A STATISTICAL MODEL OF BRITTLE FRACTURE BY TRANSGRANULAR CLEAVAGE

TSANN LIN, A. G. EVANS[†] and R. O. RITCHIE

Materials and Molecular Research Division, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, and Department of Materials Science and Mineral Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

(Received 17 June 1985; in revised form 24 December 1985)

ABSTRACT

A MODEL for brittle fracture by transgranular cleavage cracking is presented based on the application of weakest link statistics to the critical microstructural fracture mechanisms. The model permits prediction of the macroscopic fracture toughness, $K_{i,c}$ in single phase microstructures containing a known distribution of particles, and defines the critical distance from the crack tip at which the initial cracking event is most probable. The model is developed for unstable fracture ahead of a sharp crack considering both linear elastic and nonlinear elastic ("elastic/plastic") crack tip stress fields. Predictions are evaluated by comparison with experimental results on the low temperature flow and fracture behavior of a low carbon mild steel with a simple ferrite/grain boundary carbide microstructure.

NOTATION

δA	elemental area within active zone
b	characteristic dimension along crack front
c_0	diameter of cracked particle
d_{q}	average grain diameter
Ĕ	Young's modulus
f	"eligibility" factor in equation (4)
F	dimensionless parameter defining $(\sigma_{ii}/\sigma_0)_{max}$
g(S)dS	elemental strength distribution of particles
h _{ii}	dimensionless function of θ
I_n	dimensionless parameter in HRR singular solution equation (6)
J	amplitude of HRR singular solution of crack tip field
K ₁	stress intensity factor (Mode I)
K_{1c}	plane strain fracture toughness
l_{0}^{*}	characteristic distance (along $\theta = 0$)
m	shape factor in Weibull assumption
n	work hardening exponent $(1 < n < \infty)$
Ν	number of particles per unit volume
r, θ	polar coordinates, centered at crack tip
r_u	distance from tip where $\sigma = S_u$
r*	distance from tip where $d\delta\phi = 0$
r_f^*	radial characteristic distance from tip (at $K_{\rm I} = K_{\rm Ic}$)

[†]Currently with Materials Group, College of Engineering, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, U.S.A.

478	T. LIN et al.
r,	plastic zone size
S	fracture strength of particle
<i>S</i>	strength parameter
S_0^{n}	Weibull parameter
Š.	Weibull parameter reflecting strength of largest particle
$\delta V.V$	elemental and total active zone volume, respectively
X	distance directly ahead of crack tip
X	ratio $S/S_{\rm m}$
α	material constant in constitutive law equation (5)
	"effective" fracture surface energy
δ	crack tip opening displacement
č	function defined in equation (11)
η	function defined in equation (16)
v	Poisson's ratio
σ	local stress within plastic zone
σ^*	local stress when $d\delta\phi = 0$
$\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon}$	equivalent stress and strain, respectively
σ_{\pm}	maximum principal stress
σ^*	cleavage fracture stress (at $K_{\perp} = K_{\perp c}$)
σ_{ii}	stress tensor for local crack tip stresses
$\tilde{\sigma}_{ii}$	function in HRR singular solution equation (6)
σ_0, ε_0	yield (or flow) stress and strain, respectively
$\sigma_{\rm rr}$	local tensile stress
$\sigma_{ heta heta}$	local tangential stress
$\delta\phi, \Phi$	elemental and total failure probabilities, respectively

1. INTRODUCTION

Low strength structural steels fail by catastrophic brittle fracture at low temperatures. Such failures can be either transgranular or intergranular. In most *ferritic* steels fracture occurs by transgranular cleavage cracking along well-defined, low index crystallographic planes (e.g. HAHN, AVERBACH, OWEN and COHEN, 1959; KNOTT, 1973; HAHN, 1984). The process of cleavage fracture has been attributed primarily to slip-induced cracking of carbide particles,[†] generally located on grain boundaries, followed by propagation of the resultant cracks into the surrounding ferrite matrix (Fig. 1) (MCMAHON and COHEN, 1965). The critical step in this process is typically the propagation of the carbide microcrack into the adjoining ferrite grain (SMITH. 1966), except either at temperatures close to the transition temperature or in finegrained microstructures, whereupon the critical step may become the propagation of the cleavage crack across the next grain boundary (HOLTZMANN and MAN, 1971: GROOM and KNOTT, 1975).

Cleavage fracture ahead of a rounded notch (with root radius large compared to microstructural dimensions) has been considered to occur when the maximum value of the local tensile stress exceeds a critical fracture stress, generally regarded as a

^{*}At very low temperatures in mild steels and in higher Mn-containing steels, cleavage may be nucleated by twinning rather than slip (KNOTT and COTTRELL, 1963; OATES, 1969). Moreover, evidence of cleavage nucleation at manganese sulphide inclusions has been reported in higher strength bainitic steels (ROSENFIELD, SHETTY and SKIDMORE, 1983).



FIG. 1. Transgranular cleavage cracks in a mild steel associated with cracked grain boundary carbides ahead of the main crack tip.

temperature and strain rate insensitive quantity (KNOTT, 1966; WILSHAW, RAU and TETELMAN, 1968). The maximum stress occurs close to the elastic–plastic interface, at least when plasticity is confined to the notch root (i.e. for loads well below general yield) (HILL, 1950; GRIFFITHS and OWEN, 1971). Consequently, the initial cracking event occurs at a distance ahead of the notch tip of the order of the plastic zone size. Conversely, for cleavage fracture ahead of a microscopically-sharp crack, the maximum stress for contained yielding occurs within two crack tip opening displacements of the crack tip (RICE and JOHNSON, 1970). Hence, RITCHIE, KNOTT and RICE (1973) postulated that the local tensile stress must exceed the fracture stress *over a microstructurally-significant (characteristic) distance ahead of the crack tip* (Fig. 2). In their original model (hereafter referred to as RKR), the characteristic distance (for a coarse-grained high-nitrogen mild steel) was found to be a small multiple of the average ferrite grain diameter. Subsequent studies, however, have shown that the critical distance can become independent of grain size at small grain sizes (CURRY and KNOTT, 1976).

