

Reliability and Design Strength Limit Calculations on Diesel Particulate Filters

James Webb
Senior Research Scientist
Corning Incorporated

DEER Conference
Thursday September 2, 2004


Objectives:

- Communicate a methodology for assessing design strength limits (residual strength) in Diesel Particulate Filters
- Sensitivity of each parameters used in the methodology
- Show implications of these sensitivities for materials characterization

Summary

- Methodology presented for residual strength based on
 - Probability Effects
 - Size Effects
 - Fatigue Effects
- Residual strength $\sim 27\%$ for given variables; subject to:
 - Quality of strength data
 - Assumptions made
 - Modification due to understanding of the applied stress distribution and it's potential to change with time
- Residual strength calculation most sensitive to the Weibull modulus, m and Fatigue constant, n

Comments on Stress and Strength



Assumptions

- DPF is a monolithic extruded honeycomb ceramic structure (methodology could also be extended to segmented filters)
- Strength is statistical and described by the Weibull distribution
- The strength distribution and its time dependency are based on “Griffith” flaws and sub-critical crack growth theory

Factors influencing design strength limits

- **Probability Effect** – describes the strength distribution (flaw population)
 - Unlike most metals, the strength of ceramics is statistical
 - Strength is a function of a defined failure probability
 - Lower failure probabilities correspond to lower strengths
- **Size Effects** – difference between product and MOR test bars
 - Strength is surface area or volume dependent
 - Results from the statistical nature of strength
 - Weak link theory, weak link controls strength, longer chain – weaker weak link
- **Fatigue Effects** – decrease in strength over time
 - Strength decreases with environmental exposure
 - Strength impact requires definition of product lifetime

Weibull Statistics Refresher

Unreliability

$$F = 1 - \exp\left(-\left(\frac{S}{S_o}\right)^m\right)$$

Reliability


$$R = 1 - F = \exp\left(-\left(\frac{S}{S_o}\right)^m\right)$$

Key Parameters

S = strength value of interest

S_o = characteristic strength (63.2%)


m = Weibull slope or modulus – large m is desirable




Reliability Levels

Unreliability	Reliability	Unreliability
F	R (1-F)	PPM
1/10	90%	100,000
1/1,000	99.9%	1,000
1/100,000	99.999%	10


Residual Strength: Probability Effect



Size Effect: Size dependent strength / Area Ratio




MOR bar high stress area
0.75 inch sq.



DPF High stress
area estimate

$L \times D \times \pi \times 75\%$




DPF Type	Length (inches)	Diameter (inches)	Area Ratio (A/A_o)
HD	14	12	528
MD	12	9	339
LD	9	9	254

Size Effect

$$\frac{S_r}{S_o} = \left(\frac{A_o}{A} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}}$$

Residual Strength: Probability and Size Effects



Fatigue Effect: environmental exposure strength decrease

- Mechanism - in glass and ceramic materials, natural flaws extend by corrosion of stressed crack tip bonds by polar molecules such as H₂O
 - Water
 - Stress
 - Time
- Characterized by the fatigue exponent, n $n = 20$ to 50
large n desirable

$$T_f \approx S^n$$

Time to failure proportional to strength raised to n

$$T_f \approx \frac{1}{\sigma^n}$$


Time to failure inversely proportional to applied stress raised to n

DPF Type	Lifetime* (miles)	Regen. Frequency (miles)	Regen. Time (seconds)	Total Regen. Time (seconds)
MD	185,000	400	30	13,900

*EPA Useful Life 2004 and later

$$\frac{S_r}{S_o} = \left(\frac{t_{fo}}{t_{fr}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}$$

Residual Strength: Probability, Size, and Fatigue Effects




Residual Strength Summary

Probability Effect	(99.9%)	63.1%	$\frac{S_r}{S_o} = (-\ln R)^{\frac{1}{m}}$
Size Effect	(MD)	67.8%	$\frac{S_r}{S_o} = \left(\frac{A_o}{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{m}}$
Fatigue Effect	(MD)	62.6%	$\frac{S_r}{S_o} = \left(\frac{t_{fo}}{t_{fr}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}$
Combined Effect	(63.1% X 67.8% X 62.6%)	26.8%	

$$\frac{S_r}{S_o} = \left[(-\ln R)^{\frac{1}{m}} \right] \left[\left(\frac{A_o}{A} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} \right] \left[\left(\frac{t_{fo}}{t_{fr}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right]$$

Sensitivity Analysis

Parameter	Standard Value	20% offset value	order of magnitude offset
Weibull Modulus	15	12	-
Fatigue Exponent	20	16	-
Reliability	0.999	0.9992	0.9999
Lifetime	13900s	16700s	139,000s
Area Ratio	339	407	3390




- Variance in m and n have the largest impact on S_r/S_o
- Large changes in t_f and A/A_o are required to affect S_r/S_o

Test Design Impact on m and n Confidence

Typical small test plan

- Dynamic Fatigue on 4 pt bend bars
(load on bars is increased at constant loading rate until failure)
- One group at each of 4 loading rates
- Rates differ by order of magnitude each
(1-1000 seconds equivalent static fatigue time)
- 20 bars in each group x 4 groups = 80

Probability Extrapolation (m sensitivity)




Sample Data

20 points
 $S_0 = 1000$
 $m = 15$

Probability Range of Interest

- 3 or More orders of magnitude
- Residual strength sensitive to m

Time Extrapolation (n sensitivity)



Test Design Impact

- Small strength test designs produce significant extrapolations for probability and time
 - Weibull modulus sensitivity
 - Fatigue constant sensitivity
- Larger sensitivity for Weibull modulus due to larger extrapolation
- Improving confidence in the Weibull modulus, m , also improves confidence in determining the fatigue constant, n

Summary

- Methodology presented for residual strength based on
 - Probability Effects
 - Size Effects
 - Fatigue Effects
- Residual strength $\sim 27\%$ for given variables; subject to:
 - Quality of strength data
 - Assumptions made
 - Modification due to understanding of the applied stress distribution and it's potential to change with time
- Residual strength calculation most sensitive to the Weibull modulus, m and Fatigue constant, n

Final Analysis:

calculations in terms of cumulative failures and mileage

