

PREDICTION OF SPRING-BACK DEFORMATION
ASSOCIATED WITH AERONAUTICAL COMPOSITE
PARTS AFTER CURING PROCESS

BY

MOHD NAZREEN BIN MOHD NASIR

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirement for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Engineering

Kulliyyah of Engineering
International Islamic University Malaysia

FEB 2020

ABSTRACT

The aerospace industry is increasing its utilization of composite-made structures for safety and efficiency reasons but what comes with that is a phenomenon called spring-back which is defined as the deviation of the finished part from the intended design. Thus, there is a critical need for a reliable method to prevent and correct the spring-back problem. The present work employs Finite Element Analysis (FEA) to predict the spring-back behavior of composite structures by modelling the stretching of the first ply of the laminate and integrating it with an interface component between the laminate part and tool. The research study is conducted in 3 phases with pre-impregnated laminates. The first phase is for flat laminates of various sizes and thicknesses. A good agreement was obtained between the FEA simulation results and the experimental data, particularly for the smaller and thinner samples. The predominant mechanism that contributed to the spring-back warpage is found to be the in-plane stress from the ply stretching. The second phase is for curved laminates with the critical parameters identified in the flat phase being maintained with an added mechanism referred to as the Corner Effect. It was discovered that the warpage is due to the in-plane stress contributed predominantly by the corner stretching. The remainder is due to the tool-laminate interface and it has been shown that its properties are independent of the laminate geometry. The third and final phase is to study the effect of angled plies on spring-back behavior. The experimental results showed that the inclusion of angled plies in the laminate significantly raises the severity of the spring-back warpage and that orientation of the deformation is largely aligned by the fiber orientation of the first ply which reinforces the hypothesis from the first phase and overall research. Finally, the scope of the current research study only concerns with predicting the spring-back behavior but as an extension for future study, the author recommends future works focusing more on correcting the spring-back deformation via tool modification by establishing yet again both an experimental and simulation base for validating the FEA model produced in the current study for all 3 phases.

خلاصة البحث

يزداد الاهتمام في صناعة هياكل المركبات الطائرة على استعمال المواد المركبة (composite-made structures) من أجل زيادة الفاعلية ورفع مستوى السلامة، ولكن ينتج عن استعمال هذه المواد حالة تسمى بالارتداد الخلفي (spring-back) الذي يتسبب في عدم تحقيق الأجزاء النهائية للتصميم المنشود، هنا تبرز الحاجة الماسة إلى طريقة موثوقة لمنع حدوث هذه الظاهرة والعمل على تصحيحها في حال حدوثها. العمل الحالي يستعمل طريقة تحليل العناصر المحدودة (Finite Element Analysis) للتنبؤ بسلوك الهياكل المبنية من المواد المركبة بنمذجة و محاكاة التمدد للصفحة الأولى و اندماجها مع باقي طبقات التصفيح من خلال الربط بين الجزء المصفح و الأداة. أجريت الدراسة البحثية على ثلاثة مراحل على صفائح معدة مسبقاً. المرحلة الأولى تمت على الصفائح المسطحة بأبعاد و سماكات مختلفة. تم الحصول على توافق جيد بين نتائج المحاكاة FEA والبيانات التجريبية، خاصة للعينات الصغيرة و الرقيقة. و تبين ان الآلية لحدوث الارتداد الخلفي هو الاجهاد داخل الطائرة من تمدد الصفائح او الرقائق. المرحلة الثانية اجريت على الصفائح المنحنية مع الإبقاء على المعاملات الحرجة و المحددة في مرحلة الصفائح المسطحة مع آلية إضافية تسمى بتأثير الزاوية. تم اكتشاف أن الفتلان الحاصل في الصفائح يرجع إلى الضغط داخل الطائرة الذي يساهم في الغالب على تمدد الزوايا. و تعزى البقية الى أدوات الربط الصفائحي وقد تبين أن خصائصه غير مرتبطة بأبعاد الصفائح. المرحلة الثالثة والأخيرة هي دراسة تأثير الثنايا ذات الزوايا على الارتداد الخلفي. أوضحت النتائج التجريبية أن إدراج الثنايا بزاوية في الصفائح يزيد بشكل كبير من شدة الارتداد الخلفي، و اتجاه التشوه يتمشى إلى حد كبير مع اتجاه الألياف للطبقة الأولى التي تعزز الفرضية من المرحلة الأولى والبحث إجمالاً. وأخيراً، فإن نطاق الدراسة البحثية الحالية يتعلق فقط بالتنبؤ بسلوك الارتداد الخلفي ولكن كإمتداد للدراسة المستقبلية يوصي المؤلف بأعمال مستقبلية تركز بشكل أكبر على تصحيح التشوه الناتج عن الارتداد الخلفي عبر تعديل الأداة من خلال إنشاء قاعدة تجريبية وقاعدة للمحاكات للتحقق من صحة نموذج (FEA) الذي تم إنتاجه في الدراسة الحالية لكل من المراحل الثلاث.