To relate the RKR criterion to the microstructural features of cleavage fracture, CURRY and KNOTT (1978) postulated that fracture initiates from the largest observable carbide, i.e. the carbide having the lowest "strength". This assumption is deemed reasonable when the stress is almost uniform, as in the case of fracture ahead of a rounded notch. However, for fracture ahead of a sharp crack, where the stress gradient is substantial, the more numerous finer carbides also may participate in the cleavage process.

In order to examine this competition between cracked carbides of different sizes within the stress field of a sharp crack, CURRY and KNOTT (1979), and subsequently others (EVANS, 1983; BEREMIN, 1983; WALLIN, SAARIO and TÖRRÖNEN, 1984), have re-formulated the RKR model on the basis of weakest link statistics. For this purpose,



FIG. 2. Schematic illustration of the Ritchie, Knott and Rice (RKR) model for critical stress-controlled cleavage fracture directly ahead of a sharp crack.

a distribution of carbides, each having a "fracture strength" inversely related to its size, is postulated. The cleavage fracture toughness then is estimated by sampling the plastic zone for the presence of an "eligible" particle at which the fracture criterion can be satisfied.

In the present study, a fully quantitative weakest link model for cleavage fracture is presented. The approach differs from previous analyses, primarily in the choice of active zone elements consistent with crack tip stress distributions. The model is used to ascribe consistent microstructural significance to the characteristic distance, and principally to predict the lower shelf plane strain fracture toughness, K_{tc} , as a function of temperature and microstructure. Predictions are evaluated on the basis of experimental low temperature flow and fracture results in spheroidized AISI 1008 mild steel.

2. THE STATISTICAL MODELS

1. General principles

In the present model, particles located within the plastic zone are considered subject to cracking and the resultant cracks are treated as non-interacting flaws capable of propagating unstably into the surrounding matrix.[†] Weakest link statistics thus are deemed applicable. The propagation of a particle microcrack into the matrix is assumed to occur at a critical stress, characteristic of the carbide "strength" S. For a spheroidal particle containing a penny-shaped crack, S is related to the particle diameter, c_0 , as (CURRY and KNOTT, 1978):

$$S^{2} = \pi E \gamma_{p} / (1 - v^{2}) c_{0}, \qquad (1)$$

where γ_p is the effective fracture surface energy of the matrix, *E* is Young's modulus and *v* is Poisson's ratio. The size distribution of the particles thus can be associated directly with a strength distribution, g(S) dS—the number of particles per unit volume having strengths between *S* and *S*+d*S*. Weakest link statistics then require that elements δV within the plastic zone, subject to a stress σ , have the failure probability, $\delta \phi$ (MATTHEWS, SHACK and MCCLINTOCK, 1976):

$$\delta \phi = 1 - \exp\left[-\delta V \int_0^\sigma g(S) \,\mathrm{d}S\right],\tag{2}$$

and that the total failure probability Φ (due to the unstable propagation of the crack in the weakest particle), be given by

$$\Phi = 1 - \exp\left\{-\int_0^V \left[dV \int_0^\sigma g(S) \, dS\right]\right\},\tag{3}$$

where V is the plastic zone volume. A convenient and versatile expression for g(S) dS

[†] More specifically, if a crack initiates within a particle having a strength S less than the local stress, σ , the crack will continue to propagate, dynamically, into the ferrite grain and cause fracture. Alternatively, a crack in a small particle (having $S > \sigma$) will arrest at the ferrite interface and, subsequently, blunt.

is the three-parameter WEIBULL (1939) assumption

$$\int_{0}^{\sigma} g(S) \,\mathrm{d}S = \left(\frac{\sigma - S_{u}}{S_{0}}\right)^{n} fN,\tag{4}$$

where *m* is a shape factor, S_0 is a scale parameter, S_u is a lower bound strength (of the largest feasible cracked particle), and *N* is the number of particles per unit volume. The parameter *f* represents the fraction of "eligible" particles that participate in the fracture process, as dictated by the location of the particle, the orientation of the matrix grain, and so forth.

Given the stress distribution within the plastic zone, the survival probability of the structure may be ascertained from equation (3) by separately assessing S_0 , S_u , N and m from quantitative measurements of the particle size distribution, and by independently evaluating f. Solutions to this problem for extension of a sharp crack are developed below.

2. Extension of a sharp crack

Crack tip stress fields. For conditions of small-scale yielding in a power hardening (incompressible nonlinear elastic) solid that satisfies the constitutive law

$$\bar{\varepsilon}/\varepsilon_0 = \alpha (\bar{\sigma}/\sigma_0)^n,\tag{5}$$

the stress field at distance r ahead of a stationary crack, in the limit of $r \rightarrow 0$, is given by the HRR singular solution (HUTCHINSON, 1968; RICE and ROSENGREN, 1968):

$$\frac{\sigma_{ij}}{\sigma_0} \rightarrow \left(\frac{J}{\alpha \varepsilon_0 \sigma_0 I_n r}\right)^{1/(n+1)} \tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(n,\theta), \tag{6}$$

where σ_0 and ε_0 are the yield strength and yield strain, respectively, α is a material constant of order unity, *n* is the work hardening exponent, *J* is the path independent integral (RICE, 1968) and I_n and $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$ are dimensionless parameters (SHIH, 1983). By reexpressing equation (6) in terms of the Mode I stress intensity factor, K_1 , and by noting that the stresses predicted by the HRR solution are truncated directly by crack tip blunting (RICE and JOHNSON, 1970; MCMEEKING, 1977), the plane strain stress field within the near tip region has the characteristics

$$\frac{\sigma_{ij}}{\sigma_0} = \left[\left(\frac{1 - v^2}{I_n} \right) \left(\frac{K_1}{\sigma_0 \sqrt{r}} \right)^2 \right]^{1/(n+1)} \tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(n,\theta), \quad (2\delta \leq r \leq 10\delta)$$
$$\frac{\sigma_{ij}}{\sigma_0} \approx F(n), \quad (r \leq 2\delta) \tag{7}$$

where δ is the crack tip opening displacement and F(n) is a dimensionless parameter describing the maximum stress intensification at the tip, defined by the blunting solutions (Fig. 3a). Further from the crack tip (i.e. typically at $r \gtrsim 10\delta$), the stresses within the plastic zone deviate from the asymptotic HRR solution (OSTERGREN, 1969; TRACEY, 1976), such that close to the elastic-plastic interface, the solutions closely



FIG. 3. Distribution of local tensile stress σ_{xy} as a function of distance x directly ahead of a tensile-loaded crack in plane strain. Shown are (a) a comparison of the near-tip asymptotic HRR singular solution with numerical results for power law hardening (solutions are truncated very close to the tip by the Rice and Johnson blunting solution for $\sigma/E = 0.0025$), and (b) a comparison of the far-field asymptotic linear elastic singular solution with numerical results based on ideal plasticity and power law hardening.

approximate the linear elastic asymptotic solution (WILLIAMS, 1957)

$$\sigma_{ij} \to \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} h_{ij}(\theta), \quad (r \gtrsim 100\delta)$$
(8)

as shown in Fig. 3b.

