Analysis of mode I delamination of z-pinned composites using a non-dimensional analytical model
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A B S T R A C T

We present a non-dimensional analytical model for crack propagation in a z-pinned double cantilever beam specimen (DCB) under mode I loading. Effect of various design parameters on the crack bridging length and apparent fracture toughness are investigated using this model. The efficacy of the analytical model is evaluated by comparing the results with 3D finite element (FE) simulations of the DCB. In the FE model the z-pins are modeled as discrete nonlinear elements. Bi-linear cohesive elements are used ahead of the crack tip to account for the interlaminar fracture toughness of the composite material. The results for load–deflection and crack length obtained from the analytical model and the FE model are compared and found to be in good agreement. The proposed non-dimensional analytical model will be useful in the design and analysis of transversal reinforcements for composite structures.
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1. Introduction

Composite materials are widely used in aerospace and automobile structures, sporting goods and military equipment since they show superior specific stiffness and strength. Delamination is one of the most significant damage modes in laminated composites and is a key element of consideration in design and operation. It is well known that transversal reinforcements can enhance the delamination resistance and damage tolerance of composites significantly [1–4]. It is also known that sparse through-the-thickness reinforcements are not beneficial, and at the same time excessive amount of reinforcement is also deleterious as it results in damage to the composite structure and degradation in its properties [4]. The effect of z-fiber on delamination of composites has been extensively studied. Experimental approaches involve measurement of apparent fracture toughness [5], characterization of pull-out process of z-fiber [6,7] and crack propagation [7]. Analytic models are also available to find apparent fracture toughness and to establish the relationship among various design parameters [8–13]. Most analytic models used beam or plate models in which stitches are represented by an effective bridging force. Either Euler–Bernoulli beams [9–13] or Timoshenko beams [8,9] are used in association with discrete element [10] or continuous element [8,9,11–13] for the stitches. Numerical studies focused on crack initiation and progressive delamination in which J-integral [7], virtual crack closure technique (VCCT) [15] and cohesive zone method [14,16] were primarily used along with beam elements [14], plane strain elements [7], solid elements [16] or shell elements [15]. Sankar and Hu [17] used beam elements and spring elements similar to cohesive zone elements to simulate dynamic delamination propagation due to impact.

While FE models that account for each and every reinforcement may be more accurate in predicting the damage characteristics, they tend to be computationally expensive for realistic structures. On the other hand analytic models that smear the reinforcements as a continuous element are efficient and provide insight into the mechanics, but tend to be unrealistic in some situations. A summary of past work in this area is provided in Table 1. In the following we briefly describe the salient features of the work listed in that table. Cartie [7] suggested a bi-linear bridging law through experiments and conducted FE simulation using plain strain elements. Robinson and Das [11], Mabson and Deobald [12] and Byrd and Birman [13] used linear softening bridging model whereas Ratcliffe and O’Brien [10] proposed discrete element analytical model. For delamination modeling of z-pinned DCB, Dantuluri et al. [14] used 2D cohesive elements incorporating beam elements and a bi-linear bridging law. Ratcliffe and Krueger [16] used 3D cohesive model with solid elements. Grassi and Zhang [15] used VCCT for delamination modeling. It is clear from the table that various researchers have used different approaches in modeling the stated problem. Our goal here is to use both analytical and numerical approaches and compare them with available experimental data. In particular, we have developed a non-dimensional model that will be useful in the design of translaminar reinforcements for a given application. In particular we have used a 3D shell model
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in conjunction with 3D cohesive elements. Both linear softening law and more realistic tri-linear bridging law are used to model the z-pins. In order to clarify the role of z-pins, a non-dimensional analytical model is proposed. The solution of the non-dimensional equation uses an iterative procedure. We have also derived an expression for the maximum density of z-pins that can be allowed before the beam fails otherwise. The efficacy of the analytical model is verified by finite element simulation of the DCB specimen. We have used the example given in [7] for this purpose. In the FE simulation, the ligaments of the DCB are modeled using shell elements. Cohesive elements are used to simulate the delamination and discrete nonlinear elements are used to model the z-pins. The agreement between the analytical model and FE simulations is found to be excellent for various results such as load–deflection, load-crack length, and effective fracture toughness.

