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Abstract

Peel test measurements and inverse analysis to determine the interfacial mechanical parameters for the metal film/ceramic system are performed, considering that there exist an epoxy interface layer between film and ceramic. In the present investigation, Al films with a series of thicknesses between 20 and 250 μm and three peel angles of 90, 135 and 180° are considered. A finite element model with the cohesive zone elements is used to simulate the peel test process. The finite element results are taken as the training data of a neural network in the inverse analysis. The interfacial cohesive energy and the separation strength can be determined based on the inverse analysis and peel experimental result.

1. Introduction

Thin film/substrate systems have been widely used in engineering and the research on strength, ductility and reliability of film/substrate systems has attracted much interest in recent years. Thin film delamination process can be characterized by a two-parameter criterion. These two parameters are the interfacial fracture toughness G0 and the adhesion strength σ [1–5]. Usually, interfacial fracture toughness (or called cohesive energy) undergoes the great attention in the elastic case or small-scale yielding case of the adherends. When plastic dissipation cannot be neglected, one needs to consider another parameter effect additionally [6,7]. Fig. 1 shows a sketch of the peel test with the film thickness t, peel force P and peel angle ϕ. The right hand side part of Fig. 1 shows the cohesive zone (CZ) model by which the definition of the interface parameters is given [6–10]. There are two important parameters in the CZ model, (G0, σ). The determination of (G0, σ) for a film/substrate system is the most important goal in the peel test. Through the peel test measurements one can record both the peel force P and the deformation information of the film. From energy balance at the steady-state peeling, one can obtain a relationship between energy release rate P(1 – cos ϕ) with interfacial fracture toughness G0 as well as plastic dissipation energy Gp:}

\[ P(1 - \cos \phi) = G_0 + G_p \quad (1) \]

In most metal film cases Gp is a major contribution to the energy release rate P(1 – cos ϕ). So an appropriate method is needed to determine G0 when film deforms plastically [3–5,8–13].

In order to determine G0 using the peel test, in the previous methods, a beam bending model was adopted [4,5]. However, this model is not suitable for the cases of the thick film and weak interface adhesion [14–16].

In this paper we will focus our attention on the determination of interfacial parameters for thin Al films with thickness ranging between 20 and 250 μm bonded to a ceramic substrate (Al2O3) with a type of epoxy adhesive. Peel test measurements are performed and a general inverse analysis method based on neural network to determine the interfacial mechanical parameters is presented. Three cases of peel angles 90, 135 and 180° are considered. A plane strain FE model with the cohesive zone elements is adopted to simulate the peel test process. The simulation results are used as the training data to train a neural network. The trained network is adopted to predict the interfacial cohesive energy G0 and separation strength σ.

2. Experimental method

2.1. Overview

Peel tests are performed for the Al films with a series of thicknesses, 20, 50, 80, 100, 200, 225 and 250 μm, bonded to 4.5 mm thick Al2O3 substrates with one type of epoxy/polyimide paste adhesive. The mass ratio of epoxy to polyimide in the adhesive is 1.5. The adhesive shows ductile property in the peel tests, so it is called ductile adhesive in the following.

It is crucial to control the adhesive layer thickness d in preparing the samples. In our peel tests the adhesive layer thickness is kept constant by adding some small SiO2 spheres to the adhesive, see Fig. 2. The adhesive layer thickness is kept at 20 μm in this paper.
All the peel tests are performed using a standard tensile testing machine with a small-scale peel test rig specifically designed for the current research [see Fig. 3]. Several peel angles can be easily maintained with this peel test rig. A Questar microscope with long focus is used to observe the crack growth and take micrographs. The thin films are difficult to be fixed directly to the testing machine. So in order to protect the films from tearing, piece of adhesive tape is used to connect the film to some small metal sheet, and a thin nylon thread is used to connect the metal sheet to the testing machine. Since the nylon thread is about one meter long and the crosshead displacement never exceeds 30 mm, the change of the peel angle during peel test is smaller than \( \arctg(0.03) \approx 1.5^\circ \). Therefore, the peel angle is kept approximately during peel process.

Peel velocity \( v_{\text{crack}} \) is kept constant (1 mm/min) during peel process, i.e.:

\[
v/(1 - \cos \Phi) = v_{\text{crack}} = \text{const}
\]

where \( v \) is the moving velocity of the crosshead and \( \Phi \) is the peel angle.

**Table 1** Material parameters of the Al films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Film thickness (µm)</th>
<th>Young's modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Poisson's ratio</th>
<th>Yield strength (MPa)</th>
<th>Strain hardening exponent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From materials handbook.

