Impact Factor:	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582 GIF (Australia) = 0.564 JIF = 1.500	РИНЦ (Russia) = 0.126 ESJI (KZ) = 9.035 SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	PIF (India) = 1.940 IBI (India) = 4.260 OAJI (USA) = 0.350
		QR – Issue	QR – Article
SOI: <u>1.1.</u> International S Theoretical &	<u>TAS</u> DOI: <u>10.15863/TAS</u> Scientific Journal Applied Science		
p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print Year: 2021 Issue: 0	 e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online) Volume: 98 		消除後期 国建設部
Published: 11.06.2021	http://T-Science.org		

SIS (USA)

= 0.912

ICV (Poland)

= 6.630

= 6.317

ISRA (India)

Denis Chemezov Vladimir Industrial College M.Sc.Eng., Corresponding Member of International Academy of Theoretical and Applied Sciences, Lecturer, Russian Federation <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2747-552X</u> <u>vic-science@yandex.ru</u>

> Oleg Stepanov Vladimir Industrial College Student, Russian Federation

> **Lyubov Suvorova** Vladimir Industrial College Student, Russian Federation

> Aleksey Matankin Vladimir Industrial College Student, Russian Federation

> Vadim Maksimov Vladimir Industrial College Student, Russian Federation

> Aleksey Kuzin Vladimir Industrial College Student, Russian Federation

> Nikita Muzychenko Vladimir Industrial College Student, Russian Federation

THE DEFORMATION DEGREE OF VARIOUS MATERIALS DURING THE COMPRESSION TEST

Abstract: The results of the computer calculation of the compression process of the standard specimens made of aluminum, copper, armco iron, cast iron, ceramics and concrete are presented in the article. The analysis of the compression ratio of materials under conditions of shortening the specimen height by 50% from the initial height was performed. It is determined that the greatest degree of compression is observed during deformation of the specimens made of aluminum and concrete.

Key words: the specimen, the compression test, deformation, ratio. *Language:* English

Citation: Chemezov, D., et al. (2021). The deformation degree of various materials during the compression test. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 06 (98), 301-305.

 Soi:
 http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-98-33
 Doi:
 froster
 https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.06.98.33

 Scopus ASCC:
 2211.
 Doi:
 froster
 https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.06.98.33



	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
Impact Factor:	ISI (Dubai, UAE	<i>L</i>) = 1.582	РИНЦ (Russia)) = 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 9.035	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Introduction

Compression of the standard specimens is performed to determine the mechanical properties of brittle and ductile materials (for example, the compressive strength) [1]. The strength of material can be determined by the degree of volumetric deformation (fracture) of the specimen under the action of the applied load [2]. The analysis of fracture of the cast iron specimens during compression on the testing machine was performed in the work [3]. The specimen shortening under the load by 30% from the initial height leads to partial fracture of material (the symmetrical formation of cracks by the diameter at the angle of 50 degrees relative to the centerline of the specimen). Taking into account the fact that the nature of the cracks formation in the specimen on both sides is different, it can be concluded that the intensity of compression deformation of material along the section is different. The degree of compression deformation of brittle and ductile materials can be determined by

the mathematical calculation of the dynamics of the compression process of the specimens on the computer. The ratio value will reveal the percentage of volumetric deformation of material during compression.

Materials and methods

The computer calculation of the compression process of the specimens models made of aluminum, copper, concrete, cast iron, armco iron and ceramics was implemented in the ANSYS Autodyn 14.5 program [4]. The specimens models were cylinders with the diameter of 4 mm and the height of 4.5 mm. Each specimen was subjected to the variable load applied to the free from basing the end surface of the model. Deformation of the specimens models was carried out in accordance with the Lagrangian formulation. The materials properties of the specimens and the compression test scheme are presented in the table 1 and in the Fig. 1, respectively.

