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ABSTRACT

A most important structural design objective today is the reliable applications of composite materials. Reliability is associated with the probability of success or failure of a particular structure and/or composite material. For this study, the reliability associated with strength was investigated.

The objective was to develop a probabilistic anisotropic failure criterion and an analytical model which would account for the inherent strength scatter and enhance the structural reliability phase of composite design. This study analytically described the failure criterion and probabilistic failure states of an anisotropic composite in a combined stress state. Strength sensitivity and the failure mechanism within the domain of the combined stress space was based on a numerical simulation of a theoretical mathematical model. The numerical simulation was analogous to physical testing of large composite sample sizes.

For the probabilistic and mechanistic independent case examined, the failure envelopes as defined by the failure criterion exhibited a mechanistic dependent phenomenological appearance. The size and shape of the resulting phenomenological failure envelopes were dependent on the intrinsic shape parameters and their combinations associated with the longitudinal strength and transverse strength. The probabilistic formulation of the failure criterion could reconcile the difference between the phenomenologically coupled and the uncoupled failure criterion. In addition, the probabilistic failure criterion would provide analytical guidance for definitive experimental measurements. Finally, the probabilistic failure criterion would provide the analytical conditions for optimal design and feedback in composite material development and quality assurance.
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I. INTRODUCTION

One important structural design objective today is the reliable applications of composite materials. With respect to structural design, a first phase may establish the design mission requirements, i.e., the strength and stiffness requirements of a particular composite material. A second phase may determine the optimal composite material based on the design requirements and trade-offs, i.e., the benefits and costs associated with a particular composite material. A third phase may determine the optimal lamination configuration by tailoring a particular composite, i.e., volume fraction of fiber and matrix, ply angles, number of plies and ply groups. A forth phase may determine the structural reliability of a particular composite. The structural design reliability phase was characterized by evaluating the optimal structural stress or strength levels for an acceptable number of probable successes or failures. Reliability was associated with probability where structural performance and quality assurance were measured by the probability of success or failure of a particular structure and/or composite material. The objective of this study was to develop a analytical model for probabilistic anisotropic failure criterion which would account for the inherent strength scatter (directional dependence) and quantify the structural reliability phase of composite design.

The reliability of a structure would be quantitatively evaluated by examining the state of stress at every spatial location against the magnitude of the failure state as defined by the failure criterion. Mathematically, this consisted of mapping of a stress tensor associated with the spatial domain of a particular structure into a failure domain. Operationally, the spatial distribution of the stress state in a particular structure would be obtained by an appropriate branch of stress analysis (elasticity, viscoelasticity, plasticity, etc.), which were frequently implemented with many finite element analysis computer codes. The evaluation
of (proximity to) the failure state required a theoretical mathematical model of the failure state (as defined by the failure criterion). Many failure criterion have been proposed for different materials (isotropic and anisotropic, crystalline and amorphous, and homogeneous and nonhomogeneous composites) with different failure modes (yielding and brittle failure). These failure criteria may be mechanistically or phenomenologically based.

This study analytically described the failure criterion and failure states of a probabilistic anisotropic composite and was based on numerical simulations of a theoretical mathematical model. Four domains (physical, stress, failure, and normalized) were defined in this study in order to describe the spatial location of a particular structure in a prescribed space. In a physical domain, each spatial location of a particular structure was associated with a second rank stress tensor ($\sigma_{ij}$) which had nine (9) scalar stress components on three (3) orthogonal planes and was a function of coordinate orientation. It was cumbersome to represent a tensor higher than the first rank tensor in the failure domain. For simplicity and without loss of generality, the physical domain in this study was restricted to:

- each spatial location was associated with a second rank stress tensor ($\sigma_{ij}$) which only had two non-zero scalar normal stress components ($\sigma_1$, $\sigma_2$) on one plane. [Ref. 1]

Furthermore, numerical investigations were confined to the first quadrant in order to define this normal stress domain. The stress domain was defined as a biaxial normal stress state ($\sigma_1$, $\sigma_2$) with both the longitudinal stress in tension and the transverse stress in tension.

With the restriction that the shear stress components were zero, the magnitude of the normal stresses at each spatial location of a particular structure was mapped into a respective point on the biaxial stress space. If all the stress points were interior to the domain bounded by a strength distribution (failure envelope), then the entire structure was
safe (0 ≤ σ_i ≤ X_i). If any of the stress points were exterior to the domain bounded by a strength distribution (failure envelope), then the corresponding spatial location of a particular structure was not safe (failed with σ_i > X_i). If the structure was monolithic (single element), then the entire structure failed. If the structure was redundant (load sharing), then failure at a spatial location increased the probability of failure of the entire structure. This condition would not cause the direct failure of the entire structure. [Ref. 2]

The failure domain (failure criteria) was described by the failure envelope or failure surface in the biaxial stress domain and was expressed for this study by a mean strength contour and a percentile strength contour. The failure domain was presented to identify the parametric role of the variability in the longitudinal and transverse strength on the size and shape of the failure criterion. The normalized domain was used as a radial loading path transition to the biaxial stress domain.
II. BACKGROUND

One of the primary objectives of composite design is to capitalize on the high strength and stiffness-to-weight ratios, which are important attributes of composite materials. A composite is made of two or more woven or nonwoven constituent materials which are fiber-reinforced in a matrix. A fiber is a single filament which is formed in one direction (unidirectional). Matrix binds the filaments to form a composite material. [Ref. 3]

Fibers are the principal reinforcing or load carrying agent of a composite material. The primary function of matrix is to support and protect the fibers, to provide a load distribution or load sharing mechanism for a weak fiber, and to provide micro-redundancy within a composite material. [Ref. 4]

A frequently occurring consequence of composite materials is that the physical properties of the resulting materials become highly anisotropic [Ref. 5]. An anisotropic composite exhibits material properties that vary with orientation or direction of the reference coordinate system [Ref. 6].

Failure characterization of composites is defined by the level of observation. A phenomenological approach may be used to address the probabilistic anisotropic failure criteria for composite materials. The phenomenological approach treats the heterogeneous composites as a continuum, and an analytical model is used to correlate the occurrence of the material responses without necessarily explaining the mechanisms which lead to these material responses. The incorporation of probabilistic phenomena in failure criterion will provide the groundwork for the mechanistic understanding of the interacting failure mechanisms. The failure characterization of anisotropic composites will be treated herein in accordance with the fundamentals of the phenomenological approach, where: (1) conduct a numerical simulation of the theoretical model, which is analogous to physical testing of
numerous composite samples, and (2) evaluate and interpret the results of the numerical simulation and infer the definitive experiments. The phenomenological approach is intended to aid experimental design; to facilitate interpolation, correlation, and retrieval of experimental observations; and may be valuable for identifying definitive experiments to quantitatively measure the mechanisms for failure. [Ref. 7]

Failure criterion is an analytical description of the failure states of a composite material subjected to a complex state of stresses or strains [Ref. 8]. Failure criterion may be geometrically interpreted as a limiting envelope in the stress space, i.e., the condition for composite failure occurs when a given stress vector penetrates the failure envelope or failure surface [Ref. 9]. In other words, the failure envelope or failure surface is the ultimate limit (lower bound-worst case) for a combined stress or strain state as defined by the failure criterion [Ref. 10]. Taking into account the statistical scatter, the analytical structure of the failure envelope or failure surface was the objective of this study.

In the development of probabilistic anisotropic failure criteria model for composite materials, the primary theoretical basis of this study in the biaxial stress domain was on the two parameter Weibull model for the uniaxial longitudinal and transverse stress states and the resulting joint probability distribution function for the combined longitudinal and transverse stress states. The two parameter Weibull distribution and the joint probability distribution were expressed as a function of the applied stress ratio radial loading path in the two dimensional biaxial stress domain ($\sigma_1, \sigma_2$). The Weibull distribution function was characterized by an unimodal distribution and the joint probability distribution function was characterized by an unimodal or bimodal distribution.

The combined stress state explored the statistical and mechanistic contributions of the probabilistic independent and mechanistic independent case. Joint probability for this study was defined as the intrinsic strength which was activated by the stress ($\sigma_1$) in the
longitudinal or fiber direction is independent of the intrinsic strength which was activated by the stress ($\sigma_2$) in the transverse or matrix direction. The strengths were uncoupled and the failure mechanisms were not interacting. [Ref. 11]

Mechanistic independence for this study was defined as a stress activated mechanism where the stress components ($\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$) are independent. The corresponding failure mechanism in the strain space was coupled through the stress/strain constitutive relationship ($\varepsilon_{ij} = S_{ijkl}\sigma_{kl}$). In this relationship stress was the independent variable and strain was the dependent variable.

