

AIRCRAFT STRUCTURAL SAFETY: EFFECTS OF EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT
SAFETY MEASURES AND UNCERTAINTY REDUCTION MECHANISMS

By

ERDEM ACAR

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2006

Copyright 2006

by

Erdem Acar

This dissertation is dedicated to my family: my father Zuhuri Acar, my mother Şerife Acar, and my sister Asiye Acar.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express special thanks and appreciation to Dr. Raphael T. Haftka, chairman of my advisory committee. I am grateful to him for providing me with this excellent opportunity and financial support to complete my doctoral studies under his exceptional guidance. He encouraged me to attend several conferences and assisted in finding an internship during my studies. Through our weekly meetings and his open door policy, which I definitely over-exploited, he greatly contributed to this dissertation. His limitless knowledge and patience are inspiration to me. During the past three years, he was more than my PhD supervisor; he was a friend, and sometimes like a father. I sincerely hope we will remain in contact in the future.

I would also like to thank the members of my advisory committee, Dr. Bhavani V. Sankar, co-chair of the committee, Dr. Nagaraj Arakere, Dr. Nam-Ho Kim and Dr. Stanislav Uryasev. I am grateful for their willingness to review my Ph.D. research and to provide me with the constructive comments which helped me to complete this dissertation. In particular, I would like to extend special thanks to Dr. Bhavani V. Sankar for his guidance on the papers we co-authored, and Dr. Nam-Ho Kim for his comments and suggestions during the meetings of the Structural and Multidisciplinary Group.

I also wish to express my gratitude to my M.Sc. advisor, Dr. Mehmet A. Akgun, who provided a large share of motivation for pursuing a doctorate degree. The experience he supplied me during my master's degree studies contributed to this dissertation.

I also wish to thank to my colleagues at the Structural and Multidisciplinary Group of the Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Department of the University of Florida for their support, friendship and many technical discussions. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Melih Papila, Dr. Jaco Schutte, my soul sister Lisa Schutte, Tushar Goel and Ben Smarslok for their friendship (in the order of meeting with them).

Financial support provided by NASA Cooperative Agreement NCC3-994, NASA University Research, Engineering and Technology Institute and NASA Langley Research Center Grant Number NAG1-03070 is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, my deepest appreciation goes to my family: my father Zuhuri Acar, my mother Şerife Acar and my sister Asiye Acar. The initiation, continuation and final completion of this thesis would not have happened without their continuous support, encouragement and love. I am incredibly lucky to have them in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
NOMENCLATURE	xix
ABSTRACT	xxv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Motivation.....	1
Objectives	5
Methodology.....	6
Outline	7
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Probabilistic vs. Deterministic Design	12
Structural Safety Analysis	14
Probability of Failure Estimation	15
Analytical calculation of probability of failure	15
Moment-based techniques.....	16
Simulation techniques	17
Separable Monte Carlo simulations	18
Response surface approximations	19
Reliability-Based Design Optimization.....	20
Double loop (Nested) RBDO	20
Single loop RBDO	21
Error and Variability.....	22
Uncertainty Classification	22
Reliability Improvement by Error and Variability Reduction.....	23
Testing and Probabilistic Design.....	24

3	WHY ARE AIRPLANES SO SAFE STRUCTURALLY? EFFECT OF VARIOUS SAFETY MEASURES	28
	Introduction.....	28
	Structural Uncertainties	30
	Safety Measures.....	32
	Design of a Generic Component.....	33
	Design and Certification Testing.....	33
	Effect of Certification Tests on Distribution of Error Factor e	36
	Probability of Failure Calculation by Analytical Approximation	38
	Effect of Three Safety Measures on Probability of Failure.....	41
	Summary.....	51
4	COMPARING EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES THAT IMPROVE AIRCRAFT STRUCTURAL SAFETY	53
	Introduction.....	53
	Load Safety Factor	54
	Conservative Material Properties	54
	Tests.....	54
	Redundancy	55
	Error Reduction	55
	Variability Reduction	55
	Errors, Variability and Total Safety Factor	56
	Errors in Design.....	56
	Errors in Construction	58
	Total Error Factor.....	59
	Total Safety Factor	60
	Variability.....	61
	Certification Tests.....	62
	Probability of Failure Calculation	65
	Probability of Failure Calculation by Separable MCS	65
	Including Redundancy.....	70
	Results.....	70
	Effect of Errors	70
	Weight Saving Due to Certification Testing and Error Reduction.....	73
	Effect of Redundancy	74
	Additional Safety Factor Due to Redundancy.....	77
	Effect of Variability Reduction	78
	Summary.....	81
5	INCREASING ALLOWABLE FLIGHT LOADS BY IMPROVED STRUCTURAL MODELING.....	82
	Introduction.....	82
	Structural Analysis of a Sandwich Structure	85
	Analysis of Error and Variability	89