APPROVAL PAGE

The thesis of Mohd Nazreen Bin Mohd Nasir has been approved by the following:

Yulfian Aminanda
Supervisor

Mohd Sultan Ibrahim
Co-supervisor

Meftah Hrairi
Internal Examiner

Mohd Nasir Tamin
External Examiner

Wahyu Kuntjoro
External Examiner

Jamal Ahmed Bashier Badi
Chairman

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted as a whole for any other degrees at IIUM or other institutions.

Mohd Nazreen Bin Mohd Nasir

Signature

Date

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

**DECLARATION OF COPYRIGHT AND AFFIRMATION OF
FAIR USE OF UNPUBLISHED RESEARCH**

**PREDICTION OF SPRING-BACK DEFORMATION
ASSOCIATED WITH AERONAUTICAL COMPOSITE PARTS
AFTER CURING PROCESS**

I declare that the copyright holder of this thesis is International Islamic University
Malaysia.

Copyright © 2020 by Mohd Nazreen bin Mohd Nasir. All rights reserved

No part of this unpublished research may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying,
recording or otherwise without prior written permission of the copyright holder
except as provided below

1. Any material contained in or derived from this unpublished research
may be used by others in their writing with due acknowledgement.
2. IIUM or its library will have the right to make and transmit copies (print
or electronic) for institutional and academic purposes.
3. The IIUM library will have the right to make, store in a retrieved system
and supply copies of this unpublished research if requested by other
universities and research libraries.

By signing this form, I acknowledged that I have read and understand the IIUM
Intellectual Property Right and Commercialization policy.

Affirmed by Mohd Nazreen bin Mohd Nasi

.....
Signature

.....
Date

*This thesis is dedicated to my family for laying the foundation of what I turned out to
be in life*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All glory is due to Allah, the Almighty, whose Grace and Mercies have been with me throughout the duration of my program. Although, it has been tasking, His Mercies and Blessings on me ease the herculean task of completing this thesis.

The work presented in this thesis owes a significant debt to a number of individuals to whom I would like to express my most sincere gratitude. First and foremost, to my supervisors Prof. Yulfian Aminanda and Dr. Laurent Mezeix for their mentorship and support throughout the course of this work.

Many thanks as well to sister Syazwani and sister Hani from the CAD lab for allowing me to utilize the computers beyond office hours. Not forgetting the undergraduate students, brothers Thierry, Kamal and Fathi, for providing me with new perspectives and supporting data to help guide the final stages.

A great deal of this work would not have been possible without the contributions of CTRM Aero Composites Sdn. Bhd. and Strand Aerospace Malaysia. Many thanks to my fantastic friends and colleagues from Strand Aerospace Malaysia over the years for their continual friendship and encouragement which has seen me through some of my most difficult moments. Finally, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to the university for providing me with the most unique educational experience. Alhamdulillah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Abstract in Arabic	iii
Approval Page.....	iv
Declaration	v
Copyright	vi
Dedication	vii
Acknowledgement	viii
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables	xii
List of Figures	xiv
List of Symbols	xxv
List of Abbreviations	xxvii
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement and Significance	4
1.3 Research Hypothesis and Philosophy	6
1.4 Research Scope.....	7
1.5 Research Objectives	9
1.6 Thesis Organization.....	9
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Overview	11
2.2 General Aspects of Laminate Composite Manufacturing	11
2.3 Composite Laminate Manufacturing using Autoclave.....	14
2.3.1 Prepreg Lay-up and Vacuum Bagging	14
2.3.2 Autoclave Curing Cycle	15
2.4 Spring-back Phenomenon.....	17
2.4.1 Autoclave Curing Cycle	17
2.4.1.1 Chemical Mechanism	17
2.4.1.2 Thermal Mechanism.....	22
2.4.1.3 Thermal Mechanism.....	27
2.4.1.4 Fiber Volume Fraction Gradient	40
2.4.1.5 Summary	41
2.4.2 Spring-back Parameters	43
2.4.2.1 Intrinsic Parameters.....	44
2.4.2.2 Extrinsic Parameters.....	48
2.4.2.3 Summary	55
2.5 Spring-back Modelling.....	56
2.5.1 Analytical Models.....	57
2.5.2 Finite Element Models.....	70
2.6 Summary and Conclusions	91

