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Abstract

This thesis documents an experimental and theoretical investigation of nano scale fracture and fatigue of a resonant single crystal silicon micro electromechanical device. Nano scale time dependent crack growth has been observed: crack extensions of 10 to 300 nm have been measured with an accuracy of approximately 2.5 nm; crack velocities on the order of $2.0 \times 10^{-14}$ m/s have also been accurately measured. It is postulated the 10 to 40 Å silica layer that forms on the surface of freshly cleaved silicon is continuously attacked by water vapor in the environment. As the crack propagates through this layer, fresh silicon is continuously exposed, oxidized, and statically fatigued. The fatigue mechanism is rate limiting. Starter pre-cracks do not exponentially grow with stress intensity, as observed with macro scale static fatigue specimens, ultimately causing failure. The measurements were made by detecting the shift in natural frequency of a specially designed micromechanical fatigue test structure constructed from boron doped single crystal silicon. The structure is a cantilever beam with an end plate and gold inertial mass. Bridge electrodes extend over the plate, and with interface electronics and a phase sensitive control system, drive the structure continuously at resonance and sense its motion. Fatigue crack propagation is measured by detecting shifts in the natural frequency caused by the extension of a pre-crack introduced near the base of the cantilever. The pre-crack is formed by a series of nanoindentations that traverse the full width of the unetched beam.
Chapter 1

Introduction and Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

Micromechanical fabrication techniques have revolutionized the ability of designers to miniaturize electro-mechanical systems for use in compact low cost sensors, actuators, and transducers. Micromechanical devices have found many diverse applications in fields such as inertial guidance and control, fluid sensing, acoustics, robotics, and biomechanics to name a few. More exotic and novel components such as springs, gears, motors, and linkages are being fabricated and tested[13][42]. As the field emerges, other applications will be discovered opening new vistas of research and development.

A high level of engineering sophistication in several disciplines is required to successfully design micromechanical devices, and integrate associated electronic systems, subsystems, and hardware. Consequently, much effort is focused on fabrication processes and systems engineering. However, little attention is given to investigating failure processes and structural reliability. The commercial use of micromechanical devices will lead to a greater emphasis on structural reliability as questions arise dealing with the ability of a particular device to meet performance specifications under various operating conditions.

Tackling such an issue in a unified way that would reveal the nature and interaction of different failure mechanisms presents a variety of problems.
Micromechanical devices vary greatly in size, shape, and function. The materials and processes used to fabricate the devices vary as well. All these factors will in some way affect the relative susceptibility of the device to differing modes of failure, and will dictate to an extent the type of testing methodology that is appropriate. For example, testing a micromechanical gas sensor for environmental stress corrosion cracking may be more critical than testing for shock loading capability, while the reverse would be true of a micromechanical accelerometer[19].

It is necessary to establish fatigue and fracture testing techniques that have broad appeal and application so that failure analyses of micromechanical devices can evolve to yield useful information for micromechanical designers and scientists. Information gained from such tests could be readily shared with others, thereby building a common body of knowledge. The aim of this research is to introduce and demonstrate a novel fatigue testing technique particularly suited for micromechanical testing, and to utilize this technique in an analytical and experimental investigation of the fatigue effects in a specially designed micromechanical test structure.

1.2 Literature Review

1.2.1 Current Research on Micromechanical Devices

The micromechanical test structure considered in this thesis is constructed of single crystal silicon through a step by step fabrication process that involves diffusing boron into an n-type silicon wafer in a pattern identical to the device. The heavy concentration of boron makes the diffused silicon resistant to chemical etching. Therefore, after all other processing steps are complete, the wafer chip can be immersed in an etch solution that dissolves the undiffused portion of the wafer leaving a “released” structure free to move and vibrate. The etch is anisotropic and proceeds along the <111> planes of the undiffused silicon until the planes intersect at which time no further etching occurs. The boron diffusion occurs at high temperature, 1150°C, with the diffusion time controlled by the desired thickness of the device: the longer the time, the thicker the device. A consequence of diffusing boron into silicon is a high state of residual tensile stress which is a result of the silicon atoms being substitutionally replaced by the smaller boron atoms causing the lattice to
contract. A further consequence of this diffusion is a high dislocation density caused by the displaced silicon atoms. The concentration of the boron at the surface is approximately $1.0 \times 10^{20}$ atoms/cm$^3$. This fabrication method differs from polysilicon processing in that single crystal silicon is removed by selective anisotropic etching as opposed to chemically depositing polysilicon on a wafer substrate.

Currently, no effort has begun in analyzing fatigue in heavily boron-doped single crystal silicon micromechanical devices, nor has fatigue data been reported for polysilicon structures. Within the micromechanical field, polysilicon is the primary fabrication material, and as a result, polysilicon structures and their mechanical properties are a subject of intense research. However, efforts directed toward understanding the mechanical behavior of polysilicon on a fundamental level tend to be focused on characterizing the properties of the material, particularly Young's modulus. Such emphasis is a result of the large degree of variability in the growth mechanisms of polysilicon. Grain sizes and surface roughness vary considerably from one production run to another, and from one laboratory to the next. Small differences in temperature, humidity, oxygen content, and so on have profound effects on the makeup and quality of the polysilicon. Making quantifiable and generalized statements about fatigue with such variability would be difficult. However, extremely high quality single crystal silicon, grown almost to perfection, is universally available and often used in devices requiring a high degree of mechanical stability and repeatability in material behavior. For example, open loop resonant micromechanical structures used as inertial sensors must meet drift specifications on the order of a few ppm. Such properties remove many uncertainties, making single crystal silicon an ideal material for materials research on a fundamental level; including, fatigue testing on a micromechanical scale. It can be said with reasonable assurance that single crystal silicon devices constructed by the boron diffusion process will have virtually identical mechanical properties from device to device regardless of where the device is fabricated.

