I. Introduction

Delaminations in composite laminates can occur during fabrication or service, e.g., low-velocity impact. One way of avoiding the deleterious effects of delamination is frequent inspection and repair/replacement, which is very expensive. On the other hand the structures can be designed to be damage tolerant. Since most of the delaminations propagate in the same plane, fracture mechanics principles can be successfully applied to determine the loads at which a delamination will begin to grow. The strain energy release rate $G$ has been widely accepted as the fracture parameter that characterizes delamination propagation. In the case where the plate surfaces are $z = 0$ and $-h$ can be treated in an analogous manner. We will include the transverse shear deformation as well as the thickness stretch mode introduced by Whitney. Both indicial and vector notations are used for stresses, force resultants, etc., in this paper, depending on the convenience of presentation. In the following an underscore denotes a matrix, $[,]$ denotes a row matrix, a superscripted $T$ denotes matrix transpose, and a suffix preceded by a comma denotes differentiation. The displacement field in the plate is approximated by

$$\mathbf{u}_i(x_1, x_2, x_3) = U_i(x_1, x_2) + x_3 \theta_i(x_1, x_2), \quad (i = 1, 2, 3)$$  \hfill (1)

The various $U_i$ are displacement of points on the reference plane, $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$ are the rotations, and $\theta_3$ is the thickness stretch, $\theta_3$ is set to zero, and we recover the standard shear deformation theory. The strain field can be represented as

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 + x_3 \varepsilon_3$$  \hfill (2)
The force and moment resultants are defined as
\[ (N, M) = \int_0^h \sigma_3 (1, x_3) \, dx_3, \quad (i, j = 1, 2, 3) \] (6)

It should be mentioned that the limits of integration in Eq. (6) are 0 and \( h \), and hence the moment resultants are about an axis on the reference \( x_1, x_2 \) plane. It will be sometimes convenient to denote the stresses and the force and moment resultants as pseudovectors \( \sigma, N, M \) containing elements \( \sigma_{xx}, N_{xx}, M_{xx} \), respectively. The relation between the two sets of notations, e.g., \( N_{xx} \) and \( N_{xx} \), is given by \( \sigma = \sigma_{xx} \) for \( i = j \) and \( \sigma = 9 - i - j \) otherwise. In that case the force and moment resultants are
\[ (N, M) = \int_0^h \sigma_3 (1, x_3) \, dx_3 \] (7)

The stress-strain relations are
\[ \sigma = \epsilon \epsilon \] (8)

Using Eqs. (2), (7), and (8), one can derive the laminate constitutive relations as
\[ \begin{pmatrix} N \\ M \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B & D \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_3 \\ \epsilon_3 \end{pmatrix} \] (9)

where the various stiffness matrices of the laminate are given by
\[ (A, B, D) = \int_0^h \epsilon_3 (1, x_3) \, dx_3 \] (10)

By denoting the force and moment resultants as \( F \), the plate deformations as \( E \), and the laminate stiffness as \( C \), Eq. (9) can be written in a shorthand notation as \( F = CE \).

The stress equilibrium equations (neglecting body forces) are
\[ \sigma_{ij,j} = 0, \quad (i, j = 1, 2, 3) \] (11)

Integrating Eq. (11) through the thickness of the plate we obtain
\[ N_{xx,a} + t_i = 0, \quad (i = 1, 2, 3; \alpha = 1, 2) \] (12)

where \( t_i \) are the sum of surface tractions acting on the top and bottom surfaces of the plate:
\[ t_i = \sigma_{30} (x_1, x_2, h) - \sigma_{30} (x_1, x_2, 0) \] (13)

By multiplying Eq. (11) by \( x_3 \) throughout and integrating through the thickness, we obtain
\[ M_{xx,a} + m_i - N_{xx} = 0, \quad (i = 1, 2, 3; \alpha = 1, 2) \] (14)

The derivations given thus far pertain to a laminate situated just above the reference plane. For a laminate situated just below the reference plane the only change will be in the limits of integration in Eqs. (6), (7), and (10), from \(-h\) to 0 instead of 0 to \( h \).
III. Analysis of a Delaminated Plate