It was found that steady-state bridging length and maximum apparent fracture toughness can be related to interlaminar fracture toughness of the composite and maximum frictional force supported by z-pins. The relationships among various parameters are non-dimensionalized and the maximum pin friction that can be allowed before the composite beam itself fails is calculated. The non-dimensional analytical model could be a useful design tool in selecting z-pins for composite structures to improve interlaminar fracture toughness.

### 2. Non-dimensional analytical model

Consider a z-pinned composite DCB specimen of thickness $2h$ with initial crack length of $a_0$ and subjected to Mode I loading as shown in Fig. 1a. A pair of transverse forces $F$ is applied at the tip of the DCB. Due to the applied transverse force $F$ the initial crack tends to reach the current crack length denoted by $a$ (Fig. 1b). When the crack reaches the region reinforced by z-pins, a bridging zone of length $c$ begins to develop (Fig. 1c). We can define an apparent crack length $a_p$ which is the length of the crack up to the beginning of bridging zone. Current crack length ($a$) is the sum of the apparent crack length ($a_p$) and the bridging length ($c$). When the z-pins start to be completely pulled out of the composite as shown in Fig. 1d, the bridging zone becomes fully developed and a new fracture surface is created in the z-pinned zone. Therefore in the bridging zone

![Fig. 1. Schematic of initial geometry and development of bridging zone by z-pins in the composite DCB.](image)
the pull-out of pins is partial. Beyond the current crack tip the pins are assumed to be intact. The relative deflection at the tip of the DCB is denoted by $\delta$ as shown in Fig. 1e. Our goal is to determine the relationships among $F$, $a$, $c$, and $\delta$. Once the bridging zone length $c$ is determined other parameters such as $F$, $a$, and $\delta$ can be found by solving the governing equations. In the following we describe the non-dimensional equation governing the bridging zone and procedures to determine the bridging length for a given load.

We assume that the shear deformation is negligible and use Euler–Bernoulli beam equations to model the ligaments of the DCB as shown in Fig. 2b. We also assume that $z$-pins are rigid and there is sufficient friction between the $z$-pins and the composite material surrounding it. For simplicity, the relation between the frictional force ($f$) and pull out or slip distance ($d_s$) is idealized as a linear softening function as shown in Fig. 3. The validity of this assumption will be later verified in FE simulation. When the pins are intact they can exert a maximum friction force of $f_m$. As the pins pull out of the material, the loss of friction is proportional to the pullout distance $d_s$. When the pin is completely pulled out of the beam, the friction force reduces to zero. Thus the $f$-$d_s$ relationship is given by:

$$f = f_m\left(1 - \frac{d_s}{h}\right), \quad 0 \leq d_s \leq h$$

where $h$ is half the thickness of DCB.

Although the resistance offered by the pins on the beam is discreet, for the purpose of the analytical model we smear the discrete pin resistance as continuous distributed traction ($p$) acting on the crack surfaces as shown in Fig. 2c. Then the traction can be derived as:

$$p = Nf = Nf_m\left(1 - \frac{d_s}{h}\right) = p_m\left(1 - \frac{d_s}{h}\right)$$

where $N$ is $z$-pin density expressed as number of $z$-pins per unit area.

The Euler–Bernoulli beam equation for one of the ligaments, say upper ligament (Fig. 2c), of the DCB can be written as:

$$EI \frac{d^4w}{dx^4} = -bp$$

where $b$ is the beam width. The effective bending rigidity of one of the ligaments of the DCB is represented by the term $El$. Note that the flexural rigidity for a laminated composite can be taken from the bending stiffness matrix in classical plate laminate theory. Substituting for $p$ from Eq. (2) into Eq. (3), we obtain:

$$EI \frac{d^4w}{dx^4} - bps = -bp_m$$

$$\frac{d^4w}{dx^4} = \frac{1}{Eh} w$$

The pullout length $d_s$ is equal to 2$h$, where $w$ is the deflection of the top or bottom beam. Hence, the governing equation takes the form:

$$EI \frac{d^4w}{dx^4} = -bp_m$$

$$\frac{d^4w}{dx^4} = \frac{1}{Eh} w$$

The origin of the $x$-coordinate is assumed to be the point where the bridging zone begins. One should note that the origin moves as the crack propagates. The four boundary conditions (BCs) for bridging zone are:

