



**THE MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF
NOVEL LIGHTWEIGHT STRUCTURES
BASED ON CORRUGATED-CORES**

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirement of the
University *of* Liverpool for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

By
Mohd Ruzaimi Mat Rejab
October 2013

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

1. M.R.M.Rejab, W.J.Cantwell. Compression behaviour of Aluminium corrugated-core panels, 1st Annual UK-Malaysia-Ireland Engineering Science Conference 2010 (UMIES 2010), Northern Ireland, UK. June 2010.
2. M.R.M.Rejab, W.J.Cantwell. Mechanical behaviour of corrugated-core sandwich panels under compression, 32nd SAMPE EUROPE International Conference 2011 (SEICO 11), Paris, France, March 2011.
3. M.R.M.Rejab, W.J.Cantwell. Fracture modes in compression-loaded corrugated-core sandwich panels, 11th Annual Composites UK Conference, Manchester, UK, May 2011.
4. M.R.M.Rejab, M.M.Issa, W.J.Cantwell. Novel lightweight composites cores for aerospace applications, 33rd SAMPE EUROPE International Conference 2012 (SEICO 12), Paris, France, March 2012.
5. M.R.M.Rejab, W.J.Cantwell. The mechanical behaviour of corrugated-core sandwich panels. *Composites Part B: Engineering*. 2013;47:267-277.
6. M.R.M.Rejab, K.Ushijima, W.J.Cantwell. The shear response of lightweight corrugated core structures. *Journal of Composite Materials*. 2013; 0(0): 1-14.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research work is to investigate the mechanical properties of corrugated-core sandwich structures under quasi-static and dynamic loading conditions and to determine the failure mechanisms and energy-absorbing characteristics of the corrugated-cores with different cell wall thickness and filled with a foam core.

Triangular corrugation structures were made from an aluminium alloy (AL), a glass fibre reinforced plastic (GFRP) and a carbon fibre reinforced plastic (CFRP). The composite corrugations were fabricated using a hot press moulding technique and then adhesively bonded to skins based on the same material, to produce a range of lightweight sandwich structures. The role of the number of unit cells, the thickness of the cell walls and the width in determining the mechanical behaviour of the structures was investigated. Buckling of the struts was identified as the initial failure mode in these corrugated systems. Continued loading resulted in plastic deformation in the aluminium system, in contrast, fibre fracture, matrix cracking and localised delamination in the composite systems, as well as debonding between the skins and the core were observed in the composites. The compression strength and modulus were shown to be dependent on the number of unit cells and the cell wall thickness, but independent of specimen width. Subsequent mechanical testing was undertaken using an Arcan rig capable of generating a range of loading conditions between pure shear and pure compression. The failure strength in the aluminium system was accurately represented using a two dimensional quadratic failure criterion. In contrast, due to the initiation of delamination within the composite struts, the composite corrugated-cores were accurately predicted using a modified failure criterion.

Low velocity compression loading was subsequently performed on the sandwich structures, where the dynamic strength enhancement factor was shown to increase for all the corrugation systems. This was attributed to both a material strain-rate sensitivity and inertial stabilisation effects. The failure mechanisms in the sandwich structures were found to be similar under both quasi-static and dynamic loading conditions, where damage initiated due to buckling of the struts. To simulate the mechanical response of the corrugation systems, FE models have been developed using the Abaqus finite element package. The FE results were compared to measured responses, and good agreement was achieved. The failure modes predicted by the FE models show reasonably good agreement with the experimental observations.

Finally, foam filling the composite corrugation systems significantly improved the specific strength as well as specific energy-absorbing characteristics of the structures. The compression properties of the corrugated structures have been compared to those of other core materials, where the evidence suggests that these systems compare favourably with other cellular core materials.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | ii |
| LIST OF PUBLICATIONS | iii |
| ABSTRACT | iv |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | v |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xi |
| LIST OF TABLES | xxvi |

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.1 Overview | 2 |
| 1.2 Application of Corrugated-core Sandwich Structures | 5 |
| 1.2.1 Packaging Applications | 5 |
| 1.2.2 Marine Applications | 5 |
| 1.2.3 Transport Applications | 6 |
| 1.2.4 Aerospace Applications | 7 |
| 1.3 Motivation of the Research Work | 7 |
| 1.4 Project Aim and Objectives | 8 |
| 1.5 Thesis Outline | 9 |
| 1.6 References | 10 |

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.1 Introduction | 12 |
| 2.2 Design and Manufacture of Sandwich Cores | 12 |
| 2.2.1 Cellular Foams | 13 |
| 2.2.2 Two-dimensional Periodic Cores | 14 |
| 2.2.3 Three-dimensional Periodic Cores | 15 |
| 2.2.4 Multifunctional Cellular Materials | 18 |
| 2.3 Corrugated-core Sandwich Structures | 19 |
| 2.3.1 Curvilinear Corrugated-core | 19 |
| 2.3.2 Straight Corrugated-core | 20 |
| 2.3.3 Hat-type Corrugated-core | 21 |
| 2.3.4 Triangular Corrugated-core | 22 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.4 Mechanical Performance of Corrugated-core Sandwich Structures | 24 |
| 2.4.1 Mechanical Response under Static Compression Test | 24 |
| 2.4.2 Mechanical Response under Static Shear Test | 30 |
| 2.4.3 Mechanical Response under Combined Loading | 32 |
| 2.4.3.1 Cylindrical Combined Loading | 33 |
| 2.4.3.2 Combined Shear-Compression Loading | 34 |
| 2.4.3.3 Bi-axial Arcan Test | 36 |
| 2.4.3.4 Bi-axial Failure Envelopes | 39 |
| 2.4.4 Mechanical Response under Dynamic Loading | 40 |
| 2.4.4.1 Classification of Impact Response | 40 |
| 2.4.4.2 Dynamic Effects | 42 |
| 2.4.4.3 Dynamic Compression of Corrugated-core Sandwich Structure | 43 |
| 2.4.4.4 Instrumented Dynamic Compression Test | 46 |
| 2.5 Modelling of Sandwich Structures | 47 |
| 2.5.1 Background of Finite Element Method | 47 |
| 2.5.2 Modelling of Corrugated-core Sandwich Structures | 48 |
| 2.5.3 Imperfections | 52 |
| 2.6 Summary of Chapter II | 54 |
| 2.7 References | 57 |

