



AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING
Design and Production Engineering

Fracture Toughness Assessment for Steel Pipes Used in Gas Pipelines

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering

(Design and Production Engineering)

by

Ahmed Eid Said Khalil

Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

(Design and Production Engineering)

Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, 2010

Supervised By

Prof. Taher G. Abu-EL-Yazied

Prof. Aly A. EL Domiaty

Prof. Hala Abd EL Hakim Hassan

Cairo - 2017

Statement

This thesis is submitted in a partial fulfillment of Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering, specialization (Production Engineering), Faculty of Engineering, Ain shams University.

The author carried out the work included in this thesis, and no part of it has been submitted for a degree or a qualification at any other scientific entity.

Signature

.....

Ahmed Eid Said Khalil

Date: 2017

Researcher Data

Name : Ahmed Eid Said Khalil

Date of birth : 4/6/1988

Place of birth : Cairo, Egypt

Last academic degree : Bachelor of Science Degree (B.Sc.)

Field of specialization : Mechanical Engineering

University issued the degree : Ain Shams University

Date of issued degree : July, 2010

Current job : Teaching Assistant, Design and Production
Engineering Department, Faculty of
Engineering, Ain Shams University,
Cairo, Egypt.

Thesis Summary

The current work is focused on studying the Fracture assessment of steels pipe with different grades. The research is divided into two parts. The first part is focused on determination of the fracture energy for materials used in natural gas pipelines. Double edge notch tension (DENT) samples with different ligament lengths of each pipe thickness were tested in tension to determine the fracture energy of each material. Increasing the pipe thickness increased the essential work of fracture. The results have a qualitative agreement with previous work.

The second part is studying the fracture toughness on full scale steel pipes under internal pressure with axial partially-through crack using two analytical methods Folin-Ciocalteu method (FC method) and Gauss–Seidel method (GS method). In this work, a comparison is made between results obtained from FC and GS methods. The GS is more conservative assessment method as it provides smaller crack depth (a) corresponding to (J_{cr}). In addition, Finite Element model was established to simulate the crack propagation in full scale pipe. Generally, Finite Element model is almost more conservative than the analytical methods and its results close to the experimental values.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
Nomenclature	iii
Acknowledgement	vi
List of Figures	vii
List of Tables	x
1 Introduction	1
2 Literature Review	4
2.1 Fracture Mechanics.....	4
2.2 LEFM and EPFM	4
2.3 Plastic Zone Size	5
2.4 Modes of Loading.....	7
2.5 Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics (LEFM).....	8
2.6 Elastic-Plastic Fracture Mechanics (EPFM).....	11
2.7 Essential Work of Fracture (EWF).....	12
2.8 Full Scale Pipe	15
2.8.1 Failure of Pipes.....	15
2.8.2 Cracks in Pipe.....	15
2.8.3 Axial semi-elliptical part-through crack in pipe	17
2.9 The FC Method.....	19
2.10 The GS Method	19
3 Experimental Work	20
3.1 Material.....	20
3.2 Chemical Analysis.....	20
3.3 Tensile Test.....	21
3.3.1 Sample Preparation	21
3.3.2 True Stress – Strain	23
3.3.3 Ramberg – Osgood parameters	24

3.4	Essential Work of Fracture (EWF)	25
3.4.1	Test Sample	25
3.4.2	Test Procedure	29
3.4.3	Fractography	30
3.5	Full Scale Pipe	30
4	Finite Element Method	31
5	Results and Discussion	36
5.1	Tensile Test Results	36
5.2	Essential Work of Fracture	40
5.2.1	Effect of ligament length on fracture load ($P_{max.}$)	42
5.2.2	Effect of pipe thickness on the fracture load	43
5.2.3	The effect of ligament length on maximum displacement ..	44
5.2.4	Effect of pipe thickness on maximum displacement	46
5.2.5	The effect of pipe alloy and thickness on the specific total work of fracture	51
5.2.6	Interpretation of Results using Different Models	57
5.2.7	Fractography	62
5.3	Full Scale Pipe Analysis	66
5.3.1	Experimental results for investigated samples	66
5.3.2	Analytical Methods	67
5.3.3	Finite element method result	70
6	Conclusions	75
	References	77