	Deterministic Design and B-basis Value Calculations	93
	Assessment of Probability of Failure	96
	Analyzing the Effects of Improved Model on Allowable Flight Loads via Probabilistic Design	99
	Summary	101
6	TRADEOFF OF UNCERTAINTY REDUCTION MECHANISMS FOR REDUCING STRUCTURAL WEIGHT	103
	Introduction	104
	Design of Composite Laminates for Cryogenic Temperatures	106
	Calculation of Probability of Failure	108
	Probabilistic Design Optimization	112
	Probabilistic Sufficiency Factor (PSF)	112
	Design Response Surface (DRS)	113
	Weight Savings by Reducing Error and Employing Manufacturing Quality Control	114
	Choosing Optimal Uncertainty Reduction Combination	118
	Summary	119
7	OPTIMAL CHOICE OF KNOCKDOWN FACTORS THROUGH PROBABILISTIC DESIGN	121
	Introduction	122
	Testing of Aircraft Structures	123
	Quantification of Errors and Variability	125
	Errors in Estimating Material Strength Properties from Coupon Tests	125
	Errors in Structural Element Tests	127
	Allowable stress updating and the use of explicit knockdown factors	129
	Current industrial practice on updating allowable stresses using worst- case conditions (implicit knockdown factors)	129
	Proposal for a better way to update allowable stresses: Using the average failure stress measured in the tests and using optimal explicit knockdown factors	130
	Error updating via element tests	134
	Errors in Design	135
	Errors in Construction	137
	Total Error Factor	138
	Total Safety Factor	138
	Variability	139
	Simulation of Certification Test and Probability of Failure Calculation	141
	Simulation of Certification Test	141
	Calculation of Probability of Failure	142
	Results	144
	Optimal Choice of Explicit Knockdown Factors for Minimum Weight and Minimum Certification Failure Rate	145

Optimal Choice of Explicit Knockdown Factors for Minimum Weight and Minimum Probability of Failure	148
Effect of Coupon Tests and Structural Element Tests on Error in Failure Prediction	150
Effect of number of coupon tests alone (for a fixed number of element tests, $n_e=3$)	150
Effect of number of element tests alone (for a fixed number of coupon tests, $n_c=40$)	151
Advantage of Variable Explicit Knockdown Factors	153
Effect of Other Uncertainty Reduction Mechanisms	157
Effect of variability reduction	157
Effect of error reduction	159
Effect of Number of Coupon Tests	161
Effect of Number of Structural Element Tests	162
Summary	164
 8	
RELIABILITY BASED AIRCRAFT STRUCTURAL DESIGN PAYS EVEN WITH LIMITED STATISTICAL DATA	165
Introduction	165
Demonstration of Gains from Reliability-Based Structural Design Optimization of a Representative Wing and Tail System	167
Problem Formulation and Simplifying Assumptions	167
Probabilistic Optimization with Correct Statistical Data	169
Effect of Errors in Information about Deterministic Design	174
Errors in Coefficient of Variation of Stresses	174
Erroneous Mean Stresses	177
Errors in Probability of Failure Estimates of Deterministic Design	179
Effect of Using Wrong Probability Distribution Type for the Stress	181
Approximate Probabilistic Design Based on Failure Stress Distributions	182
Application of Characteristic Stress Method to Wing and Tail Problem	186
Summary	189
 9	
CONCLUDING REMARKS	192
 APPENDIX	
 A	
A-BASIS AND B-BASIS VALUE CALCULATION	197
 B	
PROBABILITY CALCULATIONS FOR CHAPTER 3	199
Calculation of $\Pr(\text{CT} e)$, the Probability of Passing Certification Test	199
Calculations of Mean and Standard Deviation of Probability of Failure	200
 C	
CONFLICTING EFFECTS OF ERROR AND VARIABILITY ON PROBABILITY OF FAILURE IN CHAPTER 3	202

