

# Zum aktuellen Stand der Simulation von Kunststoffen mit LS-DYNA

Dr. André Haufe DYNAmore GmbH





#### DYNAmore GmbH

Gesellschaft für FEM-Ingenieurdienstleistungen

Stuttgart - Karlsruhe - Ingolstadt - Langlingen - Berlin Dresden - Linköping - Götheborg - Zürich - Turin

Industriestraße 2 D-70565 Stuttgart

Tel. 07 11 - 45 96 00 - 0 Fax 07 11 - 45 96 00 - 29 e-mail: info@dynamore.de Internet: www.dynamore.de



#### Portfolio



3

#### Einsatz von Kunststoffen

Weiterentwicklung der Werkstoffe fordert Weiterentwicklung der Berechnungsmethoden!





#### Validierung und Verifizierung







6

#### έZ $T \nearrow$ stress thermoset plastic (Duroplast) thermoplastic elastomer strain 1 glasslike behaviour 4 high ductility 2 plastic or viscous flow 5 rubbery 3 low ductility crystalline thermoplastic amorphous thermoplastic Compression 160 Tension connection Weak connection loading Weak connection 140 Von Mises stress [MPa] Tension loading Interlaminar defect 120 100 End of chain 80 Amorphous region 60 Separated alien phase Shear loading Homogeneous 40 initial state 20 Crystallized domain void filler 0 0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0 Von Mises strain [-]

#### **Characteristic Structure of unreinforced Plastics**

[Junginger 2002]



#### Some material laws for visco-plasticity in LS-DYNA

No.	Keyword	Formulation	Input
24,123	MAT_PIECEWISE_LINEAR_PLASTICITY	isotropic, el-pl, von Mises strain rate	LC table
81, 82	MAT_PLASTICITY_WITH_DAMAGE	isotropic, el-pl damage strain rate	LC LC table
89	MAT_PLASTICITY_POLYMER	isotropic, el-pl strain rate	LC parameter
141	MAT_STRAIN_RATE_SENSITIVE_ POLYMER	isotropic, el-pl strain rate	parameter parameter
168	MAT_POLYMER	isotropic, el-pl strain rate, isochoric	parameter Parameter
193	MAT_DRUCKER_PRAGER	isotropic, el-pl strain-rate plastic compressibility	LC parameter parameter
187	MAT_SAMP-1	isotropic, el-pl strain rate damage plastic compressibility	LC table LC LC



8

Overview on SAMP-1 (#187)





Overview on SAMP-1 (#187): Mature options





Overview on SAMP-1 (#187): New options



#### Combining MAT\_187 and GISSMO



- GISSMO is driven by a monotonic ascending variable: the equiv. plastic strain stored in hisv(0).
- The new option allows the definition of any history variable to be the driving force of GISSMO. I.e. SAMP my deliver volumetric plastic strain on hisv(6) and this may be used to drive damage in GISSMO (used for crazing!).
- Usage: DMGTYP=YYYX with X=1 and YYY=hisv(YYY)
- Next release will be able to use multiple GISSMO-cards with reference to one material model. This will allow different hisvdriven failure criteria to act on the same material.



11









## **Reinforced Polymers**



#### **Characteristic Structure of reinforced Plastics**

Fiber **size** and **geometry** have significant influence on the part performance.

**Orthotropic** properties increase with increasing fiber content while at the same time the effect of strain rate diminishes due to the less content of matrix material.





4a TT - 27. February 2014 – A. Haufe, Ch. Liebold, T. Klöppel

14

#### Detailed approach: Locally anisotropic model

Taking process chain into account





15

#### **Un/reinforced Polymers / Process chain** Anisotropic elastic solution with MAT\_002\_ANIS



Hyperelastic (total) formulation using Green-Lagrange strain E

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = J^{-1} \mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{F}^T = J^{-1} \mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{F}^T$$

Elastic-anisotropic behavior, stiffness matrix with 21 independent coefficients:

- Several possibilities to define material directions, e.g. AOPT, ELEMENT\_SOLID\_ORTHO, …
- Use invariant node numbering is recommended  $\rightarrow$  \*CONTROL\_ACCURACY: INN=4
- No plasticity, no damage, no failure (but: brittle failure possible via \*MAT\_ADD\_EROSION)





## \*MAT\_(ANISO)TROPIC\_ELASTIC



CARD #1	mid	ro	c11	c12	c22	c13	c23	c33
CARD #2	c14	c24	c34	c44	c15	c25	c35	c45
CARD #3	c55	c16	c26	c36	c46	c56	C66	aopt
CARD #4	хр	ур	zp	al	a2	a3	macf	ihis
CARD #5	v1	v2	v3	d1	d2	d3	beta	ref