CHAPTER III: EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.1 Introduction | 67 |
| 3.2 Design and Fabrication of Corrugated-core | 67 |
| 3.2.1 Aluminium Alloy | 71 |
| 3.2.2 Glass Fibre Reinforced Plastic | 71 |
| 3.2.3 Carbon Fibre Reinforced Plastic | 72 |
| 3.3 Specimen Preparation | 72 |
| 3.4 Mechanical Properties of Materials | 77 |
| 3.4.1 Tensile Test on the Aluminium Alloy | 76 |
| 3.4.2 Tensile Tests on the Composites | 77 |
| 3.4.3 In-plane Shear Test on Composites | 79 |
| 3.4.4 Compression Tests on the Rigid PU Foam | 80 |
| 3.5 Static Compression Testing | 81 |
| 3.6 Arcan Test | 85 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.7 Low Velocity Impact Test | 90 |
| 3.8 Failure Mechanisms and Damage Characterisation | 93 |
| 3.9 Summary of Chapter III | 94 |
| 3.10 References | 95 |

CHAPTER IV: EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4.1 Introduction | 97 |
| 4.2 Mechanical Properties of Materials | 97 |
| 4.2.1 Tensile Tests on the Aluminium Alloy | 97 |
| 4.2.2 Tensile Tests on the Composites | 100 |
| 4.2.3 In-plane Shear Tests on the Composites | 103 |
| 4.2.4 Relative Density | 104 |
| 4.2.5 Compression Tests on the Rigid Polyurethane Foam | 105 |
| 4.3 Static Compression Test | 106 |
| 4.3.1 Model of the Compressive Response of the Corrugated-core Sandwich Structures | 106 |
| 4.3.2 The Compression Behaviour of the Aluminium Corrugated-Core Sandwich Structures | 110 |
| 4.3.3 The Compression Behaviour of the GFRP Corrugated-Core Sandwich Structures | 112 |
| 4.3.4 The Compression Behaviour of the CFRP Corrugated-Core Sandwich Structures | 116 |
| 4.3.5 The Influence of Crosshead Displacement Rates | 119 |
| 4.4 Arcan Tests | 123 |
| 4.4.1 Model of Compressive-Shear Response of the Corrugated-core Structure | 124 |
| 4.4.2 Pre-calibration of the Arcan Test Rig | 126 |
| 4.4.3 Arcan Tests on the Aluminium Corrugated-core Structure | 128 |
| 4.4.4 Arcan Tests on the GFRP Corrugated-core Structure | 130 |
| 4.4.5 Arcan Tests on the CFRP Corrugated-core Structure | 131 |
| 4.5 Low Velocity Impact Tests | 135 |
| 4.5.1 Impact Test | 135 |
| 4.5.2 Impact Response at Low Energies | 136 |
| 4.5.3 Impact Responses beyond Threshold Energy to Break the Specimens | 139 |

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| 4.6 Summary of Chapter IV | 145 |
| 4.7 References | 146 |

CHAPTER V: FINITE ELEMENT MODELLING

| | |
|--|-----|
| 5.1 Introduction | 148 |
| 5.2 Constitutive Models for the Aluminium Alloy | 148 |
| 5.2.1 Elasticity | 149 |
| 5.2.2 Yielding | 150 |
| 5.2.3 Plasticity | 150 |
| 5.2.4 Failure Criteria | 151 |
| 5.2.4.1 Damage for Ductile Metals | 151 |
| 5.2.4.2 Failure in Ductile Metals | 152 |
| 5.3 Constitutive Models for the Composites | 153 |
| 5.3.1 Elasticity | 153 |
| 5.3.2 Damage Development Model for the Fibre-Reinforced Composites | 155 |
| 5.4 Static Finite Element Modelling | 158 |
| 5.4.1 Modelling of Compression Corrugated-core Sandwich Structure | 158 |
| 5.4.1.1 Selection of Parts and Elements | 158 |
| 5.4.1.2 Loading and Boundary Conditions | 159 |
| 5.4.1.3 Interaction Properties | 160 |
| 5.4.1.4 Mesh Generation and Control | 161 |
| 5.4.1.5 Modelling Data Output | 161 |
| 5.4.1.6 Model Sensitivity | 162 |
| 5.4.1.7 Results from the Numerical Analysis | 168 |
| 5.4.2 Modelling of Compression Rigid Foam Core | 177 |
| 5.4.2.1 Geometry and Element | 177 |
| 5.4.2.2 Interaction Property, Boundary and Loading Conditions | 178 |
| 5.4.2.3 Material Model and Input Data | 178 |
| 5.4.2.4 Modelling Data Output | 181 |
| 5.4.2.5 Results from the Numerical Analysis | 181 |
| 5.4.3 Modelling of Bi-axial Loading of Corrugated-core Structure | 184 |
| 5.4.3.1 Geometry and Element | 184 |
| 5.4.3.2 Interaction Property, Boundary and Loading Conditions | 185 |
| 5.4.3.3 Material Model and Input Data | 185 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 5.4.3.4 Modelling Data Output | 186 |
| 5.4.3.5 Results from the Numerical Analysis | 186 |
| 5.4.4 Modelling the Compression Response of the Corrugated Foam-filled Core Structure | 189 |
| 5.4.4.1 Geometry and Element | 189 |
| 5.4.4.2 Step, Interaction Property, Boundary and Loading Conditions | 191 |
| 5.4.4.3 Material Model and Input Data | 192 |
| 5.4.4.4 Modelling Data Output | 193 |
| 5.4.4.5 Results from the Numerical Analysis | 193 |
| 5.5 Dynamic Finite Element Modelling | 199 |
| 5.5.1 Model Geometry and Element | 199 |
| 5.5.2 Interaction Property, Boundary and Loading Conditions | 199 |
| 5.5.3 Material Model and Input Data | 200 |
| 5.5.4 Modelling Data Output | 201 |
| 5.5.5 Results from the Numerical Analysis | 201 |
| 5.6 Summary of Chapter V | 205 |
| 5.7 References | 208 |
| | |
| CHAPTER VI: DISCUSSION | |
| 6.1 Introduction | 211 |
| 6.2 The Effect of Varying the Number of Unit Cells | 211 |
| 6.3 The Effect of Varying the Cell Wall Thickness | 213 |
| 6.4 The Effect of Varying Specimen Width | 216 |
| 6.5 The Effect of Foam-filled Core | 219 |
| 6.6 The Effect of Strain-Rate | 223 |
| 6.7 The Effect of Mixed-mode Loading on the Failure Strength | 227 |
| 6.8 Investigation of the Damage Mechanisms in the Corrugated-core Sandwich Structures | 233 |
| 6.9 Triangular Corrugated-cores and the Competing Core Structures | 241 |
| 6.10 Summary of Chapter VI | 246 |
| 6.11 References | 247 |