$$w(0) = w_0, \quad (0 < w_0 < h/2)$$

$$M_s(0) = a_p V_s(0) = \frac{d^2w}{dx^2}(0) = a_p \frac{d^2w}{dx^2}(0)$$

$$w(c) = 0$$

$$\frac{dw}{dx}(c) = 0$$

In the above equation $w_0$ is a prescribed deflection at the origin of the coordinate system as shown in Fig. 2c. This value will be less than $h/2$ in the beginning and will increase to a maximum value of $h/2$ as the DCB is loaded. Note that the slip distance of the $z$-pin is equal to the total opening of the DCB at that location, i.e. $2w(x) = d_s(x)$. As the crack propagates, the bridging zone will also move with the crack, but the crack opening displacement will remain as $h$ at the origin with $2w(0) = d_s(0) = h$. The terms $V$ and $M$, respectively, are the bending moment and transverse shear force on the beam cross section.

One should note that the bridging length $c$ is still an unknown. It can be determined from the fact that the strain energy release rate at the actual crack tip should be equal to the mode I fracture toughness at the instant of crack propagation. The energy release rate can be determined from the equation derived by Sankar and Sonik [18] for beam-like specimens containing delamination.

$$G = \frac{(M(c))^2}{bEI} = \frac{EI}{b} \left( \frac{d^2w(c)}{dx^2} \right)^2$$

The condition for determining $c$ is:

$$\frac{EI}{b} \left( \frac{d^2w(c)}{dx^2} \right)^2 = G IC$$

Before we solve the above equations we will non-dimensionalize the equations and BCs appropriately. Normalizing the length dimensions by $h$ and forces by $Eh^2$, the governing equation and the BCs take the following form:
\[
\frac{d^4 \tilde{w}}{dx^4} - 2p_m \tilde{w} = -\tilde{p}_m \tag{9}
\]

\[
\tilde{w}(0) = \tilde{w}_0, \quad (0 < \tilde{w}_0 \leq 1/2)
\]

\[
\frac{d^2 \tilde{w}}{dx^2} (0) = \tilde{a}_p \frac{d^2 \tilde{w}}{dx^2} (0)
\]

\[
\tilde{w}(c) = 0
\]

\[
\frac{d \tilde{w}}{dx} (c) = 0
\]

where

\[
\tilde{x} = \frac{x}{h}, \quad \tilde{a}_p = \frac{a_p}{h}, \quad \tilde{c} = \frac{c}{h}, \quad \tilde{w} = \frac{w}{h}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{p}_m = \frac{12p_m}{E}
\]

The equation for determining \( \tilde{c} \) (Eq. (8)) takes the form

\[
\left( \frac{d^2 \tilde{w}(\tilde{c})}{dx^2} \right)^2 = \tilde{G}_K
\]

where the non-dimensional fracture toughness is given by

\[
\tilde{G}_K = \frac{12Ea_p}{h^3}
\]

The solution for the governing Eq. (9) is:

\[
\tilde{w}(\tilde{x}) = C_1 \cos \tilde{x} + C_2 \sin \tilde{x} + C_3 \cosh \tilde{x} + C_4 \sinh \tilde{x} + \frac{1}{2}
\]

3. Verification

3.1. Sample problem for verifying the non-dimensional analytical model

In order to verify the analytical model a z-pinned composites designed by Cartie [7] as shown in Fig. 5 was selected. This z-pinned composite was also used in many previous works [7,15]. The configurations and material properties are represented in Table 2. These values were used for both analytical model and FE simulation presented in the next section.

First, load–deflection curve (Fig. 6) was found for \( a_p \) values ranging from 52.25 mm to 62.25 mm. Meanwhile the crack length as the summation of the apparent crack length (\( a_p \)) and the bridging length (\( c \)) obtained from the procedure depicted in Fig. 4 was computed. The variation of the bridging length as a function of DCB deflection \( \delta \) is shown in Fig. 7. The bridging length initially increases with loading until the bridging zone is fully developed, where the bridging length has the maximum value. In the beginning, the apparent crack length remains constant and the crack propagation is only due to evolution of the bridging zone. Once the bridging zone is fully developed there is little change in the bridging length thus the crack propagation is almost due to the apparent crack length. In fact there is a slight decrease in the bridging length after it reaches the maximum as the bending moment due to the transverse loads applied is a function of the apparent crack length. If a pair of couple is applied instead of a pair of forces as in the standard DCB test, then the bending moment will remain constant as the crack propagates, and one can see a steady state bridging length.

