

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Background and motivation . . . . .	5
1.2	Objectives of the study . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Experimental campaign</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Tension of smooth cylindrical specimen . . . . .	7
2.2	Tension of notched cylindrical specimens . . . . .	7
2.3	Compression of notched cylindrical specimen . . . . .	8
2.4	Tension of notched tubular specimen . . . . .	8
2.5	Torsion of notched tubular specimen . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Material modelling</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Model of elasticity . . . . .	10
3.2	Model of plasticity . . . . .	10
3.2.1	Constitutive law . . . . .	10
3.2.2	Von Mises yield criterion with associated flow rule . . . . .	11
3.2.3	Kroon–Faleskog yield criterion with associated flow rule . . . . .	11
3.2.4	Bai–Wierzbicki yield criterion with deviatoric associated flow rule . . . . .	12
3.2.5	Comparison of calibrated yield criteria . . . . .	12
3.3	Model of damage . . . . .	14
3.4	Model of failure . . . . .	16
3.4.1	Extended Mohr–Coulomb criterion . . . . .	16
3.4.2	Lou–Huh criterion . . . . .	17
3.4.3	KHPS2 criterion . . . . .	17
3.4.4	Comparison of calibrated ductile fracture criteria . . . . .	18
<b>4</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1	Small punch testing . . . . .	19
4.2	Three-point bending . . . . .	21
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>26</b>
5.1	Future studies . . . . .	26
	<b>References</b>	<b>27</b>
	<b>Abstract</b>	<b>32</b>