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSIONS

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| 7.1 Introduction | 250 |
| 7.2 Conclusions of the Research Work | 250 |
| 7.3 Recommendations for Future Work | 253 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Appendix A Technical Drawing: Corrugation Moulds | 256 |
| Appendix B A FORTRAN program for Compliance Correction Procedure | 259 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| Figure 1.1 | (a) An Airbus A380 airliner [1], and (b) distribution of composite materials and locations on the A380 [2]. | 3 |
| Figure 1.2 | VeSCo concept [3]. | 5 |
| Figure 1.3 | LASCO metallic sandwich panel [5]. | 6 |
| Figure 1.4 | Car body structure of the Shinkansen 700 series. Double-skin corrugated-core has been adopted for the roof and the side structure of the train [6]. | 7 |
| Figure 1.5 | A material property chart comparing the compression strength as a function of density, with various engineering materials and core designs [8]. | 8 |
| Figure 2.1 | Classification of cellular materials. Cellular materials are divided into stochastic and periodic microstructures [5]. | 13 |
| Figure 2.2 | Examples of (a) Polyurethane foam with a closed-cell core [13] and (b) Aluminium metal foam with an open-cell core [14]. | 14 |
| Figure 2.3 | (a) Sketch of method of square-honeycomb core assembly [16] and (b) photograph of composite square-honeycomb core [17]. | 15 |
| Figure 2.4 | (a) Manufacturing route for composite trapezium-core and (b) 70° inclined angle of carbon fibre corrugation [19]. | 15 |
| Figure 2.5 | Manufacturing route for truss core [22]. | 16 |
| Figure 2.6 | (a) A set of micro-lattice blocks and (b) the definition of lattice block for body centred cubic (BCC) [25]. | 16 |
| Figure 2.7 | Egg-box core structures: (a) metal [26] and (b) composite [28]. | 17 |
| Figure 2.8 | A carbon fibre folded core with a zigzag geometry [32]. | 18 |
| Figure 2.9 | Typical applications of cellular materials in automotive industry [34]. | 18 |
| Figure 2.10 | Traditional corrugated-core sandwich panels [35]. | 19 |
| Figure 2.11 | (a) Carbon fibre corrugated-core structure and (b) geometry of flexible core for candidate material of morphing wing [47]. | 20 |
| Figure 2.12 | (a) Free-body diagram of the corrugated-core and (b) shear modulus as function of corrugation angle [20]. | 21 |
| Figure 2.13 | (a) Monolithic corrugated-core (1 st order) and | |

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| | (b) hierarchical corrugated-core (2 nd order) [58]. | 22 |
| Figure 2.14 | Sketch of the procedure used to assemble a dry corrugated-core [66]. | 23 |
| Figure 2.15 | Deformation images of the $\rho^* = 0.05$ corrugated-core in out-of-plane compression [61]. | 25 |
| Figure 2.16 | A comparison of the experimental and predicted values of out-of-plane compressive strength of stainless steel corrugated-core panels [61]. | 25 |
| Figure 2.17 | Compression response of a single unit cell of (a) 70° and (b) 45° monolithic corrugations. The peak load at angle of 70° ($P^{70^\circ} \approx 1.05$ kN) is greater than the peak load at angle of 45° ($P^{45^\circ} \approx 0.90$ kN). Note dashed line show analytical predictions [19]. | 27 |
| Figure 2.18 | Photographs showing the failure modes of a (a) monolithic corrugated-core (1 st order) and (b) hierarchical corrugated-core (2 nd order) [58]. | 27 |
| Figure 2.19 | Compression response of a single unit cell of (a) 70° and (b) 45° hierarchical corrugations. Note that dashed line show analytical predictions [19]. | 28 |
| Figure 2.20 | Compressive strength measurements and predictions for corrugated composite core as a function of relative density; (a) unfilled core and (b) foam-filled core [67]. | 29 |
| Figure 2.21 | Shear load-displacement curve in MD direction [46]. | 30 |
| Figure 2.22 | Deformation images of the $\rho^* = 0.05$ corrugated-core in transverse shear [61]. | 31 |
| Figure 2.23 | A comparison of the experimental and predicted values of transverse shear strength of stainless steel corrugated-core panels [61]. | 31 |
| Figure 2.24 | Shear response of a single unit cell of (a) 70° and (b) 45° monolithic corrugations. The peak shear load at angle of 45° ($P^{45^\circ} \approx 5.1$ kN) is greater than the peak shear load at angle of 70° ($P^{70^\circ} \approx 2.2$ kN). Note that dashed line show analytical predictions [19]. | 32 |
| Figure 2.25 | (a) Coordinate systems and loading of a corrugated cylinder. Failure envelopes for the corrugated cylinder; (b) the axial compression and torsion quadrant and (c) the torsion and | |

