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ABSTRACT

A combined analytical/experimental study of the strength of thick-walled, adhesively bonded PMMA-to-aluminum and E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum tubular lap joints under axial load has been conducted. Test results include strength and failure mode data. Moreover, strain gages placed along the length of the outer tubular adherend characterize load transfer from one adherend to the other. The strain gage data indicate that load transfer is nonuniform and that the relatively compliant PMMA has the shorter load transfer length. Strains determined by a finite element analysis of the tested joints are in excellent agreement with those measured. Calculated bond stresses are highest in the region of observed failure, and extensive bond yielding is predicted in the E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joint prior to joint failure.

INTRODUCTION

Many horizontal axis wind turbine (HAWT) blades now in use are made of an E-glass reinforced resin composite. Composite material blades are also being considered for use on vertical axis wind turbines (VAWT). The strength and fatigue resistance of composite material blades are clearly of importance. Indeed, composite material blades are experiencing fatigue related failures that have significantly shortened their expected lifetime. Such failures often occur in the region of joints or other discontinuities.

A common design for a composite material wind turbine blade is a spar and shell. This type of design uses composite materials in an efficient manner, and can be used for both HAWT and VAWT blades. Typically, the blade attachment joint in a spar and shell design has a tubular geometry, with a thick, composite adherend joined to a metallic hub. A bonded, composite-to-metal tubular lap joint is perhaps the simplest joint design of this type.

Although there is an extensive published literature on lap joints between flat plates, there are few papers addressing tubular lap joints subjected to axial load. Lubkin and Reissner [1] present results of an approximate analysis for tubular lap joints with equal thickness, same material, isotropic adherends. The results of this study suggest that tubular lap joints behave in a qualitatively similar manner to flat plate lap joints, but the stress distribution in the two types of joints differ in detail. Accordingly, the stress distribution in a tubular lap joint cannot be related to that of a similar flat lap joint. In a more recent publication, Adams and Peppiatt [2] present results of finite element analyses of some of the configurations examined by Lubkin and Reissner. Their calculated stress distributions are in good agreement with those of Lubkin and Reissner except when very close to a bond end. Adams and Peppiatt also show that an adhesive fillet can affect calculated stress distributions. There appears to be little published literature on metal-to-composite tubular lap joints subjected to axial load. (Several papers examining a torsional loading of such joints have been found. These analyses are aimed at composite material drive shaft applications.)

Presented below are results of a combined analytical/experimental study of thick-walled, adhesively bonded PMMA-to-aluminum and E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum tubular lap joints. Joints with an E-glass/epoxy adherend are of technological importance, while those with a PMMA (acrylic) adherend allow direct observation of joint failure. All tested joints were subjected to a monotonic tensile or compressive loading. Test results include strength and failure mode data and serve as a baseline for planned fatigue tests.

JOINT TEST SPECIMENS

The E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joint test specimen bonds an aluminum tube within each end of an E-glass/epoxy tube (Fig. 1). Note that the specimen is axisymmetric (the axis of symmetry is indicated by the dashed horizontal line in Fig. 1), and is also symmetric about its midplane (the midplane position is
indicated by the vertical centerline in Fig. 1). The outer E-glass/epoxy tubular adherend is roughly 300 mm long, with a 76.2 mm diameter and a 6.4 mm wall thickness (t/t=6). The aluminum adherends are 12.5 mm thick. The bond thickness between adherends is 0.25 mm, and the bond length is 75 mm. Note, the bond end located 75 mm from the end of the E-glass/epoxy tube (i.e. where the aluminum adherend terminates) will be referred to as the inner bond end. The E-glass/epoxy tubes were obtained from General Electric and are fabricated from plain weave, glass fabric with 32 yarns/inch axial and 44 yarns/inch hoop. The PMMA-to-aluminum joint test specimens are similar to the E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum specimens, except that the PMMA tubular adherend is roughly 270 mm long.