We propose to use the plate theory developed herein for the analysis of delaminated plates, in particular to compute the strain energy release rate distribution $G(x)$ along the delamination front. We assume that 1) the delaminated sublaminates and the parent laminate are large enough compared with the plate thickness, 2) the delamination front is a smooth curve without any sharp corners or discontinuities, and 3) the distance between any point of application of external loads and the delamination front is large compared with the plate thickness. If these assumptions are valid, then the displacement of points away from the delamination front computed using the plate theory will be sufficiently accurate and hence the estimate of total strain energy in the entire plate. The delaminated plate can be considered as consisting of two laminates, the top and bottom, separated in the region of delamination, and connected to each other (intact) elsewhere (see Fig. 1). The delamination plane is used as the reference plane $(x_1, x_2)$ plane for deriving the equations of the top and bottom sublaminates and also the intact laminate.

Next we look at the nature of interaction between the top and bottom laminates in the undelaminated (intact) region. Let $C^{(1)}$ and $C^{(0)}$ be the stiffnesses of the top and bottom sublaminates, respectively. Then it is obvious from the definition of $C$ in Eq. (10) that the stiffness of the intact plate $C = C^{(1)} + C^{(0)}$. This is because the limits of integration for the intact plate is from $-h$ to $+h$, which represents the sum of integrals for the top and bottom sublaminates. Let $F_i$, $F_i^{(1)}$, and $F_i^{(0)}$ be the force and moment resultants in the intact, top, and bottom laminates respectively. From the definition of force and moment resultants in Eq. (7) it can be seen that $F = F^{(1)} + F^{(0)}$. The deformations in the top and bottom plate are the same and equal to the deformation of the intact plate, i.e., $F^{(1)} = F^{(0)} = F$. From these the reaction between the force resultants in the top laminate $F^{(1)}$ and the total force resultants $F$ can be written as

$$F^{(1)} = C^{(1)} C^{-1} F$$

Thus one can see that the force resultants in the top (or bottom) laminate are a linear combination of the force resultants acting on the intact plate. Thus, as long as no singular external tractions or couples act on the plate, the interaction between the top and bottom laminates in the intact region is characterized by smooth and nonsingular tractions and couples.

Next we will consider the situation near the delamination front.

For the purpose of convenience we will assume that the delamination front is locally tangential to the $x_1$ axis as shown in Fig. 1. Because the deformations can be different in the top and bottom sublaminates behind the crack front, there will be discontinuities (jumps) in the forces at the crack front. These jumps can be related to the line forces and couples acting between the two sublaminates at the crack front. Referring to Fig. 3 and Eqs. (21) and (22), the jump in the force resultants can be expressed as

$$\int = [N^{(1)}] - [N^{(2)}] = [N^{(3)}] - [N^{(4)}]$$

$$g_i = [M^{(1)}] - [M^{(2)}] = [M^{(3)}] - [M^{(4)}]$$

In deriving the previous two expressions, we have used the equilibrium relation

$$F^{(1)} = F^{(2)} + F^{(3)}$$

Next we apply Irwin's crack closure integral\textsuperscript{16} to compute the strain energy release rate. We will allow the crack front to grow by an arbitrary distance $\Delta x$ along the crack front. Consider a small portion of the delamination front that is locally tangential to the $x_1$ axis as shown in Fig. 1. Let its length be $\Delta x$. We will compute the work done in closing this small portion of the crack front. In applying virtual crack closure principle we consider the tractions acting in between the impeding crack surfaces over a small area ahead of the crack and multiply by the relative crack surface opening displacements at corresponding points behind the crack, and take the limit as this area or crack extension tends to zero. In doing so the work done to the distributed tractions and couples will vanish unless they exhibit a singular behavior at the crack tip. We have shown

![Fig. 3](image)

in the beginning of this section [Eq. (23)] that the tractions and couples acting between the sublaminates in the intact plate have regular behavior. Therefore, they will not contribute to the crack closure virtual work. However, there are line tractions and couples acting along the crack front, and these will contribute to the virtual work term. Thus, the work done is given by

$$\Delta W = \frac{1}{2} \Delta x \sum_{i=1}^{3} f_i [U^{(i)} - U^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \Delta x \sum_{i=1}^{2} g_i [\theta^{(i)} - \theta^{(i)}_{\infty}] = \frac{1}{2} \Delta x \sum_{i=1}^{3} f_i [U^{(i)} - U^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

