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Summary

Crack propagation data are available for two different particulate composite materials. A larger set of 38 observations is used to draw statistical inference for the second set consisting of 5 data. The Paris crack propagation relation, whose two parameters are functionally related, is used.

Introduction

Two sets of data, on particulate composite materials containing hard particles in a rubbery matrix, have been examined; one consisting of 38 observations and a smaller one of 5 observations. It is desired to obtain statistical inference for the smaller data set, including confidence limits, with the aid of the larger group of observations. It has been postulated that the rate of crack-propagation follows the Paris relationship and that the two parameters of this rule are functionally related. It has also been indicated that the parameters are normally and normally distributed. The two materials designated as MM for the larger set and MX for the smaller, though different, have similar characteristics. Furthermore, MM was tested at a cross-head speed of 0.1 in/min and MX at 0.2 in/min.

According to the Paris rule, the rate of crack propagation

$$\frac{da}{dt} = C_1 K_f^2 = \dot{a}$$

(1)

where $C_1$ and $C_2$ are correlated parameters and $K_f$ is the stress intensity factor in psi $\sqrt{in}$.

Taking logarithms of both sides

$$\log \dot{a} = \log C_1 + C_2 \log K_f$$

(2)

log $C_1$ as well as $C_2$ are assumed to be normally distributed random variables ($C_1$ is consequently log normally distributed).

As a result, log $\dot{a}$, the sum of two normally distributed variables, is also normal with a mean of

$$\log \dot{a} = \log C_1 + C_2 \log K_f$$

(3)

and standard deviation

$$\sigma_{log \dot{a}} = [\sigma_{log C_1}^2 + \log^2 K_f \sigma_{C_2}^2]^{1/2}$$

(4)

The relationship between log $C_1$ and $C_2$ is linear

$$\log C_1 = A - BC_2$$

(5)
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or in terms of standardized variables

\[
\frac{(C_2 - \bar{C}_2)}{\sigma_{C_2}} = \frac{-\log C_1 - \log \bar{C}_1}{\sigma \log C_1}
\]

(6)

that is

\[
\log C_1 = \frac{\sigma \log C_1}{\sigma_{C_2}} (C_2 - \bar{C}_2) + \log \bar{C}_1
\]

(7)

Substituting Eq. 7 into Eq. 2

\[
\log \hat{a} = C_2 \left( \log K_f = \frac{\sigma \log C_1}{\sigma_{C_2}} \right) + \frac{\sigma \log C_1}{\sigma_{C_2}} \bar{C}_2 + \log \bar{C}_1
\]

(8)

is obtained. Therefore, the variance

\[
\sigma_{\log \hat{a}}^2 = \left[ \sigma \log C_1 \log K_f - \sigma \log C_1 \right]^2
\]

(9)

