



Designation: C1360 – 01 (Reapproved 2007)

# Standard Practice for Constant-Amplitude, Axial, Tension-Tension Cyclic Fatigue of Continuous Fiber-Reinforced Advanced Ceramics at Ambient Temperatures<sup>1</sup>

This standard is issued under the fixed designation C1360; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon ( $\epsilon$ ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

## 1. Scope

1.1 This practice covers the determination of constant-amplitude, axial tension-tension cyclic fatigue behavior and performance of continuous fiber-reinforced advanced ceramic composites (CFCCs) at ambient temperatures. This practice builds on experience and existing standards in tensile testing CFCCs at ambient temperatures and addresses various suggested test specimen geometries, specimen fabrication methods, testing modes (force, displacement, or strain control), testing rates and frequencies, allowable bending, and procedures for data collection and reporting. This practice does not apply to axial cyclic fatigue tests of components or parts (that is, machine elements with nonuniform or multiaxial stress states).

1.2 This practice applies primarily to advanced ceramic matrix composites with continuous fiber reinforcement: uni-directional (1-D), bi-directional (2-D), and tri-directional (3-D) or other multi-directional reinforcements. In addition, this practice may also be used with glass (amorphous) matrix composites with 1-D, 2-D, 3-D, and other multi-directional continuous fiber reinforcements. This practice does not directly address discontinuous fiber-reinforced, whisker-reinforced or particulate-reinforced ceramics, although the methods detailed here may be equally applicable to these composites.

1.3 The values stated in SI units are to be regarded as the standard and are in accordance with IEEE/ASTM SI 10 Standard.

1.4 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use. Refer to Section 7 for specific precautions.*

<sup>1</sup> This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee C28 on Advanced Ceramics and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee C28.07 on Ceramic Matrix Composites.

Current edition approved Feb. 1, 2007. Published February 2007. Originally approved in 1996. Last previous edition approved in 2001 as C1360-01. DOI: 10.1520/C1360-01R07.

## 2. Referenced Documents

### 2.1 ASTM Standards:<sup>2</sup>

- C1145 Terminology of Advanced Ceramics
- C1275 Test Method for Monotonic Tensile Behavior of Continuous Fiber-Reinforced Advanced Ceramics with Solid Rectangular Cross-Section Test Specimens at Ambient Temperature
- D3479/D3479M Test Method for Tension-Tension Fatigue of Polymer Matrix Composite Materials
- D3878 Terminology for Composite Materials
- E4 Practices for Force Verification of Testing Machines
- E6 Terminology Relating to Methods of Mechanical Testing
- E83 Practice for Verification and Classification of Extensometer Systems
- E337 Test Method for Measuring Humidity with a Psychrometer (the Measurement of Wet- and Dry-Bulb Temperatures)
- E467 Practice for Verification of Constant Amplitude Dynamic Forces in an Axial Fatigue Testing System
- E468 Practice for Presentation of Constant Amplitude Fatigue Test Results for Metallic Materials
- E739 Practice for Statistical Analysis of Linear or Linearized Stress-Life ( $S-N$ ) and Strain-Life ( $\epsilon-N$ ) Fatigue Data
- E1012 Practice for Verification of Test Frame and Specimen Alignment Under Tensile and Compressive Axial Force Application
- E1150 Definitions of Terms Relating to Fatigue
- E1823 Terminology Relating to Fatigue and Fracture Testing
- IEEE/ASTM SI 10 Standard for Use of the International System of Units (SI) (The Modern Metric System)

## 3. Terminology Definitions

### 3.1 Definitions:

3.1.1 Definitions of terms relating to advanced ceramics, fiber-reinforced composites, tensile testing, and cyclic fatigue

<sup>2</sup> For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, [www.astm.org](http://www.astm.org), or contact ASTM Customer Service at [service@astm.org](mailto:service@astm.org). For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

as they appear in Terminology C1145, Terminology D3878, Terminology E6, and Terminology E1823, respectively, apply to the terms used in this practice. Selected terms with definitions non specific to this practice follow in 3.2 with the appropriate source given in parenthesis. Terms specific to this practice are defined in 3.3.