At low temperatures, because the plastic zone is small, the site of the most probable cracking event is close to the elastic-plastic interface. In contrast, at higher temperatures, the most probable site resides well within the plastic zone, due to the associated increase in plastic zone size. Accordingly, the statistical analysis is performed using the two limiting idealizations for the crack tip stress distributions.[†] Behavior at the lowest temperatures (i.e. at highest σ_0) is described using the far-field linear elastic solution (equation (8)), resulting in an asymptotic lower bound estimate of K_{lc} . At higher temperatures closer to the transition temperature, behavior is described in terms of the near-tip HRR solution (equation (6)), with stresses truncated at $r \sim 2\delta$ by crack tip blunting. Intermediate temperature behavior can be ascertained by interpolation. The method of analysis is presented in its entirety for the latter case, involving the HRR formulation. Only final solutions are provided for the elastic limit.

Statistical analysis. The statistical analysis based on the crack tip stress fields can be performed most conveniently by defining active elements (Fig. 4). These represent elements in which the stress is constant, i.e. in which particle microcracks liable to be activated all have strengths less than, or equal to, the appropriate local stress σ . Such elements have a volume δV given by

$$\delta V = 2b \int_0^{\pi} r \, \delta r \, \mathrm{d}\theta, \tag{9}$$

where b is a characteristic sampling dimension describing the distance between initial nucleation events along the crack front (EVANS, 1983). This distance recognizes that unstable extension of the major crack will require the sympathetic activation of several particle microcracks along the crack front. It is taken as a multiple of the grain diameter in the present steel. The element location is defined in terms of the HRR field by:

$$r = \left(\frac{K_1}{\sigma_0}\right)^2 \left(\frac{1-v^2}{I_n}\right) \left(\frac{\sigma_0}{\sigma}\right)^{n+1} \tilde{\sigma}^{n+1},\tag{10}$$

and σ is the stress component that allows linkage of activated microcracks with the main crack tip. The failure probability associated with such elements is then

$$\delta \phi = 1 - \exp[-bfN\xi K_1^4 \sigma_0^{2(n-1)} (\sigma - S_u)^m \sigma^{-(2n+3)} S_0^{-m} d\sigma],$$

[†] Incorporation of the more precise numerical solutions of OSTERGREN (1969) and TRACEY (1976) for the description of the far-field crack tip stresses was not possible in the present model as such solutions are available only for the σ_{yy} tensile opening stresses and not the complete stress tensor σ_{yy} .

with

$$\xi = 2(n+1) \left[\frac{1-v^2}{I_n} \right]^2 \int_0^{\pi} \hat{\sigma}^{2(n+1)} d\theta.$$
 (11)

The model is evaluated for σ representing either the principal tensile stress, σ_1 , or the tangential stress, $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ (Fig. 4). These assumptions regarding σ are tantamount to presuming, respectively, that all activated particle microcracks link with the crack tip or, that only those microcracks radially oriented with respect to the main crack tip are amenable to linkage.

The elemental survival probability expressed by equation (11) exhibits a minimum



(b) $\sigma = \sigma_1$

FIG. 4. Definition of the active zone, representing the region ahead of the crack tip where either (a) the local tangential stress σ_{00} or (b) the maximum principal stress σ_1 exceeds the particle fracture strength S.

at a characteristic distance r^* from the crack tip, given by $(d\delta \phi = 0)$

$$r^{*} = \left[\frac{1-\nu^{2}}{I_{n}}\right] \left[\frac{2n+3-m}{2n+3}\right]^{n+1} \left(\frac{K_{1}}{\sigma_{0}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{\sigma_{0}}{S_{u}}\right)^{n+1} \tilde{\sigma}^{n+1},$$
(12)

occurring at the stress

$$\sigma^* = \left[\frac{2n+3}{2n+3-m}\right] S_u,\tag{13}$$

as illustrated schematically in Fig. 5. When cleavage fracture occurs at $K_1 = K_{1c}$, the critical values of σ^* and r^* , σ_f^* and r_f^* , respectively, can be equated conceptually with the critical fracture stress and characteristic distance invoked in the RKR analysis. In statistical terms, the distance r^* represents the location ahead of the crack tip where the initial cracking event is most probable. Since, for a sharp crack, the local stresses are progressively decreased over microstructurally-significant dimensions ahead of the crack tip, the value of r^* reflects the competition between behavior far from the tip close to the elastic/plastic interface, where the population of eligible cracked particles is large but the stresses are low, and behavior close to the tip, where the stresses are higher but the number of eligible particles is less.

The total survival probability of material within the plastic zone can be obtained from the product of the elemental survival probabilities:

$$\Phi = 1 - \exp\left[-bfN\xi K_1^4 \sigma_0^{2(n-1)} S_0^{-m} \int_{S_m}^{\sigma_0 F} \sigma^{-(2n+3)} (\sigma - S_u)^m \,\mathrm{d}\sigma\right],\tag{14}$$

where S_m is the larger amongst S_u and σ_0 . Consequently, at the median level ($\Phi = 1/2$)



FIG. 5. Significance of the characteristic distance r^* and fracture stress σ^* , defined at the radial distance from the crack tip where the initial cracking event is most probable.

where $K_1 = K_{1c}$, the fracture toughness becomes

$$K_{1c} = \left[\frac{\ln 2}{fNb\xi\eta}\right]^{1/4} {\binom{S_0}{S_u}}^{n/4} S_u^{(1+n)/2} \sigma_0^{(1-n)/2},$$
(15)

where for the case of present interest $(S_u > \sigma_0)$,[†]

$$\eta(m,n,S_u/\sigma_0) = \int_{1}^{F\sigma_0\cdot S_u} (X-1)^m X^{-(2n+3)} \,\mathrm{d}X, \tag{16}$$

where $X = S/S_u$. In addition, by choosing $\Phi = 0.05$ and 0.95, equation (14) can be used to predict the statistical variation in K_{lc} .

