Modeling and simulation of intersonic crack growth
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Abstract

Intersonic crack growth has been studied using an interfacial fracture model in which an additional material phase within a bonding layer is proposed to describe the failure behavior of the interface. In this material phase, a strain gradient based damage model is applied with a built-in cohesive law, which is governed by an material intrinsic length scale that bridges the mechanisms that operate at continuum mechanics scale and at smaller scales. Simulations of the intersonic crack growth experiments (Rosakis et al., 1999; Rosakis, 2002) have been performed with varying material length scales and other parameters. The study is focused on two subjects: (1) the process of decohesion-induced cracking, explaining fracture process zone initiation and propagation as well as the corresponding contact mechanisms; (2) propagation speed, investigating the effects of length scales and loading parameters.

The simulations reveal that a fracture process zone initiates first and extends with a speed faster than shear wave speed. After initiation, the crack speed exhibits oscillations with an average value between $c_s \sqrt{2}$ and $c_l$, where $c_s$ and $c_l$ refer to shear wave and dilatation wave speeds, respectively. In such a quasi-steady-state propagation, the crack opening profiles exhibit a time-invariant profile, while the fracture process zone size and decohesion energy remain constant. Contact between the crack faces is taken into account in the numerical simulations. A contact zone behind the crack tip has been captured which represents a self-healing-like mechanism. The leading edge of both the fracture process zone and the contact zone may cause strong shocks. When the average crack propagation speed approaches the supersonic region, two stress shocks radiate from the crack tip, corresponding to shear and dilatation wave radiation, respectively. The simulation results demonstrate that length and time scales play vital roles during crack propagation. Here the length scales refer to the bonding layer thickness and the material's intrinsic length that governs energy dissipation during failure; whereas the time scales refer to the effects of material strain rate dependence, material failure speed, and wave propagation properties. A parameter $R_s$, expressed as the ratio of material shear strength and the applied stress that is calculated from the remote imposed displacement boundary condition, is proposed to scale crack speed. Intersonic propagation occurs when $R_s$ is greater than a threshold value. The numerical computations are compared with experiments (Rosakis et al., 1999; Rosakis, 2002) and the theoretical solution [Philos. Mag., A, in press], which demonstrates the trend that crack propagation is unstable in the open speed interval between $c_s$ and $\kappa_s c_s$.
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\( (\sqrt{2} \leq \kappa_v < c_s/c_l) \) whereas it is stable when the speed lies in the close interval between \( \kappa_v c_s \) and \( c_l \). The coefficient \( \kappa_v \) is a function of material length scale, strain rate sensitivity, and boundary conditions. The moving particle finite element method, a newly developed meshfree method, and the pinball contact algorithm are applied in the numerical analysis.
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1. **Introduction**

The issues of the limiting speed of dynamic crack growth and the stress and strain fields surrounding a crack tip moving faster than the characteristic wave speeds have recently received a lot of attention (Rosakis et al., 1999; Rosakis, 2002). Washabaugh and Knauss (1994) find that the velocity of a mode I crack tip propagating along a fabricated weak plane may asymptotically approach the Rayleigh wave speed. The tests of mode II crack propagation along a weak plane conducted by Rosakis and his co-authors (Rosakis et al., 1999, 2000) reveal that given sufficient driving force, the crack propagation speed can jump to the intersonic speed regime, speeds lying between \( c_s \) and \( c_l \), the shear and dilatational wave speeds, respectively.

The theoretical linear elastic dynamic crack growth analyses, as elegantly summarized by Freund (1990) and Broberg (1999a,b), indicate that the order of the stress singularity at such a crack tip and the corresponding energy release rate depends upon its propagation speed. For mode I crack growth in isotropic solids, the physically admissible stress singularity and the energy release rate vanish when the propagation velocity exceeds the Rayleigh wave speed. Whereas for mode II intersonic crack growth, the crack tip singularity is less than 1/2 which leads to a positive crack tip energy release rate. In this case, both the crack tip asymptotic solution (Freund, 1979) and dislocation analysis (Weertman, 1969; Weertman and Weertman, 1980) indicate that such a crack propagation is accompanied with stress radiation that has the same order as the crack tip stress except at the Eshelby speed, i.e. at \( c_s \sqrt{2} \) where the corresponding crack tip singularity is 1/2. Griffith’s Theory requires a crack tip stress singularity with a power of half. Thus, theoretically the Eshelby speed is the only admissible speed for steady-state mode II crack propagation above the shear wave speed.

On the other hand, both the analysis of seismic data (Bouchon et al., 2001) and experimental observations (Rosakis et al., 1999) demonstrate that a shear fracture on a pre-existing fault or a weak-path crack growth under mode II dynamic load can propagate in a wide range of speeds above the shear wave speed. A unified explanation is that the material decohesion in the weak path, rather than stress singularity, dominates the propagation under this situation, which actually smears out the stress concentration at the crack tip and thus removes the radiated stress singularity at shock front (Burridge et al., 1979; Broberg, 1999a,b; Needleman and Rosakis, 1999). From this view, several challenging issues are raised:

1. How does a crack initiate and grow from a static state to intersonic speeds?
2. When the Eshelby speed is no longer the uniquely admissible intersonic speed, which factors determine crack propagation speeds?
3. How does the material viscosity (strain rate sensitivity-drag effect) affect propagation?
4. What is the role of crack surface contact during decohesion and intersonic crack growth?
5. What are the effects of material intrinsic and extrinsic lengths on this class of problems?
Motivated by the Rosakis’ experiment and seismological observations, a comprehensive numerical study focusing on the issues mentioned above is performed. As compared with previous research reports, the distinguishing points and contributions of the present work are as follows:

1. A three-phase model is proposed to simulate interface fracture, in which an additional interface material phase is introduced between two solid matrices in a bi-material system. The bonding strength and related mechanical properties are defined by the constitutive law of this interfacial material phase.

2. The effects of length scales and strain rate have been investigated for the laboratory scale dynamic test. The length scales refer to the material intrinsic length presented in a strain gradient theory-based constitutive law whereas the extrinsic length refers to the bonding layer thickness that contains the interfacial phase.

3. In order to obtain the detailed information of intersonic crack propagation, the mode I and II crack opening displacements, the decohesion energy and fracture toughness are simulated and studied.