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| | external pressure quadrant [74]. | 33 |
| Figure 2.26 | Schematic data acquisition [76]. | 34 |
| Figure 2.27 | Stresses at failure of folded core material under shear and compression loading [76]. | 35 |
| Figure 2.28 | Failure curves of the aluminium honeycomb core [77]. | 36 |
| Figure 2.29 | Strength-to-failure criterion for honeycomb cores; (a) $\rho = 64 \text{ kg/m}^3$ and (b) $\rho = 128 \text{ kg/m}^3$. Note that the dashed lines correspond to the linear failure criterion [78]. | 37 |
| Figure 2.30 | Localisation of deformation in an aluminium honeycomb specimen under combined normal and shear loading in the T - W plane [82]. | 37 |
| Figure 2.31 | Mounting conditions between the uniaxial testing machine and the Arcan grips for the (a) standard and (b) clamped configuration [80]. | 38 |
| Figure 2.32 | Solution methods for different categories of impact. Note that M is mass of impactor, m_p is mass of specimen and (M/m_p) is impactor mass ratio [90]. | 41 |
| Figure 2.33 | High speed video images of the deformation at a striker velocity of 10 m/s [62]. | 43 |
| Figure 2.34 | Bi-linear relationship of the measured peak stresses in the filled and unfilled corrugated-core specimens as a function of impact velocity and applied nominal strain-rate [66]. | 44 |
| Figure 2.35 | Range of failure mechanisms at different velocities and for different core member aspect ratios. Note that the number displayed in the small box is a buckle mode shape [57]. | 45 |
| Figure 2.36 | (a) A free-fall instrumented drop-weight tower [98] and (b) an instrumented direct impact Kolsky bar set up [99]. | 47 |
| Figure 2.37 | (a) A comparison between the observed and FE predictions of the quasi-static deformation mode of the corrugated-core specimens and (b) FE predictions of the dynamic strength enhancement with and without material strain-rate sensitivity [62]. | 49 |
| Figure 2.38 | Deformed configuration of the empty and fully-filled sandwich plates at $\delta_{punch} / L = 0.25$. Note that the polymeric foam components are not shown and v_s is volume fraction of steel [101]. | 51 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| Figure 2.39 | (a) A load-displacement curves of measured and numerical prediction of V-type core sandwich panel (b) a V-type core panel made from mild steel [103]. | 53 |
| Figure 3.1 | Drawing of corrugated mould design. | 67 |
| Figure 3.2 | Assembly drawing and photograph of the corrugated mould. | 68 |
| Figure 3.3 | The apex of the triangular unit in the mould. | 69 |
| Figure 3.4 | A roll of composite prepreg in the as-received condition before cutting to size of 200 mm by 150 mm. | 69 |
| Figure 3.5 | Curing profile for (a) GFRP and (b) CFRP prepregs. | 70 |
| Figure 3.6 | Photograph of the Meyer hot press machine. | 71 |
| Figure 3.7 | Photograph of specimens following removal from the mould. | 72 |
| Figure 3.8 | (a) Schematic of the stacking orientations of the woven composite and (b) cutting the cured specimen into (i) $\pm 45^\circ$ and (ii) $0^\circ/90^\circ$ layers. | 73 |
| Figure 3.9 | Five identical unit cells of an AL corrugated-core sandwich structure. | 74 |
| Figure 3.10 | The geometry of unit cell of the corrugated-core sandwich structure. | 75 |
| Figure 3.11 | Photographs of the five different number of unit cells in the AL sandwich specimens. | 75 |
| Figure 3.12 | Carbon fibre corrugated-core sandwich panels (a) without foam, (b) semi-filled foam and (c) fully filled with foam. | 76 |
| Figure 3.13 | (a) Free-rise in the rigid PU foam and (b) a cube-shaped foam block on the weight scale. | 76 |
| Figure 3.14 | Tensile test geometry of the metal specimen. | 77 |
| Figure 3.15 | Tensile test geometry for a composite specimen. | 78 |
| Figure 3.16 | Composite specimens for tensile and in-plane shear tests. | 78 |
| Figure 3.17 | (a) Tensile test set-up and (b) the configuration of the five target and tracking points in the longitudinal and transverse directions. The middle target point is the reference point. | 79 |
| Figure 3.18 | Photo of an in-plane shear test on a composite specimen. | 80 |
| Figure 3.19 | The rigid PU foam under compression loading. | 80 |
| Figure 3.20 | (a) Photograph of the compression test set-up and the displacement measurement system, (b) front view of the specimen test set-up, (c) schematic of target points for measuring | |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| | the displacement during the quasi-static compression test. | 83 |
| Figure 3.21 | (a) Photo of the modified Arcan test rig, (b) a schematic diagram Of the arrangement for a pure shear ($\alpha = 0^\circ$) Arcan test, and (c) at a 67.5° rotation to give a combined compression-shear loading condition. | 86 |
| Figure 3.22 | (a) Cross-section showing the bonding areas of the specimen to the loading platens, (b) a photo of a CFRP specimen bonded between two loading platens. | 87 |
| Figure 3.23 | (a) Experimental test arrangement for the calibration test involving contact between two frictionless surfaces. The horizontal displacements are measured using two digital dial gauges, (b) close-up of the contact zone between the two frictionless platens and (c) the platen surfaces are covered with a Teflon film. | 89 |
| Figure 3.24 | The instrumented drop-weight impact test set-up adopted for testing the corrugated-core sandwich structures. | 90 |
| Figure 3.25 | (a) A closer view of the test set-up for a drop-weight impact test, (b) a schematic diagram illustrating the test assembly, showing how the load cell is connected between the impactor and the mass. | 91 |
| Figure 3.26 | Optical microscope equipment that was used in the study. | 93 |
| Figure 4.1 | Engineering stress-strain curves for the aluminium alloy (AL 2024-O), following three tensile tests. | 98 |
| Figure 4.2 | True tensile stress-strain curve for an aluminium alloy specimen (TTAL3). | 99 |
| Figure 4.3 | Tensile failure at approximately 40° to the loading axis (specimen TTAL3). | 99 |
| Figure 4.4 | Typical tensile stress-strain curve for a GFRP specimen. | 101 |
| Figure 4.5 | Typical tensile stress-strain curve for a CFRP specimen. | 101 |
| Figure 4.6 | Typical tensile failure modes in the woven composite (CFRP specimen) following tensile testing. | 101 |
| Figure 4.7 | Plot of the strain in transverse x-direction versus strain in the longitudinal y-direction. The slope of the line gives the value of the Poisson's ratio for this woven CFRP specimen, i.e. $\nu = 0.10$. | 102 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| Figure 4.8 | Plot of the strain in transverse x-direction versus strain in the longitudinal y-direction taken from the relative displacement images analysis. The slope of the line gives the value of the Poisson's ratio for this woven GFRP specimen, i.e. $\nu = 0.15$. | 103 |
| Figure 4.9 | Typical in-plane shear stress-strain curve for a GFRP specimen. | 104 |
| Figure 4.10 | Typical in-plane shear stress-strain curve for a CFRP specimen. | 104 |
| Figure 4.11 | Typical compression stress-strain behaviour of a rigid PU foam; (a) at the yield point and (b) at 60% strain where the densification begins. | 106 |
| Figure 4.12 | (a) A five unit cell sample under compression loading, (b) a single unit cell showing the deformed behaviour (dashed-line), (c) a free-body diagram of a compression loaded core member. | 107 |
| Figure 4.13 | (a) Typical load-displacement curves for the AL sandwich corrugated-core structures. (b) Photographs of progressive damage development in structures based on five unit cells in (a). (c) Debonding at an end of the core after loading (b – III). (d) Crumpling after the corrugated-core has been almost completely flattened. | 110 |
| Figure 4.14 | Comparison of the load-displacement traces for AL sandwich specimens based on 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 unit cells. | 112 |
| Figure 4.15 | (a) Typical load-displacement curve for a GFRP sandwich corrugated-core structure. (b) Photographs of progressive damage development in a five unit cell specimen in (a). (c) Failure mode images after crushing process. | 113 |
| Figure 4.16 | Comparison of load-displacement traces for GFRP sandwich specimens based on 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 unit cells. (Note that these are GFRP specimens of 2-ply thickness. The term of η_x is an aspect ratio based on the number of unit cells in x-direction relative to a specimen having 5 unit cells, GF2U5). | 114 |
| Figure 4.17 | Comparison of load-displacement traces following tests on five unit cell sandwich structures based on between 2 and 10 plies of GFRP. (Note that the term of η_H is a normalised average thickness of the corrugated-cores relative to the 2-ply specimen, GF2U5). | 115 |
| Figure 4.18 | Comparison of the load-displacement traces for the GFRP | |

