



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**BEHAVIOUR OF CORRUGATED COMPOSITE TUBE UNDER
COMPRESSIVE LOAD USING FINITE ELEMENT METHOD**

NG SEET WAI

FK 2009 76



**BEHAVIOUR OF CORRUGATED COMPOSITE TUBE UNDER
COMPRESSIVE LOAD USING FINITE ELEMENT METHOD**

BY

NG SEET WAI

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia
in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master Science**

December 2008



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of Master Science

**BEHAVIOUR OF CORRUGATED COMPOSITE TUBE UNDER
COMPRESSIVE LOAD USING FINITE ELEMENT METHOD**

By

NG SEET WAI

December 2008

Chairman: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmad Samsuri b. Mokhtar, Ph.D

Faculty: Engineering, UPM

This work focuses on studying the effect of composite corrugated tubes' crushing behaviour and to identify the optimised energy-absorption orientation of composite material lamination subjected to the axially compressive load. Parametric study was conducted to investigate the effect of the corrugated angles and fibre orientations on the energy absorb using the E-Glass fibre/epoxy Corrugated Cylindrical Composite Tubes (CCCT) in woven roving form. Twenty different orientations ([0/0/0], [30/0/0], [0/45/0], [60/0/0], [30/0/30], [30/45/0], [60/0/30], [45/0/45], [60/45/0], [60/0/60], [30/30/30], [30/45/30], [60/30/30], [30/45/45], [60/45/30], [30/60/60], [45/45/45], [60/45/45], [60/45/60], [60/60/60]) of E-Glass fibre/epoxy in woven roving laminations were fabricated for this purpose. Nevertheless, only three randomly chosen corrugated angles (5 degrees, 20 degrees & 35 degrees) were used for finite element analysis. Typical failure histories of their failure mechanisms are presented and discussed. Results showed that the crushing behaviour and the energy-absorption level of composite corrugated tube are found to be different when changes are made to the orientation of lamination of the composite material. CCCTs



with the lowest corrugation angles resulted with highest initial crushing load and the highest average crushing load, and vice-versa. Meanwhile, CCCTs with the low corrugated angle requires thorough study before being used as an energy absorption device because their initial crush load that is too much greater than the average crush load itself. However, the best energy absorbing CCCT for this work should have the highest possible energy absorbed per unit mass (E_s) while compensating for least possible differences between initial crush load and average crush load. With this criterion, CCCT with a corrugated angle of 20 degrees and [60/0/60] lamination orientation fulfilled the requirement. At the same time, the result of this work also shows that the average E_s for CCCT with a lower corrugated angle is higher than the CCCT with a higher corrugated angle. Subsequently, the usage of 5, 20 and 35 degrees corrugated angles has generally covered the range of corrugated angles from 0 degree to 45 degrees because as the corrugated angle of CCCTs increases, the average E_s of CCCT will reduce and will no longer significant in this project. CCCT with a corrugated angle of beyond 45 degrees will cause the woven roving composite material of CCCT to perform beyond the intended strength of direction. In addition, corrugated angles between 45 degrees and 90 degrees are similar to corrugated angles from 0 degree to 45 degrees. Thus, no study on CCCTs with corrugated angle beyond 45 degrees is required.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai
memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**KELAKUAN TIUB KOMPOSIT BERLIPAT DIBAWAH DAYA
MAMPATAN MENGGUNAKAN KAEDAH UNSUR TERHINGGA**

Oleh

NG SEET WAI

Desember 2008

Pengerusi: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmad Samsuri b. Mokhtar, Ph.D

Fakulti: Kejuruteraan, UPM

Kerja penyelidikan yang telah dijalankan tertumpu kepada kajian terhadap kelakuan renyukan tiub komposit yang berlipat disebabkan oleh daya mampatan dan penentuan orientasi lamina bahan komposit bagi mendapatkan serapan tenaga yang optimum. Kajian parametrik telah dilakukan untuk menyiasat kesan sudut lipatan dan orientasi fiber terhadap serapan tenaga dengan menggunakan tiub silinder gelas fiber jenis E yang berlipat. Dua puluh orientasi lamina ($[0/0/0]$, $[30/0/0]$, $[0/45/0]$, $[60/0/0]$, $[30/0/30]$, $[30/45/0]$, $[60/0/30]$, $[45/0/45]$, $[60/45/0]$, $[60/0/60]$, $[30/30/30]$, $[30/45/30]$, $[60/30/30]$, $[30/45/45]$, $[60/45/30]$, $[30/60/60]$, $[45/45/45]$, $[60/45/45]$, $[60/45/60]$, $[60/60/60]$) gelas fiber jenis E dikaji bagi tujuan tersebut. Walaubagaimanapun, hanya tiga sudut lipatan yang dipilih (5 darjah, 20 darjah dan 35 darjah) dan digunakan untuk analisis unsur terhingga. Perilaku kegagalan bagi mekanisme kegagalan dibentangkan dan dibincangkan. Hasil kajian yang diperolehi menunjukkan kelakuan renyukan dan paras serapan tenaga tiub komposit yang berlipat adalah berbeza mengikut perubahan yang dibuat ke atas orientasi lamina