D	COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF SINGLE ERROR FACTOR AND MULTIPLE ERROR FACTOR CASES	204
E	DETAILS OF SEPARABLE MONTE CARLO SIMULATIONS FOR PROBABILITY OF FAILURE CALCULATIONS IN CHAPTER 4.....	209
F	CALCULATION OF THE SYSTEM FAILURE PROBABILITY USING BIVARIATE NORMAL DISTRIBUTION	212
G	TEMPERATURE DEPENDENT MATERIAL PROPERTIES FOR THE CRYOGENIC LAMINATES IN CHAPTER 6	214
H	DETAILS OF CONSERVATIVE CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION (CDF) FITTING	216
I	DETAILS OF DESIGN RESPONSE SURFACE FITTING FOR THE PROBABILITY SUFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR THE CRYOGENIC LAMINATES IN CHAPTER 6.....	218
J	ASSESSMENT OF THE ERROR DUE TO LIMITED NUMBER OF COUPON TESTS.....	222
K	PROBABILITY OF FAILURE CALCULATIONS FOR CHAPTER 7 USING SEPARABLE MCS.....	224
L	CHANGE IN COST DUE TO INCREASE OF THE STRUCTURAL WEIGHT ..	230
M	RESPONSE SURFACE APPROXIMATIONS FOR RELIABILITY INDEX OF CERTIFICATION FAILURE RATE, RELIABILITY INDEX OF PROBABILITY OF FAILURE AND BUILT SAFETY FACTOR IN CHAPTER 7	232
N	CALCULATION OF THE MEAN AND THE C.O.V. OF THE STRESS DISTRIBUTION USING PROBABILITY OF FAILURE INFORMATION.....	233
O	RELATION OF COMPONENT WEIGHTS AND OPTIMUM COMPONENT FAILURE PROBABILITIES IN CHAPTER 8	236
P	HISTORICAL RECORD FOR AIRCRAFT PROBABILITY OF FAILURE	241
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	243
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	256

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
3-1 Uncertainty classification	31
3-2 Distribution of random variables used for component design and certification	36
3-3 Comparison of probability of failures for components designed using safety factor of 1.5, mean value for allowable stress and error bound of 50%.....	40
3-4 Probability of failure for different bounds on error e for components designed using safety factor of 1.5 and A-basis property for allowable stress	42
3-5 Probability of failure for different bounds on error e for components designed using safety factor of 1.5 and mean value for allowable stress.....	44
3-6 Probability of failure for different bounds on error e for safety factor of 1.0 and A-basis allowable stress	46
3-7 Probability of failure for different error bounds for safety factor of 1.0 and mean value for allowable stress	46
3-8 Probability of failure for different uncertainty in failure stress for the components designed with safety factor of 1.5, 50% error bounds e and A-basis allowable stress.	47
3-9 Probability of failure for different uncertainty in failure stress for the components designed with safety factor of 1.5, 30% error bound e and A-basis allowable stress.	47
3.10 Probability of failure for uncertainty in failure stress for components designed using safety factor of 1.5, 10% error bounds e and A-basis properties.....	48
4-1 Distribution of error factors and their bounds	59
4-2 Distribution of random variables having variability	61
4-3 Mean and standard deviations of the built and certified distributions of the error factor e_{total} and the total safety factor S_F	64
4-4 Average and coefficient of variation of the probability of failure for the structural parts designed with B-basis properties and $S_{FL}=1.5$	72