- corrugated-core sandwich specimens based on spans of 25, 50, 75 and 100 mm, respectively. (Note that these GFRP specimens are based on 2-ply cores with 5 unit cells. The width aspect ratio η_w is relative to a 25 mm wide specimen, GF2W25). 116
- Figure 4.19 (a) Typical load-displacement curve for a CFRP sandwich corrugated-core structure. (b) Photographs of progressive damage development in five unit cell corrugations in (a). (c) Failure modes after crushing process. 117
- Figure 4.20 Comparison of load-displacement traces for CFRP sandwich specimens based on 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 unit cells. (Note that these are CFRP specimens based on 2 plies and the term of η_x is an aspect ratio based on the number of unit cells in x -direction relative to 5 unit cells, CF2U5). 118
- Figure 4.21 Comparison of load-displacement traces for CFRP specimens based on between 2 plies and 6 plies. (Note that these CFRP specimens contained 5 unit cells and η_H is a normalised average thickness of the corrugated-cores relative to the 2-ply specimen, CF2U5). 118
- Figure 4.22 Comparison of the load-displacement traces of CFRP corrugated-core sandwich specimens based on spans of 25, 50, 75 and 100 mm, respectively. (Note these specimens are based on 2 plies with 5 unit cells. The aspect ratio of the width, η_w is relative to a width of 25 mm, CF2W25). 119
- Figure 4.23 Comparison of load-displacement traces of corrugated-core specimens following testing at different compression displacement rates of 1, 10 and 100 mm per minute; (a) AL, (b) GFRP and (c) CFRP. 120
- Figure 4.24 Comparison of load-displacement traces for the GFRP corrugated-core specimens for three different foam-filled core configurations. 121
- Figure 4.25 Comparison of load-displacement traces for the CFRP corrugated-core specimens for three different foam-filled core configurations. 121
- Figure 4.26 Photographs of progressive damage development in the CFPUF sandwich structure during (a) initial compression, (b) buckling in the cell wall structure and (c) core crushing. 122