4. In conjunction with a multi-scale constitutive model (Hao et al., 2000c; Hao et al., in press), the moving particle finite element (Hao et al., 2002; Hao et al., in press), a newly developed numerical method, is applied in the simulations. Using this method we are able to
   - implement the contact mechanism into the numerical simulation. Several contact-related phenomena, such as self-healing, have been captured.
   - investigate some parameters and conditions that affect propagation speed which are currently difficult to simulate by other methods.
   - capture both intersonic and supersonic shocks, either in the stress or strain fields.

5. Both crack acceleration and deceleration have been studied. It has been found that the intersonic crack tip field radiates out from the site where a crack started to decelerate.

6. The numerical simulations are generally in agreement with the experimental observations (Rosakis et al., 1999; Rosakis, 2002) and theoretical predictions (Hao et al., in press) that intersonic crack propagation is unstable in the open speed interval between $c_s$ and $\kappa c_s$, whereas it is stable when the speed lies in the close interval between $\kappa c_s$ and $c_l$. The parameter $\kappa$ is a function of material intrinsic and extrinsic lengths, strain rate hardening parameters, and boundary conditions.

A considerable number of reports regarding intersonic and supersonic crack propagation can be found in the past three decades, including Andrews (1976), Burridge et al. (1979), Weertman and Weertman (1980), Piva and Hasan (1996), Huang et al. (1998), Gumbsch and Gao (1999), Huang et al. (1999), Needleman (1999), Needleman and Rosakis (1999), Ben-Zion (2001), Dwivedi and Espinosa (submitted for publication), Federici et al. (2001), Geubelle and Kubair (2001), Samudrala et al. (2002), Guo et al. (2003) and Samudrala and Rosakis (2003). Reviews of dynamic fracture in seismic studies are presented by Dmowska and Rice (1986) and Freund (1990), and recently by Rosakis (2002). With respect to numerical analysis, Andrews (1976) first simulated intersonic shear failure using a finite difference technique. Applying cohesive finite elements, Needleman and Rosakis (1999) study the effects of loading rate and strength of the weak path. Gumbsch and Gao (1999) simulate intersonic crack growth using molecular dynamics. Molecular dynamics simulations of supersonic crack propagation were conducted recently by Gao et al. (2001). The effects of strain rate sensitivity (drag) and strain gradient on single dislocation motion with speeds in subsonic, intersonic, and supersonic regions has been analyzed by Rosakis (2001). As an complement to this paper, a theoretical analysis of steady-state intersonic crack growth has been conducted in Hao et al. (in press) based on the moving dislocation solution introduced in Weertman and Weertman (1980).

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 gives the problem statement, a brief introduction of the multi-scale damage constitutive law that is applied in the numerical simulation, and the proposed interface fracture model. The corresponding numerical scheme is illustrated in Section 3. The simulation results and discussions are presented in Section 4. Section 5 summarizes conclusions.
In the analysis that follows, boldface letters are used to represent tensors. Plan letters represent scalars. Plain letters with subscripts represent the components of a tensor, where the Einstein summation convention is applied to repeated subscripts.

2. Problem statement, interfacial fracture model, and constitutive law

2.1. Problem statement and experimental configuration

Caltech’s mode II dynamic shear rupture specimen (Rosakis et al., 1999) is shown in Fig. 1. It is composed of two pieces of Homalite-100 (a photoelastic polymer) bonded along a horizontal interface. The bonding is produced by using the monomer of the photoelastic polymer and by polymerizing in situ using a catalyst. The resulting adhesive material has elastic properties that are very close to those of the two monolithic pieces and variable strength depending on the curing time. Its strength is in general lower than the monolithic Homalite, a condition necessary to trap the resulting shear crack and to force it to propagate along the weak bond without kinking into the Homalite pieces. Its height, $h$, is of the order of 100 μm. A notch is machined along the bond line. Asymmetric dynamic loading is provided by firing a steel projectile onto the upper half of the specimen just above the pre-notch. The impact velocities range from 20 to 35 m/s. The impacting projectile loads the notch in shear (a small component of compression is also present) and produces a concentration of shear stresses along the weak bond. As the shear stresses and strain rates increase at the notch tip, a dynamically growing shear rupture is produced and grows along the bond with intersonic speeds (Rosakis et al., 1999). The rupture process is visualized by means of high speed photography (2 million frames/s) and the optical method of photoelasticity. Photoelasticity, which is sensitive to
maximum shear stresses, is the ideal technique to be used in visualizing shear dominated fracture events. Indeed, the intersonic shear ruptures reported by Rosakis et al. (1999) are seen to feature two very well resolved shear shock waves (discontinuities in shear stress) that are attached to the intersonically moving shear crack tip, clearly revealing the intersonic nature of the dynamic shear rupture processes.

2.2. Three-phase interfacial fracture model

For the specimen shown in Fig. 1, the upper and lower solid domains are made of Homalite-100 (Rosakis et al., 1999). Instead of ideal bonding, we assume that a thin material layer with a height $h$ exists between the two pieces. The bonding and decohesion properties are defined by the constitutive law that governs this third material, which will be described in the next subsection. Hence, interfacial debonding of the specimen shown in Fig. 1 is modeled as the fracture problem involving the sandwich structure shown in Fig. 2 with an additional length scale $h$, which is considered as a material “extrinsic length” for this model. In reality, such bi-material interfacial transition zones always exist at micro-scale due to the diffusions. According to experimental result, in the present analysis, the $h$ is taken from 1 to 200 μm and its effect on intersonic crack growth has been studied. For the specimen shown in Fig. 1, it has been reported that $h$ is about 20 μm (Rosakis et al., 1999; Rosakis, 2002).

2.3. Constitutive equation and length scale dependent cohesive law

In the present analysis, the bulk Homalite-100 is assumed to be isotropic and linearly elastic. The bonding layer phase is modeled by the multi-scale damage constitutive model introduced in Hao et al. (2000c) and Hao et al. (in press) that is described briefly as follows.