By adding and subtracting $U_1(0, x_2)$ and $\theta_1(0, x_2)$ in Eq. (27), we obtain

$$\Delta W = \frac{1}{2} \Delta x \sum_{i=1}^{3} f_i [U^{(i)} - U^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

$$- U_1(0, x_2) + U^{(1)}_{\infty} - U^{(1)}_{\infty} - U^{(1)}_{\infty}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \Delta x \sum_{i=1}^{2} g_i [\theta^{(i)} - \theta^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

We define the strain energy release rate computed from the plate theory $G_p$ as

$$G_p = \lim_{\Delta x \to 0} \frac{\Delta W}{\Delta x}$$

Substituting for $\Delta W$ from Eq. (28) into Eq. (29), we obtain

$$G_p = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{3} [N^{(1)} - N^{(2)}] [U^{(i)} - U^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} [M^{(1)} - M^{(2)}] [\theta^{(i)} - \theta^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

In deriving Eq. (30) we have used Eqs. (24) and (25) and also the definition of the derivative of displacements, e.g.,

$$U^{(i)}_{\infty} = \lim_{\Delta x \to 0} \frac{U_1(0, x_2) - U^{(i)}_{\infty}(-\Delta x, x_2)}{-\Delta x}$$

We will use the force equilibrium Eq. (26) and also the fact that the deformations in sublaminates 2 and 3 are the same, i.e., $F^{(2)} = F^{(3)}$, to modify Eq. (30) as follows:

$$G_p = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{3} [N^{(1)} - N^{(2)}] [U^{(i)}_{\infty} - U^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

$$+ [N^{(1)} - N^{(2)}] [U^{(i)}_{\infty} - U^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} [M^{(1)} - M^{(2)}] [\theta^{(i)} - \theta^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

$$+ [M^{(1)} - M^{(2)}] [\theta^{(i)} - \theta^{(i)}_{\infty}]$$

\textsuperscript{16} SANKAR AND SONIK
In Eq. (32) the sum of the first and third terms on the right-hand side can be written as \([E^{(4)} - E^{(3)}] \cdot [E^{(4)} - E^{(3)}]\), and the sum of the second and fourth terms can be written as \([E^{(2)} - E^{(1)}] \cdot [E^{(2)} - E^{(1)}]\). The explanation for this is as follows. We have already established that only \(N_{ij}\) and \(M_{ij}\) can be discontinuous across the delamination front. Considering the terms in the deformation vector \(E\), we find \(U_i\) and \(\theta_i\) have to be discontinuous at the delamination front. In the deformation gradients, the derivatives with respect to \(x_2\) (the delamination front is assumed to be tangential to \(x_2\)) have to be unique along the \(x_2\) axis and hence continuous across the delamination front. However, the derivatives with respect to the coordinate normal to the delamination front (\(x_1\) in this case) can be discontinuous. Thus \(U_i\) and \(\theta_i\) can be discontinuous. The terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (32) represent the product of jumps in the force resultants and deformations. By adding the jump in the continuous terms (which is equal to zero) both in the force \(E\) and deformation \(E\), we can write Eq. (32) as follows:

\[
G_p(s) = \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left[ E^{(1)} - E^{(3)} \right] \cdot [E^{(4)} - E^{(3)}] + \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left[ E^{(2)} - E^{(1)} \right] \cdot [E^{(2)} - E^{(1)}]
\]

(33)

The previous expression can be further simplified by using the equilibrium condition \(E^{(1)} + E^{(4)} = E^{(2)} + E^{(3)}\), the compatibility condition of the intact laminate, \(E^{(4)} = C^{(4)}\), and the two reciprocal relations \(E^{(1)} = C^{(1)}\) and \(E^{(2)} = C^{(2)}\). The reciprocal relations are the direct consequence of the symmetry of the laminate stiffness matrix \(C\) and also the fact that \(C^{(1)} = C^{(2)}\) and \(C^{(2)} = C^{(4)}\). The simplified version of Eq. (33) is

\[
G_p(s) = \Phi^{(1)} + \Phi^{(4)} - \Phi^{(2)} - \Phi^{(3)}
\]

(34)

In arriving at Eq. (34) we have used Eq. (17) for the laminate strain energy density. Stated in words, the strain energy release rate at a point on the delamination front is equal to the difference in the strain energy densities behind and ahead of the front at that point.

