

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
2.1 Tensile strength and total elongation of different steel grades in comparison	3
2.2 Schematic shows islands of martensite in a matrix of ferrite	5
2.3 Photomicrograph of DP steel	5
2.4 The DP 350/600 with higher TS than the HSLA 350/450K-1	6
2.5 (a) Engineering stress-strain(b)True stress-strain curves for DP steels	7
2.6 Bainite and retained austenite are additional phases in TRIP steels	7
2.7 Micrograph of TRIP 690 steel	8
2.8 TRIP with a greater total elongation than DP and HSLA steel	8
2.9 (a) Engineering stress-strain, (b) True stress-strain curves for TRIP steels	9
2.10 Schematic representation	10
2.11 Combination of basic forming operations in the forming of a square box	16
2.12 Influences of various parameters on the formability in stretching (a) and deep-drawing (b)	16
2.13 States of stress in different formability testing	17
2.14 Schematic of hydraulic bulge test	18
2.15 Scheme of Erichsen test	19
2.16 Limit dome height curve	20
2.17 Forming limit diagram define by Keeler	22
2.18 Forming limit diagrams define by Keeler and Goodwin	22
2.19 Forming limit diagrams for necking and fracture	23
2.20 Rectangular specimens with and without notches	24
2.21 Scheme of hydraulic bulge test with elliptical dies	25
2.22 Schematic layout of the punch stretching test	25
2.23 Punches used in the Keeler test	26
2.24 Schematic layout of the device used in the Marciniak test	26
2.25 Shapes of the specimens and the intermediate part	27
2.26 Schematic illustration of the specimens used in the Nakazima	27
2.27 Shape of the specimens used in the Hasek test	28
2.28 Theoretical models used in FLC calculation	29
2.29 Experimental and theoretical determined FLD of necking criteion	33
2.30 Schematic illustration of localized necking in the MK model	34
2.31 Forming limit diagram and forming limit stress diagram FLSD	36
2.32 Test set-up for hydraulic bulge test	38
2.33 Schematic set-up of a hole expanding test	39
3.1 Microstructure of the investigated	43
3.2 MTS Universal Testing Machine	44
3.3 Schematic of the ASTM E8 tensile test specimen	44
3.4 True stress-true strain curves from different testing directions determined by uniaxial tensile tests of the investigated TRIP780	46
3.5 True stress-true strain curves from different testing directions determined by uniaxial tensile tests of the investigated JAC780Y	46
3.6 Erichsen bulge/FLC tester tester model 161	48
3.7 Schematic view of Erichsen bulge/FLC tester model 161	48
3.8 Specimen geometry for hydraulic bulge test	49

## LIST OF FIGURES (Cont.)

FIGURE	PAGE
3.9 (a) Mechanical measurement device for bulge test (b) Schematic of the mechanical strain measurement device	50
3.10 Stress-strain curves of the TRIP780 steel sheet experimentally Determined by bulge test and tensile test in comparison and including extrapolation using Swift and Voce law	51
3.11 Disk compression test installed on the MTS testing machine	52
3.12 Disk Specimen	
3.13 Relationship between determined plastic strains in the RD and TD of the DP780 steel	53
3.14 Relationship between determined plastic strains in the RD and TD of the TRIP780 steel	53
3.15 Relationship between determined plastic strains in the RD and TD of the JAC780Y780 steel	54
3.16 Experimental and extrapolated stress-strain curves of the DP780 and TRIP780 steels	57
3.17 Stress-strain curves of the JAC780Y steel experimentally determined by bulge test and tensile test in comparison and including extrapolation using Swift law	58
3.18 Erichsen formability testing machine	59
3.19 The Installed Nakazima stretch-forming test on Erichsen testing	59
3.20 Schematic of the Nakazima test	60
3.21 Specimen dimensions used for the Nakazima test	60
3.22 The set up of electro chemical method applied on the sample surface	60
3.23 Thickness distribution and localized necking area on the deformed specimen at localized state during test	61
3.24 Deformed specimens after failure in the Nakazima test	61
3.25 Schematic of hole expansion test using flat bottom punch	62
3.26 Hole expansion test installed on Erichsen formability testing machine	63
3.27 Deformed hole expansion specimens	63
3.28 Direct current potential drop (DCPD) method for the determination of crack initiation during tensile test	65
3.29 Experimental setup for determination of damage curve	65
3.30 (a) Pure shear sample and (b) combined loading sample	66
3.31 Tensile samples with (a) radius-, (b) C-, (c) U- and (d) V-notch shape	67
3.32 Tensile samples with (a) central hole (H) and (b) elliptical hole (El)	67
3.33 Plane strain samples with transverse notches of different radii	68
4.1 (a) Normalized flow stresses, r-values and (b) yield locus experimentally determined and numerically predicted by different yield criteria for the investigated steel in comparison	74
4.2 (a) Calculated effective stresses on the formed tensile samples with various notches at the moment of maximum loading states and (b) comparison of engineering stress-strain curves experimentally determined and numerically predicted by different yield criteria	76