3.2 Definitions of Terms Non Specific to This Standard:

3.2.1 advanced ceramic,  $n$ —A highly engineered, high performance predominately non-metallic, inorganic, ceramic material having specific functional attributes. (See Terminology C1145.)

3.2.2 axial strain  $[LL^{-1}]$ ,  $n$ —the average longitudinal strains measured at the surface on opposite sides of the longitudinal axis of symmetry of the test specimen by two strain-sensing devices located at the mid length of the reduced section. (See Practice E1012.)

3.2.3 bending strain  $[LL^{-1}]$ ,  $n$ —the difference between the strain at the surface and the axial strain. In general, the bending strain varies from point to point around and along the reduced section of the test specimen. (See Practice E1012.)

3.2.4 ceramic matrix composite,  $n$ —a material consisting of two or more materials (insoluble in one another), in which the major, continuous component (matrix component) is a ceramic, while the secondary component(s) (reinforcing component) may be ceramic, glass-ceramic, glass, metal or organic in nature. These components are combined on a macroscale to form a useful engineering material possessing certain properties or behavior not possessed by the individual constituents (See Test Method C1275.)

3.2.5 continuous fiber-reinforced ceramic matrix composite (CFCC),  $n$ —a ceramic matrix composite in which the reinforcing phase consists of a continuous fiber, continuous yarn, or a woven fabric. (See Terminology C1145.)

3.2.6 constant amplitude loading,  $n$ —in cyclic fatigue loading, a loading in which all peak loads are equal and all of the valley loads are equal. (See Terminology E1823.)

3.2.7 cyclic fatigue,  $n$ —the process of progressive localized permanent structural change occurring in a material subjected to conditions that produce fluctuating stresses and strains at some point or points and that may culminate in cracks or complete fracture after a sufficient number of fluctuations. (See Terminology E1823.) See Fig. 1 for nomenclature relevant to




FIG. 1 Cyclic Fatigue Nomenclature and Wave Forms.

cyclic fatigue testing.

3.2.7.1 Discussion—In glass technology static tests of considerable duration are called “static fatigue” tests, a type of test generally designated as stress-rupture.

3.2.7.2 Discussion—Fluctuations may occur both in force and with time (frequency) as in the case of “random vibration.”

3.2.8 cyclic fatigue life,  $N_f$ —the number of loading cycles of a specified character that a given test specimen sustains before failure of a specified nature occurs. (See Terminology E1823.)

3.2.9 cyclic fatigue limit,  $S_f[FL^{-2}]$ ,  $n$ —the limiting value of the median cyclic fatigue strength as the cyclic fatigue life,  $N_f$ , becomes very large, (for example,  $N_f 10^6 - 10^7$ ). (See Terminology E1823.)

3.2.9.1 Discussion—Certain materials and environments preclude the attainment of a cyclic fatigue limit. Values tabulated as “fatigue limits” in the literature are frequently (but not always) values of  $S_f$  at 50 % survival at  $N_f$  cycles of stress in which the mean stress,  $S_m$ , equals zero.

3.2.10 cyclic fatigue strength  $S_N$ ,  $[FL^2]$ ,  $n$ —the limiting value of the median cyclic fatigue strength at a particular cyclic fatigue life,  $N_f$  (See Terminology E1823.)

3.2.11 gage length,  $[L]$ ,  $n$ —the original length of that portion of the test specimen over which strain or change of length is determined. (See Terminology E6.)

3.2.12 force ratio,  $n$ —in cyclic fatigue loading, the algebraic ratio of the two loading parameters of a cycle; the most widely used ratios (See Terminology E1150, E1823):

$$R = \frac{\text{minimum force}}{\text{maximum force}} \text{ or } R = \frac{\text{valley force}}{\text{peak force}}$$

and

$$A = \frac{\text{force amplitude}}{\text{mean force}} \text{ or } A = \frac{(\text{maximum force} - \text{minimum force})}{(\text{maximum force} + \text{minimum force})}$$

3.2.13 matrix-cracking stress  $[FL^{-2}]$ ,  $n$ —The applied tensile stress at which the matrix cracks into a series of roughly parallel blocks normal to the tensile stress. (See Test Method C1275.)