Equation (34) represents the pointwise strain energy release rate in the context of the plate theory. We still have to show under what conditions it is equal to the result obtained via three-dimensional analysis. Let the actual strain energy release rate distribution obtained using a three-dimensional analysis be given by \(G(s)\). For an arbitrary infinitesimally small delamination growth given by \(\Delta(s)\) the change in strain energy of the entire plate \(\Phi_p\) is given by

\[
\Delta \Phi_p = \int G(s) \Delta(s) \, ds
\]

(35)

where the contour integral is taken around the delamination front. Equation (35) is applicable only for the case where the loads remain constant during the delamination growth. In the context of plate theory we can write a similar expression for change in the plate strain energy as

\[
(\Delta \Phi_p)_{PT} = \int \Delta W
\]

(36)

where \(\Delta W\) is the crack closure work given by Eq. (27). By multiplying and dividing by \(\Delta \ell(s) \, ds\) in Eq. (36), taking the limit as \(\Delta \ell(s) \to 0\), and following the procedures used to derive Eqs. (27–34), we obtain

\[
(\Delta \Phi_p)_{PT} = \int G_p(s) \Delta \ell(s) \, ds
\]

(37)

According to the assumptions we have made in the previous section regarding the applicability of plate theories for the present problem, the change in strain energy \(\Delta \Phi_p\) computed by Eqs. (35) and (37) should be equal for any arbitrary \(\Delta \ell(s)\). This can be true only if \(G_p(s)\) is equal to \(G(s)\) all along the delamination front.

IV. \(J\) Integral for Plate Models

In three-dimensional crack problems the \(J\) integral is evaluated around a contour \(\Gamma\) that surrounds the crack tip and is vanishingly small:

\[
J = \lim_{\Gamma \to 0} \int_{\Gamma} \left( \frac{\partial (\sigma_2 u_{11})}{\partial x_2} - \sigma_{ij} u_{ij} \right) n_j \, d\Gamma
\]

(38)

Let the value of the \(J\) integral evaluated around an arbitrary path be denoted by \(J_p\). Then \(J_p\) does not represent the strain energy release rate. The difference between \(J_p\) and \(J\) can be derived as (see Appendix)

\[
J_p = \int_A \frac{\partial (\sigma_2 u_{11})}{\partial x_2} \, dA
\]

(39)

where the previous integral is evaluated over the area enclosed by the path on the \(x_1x_3\) plane (Fig. 1). For plane problems the stresses and strains do not vary along the \(x_2\)-axis, and the right-hand side of Eq. (39) will be zero, thus making \(J_p\) equal to \(J\) for all paths of integration.

It is interesting to note that Sankar and Rao \(^7\) evaluated the \(J\) integral around a zero-area path surrounding the crack tip using the stresses and displacements derived using the plate models and obtained an expression for \(J\) that was identical to that given by Eq. (34). Let us denote this by \(J_p\), to distinguish from the actual \(J\). Now we can derive the error involved in using plate models for computing \(J\) (or \(G\)). Let us denote the error by \(J_e\):

\[
J_e = J_p - J
\]

(40)

Let us assume that there is a path that is away from the crack tip such that along this path the value of \(J_p\) evaluated using plate theories is the same as the actual \(J\). Then we can add and subtract this term in Eq. (40) to obtain

\[
J = (J_p - J_{pa}) - (J_p - J_e)
\]

(41)

The terms in parentheses are actually the area integral defined in Eq. (40). Substituting from Eq. (39) into Eq. (41), we obtain

\[
J_e = \left[ \int_A \frac{\partial (\sigma_2 u_{11})}{\partial x_2} \, dA \right]_{plate} - \left[ \int_A \frac{\partial (\sigma_2 u_{11})}{\partial x_2} \, dA \right]_{exact}
\]

(42)

Equation (42) provides a measure of error in the \(J\) or \(G\) computed using plate theories [Eq. (34)].