**Fig. 1.** Peel test configuration and sketch of the cohesive zone model.

**Fig. 2.** SiO\(_2\) spheres used to control the adhesive layer thickness.

**Fig. 3.** Peel test rig made specifically for the current research.

**Fig. 4.** (a) Variations of the peel force vs. crosshead displacement, and (b) variations of the steady-state peel force vs. film thickness.
2.2. Experimental results

2.2.1. Materials

2.2.2.1. Film. The Al film is tested using the uniaxial tension and the stress–strain curve is fitted using the following piece power-law hardening relations:

$$\sigma = \begin{cases} E_s \epsilon, & (\epsilon \leq \epsilon_y) \\ \frac{\epsilon_y}{\epsilon_y} E_s \epsilon^n, & (\epsilon > \epsilon_y) \end{cases}$$

where $n$ is strain hardening exponent. Table 1 shows the fitting material parameters for the Al films.

2.2.2.2. Material Al₂O₃. Substrate material, Al₂O₃ is treated as an elastic material with Young’s modulus $E = 350$ GPa and poisson’s ration $\nu = 0.3$ in the present research.

2.2.2. Peel test results

The curves of peel force vs. crosshead displacement are recorded during the peel tests. Fig. 4a shows some typical curves of peel force vs. crosshead displacement. From Fig. 4a, obviously the peel process mainly consists of two stages: initial peeling and steady-state peeling. In the present research, we pay attention to the steady-state peeling.

At least three samples are used to do peel tests for each film thickness and each peel angle. The mean value of the measured steady-state peel forces is taken as a function of the film thickness. The functions are plotted in Fig. 4b. The steady-state peel force increases with increasing film thickness until reaches at the stable value when film thickness is larger than 200 $\mu$m. It should be noted that peel forces for 90° is larger than 135°, but lower than 180° for a given film thickness. This result may be explained by Eq. (1):

$$P = \frac{F_0 + F_p}{1 - \cos \phi}$$

From 90 to 180°, $F_p$ increases because the curvature radius of the film at the crack tip decreases which means the film is “bend more”. On the other hand, $1 - \cos \phi$ also increases from 1 to 2 when peel angle increases from 90 to 180°. The two factors determine that peel force will reach minimum at some peel angle between 90 and 180°.

Two typical configurations of the peeled films near the crack tip are shown in Fig. 5a and b for peel angle $\phi = 180°$ and 135°, respectively. All peeled films are debonded along the interface between the film and the adhesive layer.

For each peel test with $\phi = 180°$, the curvature radius of the film at the crack tip is also measured by using multiple points to fit the configuration of the film at the crack tip on the micrograph taken by the Questar measuring system, see Fig. 5a. The

![Fig. 5. (a) Peel angle 180°, film thickness 100 $\mu$m; and (b) peel angle 135°, film thickness 20 $\mu$m.](image-url)
measured result is shown in Fig. 6. It should be noted the curvature radius of the film varies in the crack tip region, and the result in Fig. 6 is the minimum value which is the true curvature radius at the crack tip.

3. Theoretical method: FE simulations and neural network inverse analysis

3.1. FE model with the CZ model

Since in the peel test the film width (10 mm) is much larger than its thickness (20–250 μm), the peel test problem can be treated as the plane strain problem. The FE simulation using ABAQUS version 6.5 is performed. Eq. (3) is used to characterize the stress-strain relation of the Al film. Large deformation, von Mises yield criterion and isotropic strain hardening will be considered in our FE model. Moreover, for substrate material, since the Al2O3 substrate undergoes very small deformation during the peel tests, it can be treated as an elastic material with Young’s modulus E = 350 GPa and Poisson’s ratio ν = 0.3.

A single layer of CZ elements [6–10] is employed to represent the adhesive layer. The interface parameters governing the traction separation law are the interface fracture toughness Γ0, separation strength _MIC_ and the factors λ1 and λ2, as described in Fig. 1. Earlier studies show that the shape of the traction separation law is relatively unimportant, and two most important parameters are Γ0 and _MIC_. In our FE model take λ1 = 0.15, λ2 = 0.5. For the convenience of exerting load on the film to simulate peel test, a rigid body is settled at the free end of the film. At first the free end of the film is rotated by the peel angle and then the film is peeled along this direction. The film and the substrate are meshed using bi-linear rectangular elements with four nodes and four integration points. The film undergoes large bending deformation during the peeling, so at least four layer elements should be divided along the thickness of the film to capture large deformation information. Since Young’s modulus of the substrate Al2O3 is about five times that of the Al film and the substrate undergoes small deformation during the peeling, sparse mesh is adopted within it. Fig. 7 shows a typical mesh used in our FE simulations.

3.2. Inverse analysis using neural network to predict Γ0 and _MIC_

Since both the interfacial fracture energy Γ0 and separation strength _MIC_ are most important parameters in the interface fracture research [5], we select them as the target to be measured in the present research. Here, an inverse analysis method is presented to identify the parameters Γ0 and _MIC_ by using the artificial neural network method.

For the film thickness 50 μm and peel angle 180°, both the peel force P and the bending curvature radius r of the film at the crack tip can be described uniquely by interfacial parameters Γ0 and _MIC_:\n
\[ P = f_1(\Gamma_0, \sigma) \]
\[ r = g_1(\Gamma_0, \sigma) \]

We also have the inverse relations:

\[ \Gamma_0 = f_2(P, r) \]
\[ \sigma = g_2(P, r) \]

Both f2 and g2 can be determined numerically by using the neural network method.