CHAPTER THREE LAMINATE FABRICATION & SPRING-BACK	
DEFORMATION MEASUREMENT	92
3.1 Global Research Methodology	92
3.2 Composite Laminate Sample Manufacturing	94
3.2.1 Phase 1: Flat Unidirectional Laminate	94
3.2.2 Phase 2: Curved Unidirectional Laminate	102
3.2.3 Phase 3: Flat Unidirectional Laminate	104
3.3 Spring-back Measurement Analysis	105
3.3.1 Phase 1: Flat Unidirectional Laminate	105
3.3.1.1 Effect of Laminate Part Thickness	108
3.3.1.2 Effect of Laminate Part Length	109
3.3.2 Phase 2: Curved Unidirectional Laminate	110
3.3.2.1 Effect of Corner Angle	111
3.3.3 Phase 3: Flat Symmetrical Laminate	113
3.3.3.1 Effect of Laminate Part Lay-up	115
CHAPTER FOUR FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS MODELLING	
CONSTRUCTION	117
4.1 Introduction	117
4.2 FEA Model Construction for Flat Unidirectional	118
4.2.1 FEA Model Geometry	118
4.2.1.1 Thermal Loading	122
4.2.1.2 Boundary Conditions	122
4.2.2 Preliminary Parameter Study	122
4.2.2.1 FEA Model Runtime Determination	122
4.2.2.2 FEA Model Mesh Size Determination	124
4.2.2.3 Interface Behavior	125
4.2.3 Determination of Critical Parameters to Spring-back	
Deformation	126
4.2.3.1 Determination of the Longitudinal Coefficient of	
Thermal Expansion of the First Ply for 300 x 300 mm ² and 4 plies	
(Laminate Only)	127
4.2.3.2 Determination of the Out-of-Plane Parameters of the	
Interface Component for 300 x 300 mm ² and 4 plies (Full Model)	
4.2.3.3 Determination of the Critical Parameters (Rest of the	
Laminates)	133
4.2.4 FEA Results Against Experimental Data	137
4.3 FEA Model Construction for Curved Unidirectional	141
4.3.1 FEA Model Geometry	141
4.3.1.1 Thermal Loading	143
4.3.1.2 Boundary Conditions	143
4.3.2 FEA Modelling Assumptions	144
4.3.2.1 Laminate Properties	146
4.4 FEA Model Construction for Flat Symmetrical	156
4.4.1 FEA Model Geometry	156
4.4.1.1 Boundary Conditions	158
4.4.2 FEA Modelling Process	158
4.4.3 FEA Results Against Experimental Data	159

CHAPTER FIVE MODEL VALIDATION AND STRESS DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS	163
5.1 FEA Model Validation for Flat Unidirectional	163
5.2 Stress Distribution for Flat Unidirectional	168
5.2.1 Out-of-Plane Shear Stress Distribution	168
5.2.2 In-Plane Stress Gradient	189
5.3 FEA Model Validation for Curved Unidirectional.....	191
5.4 Stress Distribution for Curved Unidirectional	193
5.4.1 Out-of-Plane Shear Stress Distribution	193
5.4.2 In-Plane Stress Gradient	197
5.5 Stress Distribution for Flat Symmetrical	199
5.5.1 Out-of-Plane Shear Stress Distribution	199
5.5.2 In-Plane Stress Gradient	203
 CHAPTER SIX CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 205
6.1 Conclusions	205
6.1.1 Flat Unidirectional Laminates	205
6.1.2 Curved Unidirectional Laminates.....	206
6.1.3 Flat Symmetrical Laminates	207
6.2 Recommendations for Future Work	208
 REFERENCES	 210
 APPENDIX I SPRING-BACK MEASUREMENT DATA	 220
APPENDIX II SPRING-BACK SIMULATION RESULTS	238
APPENDIX III PUBLICATIONS AND CONFERENCES.....	254
APPENDIX IV INTERFACE FAILURE SUBROUTINE	260

