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This paper is concerned with the effect of damage on free and forced vibrations of a functionally graded cantilever beam. The modes of damage considered in the paper include a region with degraded stiffness adjacent to the root of the beam, a single delamination crack, and a single crack at the root cross section of the beam propagating in the thickness direction. Closed-form solutions are suggested for all cases considered, including both forced and free vibrations; in the case of free vibrations, these solutions are exact. The peculiarities of the frequency analysis of nonprismatic and/or axially graded beams with the root crack in the presence of static thermal loads are also discussed and it is shown that neglecting axial inertia may lead to a qualitative error (this conclusion remains valid in prismatic functionally graded material beams). Numerical examples concentrate on the effect of a single root crack on the fundamental frequency, because such damage was observed in numerous loading scenarios. It is shown that the presence of a crack that has propagated through about one-third of the thickness of the beam significantly affects the fundamental frequency.

Nomenclature

\[ A = \text{extensional stiffness} \]
\[ A_{ss} = \text{extensional stiffness in the expression for transverse shear stress resultant} \]
\[ B = \text{coupling stiffness} \]
\[ b = \text{width of the beam} \]
\[ D = \text{bending stiffness} \]
\[ d = \text{depth of the crack} \]
\[ f = \text{fundamental frequency} \]
\[ K = \text{rotational stiffness of the support} \]
\[ k = \text{nondimensional compliance} \]
\[ k_2 = \text{shear correction factor} \]
\[ M = \text{stress couple (beam of the rectangular cross section) or bending moment (arbitrary cross section)} \]
\[ m = \text{mass per unit surface area (beam of the rectangular cross section) or mass per unit length (arbitrary cross section)} \]
\[ N = \text{stress resultant (beam of the rectangular cross section) or axial force (arbitrary cross section)} \]
\[ P = \text{static force} \]
\[ T = \text{Temperature} \]
\[ t = \text{Time} \]
\[ Q = \text{transverse shear stress resultant (beam of the rectangular cross section) or transverse shear force (arbitrary cross section)} \]
\[ Q_{11} = \text{reduced stiffness} \]
\[ q = \text{dynamic magnification factor} \]
\[ u = \text{axial displacement} \]
\[ v = \text{kinematic excitation (motion of the support)} \]
\[ w = \text{transverse deflection} \]
\[ x = \text{axial coordinate} \]
\[ y = \text{coordinate in the width direction of the beam} \]
\[ z = \text{transverse coordinate} \]
\[ \alpha = \text{coefficient of thermal expansion} \]
\[ \delta = \text{displacement of the tip of a cantilever beam} \]
\[ \psi = \text{normal mode (axial motion)} \]
\[ \eta = \text{normal mode} \]
\[ \lambda = \text{natural frequency} \]
\[ \rho = \text{local value of the mass density of the functionally graded material} \]
\[ \omega = \text{driving frequency} \]
\[ \psi = \text{rotation of an element that was perpendicular to the beam axis before deformation} \]

I. Introduction

FUNCTIONALLY graded materials (FGMs) have attracted the considerable attention of researchers and engineers due to a number of attractive features, such as a reduction or elimination of the interfacial stresses that often cause delamination in layered composites and enhanced thermal properties. A number of reviews dealing with various aspects of FGM have been published in recent years [1–4]. Previous research on FGM beams includes the paper by Sankar [5], who considered a FGM beam subjected to a sinusoidal transverse load applied at one of the surfaces. The problems of free vibrations, wave propagation, and static deformations in FGM shear deformable beams were solved in [6,7] using a specially developed finite element accounting for the power law and other alternative variations of elastic and thermal properties in the thickness direction.

Extensive work on the development of functionally graded piezoelectric actuators dealing with various aspects of manufacturing, modeling, and design of piezoelectric FGM beams has been conducted during the last decade. The effect of the grading of one of the critical properties such as conductivity, piezoelectric coefficient, permittivity, or porosity is considered in [8–11]. A new class of piezoceramic functionally graded actuators using the so-called dual-electro/piezo-property gradient technique that emphasizes variations of both piezoelectric coefficients and the electric permittivity was considered in [12].

Contrary to the cited papers concentrating on intact beams, the present solutions address the problems of free and forced vibrations of cantilever FGM beams with various modes of damage, including cracks propagating perpendicular to the beam surface and
delamination cracks. A particular mode of damage found in a beam depends on the nature of applied loading. For example, a single through-the-thickness crack in the vicinity of the root of the beam is anticipated in cases in which the load is either static or harmonic in time and the maximum bending moment is at the root. However, an impact may result in a continuous region with degraded stiffness, as well as in delamination cracks in sandwich beams. Numerical analysis is presented in the paper for a single through-the-thickness crack adjacent to the root of the beam.

FGM beams often operate in high-temperature environments. For example, a FGM turbine blade can be modeled as a nonprismatic cantilever beam subject to temperature predominantly varying in the thickness direction. The paper elucidates the factors that should be considered in the free-vibration analysis of nonprismatic FGM beams with a root crack (this illustration is also applicable to FGM beams with axially variable grading). It is shown that some aspects of the thermal effect on the natural frequencies will be disregarded if one neglects the contribution of axial inertia.

II. Analysis

Consider forced vibrations of a cantilever FGM beam driven by the motion of its support that is a harmonic function of time (i.e., \( \varphi = V \sin \omega t \)). A typical mode of damage in FGM cantilever beams is represented by cracks oriented in the direction that is perpendicular to the beam surface and concentrated in the immediate vicinity to the clamped end (Fig. 1). Delamination cracks may also develop in layered FGM cantilever beams with layerwise constant volume fractions of constituent phases (Fig. 2). A single crack is often observed in laminated beams and in particulate FGM beams (Fig. 3).