4-5	Reduction of the weight of structural parts by certification testing for a given probability of failure.....	74
4-6	Effect of redundancy on the probabilities of failure.....	75
4-7	Effect of redundancy on the effectiveness of certification testing	76
4-8	Effect of correlation coefficient ρ on <i>system</i> failure probabilities and effectiveness of certification testing.....	77
4-9	Additional safety factor due to redundancy	78
4-10	Comparison of system failure probabilities corresponding to different variability in failure stress σ_f	79
5-1	Deviations between measured and fitted values of “average G_c ” and “ G_c with mode mixity” for different designs	90
5-2	The mean and B-basis values of the fracture toughness of the designs analyzed....	94
5-3	Allowable flight load of failure of the sandwich panels designed using deterministic approach	96
5-4	Corresponding probabilities of failure of the sandwich panels designed using deterministic approach	99
5-5	Allowable flight loads of the sandwich panels calculated via probabilistic approach	101
6-1	Allowable strains for IM600/133	107
6-2	Deterministic optimum design	108
6-3	Coefficients of variation of the random variables.....	108
6-4	Evaluation of the accuracy of the analysis response surface.....	110
6-5	Comparison of probability of failure estimations for the deterministic optimum..	111
6-6	Probabilistic optimum designs for different error bounds when only error reduction is applied	114
6-7	Probabilistic optimum designs for different error bounds when both error and variability reduction are applied.....	116
7-1	Distribution of error factors and their bounds.....	138
7-2	Distribution of random variables having variability	140

7-3	Mean and standard deviations of the built and certified distribution of the total safety factor S_F	142
7-4	Comparing explicit knockdown factors for minimum built safety factor for a specified certification failure rate.....	148
7-5	Comparing explicit knockdown factors for minimum built safety factor for a specified probability of failure	150
7-6	Comparison of constant and variable explicit knockdown factors case and corresponding area ratios, A/A_0	154
7-7	Comparison of constant (i.e., test independent) implicit and explicit knockdown factors and corresponding area ratios A/A_0	156
7-8	Comparison of mean and coefficient of variation of total knockdown reduction at the element test level for the cases of implicit constant knockdown factor and explicit variable knockdown factors	157
7-9	Optimal explicit knockdown factors for minimum CFR when variability in failure stress is reduced by half.....	159
7-10	Optimal explicit knockdown factors for minimum CFR when all errors reduced by half.....	161
7-11	Optimal explicit knockdown factors for minimum CFR different number of coupon tests, n_c	162
7-12	Optimal explicit knockdown factors for different number of structural element tests, n_e	163
8-1	Probabilistic structural design optimization for safety of a representative wing and tail system.....	171
8-2	Probabilistic structural optimization of wing, horizontal tail and vertical tail system.....	173
8-3	Errors in the ratios of failure probabilities of the wing and tail system when the c.o.v. of the stresses under-estimated by 50%.....	175
8-4	Errors in the ratios of failure probabilities of the wing and tail system when the mean stresses are under-estimated by 20%	178
8-5	Errors in the ratios of failure probabilities of the wing and tail system when the probability of failure of the deterministic design is under-predicted	180
8-6	Errors in the ratios of failure probabilities of wing and tail system when the probability of failure of the deterministic design is over-predicted	181

8-7	Errors in the ratios of failure probabilities of the wing and tail system if the optimization is performed using wrong probability distribution type for the stress	182
8-8	Probabilistic design optimization for safety of the representative wing and tail system using the characteristic-stress method.....	188
8-9	Effect of 20% under-estimate of k on the ratios of probability of failure estimate	188
D-1	Equivalent error bounds for the SEF model corresponding to the same standard deviation in the MEF model.....	205
D-2	Comparison of system failure probabilities for the SEF and MEF models	206
D-3	Comparison of the total safety factor S_F used in the design of structural parts for the SEF and MEF models.....	207
E-1	Comparison of the probability of failure estimations.....	211
I-1	The ranges of variables for the three DRS constructed for PSF calculation.....	218
I-2	Accuracies of DRS fitted to PSF and P_f in terms of four design variables (t_1 , t_2 , θ_1 and θ_2) for error bounds, b_e , of 0, 10%, and 20%	219
I-3	Ranges of design variables for the three DRS constructed for probability of failure estimation for the error and variability reduction case	221
M-1	Accuracy of response surfaces	232
P-1	Aircraft accidents and probability of failure of aircraft structures.	242