3.2.13.1 Discussion—In some cases, the matrix-cracking stress may be indicated on the stress-strain curve by deviation from linearity (proportional limit) or incremental drops in the stress with increasing strain. In other cases, especially with materials that do not possess a linear portion of the stress-strain curve, the matrix cracking stress may be indicated as the first stress at which a permanent offset strain is detected in the unloading stress-strain curve (elastic limit).

3.2.14 modulus of elasticity  $[FL^{-2}]$ ,  $n$ —The ratio of stress to corresponding strain below the proportional limit. (See Terminology E6.)

3.2.15 proportional limit stress  $[FL^{-2}]$ ,  $n$ —the greatest stress that a material is capable of sustaining without any deviation from proportionality of stress to strain (Hooke’s law). (See Terminology E6.)

3.2.15.1 Discussion—Many experiments have shown that values observed for the proportional limit vary greatly with the sensitivity and accuracy of the testing equipment, eccentricity of loading, the scale to which the stress-strain diagram is

plotted, and other factors. When determination of proportional limit is required, specify the procedure and sensitivity of the test equipment.

3.2.16 *percent bending, n*—the bending strain times 100 divided by the axial strain. (See Practice E1012.)

3.2.17 *S-N diagram, n*—a plot of stress versus the number of cycles to failure. The stress can be maximum stress,  $S_{max}$ , minimum stress,  $S_{min}$ , stress range,  $\Delta S$  or  $S_r$ , or *stress amplitude,  $S_a$* . The diagram indicates the S-N relationship for a specified value of  $S_m$ ,  $A$ ,  $R$  and a specified probability of survival. For  $N$ , a log scale is almost always used, although a linear scale may also be used. For  $S$ , a linear scale is usually used, although a log scale may also be used. (See Terminology E1150 and Practice E468.)

3.2.18 *slow crack growth, n*—sub-critical crack growth (extension) that may result from, but is not restricted to, such mechanisms as environmentally-assisted stress corrosion or diffusive crack growth (See Test Method C1275).

3.2.19 *tensile strength [FL<sup>-2</sup>], n*—the maximum tensile stress which a material is capable of sustaining. Tensile strength is calculated from the maximum force during a tension test carried to rupture and the original cross-sectional area of the test specimen. (See Terminology E6.)

### 3.3 Definitions of Terms Specific to This Standard:

3.3.1 *fracture strength [FL<sup>-2</sup>], n*—the tensile stress that the material sustains at the instant of fracture. Fracture strength is calculated from the force at fracture during a tension test carried to rupture and the original cross-sectional area of the test specimen.

3.3.1.1 *Discussion*—In some cases, the fracture strength may be identical to the tensile strength if the force at fracture is the maximum for the test.

3.3.2 *maximum stress,  $S_{min}$ [FL<sup>-2</sup>], n*—the maximum applied stress during cyclic fatigue.

3.3.3 *mean stress,  $S_m$ [FL<sup>-2</sup>], n*—the difference between the mean stress and the maximum or minimum stress such that

$$S_m = \frac{S_{max} + S_{min}}{2} \quad (1)$$

3.3.4 *minimum stress,  $S_{min}$ [FL<sup>-2</sup>], n*—the minimum applied stress during cyclic fatigue.

3.3.5 *stress amplitude,  $S_a$ [FL<sup>-2</sup>], n*—the difference between the mean stress and the maximum stress such that

$$S_a = \frac{S_{max} - S_{min}}{2} = S_{max} - S_m = S_m - S_{min} \quad (2)$$

3.3.6 *stress range,  $\Delta S$  or  $S_r$ [FL<sup>-2</sup>], n*—the difference between the maximum stress and the minimum stress such that

$$\Delta S = S_r = S_{max} - S_{min} \quad (3)$$

3.3.7 *time to cyclic fatigue failure,  $t_f$  [t], n*—total elapsed time from test initiation to test termination required to reach the number of cycles to failure.

## 4. Significance and Use

4.1 This practice may be used for material development, material comparison, quality assurance, characterization, reliability assessment, and design data generation.