The analysis is conducted by assumption that the amplitude of motion remains small (i.e., a geometrically linear theory is applicable). Transverse shear deformations can be omitted if the beams and the regions of the beams considered in the analysis have a length-to-thickness ratio of no less than 20. However, for shorter beam regions, a first-order shear deformation theory (FSDT) should be applied, providing accurate predictions for eigenvalues such as buckling loads [13] and natural frequencies. The material of the beam is assumed to remain within the elastic range in all cases considered next.

For the problems that can be considered by a technical (slender) beam theory, the axial stress resultant and the bending stress couple are given by

\[
N = A \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - B \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2}, \quad M = B \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - D \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} \tag{1}
\]

where the stiffness terms are defined by standard equations. The following solution can be extended to a more general case in which the cross section of the beam is not rectangular. However, in such a case, \( N \) and \( M \) are the axial force and bending moment, respectively, and the stiffness terms can be found from

\[
\{A, B, D\} = \int \int E_z(y,z) \{1, z, z^2\} \, dz \, dy \tag{2}
\]

where \( E_z \) is the local modulus in the axial direction or the corresponding reduced stiffness. The integration in Eq. (2) should be performed over the thickness and width of the beam. Note that the definition of the stiffness terms \( \{A, B, D\} \) implies that the analysis using these terms is applicable to an arbitrary FGM, including materials with a continuous variation of volume fractions of the constituent phases and stepwise layered particulate composites. The local modulus of elasticity can be determined by a homogenization method applicable to FGM with an arbitrary distribution of constituent phases through the thickness, such as the Mori–Tanaka method or the self-consistent method.

In the case in which it is necessary to specify the transverse shear stress resultant or force in the absence of applied axial loads and to neglect geometrically nonlinear effects, it can be determined from the equilibrium equation \( Q = \partial M / \partial x \).
\[ A_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x} - B_n \frac{\partial^2 w_n}{\partial x^2} - m_n \ddot{u}_n = 0 \]  
\[ (3a) \]

\[ B_n \frac{\partial^3 u_n}{\partial x^3} - D_n \frac{\partial^3 w_n}{\partial x^3} - m_n (\ddot{w}_n + \ddot{v}) = 0 \]  
\[ (3b) \]

where \( n = 1, 2 \) is a number of the region and the transverse deflection \( w \) is counted relative to the moving support.

The solution must satisfy the boundary and continuity conditions:

\[ x = 0: \quad w_x = 0, \quad \frac{dw_x}{dx} = 0 \]

\[ x = L: \quad M_1 = 0, \quad Q_1 = 0 \]

\[ x = l: \quad w_1 = w_2, \quad \frac{dw_1}{dx} = \frac{dw_2}{dx} \]

\[ M_1 = M_2, \quad Q_1 = Q_2 \]  
\[ (4) \]

Additionally, axial displacements and stress resultants should satisfy the following requirements:

\[ x = 0: \quad u_2 = 0 \]

\[ x = l: \quad u_1 = u_2, \quad N_1 = N_2 \]

\[ x = L: \quad N_1 = 0 \]  
\[ (5) \]

The first condition of Eq. (5) may become questionable if the damage propagates through more than a half-thickness of the beam. However, such cases correspond to an excessive degree of damage that is not considered here.

Notably, it is impossible to analyze vibrations of a cantilever beam while neglecting the axial inertia altogether. It is easily observed that such simplification combined with the continuity requirement for the axial stress resultants would imply the absence of the axial force at the clamped end of the beam. However, such a boundary condition for the axial force contradicts the first condition of Eq. (5).

Two approaches to the solution of the problem could be considered. The more accurate, though time-consuming, method could be developed along the lines of the solution shown for shear deformable FGM beams in Sec. II.B. The solution illustrated in the present section is simpler, relying on the assumption that although the axial inertia affects the dynamic equilibrium in the corresponding direction [Eq. (3a)], its effect on the transverse equilibrium can be neglected. This is justified by the observation that a slender beam has a much larger stiffness in the spanwise direction when compared with that in the transverse direction. As a result, the effect of the axial inertia on transverse vibrations is negligible. This simplification is further justified by the results shown in Numerical Examples, in which the analytical solution obtained while neglecting the axial inertia is compared with the FEA solution accounting for it. In addition, the effect of the axial inertia on the fundamental frequency of a composite beam is estimated in the Appendix.

In view of numerous studies in which transverse motion of the beams has been accurately evaluated without accounting for the axial inertia, the methodology adopted in this section should produce acceptable results.

In the problem of free vibrations, the motion within each region of the beam can be represented by

\[ u_n = U_n(x) \sin \lambda t, \quad w_n = W_n(x) \sin \lambda t \]  
\[ (6) \]

The substitution of Eq. (6) into Eq. (3) and neglecting the axial inertia yields

\[ W_n = C_1^{(a)} \sinh \beta_0 x + C_2^{(a)} \cosh \beta_0 x + C_3^{(a)} \sin \beta_0 x + C_4^{(a)} \cos \beta_0 x \]  
\[ (7a) \]

\[ \beta_0 = \sqrt{\frac{m_n \lambda^2}{D_n - (B_n/A_n)}} \]  
\[ (7b) \]

where \( C_i^{(a)} \) are constants of integration. The substitution of Eqs. (6) and (7) into Eq. (3a) and retaining the axial inertia term yields

\[ U_n = C_3^{(a)} \sin \gamma_n x + C_4^{(a)} \cos \gamma_n x + B_n \beta_0 \left[ \frac{C_1^{(a)} \cosh \beta_0 x + C_2^{(a)} \sinh \beta_0 x}{m_n \lambda^2 + A_n \beta_0^2} \right] \]

\[ + C_3^{(a)} \sin \beta_0 x - C_4^{(a)} \cos \beta_0 x \]

\[ \gamma_n = \sqrt{\frac{m_n \lambda^2}{A_n}} \]  
\[ (8) \]

Upon the substitution of displacements given by Eqs. (7) and (8), boundary and continuity conditions (4) and (5) yield a system of 12 homogeneous algebraic equations with respect to 12 constants of integration \( C_i^{(a)} (r = 1, 2, \ldots, 6) \). The nonzero requirement for these constants yields the frequency equation and eigenvectors.

