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The Forest Products Laboratory has pointed out that the expression for $M_{st}$ in equation (A10) (p. 11) can be simplified to

$$M_{st} = \frac{st \left[ 1 + r \left( \frac{s^2}{t^2} + \frac{1}{\beta^2} \right) \right]}{(s^2 - t^2)(1 + s^2t^2)^2}$$

The absence of Poisson's ratio $\mu_f$ from this simplified expression indicates that the numerical results of the present paper are valid for any value of $\mu_f$. 

NACA-Langley - 5-11-50 - 850
A theoretical solution is obtained for the problem of the shear buckling of infinitely long simply supported elastic Metalite type sandwich plates. An approximate correction is suggested for the determination of the critical shear stresses of plates that buckle in the plastic range.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of determining the critical compressive stresses of flat rectangular Metalite type sandwich plates has recently received much attention in the literature (references 1 to 6). Little has appeared, however, on the stability of sandwich plates under conditions of loading other than compression. A loading that is very important in aircraft design is that of shear. The shear buckling of infinitely long simply supported Metalite type sandwich plates (fig. 1) has been treated in reference 7. The analysis, however, is based on assumptions that render it intrinsically approximate and is limited to the derivation of stability equations, without any presentation of numerical results.

In the present paper the problem treated in reference 7, the shear buckling of infinitely long simply supported Metalite type sandwich plates, is solved by means of the more accurate sandwich-plate theory of reference 8. The Rayleigh-Ritz energy method is used to obtain approximate values of elastic critical shear stresses for various values of the ratio of plate flexural stiffness to core shear stiffness. For two limiting values of this ratio the critical stresses are within 1 percent of exact values, and it may reasonably be concluded that the critical stresses for intermediate values of the ratio are also within 1 percent of exact values. An approximate correction to the elastic stresses is outlined for the determination of the critical shear stresses of plates that buckle in the plastic range.
Shortly after the work of the present paper was completed, reference 9, which is on the same subject as the present paper, was received at the Langley Laboratory. Approximate assumptions were made in that analysis as to the behavior of sandwich plates, and an approximate deflection function was used. The numerical results, however, agree very closely with those of the present paper and are discussed in more detail in the section entitled "Comparison with other Solutions."

\[ \text{SYMBOLS} \]

- \( E_f \) Young's modulus for face material
- \( \mu_f \) Poisson's ratio for face material
- \( t_f \) face thickness
- \( G_c \) shear modulus for core material
- \( h_c \) core thickness
- \( D \) flexural stiffness per unit width of Metalite type sandwich plate
  \[ \frac{E_f t_f (h_c + t_f)^2}{2(1 - \mu_f^2)} \]
- \( b \) plate width
- \( r \) core shear-flexibility coefficient
  \[ \frac{\pi^2 D}{b^2 G_c h_c} \]
- \( \tau_{cr} \) critical shear stress
- \( k \) elastic shear-buckling-stress coefficient
  \[ \frac{2b^2 \tau_{cr} t_f}{\pi^2 D} \]
- \( N_{xy} \) critical shear load per unit length
  \[ 2\tau_{cr} t_f \]
- \( x, y \) coordinate axes (see fig. 1)
- \( w \) deflection of middle surface of plate
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Elastic Shear-Buckling-Stress Coefficients

The elastic shear-buckling-stress coefficients of infinitely long simply supported Metalite type sandwich plates (fig. 1) are given in figure 2 for Poisson's ratio of the face material equal to 1/3. Shear-buckling-stress coefficients k are plotted as a function of the core shear-flexibility coefficient r. The values of k were computed from the approximate stability equations derived in the appendix and are summarized in table 1. From a comparison of the approximate values and known exact values of k for r equal to 0 and 1.0, it seems reasonable to conclude that the approximate values of k for intermediate values of r are accurate to within 1 percent of exact values.

As the core shear-flexibility coefficient increases, the shear-buckling-stress coefficients approach those for compressed simply supported plates (fig. 2, reference 5). The two groups of coefficients are equal for values of r equal to or greater than unity and are given by

$$k = \frac{1}{r} \quad (1)$$

This phenomenon is explained in the appendix.
Plastic Shear Buckling Stress

When buckling occurs in the plastic range, the stresses computed from the elastic shear-buckling-stress coefficients of figure 2 are too large and must be corrected for plasticity effects. An approximate plasticity correction may be obtained by means of the theory of reference 10. In that paper the plasticity corrections for solid isotropic plates have been derived and apply with no error to sandwich plates with an infinite core shear modulus \( r = 0 \). If these corrections are used for sandwich plates with finite core shear stiffness \( r > 0 \), the results are conservative and are probably accurate enough for most design purposes.