![Fig. 1. E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joint test specimen. All dimensions in mm.](image)

The joint specimens were fabricated using a method that carefully controls bond line thickness and also minimizes voids within the bond. First the bond volume is defined and isolated using spacers and elastomeric dams, then the adhesive is injected into this cavity through four fill holes in the outer adherend. The fill holes are 90 degrees apart and are axially centered with respect to the 75 mm long bond. The bonding material is a room temperature cured, high strength paste adhesive (Hysol EA 9394). The efficacy of this procedure to produce void-free, uniform thickness bonds was confirmed by a visual inspection of those joints with a transparent PMMA outer adherend. Joints with an opaque E-glass/epoxy outer adherend were inspected ultrasonically using the C-scan technique. As an aside, PMMA-to-aluminum joints containing known voids were inspected using the C-scan method to verify that this technique could detect voided regions within a bond.

All joint test specimens were instrumented with strain gages. Strain gage locations on E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joints are shown in Fig. 1. There are a total of ten gages, all located on one end of the specimen. At the specimen's midplane, 150 mm from the end of the 300 mm long composite tube, there are 4 axial gages spaced at 90 degree intervals and one transverse gage. These midplane gages are in a uniformly stressed region that is undisturbed by the adhesive bond. Consequently, the outer adherend's axial modulus and Poisson's ratio can be directly measured. PMMA-to-aluminum joints were also instrumented with 10 strain gages. To accommodate the slightly shorter PMMA tube length, gage locations differ somewhat from those shown in Fig. 1 (axial gage locations are 25, 50, 75, 100, and 133 mm from the end of the PMMA adherend). The joint specimens were loaded monotonically to failure in a 450 kN mechanical testing machine. Universal joints were used on both ends of the load train, and the aluminum adherends were attached to the universal joints by threaded rods.

**Test Results**

Two PMMA-to-aluminum and two E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joints have been loaded monotonically to failure. Test results are summarized in Table 1. Here, the PMMA-to-aluminum tests will be referred to as PMMA-1 and PMMA-2, while the E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum tests will be referred to as E/G-1 and E/G-2. Also note that $\gamma_{fail}$ is the average bond shear stress at joint failure. The load at joint failure, in Newtons, can be determined by simply multiplying $\gamma_{fail}$ by the bond's 14,900 mm² shear area.

As indicated in Table 1, one PMMA-to-aluminum joint (PMMA-1) was tested in compression, while the other PMMA-to-aluminum joint (PMMA-2) was tested in tension. In the compression test, the adhesive debonded stably under increasing load. Slow bond failure was observed visually at both ends of the joint test specimen, and strain gage data also reflect stable bond failure (Fig. -). Bond failure initiated at the inner bond end where an aluminum adherend terminates and the PMMA adherend is fully loaded. The compressive strength listed in Table 1 for PMMA-1 corresponds to initial bond failure. The maximum compressive load reached during the test occurs when $\gamma_{fail}=0.8$ MPA. At maximum load, the bond between one of the aluminum adherends and the PMMA adherend failed completely, and roughly 50% of the bond to the other aluminum adherend had also failed. In tension test PMMA-2, the PMMA adherend failed abruptly in the region where one of the aluminum adherends terminates. No bond failure was observed prior to the fracture of the PMMA adherend. The measured compressive strength of the PMMA-to-aluminum joint is less than 50% of its tensile strength.

**Table 1. Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST JOINT LOAD</th>
<th>$\gamma_{fail}$ FAILURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMMA-1 PMMA-ALUMINUM</td>
<td>COMPRESSION 0.6 BOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMMA-2 PMMA-ALUMINUM</td>
<td>TENSILE 1.9 PMMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/G-1 E-GLASS/EPoxy-ALUMINUM</td>
<td>TENSILE 13.4 BOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/G-2 E-GLASS/EPoxy-ALUMINUM</td>
<td>TENSILE 20.1 BOND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) failure load/bond shear area