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>page</u>
2-1 Building block approach	26
3-1 Flowchart for Monte Carlo simulation of component design and failure	35
3-2 Initial and updated probability distribution functions of error factor e	38
3-3 Design thickness variation with low and high error bounds	45
3-4 Influence of effective safety factor, error, and variability on the probability ratio (3-D view)	50
3-5 Influence of effective safety factor, error and variability on the probability ratio (2-D plot).....	50
3-6 Influence of effective safety factor, error and variability on the probability difference (3-D view)	51
3-7 Influence of effective safety factor, error and variability on the probability difference (2-D plot).....	51
4-1 Comparing distributions of built and certified total error e_{total} of SEF and MEF models	63
4-2 Initial and updated distribution of the total safety factor S_F	64
4-3 The variation of the probability of failure with the built total safety factor.....	68
4-4 Flowchart for MCS of component design and failure.....	69
4-5 Total safety factors for MEF model for the structural part and system after certification.....	78
4-6 Effect of variability on failure probability	79
5-1 The model of face-sheet/core debonding in a one-dimensional sandwich panel with pressure load.....	86
5-2 Critical energy release rate as a function of mode mixity	88

5-3	Comparison of actual and fitted cumulative distribution functions of variability, d_{MM} , of G_c	92
5-4	Comparison of actual and fitted cumulative distribution functions of total uncertainty (error and variability, d^A) of G_c	92
5-5	Fitted least square lines for fracture toughness, and derived B-basis allowables	95
6-1	Geometry and loading of the laminate with two ply angles.....	107
6-2	Comparison of CDF obtained via 1,000 MCS, the approximate normal distribution and conservative approximate normal distributions for ε_2 on θ_1 corresponding to the deterministic optimum.....	111
6-3	Reducing laminate thickness (hence weight) by error reduction (no variability reduction)	115
6-4	Reducing laminate thickness by error reduction (ER) and quality control (QC)...	116
6-5	Trade-off plot for the probability of failure, design thickness and uncertainty reduction measures	117
6-6	Tradeoff of probability of failure and uncertainty reduction	119
7-1	Building-block approach for aircraft structural testing.....	123
7-2	Simplified three level of tests.....	124
7-3	Current use of knockdown factors based on worst-case scenarios	131
7-4	Shrinkage of the failure surface	132
7-5	The variation of the explicit knockdown factors with ratio of the failure stress measured in the test and calculated failure stress with and without transition interval.....	133
7-6	Proposed use of explicit knockdown factors dependent on test results	134
7-7	Initial and updated distribution of the total safety factor S_F with and without structural element test.....	142
7-8	The variation of probability of failure of a structural part built by a single aircraft company.....	144
7-9	Optimal choice of explicit knockdown factors k_{cl} and k_{ch} for minimum built safety factor for specified certification failure rate	146
7-10	Comparing CFR and P_F of the structures designed for minimum CFR and minimum P_F	149

7-11	Effect of number of coupon tests on the error in failure prediction for a fixed number of element tests (3 element tests)	151
7-12	Effect of number of element tests on the error in failure prediction for a fixed number of coupon tests (40 coupon tests)	152
7-13	Evolution of the mean failure stress distribution with and without Bayesian updating	153
7-14	Comparison of variable and constant explicit knockdown factor	154
7-15	Comparison of Pareto fronts of certification failure rate and built safety factor for two different approaches while updating the allowable stress based on failure stresses measured in element tests	155
7-16	Reducing probability of failure and certification failure rate using variability reduction	159
7-17	Reducing certification failure rate using error reduction, variability reduction and combination of error and variability reduction	160
7-18	Optimal explicit knockdown factors for different number of coupon tests for minimum CFR and P_F	162
7-19	Effect of number of structural element tests, n_e	163
8-1	Stress distribution $s(\sigma)$ before and after redesign in relation to failure-stress distribution $f(\sigma)$	168
8-2	The change of the ratios of probabilities of failure of the probabilistic design of Table 8-1 versus the error in c.o.v.(σ)	176
8-3	Two different stress distributions at the wing leading to the same probability of failure of 1×10^{-7}	177
8-4	The change of the ratios of probabilities of failure with respect to the error in mean stress	179
8-5	Calculation of characteristic stress σ^* from probability of failure	185
8-6	Comparison of approximate and exact Δ and Δ^* and the resulting probabilities of failure for lognormal failure stress	186
8-7	The variation of the ratios of probabilities of failure with respect to error in k	189
D-1	System failure probabilities for the SEF and MEF models after certification	206
D-2	Total safety factors for the SEF and MEF model after certification	208