Consider now forced vibrations of a beam driven by the harmonic motion of its support. In this case, the solution can be obtained in terms of normal modes (mode-summation method). For example, the transverse motion can be represented as

\[ w = \sum W_i \left[ \delta(0 \leq x \leq l) \eta_1^{(i)}(x) + \delta(l < x \leq L) \eta_0^{(i)}(x) \right] \sin \omega t \]  
\[ (9) \]

where \( \delta(x) \) is a step function, \( \eta_1^{(i)}(x) = \sin \beta_0 i x + k_{3n1} \sin \beta_0 x \) are unknown amplitudes. The normal modes corresponding to the natural frequency \( \lambda_i \) are

\[ \eta_0^{(i)}(x) = k_{1i} \sin \beta_0 i x + k_{2n1} \cosh \beta_0 x \]

\[ + k_{3n1} \sin \beta_0 x + k_{4n1} \cos \beta_0 x \]  
\[ (10) \]

where \( k_{ni} \) are the elements of the normalized eigenvector corresponding to the \( i \)th eigenvalue, and \( \beta_0 i, \beta_0 \) is obtained from Eq. (7) using \( \lambda = \lambda_i \).

The application of the Galerkin method and neglecting the effect of the axial inertia on forced transverse vibrations yield uncoupled equations for the amplitudes of the corresponding terms in Eq. (9):

\[ W_i \left[ \int_{0}^{l} \left( D_2 - \frac{B_i^2}{A_i} \right) \beta_0^2(\lambda_i) \eta_1^{(i)}(x) - m_n \omega^2 \eta_1^{(i)} \right] \eta_1^{(i)}(x) dx \]

\[ + \int_{0}^{l} \left[ \left( D_2 - \frac{B_1^2}{A_1} \right) \beta_0^2(\lambda_i) \eta_0^{(i)}(x) - m_n \omega^2 \eta_0^{(i)} \right] \eta_0^{(i)}(x) dx \right] \]

\[ = m_n \omega^2 \int_{0}^{l} \eta_1^{(i)}(x) dx + \int_{0}^{l} \eta_0^{(i)}(x) dx \]  
\[ (11) \]

This equation can be further simplified, yielding

\[ W_i = \frac{m_n \omega^2 \int_{0}^{l} \eta_1^{(i)}(x) dx + \int_{0}^{l} \eta_0^{(i)}(x) dx}{M_i (\lambda_i^2 - \omega^2)} \]

\[ M_i = m \int_{0}^{l} \eta_1^{(i)}(x) dx + \int_{0}^{l} \eta_0^{(i)}(x) dx \]  
\[ (12) \]

B. Natural Frequencies of a FGM Beam with a Region of Reduced Stiffness

Although a typical FGM beam in potential applications is slender, the region with damage (region 2 in Fig. 1) may be relatively short. In this case, such a region should be analyzed, accounting for transverse shear effects. Accordingly, this section illustrates an exact solution for the natural frequencies of FGM cantilever beams by the FSDT. Both regions 1 and 2 are analyzed by this theory for consistency, even though the intact region may be slender.

The expressions for the axial and transverse shear stress resultants and for the bending stress couple according to FSDT are [14,15]...
\[
N = A \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + B \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}, \quad M = B \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + D \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}
\]
\[
Q = k^2 A_{55} \left( \psi + \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \right)
\]
(13)

It is noted that the shear correction factor \( k \) in Eq. (13) is affected by a distribution of the stiffness throughout the thickness of the beam. It is possible to evaluate this factor using the approach proposed by Bert and Gordaninejad [16] that was developed using a comparison between the shear strain energy of the actual beam with the energy for an equivalent Timoshenko beam. This solution provides the value of the shear correction factor as a function of the integrals affected by the variations of the modulus of elasticity and the Poisson ratio throughout the thickness.

Equations of motion of a unit-width beam, accounting for axial, rotational, and transverse inerts, are [14,15],
\[
A \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + B \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} = m \ddot{u} + H \ddot{\psi}
\]
\[
B \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + D \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} - k A_{55} \left( \psi + \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \right) = H \ddot{u} + I \ddot{\psi}
\]
(14)

\[
k^2 A_{55} \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} \right) = m \ddot{w}
\]

where
\[
\{H, I\} = \int_z \rho(z) \{z, z^2\} \, dz
\]
and the integration is conducted through the thickness of the beam.

In the problem of free vibrations, the motion is assumed to be harmonic and the terms in the right side of Eq. (14) are modified accordingly (i.e., \( \{\ddot{u}, \ddot{\psi}, \ddot{w}\} = -\lambda^2 \{u, \psi, w\} \)). The exact solution of the problem is similar to the approach discussed in the monograph of Reddy [15]. The highest-order derivatives of the displacements and rotation are expressed from Eq. (14):
\[
\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} = f_1(\psi + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} + f_3 w + f_4 \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} + f_5 u)
\]
\[
\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} = f_6 \psi + f_7 \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} + f_8 w + f_9 \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} + f_{10} u
\]
\[
\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} = f_{11} \psi + f_{12} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} + f_{13} w + f_{14} \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} + f_{15} u
\]
(15)

where the expressions for the coefficients \( f_{mn} = f_{mn}(\lambda) \) are easily available. Subsequently, the vector of displacements and their derivatives is introduced:
\[
\{\ddot{R}\} = \{\psi \ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} \ \psi \ \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \ \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \ \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} \}
\]

The system of Eqs. (15) is now replaced with
\[
\left\{ \frac{\partial \ddot{R}}{\partial x} \right\} = [T][\ddot{R}]
\]
(17)