## LIST OF FIGURES (Cont.)

FIGURE	PAGE
4.3 Comparison of engineering stress-strain curves experimentally determined and numerically predicted by different yield functions coupled with Swift and Voce hardening law for (a)V-shape sample (b)radius-shape sample and (c) U-shape sample	78
4.4 (a) Stress triaxialities, (b) equivalent plastic strains distributed along the x-axis in the middle of samples with different notch shapes calculated for the corresponding damage initiation states by different yield criteria	80
4.5 Stress triaxialities along the x-axis in the middle of V-shape sample predicted for the corresponding damage initiation states by different yield criteria and hardening	81
4.6 Equivalent plastic strains along the x-axis in the middle of V-shape sample predicted for the corresponding damage initiation states by 81different yield criteria and hardening laws	81
4.7 Stress triaxialities along the x-axis in the middle of U-shape sample predicted for the corresponding damage initiation states by different yield criteria and hardening laws.	82
4.8 Equivalent plastic strains along the x-axis in the middle of U-shape sample predicted for the corresponding damage initiation states by different yield criteria and hardening laws	82
4.9 Stress triaxialities along the x-axis in the middle of radius-shape sample predicted for the corresponding damage initiation states by different yield criteria and hardening laws	83
4.10 Equivalent plastic strains along the x-axis in the middle of radius - shape sample predicted for the corresponding damage initiation states by different yield criteria and hardening laws	84
4.11 Schematic of hole expansion test using flat bottom punch	85
4.12 Schematic of finite element model for hole expansion test	85
4.13 Sheet thickness distribution of 3D FE simulation model with Yld2000-2d	86
4.14 Comparison of numerically determined punch force-punch stroke curves using various yield functions in combination with different hardening laws with experimental results	87
4.15 Hole expansion ratios along the hole circumference at different angles experimentally determined and calculated by various yield functions coupled with Voce and Swift hardening law and different M exponent values in comparison	89
4.16 Thickness strains along the hole circumference at failure at different angles experimentally determined and calculated by various yield functions coupled with Voce and Swift hardening law and different M exponent values in comparison	90
4.17 Thickness strains along the specimen diameter in the RD and TD at failure experimentally determined and calculated by various yield functions coupled with Voce and Swift hardening law in comparison	92