In figure 3 the plastic shear buckling stresses for plates of 24S-T3 aluminum alloy are plotted against the corresponding elastic shear buckling stresses. This curve is another way of presenting the computed correction curve of figure 1 of reference 10. Plates that buckle in the plastic range may be analyzed by first computing the elastic shear buckling stress from figure 2 and then entering the curve of figure 3 with this stress to obtain the corresponding plastic shear buckling stress. Similar curves for materials other than 24S-T3 aluminum alloy may be plotted by use of the equations on the upper half of page 12 of reference 10.

Comparison with Other Solutions

The results given in reference 9 apply to plates with faces for which the resistance to bending about their own middle surface is not negligible. The face bending stiffness is shown, however, to have only a small effect on the shear-buckling-stress coefficients if the core shear flexibility coefficients are less than 1.0. In this range of values of \( r \) the shear-buckling-stress coefficients of reference 9, computed from the theory of reference 7 which is known to yield results lower than exact values, agree very closely with those of the present paper. The present results are slightly high, as is characteristic of energy solutions, but the excellent agreement with the results of reference 9 indicates the accuracy of both solutions.

When \( r \) is greater than 1.0, the bending stiffness of the faces may have a large effect on the shear-buckling-stress coefficients. The results of the present paper in this range of values of \( r \) are conservative and apply only to plates with faces that are very thin in comparison with the core. Sandwich plates having practical dimensions, however, will probably not have core shear-flexibility coefficients greater than 1.0.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The elastic shear-buckling-stress coefficients of infinitely long simply supported Metalite type sandwich plates have been computed for Poisson's ratio of the face material equal to 1/3. An approximate correction for the effects of plasticity has been outlined. This correction is theoretically conservative and is probably accurate enough for most design purposes.
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Energy expression.— The potential-energy expression for flat sandwich plates is given by equation (16) of reference 8. For plates subjected only to shear and with the physical constants of Metalite type sandwich plates given by equation (Al) of reference 5, the energy expression becomes

\[ V = \frac{D}{2} \int \int \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} - \frac{Q_x}{G_{ch_c}} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} - \frac{Q_y}{G_{ch_c}} \right) \right)^2 \]

\[ - 2(1 - \mu_r) \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} - \frac{Q_x}{G_{ch_c}} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} - \frac{Q_y}{G_{ch_c}} \right) \right\} \]

\[ - \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} - \frac{Q_x}{G_{ch_c}} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} - \frac{Q_y}{G_{ch_c}} \right) \right\}^2 \]

\[ + \frac{G_{ch_c}}{D} \left[ \left( \frac{Q_x}{G_{ch_c}} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{Q_y}{G_{ch_c}} \right)^2 \right] \int dx \, dy \]

\[ + N_{xy} \int \int \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} \, dx \, dy \] (Al)

Boundary conditions.— Because the plates considered are infinitely long, the middle-surface deflection \( w \) and the shear angles \( \frac{Q_x}{G_{ch_c}} \) and \( \frac{Q_y}{G_{ch_c}} \) are periodic in the x-direction over a wave length \( \lambda \). (See fig. 1.) Furthermore, the functions chosen for \( w, \frac{Q_x}{G_{ch_c}}, \frac{Q_y}{G_{ch_c}} \) must satisfy the simple support conditions of no moment,
no middle-surface deflection, and no rotation parallel to the boundary, due to shear deformations, of any line in the boundary perpendicular to the middle surface. These conditions are given by the following equations: At \( y = 0,b \)

\[
W = M_y = \frac{Q_x}{G_{ch_c}} = 0
\]  

where \( M_y \) is given by equation (6b) of reference 8 as

\[
M_y = -D \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} - \frac{Q_y}{G_{ch_c}} \right) + \mu_f \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial W}{\partial x} - \frac{Q_x}{G_{ch_c}} \right) \right] \tag{A3}
\]

Fourier series for the middle-surface deflections and the shear angles are therefore taken as

\[
w = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( a_n \sin \frac{n\pi x}{\lambda} + b_n \cos \frac{n\pi x}{\lambda} \right) \sin \frac{n\pi y}{b}
\]

\[
\frac{Q_x}{G_{ch_c}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( c_n \sin \frac{n\pi x}{\lambda} + d_n \cos \frac{n\pi x}{\lambda} \right) \sin \frac{n\pi y}{b} \tag{A4}
\]

\[
\frac{Q_y}{G_{ch_c}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( e_n \sin \frac{n\pi x}{\lambda} + f_n \cos \frac{n\pi x}{\lambda} \right) \cos \frac{n\pi y}{b}
\]

These equations satisfy the boundary conditions (A2) term by term.

