Acoustic emission-based methodology to investigate delamination crack growth under quasi-static and fatigue loading conditions
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Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate the applicability of Acoustic Emission (AE) technique to evaluate delamination growth in glass/epoxy composite laminates under quasi-static and fatigue loading. To this aim, Double Cantilever Beam (DCB) specimens were subjected to mode I quasi-static and fatigue loading conditions and the generated AE signals were recorded through the tests. In quasi-static loading, correlations between AE energy with released strain energy and crack growth were established. Then, using the obtained relation the delamination growth curve was predicted by AE method. In next section, delamination propagation under fatigue loading condition was predicted using the established relation between the cumulative AE energy and fatigue crack growth. The predicted crack growth was in a good agreement with the visually recorded data during the tests. The results indicated that the proposed AE-based method has good applicability to evaluate the crack growth during quasi-static and fatigue loading conditions and can be applied in real composite structures to measure the crack length.
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1. Introduction

Fiber Reinforced Plastic composites (FRP) have many advantages such as high specific strength, specific stiffness, etc. [1-4]. However, these materials suffer from different damage mechanisms, such as matrix cracking, fiber breakage, fiber/matrix debonding and delamination [5-8]. The principal mode of failure in laminated composites is the separation along the interfaces of the layers, viz, delamination [9-14]. This failure results in dramatic reduction of residual strength and stiffness of the structure. Delamination occurs under different loading conditions, i.e. mode I, mode II and mode III. However, mode I delamination is the most common mode of failure occurred in the structures. This is due to lower energy that is required for the initiation of mode I delamination [15-17].

Due to complexity of laminated composites, prediction of fatigue behavior in these materials is not straight forward [18]. Accurate measurement of fatigue crack growth has become a challenging issue in fracture mechanics analyses. Fatigue crack growth monitoring is a difficult and time-consuming test [19]. In addition, work gets harder when the crack is embedded within the structure and could not be seen visually.

Acoustic Emission (AE) is a naturally occurring phenomenon, which is the result of transient elastic wave propagation caused by a sudden release of energy inside the material [20]. There are various sources of AE events in composite materials such as matrix cracking, fiber/matrix debonding, fiber breakage, etc. [21-23]. Recently, AE has been utilized as an applicable technique to detect in-situ information from the damages that occur in laminated composites [5, 24-27].
Some studies have used AE method to investigate the delamination behavior under quasi-static loading condition [28-32]. Fotouhi and Ahmadi [33] investigate initiation of delamination in laminated composites under mixed-mode loading condition using AE method. Arumugam et al. [34] investigated damage mechanisms in glass/epoxy composite specimens under mode I delamination using AE and Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) analysis. Saedifar et al. [35] determined interlaminar fracture toughness of glass/epoxy composites under mode I, II and mixed-mode I&II loading using AE and Finite Element (FE) methods. The literature review shows that most AE based studies were focused on delamination initiation and there is a lack in the investigation of delamination propagation behavior using AE method.

Due to the complexity of the fatigue phenomenon in composite materials, little work has been done on the behavior of delamination in laminated composites under cyclic loading using AE method. Silversides et al. [36] studied delamination initiation in carbon/epoxy specimens under mixed-mode cyclic loading conditions. Romhany et al. [37] offered an algorithm to predict delamination crack growth in carbon/epoxy specimens subjected to cyclic loading. Romhany’s method has two disadvantages: a) to predict the fatigue crack growth at least two AE sensors must be utilized, and b) the accurate AE wave propagation speeds in the specimens must first be calculated.

The aim of this paper is to investigate the delamination propagation in glass/epoxy composites under mode I quasi-static and fatigue loading conditions. The article is composed of two sections. In first section, the delamination behavior under quasi-static loading condition is investigated using mechanical and AE data. Then correlations between AE energy, released strain energy and crack growth are established and quasi-static delamination growth was predicted using AE method. In second section, the
delamination crack growth under fatigue loading is predicted using the AE method. The advantages of the proposed method to predict delamination growth are: predicting delamination growth using only one AE sensor without needing to determine AE wave propagation speed in the specimens. In addition, no AE signals filtering is needed in this method. Consistency of the predicted and visually recorded values for the delamination crack growth, illustrates that AE method is more suitable than the conventional methods for detection of delamination crack growth in the laminated composites under quasi-static and fatigue loading conditions.