The two-parameter Weibull distribution was based on the reliability function $R(X)$ and was defined for this study as:

$$R(X) = 1 - F(X)$$

where:

(1) $R(X)$ was the Weibull distribution reliability function.

(2) $F(X)$ was the Weibull distribution failure function.

(3) $R_1(X_1) = \exp \left(-\frac{X_1}{\beta_1}\right)^{\alpha_1}$. The reliability function in the uniaxial longitudinal or fiber direction.

(4) $R_2(X_2) = \exp \left(-\frac{X_2}{\beta_2}\right)^{\alpha_2}$. The reliability function in the uniaxial transverse or matrix direction.

(5) $X_1$ and $X_2$ were the random intrinsic strengths in the uniaxial longitudinal and transverse directions.

(6) $\alpha_1$ and $\beta_1$ were the Weibull shape and scale parameters in the uniaxial longitudinal or fiber direction.

(7) $\alpha_2$ and $\beta_2$ were the Weibull shape and scale parameters in the uniaxial transverse or matrix direction. [Ref. 12]

As a result of joint probability (independence) assumption for the combined stress states, the joint probability function was based on the Weibull reliability functions in the
uniaxial longitudinal and transverse directions respectively and for this study was defined as:

\[ R(X) = R_1(X_1) \cdot R_2(X_2) \]

where:

(1) \[ R(X) = \exp \left[ -\left( \frac{X_1}{\beta_1} + \frac{X_2}{\beta_2} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \]

(2) \[ F(X) = 1 - R(X) = 1 - \exp \left[ -\left( \frac{X_1}{\beta_1} + \frac{X_2}{\beta_2} \right)^{\alpha} \right] \]

(3) \( R(X) \) was the reliability function and was equivalent to the probability of success associated with the random variables \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \).

(4) \( F(X) \) was the failure function and was equivalent to the probability of failure associated with the random variables \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \).

(5) \( X_1 \) was the random intrinsic stress or strength in the longitudinal or fiber direction.

(6) \( X_2 \) was the random intrinsic stress or strength in the transverse or matrix direction.

(7) \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \beta_1 \) were the joint probability shape (\( A_1 \) or \( \alpha_1 \)) and scale (\( B_1 \) or \( \beta_1 \)) parameters respectively in the longitudinal or fiber direction.

(8) \( \alpha_2 \) and \( \beta_2 \) were the joint probability shape (\( A_2 \) or \( \alpha_2 \)) and scale (\( B_2 \) or \( \beta_2 \)) parameters respectively in the transverse or matrix direction.

The joint probability failure envelope or failure surface of the failure criterion model was represented for this study by a mean failure surface and a percentile failure surface. The mean failure surface was the mean strength at which a number of samples failed for a particular applied stress ratio. The percentile failure surface was the fraction of samples which failed for a particular applied stress ratio. With respect to the intrinsic strengths, this study explored the dependency of the mean and percentile failure envelopes on the shape parameters (\( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \)). The shape parameters were expressed as a function of the combined stress state.
III. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

Material failure involves numerous complex processes, many simplifications were unavoidable in the mathematical formulation of failure states and failure criteria. The assessment of those underlying simplifying assumptions would only be made through comparison with experimental data. Experimental measurements and data collection were very difficult for the evaluation of the combined stress states and the enormous number of different stress ratios that were required to cover the entire six-dimensional (6-D) stress space. As it was impractical for the overall verification of the entire failure domain, one must focus verifications at selected critical states. Numerical simulations may be used to deduce the consequences of the proposed models and as a comparison to identify regions where the predictions by different models were large.

Appendix A and B described the development of the theoretical mathematical model and the biaxial L/T numerical simulation respectively. The objective of this study was to develop probabilistic anisotropic failure criteria for composites. The failure criterion model for this study was defined as a function of the applied stress ratio and the joint probability distribution function scale ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) and shape ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$) parameters. The initial conditions for the theoretical mathematical model and biaxial L/T numerical simulation were:

1. Sample size = 199.
2. Scale parameters $\beta_1 = 100$ and $\beta_2 = 1$.
3. Shape parameters $\alpha_1 = 60$ and $\alpha_2 = 5$.
4. Seventeen (17) applied stress ratios in the physical domain were based on the transformed theta in the normalized domain and were equivalent to: 0, 10, 20, 30, 35, 39, 42, 44, 45, 48, 51, 55, 60, 70, 80, and 90 degree radial loading paths.
A. CHANGES IN THE SHAPE PARAMETER

This study evaluated the effect of various high $(\alpha_1,2 = 60)$ and low $(\alpha_1,2 = 5)$ combinations of the uniaxial shape parameters $(\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2)$ on the joint probability function. The scale parameters $(\beta_1$ and $\beta_2)$ were fixed for this study.

The Coefficient of Variation (C.V.) is approximately equal to $1.2$ divided by the shape parameter $(\alpha)$ [Ref. 13]. As a result, high shape parameter values were equivalent to low dispersion or scatter, and low shape parameter values were equivalent to high dispersion or scatter.

The probability distribution function (pdf), which was the derivative of the joint probability failure function $F(S)$, illustrated the statistical dispersion (Figure 1). Figure 1 exhibited low dispersion or scatter for a high shape parameter combination $(\alpha_1 = 60$ and $\alpha_2 = 60)$ and exhibited high dispersion or scatter for a low shape parameter combination $(\alpha_1 = 5$ and $\alpha_2 = 5)$. Figure 1 was based on the applied stress ratio at the zero (0) degree.
radial loading path in the normalized stress domain (i.e., the uniaxial case along the longitudinal or fiber direction).

At the applied stress ratios for the normalized stress domain zero (0) and ninety (90) degree radial loading paths, the joint probability function was equivalent to the Weibull distribution function in the uniaxial longitudinal and transverse directions respectively. As a result, the joint probability function was characterized by a unimodal (one statistical mode) distribution (Figure 2).

Figures 3 and 4 exhibited the combined stress state probability distribution functions (pdf) at the applied stress ratio for the normalized stress domain forty-five (45) degree radial loading path. For the high-low shape parameter combination ($\alpha_1 = 60$ and $\alpha_2 = 5$) and the low-high shape parameter combination ($\alpha_1 = 5$ and $\alpha_2 = 60$), the joint probability function was characterized by a bimodal (two statistical modes interacting) distribution.
Figure 3
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Figure 4
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For the high ($\alpha_1 = 60$ and $\alpha_2 = 60$) and low ($\alpha_1 = 5$ and $\alpha_2 = 5$) shape parameter combinations, the joint probability function was not distinguishable from the unimodal distribution.

It was observed that the joint probability function changed from an unimodal to a bimodal distribution as the combined applied stress ratio changed. The bimodal distribution with the two statistical modes interacting was of special interest to the probabilistic independent and mechanistic independent case.

**B. THEORETICAL MATHEMATICAL MODEL**

In order to investigate the shape of the failure surface, a numerical simulation was used to study the theoretical mathematical model at seventeen (17) applied stress ratios for a particular sample size and a particular high and/or low combination of the joint probability function shape parameters ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$). The numerical simulation explored the following aspects of the theoretical mathematical model for a particular sample size, applied stress ratio, and shape parameter combination in the stress domain:

1. The joint probability reliability and failure functions
2. The relative frequency strength
3. The mean strength
4. The percentile strength
5. The mean and percentile strength contours.

For the theoretical mathematical model, the failure envelope or failure surface was defined as:

1. The mean strength contour which was normalized by the uniaxial scale parameters ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$).
2. The mean strength contour which was normalized by the mean strengths at the uniaxial longitudinal and transverse radial loading paths.
(3) The percentile strength contours which were normalized by the uniaxial scale parameters \( \beta_1 \) and \( \beta_2 \).

The mean strength and/or percentile strength contours were expressed at the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios for a large sample size, and as a function of a particular shape parameter \( (\alpha_1 \text{ and } \alpha_2) \) combination.