**Stability determinant.**—Substitution of equations (A4) in equation (A1) and integration between the limits \( x = 0,\lambda \) and \( y = 0,b \) yields, after some simplification,
\[
\frac{8}{\pi^4} \frac{\lambda^3}{bD} V = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \left[ (1 + n^2 \beta^2) a_n - d_n' - n\beta e_n' \right]^2 + \left[ (1 + n^2 \beta^2) b_n + c_n' - n\beta f_n' \right]^2 - 2(1 - \mu_x) \left[ n\beta (a_n - d_n') (n\beta a_n - e_n') \right] \\
+ n\beta (b_n + c_n') (n\beta b_n - f_n') - \frac{1}{4} (2n\beta a_n - n\beta d_n' - e_n')^2 \right\}
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{4} (2n\beta b_n + n\beta c_n' - f_n')^2 \right) + \frac{\beta^2}{r} \left( c_n'^2 + d_n'^2 + e_n'^2 + f_n'^2 \right) \Bigg] \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{16}{\pi} \beta^3 k \sum_{p} \sum_{q} \frac{pq}{r^2 - q^2} a_pb_q
\]

(A5)

where

\[
\frac{c_n'}{c_n} = \frac{d_n'}{d_n} = \frac{e_n'}{e_n} = \frac{f_n'}{f_n} = \frac{\lambda}{\pi}
\]

\[
\beta = \frac{\lambda}{b}
\]

\[
k \quad \text{shear--buckling--stress coefficient} \left( \frac{b^2 \kappa \gamma}{\pi^2 D} \right)
\]

\[
r \quad \text{core shear--flexibility coefficient} \left( \frac{\pi^2 D}{b^2 G_c h_c} \right)
\]

\[
p, q \quad \text{integers such that } p + q \text{ is odd}
\]

The undetermined Fourier coefficients \( a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n, e_n \), and \( f_n \) must now be chosen so as to make the potential energy \( V \) a minimum. This condition requires that

\[
\frac{\partial V}{\partial a_n} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial b_n} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial c_n} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial d_n} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial e_n} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial f_n} = 0
\]

(A6)
where \( n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \), or, when the indicated operations are performed, that the coefficients satisfy the following set of simultaneous equations:

\[
(1 + n^2 \beta^2) a_n - \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \mu n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r^2}\right) d_n - \frac{1}{2} \mu n \beta a_n = 0 \quad (A7a)
\]

\[
\beta(1 + n^2 \beta^2) e_n - \frac{1}{2} \mu n \beta d_n - \left(\frac{1 - \mu}{2} + n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r^2}\right) e_n = 0 \quad (A7b)
\]

\[
(1 + n^2 \beta^2) b_n + \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \mu n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r^2}\right) c_n - \frac{1}{2} \mu n \beta b_n = 0 \quad (A7c)
\]

\[
\beta(1 + n^2 \beta^2) b_n + \frac{1}{2} \mu n \beta c_n - \left(\frac{1 - \mu}{2} + n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r^2}\right) f_n = 0 \quad (A7d)
\]

\[
(1 + n^2 \beta^2)^2 a_n - (1 + n^2 \beta^2) b_n - \beta(1 + n^2 \beta^2) e_n = 0 \\
+ \frac{8}{\pi} \beta^3 k \sum_l \frac{n^l}{n^2 - l^2} b_l = 0 \quad (A7e)
\]

\[
(1 + n^2 \beta^2)^2 b_n + (1 + n^2 \beta^2) c_n - \beta(1 + n^2 \beta^2) f_n = 0 \\
- \frac{8}{\pi} \beta^3 k \sum_m \frac{nm}{n^2 - m^2} a_m = 0 \quad (A7f)
\]

where \( n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \) and \( l \) and \( m \) are integers such that \( n + l \) is odd and \( n + m \) is odd.