The E-glass/epoxy joints were both tested in tension. The two nominally identical joints have substantially different measured strengths. The average tensile joint strength corresponds to $\gamma_{fail}=6.8$ MPA, with individual strengths of 80% and 120% of this average. These test results clearly illustrate that even when joints are carefully fabricated, there can be substantial variability in joint strength. Because of the opaque nature of the outer E-glass/epoxy adherend, the failure sequence in tests E/G-1 and E/G-2 cannot be established with complete certainty. Failure occurred abruptly in both tests with no preliminary load drops. Furthermore, strain gage data give no indication of bond failure prior to joint failure. In test E/G-1, the bond on one end of the joint test specimen failed...
completely at maximum load. An ultrasonic evaluation
df the bond on the other end of the joint test specimen
showed no debonding. In test E/G-2, a partial bond
failure occurred at one end of the joint test specimen.
Bond failure is thought to have initiated at the inner
bond end and rad to the region of the fill holes
drilled through the E-glass/epoxy adherend (~40 mm from
the tube end, see the JOINT TEST SPECIMEN section above
for a description of the fabrication method). The E-
glass/epoxy adherend fractured on the plane defined by
the four fill holes, thus allowing the aluminum
adherend with a 40 mm portion of the E-glass/epoxy tube
attached to slide relative to the rest of the joint.
An ultrasonic evaluation of the bond on the other end
of the joint test specimen indicates that 30% of that
bond, in the region adjacent to the inner bond end,
had failed. Since strain gage data give no indication
of stable debonding, this partial bond failure may have
occurred when the other end of the joint test specimen
failed abruptly.
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Fig. 2. Measured strains in test PMMA-1 reflect stable
bond failure. Loads and strains are
compressive and the gage position is measured
relative to the end of the PMMA adherend.

All joint test specimens were instrumented with
strain gages along the length of the outer adherend.
Figure 3 plots strain gage results for tests PMMA-1
and PMMA-2, while Figure 4 plots results for tests E/G-1
and E/G-2. Note that 1) gage position is measured
relative to the end of the outer adherend with bond
ends at 0 and 75 mm, 2) measured strains are connected
with straight line segments to approximate the strain
distribution along the length of the outer adherend, 3)
data for a load level of roughly 40% and 100% of the
joint failure load are plotted for each test, and 4)
plotted axial strains are normalized with respect to
\( \sigma_0 \), the strain found at the specimen's midplane (where
strains are uniform and unaffected by the adhesive
bond). If a joint responds in a fully linear elastic
manner, strain distributions normalized in this manner
will show no load dependence. The normalized strain
distributions for the PMMA-to-aluminum joints do
suggest that the joint behaves in an essentially linear
manner prior to failure, and strain distributions for the
tensile and compression tests are indistinguishable
(Fig. 3). The normalized strain distribution for test
E/G-2, the most highly loaded E-glass/epoxy composite-
to-aluminum joint, does seem to show some load
dependence (Fig. 4). The axial strain distributions
for the two different outer adherends are compared in
Figure 5. These results indicate that load transfer
from the inner aluminum adherend to the outer adherend
is nonuniform, and that the relatively compliant PMMA
adherend has the shorter load transfer length.
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Fig. 3. Normalized strain distributions along the
length of the outer adherend for tested PMMA-
to-aluminum joints.

![Graph](image3)

Fig. 4. Normalized strain distributions along the
length of the outer adherend for tested
E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joints.

**ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

An axisymmetric, finite element analysis of the
tested joints has been carried out using Version 4.7 of
the ABAQUS finite element code [3]. The dimensions of
the tubular joint geometry analyzed are listed in
Figure 1, while the finite element mesh used in the
analysis is shown in Figure 6. Since the joint is
symmetric about its midplane, symmetry conditions are
applied and only one half of the joint is analyzed.
The joint is loaded by uniformly displacing the end of
the aluminum adherend. The bond is modeled with four
elements through its thickness, and the mesh is refined
at the bond ends where the highest stress gradients are
expected. This model contains 4150, 4-node, reduced
integration, axisymmetric elements (CAX4R elements).
Since the adhesive bond was cured at room temperature, thus minimizing residual fabrication stresses, residual fabrication stresses are not considered in the present analysis.