Again in the case of plane problems the area integrals in Eq. (42) vanish and hence the error \(J_e\). Thus we are able to obtain the exact \(G\) from beam or one-dimensional plate equations. Thus the only condition that we need to satisfy while using beam models is that there should be at least one cross section in each sublaminate behind and ahead of the crack tip where the stresses match the exact solution. Beam models have been used for computing \(G\) in plate structures by several authors. \(^2,3,5,7\)

V. Results and Discussion

Two sets of numerical examples were performed to demonstrate the efficacy of the present method. The first set consisted of examples for which solutions are available or can be computed by other methods, so that the present method of computing \(G\) distribution can be verified. The second set of examples illustrates the usefulness of the method in solving some practical delamination problems. All examples were carried out using nine-noded isoparametric plate elements. Each node had 5 DOF, viz., three displacements in the coordinate directions and two rotations derived using the shear deformable laminated plate theory. The thickness stretching term was not included in the examples so as to compare with available results. If the delaminated plate is modeled by more than two sublaminates, then there will be multiple sublaminates above or below the delamination plane. In that case the \(\theta_i\) term must be included in the formulation.

The strain energy release rate distribution along the crack front in a 0-deg graphite/epoxy double cantilever beam (DCB) is shown in Figs. 4 and 5. The dimensions and material properties are shown.
Length, \( L = 0.1 \) m
Specimen Dimension:
- Width, \( W = 0.025 \) m
- Thickness, \( h = 0.0033 \) m

**Fig. 4** Double cantilever beam subjected to end loads.

Table 1: Comparison of results for elliptical delaminations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect ratio, ( AR = a/b )</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( w_{0\text{FEM}}, \times 10^{-5} ) m</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( w_{0\text{Exact}}, \times 10^{-5} ) m</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Phi_{\text{FEM}}, ) N-m</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Phi_{\text{Exact}}, ) N-m</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 5** \( G \) distribution along the delamination front in DCB specimen.

in the figures. Figure 5 also includes the results for laminates with through-the-thickness stitching, which will be discussed later. From the results for the unstitched laminate one can note that the \( G \) is higher at the center of the laminate and drops to a lower value toward the edge. This is similar to the behavior observed by Raju et al.\(^{18}\) using a three-dimensional finite element analysis. This also explains the thumbnail shape that a straight delamination acquires in DCB specimens. It should be mentioned that we have used contact elements in the vicinity of the specimen edge to avoid interpenetration of the nodes of top and bottom sublaminate of the DCB, and this has resulted in a smooth variation of \( G \) unlike that in Ref. 7.

The second example is an isotropic square plate containing an elliptical delamination subjected to a pair of point forces normal to the plate at the center of the ellipse. The plate size is \( 75 \times 75 \times 3.3 \) mm. The delamination is assumed to be in the midplane of the plate. The minor axis of the delamination is kept constant at 15 mm, and the ratio of the major to minor axis varies from 1 to 3. The \( G \) distributions in the first quadrant of the delamination are shown in Fig. 6 for various aspect ratios. Since no closed-form results for \( G \) are available except for the circular delamination, we used an indirect method to verify the results. The strain energy in a clamped elliptical plate subjected to a central point force can be derived as

\[
\Phi_p = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) P u_0
\]

**Fig. 6** \( G \) distribution along elliptical delaminations in isotropic plates.

where \( P \) is the load and \( u_0 \) is the central deflection given by Young\(^{19}\):

\[
u_0 = \frac{P b^2 (1 - \nu^2)}{E h^3} (0.34773 - 0.110933 a)
\]

In the previous equation \( b \) is the minor axis, \( a \) is the major axis, \( a = b/a \), \( h \) is the plate thickness, and \( E \) and \( v \) are Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio. Let us assume that the delamination grows by an arbitrary small distance \( \Delta l \) as the load \( P \) remains constant. (\( \Delta l \) is assumed to be constant along the delamination front). The change in strain energy of the plate can be computed by two different methods. The simpler method involves differentiation of the expression for the strain energy. Thus

\[
\Delta \Phi_p = 2 \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) P \left( \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial a} \Delta l + \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial b} \Delta l \right)
\]

The factor 2 in the previous equation is to account for the two sublaminates of the plate. This method can be considered as an exact one to compute the change in strain energy. The second method of computing the change in strain energy due to delamination growth is via fracture mechanics using Eq. (35). Since \( \Delta l \) is constant along the delamination front, it can be taken out of the integral sign in Eq. (35). By comparing this expression with Eq. (45), we obtain

\[
\int G(s) \, ds = P \left( \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial a} + \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial b} \right)
\]