•  $C_{ij}$ : constants in the 6x6 anisotropic constitutive matrix  $\sigma_{ij} = C_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl}$ 



## \*MAT\_(ANISO)TROPIC\_ELASTIC



CARD #1	mid	ro	c11	c12	c22	c13	c23	c33
CARD #2	c14	c24	c34	c44	c15	c25	c35	c45
CARD #3	c55	c16	c26	c36	c46	c56	c66	aopt
CARD #4	хp	ур	zp	al	a2	a3	macf	ihis
CARD #5	v1	v2	v3	d1	d2	d3	beta	ref

- $C_{ij}$ : constants in the 6x6 anisotropic constitutive matrix  $\sigma_{ij} = C_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl}$
- AOPT: usual options to define the material's coordinate system





## \*MAT\_(ANISO)TROPIC\_ELASTIC



CARD #1	mid	ro	c11	c12	c22	c13	c23	c33
CARD #2	c14	c24	c34	c44	c15	c25	c35	c45
CARD #3	c55	c16	c26	c36	c46	c56	C66	aopt
CARD #4	хр	ур	zp	al	a2	a3	macf	ihis
CARD #5	v1	v2	v3	d1	d2	d3	beta	ref

- $C_{ij}$ : constants in the 6x6 anisotropic constitutive matrix  $\sigma_{ij} = C_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl}$
- options defining the material's coordinate system
- ihis: flag for element-wise definition of the stiffness tensor with \*INITIAL\_STRESS\_SOLID This allows mapping of locally anisotropic data.





## \*INITIAL\_STRESS\_SOLID

CARD #1	eid	nint	nhisv	larg	e	iveflg	ialegp	nth	int	nthhsv	
CARD #2	S	igxx	sig	sigyy		sigzz	sigxy		sigyz		
CARD #3	S	igzx	eps	eps		hisv1	his	hisv2		hisv3	
CARD #4	h	isv4	hist	hisv5 hisv6		his	hisv7		hisv8		
CARD #5	hisv9		hisv10			hisv11	his	712	hisv13		
CARD #6	hi	lsv14	hisv15		hisv16		his	717	h	isv18	
CARD #7	hi	isv19	hisv	hisv20		hisv21					

- The parameters C<sub>ii</sub> are written onto the history variables per integration point.
- Setting ihisv=21 in MAT\_002 will take into account the fully anistropic stiffness tensor (e.g. hisv#1 – hisv#21 have to be defined in DYNAIN for instance)



## **Un/reinforced Polymers / Process chain**

Anisotropic elastic solution with MAT\_002\_ANIS

- Two options to define the 21 material constants:
  - 1) Directly in material card: small bending test



2) Initialization with \*INITIAL\_STRESS\_SOLID: small bending test



21

## **Un/reinforced Polymers / Process chain**

Anisotropic elastic solution with MAT\_002\_ANIS

- Two options to define the 21 material constants:
  - 1) Directly in material card.

Drawback: inhomogeneous distribution (e.g. from previous short fiber filling simulation) in component needs individual part definition for every element



2) Initialization with \*INITIAL\_STRESS\_SOLID (new option in next Release R7.1) Only one part definition for whole component. Anisotropic coefficients are part of material's history field and can therefore be initialized for each integration point individually.







### **Results from Infiltration**



Small test example – simple plate, filling performed with Moldex3D





### Mapping for further simulations (current development)

Comparison btw. source and target mesh



- Biggest difference btw. meshes at the inlet
- Mapping results:







## Outlook: Initialization IP-wise for \*MAT\_ANISOTROPIC\_ELASTIC\_PLASTIC



- Anisotropic elastic solution with MAT\_002\_ANIS as stated before
- Plasticity is based on Hill criteria:

$$\begin{split} F(\sigma_{22} - \sigma_{33})^2 + G(\sigma_{33} - \sigma_{11})^2 + H(\sigma_{11} - \sigma_{22})^2 + 2L\sigma_{23}^2 + 2M\sigma_{31}^2 + 2N\sigma_{12}^2 \\ &= \left[\sigma(\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}^p, \dot{\varepsilon}_{\text{eff}}^p)\right]^2 \end{split}$$

 Initialization via DYNAIN-file, hence possibility of mapping orientation data and constitutive parameters from mould simulation

#### damage + failure part

- GISSMO or DIEM or else...
- Or any combination!