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 4.27 | Photographs of progressive damage development in the GFPUS sandwich structure during (a) initial compression, (b) the buckling process and (c) the final stages of testing. | 123 |
| Figure 4.28 | (a) A schematic of a mixed-mode loading condition on a corrugated-core structure, (b) a free body diagram of a single unit cell of the corrugated-core. | 124 |
| Figure 4.29 | Typical load versus displacement trace for a corrugated-core structure (CF45 at 45° loading angle). The unwanted displacement is removed from the Arcan mixed-mode test data. | 126 |
| Figure 4.30 | Calibration data of the horizontal load-displacement relationship for the Arcan test rig. | 127 |
| Figure 4.31 | Typical load-displacement traces for the aluminium corrugation subjected to pure compression (AL90), pure shear (AL0) and mixed compression-shear (AL67.5). The inset shows the initial stiffness in the elastic deformation region for three different loading angles. | 128 |
| Figure 4.32 | Photos of an aluminium corrugation at three different stages of compression-shear loading at 67.5° loading angle; (a) unloaded, (b) initial buckling, and (c) crumpling at high displacements. | 129 |
| Figure 4.33 | Typical load-displacement traces for the GFRP corrugation subjected to pure compression (GF90), pure shear (GF0) and mixed compression-shear (GF45). The inset shows the initial stiffness in the elastic deformation region for three different loading angles. | 130 |
| Figure 4.34 | Photograph of one of the failure modes for the case where the corrugated-core was debonded from the loading platens. | 131 |
| Figure 4.35 | Typical load-displacement traces for the CFRP corrugation subjected to pure shear (CF0), pure compression (CF90) and mixed compression-shear (CF45). The inset shows the initial response in the elastic region for three different loading angles. | 131 |
| Figure 4.36 | Photos of the CFRP composite corrugation at three stages of deformation under mixed-mode loading at 45°; (a) unloaded, (b) initial cell wall buckling, and (c) fibre fracture in the unit cells. | 132 |
| Figure 4.37 | Failure mode in a CFRP corrugated-core structure showing 3D | |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| | complex cell wall crushing. | 133 |
| Figure 4.38 | The schematic diagram showing the impact test setup. | 135 |
| Figure 4.39 | Typical $F-t$ and $d-t$ histories for an impact energy below that to break the specimen, (a) experimental data and (b) best fit curves showing that the maximum contact force and the maximum displacement happen at the same time, t_{peak} when F_{max} occurs. Data taken from an AL corrugated-core specimen at a drop height, $h = 50$ mm. | 137 |
| Figure 4.40 | Typical $F-d$ traces for an impact energy less below that to break the specimen, (a) loading and unloading response and (b) best fit line to illustrate the contact force is proportional to displacement in the elastic regime. | 138 |
| Figure 4.41 | Impact images for an initial velocity, v of 0.99 m/s, (a) just before contact with the top surface of the specimen, (b) elastic bending of the struts at the maximum impactor displacement, d_{max} and (c) the specimen returns to its original position and the impactor rebounds. Impact on a CFRP corrugated-core specimen from a drop height, $h = 50$ mm. The impactor mass ratio, $m^* = 173$. | 139 |
| Figure 4.42 | (a) Typical $F-t$ and $d-t$ histories for the AL corrugated-core sandwich specimen above its threshold absorb energy and (b) the $F-d$ traces during the impact tests at a drop height, $h = 1000$ mm. | 140 |
| Figure 4.43 | Two different buckling phenomena observed during testing: (a) asymmetrical buckling commonly found in out-of-plane compression loading (at $v = 3.13$ m/s) and (b) combination of two different buckling patterns, symmetrical and asymmetrical behaviour at an impact velocity of 4.43 m/s. | 141 |
| Figure 4.44 | (a) Typical $F-t$ and $d-t$ histories for the CFRP corrugated-core sandwich specimen above its threshold impact energy and (b) the $F-d$ curve following the impact test from a drop height, $h = 1000$ mm. | 142 |
| Figure 4.45 | Impact images of the composite (CFRP) corrugated-core sandwich specimen at an impact velocity of 4.43 m/s, (a) initial failure is dominating by buckling (combined mode shapes of 1 and 2), (b) failures (fibre fracture, matrix cracking) and (c) rebound of the | |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| | impactor as the top skin debonds from the core. | 143 |
| Figure 5.1 | Loading direction, boundary conditions and assembly of the corrugated-core model between two platens. | 159 |
| Figure 5.2 | Contact pressure-overclosure relationship for hard contact [1]. | 161 |
| Figure 5.3 | Typical meshes used in numerical modelling. | 161 |
| Figure 5.4 | Typical mesh-sensitivity analysis showing maximum load and CPU time versus element size for the AL corrugated-core specimen with shell thickness of $H = 0.5$ mm. | 163 |
| Figure 5.5 | Softened contact pressure-overclosure relationship defined in linear form [1]. | 164 |
| Figure 5.6 | Typical contact stiffness sensitivity analyses, if the case when $k_c > 10000$ N/mm ³ , is equivalent to a hard contact condition. | 164 |
| Figure 5.7 | The effect of the contact stiffness k_c on the slope (P/δ) of the AL corrugated-core model. | 165 |
| Figure 5.8 | An imperfection sensitivity analysis study for the GFRP corrugation model, with a thickness of $H = 0.2$ mm. Note that the maximum load from the experimental test was 413 N. | 167 |
| Figure 5.9 | Comparison of the effect of different shell elements, S4R and S8R. The analysis was conducted on the CFRP corrugation, with a thickness of $H = 1.10$ mm. Note that the maximum load in the experiment was 23 kN. | 168 |
| Figure 5.10 | The measured response and the predictions of the load-displacement response for AL corrugated-core sandwich structure. The load-displacement responses of the panels with FE predictions with $\xi = 0.01$ show good agreement with the measured response. | 169 |
| Figure 5.11 | Predicted deformation modes for a perfect AL corrugation; (a) initial loading, (b) peak loading, (c) symmetrical plastic hinges due to bending and (d) progressive collapse. Note that the inset gives the Mises stress. | 170 |
| Figure 5.12 | Predicted deformation modes for an imperfect AL corrugation; (a) initial loading, (b) peak loading, (c) buckling behaviour and (d) initial contact between upper platen and middle of struts. Note that the inset gives the Mises stress. | 171 |