Corresponding solutions for r^* and σ^* based on the far-field, linear elastic stress distributions pertinent to the edge of the plastic zone are

$$r^* = \frac{(5-m)^2}{50\pi} \left(\frac{K_1}{S_u}\right)^2,\tag{17}$$

$$\sigma^* = \begin{bmatrix} 5\\ 5-m \end{bmatrix} S_u, \tag{18}$$

such that the fracture toughness becomes

$$K_{1c} = \begin{bmatrix} \ln 2 \\ fNb\eta \ \bar{1.35} \end{bmatrix}^{1/4} \begin{pmatrix} S_0 \\ \bar{S}_u \end{pmatrix}^{m/4} S_u.$$
(19)

Some specific trends in toughness predicted by equations (15) and (19) are plotted in Fig. 6. The linear elastic description of the outer regions of the plastic zone evidently provides a temperature-independent K_{1c} asymptote at low temperatures, while the near-tip HRR solution results in K_{1c} values asymptotic to a transition temperature (which occurs when the integration limits in equation (14) converge). Additionally, comparison of the expression for the local fracture stress, σ_{1}^{*} , evaluated from the HRR formulation (equation (13)), with that from the far-field formulation (equation (18)), reveals that σ_{1}^{*} is predicted to be weakly dependent on temperature.

3. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

The material used to evaluate the model was an AISI 1008 mild steel of composition shown in Table 1.

To obtain a microstructure consisting of a ferritic matrix with primarily grain boundary carbides, the steel was austenitized for 1 h at 920°C, air cooled, and then spheroidized for 7 days at 700°C. The resulting microstructure, termed L7, was found to have an average ferrite grain size (d_g) of 25 μ m and a grain boundary carbide particle size distribution shown by the histogram in Fig. 7. Using this size distribution, the elemental strength distribution g(S) dS, was derived directly using equation (1).

[†] The weakest carbide always has a strength in excess of the yield strength for the material, AISI 1008 mild steel, studied in section 3.



FIG. 6. Predicted variation in fracture toughness, K_{lc} , with temperature from lower shelf to ductile/brittle transition (equations (15) and (19)), showing influence of varying (a) work hardening exponents from n = 1-10, (b) carbide size distribution from m = 1-5, (c) fraction of eligible particles from f = 0.01-0.10, and (d) relevant hard hard hard near f = 0.01-0.10, and f = 0.01-0.10, f = 0.00-0.10, f = 0.00-0.10, f = 0.00-0.10, f = 0.00-0.10, f = 0.0

(d) relevant local stress, σ_1 or $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$. (Strength and microstructure data from AISI 1008 steel.)

TABLE 1. Composition in wt. % of AISI 1008 steel

С	Mn	Р	S	Si	Fe
0.08	0.26	0.01	0.01	0.01	balance



FIG. 7. Size distribution of carbides, measured with an image analyzer in AISI 1008 mild steel after spheroidizing 7 days at 700°C (L7 microstructure).

Structure	Ferrite grain size	Carbide strength distribution		
	$d_{g}\left(\mu\mathrm{m} ight)$	т	S_0 (MPa)	S_u (MPa)
L7	25	1.7	2800	1300

TABLE 2. Grain size and grain boundary carbide strength distribution

Values of the Weibull parameters m, S_0 and S_u , computed from g(S) dS assuming equation (4), are listed in Table 2.

Mechanical properties were assessed from uniaxial tensile tests conducted at a displacement rate of 0.5 mm/min over the temperature range -196° C to 20° C. Results showing the temperature dependence of strength and ductility are plotted in Fig. 8. Work hardening exponents were found to be approximately 4 below -70° C. Plane strain fracture toughness tests to measure $K_{\rm lc}$ values were performed on fatigue pre-cracked single-edge-notched bend specimens, tested in four-point bend over the temperature range -196° C to -70° C, in accordance primarily with ASTM Standard E-399. At the higher temperatures where excessive plasticity invalidated direct linear elastic measurements of toughness, values of $K_{\rm lc}$ were computed from nonlinear elastic $J_{\rm lc}$ measurements, i.e. $J_{\rm lc} = K_{\rm lc}^2/E$, using the experimental procedures of SUMPTER and TURNER (1976). Resulting plane strain fracture toughness data are shown in Fig. 9.



FIG. 8. Experimental measurement of the temperature dependence of uniaxial tensile properties in AISI 1008 mild steel. Shown are the (lower) yield stress, U.T.S. and % elongation (on 32 mm gauge length).



FIG. 9. Experimental measurement of the temperature dependence of plane strain fracture toughness K_{lc} in AISI 1008 mild steel, based on four-point bend tests. Results above -100° C were computed from nonlinear elastic J_{lc} measurements.

4. COMPARISON BETWEEN THEORY AND EXPERIMENT

Model predictions for the fracture toughness K_{lc} of AISI 1008 steel as a function of temperature are shown in Fig. 10 and are compared to the experimental results of Fig. 9. Predictions are based on a maximum principal stress criterion, with the fraction f of "eligible" carbides set at 5%. A value of 23 J/m² is assumed for the effective fracture surface energy γ_p , as measured by GERBERICH and KURMAN (1985). The characteristic crack front width, b, is assessed from the particle activation probability along the crack front reflecting the distance between sympathetic initial nucleation events (LIN, EVANS and RITCHIE, 1986). For the present microstructure, observations of fracture nuclei suggest that b is of the order of two grain diameters. However, the results are not sensitive to this choice.

It is apparent that the predicted asymptotic lower shelf toughness is consistent with the minimal variation in toughness observed at the lowest temperatures. At higher temperatures, predictions using the nonlinear elastic HRR distribution (plotted for work hardening exponents, n, between 3 and 5) yield sharply increasing toughness values, consistent with transitional behavior approaching the upper shelf. As n is approximately 4 for this microstructure, the absolute magnitude of the cleavage



FIG. 10. Model predictions for mild steel, from equations (15) and (19), for the temperature dependence of K_{bc} compared to experimental data in Fig. 9. Predictions are shown for work hardening exponents between 3 and 5.

fracture toughness predictions can be seen to agree closely with experimental K_{tc} values for this steel.