C. BIAXIAL L/T NUMERICAL SIMULATION

In the stress domain the numerical simulation was used to study seventeen (17) different applied stress ratios for a particular sample size and a particular high and/or low combination of the joint probability function shape parameters \( (\alpha_1 \text{ and } \alpha_2) \). For the numerical simulation a sample size \( (N) \) of 199 was selected and was based the concept of Expected Rank, where the fractional probability was defined as \( N/(N+1) \). The most important aspects of the numerical simulation for a particular sample size, applied stress ratio and shape parameter combination in the stress domain were:

(1) the intrinsic strength space
(2) the realized strength space
(3) the relative frequency strength space
(4) the joint probability strength space
(5) the mean realized strength at different biaxial stress ratios and the mean realized strength contour.

For the numerical simulation the failure envelope or failure surface was defined as:

(1) the mean realized strength contour of the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios for 199 samples and a particular shape parameter combination and was normalized by the uniaxial scale parameters \( (\beta_1 \text{ and } \beta_2) \).

(2) the mean realized strength contour of the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios for 199 samples and a particular shape parameter combination and was normalized by the mean strength at uniaxial longitudinal and transverse radial loading paths.
IV. RESULTS

A. BIAXIAL L/T NUMERICAL SIMULATION

Figures 5, 6, 7, and 8 illustrated the numerical simulation for an applied stress ratio equivalent to the forty-five (45) degree radial loading path in the normalized stress domain. In order to develop an optimal experimental method for determination of the failure criteria for a given composite material, one must infer the intrinsic strength space (ISS) from the realized strength space (RSS). Figure 5 characterizes the intrinsic strength space (ISS) in the stress domain for the probabilistic independent and mechanistic independent case and a particular combination of the joint probability function scale ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) and shape ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$) parameters.

Figure 5

Intrinsic Strength Space $\theta=45$
Figure 6

Realized Strength Space $\theta=45$

Figure 7

Realized Strength Space $\theta=45$
Figures 6, 7, and 8 depicted the realized strength space (RSS) for an applied stress ratio equivalent to the forty-five (45) degree radial loading path in the normalized stress domain and a particular combination of the joint probability function scale ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) and shape ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$) parameters. Figure 6 described the RSS for the composite samples associated with fiber failure. Figure 7 described the RSS for the composite samples associated with matrix failure. Figure 8 described the RSS for the composite samples which failed by fiber and/or matrix. The failure modes were observed by the intermixing of the opened and closed points.

Figure 9 was based on the initial conditions and exhibited the realized strength space in the stress domain for five (5) different normalized applied stress ratios at the ten (10), thirty (30), forty-five (45), sixty (60), and eighty (80) degree radial loading paths and for the particular combination of the joint probability function scale ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) and shape ($\alpha_1$.
and \( \alpha_2 \) parameters. This RSS exhibited which composite samples failed by fiber and/or by matrix for various applied stress ratios.

![Realized Strength Space](image)

**Figure 9**

**Realized Strength Space \( \theta=10, 30, 45, 60, 80 \)**

Figures 10 and 11 were based on the numerical simulation initial conditions for an applied stress ratio equivalent to the forty-five (45) degree radial loading path in the normalized stress domain and a particular combination of the joint probability function scale (\( \beta_1 \) and \( \beta_2 \)) and shape (\( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \)) parameters. Figure 10 described the biaxial relative frequency strength space in the stress domain and Figure 11 described the biaxial joint probability strength space in the Weibull probability space. The biaxial relative frequency strength space exhibited the fraction of the sample distribution which failed by fiber and/or matrix. A unimodal Weibull cumulative distribution function appears as a linear function in the Weibull probability space. Of particular interest to this study was that the joint probability strength space was not linear. This was due to the bimodal condition where
two statistical modes were interacting. For reliability, the lower tail of a particular sample distribution was of major importance in the development of any failure criterion.

![Figure 10](image1.png)

Relative Frequency Strength Space \( \theta = 45 \)

![Figure 11](image2.png)

Joint Probability Strength Space \( \theta = 45 \)
Figures 12 and 13 described a mean realized strength contour in the stress domain which was based on the numerical simulation of the seventeen (17) discreet applied stress ratios and the joint probability scale ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) and shape ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$) parameters. Figure 12 was normalized by the uniaxial scale parameters ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) and Figure 13 was normalized by the uniaxial mean strength at the applied stress ratios equivalent to the zero (0) and ninety (90) degree radial loading paths in the normalized stress domain.

For the biaxial L/T numerical simulation, the mean realized strength contour defined the failure envelope or failure surface in the stress domain. Biaxial stress states interior to the domain bounded by the failure envelope or failure surface was the safe region. Biaxial stress states exterior to the domain bounded by the failure envelope or failure surface was the unsafe region.

![Figure 12](image)

**Figure 12**

*Failure Envelope or Failure Surface*
B. ANALYTICAL EVALUATION OF MODEL

Figures 14 and 15 described the theoretical mathematical model failure functions in the stress domain for five (5) applied stress ratios and were based on the particular combination of the joint probability scale ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) and shape ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$) parameters. The five (5) normalized applied stress ratios were based on the zero (0), thirty-nine (39), forty-five (45), fifty-one (51), and ninety (90) degree radial loading paths. The trends for increasing the transformed theta from the normalized zero (0) degree radial loading path in the longitudinal or fiber direction to the normalized ninety (90) degree radial loading path in the transverse or matrix direction were that the failure function curves shifted to the left.

Figures 16 and 17 described the joint probability failure function and reliability function in the stress domain for the applied stress ratio based on the normalized forty-five (45) degree radial loading path. By analyzing the longitudinal or fiber and the transverse or matrix components of the reliability and failure functions, one observed, in this particular
Failure Function $\alpha_1=60$, $\alpha_2=5$

Failure Function $\alpha_1=60$, $\alpha_2=5$
Figure 16

Failure Function $\alpha_1=60$, $\alpha_2=5$, $\theta=45$

Figure 17

Reliability Function $\alpha_1=60$, $\alpha_2=5$, $\theta=45$
case, that there exists a transition area or crossover area, where the two joint probability functions were a function of both components in the fiber and matrix directions. As a result, both the reliability and failure functions were characterized by a bimodal distribution where two statistical modes were interacting.

Figure 18 exhibited the failure function at the applied stress ratio based on the normalized forty-five (45) degree radial loading path for the theoretical model with the numerical simulation biaxial relative frequency strength space superimposed. Figure 19 exhibited the failure function and the longitudinal or fiber and transverse or matrix components of the failure function with the numerical simulation biaxial relative frequency strength space superimposed. Figure 19 exhibited the fiber and matrix transition or crossover area of the sample distribution, which was characterized by the two failure function components interacting.

![Figure 18](image)

**Figure 18**

**Relative Frequency Strength Space θ=45**
Figures 20 and 21 exhibited the analytical mean strength contour evaluated at the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios with the biaxial numerical simulated mean realized strength contour superimposed. Figure 20 was normalized by the uniaxial scale parameters ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$). Figure 21 was normalized by the uniaxial mean strength at the applied stress ratios equivalent to the zero (0) and ninety (90) degree radial loading paths in the normalized stress domain. Either mean strength contour defined the failure envelopes or failure surfaces in the failure domain which was superimposed in the stress domain.

Figures 22 and 23 exhibited the analytical mean strength contour (failure envelope or failure surface) which was normalized by the uniaxial scale parameters ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) with the percentile strength contours (fail envelope or failure surface) at the ten (10) percentile and the ninety (90) percentile superimposed. In Figure 23 the biaxial numerical simulation mean strength contour was superimposed. From the theoretical model one would
Figure 20

Failure Envelope or Failure Surface

Figure 21

Failure Envelope or Failure Surface
analytically develop percentile contour failure envelopes in order to describe the fraction of the sample distribution which failed (lower bound or worst case).
Figures 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 were based on the initial conditions and the particular combination of the joint probability scale and shape parameters and exhibited the analytical failure distribution in the stress domain as a function of the changes in the applied stress ratios. The normalized applied stress ratios were based on the fifty-five (55), forty-eight (48), forty-two (42), thirty-five (35), and thirty (30) degree radial loading paths. The objective was to analyze the unimodal and bimodal distributions of the analytical failure function over a particular applied stress ratio range. At the normalized fifty-five (55) degree radial loading path, the theoretical failure function was not distinguishable from a unimodal distribution. This would indicate that practically all composite failures were caused by matrix failure. At the normalized thirty (30) degree radial loading path the theoretical failure function also approached an unimodal distribution. This would indicate that

![Figure 24](image)

*Failure Function $\alpha_1 = 60$, $\alpha_2 = 5$, $\theta = 55$*
Failure Function $\alpha_1=60$, $\alpha_2=5$, $\theta=48$

Failure Function $\alpha_1=60$, $\alpha_2=5$, $\theta=42$
Failure Function $\alpha_1=60$, $\alpha_2=5$, $\theta=35$
practically all composite failures were caused by fiber failure. The failure functions associated with the normalized applied stress ratios at the forty-eight (48), forty-two (42), and thirty-five (35) radial loading paths were characterized as a bimodal distribution by the failure function component transition or crossover region. This would indicate that the composite failures were caused by both fiber failures and matrix failures.