![Fig. 5. Comparison of normalized strain distributions along the length of the outer adherend for PMMA and E-glass/epoxy outer adherends.](image)

![Fig. 6. Finite element mesh used to analyze tubular lap joints.](image)

The aluminum inner adherend and the PMMA or E-glass/epoxy outer adherend are all modeled as linear elastic materials. The aluminum is considered to be isotropic with a Young's modulus of 69.5 GPa and a Poisson's ratio of 0.33. Likewise, the PMMA is considered to be isotropic with a Young's modulus of 2.75 GPa and a Poisson's ratio of 0.40. The E-glass/epoxy is modeled as an orthotropic material. An axial modulus of 22.5 GPa was measured during the joint test. An axial-to-hoop Poisson's ratio of 0.17 was also measured. Other E-glass/epoxy properties are estimated using known unidirectional properties and fabric construction. Specifically, the estimated radial and hoop Young's modulus are 10 GPa and 28 GPa, respectively. The estimated shear modulus is 5 GPa, and estimated radial-to-axial and radial-to-hoop Poisson's ratio are both 0.10. The Hysol EA 9394 paste adhesive used to bond the adherends together is modeled as an elastic-plastic material. Its tensile stress-strain relation is defined in Figure 7. Cast, dog-bone tensile specimens were used to measure the adhesive's initial stress-strain response, however, these specimens contained voids that initiated premature failure. Therefore, the response at higher loads is simply estimated, with a maximum strength similar to other high strength adhesives.

![Fig. 7. Adhesive's tensile stress-strain relation used in finite element analysis.](image)

Calculated nondimensional strain distributions along the outer PMMA adherend are plotted in Figure 8 for three different load levels. Since the analysis predicts little plastic yielding at a load level of $F=2.0$ MPa (a load exceeding that observed in any PMMA-to-aluminum test), the nondimensionalized strain distributions for the three load levels overlay. Note that even though the bond terminates 75 mm from the end of the adherend, the axial strain becomes uniform only at distances greater than 100 mm. This is the result of tubular bending of the outer adherend in the region where the bond terminates. Measured strains from test PMMA-2 are also shown in Figure 8 for three similar load levels. These data points also overlay and analysis and experiment are in excellent agreement. This agreement lends some credence to calculated stresses.

![Fig. 8. Calculated normalized strain distribution along the length of the outer adherend of a PMMA-to-aluminum joint.](image)
Figure 9 plots the calculated shear stress and Figure 10 the radial stress acting on the epoxy-to-PHEMA interface for three load levels of interest. Calculated bond stresses in a lap joint are rather complex, and there are several factors that influence the nature of the stress distribution. Load is transferred from one adherend to the other by shear, and the shear stress distribution would be essentially uniform if the adherends were rigid. However, the adherends have finite stiffness, and this allows the axial strain in the adherends to differ. Differential adherend straining elevates shear stresses at the ends of the bond. Furthermore, differential straining is magnified when there is an imbalance in adherend stiffness, and shear strains are intensified at the bond end from which the less stiff adherend extends [4]. Since the adherend stiffness ratio for the PHEMA- to-aluminum joint is 25, the calculated shear stress distributions in Figure 9 reflect the effect of substantial differential straining. Calculated shear stresses are substantially higher at the inner bond end where the PHEMA adherend begins to fully carry the applied load (i.e., the bond end located 75 mm from the end of the PHEMA outer adherend). The bond is also subjected to a radial or peel stress (Fig. 10). Poisson's ratio effects and tubular end-moments generated by bondline shear stress combine to create deformations that are resisted by peel stress. The magnitude of the calculated peel stresses is also greatest at the inner bond end. The calculated shear stress is compressive for an applied tensile load. This may explain why the bond failed in the compressive PHEMA-1 test (calculated tensile peel stress), and not in the tensile PHEMA-2 test (calculated compressive peel stress). It should be finally noted that, in the region where the bond terminates, over a distance of the order of the bond thickness, the shear stress quickly decays to satisfy a stress-free condition at the end of the bond. A very complex stress state exists in this region, and within the context of continuum mechanics, stress and strain singularities can exist at points where an interface intersects the free surface. Consequently, stresses calculated using standard finite element techniques cannot be considered reliable within roughly one adhesive thickness (0.25 mm) of the bond's end.