- Figure 5.13 The measured response and the predictions of the peak load for composite corrugated-core structures; (a) GFRP and (b) CFRP. FE simulations for both GFRP and CFRP with $\xi = 0.05$ show reasonable agreement with the measured responses. 172
- Figure 5.14 The initial modelling behaviour of the composite corrugation (perfect condition); (a) initial loading, (b) peak loading, (c) plastic hinges and (d) model progressively compressed to the lower platen. Note that this is an example for a GFRP corrugation with $H = 0.19$ mm. The colour spectrum represents Hashin's fibre compression damage initiation criterion. 173
- Figure 5.15 The modelling behaviour of a composite corrugation with a geometrical imperfection; (a) at initial contact, the right-end of the strut is initially bent, (b) peak loading, (c) buckling-dominated behaviour as three of the unit cells buckled and (d) initial contact between upper platen and centre of the struts. Note that this is an example for a GFRP corrugation with $H = 0.19$ mm. The colour spectrum represents Hashin's fibre compression damage initiation criterion. 175
- Figure 5.16 The 3D brick element mesh used in the foam modelling. 177
- Figure 5.17 Loading direction, boundary conditions and assembly for the foam core model between the two rigid platens. 178
- Figure 5.18 The yield surface and flow potential in the p - q stress plane for the isotropic crushable foam model [2]. 179
- Figure 5.19 The measured mechanical response of the PUR foam. The FE simulation shows good agreement with the experimental data. 182
- Figure 5.20 The modelling behaviour of a foam core; (a) at initial contact, (b) peak loading, (c) plateau region and (d) the initial densification region. Note that the colours represent the deformations. 183
- Figure 5.21 (a) Meshing of the loading platens and corrugated-core, (b) meshed corrugated-core, and (c) meshed loading platen. 184
- Figure 5.22 Loading direction, boundary conditions and assembly of the foam core model between two rigid platens. 185
- Figure 5.23 Comparison between the analytical solutions and the numerical analysis in the form of load-displacement traces for loading angles