From this demonstration one could conclude that there existed a specific applied stress ratio range where the failure function as well as the reliability function would exhibit a bimodal distribution and a specific applied stress ratio range where both functions would exhibit an unimodal distribution. Of primary interest was the bimodal distributions where two statistical modes were interacting.

Figures 29, 30, and 31 were based on the initial conditions and an applied stress ratio normalized at the forty-five (45) degree radial loading path and exhibited the theoretical failure function in the stress domain as a function of the changes in the joint probability shape parameters ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$). Figures 29 and 31 exhibited that the failure functions associated with the high-high ($\alpha_1 = 60$ and $\alpha_2 = 60$) and low-low ($\alpha_1 = 5$ and $\alpha_2 = 5$) joint probability shape parameter combinations were not distinguishable from the unimodal distribution. Figure 30 exhibited that the failure function associated with the medium-low ($\alpha_1 = 20$ and $\alpha_2 = 5$) joint probability shape parameter combination was characterized by a bimodal distribution.

From this demonstration one could conclude that the bimodal distribution was attributed to the degree of dispersion or scatter as exhibited by the various combinations of the joint probability shape parameters. A high-high joint probability shape parameter combination would exhibit a very narrow applied stress ratio range for the bimodal distribution. A low-low joint probability shape parameter combination would exhibit a large applied stress ratio range for the bimodal distribution. As a result, a high-high joint probability
Figure 29

Failure Function $\alpha_1=60$, $\alpha_2=60$, $\theta=45$

Figure 30

Failure Function $\alpha_1=20$, $\alpha_2=5$, $\theta=45$
shape parameter combination was recommended for little or no dispersion (scatter) in the stress domain.

Figures 32 and 33 exhibited the analytical mean strength contours which were based on the initial conditions, the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios, and changes in the joint probability shape parameters ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$). The results indicated that the failure envelope or failure surface area decreased in size with decreases in the joint probability shape parameter combinations. In addition, the results indicated that the failure envelopes or failure surfaces changed from an independent appearance at the high-high joint probability shape parameter combination ($\alpha_1 = 60$ and $\alpha_2 = 60$) to a dependent appearance for the remaining joint probability shape parameter combinations.
Figure 32

Failure Envelope or Failure Surface

Figure 33

Failure Envelope or Failure Surface
Based on a Weibull weakest link (L) formulation [Ref. 14]:

\[ \beta_2 = \beta_1 \left( \frac{L_2}{L_1} \right)^{-1/\alpha} \]

where

\[ \beta_2 < \beta_1 \quad \text{if } \alpha > 1 \text{ and } L_2 > L_1 \]

The objective was to demonstrate the role of the shape parameter (\( \alpha \)) on the size and mean strength of a particular structure. If the size of a particular structure increased (\( L_2 \)) with the shape parameter (\( \alpha \)) fixed, then the mean strength would decrease based on \( \beta_2 < \beta_1 \). In addition, if the shape parameter (\( \alpha \)) decreased (increased dispersion) with the size fixed, then the mean strength of a particular structure would decrease based on \( \beta_2 < \beta_1 \).

From this demonstration one could conclude that a high-high shape parameter combination exhibited a large failure envelope or failure surface (safe region) with little or no dispersion (scatter) and a very narrow range where the two failure statistical modes interacted. In other words, the size and shape of the failure envelope or failure surface was largely dependent on the joint probability shape parameters (\( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \)).
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For the probabilistic and mechanistic independent case, the failure envelope or failure surface as presented by a mean strength contour (failure criterion) in this particular study gave the phenomenological appearance of mechanistic dependency. This result would give the erroneous inference that the intrinsic strengths were coupled and dependent, and the failure mechanisms were interacting. Whereas, this study demonstrated that the size and shape of the phenomenological failure envelope or failure surface were dependent on the strength variability of the uniaxial shape parameter ($c_1$ and $c_2$) combinations.

This study covered the two dimensional probabilistic independent and mechanistic independent case. As for recommendations, further analysis in three dimensions (including the case where the shear stress is non-zero) is required as well as an extension to the other three cases:

1. probabilistic dependent and mechanistic independent case.
2. probabilistic independent and mechanistic dependent case.
3. probabilistic dependent and mechanistic dependent case.

The objective is to infer the intrinsic strength space from the realized strength space via a numerical simulation of an analytical model for each of the four cases. Numerical simulation would identify the cause (or modes) of failure whether it was by fiber failure, or by matrix failure, or by shear failure. The failure mechanisms cannot be readily identified with the analytical model. Such understanding would form definitive recommendations for composite material development, such as identifying the benefits associated with improving the fiber or matrix or the interface in order to achieve the desired reliability under combined stress state conditions. Identification of the failure modes by numerical simulation would also aid the definition of experimental detection techniques for quality assurance.
APPENDIX A

THEORETICAL MATHEMATICAL MODEL

The theoretical model was derived for a stress domain and was expressed as a function of a strength vector, an applied stress ratio (radial loading path), and the joint probability function shape ($\alpha$) and scale ($\beta$) parameters. The applied stress ratio in the normalized domain (normalized by $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) was equivalent to the transformed theta ($\theta$), and was defined as (Figure 34):

$$\theta_1 = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{\sigma_2/\sigma_1}{\beta_1/\beta_2} \right]$$

where:

1. $\sigma_2/\sigma_1 = \tan (\theta_1) (\beta_2/\beta_1)$ in the normalized domain.

![Figure 34](image)

Figure 34

Applied Stress Ratio in Normalized Domain
The applied stress ratio in the stress domain was equivalent to the physical theta (θ) and was defined as:

$$\theta = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}\right).$$

The transformed theta was used in determining the physical theta in the stress domain. Therefore, the applied stress ratio in the stress domain for this study was defined as (Figure 35):

$$\theta = \tan^{-1}\left[\tan(\theta_1) \times (\beta_2/\beta_1)\right]$$

In the stress domain the stress component in the longitudinal or fiber direction was defined by a strength vector (S) as:

$$\sigma_1 = (|S|) \times \cos(\theta).$$
The stress component in the transverse or matrix direction was defined by a strength vector (S) as:

\[ \sigma_2 = (\|S\|) \ast \sin (\theta). \]

Based on joint probability \[ R(\|S\|) = R_1(\|S\|) \ast R_2(\|S\|) \], the theoretical model reliability function in the stress domain was expressed as:

\[ R(\|S\|) = \exp \left[ -(\|S\| \ast \cos (\theta) / \beta_1)^{\alpha_1} \right] \ast \exp \left[ -(\|S\| \ast \sin (\theta) / \beta_2)^{\alpha_2} \right]. \]

The theoretical model failure function in the stress domain was defined as:

\[ F(\|S\|) = 1 - R(\|S\|) \]

\[ F(\|S\|) = 1 - \left[ \exp \left[ -(\|S\| \ast \cos (\theta) / \beta_1)^{\alpha_1} \right] \ast \exp \left[ -(\|S\| \ast \sin (\theta) / \beta_2)^{\alpha_2} \right] \right]. \]

where:

1. \( R(\|S\|) \) was the joint probability reliability function.
2. \( F(\|S\|) \) was the joint probability failure function.
3. \((\|S\|) \ast \cos (\theta)\) was the strength component in the longitudinal or fiber direction as defined by the strength vector (S).
4. \((\|S\|) \ast \sin (\theta)\) was the strength component in the transverse or matrix direction as defined by the strength vector (S).
5. \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \beta_1 \) were the joint probability shape (A1 or alfa1) and scale (B1 or beta1) parameters respectively in longitudinal or fiber direction.
6. \( \alpha_2 \) and \( \beta_2 \) were the joint probability shape (A2 or alfa2) and scale (B2 or beta2) parameters respectively in transverse or matrix direction.

The theoretical model defined the fail envelope or failure surface by a mean strength distribution or contour and a percentile strength distribution or contour for the seventeen
applied stress ratios, a particular sample size, and a particular combination of the joint probability shape parameters ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$).