Nomenclature

LEFM	Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics
EPFM	Elastic-Plastic Fracture Mechanics
K	The stress intensity factor
K_I	The stress intensity factor - mode I
K_{IC}	Critical stress intensity factor = fracture toughness
K_{IC}	Plane strain fracture toughness - mode I (material property)
r and θ	Cylindrical polar coordinates of a point with respect to crack tip
$\sigma_{app.}$	The applied stress
h	Crack length
w	The specimen width
$f\left(\frac{h}{w}\right)$	Dimensionless parameter that depend on the geometries of the specimen and crack
P	Applied load
G	Energy release rate
J-Integral	Fracture toughness parameter for elastic-plastic material
$J_{el.}$	J - elastic
$J_{pl.}$	J - plastic
J-R curve	J resistance curve
J_c	The critical J-Integral value
CTOD	Crack Tip Opening Displacement
ρ	The length of the plastic zone
E	Modulus of elasticity
ν	Poisson's ratio
SENB	Single edge notched bend specimen
CT	Compact tension specimen
T_i	Components of the traction vector
u_i	Displacement vector components
ds	Length increment along the contour Γ
EWf	Essential work of fracture method
DENT	Double Edge Notched Tension specimens
l	Sample nominal ligament length

	t	Specimen thickness
	W_F	Total work of fracture
	W_e	Essential work of fracture
	W_p	Non-essential work of fracture
	w_F	Specific total work of fracture
	w_e	Specific essential work of fracture
	w_p	Specific non-essential work of fracture (plastic work per unit volume)
	β	The shape factor associated with the volume of plastic deformation zone (it depends on the geometry of yield zone)
GE/EPRI method		General Electric/Electric Power Research Institute method
LBB.NRC method		Leak Before Break/Nuclear Regulatory Commission method
	c	Half crack length of axial semi-elliptical part-through crack for full scale pipe
	a	Crack depth of axial semi-elliptical part-through crack for full scale pipe
	a_{cr}	Critical crack depth for full scale pipe
	σ_h	The hoop stress for pipe
	p	Pipe internal pressure
	D	Pipe outer diameter
	R	Pipe outer radius
	M_F	A front-face correction on the stress intensity factor for the surface crack
	$E_{(K)}$	Elliptical integral of the second kind
	M_{TM}	The shell-curvature correction factor for a surface crack
	M_T	Folias correction factor which include the effect of pipe curvature
	σ_o	The yield stress of the material
	ϵ_o	The strain corresponding to yield strength $\epsilon_o = \frac{\sigma_o}{E}$
	α, m	Material constants (Ramberg-Osgood parameters)
	σ_n	The nominal stress
	σ_{true}	True stress

σ	Engineering stress
ϵ_{true}	True strain
e	Engineering strain
k	Strength coefficient
n	Strain hardening exponent
r_p	Plastic zone size
P_{max}	Fracture load of DENT sample
δ_c	Critical crack opening displacement
VHN	Vickers hardness number
PZS	Plastic zone size
σ_{max}	Maximum stress on sample
d	The process zone width of DENT sample
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscope
C	Plastic constraint factor
FEM	Finite Element Method
FC Method	The Folin–Ciocalteu method
GS Method	The Gauss–Seidel method

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to my academic advisors, **Prof. Taher Gamal-El-Deen Abu-El-Yazied**, **Prof. Aly A. EL Domiaty** and **Prof. Hala Abd EL Hakim Hassan** for their guidance and motivation during this work. I am extremely thankful to **PETROJET Co.** and **Staff Training Institute (STI)** for providing material and samples preparation. Many thanks to **Prof. Iman EL-Mahalawy** with Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University for her help during this work. I appreciate my colleagues' efforts in Design and Production Engineering Department, Faculty Of Engineering, Ain Shams University.