	Aluminum [5]		Concrete (compressive strength is 25 MPa)		
	Reference density	2.71 g/cm ³		Reference density	2.75 g/cm ³	
	Equation	Shock		Equation	P alpha	
EOS	Gruneisen coefficient	2.1		Porous density	2.314 g/cm ³	
EUS	Parameter C1	5.38×10 ³ m/s		Porous sound speed	2.92×10 ³ m/s	
	Parameter S1	1.337		Initial compaction pressure	2.33×10 ⁴ kPa	
	Equation	von Mises		Solid compaction pressure	6.0×10 ⁶ kPa	
Strength	Shear modulus	2.69×10 ⁷ kPa		Compaction exponent	3.0	
	Yield stress	2.9×10 ⁵ kPa		Solid EOS	Polynomial	
	Iron-C.E.	-		Bulk modulus A1	3.527×10 ⁷ kPa	
	Reference density	7.89 g/cm^3	FOS	Parameter A2	3.958×10 ⁷ kPa	
	Equation	Linear	LOS	Parameter A3	9.04×10 ⁶ kPa	
	Bulk modulus	1.64×10 ⁸ kPa		Parameter B0	1.22	
EOS	Reference temperature	300 K		Parameter B1	1.22	
	Specific heat	452.0		Parameter T1	3 527×10 ⁷ kPa	
	Speeme near	J/(kg×K)			J.JZI^IU KFa	
	Equation	Johnson-		Reference temperature	300 K	
	Equation	Cook			500 1	
	Shear modulus	8.0×10^7 kPa		Specific heat	654.0 J/(kg×K)	
	Yield stress	2.9×10 ⁵ kPa		Compaction curve	Standard	
	Hardening constant	3.39×10 ⁵ kPa		Equation	RHT concrete	
	Hardening exponent	0.4		Shear modulus	1.67×10^{7} kPa	
Strength	Strain rate constant	0.055		Compressive strength (<i>fc</i>)	3.5×10 ⁴ kPa	
~	Thermal softening exponent	0.55		Tensile strength (<i>ft/fc</i>)	0.1	
	Melting temperature	1.811×10 ³ K		Shear strength (<i>fs/fc</i>)	0.18	
	Ref. strain rate (/s)	1.0	Star and the	Intact failure surface constant A	1.6	
	Strain rate correction	1 st order	Strength	Intact failure surface exponent N	0.61	
Al ₂ O ₃ [7-8]				Tens./comp. meridian ratio (Q)	0.6805	
Reference density 3.9 g/cm ³			Brittle to ductile transition	0.0105		
	Equation	Shock		G (elas.)/(elasplas.)	2.0	
EOS	Gruneisen coefficient	0.5		Elastic strength/ft	0.7	
	Parameter <i>C1</i> 6.9×10^3 m/s			Elastic strength/fc	0.53	

Table 1. The materials properties and the compression test scheme of the specimens.



Imme of Fe of our	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)) = 1.582	РИНЦ (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
Impact Factor:	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 9.035	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