E-1	Comparison of numerical CDF with the assumed lognormal CDF for the distribution of the required safety factor	210
G-1	Material properties E_1 , E_2 , G_{12} and ν_{12} as a function of temperature	214
G-2	Material properties α_1 and α_2 as a function of temperature	215
K-1	The variation of probability of failure with built total safety factor	227
K-2	Flowchart for MCS of component design and failure	228

NOMENCLATURE

ARS	= Analysis response surface
A'_{req}	= Minimum required cross sectional area for the component to carry the service loading without failure
A_0	= Load carrying area if there is no variability and no safety measures
α_1, α_2	= Coefficient of thermal expansion along and transverse to fiber direction
b_e	= Bound of error
β	= Reliability index
C	= Capacity of structure, for example, failure stress
CFD	= Cumulative distribution function
CFR	= Certification failure rate
CLT	= Classical lamination theory
c.o.v.	= Coefficient of variation
DRS	= Design response surface
Δ^*	= Relative change in the characteristic stress σ^* corresponding to a relative change of Δ in stress σ
e	= Error factor
e_{fc}	= Error in failure prediction at the coupon level
e_C	= Error in capacity calculation
e_{fe}	= Error in failure prediction at the element level
e_{fs}	= Error in failure prediction at the structural level

e_{fT}	= Total error in failure prediction
e_m	= Error in material property prediction
e_P	= Error in load calculation
e_R	= Error in response calculation
e_σ	= Error in stress calculation
e_t	= Error in thickness calculation
e_{total}	= Total error factor
e_w	= Error in width calculation
e^A	= Error in fracture toughness assessment if traditional (averaging) method is used
e^{MM}	= Error in fracture toughness assessment if traditional (averaging) method is used
ER	= Error reduction
E_1, E_2	= Young's modulus along and transverse to fiber direction
$\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$	= Strains in the fiber direction and transverse to the fiber direction
$f()$	= Probability density function of the failure stress
$F()$	= Cumulative distribution function of the failure stress
FAA	= Federal Aviation Administration
G	= Strain energy release rate
G_C	= Fracture toughness
G_{12}	= Shear modulus
γ_{12}	= Shear strain
k	= Error multiplier
k_A, k_B	= Tolerance coefficients for A-basis and B-basis value calculation

k_{dc}	= Knock-down factor used to calculate allowable stress
K_I, K_{II}	= Model I and II stress intensity factors, respectively
M	= Number of simulations in the first stage of MCS
MCS	= Monte Carlo simulation
MEF model	= Multiple error factor model
N	= Number of simulations in the second stage of MCS
N_x, N_y	= Mechanical loading in x and y directions, respectively
n_c	= Number of coupon tests
n_e	= Number of structural element tests
p_{allow}	= Allowable flight load
P	= Load
PDF	= Probability density function
PSF	= Probability sufficiency factor
P_d	= Design load according to the FAA specifications
P_f	= Probability of failure of a component
P_f^*	= Approximate probability of failure of probabilistic design
P_{fd}	= Probability of failure of deterministic design
P_F	= Probability of failure of a system
\bar{P}_c	= Average probability of failure after certification test
\bar{P}_{nc}	= Average probability of failure before certification test
QC	= Quality control for manufacturing
r_{et}	= Ratio of failure stresses measured in test and its predicted value
R	= Response of a structure, for example, stress