Observations of a lower shelf fracture toughness independent of yield strength, even though the yield stress is changing rapidly, have been noted previously (e.g. ODETTE and LUCAS, 1984; RITCHIE, SERVER and WULLAERT, 1979), and reflect initial fracture events dominated primarily by far-field near-elastic stresses at the edge of the relatively small plastic zone. With increasing temperature, the corresponding plastic zone size increases, such that fracture events become dominated by the near-tip elastic–plastic stresses, resulting in a toughness that depends on the yield strength and that increases with increasing temperature. The asymptotic transition temperature is the temperature at which the yield strength is reduced to an extent that the maximum crack tip stress, determined by the blunting solution (Fig. 4b), becomes insufficient to exceed the minimum carbide strength S_{u} .

The model permits investigation into the orientation and eligibility of carbide particle cracks in the fracture process. Predictions based on a critical value of the tangential stress, $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$, rather than σ_1 , yield unreasonably high values of the toughness (Fig. 11). This trend is consistent with metallographic studies (LIN *et al.*, 1986), which indicate that linkage with the macrocrack tip is not restricted to radially-oriented particle cracks. For the present microstructure, it appears that the data require roughly



FIG. 11. K_{1c} predictions for mild steel from equations (15) and (19): effect of utilizing tangential stress $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ model rather than model based on the maximum principal stress σ_1 . Note how predictions based on $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ overestimate the toughness.

5% of the carbide population to be eligible as fracture sites (Fig. 12), consistent with estimates of previous authors (COHEN and VUKCEVICH, 1969; CURRY and KNOTT, 1979). This fraction of eligible carbides probably decreases at the higher temperatures, in the transition range, because metallographic studies show that numerous particle cracks become blunted and play no further active role in the fracture process (see also COHEN and VUKCEVICH, 1969). This "exhaustion" behavior results in a more rapid approach to the transition than predicted by Figs 6, 10–12. Details of the microstructural implications of this model, specifically with respect to the question of the "exhaustion" of particle cracks and the independent roles of grain size and particle size, are treated in detail elsewhere (LIN *et al.*, 1986).

Finally, the model can be used to estimate the statistical variation in fracture toughness values by evaluating K_{Ic} from equation (14) at total survival probabilities of $\Phi = 0.05$ and 0.95. The predicted range of scatter (Fig. 13) readily embraces experimental data.

5. DISCUSSION

The statistical model for transgranular cleavage fracture described above, which permits prediction of the cleavage fracture toughness for a microstructure containing



FIG. 12. K_{lc} predictions for mild steel from equations (15) and (19): effect of different values of f, representing the fraction of eligible particles *actively* involved in the fracture process.

a known distribution of particles, is seen to provide excellent agreement with experimental K_{Ic} results in a mild steel. However, there are several limitations with the approach which should be noted.

First, the model presumes a criterion for fracture wherein the critical event is the propagation into the matrix of a microcrack within a carbide particle. The majority of experimental evidence, on low temperature cleavage cracking in steels, supports such a notion (e.g. KNOTT, 1973; HAHN, 1984). However, should the critical event change to the propagation of a ferrite microcrack through the grain boundary, as has been inferred for temperatures closer to the transition (e.g. HOLTZMANN and MAN, 1971), a weakest link model is unlikely to be appropriate, because the limiting step may then involve crack coalescence.

Second, the questions of the distance b separating initial nucleation events along the crack front, and the fraction f of eligible particle microcracks involved in the fracture process currently are not amenable to prediction *a priori*. The latter definition of f is particularly important in view of the observed "exhaustion" of certain particle cracks at higher temperatures. Orientation and location clearly are relevant here. In this context, the current analysis indicates that the critical fracture event is not restricted solely to radially orientated microcracks.

Finally, the current model relies on the asymptotic linear elastic and HRR nonlinear elastic singular solutions to describe the distribution of stresses in the vicinity of the



FIG. 13. K_{tc} predictions for mild steel from equations (15) and (19) showing the expected statistical variation in fracture toughness values. Extreme estimates are obtained at total survival probabilities of $\Phi = 0.05$ and 0.95.

crack tip. Whereas these solutions provide reasonable limiting descriptions of the local stresses at the elastic/plastic interface and near the crack tip, respectively (Fig. 3), a more accurate representation would be obtained with the numerical power hardening solutions of TRACEY (1976) and MCMEEKING (1977). However, as noted above, the latter solutions are available for the σ_{yy} stresses only, and thus are difficult to incorporate with the active zone concept implicit in the current model.

6. CONCLUSIONS

A model for transgranular cleavage fracture relying on weakest link statistical considerations has been presented for the prediction of brittle fracture toughness in single phase microstructures containing a known distribution of particles. The model, which considers cracking events within an active zone defined in terms of either the nonlinear elastic near-tip or linear elastic far-field crack tip stress fields, permits prediction of the temperature dependence and statistical variation of K_{Ic} , as a function of such variables as flow stress, work hardening exponent and particle size, from lower shelf temperatures into the ductile/brittle transition region. The analysis provides a

T. LIN et al.

natural definition of the "characteristic distance" as the critical radial dimension from the crack tip where the initial cracking event is most probable. In comparison with experiment, model predictions are found to agree closely with plane strain fracture toughness results measured in a low strength mild steel over a range of temperatures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Science Division of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098. The writers wish to thank Profs R. M. McMeeking and G. R. Odette for several helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