bahan komposit. Tiub jenis CCCT dengan sudut lipatan yang terendah menghasilkan daya renyukan awalan dan daya renyukan purata yang tertinggi begitu juga sebaliknya. Sementara itu, tiub jenis CCCT dengan sudut lipatan yang rendah memerlukan kajian yang mendalam sebelum ia digunakan sebagai alat serapan tenaga kerana daya renyukan awalannya yang tinggi melebihi daya renyukan purata. Walaubagaimanapun, CCCT yang paling baik untuk dijadikan bahan serapan tenaga dalam kajian ini adalah CCCT yang mempunyai serapan tenaga yang setinggi mungkin dan mempunyai perbezaan di antara daya renyukan awalan dan daya renyukan purata yang serendah mungkin. Dengan itu, CCCT yang bersudut lipatan 20 darjah dan berlapis arah [60/0/60] adalah pilihan yang paling sesuai untuk kriteria ini. Pada masa yang sama, hasil kajian ini juga menunjukkan bahawa purata serapan tenaga (E_s) untuk tiub jenis CCCT dengan sudut lipatan yang rendah adalah lebih tinggi daripada tiub jenis CCCT dengan sudut lipatan yang tinggi. Oleh itu, kajian kegunaan tiub jenis CCCT dengan sudut lipatan 5, 20 and 35 darjah secara am telah dapat merangkumi tiub jenis CCCT dengan sudut lipatan di antara 0 darjah hingga ke 45 darjah. Ini adalah disebabkan oleh sudut lipatan yang bertambah tinggi, di mana purata E_s tiub CCCT akan berkurangan dan keadaan sedemikian tidak lagi menjadi penting dalam kajian ini. Tiub CCCT dengan sudut lipatan melebihi 45 darjah akan mengakibatkan fiber komposit pada tiub CCCT ini berfungsi di luar kawasan kekuatannya dari arah yang sepatutnya. Tambahan pula, sudut lipatan di antara 45 darjah dan 90 darjah adalah sama seperti sudut lipatan di antara 0 darjah dan 45 darjah. Oleh yang demikian, kajian terhadap CCCT dengan sudut lipatan yang melebihi 45 darjah adalah tidak diperlukan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would not have been possible to write this thesis without the collaboration and support of a number of people. The first person I would like to thank is Dr. Rizal b. Zahari for inspiring me with many ideas and information regarding my master project. Without his invaluable guidance, this thesis would never have been completed.

Another person I would like to thank is Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmad Samsuri B. Mokhtar for his recommendations and valuable opinions throughout my thesis development.

Credits are also addressed to my fellow peer, Mr. Noorfaizal b. Yidris who spent his valuable time in sharing his knowledge in using the Finite Element software ABAQUS.

Most of all, I want to thank my wife for supporting me by all means while I was writing this thesis. Without her unwavering support and understanding I could never have accomplished it.

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 5 December 2008 to conduct the final examination of Ng Seet Wai on his thesis entitled "Behaviour Of Corrugated Composite Tube Under Compressive Load Using Finite Element Method " in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Master of Science.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Mohd Ramly Ajir

Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Ir. Mohd Saleh b. Yahaya

Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Ir. Renuganth Varatharajoo, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Ahmad Kamal Ariffin Mohd. Ihsan, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering,
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
(External Examiner)

BUJANG KIM HUAT, PhD

Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 19 February 2009

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering.

The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmad Samsuri B. Mokhtar

Department of Aerospace Engineering,
Faculty of Engineering,
University Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Dr. Rizal B. Zahari

Department of Aerospace Engineering,
Faculty of Engineering,
University Putra Malaysia
(Member)

HASANAH MOHD GHAZALI, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 9 April 2009



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledge. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.

