, 2. when the maximum force is reached, 3. at the end of the test, when force dropped back to 80% of the maximum load.



244

Figure 8. Effective strain pattern graphs: a) DENT0, b) DENT30, c) DENT45. 1) At the early stages of the test, 2) When maximum force is reached, 3) When the force dropped to 80% of its maximum.

In Figure 8, it can be observed that in DENT0 from the onset of loading symmetrical strain patterns were generated around both notches and this continued till the end of loading. As expected both notches have almost equal surrounding strain patterns. In DENT30, the strain patterns clearly tended to interact from the beginning which resulted in non-symmetrical strain pattern development. Crack growth of notch II was observed towards notch I. In DENT45 interaction between strain

patterns did not occur from the beginning and patterns developed quite separately. Notch II did not 253 grow towards notch I; considering symmetrical strain patterns around both notches the orientation of 254 crack extension is expected to be arbitrary. A horizontal path was defined at mid-width of the 255 specimen (as illustrated in Figure 8), along which effective strain evolutions were assessed (Figure 9). 256 The horizontal axis shows the distance along the midline path. The vertical axis shows the effective 257 258 strain and graphs are plotted for different remote strain values during the test. The FE results in Figure 9 are reported at a normalized remote stress (σ/σ_y) equal to 1. While different gray values 259 demonstrate various stages of the test (darker corresponding with more applied deformation), the 260 effective strain pattern at remote normalized stress equal to 1 is highlighted (with the cross marks) in 261 order to compare the experimental results with FE results as well as to emphasize the differences in 262 the patterns before and after the approximate crack growth initiation. 263



264

265



Figure 9. Strain pattern graphs: a) DENT30, b) DENT45.

267 **5. Discussion**

AIMS Materials Science

The study of CTOD (Figure 7), representative of local behavior at notch tip, reveals that for 268 distances closer than a critical value notches clearly open more than is the case for a single notch. 269 When the notches are far enough from each other they behave almost similar as an individual notch. 270 The evaluation of CTOD in the interaction zone is represented by a peak (Figure 7). This means that 271 when two identical notches are interacting, the distance between them is not the only parameter 272 defining their local behavior. However, these results need to be interpreted with caution because the 273 proposed magnitude of CTOD may not describe the interaction behavior completely. The trend of 274 CTOD before the peak point for closely located notches can be justified considering the crack tip 275 constraint. Symmetrical DENT, here known as DENTO, is a well-known example of high crack tip 276 constraint. Thus, the constraint enhances stress triaxiality which consequently delays yielding. 277 Therefore, at the point where normalized stress becomes equal to 0.95, the CTOD values of DENTO 278 and DENT5 are lower than for the other specimens, although the notches are extensively interacting. 279 280 Increasing the out-of-plane distance to 10 mm, the constraint effect reduces since the notch tips are further distanced. This explains why in DENT15 a peak appears in CTOD value, the interaction 281 between adjacent notches becomes the dominant factor when the constraint effect is negligible. 282

The symmetrical DENT specimen is not a typical configuration to be considered in flaw 283 interaction criteria. Nonetheless, ASME B&PV XI alignment criteria for non-planar flaws can be 284 compared with the results of DENT simulation. According to ASME, non-planar flaws located in two 285 planes with distance less than 12.5 millimeters should be aligned in the same plane. Therefore, in the 286 present study when the out-of-plane distance of notches becomes less than 12.5 mm interaction 287 presence should be checked and for the notches located beyond this distance ASME does not expect 288 any interaction. Although the 12.5 mm borderline seems non-conservative in comparison to the 289 results illustrated in Figure 7, the conclusion should be made with caution since DENT geometry is 290 not a conventional geometry for codes like ASME B&PV XI. Thus, further studies are required to 291 make a better judgment about the ASME (and other FFS codes) alignment criteria for this type of 292 geometry. 293

