

Technical Comments

Comment on "Experimental Verification of St. Venant's Principle in a Sandwich Beam"

CHINTAKINDI L. AMBA-RAO*

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.

THE last paragraph of author's Note¹ motivated the discussor to make some specific comments on the subject, with particular reference to photoelastic model analysis of multiply connected nonhomogeneous bodies and Araldite resins. It is hoped that the comments may be beneficial to the author in planning his future experimental work, which indeed will be very interesting and useful.

The U.S. designation of Araldite D (epoxy resin) is Araldite 502 and is a cold setting resin when used with hardener 951. The discussor is one of the earliest to advocate the use of Araldite 502 in photoelastic investigations² in view of its unique properties such as absence of prominent creep and rind effect, cold setting, the resin can be cast on metallic components (no shrinkage or temperature stresses), valuable in nonhomogeneous structures, powerful adhesive action, etc. In recent years a large number of prominent photoelasticians used Araldite 502 as model material for special projects.

The Young's modulus of the resin² prepared with 10% hardener 951 is 3.75×10^5 psi while the addition of plasticizers such as cyclohexanol, dibutyl phthalate, and others can substantially decrease the value of Young's modulus³ of the cured resin to a value of about 500 psi and thus make the core material photoelastically sensitive.

The second part of the comment deals with multiply connected bodies loaded by concentrated forces which do not reduce to a zero resultant force or a couple on any boundary. If the concentrated load in Fig. 1 of Ref. 1 is applied at B, the stress field in the sandwich beam is a function of Poisson's ratios of the core and face materials. In multiply connected homogeneous bodies, the stress distribution as predicted by photoelastic techniques, is generally slightly different from that in the prototype,⁴ and Bickley⁵ estimates the order of magnitude as 7%. In multiply connected nonhomogeneous bodies such as sandwich beams, the Poisson's ratios of face and core material, respectively, in case 1 of Ref. 1 may be assumed to be of the order of 0.49 and 0.3, and the error estimates in such situations are not clearly defined, as far as photoelastic analysis goes. Therefore caution should be exercised in interpreting the results of photoelastic model experiments to duplicate nonhomogeneous multiply connected bodies. It may be interesting to extend the work to the case where the load point B is located in the bottom surface of the beam, but still statically equivalent to load system A; or a dislocation may be introduced at the present load point B so as to annihilate the dependence of the stresses on Poisson's ratios. In either case, the sandwich beam is a simply connected nonhomogeneous elastic plane body; and the problem can be handled by using conventional photoelastic techniques.

References

- ¹ Alwar, R. S., "Experimental Verification of St. Venant's Principle in a Sandwich Beam," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Jan. 1970, pp. 160-162.

Received February 13, 1970.

* Associate Professor. Member AIAA.

- ² Amba-Rao, C. L., "The Suitability of Araldite D Resin in Photoelastic Investigations," *British Journal of Applied Physics*, Vol. 7, No. 6, June 1956, p. 229.

- ³ Dally, J. W., Durelli, A. J., and Riley, W. F., "A New Method to 'Lock-in' Elastic Effects for Experimental Stress Analysis," *Journal of Applied Mechanics*, Vol. 25, No. 2, June 1958, pp. 189-195.

- ⁴ Frocht, M. M., *Photoelasticity Vol. II*, Wiley, New York, 1948, pp. 168-193.

- ⁵ Bickley, W. G., "The Distribution of Stress Round a Circular Hole in a Plate," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 227, 1928, pp. 383-415.

Reply by Author to C. L. Amba-Rao

R. S. ALWAR*

Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, India

THE author is thankful to Amba-Rao for suggesting some materials that can be used for the core.

It is true that in multiply connected bodies with nonzero stress resultants, the stress distribution is dependent on Poisson's ratio, and one has to be careful in extrapolating the results to a prototype with entirely different materials. The object of the last paragraph in my paper is to indicate that the $E_{\text{face}}/E_{\text{core}}$ values considered in the experiments are not far from the values which occur in practice.

Received March 31, 1970.

* Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Mechanics.

Comment on "Generalized Stiffness Matrix of a Curved-Beam Element"

ROBERT P. McBEAN*

University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

AND

S. DONALD SCHABERG†

*Burns and McDonnell Engineering Company,
Kansas City, Mo.*

ALTHOUGH the author has clearly developed the stiffness matrix for a curved beam element,¹ the existence of three previous papers on the subject should be noted. In 1965 Tezcan and Ovunc² presented the stiffness matrix relative to the radial, tangential, and transverse axes of a curved member arbitrarily oriented in space, as well as the special cases of plane frame and grid members. This work was reproduced

Received December 1, 1969.

* Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering. Member AIAA.

† Structural Engineer.