The work of Gabriel and Behi is a good example of the kind of empirical experimental research being conducted on polysilicon structures [14]. In their experiment, friction and wear are characterized using a polysilicon micromechanical turbine that rotates about a concentric shaft fixed to the silicon substrate. The turbine is spun using an air jet exiting from a micropipette, and a helium/neon laser with associated optics records the angular velocity
of the turbine wheel. Measurements were made of the increase in diameter of the center hole of the wheel after rotating for a specified period of time, and of the deceleration profile of the turbine when the gas stream was stopped. Such techniques and measurements provide empirical data, but the next step is correlating such data to quantitative models that predict wear lifetimes and friction properties given appropriate attributes of the material such as surface roughness, grain size, and hardness.

Tai and Muller developed a technique for determining Young’s modulus by measuring the deflection of a polysilicon microbridge using a force measuring stylus [41]. The accuracy of such a measurement, however, is dependent on how well one knows the geometry of the bridge structure and the residual stresses, if any, which could affect the stiffness.

1.2.2 Fracture of Silicon Micromechanical Devices

Fan and Howe developed a structure to measure the fracture toughness, $K_{IC}$, of polysilicon microbridges subjected to a high residual tensile stress [12]. At the center of the structure, the configuration of the bridge resembles a compact tension specimen with a deep notch. When the microbridge is etched the residual stress either fractures the bridge at the notch, or does not, depending on the specific geometry used. Fan and Howe claim that performing a number of tests with different geometries establishes an upper and lower bound for $K_{IC}$. In conclusion, Fan and Howe determine a “critical geometry” defined as the ratio of fracture toughness to an assumed residual stress. $K_{IC}$ values or “critical geometry” factors obtained from such tests, however, must be scrutinized carefully for two reasons. First, the notch is a stress concentration, not a crack; therefore, when the device is etched, it may be that given a high prestress the state of stress at the root of the notch may exceed the cohesive strength of the polysilicon initiating a crack which in turn gives a $K_I$ well in excess of the actual $K_{IC}$. Second, the residual stress can only be inferred, it is not measured directly, which introduces some error.

A potentially promising approach to fracture toughness testing of microdevices was conducted by Johansson and Schweitz [23]. In their experiment, single crystal silicon micro-cantilevers, electrochemically etched, were deflected by a force and displacement sensing diamond tipped stylus until fracture. The thickness, length, and width of the cantilevers varied from $8 - 16 \mu m$, $75 - 500 \mu m$, and $75 - 240 \mu m$, respectively. The test was performed
in situ in a scanning electron microscope giving immediate observations of the fracture surface without handling or exposure to the environment. The advantage of this approach lies in the visual resolution and depth of field possible with the SEM which allows for accurate positioning of the stylus over the cantilever. Clearly, without the depth resolution of a SEM, positioning the stylus over the cantilever while viewing it at an angle with an optical microscope would be very difficult. Otherwise, a method for placing the stylus over the cantilever must be devised for the stylus would hide the cantilever from view when the microscope objective is above the cantilever. Johansson and Schweitz, however, did not compute a $K_{IC}$ based on a known crack initiation site and corresponding $K_I$ factor. Rather, they computed the fracture stress from beam theory, and correlated the result to random surface flaws generated during fabrication. The fracture stresses averaged about 2% of Young's modulus which is very close to the 2.06% reported by Eisner [8]. Eisner fractured silicon whiskers in tension with diameters on the order of 1$\mu$m. Tensile loading was accomplished using micromanipulators and a damped pendulum bob. Peterson and Read also fractured silicon whiskers in bending and reported fracture stress values as high as 2.6% of $E$ [35].

Experiments similar to that of Johansson and Schweitz were conducted with a nanoindenter by Nix and Weihs [21][22]. The nanoindenter was used to measure the bending stiffness of gold and LPCVD (Low Pressure Chemical Vapor Deposition) SiN$_X$ micro-cantilevers deflected at the tip. Young's modulus was then computed using beam theory equations. Although fracture experiments were not conducted, it is possible to use the nanoindenter to deflect micro-cantilevers until fracture with a known stress intensity factor associated with a pre-crack.

1.2.3 Fracture Toughness of Single Crystal Silicon

Fracture toughness experiments on silicon have been performed and documented by several researchers. Chen and Leipold determined the fracture toughness of single crystal silicon as a function of the orientation of the crystal axes. $K_{IC}$ values were determined for the $<111>$, $<110>$, and $<100>$ planes to be $0.82\; MN/m^{3/2}$, $0.90\; MN/m^{3/2}$, $0.95\; MN/m^{3/2}$, respectively [5]. In their experiment, a Knoop diamond indentation initiated a pre-crack on the top surface of a beam which was then fractured in four point bending.
Later, Chen and Leipold determined the $K_{IC}$ of single crystal silicon in the
$<111>$ plane to be $1 \, MN/m^{3/2}$ [4]. A double torsion test specimen was
used where pre-cracking was accomplished by driving a wedge into a notch
machined into the edge of the silicon specimen. Chen and Hsu reported that
the lower $K_{IC}$ value determined in [5] was due to residual compressive stress
in the region of the indentation site [3].