The criterion for the shear buckling of infinitely long simply supported Metalite type sandwich plates is determined from the condition that the Fourier coefficients have values other than zero; that is, that the plate buckles. The determinant of the coefficients of these terms in equations \((A7)\) must then be equal to zero. The determinant obtained from equations \((A7)\) is rather unwieldy, however, and may be simplified.
Simplification of stability determinant. Equations (A7a) to (A7d) may be solved to give expressions for \( d_n' \) and \( e_n' \) in terms of \( a_n \), and for \( e_n' \) and \( f_n' \) in terms of \( b_n \). These expressions are

\[
\frac{d_n'}{a_n} = -\frac{c_n'}{b_n}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{n^\beta} \frac{e_n'}{a_n}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{n^\beta} \frac{f_n'}{b_n}
\]

\[
= (1 + n^2 \beta^2) \frac{1 - \frac{\mu_f}{2}(1 + n^2 \beta^2) + \frac{\beta^2}{r}}{(1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - \frac{\mu_f}{2}}{n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r}})(1 - \frac{\mu_f}{2} + n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r}) - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\mu_f}{n^\beta}\right)^2}
\]

(A8)

where \( n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \). Substitution of equations (A8) in equations (A7e) and (A7f) then yields

\[
(1 + n^2 \beta^2)^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{(1 + n^2 \beta^2) \left[ \frac{1 - \frac{\mu_f}{2}(1 + n^2 \beta^2) + \frac{\beta^2}{r}}{(1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - \frac{\mu_f}{2}}{n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r}})(1 - \frac{\mu_f}{2} + n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r}) - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\mu_f}{n^\beta}\right)^2}}{a_n} \right]
\]

\[
+ \frac{8}{\pi} \beta^3 k \sum_l \frac{n_l}{n^2 - l^2} b_l = 0
\]

(A9a)

\[
(1 + n^2 \beta^2)^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{(1 + n^2 \beta^2) \left[ \frac{1 - \frac{\mu_f}{2}(1 + n^2 \beta^2) + \frac{\beta^2}{r}}{(1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - \frac{\mu_f}{2}}{n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r}})(1 - \frac{\mu_f}{2} + n^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r}) - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\mu_f}{n^\beta}\right)^2}}{b_n} \right]
\]

\[
- \frac{8}{\pi} \beta^3 k \sum_m \frac{n_m}{n^2 - m^2} a_m = 0
\]

(A9b)

where \( n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \) and \( n + l \) is odd and \( n + m \) is odd.
Equations (A9) may be divided into two independent groups. One group of equations involves only the Fourier coefficients
\[ a_2, a_4, a_6, \ldots; b_1, b_3, b_5, \ldots \]
whereas the other involves only the Fourier coefficients
\[ a_1, a_3, a_5, \ldots; b_2, b_4, b_6, \ldots \]
The determinants of these two groups of equations are identical. In the final simplification of the stability determinant, therefore, only one of the groups of equations need be considered.

Those equations (A9a) that involve only Fourier coefficients of the first kind may be solved to give the coefficients \( a_2, a_4, a_6, \ldots \) in terms of the coefficients \( b_1, b_3, b_5, \ldots \). These expressions are then substituted into the appropriate equations (A9b) to yield
\[ b_n + \left(\frac{8}{\pi} \beta^3 r\right)^2 \sum_i \sum_j M_{n_1} M_{i_1} b_j = 0 \]  
(A10)
where both \( M_{n_1} \) and \( M_{i_1} \) are of the form
\[
M_{st} = \frac{st}{(s^2 - t^2)(1 + s^2 \beta^2)^2} \frac{1}{1 - \left(1 - \frac{\mu_r}{2} s^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\mu_r}{2} s^2 \beta^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{r}\right) \left((1 + \frac{\mu_r}{2} s^2 \beta^2)^2 - \left(\frac{1 + \mu_r}{2} s \beta\right)^2\right)}
\]
and
\[ n = 1, 3, 5, \ldots \]
\[ i = 2, 4, 6, \ldots \]
\[ j = 1, 3, 5, \ldots \]
Solution of stability determinant. — The stability determinant to be solved is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{J} = 1 & \quad \text{J} = 3 & \quad \text{J} = 5 \\
n = 1 & \quad 1 + \left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{11}M_{11} \quad \left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{11}M_{13} \quad \left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{11}M_{15} \ldots \\
n = 3 & \quad \left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{31}M_{11} \quad 1 + \left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{31}M_{13} \quad \left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{31}M_{15} \ldots \quad = 0 \quad (\text{All}) \\
n = 5 & \quad \left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{51}M_{11} \quad \left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{51}M_{13} \quad 1 + \left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{51}M_{15} \ldots \\
\ldots & \quad \ldots & \quad \ldots \\
\end{align*}
\]