	Parameter S1	1.45		Fractured strength constant B	1.6	
Equation		von Mises		Fractured strength exponent M	0.61	
Strength	Shear modulus	1.0×10 ⁸ kPa		Compressive strain rate exp. alpha	0.032	
	Yield stress	8.0×10 ⁶ kPa		Tensile strain rate exp. delta	0.036	
	Armco iron [10]			Max. fracture strength ratio	1×10^{20}	
	Reference density	7.87 g/cm ³		Equation	RHT concrete	
	Equation	Linear		Damage constant, D1	0.04	
	Bulk modulus	1.64×10 ⁸ kPa		Damage constant, D2	1.0	
EOS	Reference temperature	300 K	Failure	Minimum strain to failure	0.01	
	Specific heat	452.0 J/(kg×K)	Fautre	Residual shear modulus fraction	0.13	
	Equation	Johnson- Cook		Tensile failure	Hydro (P _{min})	
	Shear modulus	8.0×10 ⁷ kPa	English	Equation	Geometric strain	
	Yield stress	1.75×10 ⁵ kPa	Erosion	Erosion strain	2.0	
	Hardening constant	3.8×10 ⁵ kPa		Type of geometric strain	Instantaneous	
Strength	Hardening exponent 0.32		Copper [9]			
	Strain rate constant 0.06		Reference density 8.9 g/			
	Thermal softening exponent	0.55		Equation	Shock	
	Melting temperature	1.811×10 ³ K		Gruneisen coefficient	2.0	
	Ref. strain rate (/s)	1.0	EOS	Parameter C1	3.958×10 ³ m/s	
	Strain rate correction	1 st order		Parameter S1	1.497	
					11.77	
	Equation	Johnson- Cook		Reference temperature	300 K	
	Equation Damage constant, <i>D1</i>	Johnson- Cook -2.2		Reference temperature Equation	300 K Piecewise JC	
	Equation Damage constant, <i>D1</i> Damage constant, <i>D2</i>	Johnson- Cook -2.2 5.43		Reference temperature Equation Shear modulus	300 K Piecewise JC 4.64×10 ⁷ kPa	
Failure	Equation Damage constant, <i>D1</i> Damage constant, <i>D2</i> Damage constant, <i>D3</i>	Johnson- Cook -2.2 5.43 -0.47		Reference temperature Equation Shear modulus Yield stress (zero plastic strain)	300 K Piecewise JC 4.64×10 ⁷ kPa 1.2×10 ⁵ kPa	
Failure	Equation Damage constant, <i>D1</i> Damage constant, <i>D2</i> Damage constant, <i>D3</i> Damage constant, <i>D4</i>	Johnson- Cook -2.2 5.43 -0.47 0.016		Reference temperature Equation Shear modulus Yield stress (zero plastic strain) Eff. plastic strain #1	300 K Piecewise JC 4.64×10 ⁷ kPa 1.2×10 ⁵ kPa 0.3	
Failure	Equation Damage constant, <i>D1</i> Damage constant, <i>D2</i> Damage constant, <i>D3</i> Damage constant, <i>D4</i> Damage constant, <i>D5</i>	Johnson- Cook -2.2 5.43 -0.47 0.016 0.63	Strength	Reference temperature Equation Shear modulus Yield stress (zero plastic strain) Eff. plastic strain #1 Eff. plastic strain #2	300 K Piecewise JC 4.64×10 ⁷ kPa 1.2×10 ⁵ kPa 0.3 1.0×10 ²⁰	
Failure	Equation Damage constant, <i>D1</i> Damage constant, <i>D2</i> Damage constant, <i>D3</i> Damage constant, <i>D4</i> Damage constant, <i>D5</i> Melting temperature	Johnson- Cook -2.2 5.43 -0.47 0.016 0.63 1.811×10 ³ K	Strength	Reference temperature Equation Shear modulus Yield stress (zero plastic strain) Eff. plastic strain #1 Eff. plastic strain #2 Yield stress #1	300 K Piecewise JC $4.64 \times 10^7 \text{ kPa}$ $1.2 \times 10^5 \text{ kPa}$ 0.3 1.0×10^{20} $4.5 \times 10^5 \text{ kPa}$	
Failure	Equation Damage constant, <i>D1</i> Damage constant, <i>D2</i> Damage constant, <i>D3</i> Damage constant, <i>D4</i> Damage constant, <i>D5</i> Melting temperature Ref. strain rate (/s)	Johnson- Cook -2.2 5.43 -0.47 0.016 0.63 1.811×10 ³ K 1.0	Strength	Reference temperature Equation Shear modulus Yield stress (zero plastic strain) Eff. plastic strain #1 Eff. plastic strain #2 Yield stress #1 Yield stress #2	300 K Piecewise JC $4.64 \times 10^7 \text{ kPa}$ $1.2 \times 10^5 \text{ kPa}$ 0.3 1.0×10^{20} $4.5 \times 10^5 \text{ kPa}$ $4.5 \times 10^5 \text{ kPa}$	
Failure	Equation Damage constant, <i>D1</i> Damage constant, <i>D2</i> Damage constant, <i>D3</i> Damage constant, <i>D4</i> Damage constant, <i>D5</i> Melting temperature Ref. strain rate (/s)	Johnson- Cook -2.2 5.43 -0.47 0.016 0.63 1.811×10 ³ K 1.0	Strength	Reference temperature Equation Shear modulus Yield stress (zero plastic strain) Eff. plastic strain #1 Eff. plastic strain #2 Yield stress #1 Yield stress #2 Thermal softening exponent	300 K Piecewise JC $4.64 \times 10^7 \text{ kPa}$ $1.2 \times 10^5 \text{ kPa}$ 0.3 1.0×10^{20} $4.5 \times 10^5 \text{ kPa}$ $4.5 \times 10^5 \text{ kPa}$ 1.0	



Figure 1 – The compression test scheme.