1.2.4 Stress Corrosion Fatigue in Ceramics and Silicon

Subcritical crack growth in glass and ceramics is well documented with a large
body of literature available for review. A.G. Evans and S.M. Wiederhorn have
published many informative articles about stress corrosion cracking in silica,
alumina, glass, and other ceramics. Evans gives a good review of the various
test configurations and procedures used to determine $K_{IC}$ values for brittle
materials [10]. In this article, Evans discusses single edge cracked tension
specimens, three point bending, compact tension, double cantilever, tapered
double cantilever, double torsion, constant moment, and wedge loaded dou-
ble cantilever tests; equations for the corresponding $K_I$ are also given. Also
discussed is the relation between the crack growth rate and compliance of
the specimen. Wiederhorn gives a good review and discussion of the charac-
terization of subcritical crack growth in ceramics [45]. In Wiederhorn’s
article, crack propagation data for silica is presented showing the depen-
dence of humidity and stress on crack velocity and the three characteristic
regions of subcritical crack growth on $\frac{da}{dt}$ versus $K_I$ plots. Region I, or the
slow growth region, is attributable to a stress corrosion reaction at the crack
tip enhanced by the presence of stress. In region I, crack growth depends on
the rate of the chemical reaction at the crack tip, and exponentially on the
applied stress. Region II, or the stress independent region, is a flat region
where the crack velocity is independent of stress but depends strongly on the
rate of water transport to the crack tip. Region III, or the fast growth region,
is independent of water content and exponentially dependent on stress. It
is generally accepted that crack growth in Region III is related to the struc-
ture of the material itself rather than environmental factors. Generally, these
curves are determined by applying a static stress to a test specimen and mea-
suring directly or indirectly the crack growth. Evans has shown that these
three regions also characterize subcritical crack growth in ceramic materials that are dynamically loaded either through constant strain rate or stress rate conditions [11]. Magida et al. developed lifetime predictions and design criteria for static and dynamic loading of a machinable glass ceramic used in the construction of NASA’s Gamma Ray Observatory [29]. Ritter et al. studied the effect of temperature and humidity on delayed failure of optical glass fibers [36]. The fatigue model used in the analysis exponentially relates crack velocity to an activation energy that is overcome by the presence of a stress intensity. Temperature and the partial pressure of water are included in the model directly. A comparison is made between the activation energy calculated and other values previously reported in the literature.

Fatigue data on silicon is less well documented and understood. Chen and Knapp performed a stress corrosion experiment with single crystal silicon bars that were pre-cracked by a Knoop microhardness tester and statically loaded in four point bending [6]. The surface of the beam was wetted with a wick with various liquids including distilled water, and the time to fracture recorded. The loading was on the order of 95% of the fracture load of those specimens which failed instantly. The beams which survived the initial loading were monitored for a period of up to two weeks. None failed, therefore Chen and Knapp concluded that stress corrosion cracking does not occur in the liquid environments they tested. However, it should be noted that direct measurements of the extension of the pre-crack were not made, and that it is possible the load was not sufficient to give a stress intensity above the stress corrosion threshold value. Calculations of the $K_I$ factor for those beams which did not fail were not made. Wong and Holbrook performed a similar experiment where single crystal silicon wafers were indented and pre-cracked with a Leitz Miniload microhardness tester equipped with an optical microscope [49]. The radial cracks were measured as a function of time in both ambient air and deionized water. Wong and Holbrook reported they did not observe crack healing, nor crack extension, and ultimately concluded that stress corrosion cracking does not occur in silicon because of the formation of a protective oxide layer on the surface of the silicon. The explanation given is that the molar mismatch between the oxide and silicon causes a compressive stress at the crack tip which cancels the residual tensile field of the indentation thereby removing the driving force for crack extension. Although this explanation is entirely valid for indentation experiments, external loads need to be applied to maintain a $K_I$ above the threshold for
stress corrosion cracking to occur. It should also be noted that the silicon dioxide layer which forms on the surface of silicon exposed to air or water is subject to stress corrosion cracking. Bhaduri and Wang measured subcritical crack growth in single crystal silicon using load relaxation methods with pre-cracked double torsion specimens [2]. Plots of crack velocity versus stress intensity are presented with corresponding slopes and intercepts. Their results show region III behavior in ambient air at 10% humidity and liquid water. Interestingly, region II behavior was observed when an electric field was applied to the specimen. The slope and intercept of the fatigue curves associated with these cases appeared constant when voltages of 15 and 50 volts were applied. No definitive explanation was given for electrically enhanced subcritical cracking, although Bhaduri and Wang indicated that other researchers had found an electromechanical effect in silicon where hardness values decreased when a potential of a few volts was applied [44][1]. Such experiments would be of interest to the micromechanical community because micromechanical devices are electrically excited, and small currents do flow through the structure including flexural members that provide the necessary degrees of freedom. Bhaduri and Wang's findings for silicon in air and water are reasonable considering that silicon is instantly oxidized to form a thin layer of silicon dioxide, or silica, when exposed to a moist environment. It is the silica which is attacked by moisture. As a crack propagates through the material pure silicon is continuously exposed which is then oxidized and subjected to the stress corrosion reaction. Chen and Leipold used acoustic emission monitoring and load relaxation methods to determine if subcritical cracking was present in single crystal silicon [4]. Pre-cracked double torsion specimens were used. No load relaxation was observed during the hold times suggesting the absence of subcritical cracking. However, these hold times were on the order of 5-10 minutes which may not have been long enough to detect any changes. Acoustic emission monitoring also revealed no subcritical cracking during the hold period. However, it is unlikely a stress corrosion reaction in single crystal silicon would be detected by such a technique because of the absence of grain boundaries and discontinuities in the material that would produce a measurable emission.
1.2.5 Plasticity in Silicon