### Data Analysis

The two sets of data: 38 observations of \(\log C_1\) and \(C_2\) for \(MM\), at a cross-head speed of 0.1 in/min and 5 observations for \(MX\), at a cross-head speed of 0.2 in/min are listed in Table 9, together with their sample means and sample standard deviations. The crack propagation rates, \(\log \hat{a}\) for \(K_f = 40\) psi \(\sqrt{\text{in}}\) are also listed in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test No.</th>
<th>(C_2)</th>
<th>(\log C_1)</th>
<th>(\log \hat{a})</th>
<th>Test No.</th>
<th>(C_2)</th>
<th>(\log C_1)</th>
<th>(\log \hat{a})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.42161</td>
<td>-8.91899</td>
<td>-5.03856</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1.527031</td>
<td>-5.86331</td>
<td>-3.41701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.76573</td>
<td>-6.7678</td>
<td>-3.93244</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.627629</td>
<td>-6.91217</td>
<td>-3.98331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.507719</td>
<td>-6.85865</td>
<td>-3.4449</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.608371</td>
<td>-6.17429</td>
<td>-3.59736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.563305</td>
<td>-6.90666</td>
<td>-3.59224</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.094406</td>
<td>-7.88458</td>
<td>-4.52035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.229644</td>
<td>-8.55145</td>
<td>-4.82417</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.381992</td>
<td>-5.43623</td>
<td>-3.22227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.718226</td>
<td>-6.53545</td>
<td>-3.78085</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.273468</td>
<td>-5.06151</td>
<td>-3.02123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.829256</td>
<td>-7.08562</td>
<td>-4.08712</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.019887</td>
<td>-7.35751</td>
<td>-4.36059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>2.319284</td>
<td>-8.21514</td>
<td>-4.67068</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.944194</td>
<td>-7.29269</td>
<td>-4.17809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.853258</td>
<td>-7.15843</td>
<td>-4.13824</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2.516103</td>
<td>-9.19896</td>
<td>-5.16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.286922</td>
<td>-8.46155</td>
<td>-4.79797</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.994757</td>
<td>-7.45045</td>
<td>-4.25485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.961836</td>
<td>-7.40714</td>
<td>-5.80444</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.735048</td>
<td>-6.99552</td>
<td>-4.21597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.758835</td>
<td>-6.6976</td>
<td>-3.87695</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.349725</td>
<td>-8.50174</td>
<td>-4.22748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.337755</td>
<td>-8.72234</td>
<td>-4.84362</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.845756</td>
<td>-6.99665</td>
<td>-4.07457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.403963</td>
<td>-5.53812</td>
<td>-3.28897</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.365129</td>
<td>1.214061</td>
<td>0.70221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.208551</td>
<td>-8.19052</td>
<td>-4.65735</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.981772</td>
<td>-7.43898</td>
<td>-4.26416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.981772</td>
<td>-7.43898</td>
<td>-4.26416</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.645804</td>
<td>-6.34225</td>
<td>-3.70568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.289029</td>
<td>-8.3731</td>
<td>-4.75414</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.22662</td>
<td>-4.96587</td>
<td>-2.78900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.867377</td>
<td>-7.0906</td>
<td>-4.10452</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.7753</td>
<td>-7.359</td>
<td>-2.91345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.150759</td>
<td>-4.6236</td>
<td>-2.77048</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.461</td>
<td>-10.724</td>
<td>-3.36364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.961672</td>
<td>-7.344</td>
<td>-4.20992</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.6438</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-3.26043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.551135</td>
<td>-6.02706</td>
<td>-3.54124</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.786049</td>
<td>1.557153</td>
<td>0.29832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data of $C_2$ vs. $\log C_1$, are plotted for the two materials, $MM$ and $MX$, in Fig. 1 and indicate the validity of linear relationships with correlation coefficients of $\rho = -0.99836$ and $-0.99994$, respectively.

![Graph a](image1)
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Fig. 1. Log $C_1$ vs. $C_2$ for a) MM and b) MX

It is seen that the range of values are quite different. For $MM$, $C_2$ varies between 1.16 and 2.52 with corresponding $\log C_1$ values of -4.6 and -9.2. For $MX$, $C_2$ varies from 2.8 to 4.46 with $\log C_1$ from -7.55 to -10.72.

The differences are attributable to the two different materials rather than to the changed cross-head speeds. Though the cross-head speed for $MX$ is double that for $MM$, the mode of cracking is similar. It is expected that only at much greater cross-head speeds would cracking change to a brittle fracture.

Utilizing Eqs. 3 and 4, $\log \dot{a}$ has been calculated for each datum for a stress-intensity factor of $K_I = 40$ psi$\sqrt{in}$ (Table 1).

The data were plotted on normal probability paper in Fig. 2. Though all datum points fit the normal distribution reasonably well, all $MX$ values are higher than $\log \dot{a}$ for $MM$.

In order to eliminate the influence of the material differences, the $\log \dot{a}$ values were standardized using the appropriate means and standard deviations for each material (Table 1). The data were then arranged in increasing order and were plotted on normal probability paper (Fig. 3).

It is apparent that, in this standardized form, both sets are essentially normally distributed and that they belong to the same population, the $MX$ data are interspersed with $MM$ values.
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Fig. 2. Normal probability plot of $\log \hat{a}$ for the two materials

Fig. 3. Normal probability plot of standardized $\log \hat{a}$ for the two materials
Confidence Limits

Confidence limits may be established for the normally distributed data. The meaning of such limits is that the true population mean will lie between these limits with a given probability \((1 - \alpha)\). The width of the confidence interval is a function of the number of observations, \(n\). The greater the value of \(n\), the narrower the confidence band.