Name: Ng Seet Wai

Date: 23 December 2008

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	iv
AKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
APROVAL SHEETS	vii
DECLARATION	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
NOMENCLATURE	xx
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background and Problem Statement	1
1.2 Importance of Study	2
1.3 Aims & Objectives	2
1.4 Method Statement	3
1.5 Thesis Arrangement	4
2. Background and literature review	5
2.1 The technology used for energy absorbing structures	5
2.1.1 Commercial Automotive	5
2.1.2 Composite sandwich construction of aircraft fuselage	6
2.1.3 Helicopter crashworthy seat	7
2.1.4 Sports vehicles	9
2.2 The Basic of Composite Materials	10
2.2.1 Polymer Matrix Composites	12
2.2.2 Stress Transfer Analysis	14
2.2.3 Average Fibre Stress (Von Mises)	16
2.3 Energy Absorbing Structures	17
2.4 Some of the Designs of Energy Absorbing Structures	20
3. Methodology	28
3.1 Overall methodology	28
3.2 Governing Equations of the Finite Element Method Theory	29
3.3 Computational Finite Element Method	34
3.4 Problem description	36
3.5 ABAQUS/Explicit dynamic analysis basic concept	42
3.6 Pre-processing of the analysis model with ABAQUS/Explicit	44
3.6.1 Part module design	44
3.6.2 Assembling of parts	48
3.6.3 Defining steps and output requests	49
3.6.4 Defining contact interactions	50
3.6.5 Defining boundary conditions	51
3.6.6 Selection of Element Types & Forms in the Quasi-Static Analysis with ABAQUS/Explicit	53
3.6.7 Shape of 2D shell element used	55
3.6.8 Form of QUAD shell element used	57
3.6.9 Mesh creation and job definition	58



3.6.10	Parameters used for validation and discussion purposes	62
4.	Results and Discussions	64
4.1	Validation	64
4.1.1	Introduction	64
4.1.2	Validation of results	64
4.1.3	Results yielded in the experiment	65
4.1.4	Results yielded using FEA	66
4.1.5	Comparison of results and discussions	72
4.2	Finite Element Simulation Results for CCCTs with corrugated angles of 5, 20 & 35 degrees	73
4.2.1	Analysis results of corrugated composite tubes with different orientations using FEA	74
4.3	Discussion	79
4.3.1	Crushing history	79
4.3.2	Observations and discussions of axially compressed CCCTs	80
5.	Conclusions and Recommendations	90
5.1	Conclusions	90
5.2	Recommendations	93
	REFERENCES	94
	APPENDICES	100
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	136



LIST OF TABLES

Table	Descriptions	Page
1	Graphical Orientation of woven roving E-glass fibre/epoxy laminas	37
2	Material properties of woven roving E-glass fibre/epoxy laminas	41
3	QUAD shell element types available in ABAQUS/Explicit	58
4	Axially compressed CCCTs' Simulation results versus Experimental results	72
5	Axially compressed CCCT with 5 degrees corrugated angle's simulation results for variable lamination orientations	74
6	Axially compressed CCCT with 20 degrees corrugated angle's simulation results for variable lamination orientations	76
7	Axially compressed CCCT with 35 degrees corrugated angle's simulation results for variable lamination orientations	77
8	Average energy absorbed per unit mass of CCCT with three different corrugated angles	89
9	Element Types available in ABAQUS/Explicit	100

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Descriptions	Page
1	Location of frame rails for crash energy absorption	5
2	Three fuselage concepts representing conventional, retrofit, and energy absorbing designs	7
3	Crashworthy seat	8
4	Position of the energy absorbers for the side impact and of the steering column	10
5	Combined effect of the addition of fibres to a resin matrix compared to each individual component	13
6	Equilibrium of infinitesimal length of discontinuous fibre aligned parallel to applied load	14
7	Sketch of typical corrugated tube	18
8	Ideal crush load vs. crush length	19
9	Schematic representation of targeted keel beam crushing mechanism	21
10	The proposed repeating edge local buckling of keel beam web crushing	21
11	Axial compression of CFRP tubes / collapse Mode I	23
12	Axial compression of CFRP tubes / collapse Mode II	24
13	Axial compression of CFRP tubes / collapse Mode III	25
14	Flow Chart for the overall reseach methodology	28
15	FEA model analysis arrangement	35
16	Sketch of basic dimension of a CCCT model	40
17	Part dropdown module option was used in the ABAQUS/CAE environment	44
18	CCCT final sketch in the ABAQUS/CAE environment	45
19	CCCT 3D model generated in the ABAQUS/CAE environment	45
20	3D model sketch of the rigid moveable anvil (MA)	46
21	Position of the rigid body reference point	47
22	Model assembly in ABAQUS/Explicit	49
23	Boundary conditions of model in ABAQUS/Explicit	53
24	Conventional shell elements versus continuum shell element	54