I sincerely thank my parents and my wife for their encouragement and support during this work.

List of Figures

Figure 2-1 LEFM, EPFM and plastic collapse depending on crack tip plastic zone [3]	5
Figure 2-2 Plastic zone size according to Irwin [3]	6
Figure 2-3 Plastic zone size according to Dugdale [2]	6
Figure 2-4 Plastic zone shape according to Von Mises yield criteria [2]	7
Figure 2-5 Modes of loading [2]	8
Figure 2-6 Stresses at a point in the vicinity of crack tip [2]	8
Figure 2-7 Variation of fracture toughness with specimen thickness for a steel alloy [9]	10
Figure 2-8 Arbitrary contour around the crack tip [2, 6]	11
Figure 2-9 Schematic of EWF method [15]	12
Figure 2-10 Two crack types (a) circumferential crack (b) axial crack [28]	16
Figure 2-11 Axial semi-elliptical part-through crack [34]	17
Figure 3-1 Longitudinal strip from pipe	21
Figure 3-2 Configuration and dimensions of tension test sample according to ASTM A370 [42]	22
Figure 3-3 Engineering stress – strain curve for (a) steel X42 and (b) steel X52	23
Figure 3-4 Pipe after milling operation	26
Figure 3-5 Strip shape and dimensions	26
Figure 3-6 Double edge notch sample dimensions	27
Figure 3-7 Load-Displacement curve for 7-A sample	29
Figure 4-1 Non-linear behavior of material steel X70 according to Ramberg-Osgood equation redraw after [34]	31
Figure 4-2 The behavior of bilinear material steel X70 with tangent modulus= 1741 MPa from Ansys program	32
Figure 4-3 Base mesh for pipe	32
Figure 4-4 Fracture meshing around the crack tip	33
Figure 4-5 Semi-elliptical crack in XZ plane	33
Figure 4-6 Semi-elliptical crack parameters in Ansys	34
Figure 5-1 True stress-true strain curve for (a) steel X42 and (b) steel X52	37
Figure 5-2 Stress-strain graph log scale for steel X42	38
Figure 5-3 Stress-strain graph log scale for steel X52	38
Figure 5-4 Ramberg-Osgood parameters analysis for steel X42	39
Figure 5-5 Ramberg-Osgood parameters analysis for steel X52	40

Figure 5-6 Load-Displacement curves obtained from DENT samples with different ligament lengths for steel X52 with thickness=5.74 mm samples .	41
Figure 5-7 Load-Displacement curves obtained from DENT samples with different ligament lengths for steel X52 with thickness=2.11 mm	41
Figure 5-8 Maximum load vs ligament length for two thickness of steel X52 obtained from tension test of DENT	42
Figure 5-9 Maximum load vs ligament length for two thickness of steel X42 obtained from tension test of DENT	42
Figure 5-10 Maximum load versus ligament length for steel X42, X52 and steel 37 [45].....	43
Figure 5-11 Maximum displacement vs ligament length for two thickness of steel X52	44
Figure 5-12 Maximum displacement vs ligament length for two thickness of steel X42	45
Figure 5-13 Micrographs of steel X42 pipe with thickness of 7.62mm (a) outer surface, (b) inner surface and (c) middle of the sample. The inclusions are marked with dotted red circles.	48
Figure 5-14 Dotted circles show full yielding around the ligament (a)X42 pipe with 7.62mm thickness (b) X52 pipe with 5.74mm thickness.....	49
Figure 5-15 The trapezoidal rule to calculate area under curve.....	51
Figure 5-16 Specific total work of fracture vs ligament length for $t = 2.11$ mm steel X52	53
Figure 5-17 Specific total work of fracture vs ligament length for $t = 5.74$ mm steel X52	53
Figure 5-18 Specific total work of fracture vs ligament length for $t = 2.11$ mm steel X42	54
Figure 5-19 Specific total work of fracture vs ligament length for $t = 7.62$ mm steel X42	54
Figure 5-20 Specific total work of fracture vs ligament length for steel X52 with $t=2.11$ mm and 5.74mm.....	56
Figure 5-21 Specific total work of fracture vs ligament length for steel X42 with $t=2.11$ mm and 7.62mm.....	56
Figure 5-22 Specific total work of fracture vs ligament length for X42 and X52 with 2.11 mm thickness and St. 37 with 1.2 mm thickness [45]	57
Figure 5-23 The relation between maximum stress and the ligament length along with the validity limits for (a) Steel X42 $t=2.11$ mm, (b) Steel X42 $t=7.62$ mm, (c) Steel X52 $t=2.11$ mm and (d) Steel X52 $t=5.74$ mm	58
Figure 5-24 The macroscopic fracture surface	63