The theoretical mean failure surface, as defined by a mean strength distribution or contour, was derived from the concept of Expected Value [Ref. 15]:

$$\mu = \int x f(x) \, dx$$

$$\mu = \int [1-F(\theta)] \, ds$$

where:

1. $1 - F(\theta)$ is the theoretical reliability function $R(\theta)$.

A Gauss Quadrature method for the integration of the Expected Value mean [$\mu = \int [1-F(\theta)] \, ds$] was used to find the mean strength distribution or contour (Appendix D). The percentile failure surface, as defined by the percentile strength distribution or contour, was an iterative process of the failure function $F(\theta)$ (Appendix G).
APPENDIX B

BIAXIAL L/T NUMERICAL SIMULATION

The numerical simulation of a theoretical model was equivalent to actual experimental testing. The biaxial L/T numerical simulation was a function of intrinsic strengths, an applied stress ratio (radial loading path), and the joint probability function shape ($\alpha$) and scale ($\beta$) parameters. The applied stress ratio in the normalized domain (normalized by $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) was equivalent to the transformed theta ($\theta$) and was defined as (Figure 36):

$$\theta = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{T}{L} \ast \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} \right)$$

where:

(1) $T$ is the transverse stress in the matrix direction.
(2) $L$ is the longitudinal stress in the fiber direction.

Figure 36

Applied Stress Ratio in Normalized Domain
The transformed theta was used to determine the biaxial L/T (longitudinal/transverse) applied stress ratio in the stress domain. Therefore, the applied stress ratio in the stress domain for this study was defined as (Figure 37):

\[
\text{BIAXIAL L/T} = \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} / \tan(\theta).
\]

![Figure 37](Applied Stress Ratio in Physical Domain)

The biaxial numerical simulation was based on the joint probability reliability function \([R(X) = R_1(X_1) \times R_2(X_2)]\). The numerical simulation reliability function and failure function in the stress domain were defined respectively as:

\[
R(X) = \exp\left[-\frac{(X_1/\beta_1)^{\alpha_1} + (X_2/\beta_2)^{\alpha_2}}{\sigma_0}\right]
\]

\[
F(X) = 1 - R(X) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{(X_1/\beta_1)^{\alpha_1} + (X_2/\beta_2)^{\alpha_2}}{\sigma_0}\right]
\]

where:

1. \(R(X)\) was the reliability function and was equivalent to the probability of success associated with the random variables \(X_1\) and \(X_2\).
(2) $F(X)$ was the failure function and was equivalent to the probability of failure associated with the random variables $X_1$ and $X_2$.

(3) $X_1$ was the random intrinsic strength in the longitudinal or fiber direction.

(4) $X_2$ was the random intrinsic strength in the transverse or matrix direction.

(5) $\alpha_1$ and $\beta_1$ were the joint probability shape (A1 or alfa1) and scale (B1 or beta1) parameters respectively in the longitudinal or fiber direction.

(6) $\alpha_2$ and $\beta_2$ were the joint probability shape (A2 or alfa2) and scale (B1 or beta2) parameters respectively in the transverse or matrix direction.

For the numerical simulation $X_1/X_2$ was the intrinsic strength ratio and biaxial $L/T$ was the applied stress ratio in the stress domain. Under a combined stress state, the following strength and stress conditions in the realized strength space were evaluated by the numerical simulation:

(1) If $X_1/X_2 < \text{biaxial } L/T$, the composite failed by fiber (Figure 38).

(2) If $X_1/X_2 > \text{biaxial } L/T$, the composite failed by matrix (Figure 39).

(3) If $X_1/X_2 = \text{biaxial } L/T$, the composite failed by both fiber and matrix. [Ref. 16]

---

**Figure 38**

*Composite Fails by Fiber*
Joint probability for this study was defined as the intrinsic strength which was activated by the stress ($\sigma_1$) in the longitudinal or fiber direction was independent of the intrinsic strength which was activated by the stress ($\sigma_2$) in the transverse or matrix direction. The strengths were uncoupled and the failure mechanisms were not interacting. An example follows (Figure 40):

Take a composite that has high strength in matrix ($X_2'$) and low strength in fiber ($X_1'$), the composite sample failed by fiber. Take a composite that has medium strength in matrix ($X_2''$) and medium strength in fiber ($X_1''$), the composite sample in this case failed by fiber. Take a composite that has low strength in matrix ($X_2'''$) and high strength in fiber ($X_1'''$), the composite sample failed by matrix. [Ref. 17]

For the numerical simulation the absolute intrinsic strengths for each sample defined the intrinsic (not observable) strength space (ISS) via a spatial point in the biaxial stress domain. The combined strength-stress ratio comparison defined the realized (observable) strength space (RSS) via a strength vector in the biaxial stress domain.

The biaxial numerical simulation failure envelope or failure surface in the stress domain was defined by a mean strength distribution or contour, where the mean strength was defined as the sum of the realized strength vectors divided by the number of samples.
Joint Probability (Independent) Realized Strength Space

for each of the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios, and was a function of a particular sample size and a particular combination of the joint probability function shape parameters ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$).

Appendix C exhibited two biaxial L/T numerical simulation worksheets. One was to describe the formulation of the numerical simulation. The second was to provide an example of the numerical simulation.
APPENDIX C

NUMERICAL SIMULATION FORMULATION

The most important aspects of the biaxial L/T numerical simulation [Ref. 18] for a particular sample size, applied stress ratio and the joint probability scale ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) and shape ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$) parameters in the stress domain were:

1. the intrinsic strength space
2. the realized strength space
3. the relative frequency strength space
4. the joint probability strength space
5. the mean realized strength and the mean realized strength distribution