Assuming finite deformations but infinitesimal elastic strain, we apply the additive decomposition of the strain rate tensor

$$\dot{\varepsilon} = \dot{\varepsilon}^e + \dot{\varepsilon}^p$$

(1)

where $\dot{\varepsilon}^e$, the elastic part of strain rate, obeys the same linear elastic constitutive law as the bulk Homalite-100. The plastic part of strain rate, $\dot{\varepsilon}^p$, is described by the plastic potential:

Fig. 2. A three-phase model for intersonic interfacial shear fracture.
\[ \Phi_{\text{multi}} = \left( \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sigma_{\text{intrl}}} \right)^2 + A_0 \frac{\sigma_{\text{m}}}{\sigma_{\text{intrl}}} + A_1 (f + g_1) \exp \left( \frac{-\sigma_{\text{m}}}{\sigma_{\text{intrl}}} \right) + A_2 (f + g_2) \exp \left( \frac{\sigma_{\text{m}}}{\sigma_{\text{intrl}}} \right) - (1 + q f^2) = 0 \]  

(2)

and the associative flow rule

\[ \dot{\varepsilon}_p^\text{p} = \lambda \frac{\partial \Phi_{\text{multi}}}{\partial \sigma} \]  

(3)

where \( \lambda \) is the “flow factor”, \( \bar{\sigma} \) and \( \sigma_{\text{m}} \) denote the Cauchy equivalent stress and Cauchy mean stress, respectively; \( f \) represents the void volume friction which is considered as a damage. The parameters \( A_0, A_1, A_2, g_1, g_2, \) and \( q \) are dimensionless material constants as listed in Table 1. The evolution laws of damage nucleation and growth introduced in Tvergaard and Needleman (1992) are applied in the present work. In Hao et al. (in press) a hierarchical constitutive model is developed that unions quantum physics with the sub-micro and micro-cell models in continuum mechanics. The relation (2) is derived based on the macro-scale potential obtained from micro-cell model.

The plastic potential (2) is associated with the multi-scale damage model in which the mechanisms from two scales are taken into account. At macro-scale up to the point of bifurcation, the \( J_2 \)-like plasticity and damage in the form of void nucleation and growth are taken as the dominant mechanisms of failure, which is a combination of \( J_2 \)-plasticity, the Rice–Tracey model (Rice and Tracey, 1969), and Coulomb friction. A computational methodology to calibrate the constants is introduced in Hao et al. (2000a). The collapse of the ligaments between voids or between other defects is considered as the mechanism after the onset of bifurcation, which highlights the underlying mechanisms at smaller scales which become dominant through global material failure. At this stage the matrix material is modeled by a set of material particles connected by a network of “virtual internal bonds” where each bond obeys the strain gradient-based localization solution that defines a traction-separation law [25]. The development of the micro-ligament collapse model, which is absent in the conventional Gurson’s model, is based on the idea that combines the computational cell model, the concurrent two-scale simulation (Hao et al., 2000b), and the “virtual internal bond model” (Klein and Gao, 1998). For the isotropic case, the average stress–strain response of this model is described by \( \sigma_{\text{intrl}} \) at macro-scale, which is named as “material intrinsic strength” in (2). It is defined as the combination of material strain hardening/softening law and the strain gradient-based traction-separation law:

\[ \sigma_{\text{intrl}} = \begin{cases} \bar{\sigma} \text{ strain hardening/softening,} & \bar{\varepsilon}^\text{p} \leq \bar{\varepsilon}^\text{bifurc} \\ T(\dot{Y}, l, \eta) \text{ decohesion softening,} & \bar{\varepsilon}^\text{p} > \bar{\varepsilon}^\text{bifurc} \end{cases} \]  

(4)

where the \( \bar{\varepsilon}^\text{p} \) is the plastic part of equivalent strain and \( \bar{\varepsilon}^\text{bifurc} \) denotes the \( \bar{\varepsilon}^\text{p} \) at the bifurcation point the on \( \sigma_{\text{intrl}}(\bar{\varepsilon}^\text{p}) \) relation. \( l \) is the material intrinsic length scale defined as the product of Burger’s vector \( b \) and the initial yield strength \( \sigma_{\text{Y0}} \). \( \eta \) is the equivalent strain gradient (Gao et al., 1999):

\[ l = 3 \left( \frac{E}{\sigma_{\text{Y0}}} \right)^2 b; \quad \eta = \sqrt{ \frac{1}{2} u_{k,j} u_{k,j} } \]

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( A_0 )</th>
<th>( A_1 )</th>
<th>( A_2 )</th>
<th>( g_1 )</th>
<th>( g_2 )</th>
<th>( q )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the strain-like parameter $\tilde{Y}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{Y} = \left( \bar{\varepsilon}^P - [\bar{\varepsilon}]_{\text{bifur}} \right) \frac{l}{l_0}$$

(4a)

where $l_0$ is a material constant. As illustrated in Fig. 3, $[\bar{\varepsilon}]_{\text{bifur}}$ marks the transition between the two stages of deformation, the uniform deformation with damage nucleation and growth and the failure of the ligaments between these defects. $[\bar{\varepsilon}]_{\text{bifur}}$ can be calibrated to the maximum stress on the $\sigma_{\text{intr}}(\bar{\varepsilon}^P)$ curve from the uniaxial tension test. During the second stage, the effect of the material intrinsic length scale, strain gradient, and strain rate are incorporated in $\sigma_{\text{intr}}$ (4) as

$$T = \sigma_{Y0} \cdot \bar{T}(\bar{\varepsilon}^P, l, l_0) \cdot \left( 1 + \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}}{\dot{\varepsilon}_0} \right)^m \cdot \sqrt{\left( \frac{\sigma_{\text{hom}}(\bar{\varepsilon}^P)}{\sigma_{Y0}} \right)^2 + \ln \eta}$$

(5)

The second term in (5) is the traction-separation law derived from the strain gradient-based localization solution at the micro-scale. The third and fourth terms reflect, in turn, the strain rate effect and the material hardening due to the strain gradient at macro-scale. As the micro-scale localization, representing ligament failure, is described by $\bar{T}$ in (5), the stress–strain response without bifurcation, denoted by $\sigma_{\text{hom}}(\bar{\varepsilon}^P)$, appears under the square root of the fourth term.

Based on the analytical solution described in Hao et al. (2000b), $\bar{T}$ can be approximated as

$$\bar{T} = \frac{-0.5398Y^2 + 1.5867Y - 0.0466}{1 - k_{tr}}$$

(5a)

where

$$Y = \exp \left\{ \frac{10^6 \cdot (\tilde{Y})^{11}}{k_{tr}} \right\}; \quad k_{tr} = \left| \frac{\sigma_I - 3\sigma_m}{2\sigma_I} \right| \quad \text{and} \quad k_{tr} < 1$$

where $\sigma_I$ is the maximum principle stress and $k_{tr}$ represents the triaxiality of the stress state. In the cases of pure triaxial tension and compression ($k_{tr} = 1$), it is assumed that the fine scale mechanism is not activated as no shear stress exists to trigger localization. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the primary effect of the material intrinsic length $l$ is a scaling of the energy dissipated during decohesion.

