List of Tables

Table 3.1: Breaking stress, strain at break, extension at break and breaking load for large tensile specimen (diameter 20 mm, Gauge length 80 mm) tested according to ASTM: C-749.……..……67

Table 3.2: Breaking stress, strain at break, extension at break and breaking load for compressive specimen (diameter 20 mm, length 40 mm) tested according to ASTM: C-695…….…….....69

Table 3.3: Tension and compression test results for Young's Modulus of elasticity (ASTM E111)…….…….....70

Table 4.1(a): Formulas for Effective Volumes for Rectangular Beams loaded in Flexure for bimodular specimens, **(b)** Formulas for Effective Surfaces for Rectangular Beams loaded in Flexure for bimodular specimens……...89

Table 4.2 Conversion factor for converting strengths among four-point and three-point flexure specimens with the same cross-section sizes tested on 10 mm x 30 mm fixture and 20 mm x 40 mm fixture as a function of the Weibull Modulus……..94

Table 4.3 Cylindrical loading span specifications for flexural specimen…….95

Table 4.4: Experimental test results for small three-point bend specimen……98

Table 4.5: Experimental test results for large three-point bend specimen…....99

Table 4.6 Experimental test results for small specimen subjected to four-point bend test with 1/3 loading …….…….101

Table 4.7 Experimental test results for large specimen subjected to four-point bend test with 1/3 loading……..102

Table 4.8 Experimental test results for small four-point bend specimens with ¼ loading…….……...103

Table 4.9 Experimental test results for large four-point bend specimens with ¼ loading……...……104

Table 4.10: Comparison of Weibull Parameters and goodness of fit for flexural specimen……...126

Table 4.11 The results obtained from the three-point bend specimen simulation ……...132

Table 4.12. The unimodular and bimodular *effective volume* estimated with analytical derived expression and FE model for the flexural graphite specimens. ……..136

Table 5.1: Comparison of the results (V_E and A_E) obtained from the newly developed semi-analytical expressions in this chapter with the analytical

expression developed by Quinn (Quinn 2003a); Unimodular beam with *Weibull Modulus m = 10, R = 3.2 mm and L_0 = 51 mm*……159

Table 5.2: Final expressions of the *effective volume* for cylindrical beam loaded in flexure (a) Effective Volume (Integral Form Expression) (b) Effective Volume (Closed Form Solution)…….164

Table 5.3 Final expressions of the *effective surface* for cylindrical beams loaded in flexure……166

Table 5.4 Conversion factor for converting strengths among four-point and three-point flexure specimens having similar dimension but different loading configurations…….168

Table 5.5 Cylindrical loading span specifications for flexural specimen.....171

Table 5.6 Support and block dimension in formulating finite element model...174

Table 5.7: The characteristic strength (strength at 63.21% of probability of failure) and Weibull Modulus for large and small flexural specimen having corresponding co-efficient of determination for different loading configurations……184

Table 5.8 Effective volume tabulation for analytical and experimental analysis…….186

Table 5.9 Tabulation of Effective volume for analytical and experimental analysis……..186

Table 6.1 Weibull effective volumes and effective surface area expressions for bimodular C-ring specimens **(a)** Weibull Effective Volume **(b)** Weibull Effective Surface Area……...215

Table 6.2 Description of meshing pattern …….224

Table 6.3 Comparison of Weibull Parameter for C-ring specimen……....240

Table 6.4 Comparison of effective volume of C-ring specimen with different FE mesh and analytical solution for unimodular graphite strength……...242

Table 6.5(a) The unimodular and bimodular *effective volume* estimated with analytical derived expression and finite element model for the C-ring graphite specimens. **(b)** Percent difference analysis between the *effective volume* estimates from experimental based simulation and semi-analytic solution……245

Table 6.6 (a) The unimodular and bimodular *effective surface area* estimated with analytical derived expression and finite element model (50000 elements) for the C-ring graphite specimens. **(b)** Percent difference analysis between the *effective surface area* estimated from experimental based simulation and semi-analytic solution……..247

Table 7.1 Evaluation of J_{Ic} using published literature data (Chi 2016) and comparison with G_{Ic} …….269

Table 7.2 Evaluation of crack growth resistance in terms of fracture parameters K_{Ic} , J_{Ic} and G_{Ic} ……..270

Table 7.3 Co-efficient of determination (R^2), slope parameter and mean characteristic load parameter with three parameter and two parameter Weibull distribution……278

Table 7.4 J_{Ic} (evaluated from experimental K_{Ic}) and G_{Ic} value for mean peak load estimated from Fig. 7.13……280

Table 7. 5 Unimodular and bimodular 3D *J*-integral and 2D Rice's *J*-integral is tabulated for all twelve contour with average corresponding value……303

Table 9.1. Properties of Magnetostrictive Material ……349

Table 9.2: The of $\left(J_k^u\right)_{3D}$ in value at saturate magnetization ……349

Table A1 Tensile strength of thin C-ring (r_i-r_o:: 40-50mm)specimens tested in tension…….390

Table A2 Tensile strength of thick (r_i-r_o:: 30-50mm)C-ring specimens tested in tension……..391

Table A3 Tensile strength of thin (r_i-r_o:: 40-50mm) C-ring specimens tested in compression……392

Table A4 Tensile strength of thick (r_i-r_o:: 30-50mm) C-ring specimens tested in compression…….393