The force \( F \) acting on the DCB and opening displacement \( \delta \) at the end of the beam can be obtained using the following relations:

\[
F = -E \frac{d^2 \tilde{w}}{dx^2} |_{x=0} \tag{13}
\]

\[
\delta = 2 \left( \tilde{w}(0) + \tilde{a}_p \frac{d \tilde{w}}{dx} |_{x=0} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{d^2 \tilde{w}}{dx^2} |_{x=0} \tilde{a}_p^2 \right) \tag{14}
\]

The variations of transverse force and crack length with increments in opening displacement are shown in Fig. 6. Initially the transverse force increases with opening displacement and begins to drop as interlaminar crack in unreinforced region propagates. However, the transverse force increases during the development of the bridging zone and decreases again with the movement of the fully developed bridging zone and the new crack surface.
In order to estimate the apparent fracture toughness during crack propagation we use bending moment at the apparent crack tip as a measure of increased fracture toughness. This is similar to calculating the fracture toughness of unreinforced beam using Eq. (7). Then the apparent fracture toughness is defined as:

\[ G_{IC,app} = \frac{EI}{b} \left( \frac{d^2w(0)}{dx^2} \right)^2 \quad (15) \]

The above relation can be non-dimensionalized as:

\[ \tilde{G}_{IC,app} = \left( \frac{d^2\tilde{w}(0)}{dx^2} \right)^2 \quad (16) \]

The variation of apparent fracture toughness during crack propagation is shown in Fig. 8. The apparent fracture toughness increases during development of the bridging length since the bending moment required at the beginning of bridging zone to
overcome the bridging force is increases gradually. Maximum attainable apparent fracture toughness can be predicted by the relationship expressed in terms of interlaminar fracture toughness and bridging force due to z-pins. The relationship is exactly the same as the equation based on energy balance. As the crack propagates it has to overcome the frictional forces in the z-pins. The amount of extra work done is equal to the area under the load–deflection diagram in Fig. 3. Thus the maximum apparent fracture toughness can be derived as:

$$ G_{IC-app-max} = G_{IC} + N \left( \frac{1}{2} f_m h \right) $$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

Multiplying throughout by \((12/Eh)\) we obtain the above relation in a non-dimensional form as:

$$ \tilde{G}_{IC-app-max} = \tilde{G}_{IC} + 1 \frac{1}{2} \tilde{p}_m $$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

This maximum value can be realized when a pair of couple is applied instead of a pair of transverse forces. As shown in Fig. 8 apparent fracture toughness for transverse loading is always less than the maximum value. Furthermore, our definition of apparent fracture toughness in Eq. (16) is also slightly different from the energy based relation given in Eq. (18) making the apparent fracture toughness under transverse loading less than the maximum realizable value. This is useful in evaluating the increase in apparent fracture toughness for a given design of z-pins. Moreover this value is related to strain exerted in the ligaments of DCB and will be discussed later.

3.2. FE simulation for verifying the non-dimensional analytical model

For the sake of comparison with the analytical model, FE simulation of the same specimen using the finite element software, ABAQUS\(^*\), was performed. The FE model containing discrete z-pins can verify the analytical model where z-pins are smeared and represented by distributed traction. The three-dimensional FE analysis was used to simulate crack propagation in the DCB specimen with z-pins. The specimen was modeled using shell elements (S4), and cohesive elements (COH3D8) were used to simulate progressive delamination. The behavior of cohesive elements can be characterized by bilinear traction separation law (Fig. 9) [19] given by:

$$ \sigma = (1 - D)Kd $$

where

$$ D = \begin{cases} 
\frac{d_0 - d}{d_f - d_0}, & d_0 < d < d_f \\
1, & d_f < d 
\end{cases} $$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

where \(\sigma\) is traction, \(K\) is stiffness, \(D\) is damage variable, \(d\) is displacement, \(d_0\) is displacement at damage initiation and \(d_f\) is final displacement.

The above parameters were taken as: \(K = 10^6 \text{ N/mm}\), \(\sigma_m = 35 \text{ Mpa}\) and \(G_{IC} = 0.258 \text{ N/mm}^2\) [7,19].