For the numerical simulations we employed a bilinear approximation to (5a) that incorporates the essential characteristics in an expression with reduced complexity (see Fig. 4).
\[ T_0 = \begin{cases} 1 - \kappa_0 (\varepsilon^p - [\varepsilon]_{\text{bifurc}}), & \varepsilon^p - [\varepsilon]_{\text{bifurc}} \leq \varepsilon^* \\ \kappa_1 - \kappa_2 (\varepsilon^p - [\varepsilon]_{\text{bifurc}}), & \varepsilon^p - [\varepsilon]_{\text{bifurc}} > \varepsilon^* \end{cases} \]

where
\[ \kappa_0 = \frac{1}{\pi}; \quad \kappa_1 = \frac{1 - \varepsilon^*/\pi}{1 - \sqrt{3}/2}; \quad \kappa_2 = \frac{1 - \varepsilon^*/\pi}{\varepsilon^*(2/\sqrt{3} - 1)}; \quad \varepsilon^* = 0.041 \frac{l}{l_0} \]

For a metal, it is suggested that \( l_0 = 100 \mu m \) (Hao et al., in preparation).

3. Numerical scheme

3.1. Discretization and model parameters

Three-dimensional meshfree simulations have been performed using the configuration shown in Fig. 5a. The specimen is discretized into 2–5 layers in thickness direction. Each layer has about 11,000 nodes (total 5 layers) to 112,000 nodes (total 2 layers). The distribution of nodes in the vicinity of the notch tip is illustrated in Fig. 5b.

The impact of the projectile is modeled by two methods: the projectile is assumed to be a rigid body acting on the specimen; and the projectile is replaced by a prescribed velocity boundary condition. No significant differences are observed between the two approaches. The contact algorithm used with the rigid projectile requires additional computational effort. The fixed velocity boundary condition is imposed on the specimen edge along a height equal to the diameter of the projectile. The imposed velocity varies in time as described by Needleman (1999) and Needleman and Rosakis (1999):

\[ V_p(t) = \begin{cases} V_p t/t_s, & 0 < t < t_s \\ V_p, & t_s \leq t \leq t_p \\ V_p [1 - (t - t_p)/t_s], & t_p \leq t \leq t_p + t_s \\ 0, & t_p + t_s \leq t \end{cases} \]

where \( V_p \) is the velocity of the projectile. In the present computation, \( t_s \) and \( t_s \) are chosen to be zero while \( t_p \) is equal to twice the time that a dilatational wave takes to travel the length of the projectile.
The numerical study was conducted by varying material intrinsic length, bonding layer thickness, strain rate, bonding strength, loading condition, and impact velocities. The values of these parameters are listed in Table 2.

### 3.2. Numerical schemes

The moving particle finite element method (MPFEM) (Hao et al., 2002; Hao and Liu, 2002; Hao et al., in press), a new numerical method based on conventional finite element method (Oden, 1972; Hughes, 1987; Belytschko et al., 2000) and the meshfree methodologies introduced in Belytschko et al. (1994) and Liu et al. (1995, 1996, 1997), has been applied in the numerical analysis. The idea of the method can be briefly described using the boundary value problem illustrated in Fig. 6a. An interpolated solution of displacement $u$ in a finite element can be expressed as

![Fig. 5. Particles modeling of the three-phase model introduced in Fig. 2 (the A–A’ image will be removed).](image-url)
\[ u(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{NE} N_I^E(x) \cdot u_I^E \]

where \( N_I^E(x) \) is the interpolation function (shape function) for element \( E \), \( u_I^E \) is the displacement at node \( I \) in element \( E \), and \( NE \) denotes the total number of nodes in element \( E \). The derivative of the field \( u(x) \) at a point \( x \) (see Fig. 6b) can be obtained either through the interpolation of its left side element \( E_1 \) or the right side element \( E_2 \):

\[ \frac{du(x)}{dx} \bigg|_{E_1} = \sum_{i=1}^{NE_1} \frac{dN_I^{E_1}(x)}{dx} u_I^{E_1} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{du(x)}{dx} \bigg|_{E_2} = \sum_{i=1}^{NE_2} \frac{dN_I^{E_2}(x)}{dx} u_I^{E_2} \]

where \( N_I^{E_i}(x) \) is the shape function for element \( E_i \), \( NE_1 \) and \( NE_2 \) represent the number of nodes in elements \( E_1 \) and \( E_2 \), respectively. For regular finite element method, a gap exists between these two interpolations though they approach a convergent solution when the finite elements become very small. This is because derivatives in conventional finite element solutions are discontinuous at element edges. The concept of the MPFEM can be interpreted as a weighted summation of the solution from all finite elements adjacent to \( x \), as illustrated in Fig. 6c:

\[ \frac{du(x)}{dx} = \sum_{i=1}^{NE} \sigma_i \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{NE} \frac{dN_I^{E_i}(x)}{dx} u_I^{E_i} \right\} \quad (6a) \]

where the weight \( \sigma_i \) is calculated by minimizing the interpolation error using a meshfree scheme, which removes the numerical discontinuity at element edges. Therefore, the basic idea of MPFEM can be interpreted as an interpolation of finite element interpolation, which combines salient features of finite element and meshfree methods while alleviates certain problems that plague meshfree techniques. It displays considerable stability under large deformations and efficiency with acceptable accuracy, especially for dynamic problems involving high speed impacts. A detailed description of MPFEM can be found in literatures, e.g. in Hao et al. (in press).

For the intersonic crack propagation, the numerical analysis is carried out using a Lagrangian, large deformation Galerkin formulation (Belytschko et al., 2000). The pinball contact algorithm (Belytschko and Neal, 1991) is applied in the simulation. The reviews of the recent developments of meshfree methods can be found in Belytschko et al. (1996) and Babuska et al. (in press).
4. Results and discussion

4.1. Crack initiation—an observation

Fig. 7 presents a set of snapshots of the numerical simulation of the specimen shown in Fig. 2. The contours of the stress $\sigma_{22}$, which is normal to the crack propagation path, are displayed in the vicinity of the notch tip at different time steps. According to these figures, intersonic crack initiation may be divided into four stages:

1. Initial wave propagation (Fig. 7a and b): the impact of the projectile induces a dilatational wave that (dark blue color) sweeps transversely over the specimen with a distinct wave front. However, two kinds of shear wave impulses could also exist behind the dilatation wave front but they are overshadowed in these figures. They are the impact induced shear wave, which is behind the dilatation wave front with the distance $t(c_1 - c_s)$ where $t$ is time, and the reflect shear wave when the dilatation wave impulse hits the traction-free notch surface and bi-material interface.