The first worksheet described the formulation of the numerical simulation. The second worksheet provided an example numerical simulation that was based on a sample size of 19, an applied stress ratio normalized for the forty-five (45) degree radial loading path, and the joint probability shape ($\alpha_1 = 60$ and $\alpha_2 = 5$) and scale ($\beta_1 = 100$ and $\beta_2 = 1$) parameters. The worksheets were based on Microsoft Excel software.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>alfa1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>physical theta</td>
<td>biaxial/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>beta1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>radian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>alfa2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>transformed theta</td>
<td>Theta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>beta2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>alfa and beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>columns D and E define the intrinsic strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>are shape and scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>parameters respectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>space (SS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>column B defines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relative intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strength in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>longitudinal or fiber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>column C defines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relative intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strength in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transverse or matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A21+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B21))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A22+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B22))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A23+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B23))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A24+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B24))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A25+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B25))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A26+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B26))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A27+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B27))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A28+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B28))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A29+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B29))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A30+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B30))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>A31+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B31))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A32+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B32))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A33+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B33))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A34+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B34))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>A35+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B35))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>A36+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B36))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A37+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B37))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>A38+1</td>
<td>=RAND()+0.000001</td>
<td>=EXP((LN(LN(1-B38))+alfa1*LN(beta1))/alfa1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \frac{\text{beta1/beta2}}{\text{TAN(radian)}} )</td>
<td>( = (3.1415926535278/180)^\theta )</td>
<td>columns G to J define the realized</td>
<td>columns G to J are the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>stress space (RSS)</td>
<td>comparison of intrinsic strength ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>column F defines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to biaxial L/T applied stress ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>column E defines</td>
<td>intrinsic strength in the transverse</td>
<td>fiber strength associated with</td>
<td>fiber failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>matrix direction</td>
<td>or strength</td>
<td>matrix strength associated with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>strength</td>
<td>fails</td>
<td>fails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>( \frac{X1}{X2} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C21)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D21/E21} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F21-biaxial, D21, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F21-biaxial, D21/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C22)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D22/E22} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F22-biaxial, D22, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F22-biaxial, D22/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C23)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D23/E23} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F23-biaxial, D23, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F23-biaxial, D23/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C24)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D24/E24} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F24-biaxial, D24, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F24-biaxial, D24/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C25)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D25/E25} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F25-biaxial, D25, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F25-biaxial, D25/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C26)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D26/E26} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F26-biaxial, D26, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F26-biaxial, D26/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C27)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D27/E27} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F27-biaxial, D27, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F27-biaxial, D27/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C28)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D28/E28} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F28-biaxial, D28, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F28-biaxial, D28/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C29)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D29/E29} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F29-biaxial, D29, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F29-biaxial, D29/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C30)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D30/E30} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F30-biaxial, D30, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F30-biaxial, D30/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C31)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D31/E31} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F31-biaxial, D31, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F31-biaxial, D31/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C32)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D32/E32} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F32-biaxial, D32, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F32-biaxial, D32/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C33)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D33/E33} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F33-biaxial, D33, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F33-biaxial, D33/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C34)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D34/E34} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F34-biaxial, D34, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F34-biaxial, D34/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C35)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D35/E35} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F35-biaxial, D35, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F35-biaxial, D35/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C36)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D36/E36} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F36-biaxial, D36, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F36-biaxial, D36/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C37)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D37/E37} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F37-biaxial, D37, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F37-biaxial, D37/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C38)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D38/E38} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F38-biaxial, D38, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F38-biaxial, D38/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>( = \exp((\ln(\text{LN(1-C39)})) + \text{alpha}^2 \ln(\text{beta2})) / \text{alpha2} )</td>
<td>( = \text{D39/E39} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F39-biaxial, D39, 0.001)} )</td>
<td>( = \text{IF(F39-biaxial, D39/biaxial, 0.001)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No of tests</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>calculated</td>
<td>alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>calculated</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>numerical simulation</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>column I defines</td>
<td>column J defines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>fiber strength associated with</td>
<td>matrix strength associated with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>matrix failure</td>
<td>matrix failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>Fibr fail</td>
<td>Mtrx fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>fails</td>
<td>fails</td>
<td>vector</td>
<td>vector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>=IF(F21&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E21,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F21&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E21,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G21<em>2+H21</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G21<em>2+J21</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>=IF(F22&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E22,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F22&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E22,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G22<em>2+H22</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G22<em>2+J22</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>=IF(F23&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E23,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F23&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E23,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G23<em>2+H23</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G23<em>2+J23</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>=IF(F24&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E24,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F24&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E24,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G24<em>2+H24</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G24<em>2+J24</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>=IF(F25&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E25,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F25&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E25,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G25<em>2+H25</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G25<em>2+J25</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>=IF(F26&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E26,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F26&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E26,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G26<em>2+H26</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G26<em>2+J26</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>=IF(F27&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E27,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F27&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E27,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G27<em>2+H27</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G27<em>2+J27</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>=IF(F28&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E28,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F28&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E28,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G28<em>2+H28</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G28<em>2+J28</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>=IF(F29&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E29,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F29&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E29,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G29<em>2+H29</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G29<em>2+J29</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>=IF(F30&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E30,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F30&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E30,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G30<em>2+H30</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G30<em>2+J30</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>=IF(F31&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E31,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F31&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E31,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G31<em>2+H31</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G31<em>2+J31</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>=IF(F32&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E32,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F32&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E32,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G32<em>2+H32</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G32<em>2+J32</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>=IF(F33&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E33,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F33&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E33,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G33<em>2+H33</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G33<em>2+J33</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>=IF(F34&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E34,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F34&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E34,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G34<em>2+H34</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G34<em>2+J34</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>=IF(F35&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E35,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F35&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E35,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G35<em>2+H35</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G35<em>2+J35</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>=IF(F36&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E36,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F36&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E36,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G36<em>2+H36</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G36<em>2+J36</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>=IF(F37&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E37,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F37&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E37,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G37<em>2+H37</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G37<em>2+J37</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>=IF(F38&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E38,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F38&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E38,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G38<em>2+H38</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G38<em>2+J38</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>=IF(F39&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E39,0.001)</td>
<td>=IF(F39&gt;biaxial_biaxial&quot;E39,0.001)</td>
<td>=SORT(G39<em>2+H39</em>2)</td>
<td>=SORT(G39<em>2+J39</em>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(entered data)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>=Z40</td>
<td>=Z40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>=(W40/N)^{(1/alfa)}</td>
<td>Calc from iteration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>=SUM($M21:$M39)/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4. Copy columns D to E, G to J and N to U via Scrapbook Function to Cricket Graph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5. columns N to P and U defines the Relative Frequency strength space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6. columns Q to S and T defines the Joint Probability strength space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
<th>Realized</th>
<th>Ordered</th>
<th>Ordered</th>
<th>Ordered</th>
<th>Ordered</th>
<th>Ordered</th>
<th>Ordered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Fibr fail</td>
<td>Mtrx fail</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vector</td>
<td>vector</td>
<td>vector</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>K21+L21</td>
<td>K21</td>
<td>=L21</td>
<td>=M21</td>
<td>=L(N21)</td>
<td>=L(N21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>=K21+L21</td>
<td>=K21</td>
<td>=L21</td>
<td>=M21</td>
<td>=L(N21)</td>
<td>=L(N21)</td>
<td>=L(N21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>=K22+L22</td>
<td>=K22</td>
<td>=L22</td>
<td>=M22</td>
<td>=L(N22)</td>
<td>=L(N22)</td>
<td>=L(N22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>=K23+L23</td>
<td>=K23</td>
<td>=L23</td>
<td>=M23</td>
<td>=L(N23)</td>
<td>=L(N23)</td>
<td>=L(N23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>=K24+L24</td>
<td>=K24</td>
<td>=L24</td>
<td>=M24</td>
<td>=L(N24)</td>
<td>=L(N24)</td>
<td>=L(N24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>=K26+L26</td>
<td>=K26</td>
<td>=L26</td>
<td>=M26</td>
<td>=L(N26)</td>
<td>=L(N26)</td>
<td>=L(N26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>=K27+L27</td>
<td>=K27</td>
<td>=L27</td>
<td>=M27</td>
<td>=L(N27)</td>
<td>=L(N27)</td>
<td>=L(N27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>=K28+L28</td>
<td>=K28</td>
<td>=L28</td>
<td>=M28</td>
<td>=L(N28)</td>
<td>=L(N28)</td>
<td>=L(N28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>=K29+L29</td>
<td>=K29</td>
<td>=L29</td>
<td>=M29</td>
<td>=L(N29)</td>
<td>=L(N29)</td>
<td>=L(N29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>=K30+L30</td>
<td>=K30</td>
<td>=L30</td>
<td>=M30</td>
<td>=L(N30)</td>
<td>=L(N30)</td>
<td>=L(N30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>=K31+L31</td>
<td>=K31</td>
<td>=L31</td>
<td>=M31</td>
<td>=L(N31)</td>
<td>=L(N31)</td>
<td>=L(N31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>=K32+L32</td>
<td>=K32</td>
<td>=L32</td>
<td>=M32</td>
<td>=L(N32)</td>
<td>=L(N32)</td>
<td>=L(N32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>=K33+L33</td>
<td>=K33</td>
<td>=L33</td>
<td>=M33</td>
<td>=L(N33)</td>
<td>=L(N33)</td>
<td>=L(N33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>=K34+L34</td>
<td>=K34</td>
<td>=L34</td>
<td>=M34</td>
<td>=L(N34)</td>
<td>=L(N34)</td>
<td>=L(N34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>=K35+L35</td>
<td>=K35</td>
<td>=L35</td>
<td>=M35</td>
<td>=L(N35)</td>
<td>=L(N35)</td>
<td>=L(N35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>=K36+L36</td>
<td>=K36</td>
<td>=L36</td>
<td>=M36</td>
<td>=L(N36)</td>
<td>=L(N36)</td>
<td>=L(N36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>=K37+L37</td>
<td>=K37</td>
<td>=L37</td>
<td>=M37</td>
<td>=L(N37)</td>
<td>=L(N37)</td>
<td>=L(N37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>=K38+L38</td>
<td>=K38</td>
<td>=L38</td>
<td>=M38</td>
<td>=L(N38)</td>
<td>=L(N38)</td>
<td>=L(N38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAL PTS FOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOINT PROBABILITY PLOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ordered</td>
<td>Joint Probability</td>
<td>Expected xi*alfa</td>
<td>ln(xi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ln X</td>
<td>F*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LN(P21)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U21))</td>
<td>LN(M21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>LN(P22)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U22))</td>
<td>LN(M22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LN(P23)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U23))</td>
<td>LN(M23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>LN(P24)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U24))</td>
<td>LN(M24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>LN(P25)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U25))</td>
<td>LN(M25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LN(P26)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U26))</td>
<td>LN(M26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>LN(P27)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U27))</td>
<td>LN(M27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>LN(P28)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U28))</td>
<td>LN(M28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>LN(P29)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U29))</td>
<td>LN(M29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>LN(P30)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U30))</td>
<td>LN(M30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>LN(P31)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U31))</td>
<td>LN(M31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>LN(P32)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U32))</td>
<td>LN(M32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>LN(P33)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U33))</td>
<td>LN(M33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>LN(P34)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U34))</td>
<td>LN(M34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>LN(P35)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U35))</td>
<td>LN(M35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LN(P36)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U36))</td>
<td>LN(M36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>LN(P37)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U37))</td>
<td>LN(M37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>LN(P38)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U38))</td>
<td>LN(M38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>LN(P39)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U39))</td>
<td>LN(M39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>LN(P40)</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U40))</td>
<td>LN(M40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>LN(beta*{(LN(1-U40))}</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U40))</td>
<td>SUM(W21 W39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>LN(beta*{(LN(1-U41))}</td>
<td>LN(LN(1-U41))</td>
<td>SUM(X21 X39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. Set Transformed Theta - applied stress ratio in normalized domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2. Calculate via Calculate New Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3. Sort NOGORS by Column P in ascending order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4. Copy columns D to E, G to U, and N to U via Scrapbook Function to Cricket Graph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ordered</th>
<th>Ordered</th>
<th>Ordered</th>
<th>Ordered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vector</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>x_i^alpha</th>
<th>ln(x_i)</th>
<th>x_i^alpha *) ln(x_i)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ln L</td>
<td>ln T</td>
<td>ln X</td>
<td>F*</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-2.970</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>-2.250</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>-1.817</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>-1.500</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>-1.246</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>-1.031</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-0.842</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-0.672</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-0.514</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-6.61</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-6.62</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>CAL PNTS FOR</td>
<td>2.9366</td>
<td>-11.513</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>3.62E+15</td>
<td>8.42E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>JOINT PHOB</td>
<td>4.8546</td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>999999</td>
<td>Iterated alpha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