In the inverse analysis based on the neural network method, the finite element solutions are used first as training data to train the neural network. Given a series of values (Γ0, σ) and the factors C0 and k1 and k2, as described in Fig. 1. The obtained results are used as input data for training the neural network.

A single layer of CZ elements is employed to represent the adhesive layer. The interface parameters governing the traction separation law are the interface fracture toughness Γ0, separation strength _MIC_ and the factors λ1 and λ2, as described in Fig. 1. Earlier studies show that the shape of the traction separation law is relatively unimportant, and two most important parameters are Γ0 and _MIC_. In our FE model take λ1 = 0.15, λ2 = 0.5. For the convenience of exerting load on the film to simulate peel test, a rigid body is settled at the free end of the film. At first the free end of the film is rotated by the peel angle and then the film is peeled along this direction. The film and the substrate are meshed using bi-linear rectangular elements with four nodes and four integration points. The film undergoes large bending deformation during the peeling, so at least four layer elements should be divided along the thickness of the film to capture large deformation information. Since Young’s modulus of the substrate Al2O3 is about five times that of the Al film and the substrate undergoes small deformation during the peeling, sparse mesh is adopted within it. Fig. 7 shows a typical mesh used in our FE simulations.

Fig. 6. The curvature radius of the film at the crack tip.

Fig. 7. A typical mesh used in the FE calculations.

Fig. 8. Sketch of the neural network.
and two independent variables, providing that the function is not continuous only at finite points [18].

4. Results and discussions

The network described in Fig. 8 is trained by using 100 values of \((P^*, r^*)\) and \((r_0^*, \theta^*)\), noting that these values are obtained based on the finite element calculations. The variations of \(g_2\) and \(f_2\) based on the neural network method are shown in Figs. 9 and 10, respectively. In these figures, \(T\) and \(\sigma\) stand for the values of \((T_0, \theta)\) to be determined, and \(T\) is target value.

From Figs. 9 and 10, obviously, the simulated \(f_2\) and \(g_2\) by using the trained neural network are considerably accurate. By inputting the experimental data \((P = 0.51 \text{ N/mm}, r = 0.12 \text{ mm})\) into the trained network, one can obtain \(T_0 = 0.12 \text{ N/mm}, \theta = 28 \text{ MPa}\). In order to validate the cohesive parameters obtained in above Subsection 3.2, the peel tests with other film thicknesses and peel angles are predicted using the FE model with adopting above determined cohesive parameters. Fig. 11 shows the variation of the peel force as a function of the film thickness for various peel angles. The experimental results are also shown. From Fig. 11, it can be seen that the FE result captures the trend of experimental results. It is

![Fig. 9. The effect of simulating \(g_2\). \(\sigma\) is predicted values by the network with the input data \((P^*, r^*)\). \(T\) is target values and \(R = 0.998\) is the correlation coefficient of \(\sigma\) and \(T\).](image1)

![Fig. 10. The effect of simulating \(f_2\). \(\Gamma\) is predicted values by the network with the input data \((P^*, r^*)\). \(T\) is target values and \(R = 0.998\) is the correlation coefficient of \(\Gamma\) and \(T\).](image2)

![Fig. 11. The variation of the peel force as a function of the film thickness.](image3)

![Fig. 12. Configuration of the film at the crack tip, film thickness = 50 \(\mu\text{m}\), peel angle = 180\(^\circ\) : (a) FE simulation, and (b) experiment.](image4)
found that once \((\Gamma_0, \delta)\) are determined for one case of film thickness and peel angle, the result can be suitable for other cases of the film thicknesses and peel angles. It seems to conclude that the fracture toughness \(\Gamma_0\) and the separation stress \(\delta\) can be taken as the intrinsic interfacial parameters which are independent of the film thickness and peel angle.

Fig. 12a shows the simulated configuration of the film at the crack tip. An experimental photograph is shown in Fig. 12b. From FE simulation, the bending curvature radius \(r_1\) of the film at the crack tip is about 116 \(\mu m\) (see Fig. 12a). The range of \(r_1\) from experiment is 105–125 \(\mu m\) (see Fig. 12b). The FE model captures both the steady-state peeling force and the deformation features of the film.

5. Conclusion

Peel test measurements for the Al film delamination along the ceramic substrate with different peel angles and different film thicknesses have been performed. The interface toughness and separation strength have been determined.

A FE model with the cohesive zone elements is used to simulate the peel test process. The FE results are used to train a neural network. The trained network is adopted to predict the interfacial cohesive energy \(\Gamma_0\) and separation strength \(\delta\) for the film/substrate system.

From the present research, we have noted that the FE model and the inverse analysis can effectively capture the peel test features for both the steady-state peel force and the film deformation. Both the cohesive energy \(\Gamma_0\) and the separation strength \(\delta\) can be taken as the intrinsic interfacial parameters which are independent of the film thickness and peel angle.
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