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| | from 0° to 90° . | 186 |
| Figure 5.24 | Prediction of initial stiffness (P/δ) from analytical methods compared to numerical analysis, from $0^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 180^\circ$: (a) AL, (b) CFRP, and (c) GFRP. | 187 |
| Figure 5.25 | The modelling behaviour of the Arcan test for the AL corrugation at a loading angle of 67.5° (a) at initial contact, (b) peak loading, (c-d) progression of buckling and collapse of the unit cells. Note that the colours represent the Mises stress. | 188 |
| Figure 5.26 | The sharp edge contact between the corrugated-core and the upper skin; (a) contact set-up, (b) initial deformation and (c) progression and penetration of the sharp corner. | 189 |
| Figure 5.27 | The corrugated-core sandwich structures filled with foam; (a) dashed-line is the cut area, and (b) types of elements used in the modelling. | 190 |
| Figure 5.28 | The meshes for modelling; (a) conventional corrugated-core, (b) semi-filled core and (c) fully-filled with foam core. | 191 |
| Figure 5.29 | Loading direction, boundary conditions and assembly of the corrugated-core with foam model. | 192 |
| Figure 5.30 | The measured response and the predictions of the load-displacement response for conventional GFRP corrugated-core structure. Note that in this FE analysis, the platen was displaced by 3.5 mm. | 193 |
| Figure 5.31 | Predicted deformation modes for the composite corrugated-core structure; (a) initial buckling and (b) contact between the upper skin and middle of the struts. Note that the inset gives the Mises stress. | 194 |
| Figure 5.32 | The measured response for a GFRP corrugated-core with a foam-filled structure and compared with two numerical simulations, the corrugated-core tied or untied with the PU foam. | 195 |
| Figure 5.33 | Predicted deformation modes for a corrugated-core structure with untied foam; (a) initial buckling and (b) both sides of foam went out from the core. Note that the inset gives the Mises stress. | 195 |
| Figure 5.34 | Comparison of a unit cell in the corrugated-core structure with fully-filled at different magnitudes; (a) deformation and (b) stress. | 196 |
| Figure 5.35 | Predicted deformation modes for a corrugated-core structure with | |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| | fully-filled foam; (a) initial loading, (b) peak loading, (c-d) deformation in progress as the corrugated-core buckled and the foam been compressed. Note that the inset gives the deformation values. | 197 |
| Figure 5.36 | The measured response and predictions of the load-displacement response for a corrugated-core with semi-filled structure. Note that this is GFRP sandwich structure with semi-filled core (GFPUS). | 198 |
| Figure 5.37 | Predicted deformation modes for a corrugated-core structure with semi-filled foam; (a) peak loading and (b) collapse of corrugated-core sandwich structure. Note that the inset gives the deformation magnitude. | 198 |
| Figure 5.38 | The meshes of the sandwich structure modelling. | 199 |
| Figure 5.39 | Loading direction, boundary conditions and assembly for the dynamic compression model. | 200 |
| Figure 5.40 | The measured response for an aluminium corrugated-core structure compared to the numerical simulation. The force-displacement responses for the model with $FE-\xi = 0.01$ show reasonable agreement with the measured response. Note that in this FE analysis, an initial velocity of (a) 0.99 m/s and (b) 3.13 m/s has been applied. | 202 |
| Figure 5.41 | Predicted deformation modes for an aluminium corrugated-core structure at a velocity of 3.13 m/s; (a) initial contact and (b) buckling of the struts. Note that the inset gives the Mises stress. | 203 |
| Figure 5.42 | The measured response for the GFRP corrugated-core structure compared to the numerical simulation. The force-displacement responses of the model with $FE-\xi = 0.05$ show reasonable agreement with the measured response. Note that in this FE analyses, an initial velocity of (a) 0.99 m/s and (b) 3.13 m/s has been applied. | 204 |
| Figure 5.43 | Predicted deformation modes for a corrugated-core structure at a velocity of 3.13 m/s; (a) initial buckling and (b) fibre fracture in the struts. Note that the inset gives the magnitude of fibre damage in compression. | 205 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 6.1 | (a) Comparison of the measured and numerical data for compression strength of the AL5 and GF2U5 corrugated-core sandwich structures, and (b) compression strength and modulus properties as a function of the number of unit cells for the CF2U5 corrugated-core sandwich structures. | 212 |
| Figure 6.2 | Photos of damage in GFRP corrugated-core specimens based on an increasing number of units cells. | 213 |
| Figure 6.3 | Comparison of the experimental data and numerical predictions of the compression strength and modulus as a function of cell wall thicknesses for sandwich structures based on: (a) GFRP and (b) CFRP. | 214 |
| Figure 6.4 | Comparison of the specific strength as a function of cell wall thickness for the GFRP, CFRP and aluminium corrugated-cores. | 216 |
| Figure 6.5 | Comparison of the maximum compression load with stiffness as a function of width (a) the GFRP and (b) the CFRP sandwich specimens. | 217 |
| Figure 6.6 | Comparison of the experimental data and numerical predictions of the compression strength and modulus as a function of normalised width of (a) the GFRP and (b) the CFRP sandwich specimens. | 218 |
| Figure 6.7 | Comparison of the plain compression stress-strain behaviour of the PU foam, conventional corrugated core (unfilled foam) and foam-filled core of (a) GFRP and (b) CFRP sandwich structures. | 220 |
| Figure 6.8 | The variation of strain-rate of the compression strength of the corrugated-core (a) AL (b) GFRP and (c) CFRP sandwich structures. | 224 |
| Figure 6.9 | The measured maximum contact force and energies as a function of impact velocity, for (a) AL, (b) GFRP and (c) CFRP sandwich panels. Note that the impactor mass ratio, m^* , to AL, GFRP and CFRP is 98, 170 and 173 respectively. | 226 |
| Figure 6.10 | The dynamic strength enhancement factor obtained by normalising the maximum dynamic stress by the quasi-static strength, plotted as a function of the impact velocity. | 227 |
| Figure 6.11 | (a) Variation of the maximum compression and shear stresses | |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| | with loading angle, (b) strength-failure criterion for the AL corrugated-core structure. | 229 |
| Figure 6.12 | (a) Variation of the maximum compression and shear stresses with loading angle, (b) strength-failure criterion for the GFRP corrugated-core specimen. | 230 |
| Figure 6.13 | (a) Variation of the maximum compression and shear stresses with loading angle, (b) strength-failure criterion for the CFRP corrugated-core structure. | 231 |
| Figure 6.14 | Determination of n values to fit the yield surface criteria of (a) GFRP and (b) CFRP corrugated-core structure. | 232 |
| Figure 6.15 | Low magnification optical micrographs of polished sections of the corrugated-core sandwich structures at $H/L = 0.035$; (a) GFRP and (b) CFRP specimens. Fibre fracture, delamination and debonding are typical failure modes in quasi-static and dynamic loadings. | 235 |
| Figure 6.16 | Post-damage photos of the AL corrugated-core sandwich structures for an aspect ratio of $H/L = 0.035$. | 236 |
| Figure 6.17 | Post-test photos of the composite sandwich structures for an aspect ratio of $H/L = 0.035$; (a) Semi-filled and (b) Fully-filled. | 236 |
| Figure 6.18 | Photographs of impacted specimens beyond the threshold energy to initiate fracture, at velocity of 4.43 m/s; (a) AL, (b) CFRP and (c) GFRP materials. | 237 |
| Figure 6.19 | Values of compression strength and energy absorbed for all the tested corrugated-core sandwich structures. | 241 |
| Figure 6.20 | Comparison of the specific strength and specific energy absorption values of the corrugated-core sandwich structures for an aspect ratio of $H/L = 0.035$. | 242 |
| Figure 6.21 | Comparison of the compression strength of the experimental data with commercially available sandwich core types for lightweight applications, as a function of equivalent core density. | 243 |
| Figure 6.22 | Collection of experimental data summarising the compression strength of current core types design developed by researchers in recent years, as a function of equivalent core density. | 244 |