2 Experimental Procedures

2.1 Materials and specimens preparation

The experimental work was carried out on the epoxy resin reinforced by the E-glass unidirectional and woven fibers with the density of 1.17 g/cm³, 390 g/m² and 300 g/m², respectively. The laminates were prepared by hand lay-up. The starter crack was formed by inserting a Teflon film with a thickness of 20 μm at mid-plane during molding as an initial crack for the delamination. The laminated composite test specimens consist of a rectangular shape and uniform thickness consists of 14 plies. Characteristics of the specimens used for this study are illustrated in Fig. 1. For ease of working, the unidirectional specimen [0]₁₆ is named U and the woven specimen [(0-90)]₈ is named W.
2.2 Test procedure

2.2.1 Quasi-static and cyclic loadings

First, the specimens were examined under quasi-static loading condition according to ASTM D5528 standard [38]. A properly calibrated tensile test machine (HIWA) in the range of 0.5 to 500 mm/min was used in a displacement control mode. The delamination tests were carried out at room temperature and at a constant displacement rate of 3 mm/min. The load and displacement were continuously recorded by the machine and the crack length was recorded using a digital video camera (SONY HDR-XR150) with 25X optical zoom and 300X digital zoom. The fatigue loading tests were performed by a properly calibrated tensile test machine (Dartec) according to ASTM D6115 [39]. Based on ASTM D6115 recommendation the tests were performed under displacement control mod with loading frequency 3 Hz. For ease of working, the quasi-static and fatigue loading specimens are illustrated by ‘S’ and ‘F’ subscripts, respectively. The test apparatus is shown in Fig. 2.
Fig. 2. The experimental setup for quasi-static and fatigue tests.

2.2.2 AE device

AE events were recorded using Acoustic Emission software AEWin and a data acquisition system Physical Acoustics Corporation (PAC) PCI-2 with a maximum sampling rate of 40 MHz. PICO which is a broadband, resonant-type, single-crystal piezoelectric transducer from PAC, was used as the AE sensor. The sensor has a resonance frequency of 513.28 kHz and an optimum operating range of 100–750 kHz. In order to provide good acoustic coupling between the specimen and the sensor, the surface of the sensor was covered with grease. The signal was detected by the sensor and enhanced by a 2/4/6-AST preamplifier. The gain selector of the preamplifier was set to 37 dB. The test sampling rate was 1 MHz with 16 bits of resolution between 10 and 100 dB.
3 Results and discussion

3.1 Quasi-static loading

3.1.1 Mechanical results

Double Cantilever Beam (DCB) specimens were subjected to mode I quasi-static loading according to ASTM D5528 standard [38]. Fig. 3 shows the load-displacement and crack growth-displacement diagrams for specimens U_{S1} and W_{S1}. As can be seen, the crack growth in specimen W_{S1} is more stable than specimen U_{S1}. This instabilities and rise and fall behaviors in crack growth and load diagrams are called pop-in phenomenon [40]. The big pop-ins in specimen U_{S1} are caused by fiber bridging phenomenon [38, 41-42]. Fiber bridging phenomenon described as the stretching of some fibers between upper and lower layers of the crack plane. This phenomenon occurred at the behind of the crack tip and resulted to the additional resistance against the crack growth [41-42]. When the stress in these fibers reaches to the fibers strength, the fibers are broken and crack abruptly propagates for a few millimeters. By bridging the new fibers, the crack is arrested again. Some small pop-ins in specimen W_{S1} are due to change in the delamination propagation plane that is a common phenomenon in non-unidirectional laminated composites (see Fig. 4).
Fig. 3. Load-displacement and crack growth-displacement diagrams for specimens $U_{S1}$ and $W_{S1}$. 
3.1.2 AE results

Major damage mechanisms in laminated composites are matrix cracking, fiber breakage, and delamination \[.\] In order to estimate delamination growth using AE method, first, the AE signals of delamination must be specified and discriminated from other damage mechanisms. To this aim, tensile tests of pure resin and fiber bundle were conducted. The pure resin tensile test was performed on a tensile test sample made of epoxy resin and the fiber breakage test was conducted in a tension test on bundle of about 1000 filaments. The AE signals were recorded by the AE sensors that are mounted on the surface of resin and fiber samples (see Fig. 5). According to literature review, best parameters for damage clustering in composite materials using AE method
is peak frequency. It is due to this fact that the peak frequency of a signals does not affected by attenuation. The AE signals of fiber bundle and pure resin tests were analyzed using Fast Furrier Transform (FFT). The frequency range of matrix damage and fiber damage are shown in Fig. 6. As can be seen, frequency range of matrix and fiber damages are [0-150 kHz] and [400-500 kHz], respectively.