Plasticity in silicon has been investigated on a fundamental level by a number of researchers. Hirsch et al. studied the effect of doping on dislocation mobility in single crystal silicon using a microhardness indenter on a heated stage [37]. He found doping enhances dislocation motion, n doping being more effective than p doping, at temperatures of approximately 400°C. Although this temperature is higher than the practical limits of a micromechanical device, the highest p type doping concentration used in the test was $2 \times 10^{18}$ atoms/cm$^{-3}$ which is considerably less than the concentrations used to fabricate microdevices. The typical surface concentration of a micromechanical device produced by boron diffusion is on the order of $1 \times 10^{20}$ atoms/cm$^{-3}$. Furthermore, silicon diffused with boron has a substantial dislocation density, which is not the case with wafers doped during the melt. Such wafers are virtually dislocation free. The mechanism of dislocation motion is attributed to electrically charged kinks which bridge secondary Peierls potentials. Theses kinks migrate in the direction of the dislocation line given adequate thermal energy and applied stress [20]. Haasen also developed expressions for kink migration based on activation energies necessary to overcome the Peierls potential [16]. Rybicki and Pirouz evaluated fracture and indentation plasticity in silicon using a microhardness tester and dislocation free float zone single crystal silicon [39]. P type silicon was boron doped in the melt to a concentration of $4.5 \times 10^{17}$ atoms/cm$^{-3}$, and n type silicon was phosphorous doped to $6 \times 10^{18}$ atoms/cm$^{-3}$. Rybicki and Pirouz found that doping affects hardness to a small extent, with n type doping giving the greatest dislocation mobility. The brittle to ductile transition temperature was reduced 15°C in the p material, and 35°C for the n type material. The DBTT for pure undoped silicon is 660°C. Considering the high DBTT of silicon and the relatively small effect doping has on this temperature, room temperature dislocation motion should be negligibly small; therefore, dynamic fatigue of p-type silicon at room temperature is not expected. No doping related effects on fracture toughness were observed.

1.2.6 Conclusion

From review of the literature, fatigue in heavily boron doped micromechanical structures is an open question. Stress corrosion fatigue appears to be
present in single crystal silicon, and may be enhanced by an electrical potential. Room temperature dynamic fatigue should not be a factor because of the high DBTT, and the relative insensitivity of this temperature to doping concentration. æ
Chapter 2

Fatigue Test Structure Design

2.1 Test Structure Layout (Generation 1)

Figures 2.1 and 2.2 are diagrams of the generation 1 micromechanical fatigue test structure. The dimensions shown correspond to the T38 series of fatigue devices which were the first operational devices fabricated providing preliminary test data. A cantilever beam 11.5 \( \mu m \times 130 \mu m \times 2.9 \mu m \) thick is etched free from the surface of a silicon wafer. At the free end of the cantilever is a rectangular plate 120 \( \mu m \) wide by 157 \( \mu m \) long. This plate provides area for electrostatic forcing and sensing, and gold metallic plating which is used as a counterweight to lower and adjust the natural frequency. The volume etched beneath the beam and plate extends to a depth of approximately 70 \( \mu m \). Gold bridge electrodes are used to electrostatically drive the cantilever and sense its motion.

10 \( \mu m \) from the base of the cantilever a pre-crack or crack initiation site is introduced into the surface of the beam. A small extension of a crack from this site reduces the total stiffness of the beam causing a significant change in resonant frequency. Therefore, driving the cantilever continuously at resonance while simultaneously measuring the frequency is a method by which the rate of propagation of a crack from the initiation site can be determined. The location of the crack initiation site, near the base of the cantilever, maximizes the frequency sensitivity to cracking and the bending moment applied to the crack.

The method of fatigue testing proposed in this experiment is analogous to
compliance testing on a macro-scale where a constant load or displacement is applied to a pre-cracked specimen and the corresponding change in load or displacement is measured as a function of time and correlated to crack growth. However, in this experiment, the frequency is measured which in turn is related to a stiffness change at the crack site.

The cantilever configuration has a number of advantages. First, and foremost, is simplicity. The geometry does not present unusual difficulties in analyzing the dynamics of the structure, or in determining the internal stresses. Furthermore, a tensile stress field will be generated in the vicinity of the crack initiation site so that mode I fracture and fatigue behavior should dominate. The device is free-standing, meaning that it is connected at one point only to the base; therefore, the structure stress relieves itself from the lattice contraction caused by the boron diffusion[48]. If this contraction is not free to occur when the device is etched, as in a structure connected at two points, significant tensile stresses can be generated. A large pretension in the structure would likely cause uncontrolled breakage at the crack initiation site during etching. Lastly, the bridge electrodes allow a deep well to be etched beneath the beam and plate minimizing viscous air damping.

The dimensions corresponding to the plan view of the device, Figure 2.1, are fixed by the photomask. However, the thickness dimensions shown in the cross section, Figure 2.2, are process variables which can be varied by altering diffusion and deposition times.