## LIST OF FIGURES (Cont.)

FIGURE	PAGE	
4.18	Thickness strains along the specimen diameter in the RD and TD at failure experimentally determined and calculated by Yld2000-2d yield criterion coupled with Voce and Swift hardening law and different M exponent values in comparison	93
5.1	Geometric imperfection in the Marciniak – Kuczinsky model	99
5.2	Experimentally determined FLDs of the investigated DP780 and TRIP780 steels	101
5.3	Experimental and extrapolated stress-strain curves of the DP780 and TRIP780 steels	100 101
5.4	Comparison between experimentally determined and theoretically calculated FLDs for the DP780 steels	102
5.5	Comparison between experimentally determined and theoretically calculated FLDs for the TRIP780 steel	103
5.6	Determined FLSDs based on the experimental FLDs and different yield criteria and hardening models for the DP780 steel	104
5.7	Comparison between determined FLSDs based on the FLDs obtained by experiments and M-K model for the DP780 steel	105
5.8	Schematic of hole expansion test with flat bottom punch	106
5.9	Strain paths from the hole expansion test until experimental failure calculated using different yield criteria and Swift hardening law in the FLD of the DP780 steel	107
5.10	Strain paths from the hole expansion test until experimental failure calculated using different yield criteria and Swift hardening law in the FLD of the TRIP780	107
5.11	Stress paths from the hole expansion test until experimental failure calculated using Yld2000-2d yield criterion and Swift hardening law in the FLSD based on the experimental FLD data of the DP780 and TRIP780 steels	108
6.1	(a) Experimentally determined force and electric potential difference versus time and (b) experimentally determined and predicted force-displacement curves of the U-notch sample	114
6.2	Calculated strain distributions on the C-, radius-notch, pure shear and combined loading samples	114
6.3	Calculated strain distributions on the V-, U-notch, central hole, elliptical hole and plane strain samples	115
6.4	(a) Experimentally determined force and electric potential difference versus time and (b) experimentally determined and predicted force-displacement curves of the V-notch sample	116
6.5	(a) Experimentally determined force and electric potential difference versus time and (b) experimentally determined and predicted force displacement curves of the radius-notch sample	117
6.6	(a) Experimentally determined force and electric potential difference versus time and (b) experimentally determined and predicted force-displacement curves of the CL sample	118
6.7	Experimentally determined force and electric potential difference versus time of the (a) EL (b) H and (c) Plane Strain samples	120

## LIST OF FIGURES (Cont.)

FIGURE	PAGE
6.8 (a) Determined damage curves for crack initiation using different yield criteria and stress–strain paths from the Nakazima samples (b) B15, (c) B30, (d) B75 and (e) B115 calculated using different yield criteria in comparison with the damage curves for the DP steel	123
6.9 Deformed Nakazima samples at failure state from the experiments and FE simulations	124
6.10 Comparison of force–displacement curves experimentally determined and numerically predicted by different yield functions coupled with the Swift law for the (a) B15, (b) B30, (c) B75 and (d) B115 Nakazima samples	126
6.11 States of crack initiation of deformed Nakazima samples in force – displacement curves identified by the obtained damage curves and FE results	127
6.12 SEM images of the middle area of the Nakazima sample B15 (a) at the crack initiation state and (b) at the instability state	127
6.13 SEM images of the middle area of the Nakazima sample B30 (a) at the crack initiation state and (b) at the instability state	128
6.14 SEM images of the middle area of the Nakazima sample B75 (a) at the crack initiation state and (b) at the instability state	128
6.15 SEM images of the middle area of the Nakazima sample B115 (a) at the crack initiation state and (b) at the instability state	128
6.16 (a) Determined damage curves for crack initiation and plastic instability using different yield criteria and calculated stress–strain paths from (b) B15, (c) B30, (d) B75 and (e) B115 deformed Nakazima samples based on different yield criteria compared to the damage curves	132
6.17 Predicted dome heights of formed Nakazima samples at the moment of crack initiation and plastic instability calculated by means of the damage curves based on different yield criteria	133
6.18 Stamped industrial part at failure with indicated fracture areas	134
6.19 Stress–strain paths from the areas (a) P1, (b) P2, (c) P3 and (d) P4 of the industrial part calculated using different yield criteria in comparison with the damage curves	136
6.20 Illustrated DCs represented in plane stress triaxialities and plastic strain	137
6.21 Determined forming limit curves based on crack initiation and instability DCs using different yield criteria	138
6.22 Comparison between FLCs based on Nakazima test and FLCs calculated by the crack initiation and instability DCs for the DP steel	139
6.23 Strain paths of the critical elements in the Nakazima test calculated by FE simulations until the experimental failure using different yield criteria in comparison with the instability DC based FLDs	140
6.24 Strain paths from the area (a)P1, (b)P2, (c)P3 and (d)P4 of the industrial pressed part until experimental fractures calculated by using different yield criteria in the instability DC based FLCs and conventional FLC	143