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Coefficients of thermal expansion of various carbon fibers (Kurdi, 2003)	23
Table 2.2 Coefficients of thermal expansion of non-reinforced epoxy resin between the ambient temperature and $T_g = 20^\circ\text{C}$ (dependent on the class of matrix) (Kurdi, 2003)	24
Table 2.3 Coefficient of thermal expansion of a unidirectional carbon-epoxy ply (Kurdi, 2003)	24
Table 2.4 Summary on the parameters that effect spring-back deformation (Twiggg et al., 2003; Albert et al., 2002)	56
Table 3.1 Sample configuration for the tested flat unidirectional laminate prepreg	101
Table 3.2 Sample configurations for the curved unidirectional laminate	103
Table 3.3 Sample configuration for the tested flat symmetrical laminate prepreg	104
Table 3.4 Maximum average warpage for unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates	107
Table 3.5 Average spring-in warpage for unidirectional curved IMA/M21E laminates	110
Table 3.6 Average maximum warpage for flat symmetrical IMA/M21E laminates	115
Table 4.1 Material and element properties for each of the FEA model component	121
Table 4.2 The longitudinal coefficients of thermal expansion of the first ply corresponding to 80% of the experimental results for unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates	133
Table 4.3 Comparison of the average maximum warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates	137
Table 4.4 Comparison of the average warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional curved IMA/M21E laminates	147
Table 4.5 Thickness measurements for 30° laminate	150

Table 4.6 Thickness measurements for a 45° laminate	151
Table 4.7 Thickness measurements for a 90° laminate	151
Table 4.8 Comparison of the average warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional curved IMA/M21E laminates (with modified Young's modulus)	152
Table 4.9 Comparison of the average warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional curved IMA/M21E laminates	155
Table 4.10 Comparison of the average warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the symmetrical flat IMA/M21E laminates	159
Table 4.11 Comparison of the average warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the symmetrical flat IMA/M21E laminates (1 x 1 mm ²)	162
Table 5.1 FEA validation study using the 350x350 mm ² and 4 plies unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminate configuration	166
Table 5.2 Tested IMA/M21E laminate configurations	192
Table 5.3 Comparison between the FEA results and the experimental data	192

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 Composite structures integrated in various Airbus aircrafts (Bold, 2007)	2
Figure 1.2 Research phases	8
Figure 2.1 General overview of the many types of laminate composite manufacturing processes (Ermanni, 2017)	13
Figure 2.2 Vacuum bagging for autoclave processing (Niu, 1999)	15
Figure 2.3 Standard 2-hold curing profile for an AS4/3501-6 prepreg (Niu, 1999)	16
Figure 2.4 Cross-linking and polymerization of thermoset resin during cure resulting in chemical shrinkage of the resin (Schubel et al., 2007)	18
Figure 2.5 Phases in resin property development for a resin with a glass transition temperature greater than the maximum curing temperature (Fernlund et al., n.d.)	19
Figure 2.6 Development of the reduced curvature samples during curing plotted together with changes in the transverse tensile modulus of a laminate composite (Olivier, 2006)	20
Figure 2.7 Chemical resin shrinkage strain in longitudinal and transverse directions in glass/polyester composite materials (Bogetti et al., 1992)	21
Figure 2.8 Schematic of a) volume change and b) density change during the cure process (Guillermin, n.d.)	22
Figure 2.9 Curvature in an asymmetrical cross-ply laminate [0/90] due to residual thermal stresses (Vo et al., 2012)	25
Figure 2.10 Schematic view of the a) residual stress formation in an asymmetrical cross-ply laminate, b) residual thermal stresses when the laminate is constrained and c) the isometric view of the out-of-plane deformation when unconstrained (Harris, 1999)	26
Figure 2.11 Distorted shapes due to asymmetrical lay-ups; a) original; b) saddle-shaped; c) and d) cylindrical-shaped; e) and f) rotated cylindrical (Rapp, 2011)	27
Figure 2.12 Distortion of the composite laminate part due to the tool-part interaction (Twigg et al., 2003)	28