Results and discussion

Modeling the compression process was performed before shortening the model height by 50% from the initial height of the specimen. The calculated values of the compression ratio were obtained along the axis of the deformed specimen. The distance values on the graph are presented by the height values of the deformed specimen. The zero value for this coordinate axis of the graph is the reference point of the specimen height from the side of the applied load. The dependencies of the compression ratio of materials on the height of the deformed specimens are presented in the Fig. 2.

Ref. strain rate (/s)



1.0



Figure 2 – The dependencies of the compression ratio of materials on the height of the deformed specimens: A – aluminum; B – iron-C.E.; C – Al₂O₃; D – copper; E – concrete (the compressive strength is 25 MPa); F – armco iron.

After analyzing the obtained graphs, it was determined that the greatest compressive strength is observed in the specimen made of ceramics. The compression ratio of ceramics during corresponding deformation is 0.39. In this case, the change range of the ratio value over the entire cross section of the specimen is no more than 0.03. This minimal change in the ratio value indicates the most uniform compression of material over the entire volume of the

specimen. The lowest compressive strength is observed in the specimens made of aluminum and concrete. The compression ratio of these materials during corresponding deformation is 0.81 and 0.83, respectively. The change range of the compression ratios of aluminum and concrete increases by 5 times compared to ceramics. Iron-containing alloys are subjected to compression deformation in the same way and have the average values of the ratios. All



	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
Impact Factor:	ISI (Dubai, UAE)) = 1.582	РИНЦ (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 9.035	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

materials are characterized by an increase in the compression ratio in the direction from the end surface on which the load is applied to the end surface on which basing the specimen is performed.

Conclusion

Thus, aluminum and concrete are destroyed during compression deformation of the volume by

50%, since the calculated compression ratio is 0.81-0.83 of 1.0 (where 1.0 is total failure of material). Compression of the ceramic products does not lead to the formation of significant change in the values of internal deformations in the volume. This indicates almost the same properties over the entire volume of deformed material. The compression ratio of ceramics is 0.39, which is half that of aluminum and concrete.

References:

- 1. (2011). ISO 13314:2011. Mechanical testing of metals Ductility testing Compression test for porous and cellular metals.
- Khlystov, N., Lizardo, D., Matsushita, K., & Zheng, J. (2013). Uniaxial Tension and Compression Testing of Materials. 3.032 Lab Report, p. 19.
- 3. Chemezov, D., et al. (2020). Experimental study of fracture of the cast iron specimen during compression. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12 (92), 144-148.
- 4. (2020). Autodyn User's Subroutines Guide. ANSYS Inc., p. 120.
- 5. Grard, C. (1920). Aluminium and its alloys. Their properties, thermal treatment and industrial application. Constable & Company LTD, p. 226.

- 6. Sivakumar, G. (2010). *Compressive Strength of Concrete*. ICOMAT.
- Doremus, R. H. (1990). Alumina-silica system. Handbook of ceramics and composites, Vol. 1: Synthesis and properties, New York, Basel, 23-34.
- Galusek, D. (2010). *Ceramic oxides. Ceramics science and technology*, Vol. 2: Materials and properties, Darmstadt: Wiley-VCH, 3-58.
- (n.d.). AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING MATERIALS (Revised Annually). "Copper and Copper Alloys." *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, Vol. 2.1 (2), (ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA).
- 10. (n.d.). *ARMCO[®] PURE IRON. High purity iron.* AK Steel International, p. 24.