2. After the dilation wave front has passed, a drop of $\sigma_{22}$ can be seen along the bonding layer ahead the notch tip (Fig. 7b and c), marked as the line segment with light color emanated from the notch tip. This drop is caused by the nucleation of a fracture process zone after the onset of material decohesion. Within this zone, the softening of the interface material results in the localized fluctuation of stresses.
3. Crack initiation (Fig. 7c and e): After a considerable fracture process zone formed, a significant stress drop occurs in a relatively large area near the notch end, characterized by an increasing stress noise radiation at both sides of the bonding layer, which can be interpreted as a crack initiation that creates nearly traction-free new surfaces. It is well-known that a crack induced by mode II loading is always accompanied by some mode I crack opening, which relaxes the impact induced compressive $\sigma_{22}$ and results in a shock-like contour of stress noise (red color).

4. Acceleration and steady-state propagation (Fig. 7e and f): the angle between stress shock front and bonding layer becomes smaller, implying that the crack growth is speeding up. In general this angle $\theta$ is related to the propagation speed $v$ through the relation (Weertman and Weertman, 1980):

$$\theta = \sin^{-1} \left( \frac{c_s}{v} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

when $v \geq c_s$.

Crack propagation can be considered as the accumulation of damage in the forms of micro-defects (such as voids or micro-cracks) nucleation, growth, and coalescence. This process is characterized by the fast softening stage defined in (4) and (5) of the constitutive model (see Figs. 3 and 4). When the dilatation wave front hit the notch tip, the resulting shear stress causes the softening of the bonding layer material and triggers spontaneous debonding along the weak path, which is reflected as the fracture process zone emanating from the notch tip, as shown in Fig. 7.

Fig. 8 shows a comparison with experimental observations (Rosakis et al., 1999). The simulation results in Fig. 8b show a strain ($\epsilon_{22}$) shock angle about 44° which is consistent with the experimental measurement (Fig. 8a). As depicted in Fig. 8c, the simulated crack propagation speed, calculated using (7), agrees with experiments.

4.2. Stress wave motion and decohesion

Fig. 9 illustrates an overview of the wave propagation mechanism for the specimen of Fig. 2. The stress distributions along the line AA' in Fig. 9a are displayed in Fig. 9b at three times, in which the dilatation wave propagation demonstrated in Fig. 7 is actually formed by a rectangular-like $\sigma_{11}$ impulse, plotted as the dashed line in Fig. 9b. The $\sigma_{11}$ impulse front, is accompanied simultaneously with the $\sigma_{22}$ and $\sigma_{12}$ components. Fig. 9b at time $t = 2.0e^{-5}$ shows the convex-shaped $\sigma_{12}$ and $\sigma_{22}$ impulses. This $\sigma_{12}$ impulse actually imposes a mode II load on the notch tip, which triggers the fracture process zone initiation and drives it to...
move forwards along the weak path. The amplitude of $\sigma_{11}$ impulse remains nearly constant while both the $\sigma_{22}$ and $\sigma_{12}$ decay earlier as new crack surfaces are formed. The trailing random stress impulses are the result of crack face contact and wave reflections.

The numerical results demonstrate that the combination of computation and analysis may provide insight for designing a dynamic fracture specimen. For the specimen shown in Fig. 1, to achieve a mode II-like loading along the weak path requires the maximum shear stress and minimum normal compressive stress $\sigma_{22}$, which causes contact, around the notch tip. Considering the dilatation wave front as the envelop of the dilatation waves radiated from the point sources along the contact surface between specimen and projectile, the maximum $\sigma_{12}$ is attained when the tangent of the envelop declines to the notch with the angle of $\pi/4$. This preliminary analysis estimates that the optimal $W_p$ in Fig. 2 should be the same as the length of the pre-manufactured notch.

4.3. Definition of the “fracture process zone”

A precise definition of the “fracture process zone” is crucial for interpreting the results of a numerical simulation in terms of quantitative analyses. According to the constitutive law defined in (4) and (5–5b), decohesion begins when the equivalent plastic strain reaches $\varepsilon_{\text{pl}}$, that characterizes the onset of material
bifurcation. This leads to an unambiguous definition (Fig. 10a): the fracture process zone starts where \( \bar{\varepsilon}_p = \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{bifur}}}{2} \) and ends where the stress drops to zero. The physical meaning of the end of a fracture process zone is obvious: when a material suffers enough deformation and thus is fully damaged, it loses the capacity to sustain stress; which results in cracking.

The computed equivalent stress and strain along the bonding layer are plotted in Fig. 10b, illustrating the fracture process zone measurement in this study. The mode II crack opening displacement (COD) is also plotted in this figure, where the COD is defined as the separation between upper and lower boundaries of the bonding layer. A time sequence of the computed equivalent stresses and strains along the bonding layer are displayed in Fig. 10c.

4.4. Contact mechanism and self-healing phenomenon

The numerical simulation demonstrates that contact between newly formed crack surfaces is inevitable during intersonic crack propagation in the specimen shown in Fig. 2 due to the material stretching perpendicular to impact direction. The contact mechanisms for such a dynamic crack growth can be explained through the four deformation regions that are illustrated in Fig. 11a–c. They are: (I) decohesion zone (fracture process zone), (II) opening, even under shear dominant loading, (III) crack closure leading to contact among the material elements within the bonding layer, (IV) contact between two matrices. Stage IV occurs only when the material in the bonding layer is fully damaged thus losing its capacity to sustain any load according to the constitutive law (4) and (5).

Fig. 12 presents snapshots of the contours of equivalent plastic strain, strain gradient, and shear strain within the bonding layer from a computation with \( \tilde{h} = 2l \), where the vertical scale has been significantly enlarged while the horizontal scale sustains. In this computation the upper half part of the specimen is hit by a projectile. The equivalent plastic strain and strain gradient are plotted on the undeformed configuration whereas the shear strain contours are plotted on the deformed configuration. The decohesion-induced plastic strain (the contours with red color) represents the crack opening profile that is actually composed of these fully damaged material elements, which are mainly concentrated in the upper half layer with a width close to the material intrinsic length \( l \). However, considerable plastic strain also exists in the rest of the layer. Ultimately, all material elements in the bonding layer are fully damaged in the contact zone IV.