Equation (All) cannot be solved exactly and approximate methods must be used to obtain values of the elastic shear-buckling-stress coefficient \( k \). The method used in the present paper is to approximate the infinite stability determinant by finite subdeterminants, in effect to use an infinite number of Fourier coefficients \( a_n, d_n, \) and \( e_n \), but only a finite number of Fourier coefficients \( b_n, c_n, \) and \( f_n \). A first approximation is given by the first order determinant as

\[
\left(\frac{8\beta^3k}{\pi}\right)^2 = -\frac{1}{\sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{11}M_{11}} \quad (\text{All2})
\]
The second approximation is given by the second-order determinant as

\[
\left( \frac{8}{\pi} \beta^3 k \right)^4 \left[ \left( \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{11} M_{11} \right) \left( \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{31} M_{11} \right) - \left( \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{11} M_{11} \right) \left( \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{31} M_{11} \right) \right]
\]

\[+ \left( \frac{8}{\pi} \beta^3 k \right)^2 \left( \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{11} M_{11} + \sum_{i=2,4,6,\ldots}^{\infty} M_{31} M_{11} \right) + 1 = 0 \quad (A13)
\]

The shear-buckling-stress coefficient \( k \) is a function of the parameters \( r \) and \( \beta \). For a given value of \( r \) the correct value of \( \beta \) is that which yields the lowest value of \( k \). In the computations made for the present paper, therefore, the parameter \( \beta \) was varied until a minimum value of \( k \) was obtained for a given value of \( r \). The results of the computations made with equations (A12) and (A13) are summarized in table 1. The values of \( k \) for \( r = 0 \) and \( r = 1.0 \) obtained from the second approximation are seen to agree excellently with the known exact values. The exact value of \( k \) for \( r = 0 \) was obtained from reference 11 and agrees with the second approximation to two decimal places. The exact value of \( k \) for \( r = 1.0 \) was obtained as a result of physical reasoning, which is explained in the next section, and is only 1 percent lower than the second approximation. It may reasonably be concluded that the approximate values of \( k \) for the intermediate values of \( r \) are also within 1 percent of the corresponding exact values.

**Stability criterion when \( r > 1 \).**—A shear buckling mode that is possible for Metalite type sandwich plates is shown in figure 4. The plates may buckle with straight nodal lines inclined at an angle of \( 45^\circ \) to the direction of the shear stress and with an infinitely small wave length. If an element of plates between consecutive nodal lines is isolated (fig. 4), it is seen to be subjected to a compressive stress which is equal in magnitude to the critical shear stress. The element is therefore equivalent to a very short compressed simply supported plate for which the buckling load is given by equation (1) of reference 6 as

\[ k = \frac{1}{r} \quad (A14) \]
The computations of the present paper indicate that the wave length of buckle rapidly decreases with increasing $r$ so that the shear-buckling-stress coefficients approach those of compressed simply supported plates. When $r$ is equal to or greater than 1.0 the shear-buckling-stress coefficients are given exactly by equation (Al4).

As was noted in reference 6, this result is a consequence of the assumption implied by the sandwich-plate theory of reference 9, that the stiffness of the plate faces in bending about their own middle surface is negligible. The plate is then free to buckle as shown in section A–A of figure (4); that is, buckling is due to the core shearing in planes perpendicular to the faces, with no interference due to bending of the faces.
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TABLE I
SHEAR-BUCKLING COEFFICIENTS FOR INFINITELY LONG SIMPLY
SUPPORTED METALITE TYPE SANDWICH PLATES

\[
\mu_r = \frac{1}{3}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>r</th>
<th>( k_{xy} )</th>
<th>( k_{xy} )</th>
<th>( k_{xy} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First approx.</td>
<td>Second approx.</td>
<td>Exact solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. - Infinitely long simply supported Metalite type sandwich plate under shear.
Figure 2.— Elastic shear-buckling-stress coefficients for infinitely long simply supported Metalite type sandwich plates ($\mu_f = \frac{1}{3}$).
Figure 3.— Relationship between shear buckling stresses for an infinitely long simply supported plate computed from theories of elastic and plastic buckling of 24S–T3 aluminum alloy.
Figure 4.—Buckled shape of plate with core of low shear stiffness.