GAUSS QUADRATURE MEAN STRENGTH INTEGRATION

A Gauss Quadrature method [Ref. 19] was used for the integration of the Expected Value mean \( \mu = \int [1 - F(l)] ds \) in order to find the theoretical model mean strength distribution in the stress domain for each of the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios based on a particular combination of the joint probability shape \((\alpha_1, \alpha_2)\) and scale \((\beta_1, \beta_2)\) parameters. The computer program was formatted in Microsoft Basic. There were two basic programs developed:

1. the mean integration for the applied stress ratios which were based on the normalized zero (0) through ninety (90) degree radial loading paths:

REM GAUSS QUADRATURE MEAN INTEGRATION
REM MEAN INTEGRATION FOR NORMALIZED THETA=0 TO 90

OPEN "MEAN DATA AA=" FOR OUTPUT AS #7
enter:
DIM gnums(48)
REM type gnums constants here

b = 13 TO 24 STEP 1
   gnums(i) = -gnums(25-i)
NEXT i

64
FOR i = 37 TO 48 STEP 1
    gnums(i) = gnums(73 - i)
NEXT i

REM THETAS = NORMALIZED THETA
10 PRINT "input THETAS (in degrees)";
INPUT THETAS

IF (THETAS < 0) THEN CLOSE #7
IF (THETAS < 0) THEN STOP

PRINT #7, "THETAS = "; THETAS

REM input limits of integration here (right > left)
PRINT "input the limits of integration (right > left)"

PRINT "input left";
INPUT left

PRINT #7, "left limit of integration = "; left

PRINT "input right";
INPUT right

PRINT #7, "right limit of integration = "; right

REM A1 = ALFA1; A2 = ALFA2; B1 = BETA1; B2 = BETA2
REM ALFA AND BETA ARE SHAPE AND SCALE PARAMETERS
REM RESPECTIVELY

A1 = 60
A2 = 5
B1 = 100
B2=1

REM SIGMA=SIGMA2/SIGMA1
THETAS1 = THETAS *3.141592654# / 180
SIGMA=TAN(THETAS1)*B2/B1

REM THETA=PHYSICAL THETA
THETA= ATN(SIGMA)

c1 = -(left + right) / (right - left)
c2 = 0.5 * (right - left)

ANSWER= 0

REM FUNCTION TO BE INTEGRATED
FOR i = 1 TO 24
   X = (gnums(i) - c1)*c2
   F = EXP(-((X*COS(THETA)/B1)^A1 + (X*SIN(THETA)/B2)^A2))
   ANSWER = ANSWER + gnums(i+24) * F
NEXT i

ANSWER = ANSWER * c2

PRINT "ANSWER = ";ANSWER
PRINT
PRINT #7,"ANSWER=");ANSWER
PRINT #7," 

GOTO 10
END

(2) the mean integration for the applied stress ratios which were based only on the normalized (uniaxial) zero (0) and ninety (90) degree radial loading paths:

REM GAUSS QUADRATURE MEAN INTEGRATION
REM MEAN INTEGRATION FOR NORMALIZED THETA=0 AND 90 ONLY

OPEN "MEAN DATA A=" FOR OUTPUT AS #7
enter:
DIM gnums(48)
REM type gnums constants here
gnums(1) = -.9951872199970214#
gnums(2) = -.9747285559713095#
gnums(3) = -.9382745520027328#
gnums(4) = -.886415527004401#
gnums(5) = -.8200019859739029#
gnums(6) = -.7401241915785544#
gnums(7) = -.6480936519369755#
gnums(8) = -.5454214713888395#
gnums(9) = -.4337935076260451#
gnums(10) = -.3150426796961634#
gnums(11) = -.1911188674736163#
gnums(12) = -6.405689286260564D-02

FOR i = 13 TO 24 STEP 1
  gnums(i) = -gnums(25-i)
NEXT i

gnums(25) = .0123412297999872#
gnums(26) = 2.853138862893366D-02
gnums(27) = 4.427743881741981D-02
gnums(28) = 5.929858491543678D-02
gnums(29) = .0733464814110803#
gnums(30) = 8.619016153195327D-02
gnums(31) = 9.761865210411388D-02
gnums(32) = .1074442701159656#
gnums(33) = .1155056680537256#
gnums(34) = .1216704729278034#
gnums(35) = .1258374563468283#
gnums(36) = .1279381953467522#

FOR i = 37 TO 48 STEP 1
  gnums(i) = gnums(73-i)
NEXT i

REM THETAS=THETA NORMALIZED
10 PRINT "input THETAS (in degrees)";
INPUT THETAS

IF (THETAS<0) THEN CLOSE #7
IF (THETAS<0) THEN STOP

PRINT #7,"";THETAS

REM input limits of integration here (right > left)
PRINT "input the limits of integration (right > left)"

PRINT "input left";
INPUT left
PRINT#7,"left limit of integration=": left

PRINT"input right";
INPUT  right

PRINT#7,"right limit of integration=": right

REM A1=ALFA1;  A2=ALFA2;  B1=BETA1;  B2=BETA2
REM ALFA AND BETA ARE SHAPE AND SCALE PARAMETERS
REM RESPECTIVELY

A1=60
A2=5
B1=100
B2=1

REM THETAS1=PHYSICAL THETA
THETAS1 = THETAS *3.141592654# / 180

c1 = -(left + right) / (right - left)
c2 = .5 * (right - left)

ANSWER= 0

REM FUNCTION TO BE INTEGRATED
FOR i = 1 TO 24
   X = (gnums(i) - c1)*c2
   F = EXP(-((X*COS(THETAS1)/B1)^A1 + (X*SIN(THETAS1)/B2)^A2))
   ANSWER = ANSWER + gnums(i+24) * F
NEXT i

ANSWER = ANSWER * c2

PRINT "ANSWER = ";ANSWER
PRINT
PRINT #7, "ANSWER=";ANSWER
PRINT #7," 
GOTO 10
END
This particular worksheet exhibited the formulation of the mean strength failure envelopes or failure surfaces in the stress domain as defined by the failure criteria for both cases. For the biaxial L/T numerical simulation and the theoretical mathematical model, the failure envelope or failure surface was defined as:

1. the mean strength distribution or contour of the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios for a particular sample size and a particular shape parameter (α₁ and α₂) combination with the mean strength distribution or contour normalized by the joint probability function (uniaxial) scale parameters (β₁ and β₂).

2. the mean strength distribution or contour of the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios for a particular sample size and a particular shape parameter (α₁ and α₂) combination with the mean strength distribution or contour normalized by the mean strength at the normalized (uniaxial) zero (0) degree and ninety (90) degree radial loading paths (transformed theta) respectively.