The contact zone II introduced in Fig. 11 represents an opening dominated crack profile that forms even under shear loading. This zone was detected using the results shown in Fig. 13 where the \( \sigma_{12} \) and \( \sigma_{22} \)
are plotted along the bonding layer. Behind the convex peaks caused by impact induced impulse, both stresses nearly vanish until the contact zone III, which is characterized by the fluctuating stress distribution along the bonding layer. The stress shock presented in Fig. 7 is another result of the contact zone II.

Plotted in Fig. 14 are the COD\textsubscript{I} (mode I COD) and COD\textsubscript{II} (mode II COD) along the crack growing path at three time steps, normalized by \( h \), the bonding layer thickness. These diagrams show that COD\textsubscript{I} is negative, indicating that the crack faces are driven into contact. However, after a certain amount of crack growth the COD\textsubscript{I} stays at the constant value about \(-h\) while the increase of COD\textsubscript{II} is also slows (Fig. 14c), which hints that the contact between two matrices occurs and the relative sliding between them almost diminishes after the bonding layer material is fully damaged. This phenomenon is quite similar to the self-contact/healing process that has been frequently observed in seismic motion (Perrin et al., 1995; Ben-Zion, 2001).

Theoretically, COD is defined over an idealized crack that is a line without width. In the numerical simulations, it is measured over the gauge length \( h \), denoted by the superscript *, which is actually a
measurement of the average deformation over the bonding layer material. This average overshadows the tiny positive COD along the new crack surfaces.

In Fig. 15, the mode II separation is plotted with respect to a moving coordinate system with its origin fixed to the tip of the fracture process zone. Over the different time steps, an almost constant crack opening profile is present, indicating a nearly steady-state propagation.
4.5. The effects of length scales: a parameter study

Dual functions have been assigned to the material intrinsic length $l$ in the constitutive equations (4) and (5): governing the strain gradient induced hardening before material bifurcation and scaling the energy dissipation in post-bifurcation stage (see Figs. 3 and 4). Comparing Fig. 3 with Fig. 10 that illustrates the definition of fracture process zone, one can find that the intrinsic length $l$ actually scales the size of fracture process zone and the decohesion energy.

The crack tip in the specimen in Fig. 2 is governed by the elastic–plastic field within the bonding layer and the elastic field in the surrounding matrices. The material extrinsic length, the thickness $h$, determines the ratio of the influences from these two fields on the crack tip. The slip-field analysis in Hao et al. (1997) reveals that $h$ also determines the amplitude of the stress triaxiality in the bonding layer.

These functions of $l$, $h$ and their effects on intersonic growth are studied quantitatively in this subsection. According to dislocation theory (Weertman and Weertman, 1980) the decohesion energy within the fracture process zone can be calculated by:

![Fig. 14. A numerical example of mode I and II opening profiles during propagation, where $h$ is the thickness of the bonding layer; in (c) the I, II, III, IV refer to the contact zones illustrated in Fig. 11.](image)

![Fig. 15. The mode II crack opening profiles during propagation, plotted in a coordinate frame fixed to the moving crack tip.](image)
\[ G_R = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Delta a_C} D(X_1) \sigma_{12}(X_1) \, dX_1 \] (8)

where the coordinate \( X_1 \) is originated at the crack tip and \( \Delta a_C \) represents the length of fracture process zone; \( D(X_1) \) is related to the mode II separation by:

\[ D(X_1) = -2[u_{11}] \] (9)

Eq. (8) can also be derived by calculating the \( J \)-integral along a contour surrounding the fracture process zone along the lower and upper boundaries of the bonding layer.

Fig. 16 shows the evolution of decohesion energy \( G_R \) computed using (8) with crack length \( a \) and time \( t \), respectively, with varying \( l \). Two stages can be identified in both \( G_R(a) \) and \( G_R(t) \) curves: crack initiation-acceleration stage and steady-state propagation. Initially, \( G_R \) increases while the slopes \( \frac{dG_R}{da} \) and \( \frac{dG_R}{dt} \) decrease with increasing \( a \) and \( t \). Both \( G_R(a) \) and \( G_R(t) \) finally approach constant levels whereas the average value of \( \frac{dG_R}{da} \) or \( \frac{dG_R}{dt} \) approaches zero, implying a steady-state propagation. The amplitude of \( G_R \) is nearly linearly proportional to the material intrinsic length \( l \) in this stage.

Plotted in Fig. 17 are the fracture process zone sizes against time and crack length, respectively. They demonstrate a similar trend as those shown in Fig. 16. These numerical results demonstrate that at steady-state propagation stage, the fracture process zone size \( \Delta a_C \) attains a size that is linearly proportional to material intrinsic length, i.e.

\[ \Delta a_C = l \cdot F(\text{material constants}, h) \] (10)

where \( F \) is a function of material constants and extrinsic length \( h \). According to Fig. 3, \( l \) scales energy dissipation at softening stage. For a linear softening, \( l \) actually is the inverse of \( w \), the slope of the traction-separation law; thus

\[ \Delta a_C \propto \frac{F(\text{material constants}, h)}{w} \] (11)

(10) or (11) conforms the general conclusion that is obtained by the theoretical analysis of Uenishi and Rice (2003).
Presented in Figs. 18 and 19 are another set of simulations with fixed \( l \) but varying \( h \), demonstrating that smaller \( h \) also results in less energy dissipation and shorter fracture process zone. The slip-field analysis from Hao et al. (1997) indicates that a smaller ratio of \( h \) to the specimen thickness produces higher stress triaxiality and strain gradient within the bonding layer, which drives damage evolution and accelerates failure of the bonding layer material. Consequently, it accelerates decohesion and debonding. On the other hand, smaller \( h \) reduces the contribution of the elastic plastic stress–strain field in the bonding layer because there is less space left for such a kind of deformation. All of these make the bonding layer more “brittle”, represented by less energy dissipation and shorter fracture process zone size.