Figure 2.13 Male and female tools for ply lay-up (Niu, 2010)	29
Figure 2.14 Fiber stresses due to corner consolidation (Ozsoy et al., 2007)	30
Figure 2.15 a) Interfacial shear and b) in-plane stress distributions for the case of a sliding friction interface (Twiggg et al., 2003)	31
Figure 2.16 Free-body diagram on half of a thin tool under a) sliding conditions and b) sticking conditions (Twiggg et al., 2003)	32
Figure 2.17 a) Interfacial shear and b) in-plane stress distribution for a perfectly bonded tool-part interface (Twiggg et al., 2003)	34
Figure 2.18 Interfacial shear stress development as a function of interface displacement (Twiggg et al., 2003)	35
Figure 2.19 Arrangement of the strain gauge experiment (Twiggg et al., 2003)	36
Figure 2.20 Mechanical strain evolution in the instrumented tool for the entire process cycle (586 kPa autoclave pressure/release agent interface) (Twiggg et al., 2003)	36
Figure 2.21 Progression of the interfacial shear stress distribution from the tool end to the center (Twiggg et al., 2003)	38
Figure 2.22 Placement of the optical fibers (in yellow) on a flat unidirectional 8 plies laminate sample (Mulle et al., 2009)	39
Figure 2.23 Longitudinal strain changes of a flat unidirectional 8 plies laminate sample (Mulle et al., 2009)	39
Figure 2.24 Effect of the fiber volume fraction gradient during laminate cool-down	40
Figure 2.25 A micrograph of cross-sections of a unidirectional laminate showing resin rich regions between the plies (Darrow, Jr. et al., 2002)	41
Figure 2.26 Evolution of the resin throughout the curing cycle	42
Figure 2.27 Maximum warpage of a composite laminate part	44
Figure 2.28 Maximum warpage as a function of part length for 8-ply parts (Twiggg et al., 2003)	45
Figure 2.29 Maximum warpage as a function of part thickness for 600 mm length parts (Twiggg et al., 2003)	46
Figure 2.30 Effect of part lay-up on spring-back (T-800H/3900-2) (Albert et al., 2002)	47
Figure 2.31 Effect of part lay-up on spring-back (AS4/8552) (Vo et al., 2012)	47

Figure 2.32 Effect of part geometry on spring-back (Albert & Fernlund, 2002)	48
Figure 2.33 Effect of different cure cycles on spring-back (Albert et al., 2002)	49
Figure 2.34 Effect of tool material on spring-back (Albert et al., 2002)	51
Figure 2.35 Effect of tool surface on spring-back (Albert et al., 2002)	52
Figure 2.36 Maximum warpage as a function of autoclave pressure with an FEP sheet (Twigg et. al, 2003)	53
Figure 2.37 Experimental data fitted with an empirical relationship to predict the maximum warpage (Twigg et al., 2003)	55
Figure 2.38 a) Schematic of a flat part on a solid tool and b) displacement boundary conditions (Arafath et al., 2008)	59
Figure 2.39 Comparison between analytical model and actual experimental results of warpage for flat parts (Arafath et al., 2008)	61
Figure 2.40 a) Schematic of a curved part on a tool and b) a half-symmetry model considered for analysis (Arafath et al., 2009)	61
Figure 2.41 Part geometry assumptions for the analytical model, sliding friction occurs at both the tool-part interface and the interplay region (Twigg et al., 2003)	63
Figure 2.42 In-plane stress distribution with sliding friction at the 1 st -2 nd ply interface at an arbitrary x-coordinate (Twigg et al., 2003)	64
Figure 2.43 Comparison of experimental and analytical warpage for flat parts (Twigg et al., 2003)	66
Figure 2.44 Comparison between the experimental (symbols) and the predicted (lines) center displacement of flat parts cured at 175°C on aluminum and invar tooling (Darrow, Jr. et al, 2002)	69
Figure 2.45 FEA mesh around the corner section of the tool, part and shear layer i.e. interface (Fernlund et al., 2002)	70
Figure 2.46 Modulus development for the shear layers (Fernlund et al., 2002)	72
Figure 2.47 Comparison of measured (experimental) and predicted (FEA) spring-back for both the L-shaped and C-shaped parts (Fernlund et al., 2002)	73
Figure 2.48 FEA prediction vs. average experimental result for warpage of 4 plies (shear layer modulus = 6.9 kPa, initial resin modulus = 41 kPa) (Twigg et al., 2003)	75