Following Dorf [17], the solution is sought in the form
\[
\{\ddot{R}\} = e^{j\lambda x}\{\ddot{K}\}
\]
(19)

where \( \{\ddot{K}\} \) is a sixth-order vector of unknown constants and
\[
e^{[T]\ddot{x}} = \sum_{r=0}^{n} \frac{[T]\ddot{x}}{r!}
\]

It is immediately obvious that Eq. (19) satisfies Eq. (17). Furthermore, Eqs. (19) and (20) can be represented in the form
\[
\{\ddot{R}\} = [P_{n}(x, \lambda)]\{\ddot{K}\}
\]
(21)

where \( n \) identifies the beam region. For example, limiting series (20) to \( r \leq 3 \), the \( j \)th element of the matrix \([P_{n}(x, \lambda)]\) is
\[
P_{ij} = I_{ij} + T_{ij}x + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{6} T_{ij}k_{x}x^2 + \frac{1}{6} \sum_{k=1}^{6} T_{ij}k_{x}T_{ij}k_{x}x^3
\]
where \( I_{ij} \) is an element of an identity matrix.

The boundary and continuity conditions that have to be satisfied are
\[
x = 0: \ w_2 = u_2 = \psi_2 = 0
\]
\[
x = L: \ M_1 = Q_1 = N_1 = 0
\]
\[
x = l: \ w_1 = u_2, \ u_1 = u_2, \ \psi_1 = \psi_2
\]
\[
M_1 = M_2, \ Q_1 = Q_2, \ N_1 = N_2
\]
(23)

There are 12 conditions that can be represented as a system of homogenous equations with respect to 12 unknown constants of integration:
\[
[S(\lambda)]\{K_1\} = [0]
\]
(24)

The frequency equation (i.e., \( \det[S(\lambda)] = 0 \)) yields the values of natural frequencies.

C. Beams with a Delamination Crack

Consider the case in which a FGM cantilever beam of a rectangular cross section with a layerwise constant volume fraction of constituent phases has a delamination crack (Fig. 2). The beam can be subdivided into regions, as shown in Fig. 2.

Vibrations of delaminated composite beams have been considered by numerous investigators (see [18] for a review of relevant work published before 2000). The complication involved in the study is related to the necessity to define a contact law between two delaminated regions of the beam during the cycle of motion. It is reasonable to assume that as the distance between regions 3 and 4 increases compared with the static configuration (i.e., the delamination crack becomes wider), the contact pressure between these regions is equal to zero. However, during the other part of the cycle, the distance between regions 3 and 4 decreases and eventually, the crack may close. The contact law during the motion corresponding to a narrowing (but not closed) delamination crack reflects the presence of a partially intact matrix and fibers within the crack. Luo and Hanagud [18] modeled the interaction between regions 3 and 4 by a spring with a linear force-distance relationship within the range of deflections \((w_3-w_4)\) varying from zero to the value corresponding to a closed crack. The spring constant would be determined from experiments. Wang and Tong [19] considered two different contact laws between delaminated regions, including a linear spring and a nonlinear Hertz-type contact function. Contrary to [18], the stiffness of the linear spring was approximated by an effective modulus of two springs in series, each spring reflecting the stiffness of the corresponding region of the beam. A constant in the Hertz-type contact law in which the reaction was proportional to a 1.5 power of the distance between the regions was chosen arbitrarily.
The complexity of the analysis described earlier is related to difficulties associated with specifying the contact law for the part of motion cycle when the regions begin to press against each other. In addition to an uncertain amount of residual material within the crack, its width should also affect the exact distance between the regions when they begin to apply pressure to each other. Noticeably, some studies assume that vibrations of delaminated regions occur with small enough amplitude so that the crack always remains open [20].

In the present paper, we suggest a different approach; that is, instead of trying to exactly define the fundamental frequency of the beam with a delamination or a notch, we establish the boundaries of this frequency. The lower boundary corresponds to the beam in which the regions of the beam vibrate without any contact pressure. The upper boundary is evaluated by assuming that during a part of the cycle when the distance between the regions increases, the pressure between them is equal to zero and that during the other part of the cycle, the regions move toward each other and the crack is closed, so that the beam vibrates as an intact structure. This implies that it is sufficient to determine two frequencies; the lower frequency \( \lambda' \) found from the analysis shown next and the upper frequency \( \lambda'' = 2/(\lambda' + 1) \), where \( \lambda' \) is a frequency of the intact structure.

The actual natural frequency will be within the range \( \lambda' < \lambda < \lambda'' \). Accordingly, the present section illustrates the analysis of vibrations of the beam without a contact between delaminated regions that would yield the lower limit for the frequency. Note that as long as the crack remains short and vibrations are linear, it is anticipated that the effect of the pressure between delaminated regions will be small, with the fundamental frequency being close to the lower limit. The issue of closing cracks is also revisited in Sec. II.D.

The free vibrations of each region are characterized by Eqs. (3), in which \( v = 0 \) as long as the slender beam theory is applicable. Note that the term accounting for the stretching of the beam [i.e., \( N_y (\partial^2 u_y / \partial x^2) \)] does not appear in these equations because it is nonlinear (this term would be present in the linear formulation only if an axial force was applied to the beam). The exception may be found in the case in which residual stresses, though in self-equilibrium at every cross section, vary throughout the depth of the beam. In such a case, the static stress resultants appear in the equations of motion for regions 3 and 4 and the analysis will be affected by the corresponding terms (this situation is not considered here, though the present analysis could be expanded to account for such residual effects).

In the case in which the effect of the axial inertia on the equation of motion in the transverse direction is neglected, Eqs. (7) and (8) represent free vibrations of each of four regions of the beam.