4.6. Crack propagation speed

4.6.1. Intersonic and supersonic propagation

We define the propagation speed of the leading edge of fracture process zone as the crack speed. Fig. 20a shows the variation in propagation speed with crack tip position from two computations with the same length scales (\( l = 0.02, h = 0.02 \)) but different strain rate hardening power \( m \), as defined in (5). Similar to
the results illustrated in Fig. 7, the propagation speed for both cases accelerates to the supersonic regime in a very short time when the fracture process zone bursts out from the notch tip. Then it falls back into the intersonic regime, followed by propagation at speeds fluctuating between \( c_l \) and \( c_s \), where \( c_0 \) is about \( \sqrt{2} \) for the case \( m = 0.01 \) and \( 1 \) for the case \( m = 0.1 \). The spacing of each oscillation is about 1.5–2 mm of crack growth. The average speeds, which can be determined as the average slope of the \( a(t) \) curve, lie in the region between \( \sqrt{2}c_s \) and \( c_l \) for both cases.

Fig. 20b and c show the corresponding stress shocks. For the case with a larger \( m \) (Fig. 20c), two stress shocks appear in the lower half of the specimen. The first arc-shaped stress shock characterizes supersonic-like propagation as it appears only when the propagation speed surpasses the dilatational wave speed. The second shock appears when propagation is faster than shear stress wave. This observation supports the results shown in Fig. 20a where the average propagation speed for this case is close to the dilatational wave speed and the upper bound of the propagation speed surpasses \( c_l \).

It should be emphasized that all the numerical simulations in the present work show that the fracture process zone, thus crack tip, is always behind the dilatational wave front, e.g. Fig. 7. However, a spontaneous failure along a thin bonding layer occurs after a dilatational wave front sweeps passed, which can
causes the crack front to jump ahead in an instant at faster than $c_l$. As crack propagation is a non-inertia motion (Freund, 1990), the fracture process zone and crack tip can never surpass the dilatational wave front if there is no previously imposed stress or strain on the weak path. Hence, a supersonic-like weak-path propagation can not be sustained. It will fall back to intersonic regime immediately, as demonstrated in Fig. 20a.

The results presented in Fig. 20 demonstrate that the strain rate hardening power $m$ has strong effects on intersonic crack propagation. A quantitative explanation is that higher strain rate sensitivity (higher $m$) results in less ductility for the bonding layer material because its yield strength will be elevated and the corresponding softening/damage evolution will be speeded up in the post-bifurcation stage. These results agree qualitatively with the analysis of single dislocation motion in Rosakis (2001).

4.6.2. The effect of remote boundary condition

The simulations with various projectile velocities ($V_p$) have been performed with other parameters held fixed. The relation between the average crack propagation speed and $V_p$ is plotted in Fig. 21a, which demonstrates a slight elevation of propagation speed when $V_p$ varies from 25 to 70 m/s. Plotted in Fig. 21b are the evolution of decohesion energy against time for the cases in Fig. 21a, from which one can distinguish that higher $V_p$ results in earlier crack initiation.

The diffraction solution of an impact induced stress wave around a crack tip (Achenbach, 1973) indicates that the amplitude of shear stress at the crack tip can be estimated by

$$\sigma_{12} \propto \sqrt{t} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{12}^{\max} \approx \frac{E \cdot V_p}{c_l}$$

Hence, at a given instant $t$, a higher impact speed $V_p$ causes higher stress. The sequence of crack propagation demonstrated in Fig. 21b hints that an intersonic crack initiates when the impact induced shear stress impulse reaches a certain threshold value at the crack tip. Taking the second equation of (12) as the driving force and $\tau_{Y_0}(=\frac{\sigma_{12}^{\max}}{\sqrt{3}})$, the shear yield strength of bonding layer, as the resistance, we define a parameter $R_s$, the ratio of this driving force and resistance:

$$R_s = \frac{\sigma_{12}^{\max}}{\tau_{Y_0}} = \frac{E \cdot V_p c_i^{-1}}{\tau_{Y_0}}$$

(13)

to characterize intersonic crack growth. When $R_s$ is greater than $R_s^c$, the threshold of $R_s$, intersonic propagation will occur; otherwise, the imposed stress impulse is not strong enough to trigger “spontaneous” debonding along a weak path, and a crack will grow at subsonic speeds. In the cohesive element analysis of Needleman (1999), the bonding strength is taken as a control parameter and a transition from

![Fig. 21. The effects of strain rate hardening and impact velocity on propagation velocities. (a) The average propagation speed vs. impact velocity. (b) The decohesion energy vs. time for the cases in (a). (c) Nominal crack speed vs. $R_s$ defined in (13).](image-url)
subsonic to intersonic propagation has been observed when the bonding strength is decreasing. By combining the numerical results in Needleman (1999) with the present work, Fig. 21c presents the relationship between propagation speeds and $R_s$. This figure shows that the threshold $R_s^{cr}$ is around one.

4.6.3. Comparison with theoretical analysis

A further question is how fast can a crack grow when $R_s > R_s^{cr}$?

Based on the Weertman's moving dislocation solution (Weertman, 1969; Weertman and Weertman, 1980) and Rice–Thomson’s dislocation emission model (Rice and Thomson, 1974), a generalized Bilby–Conttrel–Swinden–Dugdale model (Bilby et al., 1963) has been proposed in Hao et al. (in press) (see Fig. 22). In this work, the solutions of steady-state weak-path intersonic crack growth with three classes of cohesive laws have been obtained. In this model the remote boundary condition has been represented as equivalent traction acting on the crack surface, which is expressed as the summation of a constant remote imposed stress $\tau_{d,\text{remote}}$ and a non-constant term $\tau_{d,\text{remote}} D(x)$. The latter can be a remote, imposed stress rate or non-uniform, distributed, remote stress. In this product, the $D(x)$ is given by (9) and $\tau_{d,\text{remote}}$ is proportional to $R_s$:

$$\tau_{d,\text{remote}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } v \leq c_s \\ EQ \left( \frac{R_s}{R_s^{cr}} - 1 \right) & \text{for } v > c_s \end{cases}$$

where $Q$ is a function of the specimen geometry which can be calculated through an energy balance.

According the solutions in Hao et al. (in press) the relationships between propagation speed and $\tau_{d,\text{remote}}$ are plotted in Fig. 23a for different $h/l$. In this figure each curve includes two parts separated by the saddle point defined by $\kappa_s c_s$, where $\sqrt{2} < \kappa_s \leq c_1/c_s$. In the interval $c_s < v < \kappa_s c_s$, crack growth is unstable as the propagation speed will be increasing while $\tau_{d,\text{remote}}$ decreases. The interval $\kappa_s c_s \leq v < c_1$ represents a stable propagation regime, in which crack acceleration requires increasing $\tau_{d,\text{remote}}$. The coefficient $\kappa_s$ is a function of the material intrinsic and extrinsic lengths, strain rate hardening parameters, and remote boundary condition represented by $\tau_{d,\text{remote}}$. A comparison between numerical computation and theoretical prediction is given in Fig. 23b. The difference in the results is due to the slight difference in boundary condition between two approaches.