Fig. 5 shows frequency distribution of the recoded AE signals during the loading of specimen U81.
Fig. 5 shows load-displacement and cumulative AE energy-displacement curves for specimens U$_{S1}$ and W$_{S1}$. In load-displacement diagrams, several pop-ins are observable which are related to the sudden crack growths and each pop-in is accompanied by a well-defined acoustic energy jump. By applying the load to the specimen as long as the crack is arrested, the strain energy is stored in the specimen. When the stored strain energy reaches to the critical value, the crack propagates and the stored strain energy is released (see Fig. 6). According to Fig. 6, released strain energy at each pop-in ($\Delta U|_\Delta$), can be calculated by Eq. 1 [43]:

$$dU|_\Delta = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \cdot dP$$

(1)

where $\Delta$ and $dP$ are displacement and load drop, respectively.

A part of this released energy transmitted within the specimen in the form of stress waves [40], which the AE sensors recorded these waves as AE signals. Thus, the energy
of recorded AE signals ($\Delta E_{AE}$) is some proportion of the available elastic energy ($\Delta U$), i.e. []:

$$\Delta U \sim \Delta E_{AE}$$

(2)

Fig. 5. Load-displacement and cumulative AE energy curves for specimens $U_{S1}$ and $W_{S1}$. 
Fig. 6. Changing the strain energy due to infinitesimal crack growth under displacement control mode (a and da are crack length and infinitesimal crack growth, respectively).

Using Eq. 1, released strain energy at each pop-in was calculated. The corresponding AE energy jump at each pop-in was also calculated using the AE data recorded by the AE sensors. The obtained values of released strain energy (dU) and corresponded AE energy jump (dE_{AE}) at each pop-in are represented in Tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1. The values of released strain energy (dU) and AE energy jump (dE_{AE}) at each pop-in for specimen U_{S1}.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pop-in number</th>
<th>Δ (mm)</th>
<th>P_1 (N)</th>
<th>P_2 (N)</th>
<th>dP (N)</th>
<th>E_{AE-1} (×10^{-14} J)</th>
<th>E_{AE-2} (×10^{-14} J)</th>
<th>dE_{AE} (×10^{-14} J)</th>
<th>dU (×10^{-3} J)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>54.03</td>
<td>49.32</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>49.33</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>42.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>54.09</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>68.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>42.08</td>
<td>37.37</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>22.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>42.12</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>33.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>42.13</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>44.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P_1: the initial load at each pop-in, P_2: the final load at each pop-in, dP=P_1-P_2, E_{AE-1}: the initial cumulative AE energy at each pop-in, E_{AE-2}: the final cumulative AE energy at each pop-in, dE_{AE}=E_{AE-2}-E_{AE-1}. 
Table 2. The values of released strain energy (dU) and AE energy jump (dE_{AE}) at each pop-in for specimen W_{SI}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pop-in number</th>
<th>Δ (mm)</th>
<th>P_1 (N)</th>
<th>P_2 (N)</th>
<th>dP (N)</th>
<th>E_{AE-1} (×10^{-14} J)</th>
<th>E_{AE-2} (×10^{-14} J)</th>
<th>dE_{AE} (×10^{-14} J)</th>
<th>dU (×10^{-6} J)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>60.02</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>56.47</td>
<td>48.14</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>39.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>51.70</td>
<td>49.36</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>12.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>48.14</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>15.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>48.04</td>
<td>42.31</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>45.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>43.31</td>
<td>42.21</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>43.32</td>
<td>39.71</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>34.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>159.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>36.16</td>
<td>33.83</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>35.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td>33.72</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>74.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>40.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>22.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.40</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>41.90</td>
<td>44.20</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>62.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>47.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P_1: the initial load at each pop-in, P_2: the final load at each pop-in, dP=P_1-P_2, E_{AE-1}: the initial cumulative AE energy at each pop-in, E_{AE-2}: the final cumulative AE energy at each pop-in, dE_{AE}=E_{AE-2}-E_{AE-1}.

Fig. 7 illustrates the correlation between AE energy jump and released strain energy at the pop-ins. As can be seen, a linear relationship established between the AE energy jump and released strain energy. Thus, amount of AE energy induced by crack growth, is a function of released strain energy of the specimen.
Fig. 7. Correlation between AE energy jump and strain energy drop at the pop-ins for specimens $U_{S1}$ and $W_{S1}$.