25	Moments in Shell Elements	56
26	Stresses in Shell Elements	56
27	Element shapes available in ABAQUS/Explicit	57
28	2D Shell Elements	58
29	CCCTs with elements number ranges from 160 S4R elements to 1558 S4R elements	60
30	CCCTs with elements number ranges from 1634 S4R elements to 95472 S4R elements	61
31	Mesh creation of CCCT / De-formable part of the model in ABAQUS/Explicit	62
32	Convergence test graph of the initial crushing load (P_i) versus the number of elements used for the CCCT finite element model.	65
33	Load–displacement curves for axially crushed GFRE composite tubes with different corrugation angles	66
34	Graph of Crushing Loads versus Crushing Distance	67
35	Crushing responses of 10 degrees corrugated angle CCCT in ABAQUS/Explicit FEA simulations	70
36	Crushing responses of 10 degrees corrugated angle CCCT in ABAQUS/Explicit FEA simulations at crushing distance of 200mm between MA & SA	71
37	Graph of Initial crushing load (kN) vs Orientation of CCCTs' laminas – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	80
38	Graph of Average crushing load (kN) vs Orientation of CCCTs' laminas – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	81
39	Graph of Energy absorbed per unit mass (kJ/kg) vs Orientation of CCCTs' laminas – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	82
40	Graph of Initial crushing load (kN) vs Orientation of CCCTs' laminas – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	83
41	Graph of Average crushing load (kN) vs Orientation of CCCTs' laminas – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	84
42	Graph of Energy absorbed per unit mass (kJ/kg) vs Orientation of CCCTs' laminas – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	85
43	Graph of Initial crushing load (kN) vs Orientation of CCCTs' laminas – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	86
44	Graph of Average crushing load (kN) vs Orientation of CCCTs' laminas – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	87

45	Graph of Energy absorbed per unit mass (kJ/kg) vs Orientation of CCCTs' laminas – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	88
46	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/0/0] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	106
47	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/30/0] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	106
48	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/45/0] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	107
49	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/60/0] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	107
50	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/0/30] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	108
51	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/0/45] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	108
52	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/0/60] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	109
53	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/0/45] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	109
54	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/0/60] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	110
55	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/0/60] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	110
56	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/30/30] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	111
57	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/45/30] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	111
58	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/60/30] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	112

59	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/30/45] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	112
60	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/30/60] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	113
61	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/60/30] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	113
62	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/45/45] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	114
63	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/45/45] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	114
64	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/45/60] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	115
65	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/60/60] – CCCTs with 20 degrees corrugated angles	115
66	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/0/0] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	116
67	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/30/0] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	116
68	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/45/0] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	117
69	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/60/0] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	117
70	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/0/30] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	118
71	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/0/45] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	118
72	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/0/60] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	119

73	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/0/45] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	119
74	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/0/60] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	120
75	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/0/60] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	120
76	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/30/30] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	121
77	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/45/30] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	121
78	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/60/30] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	122
79	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/30/45] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	122
80	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/30/60] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	123
81	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/60/30] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	123
82	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/45/45] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	124
83	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/45/45] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	124
84	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/45/60] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	125
85	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/60/60] – CCCTs with 5 degrees corrugated angles	125
86	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/0/0] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	126

87	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/30/0] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	126
88	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/45/0] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	127
89	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [0/60/0] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	127
90	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/0/30] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	128
91	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/0/45] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	128
92	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/0/60] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	129
93	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/0/45] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	129
94	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/0/60] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	130
95	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/0/60] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	130
96	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/30/30] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	131
97	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/45/30] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	131
98	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [30/60/30] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	132
99	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/30/45] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	132
100	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/30/60] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	133

101	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/60/30] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	133
102	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [45/45/45] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	134
103	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/45/45] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	134
104	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/45/60] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	135
105	Graph of Crushing Load versus Crushing Distance for CCCT with orientation of lamination [60/60/60] – CCCTs with 35 degrees corrugated angles	135