Figure 2.49 FEA prediction vs. average experimental result for warpage of 8 plies (shear layer modulus = 6.9 kPa, initial resin modulus = 41 kPa) (Twigg et al., 2003)	75
Figure 2.50 FEA prediction vs. average experimental result for warpage of 16 plies (shear layer modulus = 6.9 kPa, initial resin modulus = 41 kPa) (Twigg et al., 2003)	76
Figure 2.51 Interfacial shear stress distribution for a model with high shear layer stiffness (8 plies/600 mm part, initial resin modulus = 410 kPa) (Twigg et al., 2003)	77
Figure 2.52 Interfacial shear stress distribution for a model with low shear layer stiffness (8 plies/600 mm part, initial resin modulus = 410 kPa) (Twigg et al., 2003)	78
Figure 2.53 Interface friction characteristics (Ozsoy et al., 2002)	79
Figure 2.54 Shear stress (S12) values for 500 mm part at the end of Step-2 (Ozsoy et al., 2002)	80
Figure 2.55 Fiber direction stresses at various cross-sections (0 mm, 100 mm, 200 mm, 300 mm and 400 mm away from the symmetry line) at the end of the Step-2 (MPa) (Ozsoy et al., 2002)	81
Figure 2.56 Experimental vs FEA results of spring-in for parts of various thicknesses (Ozsoy et al., 2002)	82
Figure 2.57 Experimental vs FEA of spring-in results for unidirectional parts (Ozsoy et al., 2007)	83
Figure 2.58 FEA element mesh construction for the prediction of dimensional stability (Clifford et al., 2006)	83
Figure 2.59 Comparison of the predictions of deformation of V-shape predicted by shell-solid coupled mesh for 3 different cooling rates, with the observed part deformation in carbon fiber-reinforced epoxy samples (Clifford et al., 2006)	85
Figure 2.60 Comparison of the predictions of deformation of V-shape predicted by shell-solid coupled mesh for a 45-minute cooling period, with and without the effect of tool-part interaction (Clifford et al., 2006)	86
Figure 2.61 a) Boeing 777 aft strut trailing edge fairing with selected 2D sections; b) FEA mesh on one-half of Section 2 with the process tool (Fernlund et al., 2003)	88
Figure 2.62 Schematic of the procedure of matching the displacements between the 2D model and the corresponding 3D strip model (Fernlund et al., 2003)	89

Figure 2.63 Schematic of the 3D FEA model showing the lines where a) the moments are applied and b) the linear interpolation of the moments per unit width between the 4 strips (Fernlund et al., 2003)	89
Figure 2.64 Experimental vs FEA (2D and 3D) of spring-in results (Fernlund et al., 2003)	90
Figure 3.1 General flowchart of the research methodology for the current research	93
Figure 3.2 Fabricating tool, steel 275JR	94
Figure 3.3 Manufacturing flowchart for the IMA/M21E laminate prepreg	95
Figure 3.4 The prepreg Hot Melt process	96
Figure 3.5 Release film (PTFE) placement on the tool	97
Figure 3.6 Laminate composite samples being held in place by cork dams	98
Figure 3.7 Prepreg with release film (PTFE) on top for consolidation	99
Figure 3.8 Breather cloth placed above the prepreg before final bagging	99
Figure 3.9 Final bagging before autoclave curing	100
Figure 3.10 Autoclave curing cycle	101
Figure 3.11 Spring-in warpage for a curved unidirectional laminate sample	102
Figure 3.12 Various corner angles for a curved unidirectional laminate sample	103
Figure 3.13 Dispersed measurement points on a unidirectional flat laminate sample seen at top view (left) and isometric view (right)	106
Figure 3.14 Evolution of the normalized (average maximum warpage over the warpage for 4 plies) for unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates	108
Figure 3.15 Evolution of the normalized (average maximum warpage over the warpage for 500 x 500 mm ²) for unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates	109
Figure 3.16 Measurement points on the deformed sample for a curved unidirectional laminate	110
Figure 3.17 Average spring-in warpage deformation for unidirectional curved IMA/M21E manufactured on various corner angles	112

Figure 3.18 Evolution of the normalized average maximum warpage for curved unidirectional IMA/M21E laminates in function of the corner angle	113
Figure 3.19 Dispersed measurement points on a symmetrical flat laminate sample seen at top view (left) and isometric view (right)	114
Figure 3.20 Evolution average maximum warpage for symmetrical flat IMA/M21E laminates in function of the lay-up configurations	116
Figure 4.1 Flowchart of the research methodology for predicting the spring-back deformation for flat unidirectional laminates	119
Figure 4.2 FEA model construction (cross-sectional view)	120
Figure 4.3 FEA model construction for flat unidirectional sample (isometric view)	120
Figure 4.4 Out-of-plane shear stress law behavior of the interface component	121
Figure 4.5 Out-of-plane shear stress distribution in function of varying FEA runtime	123
Figure 4.6 Evolution of the maximum warpage in function of the mesh size	124
Figure 4.7 Flowchart for determining the parameters for predicting the spring-back deformation for flat unidirectional laminates	128
Figure 4.8 Spring-back warpage design chart for a unidirectional 300 x 300 mm ² and 4 plies configuration	130
Figure 4.9 Coefficient of determination between the experimental averaged measures and numerical results along the longitudinal direction with a fixed out-of-plane shear stress failure, $\tau_{xz, failure} = 3.8$ MPa	132
Figure 4.10 Coefficient of determination between the experimental averaged measures and numerical results along the transversal direction with a fixed out-of-plane shear stress failure, $\tau_{xz, failure} = 3.8$ MPa	132
Figure 4.11 Evolution of the normalized longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion of the first ply for unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates in function of the part thickness	134
Figure 4.12 Evolution of the normalized longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion of the first ply for unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates in function of the part size	135
Figure 4.13 Comparison of the average maximum warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional flat and 300 x 300 mm ² IMA/M21E laminates	138