For small numbers of observations, confidence intervals are based on Student's \(t\) distribution [1]. For a variable \(X\), with sample mean, \(\bar{X}\), and standard deviation, \(S\), the population mean \(\mu_{1-\alpha}\) will lie between the following confidence limits

\[
[(\bar{X} - t_{\alpha/2}, n - 1 S/\sqrt{n}) < \mu_{1-\alpha} < (\bar{X} + t_{\alpha/2}, n - 1 S/\sqrt{n})]
\]

where \(n\) is the sample size and \(t_{\alpha/2,n-1}\) is the tabulated value of the \(t\) distribution with \(\alpha/2\) and number of degrees of freedom \(f = n - 1\).

In the case of \(\log \alpha\), for \(MM\), with a confidence \(1 - \alpha\) of .99 \(\log \alpha = 4.07457\), \(S_{\log \alpha} = .702212\) and \(n = 38\), \(\alpha = .01\), \(\alpha/2 = .005\), \(f = 37\), \(p = 1 - \alpha/2 = .995\).

\[
t_{.995,37} = 2.72 \text{ (by interpolation)}
\]

\[
\left[-4.07457 - 2.72 \left(\frac{.702212}{\sqrt{38}}\right)\right] < \mu_{\log \alpha(1-\alpha)} < \left[-4.07457 + 2.72 \left(\frac{.702212}{\sqrt{38}}\right)\right]
\]

Therefore

\[-4.38442 < \mu_{\log \alpha(1-\alpha)} < -3.76472\]  

(12)

a difference of 0.62.

The true mean lies between -4.38442 and -3.76472 with a confidence of 0.99.

In contrast, for \(MX\), with \(\log \alpha = -3.26042\), \(S_{\log \alpha} = .298318\), \(n = 5\), for a confidence of \(1 - \alpha\) = .99, \(f = n - 1 = 4\), \(t_{\alpha/2,n-1} = t_{.995,4} = 4.604\)

\[
\left(-3.26043 - 4.604 \frac{.298318}{\sqrt{5}}\right) < \mu_{\log \alpha(1-\alpha)} < \left(-3.26043 + 4.604 \frac{.298318}{\sqrt{5}}\right)
\]

(13)

\[-3.87466 < \mu_{\log \alpha(1-\alpha)} < -2.64620\]

(14)

with a difference of 1.228.

The confidence interval for \(MX\) is much greater than for \(MM\), because the former set has a small sample size.

To improve on the confidence interval for the smaller sample, the standardized normal distribution, Fig. 4, may be used. With a mean of zero and standard deviation of unity, Eq. 11 is modified as

\[
[(0 - t_{\alpha/2,n-1}/\sqrt{n}) < \mu_{1-\alpha} < (0 + t_{\alpha/2,n-1}/\sqrt{n})]
\]

(15)
Again for $1 - \alpha = .99$, with $n = 43$, $t_{.995,42} = 2.6948$.

For the standardized variables
\[
\left[ (0 - 2.6948 \frac{1}{\sqrt{44}}) < \mu_{.99} < (0 + 2.6948 \frac{1}{\sqrt{44}}) \right]
\]
(16)
or
\[-0.4063 < \mu_{.99} < .4063\]

$X_L < \mu_{.99} < X_U$

Performing the standardization backwards
\[
\frac{(x_L - \bar{x})}{S} = X_L, \quad \frac{(x_U - \bar{x})}{S} = X_U
\]

Where $L$ and $U$ indicate the lower and upper confidence levels, $\bar{x}$ and $S$ are the mean and standard deviation of $\log \dot{a}$ for $MX$

\[
X_L = \log \dot{a}_L = -2.9832 \times .4063 - 3.26043 = -3.3816
\]

\[
X_U = \log \dot{a}_U = .29832 \times .4063 - 3.26043 = -3.1392
\]

Therefore the mean $\log \dot{a}$ for $MX$ with a confidence of .99 lies between

$3.3816 < \mu_{.99} < -3.1392$

with an interval width of .242 instead of 1.228 based on the original data.

The validity of the suggested calculation hinges on the assumption of normality for both sets of data and that crack propagation is not significantly different in the two materials.
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