### 2.2 Dynamic Modeling

An accurate dynamic model of the device is necessary to make predictions of the resonant frequency, and the anticipated frequency shift given a known crack geometry and extension. A number of alternatives are available for modeling. A three degree of freedom lumped system was chosen for three reasons. First, a discrete system simplifies the analysis versus solving the partial differential equation of a Bernoulli/Euler beam with a mass and inertia at the free end. Second, the effects of cracking and damping are easily included; plant modeling for control system design is simplified, and additional stiffnesses, such as that associated with flexing of the end plate, can be incorporated if necessary. Thirdly, for an uncracked uniform beam, two degrees of freedom appear to be the minimum necessary for accurate pre-
dictions of the first mode frequency because the large mass and inertia of the end plate produce translational and rotational inertial forces that tend to act independently in deflecting the beam. Single degree of freedom models do not fully account for this effect as shown later by the relatively high frequencies calculated.

In order to solve the equations of motion of the device many parameters must be computed: masses, inertias, stiffnesses, damping constants, and electrostatic forces. Furthermore, other important factors must be calculated including output voltages, control system parameters, stress intensities, surface tension forces, critical clearances in the electrode air gaps, electrode buckling calculations, and additional dynamics such as torsional modes and out of plane bending. To optimize the design of the fatigue structure many test cases must be analyzed until the best combination of dimensions and variable process parameters can be found that satisfies the requirements of the fatigue experiment and the fabrication process. Because of the large number of calculations involved in a single analysis, a design program was written in PASCAL to serve as the principal design, modeling, and analysis tool. This program is called the FTEST2.PAS design program. A copy of the code is included in Appendix G. Appendix G.1 contains the input file for the T38 design.

2.2.1 Derivation of Matrix Equations

In this section, Lagrange's equations are used to derive the matrix equations of motion of the system. A polynomial is chosen approximating the beam deflection and satisfying the geometric boundary conditions at the fixed end. Continuity must also be preserved on the interior of the beam to at least first order except at the crack site where a rotational spring that models the crack produces a discontinuity in slope. Equations 2.1 and 2.2 are used to as the approximation.

\[ v_a(x,t) = v_1(t) \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^2 + v_2(t) \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^3 \quad 0 \leq x \leq \ell_{ab} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

\[ v_b(x,t) = v_1(t) \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^2 + v_2(t) \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^3 + \theta(x - \ell_{ab}) \quad \ell_{ab} \leq x \leq \ell_{ac} \] \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

The form of Equations 2.1 and 2.2 is that of a cantilever statically deflected by an external moment and force applied at the free end. By modeling
this way, it is implicitly assumed the beam always responds statically to the
inertial forces and torques of the end plate. Considering the large mass of
the end plate ($M = 1.51 \times 10^{-9}$ kg), relative to the mass of the beam ($m_b =
9.97 \times 10^{-12}$ kg), the inertial forces of the beam will be almost negligible;
therefore, the approximation should be close to the actual deflection. $v_1(t)$
and $v_2(t)$ are time varying independent degrees of freedom and $\theta(t)$ is the
motion at the crack site. Equation 2.1 satisfies the geometric boundary
conditions at the fixed end of the cantilever and preserves continuity to second
order anywhere in the interior of the beam over the specified region; likewise
for Equation 2.2. At $x = \ell_{ab}$, continuity in displacement must be maintained,
however, continuity in slope is not because of the rotational spring, $K_r$. The
boundary conditions therefore are:

$$v_a(0,t) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

$$v_a(\ell_{ab},t) = v_b(\ell_{ab},t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

$$\left( \frac{\partial v_a(x,t)}{\partial x} \right)_{x=0} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

$$\left( \frac{\partial v_b(x,t)}{\partial x} \right)_{x=\ell_{ab}} - \left( \frac{\partial v_a(x,t)}{\partial x} \right)_{x=\ell_{ab}} = \theta(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

where

$$\frac{\partial v_a(x,t)}{\partial x} = \frac{2v_1}{\ell_{ac}^2} x + \frac{3v_2}{\ell_{ac}^3} x^2  \quad 0 \leq x \leq \ell_{ab}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

$$\frac{\partial v_b(x,t)}{\partial x} = \frac{2v_1}{\ell_{ac}^2} x + \frac{3v_2}{\ell_{ac}^3} x^2 + \theta  \quad \ell_{ab} \leq x \leq \ell_{ac}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.8)

Figure 2.3 defines the coordinate system and displacement vector of the
deflected cantilever. Also shown are the nonconservative external forces of
the driving electrode and damping.

Using the Bernoulli/Euler model, the strain energy stored in the cantilever can be written as follows.

$$V = \frac{EI}{2} \int_0^{\ell_{ab}} \left( \frac{\partial^2 v_a}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 dx + \frac{EI}{2} \int_{\ell_{ab}}^{\ell_{ac}} \left( \frac{\partial^2 v_b}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} K_r \theta^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.9)
Figure 2.3: Micromechanical Cantilever

The strain energy stored in the cantilever reduces to an integration over the entire length of the beam, because the second derivative of \( v_a \) and \( v_b \) are identical. The strain energy can be simplified to the following equation.

\[
V = \frac{EI}{2} \int_0^\ell_{ac} \left( \frac{\partial^2 v_a}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} K_s \theta^2
\]  
(2.10)