RMSE	= Root mean square error
RSA	= Response surface approximation
R^2_{adj}	= Adjusted coefficient of multiple determination
ρ	= Coefficient of correlation
$s()$	= Probability density function of the stress
SEF model	= Single error factor model
S_c	= Additional company safety factor
S_{cl}	= Additional company safety factor if the failure stress measured in element tests are lower than the predicted failure stress
S_{ch}	= Additional company safety factor if the failure stress measured in element tests are higher than the predicted failure stress
S_{fe}	= Total safety factor added during structural element tests
S_{FL}	= Load safety factor of 1.5 (FAA specification)
S_F	= Total safety factor
σ	= Stress
σ^*	= Characteristic stress
σ_a	= Allowable stress
σ_f	= Failure stress
t	= Thickness
v_t	= Variability in built thickness
v_w	= Variability in built width
V_R	= Coefficient of variation
w	= Width
W	= Weight

W_d	= Weight of the deterministic design
Φ	= Cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution
ψ	= Mode-mixity angle

Subscripts

act	= The value of the relevant quantity in actual flight conditions
built	= Built value of the relevant quantity, which is different than the design value due to errors in construction
calc	= Calculated value of the relevant quantity, which is different from the true value due to errors
cert	= The value of the relevant quantity after certification test
d	= Deterministic design
design	= The design value of the relevant quantity
spec	= Specified value of the relevant quantity
target	= Target value of the relevant quantity
true	= The true value of the relevant quantity
worst	= The worst value of the relevant quantity
W	= Wing
T	= Tail

Subscripts

ave	= Average value of the relevant quantity
ini	= Initial value of the relevant quantity
upd	= Updated value of the relevant quantity

U = Upper limit of the relevant quantity

L = Lower limit of the relevant quantity

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

AIRCRAFT STRUCTURAL SAFETY: EFFECTS OF EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT
SAFETY MEASURES AND UNCERTAINTY REDUCTION MECHANISMS

By

Erdem Acar

August 2006

Chair: Raphael T. Haftka

Cochair: Bhavani V. Sankar

Major Department: Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

Aircraft structural safety is achieved by using different safety measures such as safety and knockdown factors, tests and redundancy. Safety factors or knockdown factors can be either explicit (e.g., load safety factor of 1.5) or implicit (e.g., conservative design decisions). Safety measures protect against uncertainties in loading, material and geometry properties along with uncertainties in structural modeling and analysis. The two main objectives of this dissertation are: (i) Analyzing and comparing the effectiveness of structural safety measures and their interaction. (ii) Allocating the resources for reducing uncertainties, instead of living with the uncertainties and allocating the resources for heavier structures for the given uncertainties.

Certification tests are found to be most effective when error is large and variability is small. Certification testing is more effective for improving safety than increased safety factors, but it cannot compete with even a small reduction in errors. Variability reduction is even more effective than error reduction for our examples.

The effects of structural element tests on reducing uncertainty and the optimal choice of additional knockdown factors are explored. We find that instead of using implicit knockdown factors based on worst-case scenarios (current practice), using test-dependent explicit knockdown factors may lead weight savings. Surprisingly, we find that a more conservative knockdown factor should be used if the failure stresses measured in tests exceeds predicted failure stresses in order to reduce the variability in knockdown factors generated by variability in material properties.

Finally, we perform probabilistic optimization of a wing and tail system under limited statistical data for the stress distribution and show that the ratio of the probabilities of failure of the probabilistic design and deterministic design is not sensitive to errors in statistical data. We find that the deviation of the probabilistic design and deterministic design is a small perturbation, which can be achieved by a small redistribution of knockdown factors.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Motivation

Traditionally, the design of aerospace structures relies on a deterministic design (code-based design) philosophy, in which safety factors (both explicit and implicit), conservative material properties, redundancy and certification testing are used to design against uncertainties. An example of explicit safety factor is the load safety factor of 1.5 (FAR 25-303), while the conservative decisions employed while updating the failure stress allowables based on structural element tests are examples for implicit safety factors. In the past few years, however, there has been growing interest in applying probabilistic methods to design of aerospace structures (e.g., Lincoln 1980, Wirsching 1992, Aerospace Information Report of SAE 1997, Long and Narciso 1999) to design against uncertainties by effectively modeling them.