 $\sqrt{G+H}$ 

cross section for  $\sigma_{12} = \sigma_{23} = \sigma_{13} = 0$ 

size of cross section is decreasing

with increasing shear loading

 $\sigma_{22}$ 

·H

 $\frac{\sigma_y}{\sqrt{F+G}}$ 



ook

25

Quick (!) solution with orthotropic material + failure model

MAT\_ORTHO\_ELASTIC\_PLASTIC (#108) + MAT\_54 + MAT\_ADD\_EROSION (GISSMO, DIEM)

elastic + plastic part

- elastic and plastic behavior is orthotropic
- Plastic yield surface is Hill 1948 (others also available)



damage + failure part

GISSMO Xue Hutchinson or DIEM or else... Gurson std. 0.5 Typical stress  $\overline{\varepsilon}_{f}$ Or any combination!  $\theta$ state in shells -0.5 0. °η 0.5 50°\_ -0.5 (Source: Wierzbicki et al.) η



#### Model calibration exemplified on PA6GF60

#### DAIMLER [Diss. J.Schöpfer]

#### True stress-strain input



#### Tension test calibration results

Kraft-Weg-Verlauf "Zug" (PA6GF60 kond. längs)



Kraft-Weg-Verlauf "Zug" (PA6GF60 kond. quer)





#### **Fiber Reinforced Polymers** Calibration results (tension & shear) PA6GF30

DAIMLER [Diss. J.Schöpfer]





Quasi static three point bending test of PA6GF30

DAIMLER [Diss. J.Schöpfer]





15mm punch travel

40mm punch travel





DYNA

29

Quasi static three point bending test of PA6GF30

DAIMLER [Diss. J.Schöpfer]



#### Comparison of test vs. simulation



4a TT - 27. February 2014 – A. Haufe, Ch. Liebold, T. Klöppel



30

Quasi static three point bending test of PA6GF30

DAIMLER [Diss. J.Schöpfer]



#### Comparison of test vs. simulation







### Composites



#### **Target: Predict serviceability in crashworthiness**

Crushing/cracking/delamination/buckling on different length scales...



➡ Optimal product design? New approaches in CAE necessary!



**Steel/Aloy** Isotropic Elasto plastic Ductile





**CFRP** Anisotropic Stacked laminate Elastic Brittle failure





#### **Target: Predict serviceability in crashworthiness**

Crushing/cracking/delamination/buckling on different length scales...







#### ... only possible if process simulation is predictively solved!

- Know fiber influence (orientation) and matrix properties on relevant length scale
  - producibility simulation
  - Measurements
- Homogenize and map data to target length scale

Find suitable (predictive) models on that scale! —









35

#### ... only possible if process simulation is predictively solved!

Know fiber influence (orientation) and matrix properties on relevant length scale producibility simulation Measurements Homogenize and map data to target length scale Find suitable (predictive) models on that scale!



36



## Producibility

## New model for draping

(available in R7.1 as MAT\_249)



#### **Thermoplastic pre-pregs – fiber contribution**

- Anisotropic and hyperelastic material definition
- Discretization with shell elements, where the fiber families are represented by vectors stored at the integration points
  - Its initial orientation  $\vec{m}_i^0$  is an input parameter
  - current configuration is given as  $\vec{m}_i = \underline{F}\vec{m}_i^0$
- Behavior under compression / tension
  - Elongation can easily be computed using the current length  $\lambda_i$  of vector  $\vec{m}_i$
  - Load curve defines stresses for given  $\lambda_i$
- Shear response
  - Based on the angle between neighboring fibers
  - Load curve defines stresses for given angle





#### **Thermoplastic pre-pregs – fiber contribution**

- Anisotropic and hyperelastic material definition
- Discretization with shell elements, where the fiber families are represented by vectors stored at the integration points
  - Its initial orientation  $\vec{m}_i^0$  is an input parameter
  - current configuration is given as  $\vec{m}_i = \underline{F}\vec{m}_i^0$
- Behavior under compression / tension
  - Elongation can easily be computed using the current length  $\lambda_i$  of vector  $\vec{m}_i$
  - Load curve defines stresses for given  $\lambda_i$
- Shear response
  - Based on the angle between neighboring fibers
  - Load curve defines stresses for given angle





#### **Tensile test specimen**

- Prescribed motion of top nodes
- Arrows indicate the principal stresses



Results show that

- stress orientations are independent of element orientations
- material definition accounts correctly for anisotropic (non-orthotropic) material behavior







#### **Draping example: Rail**

#### Process simulation







[geometry provided by Benteler-SGL]



#### **Draping example: S-Rail**

Fiber angle  $\pm 45^{\circ}$ , final state





Fiber angle  $\pm 60^{\circ}$ , final state







### **Producibility**

#### New thermo-mechanical model

(available in R7.1 as MAT\_249)



#### Thermoplastic pre-pregs – process overview

- Properties of thermoplastic matrix material
  - At high temperature, molten material behaves like a viscous fluid
  - At low temperature, material can be described as an elastio-plastic solid



Process overview



#### **Thermoplastic pre-pregs – constitutive aspects**

- Additive split for matrix and fiber contributions
- Matrix formulation
  - Elastic properties are defined with load curves w.r.t. to temperature
  - Van-Mises yield criterion is implemented
  - Yield stress is given by load tables w.r.t.
    - Temperature
    - Equivalent plastic strain
  - Return-mapping algorithm
  - If dependency on first stress invariant is seen necessary appropriate modifications may be done.