The kinetic energy of the tip mass and beam are given by Equations 2.11 and 2.12 respectively.

\[
T_M^* = \frac{1}{2} M \left \{ v_b(\ell_{ac}) + \left( \frac{\partial^2 v_b}{\partial x \partial t} \right)_{x=\ell_{ac}} \ell_{cgx} \right \}^2 + \left \{ \left( \frac{\partial^2 v_b}{\partial x \partial t} \right)_{x=\ell_{ac}} \ell_{cgx} \right \}^2 \\
+ \frac{1}{2} J \left( \frac{\partial^2 v_b}{\partial x \partial t} \right)_{x=\ell_{ac}}^2
\]  
(2.11)

\[
T_B^* = \frac{1}{2} m \int_0^{\ell_{ab}} \dot{v}_b^2(x) \, dx + \frac{1}{2} m \int_{\ell_{ab}}^{\ell_{ac}} \dot{v}_b^2(x) \, dx
\]  
(2.12)

where,

\[
m = \text{mass/length of beam:} \quad \left( \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}} \right)
\]
\[ M = \text{mass of end plate: (kg)} \]
\[ \bar{I} = \text{rotational inertia of end plate: (kg m}^2) \]
\[ \ell_{cgy} = \text{distance from point C to c.g. of end plate along x axis: (m)} \]
\[ \ell_{cgy} = \text{height of c.g. of end plate along y axis: (m)} \]

Substituting Equations 2.1 and 2.2 into Equations 2.10, 2.11, and 2.12, and performing the indicated operations gives the following set of equations.

\[ V = \frac{2EI}{\ell_{ac}^3} (v_1^2 + 3v_1v_2 + 3v_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} K \dot{\theta}^2 \quad (2.13) \]

\[ T_M^* = \frac{1}{2} M \left\{ (\zeta_1 \dot{v}_1 + \zeta_2 \dot{v}_2 + \zeta_3 \dot{\theta} \ell_{bc})^2 + (\zeta_4 \dot{v}_1 + \zeta_5 \dot{v}_2 + \zeta_6 \dot{\theta} \ell_{bc})^2 \right\} \]
\[ + \frac{1}{2} I \left( \frac{2}{\ell_{ac}} \ddot{v}_1 + \frac{3}{\ell_{ac}} \ddot{v}_2 + \ddot{\theta} \right) \quad (2.14) \]

where,

\[ \zeta_1 = \left( 1 + \frac{2 \ell_{cgy}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \]
\[ \zeta_2 = \left( 1 + \frac{3 \ell_{cgy}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \]
\[ \zeta_3 = \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{cgy}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) \]
\[ \zeta_4 = 2 \frac{\ell_{cgy}}{\ell_{ac}} \]
\[ \zeta_5 = 3 \frac{\ell_{cgy}}{\ell_{ac}} \]
\[ \zeta_6 = \frac{\ell_{cgy}}{\ell_{bc}} \]

\[ T_B^* = \frac{m \ell_{ac}}{2} \left( \frac{v_1^2}{5} + \frac{\dot{v}_1 \dot{v}_2}{3} + \frac{\dot{v}_2^2}{7} \right) + m \frac{\dot{v}_1 \dot{\theta}}{\ell_{ac}} \left( \frac{1}{12} - \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^3 + \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^4 \right) \]
\[ + m \frac{\dot{v}_2 \dot{\theta}}{\ell_{ab}} \left( \frac{1}{20} - \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^4 + \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^5 \right) \]
\[ + \frac{m \dot{\theta}^2}{2} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}^3}{3} + \ell_{ac} \ell_{ab} \ell_{bc} - \ell_{ac} - \frac{\ell_{ab}^3}{3} \right) \quad (2.15) \]
For $\ell_{ac} \gg \ell_{ab}$ and $\ell_{ac} \approx \ell_{bc}$

\[
\left( \frac{1}{12} - \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^3 + \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^4 \right) \approx \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^4
\]

\[
\left( \frac{1}{20} - \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^4 + \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^5 \right) \approx \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{\ell_{ac}}{\ell_{ab}} \right)^5
\]

\[
\left( \frac{\ell_{ac}^3}{3} + \ell_{ac} \ell_{ab} (\ell_{ab} - \ell_{ac}) - \frac{\ell_{ab}^3}{3} \right) \approx \frac{\ell_{ac}^3}{3}
\]

and with the following definitions

\[v_3 = \theta \ell_{bc}\]

\[K_B = \frac{K_r}{\ell_{bc}^2}\]

the potential and kinetic energies can be rewritten as follows.

\[V = \frac{2EI}{\ell_{ac}^3} (v_1^2 + 3v_1v_2 + 3v_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} K_B v_3^2 \quad (2.16)\]

\[T_M^* = \frac{1}{2} M \left\{ (\zeta_1 \dot{v}_1 + \zeta_2 \dot{v}_2 + \zeta_3 \dot{v}_3)^2 + (\zeta_4 \ddot{v}_1 + \zeta_5 \ddot{v}_2 + \zeta_6 \ddot{v}_3)^2 \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{2}{\ell_{ac}} \dot{v}_1 + \frac{3}{\ell_{ac}} \dot{v}_2 + \frac{\dot{v}_3}{\ell_{bc}} \right)^2 \quad (2.17)\]

\[T_B^* = m \ell_{ac} \left( \frac{\dot{v}_1^2}{5} + \frac{\dot{v}_1 \dot{v}_2}{3} + \frac{\dot{v}_2^2}{7} \right) + m \ell_{ac} \frac{\dot{v}_1 \dot{v}_3}{4} + m \ell_{ac} \frac{\dot{v}_2 \dot{v}_3}{5} + m \ell_{ac} \frac{\dot{v}_3^2}{6} \quad (2.18)\]

Using Equations 2.16, 2.17, and 2.18, the Lagrangian, $L$, can be written in terms of $v_1$, $v_2$, and $v_3$.

\[L = T_M^* + T_B^* - V. \quad (2.19)\]

Lagrange’s equations are written as follows.