![Fig. 22. Dislocation accumulation-induced intersonic crack growth model (Hao et al., in press); (a) lattices before crack growth; (b) dislocation emission (Rice and Thomson, 1974); (c) smeared-out moving dislocation (Weertman’s solution, 1969); (d) dislocations accumulation-induced steady-state intersonic crack growth with fracture process zone.](image-url)
4.7. Sudden deceleration of intersonic crack growth

Two issues are discussed in this subsection: the condition that causes sudden deceleration and the corresponding wave propagation mechanism.

Fig. 24 is a set of the snapshots of strain shocks during a deceleration process, where the white arrow indicates the position of the crack tip in each figure. It demonstrates that before deceleration the crack grows with an intersonic speed, accompanied by a strain shock radiated from the crack tip (Fig. 24a). According to the angle between the strain shock and fracture path, the average propagation speed is about $1.46c_s$. This crack tip shock radiation ceases in Fig. 24b while the existing strain shocks continuously spread out and march forwards passing the moving crack tip (Fig. 24c and d), which implies that the crack propagation has already decelerated to sub-Rayleigh regime.

Fig. 9b indicates that after the projectile impacts the specimen edge, a $\sigma_{11}$ impulse travels with the dilatational wave speed transversely through the specimen. The shear stress component caused by this dilatational stress impulse triggers the mode II crack initiation and drives it at intersonic speeds when $R_s$ (13) is greater than its threshold $R_s^{cr}$. Since the average crack propagation speed is always slower than dilatational speed, after the dilatational stress impulse passes the crack tip, $R_s$ drops below $R_s^{cr}$ immediately, so the crack loses its driving force and its propagation speed decreases.
Fig. 24 also demonstrates that after crack deceleration, the strain shocks radiated out before deceleration continue to move forward with a constant angle. Several strain shocks appear and one follows another, reflecting the fluctuating propagation speed shown in Fig. 20a. In Fig. 24 the white dash lines indicate the extension of the strain shock fronts. The intersections between these white dash lines and the weak path indicate the position of crack tip if there were no deceleration. It should also be noticed that the strain shocks, which were straight lines before the crack decelerates, become curved bending toward the crack tip. If we consider a moving crack tip as a source which radiates both dilatation and shear waves, the shocks demonstrated in Fig. 24 are actually the envelopes of the shear waves radiated from the crack tip at each instance. When the crack propagation speed decelerates from intersonic regime to subsonic regime, this envelop will degenerate to a curve, as depicted in Fig. 25. It implies that the intersonic steady-state crack tip stress–strain field radiates out from the position where deceleration occurs with a shear wave speed. This phenomenon is similar to the theoretical prediction in Freund’s subsonic non-uniform crack motion solution (Freund, 1972) where the equilibrium solution immediately radiates out from the crack tip at a speed less than dilatation wave speed when a sub-Rayleigh crack propagation is suddenly stopped.

5. Conclusions

Intersonic crack growth has been investigated based on the dynamic fracture test conducted by Rosakis and his co-authors (Rosakis et al., 1999). A three-phase interfacial fracture model is proposed for numerical simulations, in which an additional material phase is introduced to reproduce the mechanical behavior of the interface. Numerical simulations have been performed with varying load, material intrinsic and extrinsic length, strain rate hardening exponents. The results and conclusions are summarized as follows:

1. The numerical simulations demonstrate that the crack propagation speed exhibits oscillations ranging from intersonic to supersonic speeds. The upper bound of this oscillation is around the dilatational wave speed whereas the lower bound is around the shear wave speed to $\sqrt{2}$ times shear wave speed, depending
on the material intrinsic length, bonding layer thickness, strain rate sensitivity, and loading conditions. The steady-state propagation speed is the average of these upper and lower limits which lies between $c_s \kappa_v$ and dilatation wave speed, where $\sqrt{2} \leq \kappa_v < c_l/c_s$. Both the numerical solution and the theoretical solution, derived from the generalized Bilby–Cottrell–Swinden–Dugdale model (Hao et al., in press), indicate that the coefficient $\kappa_v$ is a function of the material intrinsic and extrinsic lengths, strain rate hardening parameters, and remote boundary conditions.

2. The parameter $R_s$, defined as the ratio between remote impact velocity and material shear strength:

$$R_s = \frac{E \cdot V_p}{\tau_0 c_l}$$

is proposed to characterize crack propagation speed. An estimated threshold of $R_s$ defining the boundary between subsonic and intersonic propagation is about unity. When $R_s$ is smaller than its threshold, a crack grows with sub-Rayleigh speed; otherwise, it grows with an intersonic speed.

3. Stress shocks, characterized by both the intersonic and supersonic speeds, have been captured in the numerical simulations for the case where the average crack propagation speed is close to $c_l$.

4. Two types of contact exist, contact within fracture process zone and contact between the crack wedges behind moving crack tip. In the present simulation the former is taken into account by the constitutive modeling of the interface material phase; the latter is simulated by additional numerical contact algorithm. The contact behind crack tip can cause additional strain shocks. A “self-healing” mechanism, crack surfaces sticking together, has been captured in the simulation. Both material intrinsic and extrinsic lengths have strong effects on the contact behavior.

5. The dual functions of material intrinsic length are presented in the simulations: governing the strain gradient induced hardening before material bifurcation and scaling the dissipated energy after bifurcation. A nearly linear relationship between fracture process zone size and material intrinsic length has been found during steady-state propagation.

6. The material extrinsic length, defined as the bonding layer thickness, determines the ratio of the effects from the elastic–plastic crack tip field inside a bonding layer and the elastic field in the surrounding matrices. It has a strong effect on the contact/self-healing behind moving crack tip.

7. Crack deceleration from intersonic to subsonic speeds has been also captured in the numerical simulations. Crack deceleration occurs after an impact induced dilatational stress impulse passes the crack tip which moves at intersonic speeds. The intersonic stress–strain field, which is characterized by shear stress shock radiation, continuously spreads out at the shear wave speed from the site where deceleration occurs. This observation is similar to the Freund’s subsonic non-uniform crack motion solution subjected to general load (Freund, 1972).
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