



ELSEVIER

International Journal of Solids and Structures 41 (2004) 2799–2800

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF  
**SOLIDS and  
STRUCTURES**

www.elsevier.com/locate/ijsolstr

## Erratum

# Dynamic fracture parameters and constraint effects in functionally graded syntactic epoxy foams [International Journal of Solids and Structures 40 (2003) 1885–1906] ☆,☆☆

Medhat A. El-Hadek, Hareesh V. Tippur \*


*Department of Mechanical Engineering, 202 Ross Hall, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849-5341, USA*

The corresponding author offers the following corrections to the above referenced publication.

Figure 10(b):

The legend in the figure is incorrect.  $E_2/E_1 > 1$  should have been  $E_2/E_1 < 1$  and  $E_2/E_1 < 1$  should have been  $E_2/E_1 > 1$ . That is, a crack tip located on the stiffer side of the FGM beam loses its negative constraint ( $\beta = T\sqrt{(\pi a)}/K_I$ ) at much shorter crack lengths than the one with the crack on the compliant side. And, the algebraic values of  $\beta$  are consistently higher for the crack on the stiffer side compared to the one on the compliant side.

Figure 11:



☆ PII of original article S0020-7683(03)00028-3.

☆☆ DOI of original article 10.1016/S0020-7683(03)00028-3.

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1-334-844-3327; fax: +1-334-844-3307.

E-mail address: [htippur@eng.auburn.edu](mailto:htippur@eng.auburn.edu) (H.V. Tippur).

The constraint parameter histories shown in Fig. 11 of the original article are incorrect. The correct plots are shown above. As noted in the original article,  $\beta(t)$  values are strongly negative initially. After the crack tip interacts with the stress waves,  $\beta(t)$  values are more negative for the case with the crack on the compliant side ( $E_2/E_1 > 1$ ) when compared to the one on the stiffer side  $E_2/E_1 < 1$ , similar to the static case. Hence, higher crack tip loading rate  $dK_I/dt$  for the case with crack on the compliant side occurs when constraint  $\beta$  is more negative or algebraically lower. Also, in view of these corrections, the observations made in the original article regarding  $d\beta/dt$  is not meaningful. The authors regret overlooking these during the original work.