The constants of integration are determined from the boundary conditions at the ends \( x = 0 \) and \( x = L \), as given by Eq. (4) and the axial boundary conditions:

\[
u_2(x = 0) = 0, \quad N_i(x = L) = 0 \tag{25}\]

The continuity conditions for the adjacent regions are formulated by an extrapolation of the solution for delamination buckling problems developed by Simitses [21]:

\[
x = a: \quad u_1 = u_3 = u_4, \quad \frac{du_1}{dx} = \frac{du_3}{dx} = \frac{du_4}{dx}, \quad M_1 = M_3 + M_4, \quad Q_1 = Q_1 + Q_2, \quad N_1 + N_4 = 0
\]

\[
x = b: \quad u_3 = u_4 = u_4, \quad \frac{du_3}{dx} = \frac{du_4}{dx} = \frac{du_4}{dx}, \quad M_3 = M_3 + M_4, \quad Q_2 = Q_1 + Q_2, \quad N_2 = N_3 + N_4 \tag{26}\]

In addition to Eq. (26), it is necessary to satisfy the continuity of axial displacements for adjacent regions, that is,

\[
x = a: \quad u_1 = u_1 + z_{13} w_{13}, \quad u_4 = u_4 + z_{14} w_{13}
\]

\[
x = b: \quad u_3 = u_3 + z_{23} w_{23}, \quad u_4 = u_4 + z_{24} w_{23} \tag{27}\]

where \( z_{13} = z_{23}, \ z_{14} = z_{24} \) are the distances between the centroids of the corresponding regions of the beam, taken with the appropriate sign according to Fig. 2.

The expressions for \( W_i \) and \( U_i \) for four regions of the beam contain 24 constants of integration. Substituting these expressions into four boundary conditions (4) that refer to the ends of the beam, two axial boundary conditions (25) and 18 continuity conditions (26) and (27) yields a system of 24 linear homogeneous algebraic equations for the constants of integration. The frequency equation is formulated based on the nonzero requirement to these constants. The eigenvalues (frequencies) and eigenvectors (mode shapes) can be evaluated from this equation.

Forced vibrations of the beam can now be found as an appropriate modification of the previous solution for the case of a region of degraded stiffness. For example, the transverse motion is represented by

\[
w = \sum_i W_i \delta(0 < x < L) \eta_i(x) + \delta(a < x < a) \eta_i(x) + \delta(b < x < L) \eta_i(x) + \delta(b < x < a) \eta_i(x) \sin \omega t \tag{28}\]

where \( \delta(x_1 < x < x_2) \) identifies the corresponding region of the beam \( (m = 3, 4) \).

The Galerkin equation for \( W_i \) obtained by assumption that the contribution of the axial inertia is negligible is

\[
W_i \left\{ \int_a^L \left[ \left( D_2 - \frac{B_z^2}{A_z} \right) \beta_2^2(\lambda_i) \eta_i''(x) - m \omega^2 \eta_i(x) \right] \eta_i(x) \, dx \right. \\
+ \int_a^L \left[ \left( D_1 - \frac{B_z^2}{A_z} \right) \beta_1^2(\lambda_i) \eta_i''(x) - m \omega^2 \eta_i(x) \right] \eta_i(x) \, dx \\
+ \int_a^L \left[ \left( D_3 - \frac{B_z^2}{A_z} \right) \beta_3^2(\lambda_i) \eta_i''(x) - m \omega^2 \eta_i(x) \right] \eta_i(x) \, dx \\
\left. + \int_a^L \left[ \left( D_4 - \frac{B_z^2}{A_z} \right) \beta_4^2(\lambda_i) \eta_i''(x) - m \omega^2 \eta_i(x) \right] \eta_i(x) \, dx \right\} = 0
\]

\[
= \omega^2 \left[ m \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx + m \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx \\
+ m_3 \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx + m_4 \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx \right] \tag{29}\]

where \( m, m_3, \) and \( m_4 \) refer to the mass per unit surface of the corresponding beam region.

This equation can be further simplified by introducing

\[
M_i' = m \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx + m \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx \\
+ m_3 \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx + m_4 \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx \tag{30}\]

Then the expression for the amplitude of the \( i \)th term in Eq. (28) is

\[
W_i = \frac{\omega^2 V}{M_i' (\lambda_i^2 - \omega^2)} \left[ m \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx + m \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx \\
+ m_3 \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx + m_4 \int_a^L \eta_i''(x) \, dx \right] \tag{31}\]

D. Beams with a Single Crack in the Vicinity of the Support

As was observed in experiments, fracture in an isotropic cantilever beam is often associated with a single crack located close to the support and oriented perpendicular to the beam surface (root crack). In the case of a harmonic dynamic loading, two cracks may start propagating toward each other from the opposite surfaces of the beam. In FGM beams composed of pseudos isotropic layers of particulate materials with a layerwise constant volume fraction of the
constituents, a single crack close to the support is also a likely scenario. The effect of such a crack that practically coincides with a part of the clamped boundary is considered in this section of the paper.

The approach adopted in this paper is based on modeling the effect of the crack through a rotational spring at the clamped end (Fig. 3). This reflects the fact that although the crack does not affect the resistance to transverse deflections at the clamped end, a certain degree of compliance to rotational deformations about this end is unavoidable. Therefore, it is possible to incorporate the effect of the crack, combining experimental or numerical data on the rotational stiffness at the clamped end with the analytical solution. Note that in line with the previous discussion on the effect of the interaction between delaminated regions of a beam during the part of the cycle when the distance between the regions decreases, it is necessary to account for the effect of the closing of the crack during the motion. Accordingly, the present solution refers to the case in which the crack remains open and there is no mechanical pressure between the parts of the beam and support encompassing the crack (lower limit of the fundamental frequency). The upper limit of the solution obtained by assuming that the crack is closed during the part of motion when the beam rotates in the counterclockwise direction (refer to Fig. 3), is estimated in numerical examples. The proposed approach includes three steps outlined next.