Thus the comparison of the two terms in the previous equation is a measure of accuracy of the present method for computing \( G(s) \). The results are given for various aspect ratios of the ellipse in Table 1.
problems: 1) effects of stitches in reducing the strain energy release rate, and 2) strain energy release rate in orthotropic plates due to elliptical delaminations. The DCB specimen shown in Fig. 4 was assumed to have through-the-thickness stitches. The stitches in the delaminated region were modeled using uniaxial bar elements with stiffnesses 1000 and 10,000 N/m. The stitch spacing and pitch are given in Fig. 5. The (s) was computed using Eq. (34). It may be seen from Fig. 5 that the stitching has a profound effect on reducing the strain energy release rate in delaminated specimens. Figure 7 depicts the load-deflection curve of a DCB specimen during progressive failure of stitches and delamination propagation.

Figure 8 depicts the variation of G in a 0-deg graphite/epoxy laminate due to elliptical delaminations. The delamination is subjected to a pair of opening forces at the center. The results are shown only for the first quadrant of the ellipse. It may be noted that for a circular delamination (aspect ratio AR = 1) the G is much higher at θ = 0, and hence there will be a propensity for the crack to propagate along the 0-deg direction and become an elliptical delamination. When the aspect ratio a/b is approximately 1.67, the G(s) is almost constant along the delamination front, and the crack may grow in a self-similar manner thereafter. In fact, elliptical delamination of any arbitrary aspect ratio will eventually change shape to attain this particular aspect ratio.

VI. Conclusions

A simple expression for the pointwise strain energy release rate G along the delamination front has been derived using Irwin’s crack closure technique. The expression suggests that the G at any point on the delamination front is the difference between the plate strain energy densities behind and ahead of the crack front. The present procedure for computing G is first verified by applying to problems for which solutions are known. The efficiency of the method is illustrated for stitched double cantilever beam (DCB) specimens and also for elliptical delaminations in composite plates. The results demonstrate the validity of the present technique in analyzing delaminated coupons and structures.

Appendix

In plane solids where the stresses and strains do not vary along the *x* axis, the following integral is equal to zero for any closed contour on the *x*c plane:

\[
\int (W_n - T_i u_i) \, dS = 0
\]

where \(W\) is the strain energy density and \(T_i\) are the tractions. However, the same is not true for three-dimensional states of stress. For three-dimensional cases we have

\[
\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_1} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_2} \frac{\partial \epsilon_{ij}}{\partial x_1} = \sigma_{ij} \epsilon_{ij} \quad (A2)
\]

Applying divergence theorem to the previous equation, we can show that on any closed surface

\[
\int_s (W_n - T_i u_i) \, dS = 0 \quad (A3)
\]

Consider a prismatic body enclosed by two identical areas on the \(x_1 x_2\) plane separated by a small distance \(\Delta x_2\). Applying the surface integral in Eq. (49) to this prismatic body, we obtain

\[
\Delta x_2 \int_s (W_n - T_i u_i) \, ds = \Delta x_2 \int_A \frac{\partial (\sigma_{2i} u_i)}{\partial x_2} \, dA = 0 \quad (A4)
\]

The first term on the left-hand side of the previous equation is the contribution from the lateral surface given by \(n_2 = 0\). The second term is from the bases of the prism given by \(n_2 = \pm 1\). Canceling \(\Delta x_2\) throughout, we obtain

\[
\int_s (W_n - T_i u_i) \, ds = \int_A \frac{\partial (\sigma_{2i} u_i)}{\partial x_2} \, dA \quad (A5)
\]

Now consider the closed contour ABCD shown in Fig. A1. This closed contour does not include the crack tip, and hence Eq. (A5) holds good.
Fig. A1 The zero-area path and an arbitrary path for computing the J-integral.

holds good for this contour. The integral on the left-hand side of Eq. (A5) vanishes along the crack surfaces BC and DA. The integral along CD can be written as negative of that along DC. We can recognize the integral along AB as \( J_a \) and that along DC as \( J_a \). Hence Eq. (A5) becomes

\[
J - J_a = \int_\Delta \frac{\partial (\sigma_{22} \mu_i)}{\partial x_2} \, dA
\]  

(A6)

Equation (A6) represents a measure of difference between the zero-area \( J \) integral and that evaluated around an arbitrary path surrounding the crack tip. It should be noted that the area integral in Eq. (A6) does not include the crack tip.
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