Even though probabilistic design is a more efficient way of improving structural safety than deterministic design, many engineers are skeptical of probability of failure calculations of structural designs for the following reasons. First, data on statistical variability in material properties, geometry and loading distributions are not always available in full (e.g., joint distributions), and it has been shown that insufficient information may lead to large errors in probability calculations (e.g., Ben-Haim and Elishakoff 1990, Neal *et al.* 1992). Second, the magnitude of errors in calculating loads and predicting structural response is not known precisely, and there is no consensus on how to model these errors in a probabilistic setting. As a result of these concerns, it is

possible that transition to probability based design will be gradual. An important step in this transition is to understand the way safety is built into aircraft structures now, via deterministic design practices.

One step taken in the transition to probabilistic design is in the definition of conservative material properties (A-basis or B-basis material property values depending on the failure path in the structure) by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulation (FAR 25.613). A-basis material property is one in which 99 percent of the material property distribution is better than the design value with a 95 percent level of confidence, and B-basis material property is one in which 90 percent of the material property distribution is better than the design value with a 95 percent level of confidence. The use of conservative material properties is intended to protect against variability in material properties.

In deterministic design the safety of a structure is achieved through safety factors. Even though some safety factors are explicitly specified, others are implicit. Examples of explicit safety factors are the load safety factor and material property knock-down values. The FAA regulations require a load safety factor equal to 1.5 for aircraft structures (FAR 25-303). The load safety factor compensates for uncertainties such as uncertainty in loading and errors in load calculations, structural stress analysis, accumulated damage, variations in material properties due to manufacturing defects and imperfections, and variations in fabrication and inspection standards. Safety factors are generally developed from empirically based design guidelines established from years of structural testing of aluminum structures. Muller and Schmid (1978) review the historical evolution of the load safety factor of 1.5 in the United States. Similarly, the use of A-basis or B-basis

material properties leads to a knock-down factor from the average values of the material properties measured in the tests. Note that these knock-down factors depend on the number of tests, because they compensate for both variability in material properties and uncertainty due to a finite number of tests.

As noted earlier, an important step in transition to probabilistic design is to analyze the probabilistic impact of the safety measures used in deterministic design. This probabilistic analysis requires quantification of uncertainties encountered in design, manufacturing and actual service conditions of the aircraft structures.

A good analysis of different sources of uncertainty in engineering modeling and simulations is provided by Oberkampf *et al.* (2000, 2002). These papers also supply good literature reviews on uncertainty quantification and divide the uncertainty into three types: variability, uncertainty, and error. In this distinction, variability refers to aleatory uncertainty (inherent randomness), uncertainty refers to epistemic uncertainty (due to lack of knowledge), and error is defined as a recognizable deficiency in any phase or activity of modeling and simulation that is not due to lack of knowledge.

To simplify the treatment of uncertainty control, in this dissertation we combine the unrecognized (epistemic) and recognized error in the classification of Oberkampf *et al.* and name it error. That is, we use a simple classification that divides the uncertainty in the failure of a structural member into two types: errors and variability. Errors reflect inaccurate modeling of physical phenomena, errors in structural analysis, errors in load calculations, or deliberate use of materials and tooling in construction that are different from those specified by the designer. Errors affect all the copies of the structural components made and are therefore fleet-level uncertainties. Variability, on the other

hand, reflects the departure of material properties, geometry parameters or loading of an individual component from the fleet-average values and hence are individual uncertainties.

Modeling and quantification of variability are much easier compared to that of error. Improvements in tooling and construction or application of tight quality control techniques can reduce variability. Quantification of variability control can be easily done by statistical analysis of records taken throughout process of quality control. However, quantification of errors is not as easy, because errors are largely not known before a structure is built. So, errors can only be quantified after the structure has been built. Errors can be controlled by improving accuracy of load and stress calculations, by using more sophisticated analysis and failure prediction techniques or by testing of structural components.

Testing of aircraft structural components is performed in a building block type of approach starting with material characterization tests, followed by testing of structural elements and including a final certification test. Testing of structures is discussed in detail in the next chapter.

The comparison of deterministic design and probabilistic design can be performed in many views. First of all, input and output variables of deterministic design are all deterministic values, while input and output variables of probabilistic design are random (along with some deterministic variables, of course). Here, on the other hand, we compare probabilistic design and deterministic design in terms of use of safety factors. In deterministic design uniform safety factors are used; that is, the same safety factor is used for all components of a system. However, probabilistic design allows using variable