Strain energy release rate in mode I ($G_I$) for DCB specimen is calculated as follow:

$$dE_{AE} = (1.26dU+1.50) \times 10^{-15}$$
\[ G_I = -\frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{dU}{da} \right)_\Delta = \frac{12P^2a^2}{EB^2h^3} \]  

(3)

where \( B \) is specimen width, \( P \) is load, \( a \) is initial crack length, \( E \) is young modulus, \( U \) is released strain energy, and \( h \) is a half thickness of the specimen. Thus, the elastic released strain energy \( \Delta U \) due to growth of delamination as much as \( \Delta a \) is calculated as follows:

\[
dU = -\frac{12P^2a^2}{EBh^3} da \]

(4)

\[
\int_0^{\Delta U} da = -\int_a^{a+\Delta a} \frac{12P^2a^2}{EBh^3} da
\]

(5)

\[
\Delta U = -\frac{4P^2}{EBh^3} [(a+\Delta a)^3-a^3]=aP^2[(a+\Delta a)^3-a^3]
\]

(6)

Combining Eqs. 2 and 6 leads to

\[
\Delta E_{AE} = \beta P^2 [(a+\Delta a)^3-a^3]
\]

(7)

Using \( x^3 - y^3 = (x - y)(x^2 + xy + y^2) \) substitution, Eq. 7 modified as follow:

\[
\Delta E_{AE} = \beta P^2 [(a+\Delta a)^3-a^3] = \beta P^2 [\Delta a^3 + 3a\Delta a^2 + 3a^2\Delta a]
\]

(8)

Finally, Eq. 8 can be simplified as follow:

\[
E_{AE} = \alpha \Delta a^3 + \beta \Delta a^2 + \gamma \Delta a + \eta
\]

(9)

Fig. 8 shows the relation between cumulative crack growth and cumulative AE energy for specimens U_{S1} and W_{S1}. Due to high value of R-square for the fittings (i.e. 0.97778 and 0.99644 for specimens U_{S1} and W_{S1}, respectively.), it is concluded that the 3-order polynomial of Eq. 9 expresses the relation between \( E_{AE} \) and \( \Delta a \) very well.
Fig. 8. Correlation between visual crack growth and cumulative AE energy for specimens U_{S1} and W_{S1}. 
The real root of Eq. 9 at a specific cumulative AE energy determines the value of crack growth. Fig. 9 shows the delamination crack growth estimated by cumulative AE energy versus visually recorded experimental data. As it is obvious, excellent agreement exists between the results. In order to qualify the performance of the proposed method in different loading condition, two other specimens were tested with 1 mm/min loading rate. Fig. 10 shows the predicted delamination propagation curve versus the visually recorded curve for these specimens. As can be seen, by changing the loading condition, AE still can predict delamination propagation precisely.
Fig. 9. Prediction of crack growth using AE method for specimens U$S_1$ and W$S_1$.

![Graph showing crack growth comparison for Specimen U$S_2$ and W$S_2$]

Fig. 10. Prediction of crack growth using AE method for specimens U$S_2$ and W$S_2$.

Table 3 represents the average and maximum differences between the predicted delamination crack growth by AE method and the visually detected crack growth. The results show that the proposed AE method has a good performance to predict quasi-static delamination crack growth.

Table 3. The maximum and average error of the AE crack growth prediction.
### 3.2 Fatigue loading

The samples similar to quasi-static specimens were subjected to the fatigue loading. The tests are performed according to ASTM D6115 standard [39] under displacement control mode. The specifications of the fatigue loading tests are represented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimens</th>
<th>Loading rate (mm/min)</th>
<th>Maximum error (mm)</th>
<th>Average error (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U$_{S1}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W$_{S1}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U$_{S2}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W$_{S2}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. The specifications of the cyclic loading tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimens</th>
<th>Load frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>$\frac{\delta_{\text{max}}^2}{\delta_{\text{cr}}^2}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{\text{max}}}{G_{\text{lc}}}$</th>
<th>$\delta_{\text{min}}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$\delta_{\text{max}}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$R = \frac{\delta_{\text{min}}}{\delta_{\text{max}}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U$_{F1}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$G_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W$_{F1}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$G_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U$_{F2}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$G_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W$_{F2}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$G_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\delta_{\text{min}}$: minimum displacement for cyclic loading, $\delta_{\text{max}}$: maximum displacement for cyclic loading, $\delta_{\text{cr}}$: displacement corresponding to crack initiation for quasi-static loading, $G_{\text{max}}$: fracture energy release rate corresponded to $\delta_{\text{max}}$ for cyclic loading, $G_{\text{lc}}$: interlaminar fracture toughness calculated from quasi-static mode I loading.