The effective strain patterns illustrated in Figure 8 show that the interaction not only can be 294 identified by local behavior (i.e., CTOD) but also can be observed in global behavior around the 295 flaws. Referring to Figure 7, interaction is assumed for less than 35 mm distance between two flaws. 296 297 As highlighted in Figure 8, there are considerable differences in strain patterns between the DENT30 (which is inside the interaction zone) and DENT45 (which is outside the interaction zone) specimens. 298 The same differences are apparent in Figure 9, where for DENT45 (subfigure b) the effective strain 299 evolutions around both notches are independent and almost equal (till maximum load). From this 300 301 point on a crack may start to grow which makes the strain pattern asymmetric. The strain evolution in the region between both notches remains unaffected by the notch deformations. It can therefore be 302 assumed that the notches do not interact. Figure 9b shows that, although the FE model tends to over 303 predict the strains in the vicinity of notch tips, the general trend of strains can be reasonably 304 predicted by the model. For DENT30 (Figure 9a) strain concentration appears in between the two 305 notches from the beginning of the test. This reveals that both notches are interacting. Beyond 306 maximum load the strain concentration is most pronounced around one of the notches. However, the 307 308 effective strain in between both notches is also further increasing. This clearly demonstrates that both 309 notches are indeed interacting. The FE result in Figure 9a also shows higher strains in comparison to the experiment, and since the notches are closer to each other in DENT30 compared to DENT45, 310

higher strains around the notches superimpose with each other. Nonetheless, the same conclusion fordetermining the interaction can be derived by applying either experimental or FE results.

Although the approaches illustrated by Figure 7 (local approach based on CTOD) and Figure 9 (global approach based on effective strain evolution) are different in essence, they lead to a similar evaluation of notch interaction.

316 6. Conclusion

In this paper, a generic fully parametric FE model is introduced to simulate the notch interaction in (a)symmetric double edged notched specimens. The model is successfully verified through a series of full-field strain analyses and clip gauge measurements. The following is concluded:

- DIC as a full-field optical strain measurement method is applied adequately in assessing the
 crack opening displacement and deformation around the notches in (a)symmetrical DENT
 specimens.
- Although CTOD is a useful parameter to identify the interaction behavior in DENT geometry, the
 crack tip constraint also affects the local behavior for distinct distances. This aspect of defect
 interaction requires further investigation.
- Global deformation around the notches obtained through DIC measurements can also be applied
 to study the interaction. Results show that the same conclusion can be drawn by applying either a
 quantitative criterion based on CTOD or a qualitative study using effective strain patterns.
- More efforts are required to quantify the effect of different factors on interaction with the aim to develop a better understanding in terms of local and global behavior.

331 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial supports from Ghent University through grant number BOF13/24J/122.

334 **Conflict of Interest**

All authors declare no conflicts of interest in this paper.

336 **References**

- Kamaya M, Haruna T (2006) Crack initiation model for sensitized 304 stainless steel in high temperature water. *Corros Sci* 48: 2442–2456.
- Yan X (2006) Multiple crack fatigue growth modeling by displacement discontinuity method
 with crack-tip elements. *Appl Math Model* 30: 489–508.
- 341 3. Kamaya M (2008) Growth evaluation of multiple interacting surface cracks. Part II: Growth
 avaluation of parallel cracks. *Eng Fract Mech* 75: 1350–1366.
- Tang H, Fairchild DP, Cheng W, et al. (2014) Development of Surface Flaw Interaction Rules for
 Strain-Based Pipelines. The Twenty-fourth International Ocean and Polar Engineering
 Conference, 3: 476–486.
- 5. American Petroleum Insititute (2013) API Standard 1104: Welding of Pipelines and Related