45

#### **Thermoplastic pre-pregs – picture frame test**

- Standard experimental set-up to characterize shear behavior
- Results show significant temperature dependence
  - At low temperature, matrix material dominates
  - At high temperature, equivalent to dry fabric materia



- Tool is closed within 80ms, kept closed for 3ms, and opened within 56.5ms (time is scaled)
- Thermo-mechanical coupling between working piece and tools can be included
- Material parameters for matrix and textile from picture frame test
- 2 fiber families
  - ±45°
  - Woven structure





- Closing and opening at a constant temperature of 225°C (molten phase of matrix material)
- Deformation is governed by properties of the fabric
  - Very low plastic deformations induced
  - Many wrinkles form





- Closing and opening at a constant temperature of 210°C
- Matrix shows elasto-plastic behavior
  - Plastic deformations are induced
  - Still significant influence of fiber orientations on deformation pattern
  - Significant spring-back





- 225°C up to t=70 ms, then cooling down (13 ms) to 210°C
- Opening at a constant temperature of 210°C
- Significantly reduced spring-back
- Only few wrinkles form





50

Temperature 2.250e+02 \_ 2.225e+02



#### Serviceability

#### Crashworthiness

(New models in R7.1)



#### The challenge to predict failure in crashworthiness





#### Modeling failure: Interlaminar vs. intralaminar

#### Interlaminar (between laminae):

Intralaminar (within one lamina):

53



Element size in crashworthiness models is 1-2 orders of magnitude bigger, hence damage and failure cannot be described in detail. A smeared approach is unavoidable.



#### **LS-DYNA: Recent developments**

#### Constitutive models for composite structures

#### \*MAT\_Camanho (Continuum-Damage-Model)

- ✓ plane stress
- ✓ coupled failure criteria
- ✓ bi-linear softening law based on fracture toughness
- ✓ 1D-plasticity-model (mixed hardening) for in-plane shear behavior

#### \*MAT\_Pinho (Continuum-Damage-Model)

- ✓ 3D-stress space
- ✓ coupled failure criteria
- ✓ complex 3D-fibre kinking model
- ✓ linear softening law based on fracture toughness
- ✓ 1D-plasticity-model (mixed hardening) in in-plane shear behavior

#### Options for composite (part) modeling (LS-DYNA 971 R6)

#### \*PART\_Composite

Easier definition of lay-ups in part-section by just defining MATID, thickness and orientation.

#### \*ELEMENT\_(t)shell\_composite

Same input scheme as in \*PART\_Composite but on element level. Useful to define different lay-ups within one part (elementwise definition of lay-up).







#### **Features of Pinho/Camanho**

\*MAT 262 (Comonbo)



\*MAT 261 (Dipho)

	Failure criterion based on plane stress assumption	Failure criterion may use 3D-stress state
Fiber tension	Maximum strain criterion	Maximum stress criterion
Fiber compression	Use constant fiber misalignment angle based on shear and longitudinal compressive strength	Complex 3D-fiber kinking model, expensive search for controlling fracture plane
Matrix failure: transverse tension	Use constant fiber misalignment angle based on shear and longitudinal compressive strength	Complex 3D-fiber kinking model, expensive search for controlling fracture plane
Matrix failure: transv. compression/shear	Assume constant fracture plane angle (i.e. 53°)	Search for controlling fracture plane
In-plane shear treatment	1D-plasticity model with combined (iso/kin) linear hardening	1D-plasticity model with combined (iso/kin) hardening based on DEFINE_CURVE
Damage evolution	Bi-/linear damage based on fracture toughness	Linear damage based on fracture toughness



#### **Comparison of the material models**

1-Element-Test, Single-Layer (,SHELL', ELFORM=2)

Material Parameter:

XT= 1.95 [kN/mm<sup>2</sup>]

XC= 1.35 [kN/mm<sup>2</sup>]

... and more .... (model dependent)



EA= 132.0 [kN/mm<sup>2</sup>]

4a TT - 27. February 2014 – A. Haufe, Ch. Liebold, T. Klöppel



56



FIN

#### Dynamore GmbH

Industriestraße 2 70565 Stuttgart http://www.dynamore.de

Dr. André Haufe andre.haufe@dynamore.de