A mathematical mean function based on the uniaxial longitudinal and transverse scale (β) and shape (α) parameters and the Gamma function was used at the normalized (uniaxial) zero (0) degree and ninety (90) degree radial loading paths for correlation of the numerical simulation and theoretical model mean strengths at the respective radial loading paths. The mathematical mean function was defined as: \( \mu = \beta \Gamma(1 + 1/\alpha) \) [Ref. 20].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETA1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFA1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFA2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a and b are the joint probability shape and scale parameters, respectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMULAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= \( \text{BETA1} \cdot 0.9904745 \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The numerical simulation mean strength was based on the biaxial L/N numerical simulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The theoretical model mean strength was based on the Gauss Quadrature integration method.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NON-NORMALIZED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>THETA</td>
<td>U*COS()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A13*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B13*COS($H13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A14*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B14*COS($H14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A15*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B15*COS($H15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A16*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B16*COS($H16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A17*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B17*COS($H17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A18*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B18*COS($H18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A19*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B19*COS($H19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A20*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B20*COS($H20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A21*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B21*COS($H21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A22*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B22*COS($H22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A23*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B23*COS($H23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A24*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B24*COS($H24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A26*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B26*COS($H26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A27*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B27*COS($H27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A28*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B28*COS($H28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($A29*3.141592654/180)*BETA2/BETA1)</td>
<td>=$B29*COS($H29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SIMULATED</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U(0)</td>
<td>=$B13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>U(90)</td>
<td>=$B29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NUMERICAL</td>
<td>SIMULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>failure envelopes as defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>failure criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U*COS()/B1</td>
<td>U*SIN()/B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>=$I13/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J13/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>=$I14/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J14/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>=$I15/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J15/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>=$I16/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J16/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>=$I17/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J17/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>=$I18/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J18/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>=$I19/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J19/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>=$I20/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J20/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>=$I21/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J21/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>=$I22/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J22/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>=$I23/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J23/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>=$I24/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J24/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>=$I25/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J25/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>=$I26/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J26/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>=$I27/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J27/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>=$I28/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J28/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>=$I29/BETA1</td>
<td>=$J29/BETA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U=mean strength</td>
<td>U(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>failure envelopes as defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>failure criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U*COS()</td>
<td>$C13$*COS($H13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C14$*COS($H14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C15$*COS($H15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C16$*COS($H16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C17$*COS($H17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C18$*COS($H18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C19$*COS($H19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C20$*COS($H20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C21$*COS($H21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C22$*COS($H22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C23$*COS($H23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C24$*COS($H24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C25$*COS($H25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C26$*COS($H26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C27$*COS($H27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C28$*COS($H28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>$C29$*COS($H29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>=S$C13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>=S$C29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$U'*SIN()$/$B2$</td>
<td>SIGMA1/$U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>=$Q13/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P13/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>=$Q14/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P14/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>=$Q15/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P15/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>=$Q16/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P16/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>=$Q17/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P17/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>=$Q18/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P18/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>=$Q19/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P19/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>=$Q20/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P20/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>=$Q21/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P21/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>=$Q22/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P22/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>=$Q23/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P23/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>=$Q24/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P24/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>=$Q25/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P25/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>=$Q26/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P26/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>=$Q27/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P27/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>=$Q28/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P28/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>=$Q29/\text{BETA}2$</td>
<td>=$P29/U(0)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

RELIABILITY/FAILURE FUNCTION WORKSHEET

This particular worksheet exhibited the formulation of the joint probability reliability and failure functions based on an applied stress ratio and a particular combination of the joint probability shape ($\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$) and scale ($\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) parameters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 alpha1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 beta1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 alpha2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 beta2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>alpha and beta are the joint probability shape and scale parameters respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>THEORETICAL MODEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>STRENGTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RELIABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>VECTOR FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S R(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>=A11+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>=A12+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>=A13+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>=A14+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>=A15+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>=A16+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>=A17+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>=A18+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>=A19+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>=A20+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>=A21+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>=A22+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>=A23+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>=A24+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>=A25+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>=A26+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>=A27+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>=A28+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>=A29+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>=A30+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>=A31+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R(S) = \exp(-((A11 \cdot \cos(\theta))/\beta_1) \cdot \alpha_1 + (A11 \cdot \sin(\theta))/\beta_2) \cdot \alpha_2) \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
<td>THETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIG2SIG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>radians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NORMALIZED</td>
<td>THETA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>R1(S)</td>
<td>R2(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EXP(-((A11*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A11*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EXP(-((A12*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A12*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>EXP(-((A13*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A13*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>EXP(-((A14*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A14*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>EXP(-((A15*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A15*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>EXP(-((A16*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A16*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>EXP(-((A17*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A17*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>EXP(-((A18*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A18*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>EXP(-((A19*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A19*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EXP(-((A20*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A20*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>EXP(-((A21*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A21*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>EXP(-((A22*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A22*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>EXP(-((A23*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A23*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>EXP(-((A24*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A24*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>EXP(-((A25*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A25*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>EXP(-((A26*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A26*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>EXP(-((A27*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A27*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>EXP(-((A28*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A28*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>EXP(-((A29*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A29*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>EXP(-((A30*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A30*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>EXP(-((A31*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A31*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>EXP(-((A32*COS(TTHETA)/beta1)*alpha1))</td>
<td>EXP(-((A32*SIN(TTHETA)/beta2)*alpha2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
<td>$F_2(S)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$F(S)$</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
<td>$F_1(S)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table represents a theoretical model with columns for E, F, and G, and rows for different values of S. The values in the table are placeholders and need to be replaced with actual data.
APPENDIX G

PERCENTILE STRENGTH WORKSHEET

This particular worksheet exhibited the formulation of the percentile strength failure envelopes or failure surfaces in the stress domain as defined by the theoretical model failure criteria. The percentile failure contour was obtained at the different combined stress levels by assigning \( F(I_S) \) a constant percentile (i.e., \( F(I_S) = 0.10 \) for the ten (10) percentile contour) and solving for \( (I_S) \) by iteration. This iteration was repeated for the seventeen (17) applied stress ratios for a particular combination of the joint probability shape parameters (\( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 alpha and beta are the joint parameters respectively</td>
<td>alpha1 beta1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 probability shape and scale</td>
<td>alpha2 beta2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 S is the strength vector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 old S</td>
<td>=$B9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 new S</td>
<td>=$B8*(1-converge*(C8-aim)/MAX(aim,C8))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 aim</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 converge</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>theoretical model failure function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 F(S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 =1·EXP(-[B\theta\cos(\theta)/\beta_1]^\alpha_1+(B\theta\sin(\theta)/\beta_2)^\alpha_2))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 percentile aim point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>columns A to F is the iterate process to determine the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>percentile strength for a particular applied stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ratio and a particular joint shape and scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>combination and a particular percentile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>non-normalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>theta = ATAN(TAN($F10*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>normalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>theta1 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F(S) = .900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H11*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H12*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H13*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H14*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H15*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H16*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H17*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H18*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H19*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H20*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H21*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H22*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H23*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H24*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H25*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H26*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>=ATAN(TAN($H27*3.141592654/180)*beta2/beta1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$S\cdot\cos()$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$-S_{11}\cdot\cos(S_{11})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$-S_{12}\cdot\cos(S_{12})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$-S_{13}\cdot\cos(S_{13})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$-S_{14}\cdot\cos(S_{14})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$-S_{15}\cdot\cos(S_{15})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$-S_{16}\cdot\cos(S_{16})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$-S_{17}\cdot\cos(S_{17})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$-S_{18}\cdot\cos(S_{18})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$-S_{19}\cdot\cos(S_{19})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$-S_{20}\cdot\cos(S_{20})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$-S_{21}\cdot\cos(S_{21})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$-S_{22}\cdot\cos(S_{22})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$-S_{23}\cdot\cos(S_{23})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>$-S_{24}\cdot\cos(S_{24})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>$-S_{25}\cdot\cos(S_{25})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>$-S_{26}\cdot\cos(S_{26})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>$-S_{27}\cdot\cos(S_{27})$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

columns N and O define the percentile strength distribution based on the theoretical model failure criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$S^*\sin() / B2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>=$M11/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>=$M12/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>=$M13/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>=$M14/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>=$M15/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>=$M16/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>=$M17/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>=$M18/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>=$M19/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>=$M20/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>=$M21/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>=$M22/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>=$M23/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>=$M24/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>=$M25/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>=$M26/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>=$M27/\beta a2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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