1. Static Problem for the Free-End Deflection

Consider a relationship between the deflection of the free end of the FGM beam of a rectangular cross section (shown in Fig. 3) and the coefficient of elastic rotational constraint introduced by the elastic spring. Equations of static equilibrium of the beam are represented by the static version of Eq. (3), and the boundary conditions are

\[
\begin{align*}
  x &= 0: \ w &= 0, \quad u = 0, \quad \frac{dw}{dx} = -K^{-1}M \\
  x &= L: \ M &= 0, \quad N = 0, \quad Q = \frac{dM}{dx} = P
\end{align*}
\]

If the crack is longer than the half-thickness of the beam, the condition \( u(x = 0) = 0 \) becomes invalid, but such a case corresponding to an extensive damage that usually results in a rapid collapse is not considered here.

The solution of the equations of equilibrium yields both the transverse and axial displacements. Applying boundary conditions to specify the constants in integration, the deflection of the free end is related to the applied force by

\[
w(x = L) = \frac{PL^2}{3(D - (B^2/A)b)} \left[ L + 3K^{-1} \left( D - \frac{B^2}{A} \right) b \right]
\]

(33)

If the displacement magnification factor \( q \) is defined as a ratio of the deflection of the tip of the cantilever with a root crack to that in the intact counterpart subject to the same load, the coefficient \( K \) is determined from

\[
K = \frac{3[D - (B^2/A)b]}{(q - 1)L}
\]

(34)

Therefore, using experimental data from the tests on beams with the known depth of the crack, it is possible to establish a relationship between this depth and the stiffness of the rotational constraint \( K \). Alternatively, this stiffness can be found from finite element analysis, such as ABAQUS, employed in the Numerical Examples section.

2. Vibrations of a FGM Beam with Rotational Restraint (Open Crack)

The problem of free vibrations of the beam can be analyzed using the equations of motion (3) without the term \( mw\ddot{v} \) and using the boundary conditions (32) with \( P = 0 \). The solution is sought by representing both axial and transverse displacements in the form of Eq. (6). This solution may be further simplified by neglecting the effect of the axial inertia on both transverse and axial motions. The inaccuracy introduced by this simplification is insignificant, as follows from the comparison between analytical and finite element results (see Numerical Examples). Accordingly, the solution is presented as

\[
\begin{align*}
  w &= W\bar{\eta}(x) \sin \omega t = (C_1 \sinh \bar{\beta}x + C_2 \cosh \bar{\beta}x + C_3 \sin \bar{\beta}x + C_4 \cos \bar{\beta}x) \sin \omega t \\
  u &= W\bar{\phi}(x) \sin \omega t = B \left( \frac{dw}{dx} \right) + C_5 \sin \omega t
\end{align*}
\]

(35)

where \( C_i \) are constants of integration; \( \bar{\beta} \) is given by Eq. (7b), omitting the subscript \( n \); and the boundary condition \( N(x = L) = 0 \) is already accounted for.

The application of the boundary conditions yields the following system of equations:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  0 & -K^{-1} & 0 & 1 \\
  1 & -K^{-1} & 1 & K^{-1} \left( D - \frac{B^2}{A} \right) \bar{\beta} \\
  \sinh \bar{\beta}L & \cosh \bar{\beta}L & -\sin \bar{\beta}L & -\cos \bar{\beta}L \\
  \cosh \bar{\beta}L & \sin \bar{\beta}L & -\cos \bar{\beta}L & \sin \bar{\beta}L
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
  C_1 \\
  C_2 \\
  C_3 \\
  C_4
\end{bmatrix} = 0
\]

(36)

and the constant of integration in the expression for axial displacements is

\[
C_5 = -\frac{B}{A} \bar{\beta} (C_1 + C_3)
\]

(37)

The natural frequencies can be determined from the requirement that the determinant of Eq. (36) should be equal to zero. Subsequently, the solution is represented by Eq. (35) and the normal modes corresponding to the \( n \)th natural frequency are given by

\[
\bar{\eta}(x) = \sinh \bar{\beta}x + f_2 \cosh \bar{\beta}x + f_3 \sin \bar{\beta}x + f_4 \cos \bar{\beta}x
\]

(38)

\[
\bar{\phi}(x) = \frac{B}{A} \bar{\beta} \left[ \frac{(\cosh \bar{\beta}x - 1) + f_2 \sin \bar{\beta}x - f_3 (\cosh \bar{\beta}x - 1) + f_4 \sin \bar{\beta}x}{2} \right]
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
  x &= 0: \ w &= v, \quad u = 0, \quad \frac{dv}{dx} = -K^{-1}M \\
  x &= L: \ M &= 0, \quad N = 0, \quad Q = \frac{dM}{dx} = 0
\end{align*}
\]

(39)

The displacements are sought in the form of the series in terms of normal modes:

\[
w = \sum_i W_i \bar{\eta}(x) \sin \omega t, \quad u = \sum_i W_i \bar{\phi}(x) \sin \omega t
\]

(40)

The amplitude of the terms in series (40) is available from the equations of motion:

\[
W_i = \frac{m \omega^2 \bar{g}_i V}{[(D - B^2/A)\bar{\beta}_i^2 - \omega^2] f_i}
\]

(41)

where
implies $d \sim (44)$

is the static axial force that is equal to zero. This is evident to be solved), and

is a mass per unit length that varies in the $x$ direction.

The response of the beam is now subdivided into static and dynamic components so that

Equations of motion obtained by the substitution of Eqs. (43) and (47) into Eq. (46) become

E. Vibrations of a FGM Cantilever with a Root Crack Subject to Temperature

FGM beams often operate in high-temperature environments. An example is a FGM turbine blade modeled as a nonprismatic cantilever beam of a variable cross section subject to temperature that mostly varies in the thickness direction. In addition to nonprismatic beams, the following discussion also refers to beams with a uniform cross section but variable grading in the axial direction and that are subject to thermal loads. It is noted that the effect of temperature on eigenfrequencies of structures has also been investigated by other researchers; mentioned here are papers by Librescu et al. [22,23]. Contrary to the previous studies, this section presents a qualitative conclusion regarding the frequencies of a beam exposed to an arbitrary thermal environment.