Nonlinear spring element (CONN3D2) whose behavior is defined by linearly decreasing force (Fig. 3) for each z-pin was also implemented between the two ligaments of the DCB (Fig. 10). The load–deflection curves and the variations of crack lengths with deflection are shown in Fig. 6. Both FE and analytical model results are presented with that from the experiment by Cartie [6]. The agreement between the analytical model and the FE simulations is satisfactory for both load–deflection and delamination length. The slight discrepancy in the initial slope of the load–deflection curve between the analytical model and the FE model is due to the fact that the analytical model uses Euler–Bernoulli beam theory whereas FE model considered shear deformation as it occurs in test specimens. The good comparison between the analytical model and the results from FEA and experiments suggests that the discrete bridging force can be represented by a distributed traction.

4. Discussion of results from the non-dimensional model

4.1. Parametric studies using the non-dimensional analytical model

Our goal was to study the effects of inherent interlaminar fracture toughness of the composite material \(G_{IC}\), and the non-dimensional frictional force \(p_m\) on (i) the maximum apparent fracture toughness \(G_{IC-app-max}\) and (ii) steady state bridging length \(c\). Such relationships are extremely useful in design process to evaluate the influence of design variables on performance of the composite. In this parametric study we assume that the DCB is loaded by end couples instead of transverse forces. This assures steady state crack propagation in the beam and effect of increasing crack length on the results is thus eliminated. In the simulations, \(G_{IC}\) is varied from \(10^{-2}\) to \(10^{-6}\) and \(p_m\) ranged from \(10^{-19}\) (almost zero friction representing the case of unreinforced beam) to 0.1.

Fig. 11 shows that the steady state bridging length decreases with increasing \(G_{IC}\) and \(p_m\). If the composite material is inherently...
tough, it will not allow a larger bridging length. Similarly a large friction force also will reduce the bridging length. The maximum apparent fracture toughness \(\frac{G_{lc-app}}{C_{0-app}}\) is another measure to evaluate the effect of translaminar reinforcement. Fig. 12 shows that the maximum apparent fracture toughness, computed by Eq. (16), varies linearly with increasing \(\frac{G_{lc-app}}{C_{0-app}}\) and \(p_m\). This result is in accordance with Eq. (18). Since the range of \(p_m\) is wider than that of \(G_{lc}\) in reality, \(\frac{G_{lc-app}}{C_{0-app}}\) is more sensitive to the value of \(p_m\).

In other words the apparent fracture toughness is dominated by the translaminar reinforcement. From the results shown in Figs. 11 and 12, it is clear that higher friction force exerted by the z-pins provides enhanced fracture toughness and at the same time reduces the bridging length. The latter is important to maintain the stiffness of the structure for a larger bridging length leads to reduction in the stiffness of the structure.

### 4.2. Maximum allowable translaminar reinforcement

Even though large frictional force between the z-pin and the surrounding matrix material is desirable for increased fracture toughness, a frictional force beyond a critical value will cause the beam to fail. The maximum normal strain in a beam cross section is given by

\[
e_{\max} = \frac{h}{2} \left| \frac{d^2w}{dx^2} \right|
\]

(20)

Note the strain is already non-dimensional and the right hand side of the above equation can be written as:

\[
e_{\max} = \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{d^2w}{dx^2} \right| = \kappa
\]

(21)

where \(\kappa\) is the non-dimensional curvature which has the maximum value at \(x = 0\). Using Eqs. (16) and (18) we obtain

\[
\kappa = \sqrt{G_{lc} + \frac{1}{2}p_m}
\]

(22)

Let us assume the allowable strain in the composite is given by \(\varepsilon_u\). Then,

\[
\sqrt{G_{lc} + \frac{1}{2}p_m} < 2\varepsilon_u
\]

(23)
From the above equation one can derive

\[ p_m < \frac{2}{(4c_s^2 - G_k)} \]

or

\[ p_m = N_{fm} < \frac{2E_u}{2 - \frac{c_s}{h}} \]

The above equation provides an upper limit on the z-pin density which should be taken into consideration in the design of translaminar reinforcements. Thus the allowable density or maximum frictional force of z-pins can be determined at a given geometry and material properties of a composite material.