COHEN, M. and VUKCEVICH, M. R. 1969 Physics of Strength and Plasticity (ed. Argon, A. S.), p. 295, M.I.T. Press, MA. CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1976 Met. Sci. 10, 1. CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1978 Ibid. 12, 511. CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1979 Ibid. 13, 341. EVANS, A. G. 1983 Metall. Trans. A 14A, 1349. GREBERICH, W. W. and 1985 Scripta Met. 19, 295. KURMAN, E. 1971 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 19, 419. GROM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. 1975 Met. Sci. 9, 390. HAHN, G. T. 1984 Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., 1950 Fracture (cd. Averbach, B. L. et al.), p. 91, Wiley, N.Y. WILL, R. 1950 The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity, Oxford Univ. Press. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. 1971 J. Iron Steel Inst. 209, 836. HUTCHINSON, J. W. 1966 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. 1976 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. 1976 J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249. LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and 1976 J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304. MCCLINTOCK, F. A. 1976 J	Beremin, F. M.	1983	Metall. Trans. A 14A, 2277.
p. 295, M.I.T. Press, MA. CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1976 Met. Sci. 10, 1. CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1978 Ibid. 12, 511. CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1978 Ibid. 13, 341. EVANS, A. G. 1983 Metall. Trans. A 14A, 1349. GERBERICH, W. W. and 1985 Scripta Met. 19, 295. KURMAN, E. GRIFFITHS, J. R. and 1971 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 19, 419. OWEN, D. R. J. GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. 1975 Met. Sci. 9, 390. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., 1959 Fracture (ed. Averbach, B. L. et al.), p. 91, Wiley. OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. 1950 The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity, Oxford HILL, R. 1950 The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity, Oxford HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. 1971 J. Iron Steel Inst. 209, 836. HUTCHINSON, J. W. 1968 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 13. KNOTT, J. F. 1966 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. 1966 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H. 1963 J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249. LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and 1976 J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 3	COHEN, M. and VUKCEVICH, M. R.	1969	Physics of Strength and Plasticity (ed. Argon, A. S.),
CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1976 Met. Sci. 10, 1. CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1978 Ibid. 12, 511. CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1979 Ibid. 13, 341. EVANS, A. G. 1983 Metall. Trans. A 14A, 1349. GERBERICH, W. W. and 1985 Scripta Met. 19, 295. KURMAN, E. 1985 Scripta Met. 19, 295. GRIFFITHS, J. R. and 1971 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 19, 419. OWEN, D. R. J. 1984 Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947. GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. 1975 Met. Sci. 9, 390. HAHN, G. T. 1984 Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947. HAHN, G. T. 1984 Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947. HAHN, G. T. 1950 Fracture (ed. Averbach, B. L. et al.), p. 91, Wiley. N.Y. OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. 1971 J. Iron Steel Inst. 209, 836. HUTCHINSON, J. W. 1968 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 13. KNOTT, J. F. 1976 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. 1966 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H. 1963 J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249. LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and 1976 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>p. 295, M.I.T. Press, MA.</td>			p. 295, M.I.T. Press, MA.
CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1978 <i>Ibid.</i> 12, 511. CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1979 <i>Ibid.</i> 13, 341. EVANS, A. G. 1983 <i>Metall. Trans. A</i> 14A, 1349. GERBERICH, W. W. and 1985 <i>Scripta Met.</i> 19, 295. KURMAN, E. 1971 <i>J. Mech. Phys. Solids</i> 19, 419. OWEN, D. R. J. 1971 <i>J. Mech. Phys. Solids</i> 19, 419. OWEN, D. R. J. 1975 <i>Met. Sci.</i> 9, 390. HAHN, G. T. 1984 <i>Metall. Trans. A</i> 15A, 947. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., 1959 <i>Fracture</i> (ed. Averbach, B. L. <i>et al.</i>), p. 91, Wiley. OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. 1950 <i>The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity</i> , Oxford HILL, R. 1950 <i>The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity</i> , Oxford Univ. Press. 1966 <i>J. Iron Steel Inst.</i> 209, 836. HUTCHINSON, J. W. 1966 <i>J. Iron Steel Inst.</i> 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. 1976 <i>J. Iron Steel Inst.</i> 201, 249. LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and 1976 <i>J. Amer. Ceram. Soc.</i> 59, 304. MCCLINTOCK, F. A. 1976 <i>J. Mach. Phys. Solids</i> 25, 357. OATHEWS, J. R., MACK, W. and 1977 <i>J. Mech. Phys. Solids</i> 25, 357. <td>CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F.</td> <td>1976</td> <td>Met. Sci. 10, 1.</td>	CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F.	1976	Met. Sci. 10, 1.
CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F. 1979 Ibid. 13, 341. EVANS, A. G. 1983 Metall. Trans. A 14A, 1349. GREBERICH, W. W. and 1985 Scripta Met. 19, 295. GRIFFITHS, J. R. and 1971 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 19, 419. OWEN, D. R. J. GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. 1975 GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. 1975 Met. Sci. 9, 390. HAHN, G. T. 1984 Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947. HAHN, G. T. 1986 Fracture (ed. Averbach, B. L. et al.), p. 91, Wiley. OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. 1959 Fracture (ed. Averbach, B. L. et al.), p. 91, Wiley. OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. 1950 The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity, Oxford Univ. Press. HUTCHINSON, J. W. 1968 J. Iron Steel Inst. 209, 836. HUTCHINSON, J. W. 1964 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. 1966 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. 1963 J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249. LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and 1976 J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. 1965 Acta Met. 13, 591. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. 1965 Acta Met. 13, 59	CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F.	1978	<i>Ibid.</i> 12 , 511.
 EVANS, A. G. EVANS, A. G. IP83 Metall. Trans. A 14A, 1349. GREBERICH, W. W. and GREBERICH, W. W. and GREBERICH, W. W. and IP85 Scripta Met. 19, 295. Scripta Met. 19, 295. Scripta Met. 19, 295. Scripta Met. 19, 295. Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947. IP71 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 19, 419. OWEN, D. R. J. GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. IP75 Met. Sci. 9, 390. HAHN, G. T. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., IP97 Met. Sci. 9, 390. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., IP97 J. Methematical Theory of Plasticity, Oxford Univ. Press. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. IP71 J. Iron Steel Inst. 209, 836. HUTCHINSON, J. W. IP68 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 13. KNOTT, J. F. IP66 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. IP66 J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. IP66 J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249. LUN, T., EVANS, A. G. and IP67 J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304. MCCLINTOCK, F. A. MCMAEKING, R. M. IP77 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357. OATES, G. OMER, M. IP77 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357. OATES, G. OSTERGREN, W. J. IP69 J. Iron Steel Inst. 207, 264. OSTERGREN, W. J. IP68 J. Nucl. Matls. 117, 264. OSTERGREN, W. J. IP68 J. Mucl. Matls. 117, 264. OSTERGREN, W. J. IP68 J. Mucl. Matls. 16, 1. IP73 Ibid. 21, 395. Ritchie, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and ROSENGREN, G. F. IP68 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1. Ip73 J. Bid. 21, 395. 	CURRY, D. and KNOTT, J. F.	1979	<i>Ibid.</i> 13 , 341.