Figure 5-25 SEM fractography shows the direction of the crack growth and overload area in X52 DENT samples	63
Figure 5-26 SEM fractography shows ductile features of X52 DENT samples (a) Low magnification and (b) Higher magnification.....	64
Figure 5-27 SEM fractography of X42 DENT samples (a) Mix of ductile and cleavage fracture features (arrowed) (b) Cleavage fracture areas at higher magnification	65
Figure 5-28 J-integral vs a by FC and GS methods for used pipes (a) 52-I, (b) 65-I, (c) 65-II, (d) 70-I and (e) 70-II.....	68
Figure 5-29 The J-integral at fracture pressure for (a) Steel X65 and (b) Steel X70.....	71
Figure 5-30 Comparison between J-a relation from FC, GS and Finite Element methods for used pipes (a) 52-I, (b) 65-I, (c) 65-II, (d) 70-I and (e) 70-II.....	72

List of Tables

Table 3-1 Selected steel pipes grades and their dimensions [40]	20
Table 3-2 The chemical composition of X42 and X52 seamless steel pipes	20
Table 3-3 The chemical composition of X42 and X52 according to API 5L [41].....	21
Table 3-4 Samples identification number for steel X52 and steel X42	27
Table 3-5 Actual ligament length (l) for DENT samples	28
Table 3-6 Check validity conditions of samples of steel X52	28
Table 4-1 Full scale pipe: Materials, Dimensions and Identification number for investigated pipes[34]	35
Table 5-1 Mechanical properties for steel X42 and X52.....	36
Table 5-2 Yield and ultimate strength ranges for steel X42 and X52 according to API 5L [41]	36
Table 5-3 The values of strength coefficient k and strain hardening exponent n for steel X42 and X52	39
Table 5-4 Ramberg – Osgood parameters for steel X42 and X52.....	40
Table 5-5 Fracture load for steel X52 and steel X42 samples	44
Table 5-6 Critical crack opening displacement (δ_c) for X52 and X42	45
Table 5-7 Maximum Displacement at fracture for steel X52 and steel X42 DENT samples	46
Table 5-8 Microhardness measurements of X42 sample with 7.62mm thickness.....	48
Table 5-9 Plastic zone size for each sample for steel X42 and X52.....	50
Table 5-10 Total work of fracture (W_t) for steel X52 and steel X42 samples	52
Table 5-11 Specific total work of fracture (w_t) for steel X52 and steel X42	52
Table 5-12 Summary of essential work of fracture (w_e) for both X42 and X52 steel with different thicknesses	55
Table 5-13 Mean maximum stress for steel X42 and X52	58
Table 5-14 Values of specific essential work of fracture (w_e) compared to Wells method results.....	61
Table 5-15 The mechanical properties for steel pipe X42 and X52	62
Table 5-16 Values of specific essential work of fracture (w_e) compared to estimated J_c	62
Table 5-17 Mechanical properties and J_{cr} for pipe materials [34]	66
Table 5-18 Plastic constraint factor (C) and fracture pressure for each pipe [34].....	67

Table 5-19 The deviation percentage in the critical crack depth of each method relative to the experimental value	74
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----