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{v}_1} \right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_1} = \Xi_1 \quad (2.20)
\]

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{v}_2} \right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_2} = \Xi_2 \quad (2.21)
\]

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{v}_3} \right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial v_3} = \Xi_3 \quad (2.22)
\]
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Substituting Equations 2.16, 2.17, 2.18, and 2.19 into Equations 2.20 through 2.22 gives

\[
\begin{align*}
\left( M(\zeta_1^2 + \zeta_4^2) + \frac{4 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac}^2} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{5} \right) \ddot{v}_1 + \left( M(\zeta_1 \zeta_2 + \zeta_4 \zeta_5) + \frac{6 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac}^2} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{6} \right) \ddot{v}_2 + \\
\left( M(\zeta_1 \zeta_3 + \zeta_4 \zeta_6) + \frac{2 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac} \ell_{bc}} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{4} \right) \ddot{v}_3 + \frac{4 EI}{\ell_{ac}^3} v_1 + \frac{6 EI}{\ell_{ac}^3} v_2 = \Xi_1 
\end{align*}
\tag{2.23}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\left( M(\zeta_1 \zeta_2 + \zeta_4 \zeta_5) + \frac{6 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac}^2} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{14} \right) \ddot{v}_1 + \left( M(\zeta_1^2 + \zeta_4^2) + \frac{9 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac}^2} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{7} \right) \ddot{v}_2 + \\
\left( M(\zeta_2 \zeta_3 + \zeta_5 \zeta_6) + \frac{3 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac} \ell_{bc}} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{5} \right) \ddot{v}_3 + \frac{6 EI}{\ell_{ac}^3} v_1 + \frac{12 EI}{\ell_{ac}^3} v_2 = \Xi_2 
\end{align*}
\tag{2.24}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\left( M(\zeta_1 \zeta_3 + \zeta_4 \zeta_6) + \frac{2 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac} \ell_{bc}} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{4} \right) \ddot{v}_1 + \\
\left( M(\zeta_2 \zeta_3 + \zeta_5 \zeta_6) + \frac{3 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac} \ell_{bc}} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{5} \right) \ddot{v}_2 + \\
\left( M(\zeta_3^2 + \zeta_6^2) + \frac{\bar{I}}{\ell_{bc}^2} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{3} \right) \ddot{v}_3 + K_B v_3 = \Xi_3 
\end{align*}
\tag{2.25}
\]

Expressions for the generalized forces, \(\Xi_1, \Xi_2,\) and \(\Xi_3\) will be derived in a later section. First, the frequencies of the system will be computed and compared to that obtained for single degree of freedom models. Defining

\[
m_{11} = M(\zeta_1^2 + \zeta_4^2) + \frac{4 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac}^2} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{5} \tag{2.26}
\]

\[
m_{12} = M(\zeta_1 \zeta_2 + \zeta_4 \zeta_5) + \frac{6 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac}^2} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{6} \tag{2.27}
\]

\[
m_{13} = M(\zeta_1 \zeta_3 + \zeta_4 \zeta_6) + \frac{2 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac} \ell_{bc}} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{4} \tag{2.28}
\]

\[
m_{21} = m_{12} \tag{2.29}
\]

\[
m_{22} = M(\zeta_1^2 + \zeta_4^2) + \frac{9 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac}^2} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{7} \tag{2.30}
\]

\[
m_{23} = M(\zeta_2 \zeta_3 + \zeta_5 \zeta_6) + \frac{3 \bar{I}}{\ell_{ac} \ell_{bc}} + \frac{mI_{ac}}{5} \tag{2.31}
\]
\[ m_{31} = m_{13} \quad (2.32) \]
\[ m_{32} = m_{23} \quad (2.33) \]
\[ m_{33} = M(\zeta_3^2 + \zeta_6^2) + \frac{I}{\ell_{bc}^2} + \frac{m \ell_{ac}}{3} \quad (2.34) \]
\[ k_{11} = \frac{4EI}{\ell_{ac}^3} \quad (2.35) \]
\[ k_{12} = \frac{6EI}{\ell_{ac}^3} \quad (2.36) \]
\[ k_{13} = 0 \quad (2.37) \]
\[ k_{21} = k_{12} \quad (2.38) \]
\[ k_{22} = \frac{12EI}{\ell_{ac}^3} \quad (2.39) \]
\[ k_{23} = 0 \quad (2.40) \]
\[ k_{31} = k_{13} \quad (2.41) \]
\[ k_{32} = k_{23} \quad (2.42) \]
\[ k_{33} = K_B \quad (2.43) \]

the matrix equation of motion can be written as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  m_{11} & m_{12} & m_{13} \\
  m_{21} & m_{22} & m_{23} \\
  m_{31} & m_{32} & m_{33}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
  \ddot{v}_1 \\
  \ddot{v}_2 \\
  \ddot{v}_3
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
  k_{11} & k_{12} & k_{13} \\
  k_{21} & k_{22} & k_{23} \\
  k_{31} & k_{32} & k_{33}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
  v_1 \\
  v_2 \\
  v_3
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
  \Xi_1 \\
  \Xi_2 \\
  \Xi_3
\end{bmatrix} \quad (2.44)
\]

or,

\[
M \dddot{U} + KU = R \quad (2.45)
\]