 GERBERICH, W. W. and KURMAN, E. GRIFTITHS, J. R. and OWEN, D. R. J. GROM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. HAHN, G. T. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. HILL, R. HILL, R. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HOTCHINSON, J. W. HO68 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 13. J. Iron Steel Inst. 209, 836. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HO68 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 13. J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104. KNOTT, J. F. HO63 J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249. LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and HO86 Metall. Trans. A 16A, in review. RITCHE, R. O. MATTHEWS, J. R., SHACK, W. and MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. HO76 J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304. MCCLINTOCK, F. A. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. HO76 J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304. MCMAEKING, R. M. HO77 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357. J. Iron Steel Inst. 207, 264. J. Nucl. Matls. 117, 264. STERGREN, W. J. HO85 Lensis, Brown University, Providence, R.I. Inelastic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y. RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. HO70 Inelastic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. HO84 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1. H753 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1. H754 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1. H75	Evans, A. G.	1983	Metall. Trans. A 14A, 1349.
KURMAN, E.GRIFFITHS, J. R. and OWEN, D. R. J.1971J. Mech. Phys. Solids 19, 419.GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F.1975Met. Sci. 9, 390.HAHN, G. T.1984Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947.HAHN, G. T.1984Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947.HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M.1959Fracture (ed. Averbach, B. L. et al.), p. 91. Wiley. N.Y.HILL, R.1950The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity, Oxford Univ. Press.HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J.1971J. Iron Steel Inst. 209, 836.HUTCHINSON, J. W.1968J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 13.KNOTT, J. F.1976J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104.KNOTT, J. F.1973Fundamentals of Fracture Mechanics, Butterworths, London.KNOTT, J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H.1963J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249.Lin, T., EVANS, A. G. and MCCLINTOCK, F. A.1976J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304.MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M.1976J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304.MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M.1965Acta Met. 13, 591.MCMEEKING, R. M.1977J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357.OATES, G.1969J. Iron Steel Inst. 207, 264.ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E.1983J. Nucl. Matls. 117, 264.OSTEERGREN, W. J.1970Inelastic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y.RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F.1968J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1.RITCHE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R.1973Ibid. 21, 395.<	GERBERICH, W. W. and	1985	Scripta Met. 19, 295.
 GRIFFITHS, J. R. and OWEN, D. R. J. GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. HAHN, G. T. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., 1984 Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., 1959 Fracture (ed. Averbach, B. L. et al.), p. 91, Wiley, N.Y. WEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. HILL, R. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HOT, J. F. HOKANN, J. W. HOUTCHINSON, J. W. HOT, J. F. HOKANN, M. and COTTRELL, A. H. HOKANN, J. F. HORANN, A. G. and COTTRELL, A. H. INO, T., J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H. INO, T., J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H. INO, T., J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H. INO, T., J. F., SHACK, W. and MCLINTOCK, F. A. MCCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. MCMAHON, C. J. and LUCAS, G. E. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. MICH, Mattls. 117, 264. MICH, MATHL, M. M. <li< td=""><td>Kurman, E.</td><td></td><td></td></li<>	Kurman, E.		
 OWEN, D. R. J. GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. HAHN, G. T. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. HILL, R. HILL, R. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HOLZMANN, M. A. HOLZMAN, M. HOLZMAN	GRIFFITHS, J. R. and	1971	J. Mech. Phys. Solids 19, 419.
 GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F. HAHN, G. T. HAHN, G. T. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. HILL, R. HILL, R. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HOLZMANN, M. A. <li< td=""><td>OWEN, D. R. J.</td><td></td><td></td></li<>	OWEN, D. R. J.		
 HAHN, G. T. HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. HILL, R. HULL, R. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HOKATT, J. F. HOKATT, J. F. HOKATT, J. F. HOKATT, J. F. HONGON, C. J. and COTTRELL, A. H. ISS MCMAHON, C. J. and LUCAS, G. E. ODETTE, G. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. RICE, J. R. MARTINEWS, J. R. MCMEMERY AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND	GROOM, J. D. G. and KNOTT, J. F.	1975	Met. Sci. 9, 390.
 HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M. HILL, R. HULZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HOZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HOK KNOTT, J. F. HOT, J. K. HOT, J. M. HOT, J.	Hahn, G. T.	1984	Metall. Trans. A 15A, 947.
 HILL, R. HILL, R. HILL, R. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HOKANT, J. F. HOKANT, J. F. ANG COTTRELL, A. H. H	HAHN, G. T., AVERBACH, B. L., OWEN, W. S. and COHEN, M.	1959	Fracture (ed. Averbach, B. L. et al.), p. 91, Wiley, N.Y.
 HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HOLZMANN, M. A. HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J. HUTCHINSON, J. W. HOLZMANN, M. A. HOLZMANN, M. HOLZMANN, M. HOLZMANN, M.	HILL, R.	1950	The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity, Oxford Univ. Press.
 HUTCHINSON, J. W. HUTCHINSON, J. W. KNOTT, J. F. KNOTT, J. F. If and COTTRELL, A. H. If and Cotter an	HOLZMANN, M. and MAN, J.	1971	J. Iron Steel Inst. 209, 836.