Figure 4.14	Comparison of the average maximum warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional flat and 400 x 400 mm ² IMA/M21E laminates	138
Figure 4.15	Comparison of the average maximum warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional flat and 500 x 500 mm ² IMA/M21E laminates	139
Figure 4.16	Comparison of the spring-back warpage orientation between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional flat laminates	139
Figure 4.17	Flowchart of the research methodology for predicting the spring-back deformation for curved unidirectional laminates	142
Figure 4.18	FEA model construction for curved unidirectional sample (isometric view)	144
Figure 4.19	Flowchart of the FEA modelling approach for unidirectional curved laminate samples	145
Figure 4.20	The corner arc section (in green) and flange section (in grey) of the curved unidirectional 500x500 mm ² and 4 plies IMA/M21E laminate	146
Figure 4.21	Comparison of the average maximum warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional curved IMA/M21E laminates (baseline condition)	148
Figure 4.22	FEA simulation representation (left) to the actual manufactured sample for the unidirectional curved laminates (30°)	148
Figure 4.23	Measurement points on the flange and corner sections of the curved unidirectional laminate	150
Figure 4.24	Decrease of the longitudinal Young's modulus of the flange section to the Young's modulus of the corner section in function of the corner angle for the laminate configuration 500x500 mm ² and 4 plies thickness	152
Figure 4.25	Comparison of the average maximum warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional curved IMA/M21E laminates (with modified Young's modulus)	153
Figure 4.26	Increase of the longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion of the corner section to the longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion of the flange section in function of the corner angle for the laminate configuration 500x500 mm ² and 4 plies thickness	155
Figure 4.27	Comparison of the average maximum warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional	

curved IMA/M21E laminates (with longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion at the corner section)	156
Figure 4.28 Flowchart of the research methodology for predicting the spring-back deformation for flat symmetrical laminates	157
Figure 4.29 FEA model construction for curved unidirectional sample (isometric view)	158
Figure 4.30 Comparison of the average maximum warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional curved IMA/M21E laminates	160
Figure 4.31 Comparison of the spring-back warpage orientation between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the symmetrical flat laminates	160
Figure 4.32 Evolution of the maximum warpage in function of the mesh size for flat symmetrical laminates	162
Figure 5.1 Progression of the interfacial shear stress distribution from the tool end to the center for (a) the previous research study obtained by Twigg et al., (2003) and (b) the current research study for 300x300 mm ² and 4 plies	164
Figure 5.2 Distribution of the in-plane stress through the thickness of the laminate for (a) the previous research study obtained by Twigg et al., (2003) and (b) the current research study for 300x300 mm ² and 4 plies	165
Figure 5.3 Evolution of the normalized longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion of the first ply for unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates in function of the part thickness (included for 300 x 300 mm ² and 6 plies)	167
Figure 5.4 Evolution of the normalized longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion of the first ply for unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates in function of the part size (included for 4 plies, 350 x 350 mm ² and 450 x 450 mm ²)	167
Figure 5.5 Comparison of the average maximum warpage between the experimental and FEA simulation results for the unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates	168
Figure 5.6 Evolution of failure temperature of the interface in function of the part thickness	170
Figure 5.7 Evolution of failure temperature of the interface in function of the part size	170