The E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joint was also analyzed. Figure 11 plots the nondimensionalized strain distribution along the outer E-glass/epoxy adherend for three different load levels. Measured data for similar load levels are also plotted. The analysis indicates that extensive bond yielding occurs when loads exceed 7 MPa. Extensive bond yielding causes the calculated non-dimensionalized strain distributions to shift with load. Nondimensionalized E-G-2 test date also show a shift with increasing load, and are in good agreement with calculated results. Figure 12 plots the calculated shear stress and Figure 13 the calculated radial stress along the epoxy-to-E-glass/epoxy interface for three load levels of interest. The shear stress distributions clearly show that there is large scale bond yielding as load increases. As discussed above, the presence of elevated shear stress and peel stress at bond ends is expected. Since the E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum stiffness ratio is substantially lower than that of PHEMA-to-aluminum (3 versus 25), calculated shear and peel stress distributions are not as highly biased to the bond end from which the loaded outer adherend extends.

Fig. 9. Calculated shear stress distribution along the epoxy-to-PHEMA interface. Distance measured relative to the end of the PHEMA adherend.

Fig. 10. Calculated radial stress distribution along the epoxy-to-PHEMA interface.

Fig. 11. Calculated normalized strain distribution along the length of the outer adherend of a E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joint.
Fig. 12. Calculated shear stress distribution along the epoxy-to-E-glass/epoxy interface. Distance measured relative to the end of the E-glass/epoxy adherend.

Fig. 13. Calculated radial stress distribution along the epoxy-to-E-glass/epoxy interface.

SUMMARY

Two PMMA-to-aluminum and two E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum thick-walled, adhesively bonded, tubular lap joints have been loaded monotonically to failure. The measured compressive strength of the PMMA-to-aluminum joint is less than 50% of its measured tensile strength. In the compression test, adhesive bond failure occurred under increasing load, while in the tension test, the PMMA tube failed abruptly. The E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joints were both tested in tension. These joints failed abruptly when the adhesive bond failed. The two nominally identical joints failed at load levels that differed by 40%; a clear illustration of the variable nature of joint strength.

Strain gages, placed along the length of the thick outer adherend, were used to characterize load transfer between the adherends. The strain data indicate that load transfer from one adherend to the other is nonuniform, and that the relatively compliant PMMA adherend has the shorter load transfer length. The strain gage data also suggest that the PMMA-to-aluminum joint behaves in an essentially linear manner to failure, while the E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joint exhibits some material nonlinearity when highly loaded. A finite element analysis of the tested joints predicts strains that are in excellent agreement with those measured. The analysis indicates that bond stresses are highest in the region of observed failure, and that extensive bond yielding occurs when the E-glass/epoxy composite-to-aluminum joint is highly loaded.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

E. A. Correa developed procedures for fabricating tubular lap joints with a void-free, uniform thickness bond and also assembled all tested joints. M. E. Stevig strain-gaged the specimens and carried out the joint tests. He also carried out the tests on the neat EA 9394 adhesive. P. D. Walkington conducted the pretest and post-test ultrasonic inspections of the joint specimens. This work performed at Sandia National Laboratories supported by U. S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC04-76DP00789.

REFERENCES


3. ABAQUS, Hibbitt, Karlsson, & Sorensen, Providence, Rhode Island.