Fatigue crack growth curves for specimens U$_{F1}$ and W$_{F1}$ are illustrated in Fig. 11. As can be seen, the fatigue crack growth in woven specimen (W$_{F1}$) is more stable than unidirectional specimen (U$_{F1}$). Similar to the quasi-static loading, instability of fatigue crack growth in specimen U$_{F1}$ refers to the fiber bridging phenomenon.
3.3 Prediction of fatigue crack growth using AE

Cumulative AE energy of specimens $U_{F1}$ and $W_{F1}$ are illustrated in Fig. 12. By comparing Figs. 11 and 12, it is obvious that the cumulative AE energy curve has similar trend to the fatigue crack growth curve. Thus, similar to the relation between delamination growth and cumulative AE energy in quasi-static loading, there is linear relation between cumulative fatigue crack growth and cumulative AE energy.
Fig. 12. Cumulative AE energy curve of specimens $U_{F1}$ and $W_{F1}$.

Fig. 13 shows the linear relationship between the cumulative fatigue crack growth and cumulative AE energy for specimens $U_{F1}$ and $W_{F1}$. 
Fig. 13. Correlation between fatigue crack growth and cumulative AE energy for specimens $U_{F1}$ and $W_{F1}$.

Fig. 14 illustrates the predicted fatigue crack growth and visually recorded crack growth for specimens $U_{F1}$ and $W_{F1}$. The results show that this method could predict the fatigue crack growth precisely.
Fig. 14. Predicted and visually detected delamination fatigue crack growth for specimens $U_{F1}$ and $W_{F1}$.

In order to qualify the performance of the proposed method for different fatigue loading conditions, the specimens $U_{F2}$ and $W_{F2}$ were tested under lower stress levels ($\left[ \frac{\delta_{\text{max}}}{\delta_{\text{cr}}}, \frac{G_{\text{Imax}}}{G_{lc}} \right] = 0.5$). The predicted fatigue crack growth curve for these specimens are illustrated in Fig. 15.
Fig. 15. Predicted and visually detected delamination fatigue crack growth for specimens $U_{F2}$ and $W_{F2}$.

Table 5 represents the average and maximum differences between the predicted fatigue crack growth by AE method and the visually detected fatigue crack growth. The results show that the proposed AE method has an excellent performance to predict fatigue delamination crack growth.

Table 5. The maximum and average error of the AE fatigue crack growth prediction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimens</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{max}}{G_{IC}}$</th>
<th>Maximum error (mm)</th>
<th>Average error (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate the delamination propagation in glass/epoxy composites under mode I quasi-static and fatigue loading conditions. The results are represented in two sections. In first section, correlations among AE energy with released strain energy and crack growth are established and quasi-static delamination growth was predicted using AE method. In second section, the delamination crack growth under fatigue loading is predicted using the proposed AE method. The proposed AE method has some advantages such as predicting delamination growth using only one AE sensor without needing to determine AE wave propagation velocity in the specimens and without need to filtering some AE recorded signals. Finally, the obtained results show that the proposed AE method has good applicability to predict the delamination propagation in laminated composite structures.
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\[
G = -\frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{dU}{da} \right)_x = \frac{12P^2a^2}{EB^2h^3}
\]

\[
dU = -\frac{12P^2a^2}{EBh^3} da
\]

\[
\Delta U = -\int \frac{12P^2a^2}{EBh^3} da
\]

\[
\Delta U = -\frac{4P^2}{EBh^3} \{(a+\Delta a)^3-a^3\} = \alpha P^2 \{(a+\Delta a)^3-a^3\}
\]

\[
\Delta U \sim \Delta E_{AE}
\]

\[
\Delta E_{AE} = \beta P^2 \{(a+\Delta a)^3-a^3\}
\]

\[
x^3 - y^3 = (x - y)(x^2 + xy + y^2)
\]

\[
\Delta E_{AE} = \beta P^2 \{(a+\Delta a)^3-a^3\} = \beta P^2 \{(a^3 + 3a\Delta a^2 + 3a^2\Delta a)\}
\]

\[
E_{AE} = \alpha \Delta a^3 + \beta \Delta a^2 + \gamma \Delta a + \eta
\]