4.2 Continuous fiber-reinforced ceramic matrix composites are generally characterized by crystalline matrices and ceramic

fiber reinforcements. These materials are candidate materials for structural applications requiring high degrees of wear and corrosion resistance, and high-temperature inherent damage tolerance (that is, toughness). In addition, continuous fiber-reinforced glass matrix composites are candidate materials for similar but possibly less-demanding applications. Although flexural test methods are commonly used to evaluate the mechanical behavior of monolithic advanced ceramics, the non-uniform stress distribution in a flexural test specimen in addition to dissimilar mechanical behavior in tension and compression for CFCCs leads to ambiguity of interpretation of test results obtained in flexure for CFCCs. Uniaxially-loaded tensile tests provide information on mechanical behavior for a uniformly stressed material.

4.3 The cyclic fatigue behavior of CFCCs can have appreciable non-linear effects (for example, sliding of fibers within the matrix) which may be related to the heat transfer of the specimen to the surroundings. Changes in test temperature, frequency, and heat removal can affect test results. It may be desirable to measure the effects of these variables to more closely simulate end-use conditions for some specific applications.

4.4 Cyclic fatigue by its nature is a probabilistic phenomenon as discussed in STP 91A<sup>3</sup> and STP 588<sup>4</sup>. In addition, the strengths of the brittle matrices and fibers of CFCCs are probabilistic in nature. Therefore, a sufficient number of test specimens at each testing condition is required for statistical analysis and design, with guidelines for sufficient numbers provided in STP 91A<sup>3</sup>, STP 588<sup>4</sup>, and Practice E739. Studies to determine the influence of test specimen volume or surface area on cyclic fatigue strength distributions for CFCCs have not been completed. The many different tensile test specimen geometries available for cyclic fatigue testing may result in variations in the measured cyclic fatigue behavior of a particular material due to differences in the volume of material in the gage section of the test specimens.

4.5 Tensile cyclic fatigue tests provide information on the material response under fluctuating uniaxial tensile stresses. Uniform stress states are required to effectively evaluate any nonlinear stress-strain behavior which may develop as the result of cumulative damage processes (for example, matrix microcracking, fiber/matrix debonding, delamination, cyclic fatigue crack growth, etc.)

4.6 Cumulative damage due to cyclic fatigue may be influenced by testing mode, testing rate (related to frequency), differences between maximum and minimum force ( $R$  or  $A$ ), effects of processing or combinations of constituent materials, and/or environmental influences (including test environment and pre-test conditioning), or both. Some of these effects may be consequences of stress corrosion or sub critical (slow) crack growth which can be difficult to quantify. Other factors which may influence cyclic fatigue behavior are: matrix or fiber material, void or porosity content, methods of test specimen

<sup>3</sup> A Guide for Fatigue Testing and The Statistical Analysis of Fatigue Data, ASTM STP 91 A, ASTM, 1963. Alternative reference: Fatigue Data Analysis, R.C. Rice, in ASM Handbook, Vol 8, 1985, pp. 695–720.

<sup>4</sup> Manual on Statistical Planning and Analysis for Fatigue Experiments, ASTM STP 588, ASTM, 1975.



preparation or fabrication, volume percent of the reinforcement, orientation and stacking of the reinforcement, test specimen conditioning, test environment, force or strain limits during cycling, wave shapes (that is, sinusoidal, trapezoidal, etc.), and failure mode of the CFCC.

4.7 The results of cyclic fatigue tests of test specimens fabricated to standardized dimensions from a particular material or selected portions of a part, or both, may not totally represent the cyclic fatigue behavior of the entire, full-size end product or its in-service behavior in different environments.

4.8 However, for quality control purposes, results derived from standardized tensile test specimens may be considered indicative of the response of the material from which they were taken for given primary processing conditions and post-processing heat treatments.

4.9 The cyclic fatigue behavior of a CFCC is dependent on its inherent resistance to fracture, the presence of flaws, or damage accumulation processes, or both. There can be significant damage in the CFCC test specimen without any visual evidence such as the occurrence of a macroscopic crack. This can result in a loss of stiffness and retained strength. Depending on the purpose for which the test is being conducted, rather than final fracture, a specific loss in stiffness or retained strength may constitute failure. In cases where fracture occurs, analysis of fracture surfaces and fractography, though beyond the scope of this practice, is recommended.