Figure 5.8 Distribution of the out-of-plane shear stress at the tool-part interface along the longitudinal direction at various temperatures and at the transversal position (a) $y = 150$ mm; (b) $y = 75$ mm and (c) $y = 0$ mm (300×300 mm ² and 4 plies)	171
Figure 5.9 Distribution of the out-of-plane shear stress at the tool-part interface along the longitudinal direction at various temperatures and at the transversal position (a) $y = 150$ mm; (b) $y = 75$ mm and (c) $y = 0$ mm (300×300 mm ² and 8 plies)	172
Figure 5.10 Distribution of the out-of-plane shear stress at the tool-part interface along the longitudinal direction at various temperatures and at the transversal position (a) $y = 150$ mm; (b) $y = 75$ mm and (c) $y = 0$ mm (300×300 mm ² and 16 plies)	173
Figure 5.11 Distribution of the out-of-plane shear stress at the tool-part interface along the longitudinal direction at various temperatures and at the transversal position (a) $y = 200$ mm; (b) $y = 100$ mm and (c) $y = 0$ mm (400×400 mm ² and 4 plies)	174
Figure 5.12 Distribution of the out-of-plane shear stress at the tool-part interface along the longitudinal direction at various temperatures and at the transversal position (a) $y = 200$ mm; (b) $y = 100$ mm and (c) $y = 0$ mm (400×400 mm ² and 8 plies)	175
Figure 5.13 Distribution of the out-of-plane shear stress at the tool-part interface along the longitudinal direction at various temperatures and at the transversal position (a) $y = 200$ mm; (b) $y = 100$ mm and (c) $y = 0$ mm (400×400 mm ² and 16 plies)	176
Figure 5.14 Distribution of the out-of-plane shear stress at the tool-part interface along the longitudinal direction at various temperatures and at the transversal position (a) $y = 250$ mm; (b) $y = 125$ mm and (c) $y = 0$ mm (500×500 mm ² and 4 plies)	177
Figure 5.15 Distribution of the out-of-plane shear stress at the tool-part interface along the longitudinal direction at various temperatures and at the transversal position (a) $y = 250$ mm; (b) $y = 125$ mm and (c) $y = 0$ mm (500×500 mm ² and 8 plies)	178
Figure 5.16 Distribution of the out-of-plane shear stress at the tool-part interface along the longitudinal direction at various temperatures and at the transversal position (a) $y = 250$ mm; (b) $y = 125$ mm and (c) $y = 0$ mm (500×500 mm ² and 16 plies)	179
Figure 5.17 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (300×300 mm ² and 4 plies)	180
Figure 5.18 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (300×300 mm ² and 8 plies)	181

Figure 5.19 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (300x300 mm ² and 16 plies)	182
Figure 5.20 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (400x400 mm ² and 4 plies)	183
Figure 5.21 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (400x400 mm ² and 8 plies)	184
Figure 5.22 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (400x400 mm ² and 16 plies)	185
Figure 5.23 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (500x500 mm ² and 4 plies)	186
Figure 5.24 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (500x500 mm ² and 8 plies)	187
Figure 5.25 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (500x500 mm ² and 16 plies)	188
Figure 5.26 Distribution of the in-plane stress through the thickness of the 300x300 mm ² unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates	189
Figure 5.27 Distribution of the in-plane stress through the thickness of the 400x400 mm ² unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates	190
Figure 5.28 Distribution of the in-plane stress through the thickness of the 500x500 mm ² unidirectional flat IMA/M21E laminates	190
Figure 5.29 C-shaped geometry angled at 90° of the tested laminate part (Albert et al., 2002)	191
Figure 5.30 FEA models of the laminate part geometries for 45° (left) and 90°(right)	191
Figure 5.31 Evolution of failure temperature of the interface in function of the corner angle	193
Figure 5.32 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (30° with longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion at the corner section)	194
Figure 5.33 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (45° with longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion at the corner section)	195
Figure 5.34 Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature (90° with longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion at the corner section)	196

Figure 5.35	Distribution of the in-plane stress through the thickness of the unidirectional 30° curved IMA/M21E laminates (longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion at the corner section)	198
Figure 5.36	Distribution of the in-plane stress through the thickness of the unidirectional 45° curved IMA/M21E laminates (longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion at the corner section)	198
Figure 5.37	Distribution of the in-plane stress through the thickness of the unidirectional 90° curved IMA/M21E laminates (longitudinal coefficient of thermal expansion at the corner section)	199
Figure 5.38	Evolution of failure temperature of the interface in function of the part lay-up	200
Figure 5.39	Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature ([45/0]s)	201
Figure 5.40:	Evolution of the interface failure in function of the temperature ([45/-45]s)	202
Figure 5.41	Distribution of the in-plane stress through the thickness of the 300x300 mm ² and 4 plies symmetrical flat IMA/M21E laminates	204