In order to verify the result for the maximum allowable translaminar reinforcement given in Eq. (24), we performed finite element analysis of a specimen. The properties used were: \( G = 0.258 \) N/mm, \( h = 1.6 \) mm, \( E = 138 \) GPA, \( N_{fm} = 1.58 \) N/mm² [7]. The FE simulation was used to calculate the maximum strain in the ligaments of the DCB specimen at the instant of crack propagation, and it was compared with the \( e_u \) obtained from Eq. (24). Two loading cases, namely end couples and transverse forces, were considered. For the set of properties used Eq. (24) yields a maximum strain \( e_u = 4.5 \times 10^{-3} \). Note that if \( N_{fm} > 1.58 \) N/mm² then the maximum strain exceeds the ultimate strain. From the FE simulations we obtained \( e_{max} = 4.521 \times 10^{-3} \) for the case of end couples and \( e_{max} = 3.906 \times 10^{-3} \) for the case of transverse loading of the DCB (Fig. 13). The results indicate the strains in the beam are higher for the moment loading compared to that due to the transverse loading. However, in a practical structure the delamination will experience a combination of shear and moment loadings, and hence the conservative value should be used. That means the maximum allowable stitch density given in Eq. (24) should be used although it is applicable only to moment loading case, and hence conservative.

4.3. Effect of tri-linear bridging law

So far we have used the linear softening bridging law for developing the non-dimensional analytical model and verifying the same using FEA. Although this bridging law is simple, it may not be realistic. Dai et al. [6] performed pull-out tests using z-pins of various diameters to determine the actual bridging law. They found that a high value of debonding force was reached before the debonding of the pins began. After the debonding was initiated, the pull-out force dropped to a lower value before reducing linearly to zero value as the pins were pulled out steadily against frictional force that seemed to have a constant coefficient of friction. They represented this pullout behavior by a tri-linear bridging law as depicted in Fig. 14. The tri-linear behavior can be attributed to an elastic deformation (from (0, 0) to (0.0185, 35.3) in Fig. 14), debonding from surrounding matrix (from (0.0185, 35.3) to (0.17, 14.86) in Fig. 14) and slip-out of z-pins (from (0.17, 14.86) to (1.6, 0) in Fig. 14).

The finite element simulations of the DCB described in Section 3.2 were repeated with the tri-linear bridging law. We did not at-
tempt analytical solution as it will be very complicated due to the piece-wise continuous bridging law. The numerical values for the tri-linear law were chosen such that the area under the force–displacement curve, which is related to the increase in fracture toughness, is equal to the linear softening law used in the earlier example. That is the areas under the two force–displacement curves in Fig. 14 are equal to each other. The resulting load–deflection diagram of the z-pinned DCB specimen is shown in Fig. 15. The load deflection behavior is almost identical to that obtained using the linear bridging law indicating that the apparent fracture toughness is same in both cases. It must be noted that the peak force in the tri-linear case is almost twice as that of the linear softening law. The variations of crack length as a function of the DCB specimen opening (deflection) are also similar in both cases. This indicates that the details of the bridging law do not seem to affect the global behavior of the specimen as long as the energy dissipated by the pins is properly accounted for.

5. Summary and conclusions

Mode I delamination propagation in DCB specimens containing z-pins is studied. A simple analytical model based on linear softening type bridging law for the z-pins has been developed and suitable non-dimensional parameters have been identified. The load–deflection curve of the DCB specimen was calculated using the analytical model. It is seen that the bridging zone, wherein the pins are partially pulled out, develops as the crack propagates, but attains a steady state value. The length of the bridging zone is a function of the mode I fracture toughness and the frictional force between the z-pins and the surrounding material. An expression was derived for the apparent or effective fracture toughness values. Although increase in frictional force as the z-pins increases the fracture toughness, there is an upper limit to this friction as the DCB ligaments would break if the friction is very high. The limiting value of the pin friction is derived.

The efficacy of the analytical model was evaluated by the simulation of the DCB specimen using finite element simulations. In the FE model the delamination propagation was simulated by cohesive elements and the z-pins were modeled as discrete non-linear elements. The results for load–deflection curve and the crack bridging zone length agreed quite well with the analytical model. As an alternative to the linear bridging law, a more realistic tri-linear bridging law was used in the FE simulations. It is found that the global delamination behavior of the specimen was not affected much as long as the energy dissipated by the pins is kept the same.

The non-dimensional model with few parameters will serve as a design tool when translaminar reinforcements such as z-pins are selected for laminated composite structures in order to improve their fracture toughness. The analytical models will also be useful in optimization studies and simulation of large composite structures containing translaminar reinforcements.
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