If a nonprismatic FGM beam is subject to an arbitrary temperature distribution, the constitutive relations are modified to account for variable stiffness and thermal terms:

where $\tilde{T}$ is the temperature (the heat conduction problem is assumed to be solved), and

It is emphasized that the terms $N$ and $M$ in Eq. (43) represent the force and moment, rather than the stress resultant and stress couple. In the case of a nonprismatic beam, the stiffness terms in Eq. (44) are

The reduced stiffness $Q_{ij}(\tilde{T}, x, z)$ and the coefficient of thermal expansion $\alpha(\tilde{T}, x, z)$ reflect the influence of external thermal load that affects the distribution of temperature throughout the beam and, accordingly, the properties of the material.

The equations of free vibrations of the beam are written to include the effect of in-plane force:

where $m(x) = \int_{0}^{L} \rho \, dz \, dy$ is a mass per unit length that varies in the $x$ direction.

The response of the beam is now subdivided into static and dynamic components so that

Equations of motion obtained by the substitution of Eqs. (43) and (47) into Eq. (46) become

where $M_{x,x} = m(x) \ddot{w}$

It is obvious from Eq. (49) that static deflections due to thermal loading affect equations of motion and, accordingly, the eigenvalues. This effect is introduced through the underlined term in Eq. (49).

Dynamic boundary conditions obtained from the correspondingly modified Eqs. (32) are uncoupled from the corresponding static conditions:

The last condition in Eq. (50) accounts for the fact that both static and dynamic axial forces at the free end are equal to zero.

The equations of motion are affected by thermal terms, even if the temperature is uniform. Therefore, the frequencies of vibrations, including the fundamental frequency, and the corresponding eigenvectors are influenced by static thermal loading.

If the effect of the axial inertia was neglected, the first equation of motion would be reduced to $N\ddot{w} + \vec{N} = 0$. Accordingly, the boundary condition $N(x = L) = 0$ implies $N = \vec{N} = 0$ and Eq. (46b) becomes

The equations are still temperature-dependent through the material properties, but the nonlinear term $(\partial / \partial x)(N u_{,x})$ is now equal to zero in Eq. (51) and the associated temperature effect is not included in Eq. (49b). In conclusion, even in the case of a prismatic beam subject to temperature that is independent of the axial coordinate, the explicit effect of temperature on free vibrations is present as long as axial inertia is accounted for (in addition, temperature affects natural frequencies through its influence on material properties).

III. Numerical Examples

The following examples are based on a beam manufactured from Ti and TiB (titanium boride), because data were available for the fundamental frequency for intact specimens. The length, width, and thickness of the beam were 101.6 (unless indicated otherwise), 25.4, and 3.175 mm, respectively. All seven layers were quasi-isotropic,
each layer having constant volume fractions of TiB and Ti. The composition and thickness of the layers are shown in Table 1. The same table presents the properties of each layer measured by Hall and Lin [24] and estimated by the beam manufacturer, Cercom, Inc. A side view of the beam photographed with a 50× magnification is shown in Fig. 4. The variations of the modulus of elasticity and the Poisson ratio dependent on the volume fraction of titanium boride are illustrated in Fig. 5. The examples discussed next are presented for the beam with a single crack at the root, similar to that shown in Fig. 3. The fact that this mode of damage was observed in experiments motivated close attention to the effect of a root crack on the fundamental frequency of the beam. If this is significant, it would both affect the resonant conditions and motivate using non-destructive testing when monitoring the natural frequencies.

The displacement of the tip of a cantilever beam statically loaded by a force $P$ (Fig. 3) is shown as a function of the depth of the crack in Fig. 6. These results were generated numerically by ABAQUS to elucidate the effect of the crack on maximum displacements and were used in Eqs. (33) or (34) to evaluate the stiffness of the equivalent rotational spring. The beam model used in ABAQUS used four-noded shell elements. Each layer was modeled with the mechanical properties from Table 1. The crack was modeled by removing constraints against displacements at the corresponding nodes of the elements adjacent to the boundary of the beam. As follows from Fig. 6, the effect of the crack becomes noticeable as its depth approaches 1 mm (i.e., about a third of the depth of the beam). Predictably, this effect is particularly prominent for cracks originating at the stiffer titanium boride surface.

The spring constant is shown as a function of the displacement magnification factor in Fig. 7, in which the latter factor is kept in the range anticipated based on the previous analysis (Fig. 6). The stiffness becomes infinite for the magnification factor equal to zero, because this corresponds to the intact beam with a complete clamping. However, as follows from Fig. 7, the stiffness rapidly decreases, even as a result of relatively short cracks.

The effect of the stiffness of the rotational spring on the fundamental frequency is shown in Fig. 8, in which the nondimensional compliance $k = K^{-1} (D - B^2 / \bar{A})$. The nondimensional stiffness varies in the range anticipated for cracks considered in examples that do not exceed a half-thickness of the beam. It is evident that the changes in the fundamental frequency as a result of the root crack are large enough to justify vibrational nondestructive testing. The presence of a crack also affects the resonant conditions for the structure. This means that a beam that did not develop large vibrations under a load with the prescribed frequency may exhibit violent response as its fundamental frequency decreases due to a root crack. The result shown in Fig. 2 elucidates the effect of the length of the beam with a root crack on its fundamental frequencies. Although numerical results depend on the length of the beam, the qualitative conclusions remain unaltered.