- 347 Facilities.
- American Petroleum Institute (2007) API-579-1/ASME FFS-1: Recommended practice for
 fitness-for-service.
- 350 7. British Standards Institute (2015) BS7910:2013+A1:2015: Guide to methods for assessing the
 acceptability of flaws in metallic structures.
- American Society of Mechanical Engineers (2010) ASME Boiler and Pressure vessel Code XI:
 Rules for Inservice Inspection of Nuclear Power Plant Components.
- Kamaya M (2006) Flaw Proximity Rules for Parallel Surface Cracks Based on Elastic,
 Elastic-Plastic Fracture Mechanics and Limit Load Analyses. ASME 2006 Pressure Vessels and
 Piping/ICPVT-11 Conference, 1–8.
- 10. Hasegawa K, Miyazaki K, Saito K, et al. (2009) Evaluation of alignement rules using stainless
 steel pipes with non-aligned flaws. ASME 2009 Pressure Vessels and Piping Conference, 1–8.
- 11. Kamaya M (2003) A Crack Growth Evaluation Method for Interacting Multiple Cracks. *JSME Int J Series A* 46: 15–23.
- 12. Kamaya M, Masanori Kikuchi EM (2009) Growth Behavior of Two Interacting Surface Cracks
 of Dissimilar Size. ASME 2009 Pressure Vessels and Piping Conference, 1–5.
- 13. Hasegawa K, Miyazaki K, Saito K (2010) Behavior of plastic collapse moments for pipes with
 two non-aligned flaws. ASME 2010 Pressure Vessels and Piping Division/K-PVP Conference,
 1–7.
- 14. Suga K, Miyazaki K, Kawasaki S, et al. (2011) Study On Interaction of Multiple Flaws in Ductile
 Fracture Process. ASME 2011 Pressure Vessels and Piping Conference.
- Suga K, Miyazaki K, Senda R, et al. (2012) Interaction Efect Evaluation of Plural Surface Cracks
 in Ductile fracture Process. ASME 2012 Pressure Vessels and Piping Conference, 1–6.
- Iwamatsu F, Miyazaki K, Saito K, et al. (2009) Experimental Estimation of Fully Plastic Collapse
 Stresses for Pipes with Three Circumferential Flaws Fuminori. ASME 2009 Pressure Vessels and
 Piping Conference, 1–5.
- 17. Iwamatsu F, Miyazaki K, Takazawa H, et al. (2013) Evaluation Procedure of Limit Load for
 Non-aligned Multiple Flaws. ASME 2013 Pressure Vessels and Piping Conference, 1–6.
- 18. Miyazaki K (2011) Effect of flaw dimensions on ductile fracture behavior of non-aligned
 multiple flaws in a plate. ASME 2011 Pressure Vessels and Piping Conference.
- 19. Hutchinson JW (1983) Fundamentals of the Phenomenological Theory of Nonlinear Fracture
 Mechanics. *J Appl Mech* 50: 1042.
- 20. Chang D, Kotousov A (2012) A strip yield model for two collinear cracks in plates of arbitrary
 thickness. *Int J Fract* 176: 39–47.
- 21. Zhang YM, Ariffin MZ, Xiao ZM, et al. (2015) Nonlinear elastic-plastic stress investigation for
 two interacting 3-D cracks in offshore pipelines. *Fatigue Fract Eng M* 38: 540–550.
- 22. De Waele W, Denys Rudi, Lefevre A (2006) Development of defect interaction criteria for
 pipeline girth welds subjected to plastic collapese conditions. ASME 2006 Pressure Vessels and
 Piping/ICPVT-11 Conference.
- 23. De Waele W (2005) The Interaction of Weld Defects under Plastic Collapse. *Mater Sci Forum* 475: 2735–2738.
- 24. Verstraete MA, Hertelé S, Denys RM, et al. (2014) Evaluation and interpretation of ductile crack
 extension in SENT specimens using unloading compliance technique. *Eng Fract Mech* 115:
 190–203.

- 25. Exxonmobil (2010) Measurement of Crack-Tip Opening Displacement (CTOD) Fracture 391 Resistance Curves Using Single-Edge Notched Tension (SENT) Specimens. 392
- 26. ASTM International (2003) ASTM E1823-96:Standard Terminology Relating to Fatigue and 393 Fracture Testing. 394
- 27. Sutton MA, Deng X, Ma F, et al. (2000) Development and application of a crack tip opening 395 396 displacement-based mixed mode fracture criterion. Int J Solids Struct 37: 3591–3618.
- 28. Kim NH (2015) Introduction to Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis, New York: Springer. 397
- 29. Abaqus Documentation 6.13 (2013) Dassault Systèmes Simulia Corp., Providence, RI, USA. 398
- 30. Schwalbe K-H, Heerens J, Zerbst U, Pisarski H, Koçak M. GKSS test procedure for determining 399 the fracture behaviour of materials (GKSS 2002/24). Geesthacht: GKSS- Forschungszentrum 400 Geesthacht GmbH: 2002. 401
- 31. Weeks TS, Sowards JW, Rentz RA, et al. (2016) Comparison of J-intergal Measurment Method 402 403 on Clamped Single-Edge Notched Tension Specimens. 2016 11th International Pipeline Conference, 1–11. 404
- 32. Fagerholt E, Østby E, Børvik T, et al. (2012) Investigation of fracture in small-scale SENT tests 405
- of a welded X80 pipeline steel using Digital Image Correlation with node splitting. Eng Fract 406
- 407 Mech 96: 276-293.

408

409

410



© 2017 Kaveh Samadian, et al., licensee AIMS Press. This is an open AIMS Press access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0)