NOMENCLATURES

	<u>DESCRIPTIONS</u>	<u>UNITS</u>
2D	Two-dimensional	-
3D	Three-dimensional	-
BBP	Braided Pultruded Process	-
CCCT	Corrugated Cylindrical Composite Tubes	-
CFRP	Carbon Fibre Reinforced Plastic	-
E	Young Modulus	GPa
E_s	Energy absorbed per unit mass	kJ/kg
FEA	Finite Element Analysis	-
G	Shear Modulus	GPa
MA	Moveable rigid anvil	-
P_i	Initial crushing load	kN
P_m	Average crushing load	kN
QUAD	Quadrilateral elements	-
SA	Stationary rigid anvil	-
TRIA	Triangle elements	-
l	Fibre length	m
l_c	Critical fibre length	m
l_t	Load-transfer length	m

σ	Stress	kPa
σ_f	Fibre stress in axial direction	kPa
σ_{f0}	Stress on the fibre end	kPa
ϵ	Strain	kPa
τ	Shear stress	kPa
τ_y	Matrix yield stress in shear	kPa

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter serves as the introductory page on this thesis. The major focus in this chapter is for the discussion on the subject matter and the overall objectives of this project. In this chapter, issues of interest, objectives and the overview of the thesis are discussed.

Background and Problem Statement

Due to the human desire in designing high speed transport vehicles to reduce travelling time, the survivability of occupants in the vehicles had become the major concern to vehicles designers. Regardless of air, sea, and ground vehicles, the design features were increasingly driven by minimum weight considerations to increase carrying capacity and at the same time, tolerates for passenger safety. Upon introducing safety features in vehicles, which include the seat belts, safety helmets, vehicle crash protective bars, etc., has created an increased interest in the research and development of lightweight transportation vehicles. The primary goal to the lightweight vehicle is to achieve the superior strength-to-weight ratio and to improve the fuel economics of vehicles. This ideology had brought for the change of types of materials used from metallic to composite material. When composite structures or components are perfectly designed and fabricated, a very low stress loading, lightweight and high crashworthiness performance could be achieved. This will served as a high energy-dissipating device to most of the vehicle components.

Eventually, the researches in composite crushing behaviour and energy absorption of composite components with customised shapes and geometries

serves as the primary but vital steps in producing the desired “Near Perfect” components.

Importance of Study

Due to the simplicity in manufacturing and cost efficiency of hollow tubes as compared to solid tubes, hollow tubes are favourable for the used as structural components in today’s world. Subsequently, cylindrical shape tubes were chosen for this research mainly due to no sharp edges along the tube body that eventually serves as weak buckling points. Thus, giving optimal longitudinal strength.

The study at the crushing & behaviours of the desired orientations of fibre lamination for axially loaded tubes using FEA software is beneficial as follows;

- Optimisation of designed of crushing device with optimal geometrical shapes and fibre orientations.
- Identification of the possibility of such designed prior to experimental approach. Time and cost saving as compared to prototypes building for trial-an-error experimental approach.

Aims & Objectives

The objectives of this project are:

- To investigate the effect of varying the corrugated angles on the crushing behaviour of CCCT under compression using FEM.
- To determine the optimal orientations of composite (woven roving glass fibre/epoxy) laminas of several commonly used Corrugated Cylindrical

Composite Tubes (CCCT) when axial load applied onto one end of the tube using FEA (ABAQUS) method.

Method Statement

This research focuses in studying the effect of composite material (woven roving glass fibre/epoxy) fabrication orientation in Corrugated Cylindrical Composite Tubes (CCCT) on energy absorption capacity, failure mechanism, and failure mode using the Finite Element Analysis (FEA) simulation method.

In the beginning of the study, finite element models were built in the ABAQUS/CAE. Referring to Elgalai et al. (2004) work as the based study for this thesis; several corrugated tubes with reference to the journal were built for the study. Axially compressive loads were simulated and applied onto the selected tubes in the software environment. These corrugated tubes models were then be analysed using ABAQUS/Explicit for validation.

Upon validation of several cases using the work, the study of several selected corrugated tubes with corrugated angle of 5, 20 & 35 degrees were used for the study. 20 corrugated tubes formed by 20 respective different orientations of E-Glass fibre/epoxy in woven roving form were simulated for axially compressed loading. The energy absorption capacity, failure mechanism, and failure mode of the composite corrugated tubes were then be analysed and discussed.