Finally, fundamental frequencies of a FGM cantilever beam are shown as functions of the depth of the root crack in Fig. 10. It is seen

![Fig. 4 Photograph of a TiB/Ti FGM beam magnified by a factor of 50.](image)

![Fig. 5 Variations of the modulus of elasticity (left) and the Poisson ratio (right) as functions of the volume fraction of titanium boride.](image)
that the analytical solution that neglected the axial inertia agrees well with the results obtained by ABAQUS, which accounted for this inertia. It is obvious from Fig. 10 that cracks deeper than 1 mm noticeably affect the fundamental frequency of the beam. Predictably, cracks originating from the stiffer surface resulted in a larger reduction in the fundamental frequency than identical cracks that started at the surface on which the stiffness is lower.

A comparison with data from intact beams indicates that the presence of the boundary throughout the cycle of motion. Accordingly, these results represent the lower limit of the fundamental frequency. The effect of the mass of the accelerometer was estimated using the Dunkerley method [25]. Using the analytical solution and properties from [24], the fundamental frequency for the intact FGM beam is about 6% higher than the average of the test results. The error bars show the range of the experimentally measured frequencies. As can be seen, the scatter in the data is large (≈ ± 12%) and may be an indication of microcracking in the material or this may be an indication of the variability of the material properties associated with the method of manufacture of the specimens. Tests with uniform material (aluminum and uniform 85% TiB/15% Ti specimens) showed less scatter (≈ ± 1%) and agreed well with theory. In any case, a decrease of frequency would be expected once a crack occurs.

It is emphasized that the results shown in Figs. 8–10 were obtained by assuming that the crack remains open and unaffected by the presence of the boundary throughout the cycle of motion. Accordingly, these results represent the lower limit of the fundamental frequency. The upper limit can easily be evaluated from Fig. 10 as \( f_2(d) = 2 [f^{-1}(d) + f^{-1}(d = 0)] \). As anticipated, the difference between the lower and upper limits remains small if the crack is short. For example, for a 1-mm-deep crack that initiated at the TiB-rich surface of the beam, this difference is only 2.5% (using the properties from [24]). However, if the crack is 2 mm deep, this difference exceeds 13%. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that such deep cracks exceeding 60% of the thickness of the beam are

---

Fig. 6  Displacement of the tip of FGM beam as a function of crack depth from ABAQUS; Ti denotes the crack initiated at the TiB-rich surface and Ti denotes the crack initiated at the titanium surface.

Fig. 7  Stiffness of the rotational spring as a function of the displacement magnification factor; Ti denotes the purely titanium beam, TiB denotes the beam consisting of 85% TiB and 15% Ti, [25] denotes the FGM beam with properties according to [24], and Cercom denotes the FGM beam with properties according to Cercom, Inc.

Fig. 8  Fundamental frequency as a function of the nondimensional compliance of the FGM beam; Ti denotes the purely titanium beam, TiB denotes the beam consisting of 85% TiB and 15% Ti, [25] denotes the FGM beam with properties according to [24], and Cercom denotes the FGM beam with properties according to Cercom, Inc.

Fig. 9  Effect of the length of a FGM beam with a root crack on the fundamental frequency; labels represent the length of the beam in meters; and material properties are according to [24].

Fig. 10  The fundamental frequency of a FGM cantilever beam as a function of the depth of the crack at the clamped end; TiB denotes the crack initiated at the TiB-rich surface, Ti denotes the crack initiated at the titanium surface, solid curves denote the results of the analytical solution, AB denotes the ABAQUS results, and Exp denotes the experimental result.
unlikely to be encountered in applications. Therefore, the lower limit of the frequency is considered to be the lower limit of the range within which driving frequencies are lower than the fundamental frequency of the structure.

IV. Conclusions

The paper presents the analysis of free and forced vibrations of a damaged cantilever FGM beam. The modes of damage considered in this paper include damage to the beam with a region of reduced stiffness, delamination, and root cracks. The solutions for free-vibration problems are exact, whereas forced vibrations are determined by the mode-summation method. Numerical results elucidate the effect of root cracks on the fundamental frequency of a FGM beam. The same observation remains valid for uniform FGM beams, even if temperature is independent of the axial coordinate. The same conclusion can be reached by considering other typical composite and FGM beam configurations and using the estimate given by (A4).

Appendix: Effect of the Axial Inertia on the Fundamental Frequency of a Composite Beam

The equations of motion of a slender asymmetrically laminated or FGM beam are

\[ A \frac{d^2 w}{dx^2} - B \frac{d^2 w}{dx^4} - \frac{m}{L} \frac{d^2 w}{dt^2} = 0, \quad B \frac{d^2 w}{dx^4} - D \frac{d^2 w}{dx^4} - \frac{m}{L} \frac{d^2 w}{dt^2} = 0 \]  

(A1)

The boundary conditions corresponding to simply supported edges that are not constrained against axial displacements are satisfied if

\[ u = U \cos \frac{\pi x}{L} e^{i \omega t}, \quad w = W \sin \frac{\pi x}{L} e^{i \omega t} \]  

(A2)

where the amplitudes of axial and transverse vibrations are denoted by \( U \) and \( W \), respectively.

The substitution of Eq. \( (A2) \) into Eq. \( (A1) \) and straightforward transformations yield

\[ \lambda^2 = \frac{[D - (B^2/A)(\pi/L)^4]}{m[1 - (B/A)(\pi/L)(U/W)]} \]  

(A3)

The ratio of the fundamental frequency obtained by accounting for the effect of the axial inertia compared with the ratio without this effect is now evaluated as

\[ r = \sqrt{1 + (B/A)(\pi/L)(U/W)} \approx 1 - \frac{1}{2} \pi \frac{U}{A} \frac{1}{L} \]  

(A4)

For a beam analyzed in numerical examples, \( A = 6.621 \times 10^6 \) N/m, \( B = 2.818 \times 10^5 \) N, and \( L = 0.1016 \) m, where the stiffness coefficients are obtained using the properties suggested in [24]. Accordingly, Eq. \( (A4) \) yields \( r = 1 - 0.00658(U/W) \).
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