## 5. Interferences

5.1 Test environment (vacuum, inert gas, ambient air, etc.) including moisture content (for example, relative humidity) may have an influence on the measured cyclic fatigue behavior. In particular, the behavior of materials susceptible to slow crack growth fracture will be strongly influenced by test environment and testing rate. Conduct tests to evaluate the maximum strength potential of a material in inert environments or at sufficiently rapid testing rates, or both, to minimize slow crack growth effects. Conversely, conduct tests in environments or at test modes, or both, and rates representative of service conditions to evaluate material performance under use conditions. Regardless of whether testing is conducted in uncontrolled ambient air or controlled environments, monitor and report relative humidity and temperature at a minimum at the beginning and end of each test, and hourly (if possible) if the test duration is greater than 1 h. Testing at humidity levels greater than 65 % relative humidity (RH) is not recommended.

5.2 Rate effects in many CFCCs may play important roles in degrading cyclic fatigue performance. In particular, high testing rates (that is, high frequency) may cause localized heating due to frictional sliding of debonded fibers within the matrix. Such sliding may accelerate mechanical degradation of the composite leading to rapid cyclic fatigue failures. Conversely, low testing rates (that is, low frequency or wave forms with plateaus) may serve to promote environmental degradation as the material is exposed to maximum tensile stresses for longer periods of time.

5.3 In many materials, amplitude of the cyclic wave form is a primary contributor to the cyclic fatigue behavior. Thus, choice of force ratio,  $R$  or  $A$ , can have a pronounced effect on the cyclic fatigue behavior of the material. A force ratio of  $R =$

1 (that is, maximum equal to minimum) constitutes a constant force test with no fluctuation of force over time. A force ratio of  $R = 0$  (that is, minimum equal to zero) constitutes the maximum amplitude (that is, amplitude equal to one half the maximum) for tension-tension cyclic fatigue. A force ratio of  $R = 0.1$  is often chosen for tension-tension cyclic fatigue so as to impose maximum amplitudes while minimizing the possibility of a “slack” (that is, loose and non-tensioned) force train. The choice of  $R$  or  $A$  is dictated by the final use of the test result.

5.4 Surface preparation of test specimens, although normally not considered a major concern in CFCCs, can introduce fabrication flaws which may have pronounced effects on cyclic fatigue behavior (for example, shape and level of the resulting stress-strain curves, cyclic fatigue limits, etc.). Machining damage introduced during test specimen preparation can be either a random interfering factor in the determination of cyclic fatigue or ultimate strength of pristine material (that is, more frequent occurrence of surface-initiated fractures compared to volume-initiated fractures), or an inherent part of the strength characteristics to be measured. Surface preparation can also lead to the introduction of residual stresses. Universal or standardized methods for surface preparation do not exist. In addition, the nature of fabrication used for certain composites (for example, chemical vapor infiltration or hot pressing) may require the testing of specimens in the as-processed condition (that is, it may not be possible to machine the test specimen faces without compromising the in-plane fiber architecture). Note that final machining steps may, or may not, negate machining damage introduced during the initial machining. Thus, report test specimen fabrication history since it may play an important role in the cyclic fatigue behavior.

5.5 Bending in uniaxial tensile tests can cause or promote non-uniform stress distributions with maximum stresses occurring at the test specimen surface leading to non-representative fractures originating at surfaces or near geometrical transitions. In addition, if deformations or strains are measured at surfaces where maximum or minimum stresses occur, bending may introduce over or under measurement of strains depending on the location of the strain-measuring device on the test specimen. Similarly, fracture from surface flaws may be accentuated or suppressed by the presence of the non-uniform stresses caused by bending.

5.6 Fractures that initiate outside the uniformly-stressed gage section of a test specimen may be due to factors such as stress concentrations or geometrical transitions, extraneous stresses introduced by gripping, or strength-limiting features in the microstructure of the test specimen. Such non-gage section fractures will normally constitute invalid tests. In addition, for face-forced geometries, gripping pressure is a key variable in the initiation of fracture. Insufficient pressure can shear the outer plies in laminated CFCCs; while too much pressure can cause local crushing of the CFCC and may initiate fracture in the vicinity of the grips.

## 6. Apparatus

6.1 *Tensile Testing Machines*—Machines used for determining proportional limit stress, ultimate strength or other “static” material properties shall conform to Practices E4. Machines used for cyclic fatigue testing may be either nonresonant