 KNOTT, J. F. KNOTT, J. F. KNOTT, J. F. IP73 Fundamentals of Fracture Mechanics, Butterworths, London. KNOTT, J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H. IP63 J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249. LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and RITCHIE, R. O. MATTHEWS, J. R., SHACK, W. and MCCLINTOCK, F. A. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. IP65 Acta Met. 13, 591. MCMEEKING, R. M. IP77 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357. OATES, G. IP69 J. Iron Steel Inst. 207, 264. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. IP83 J. Nucl. Matls. 117, 264. OSTERGREN, W. J. RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. IP69 K. C. thesis, Brown University, Providence, R.I. IP70 Inelastic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y. RICE, J. R. R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R. 	HUTCHINSON, J. W.	1968	J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 13.
 KNOTT, J. F. I973 Fundamentals of Fracture Mechanics, Butterworths, London. KNOTT, J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H. I963 J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249. LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and RITCHIE, R. O. MATTHEWS, J. R., SHACK, W. and I976 J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304. MCCLINTOCK, F. A. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. I965 Acta Met. 13, 591. MCMEEKING, R. M. I977 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357. OATES, G. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. OSTERGREN, W. J. RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. I970 Inelastic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y. RICCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R. 	KNOTT, J. F.	1966	J. Iron Steel Inst. 204, 104.
 KNOTT, J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H. 1963 J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249. LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and 1986 Metall. Trans. A 16A, in review. RITCHIE, R. O. MATTHEWS, J. R., SHACK, W. and 1976 J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304. MCCLINTOCK, F. A. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. 1965 Acta Met. 13, 591. MCMEEKING, R. M. 1977 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357. OATES, G. 1969 J. Iron Steel Inst. 207, 264. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. 1983 J. Nucl. Matls. 117, 264. OSTERGREN, W. J. 1969 M.Sc. thesis, Brown University, Providence, R.I. RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. 1970 Inelastic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. 1968 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1. RITCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R. 	KNOTT, J. F.	1973	Fundamentals of Fracture Mechanics, Butterworths, London.
 LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and RITCHIE, R. O. MATTHEWS, J. R., SHACK, W. and MCCLINTOCK, F. A. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. MCMEEKING, R. M. OTERS, G. OATES, G. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. OSTERGREN, W. J. Rice, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. RITCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R. MCMEMERING, R. M. MCMEMERING, R. M. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. MCMEMERING, R. M. MCMAHON, C. J. AND COHEN, M. MCMEMERING, R. MCMAHON, C. J. AND COHEN, M. MCMAHON, C. J. AND COHEN, M. MCMEMERING, R. MCMAHON, C. J. AND COHEN, M. MCMEMERING, R. MCMAHON, C. J. AND COHEN, M. MCMEMERING, M.	KNOTT, J. F. and COTTRELL, A. H.	1963	J. Iron Steel Inst. 201, 249.
 RITCHIE, R. O. MATTHEWS, J. R., SHACK, W. and 1976 J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304. MCCLINTOCK, F. A. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. 1965 Acta Met. 13, 591. MCMEEKING, R. M. 1977 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357. OATES, G. 1969 J. Iron Steel Inst. 207, 264. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. 1983 J. Nucl. Matls. 117, 264. OSTERGREN, W. J. 1969 M.Sc. thesis, Brown University, Providence, R.I. RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. 1970 Inelastic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. 1968 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1. RITCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R. 	LIN, T., EVANS, A. G. and	1986	Metall. Trans. A 16A, in review.
 MATTHEWS, J. R., SHACK, W. and MCCLINTOCK, F. A. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. MCMEEKING, R. M. MCMEEKING, R. M. MOTT J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357. OATES, G. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. OSTERGREN, W. J. RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. MCMESING, R. M. MCMESING, M. A. MCMESING, MCMESING, MCMESING,	RITCHIE, R. O.		
 MCCLINTOCK, F. A. MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M. MCMEEKING, R. M. MCMEEKING, R. M. MOTES, G. MCMETE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. MCMEERING, W. J. MCMERING, W. J. <l< td=""><td>MATTHEWS, J. R., SHACK, W. and</td><td>1976</td><td>J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304.</td></l<>	MATTHEWS, J. R., SHACK, W. and	1976	J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 59, 304.
 McMahon, C. J. and Cohen, M. McMeeking, R. M. McMeeking, McMeeking, Solids 25, 357. McMeeking, C. P. McMeeking, McMeeking, Mc	McClintock, F. A.		
 McMEEKING, R. M. MCMEEKING, G. R. MCMEEKING, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. MCMEEKING, R. M. J. MCMEEKING, R. M. M. MCMEEKING, MCMETHING, MCME	MCMAHON, C. J. and COHEN, M.	1965	Acta Met. 13, 591.
 OATES, G. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. OSTERGREN, W. J. RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. RITCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R. 	MCMEEKING, R. M.	1977	J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25, 357.
 ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E. OSTERGREN, W. J. RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. RICE, J. R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R. 	OATES, G.	1969	J. Iron Steel Inst. 207, 264.
 OSTERGREN, W. J. RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. Indestic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. RITCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R. 	ODETTE, G. R. and LUCAS, G. E.	1983	J. Nucl. Matls. 117, 264.
 RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A. 1970 Inelastic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y. RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. 1968 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1. RITCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and 1973 Ibid. 21, 395. RICE, J. R. 	OSTERGREN, W. J.	1969	M.Sc. thesis, Brown University, Providence, R.I.
RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F. 1968 J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1. RITCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and 1973 Ibid. 21, 395. RICE, J. R.	RICE, J. R. and JOHNSON, M. A.	1970	Inelastic Behavior of Solids (eds. Kanninen, M. F. et al.), p. 641, McGraw-Hill, N.Y.
RITCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and 1973 <i>Ibid.</i> 21, 395. RICE, J. R.	RICE, J. R. and ROSENGREN, G. F.	1968	J. Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 1.
	RITCHIE, R. O., KNOTT, J. F. and RICE, J. R.	1973	<i>Ibid.</i> 21 , 395.

RITCHIE, R. O., SERVER, W. L. and	1979	Metall. Trans. A 10A, 1557.
WULLAERT, R. A.		
ROSENFIELD, A. R., SHETTY, D. K. and SKIDMORE, A. J.	1983	<i>Ibid.</i> 14A , 1934.
Shih, C. F.	1983	Brown University Report No. MRL E-147, Provi- dence, R.I.
Smith , E.	1966	Proc. Conf. Physical Basis of Yield and Fracture, p. 36, Inst. Phys. and Phys. Soc., Oxford.
SUMPTER, J. D. G. and TURNER, C. E.	1976	Cracks and Fracture, ASTM STP 601, p. 3, ASTM, Philadelphia.
TRACEY, D. M.	1976	J. Eng. Matls. Tech. 98, 146.
WALLIN, K., SAARIO, T. and TÖRRÖNEN, K.	1984	Met. Sci. 18, 13.
WEIBULL, W.	1939	Ing. Vetenskap. Akad. Handl. 12, 153.
WILLIAMS, M. L.	1957	J. Appl. Mech. 24, 109.
WILSHAW, T. R., RAU, C. A. and TETELMAN, A. S.	1968	Engng. Fracture Mech. 1, 191.