Defining

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  m_{11} & m_{12} \\
  m_{21} & m_{22}
\end{bmatrix} = M_A \quad (2.46)
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  m_{13} \\
  m_{23}
\end{bmatrix} = M_C \quad (2.47)
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  m_{13} & m_{23}
\end{bmatrix} = M_C^T \quad (2.48)
\]

\[
m_{33} = M_B \quad (2.49)
\]
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
k_{11} & k_{12} \\
k_{21} & k_{22}
\end{bmatrix}
= \mathbf{K}_A
\quad (2.50)
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
k_{13} \\
k_{23}
\end{bmatrix}
= \mathbf{K}_C
\quad (2.51)
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
k_{13} & k_{23}
\end{bmatrix}
= \mathbf{K}_C^T
\quad (2.52)
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\ddot{v}_1 \\
\ddot{v}_2 \\
\ddot{v}_3
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{u}_A \\
\nu_3
\end{bmatrix}
\quad (2.53)
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Xi_1 \\
\Xi_2 \\
\Xi_3
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{r}_A \\
\Xi_3
\end{bmatrix}
\quad (2.54)
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{M}_A & \mathbf{M}_C \\
\mathbf{M}_C^T & \mathbf{M}_B
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_A \\
\nu_3
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{K}_A & \mathbf{K}_C \\
\mathbf{K}_C^T & \mathbf{K}_B
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{u}_A \\
\nu_3
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{r}_A \\
\Xi_3
\end{bmatrix}
\quad (2.55)
\]

To analyze the dynamics of the cantilever system without cracking, the third row and column of the matrix equation of motion is eliminated giving the following equation.

\[
\mathbf{M}_A \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_A + \mathbf{K}_A \mathbf{u}_A = \mathbf{r}_A
\quad (2.56)
\]

The free vibration problem is solved by setting \( \mathbf{r}_A = 0 \) and substituting a solution of the form

\[
\mathbf{u}_A = \phi_A e^{i\omega t}
\quad (2.57)
\]

into Equation 2.56. For nontrivial solutions,

\[
|\mathbf{K}_A - \omega^2 \mathbf{M}_A| = 0
\quad (2.58)
\]

The determinant is expanded and solved for the natural frequencies:

\[
\omega_{1A} = \sqrt{\frac{A - (A^2 - 4B)^{1/2}}{2}}
\quad (2.59)
\]

\[
\omega_{2A} = \sqrt{\frac{A + (A^2 - 4B)^{1/2}}{2}}
\quad (2.60)
\]
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where,

\[
A = \frac{k_{11}m_{22} + k_{22}m_{11} - 2m_{12}k_{12}}{m_{11}m_{22} - m_{12}^2}
\]

\[
B = \frac{k_{11}k_{22} - k_{12}^2}{m_{11}m_{22} - m_{12}^2}
\]

Numerical values will be given for \( \omega_{1A} \) and \( \omega_{2A} \), but first two single degree of freedom models will be evaluated.

### 2.2.2 Single Degree of Freedom Models

Two single degree of freedom models are now presented which illustrate the relative inaccuracy of these idealizations in computing the natural frequency. In the first model, rotational inertia effects are neglected by assuming the motion is predominately translational. A point load is applied at the center of gravity of the structure, point G, in Figure 2.3 and the deflection computed at point C, \( v_C \). The spring constant associated with \( v_C \) is as follows.

\[
K_C = \frac{3EI}{\ell_{ac}^3 \left(1 + \frac{3\ell_{ac}}{2\ell_{ac}}\right)}
\]  

(2.61)

Excluding damping, summing forces in the vertical direction at point C gives the following equation of motion.

\[
M\ddot{v}_C + K_C v_C = F_T
\]  

(2.62)

The frequency for this model is given as follows.

\[
\omega_C = \sqrt{\frac{K_C}{M}}
\]  

(2.63)

The second model includes rotational inertia. Summing moments about point A in Figure 2.3 gives the equation of motion.

\[
\bar{I}_A \ddot{\theta} + K_\phi \theta = T_A
\]  

(2.64)

where,

\[
T_A = F_T(\ell_{ac} + \ell_{cd})
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOF</th>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lagrangian</td>
<td>$\omega_{1A} = 2745$ $\omega_{2A} = 102153$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Translational</td>
<td>$\omega_c = 4554$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rotational</td>
<td>$\omega_\theta = 3246$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Frequency Comparison for T38 Series

\[
\bar{I}_A = M(\ell_{cg} + \ell_{ac})^2 + \bar{I} \\
\theta = \frac{v_c}{\ell_{ac}} \\
K_\theta = \frac{3EI}{\ell_{ac}} \left( \frac{1 + \frac{\ell_{cg}}{\ell_{ac}}}{1 + \frac{3\ell_{cg}}{2\ell_{ac}}} \right)
\]

The natural frequency for this model is as follows.

\[
\omega_\theta = \sqrt{\frac{K_\theta}{\bar{I}_A}} \tag{2.65}
\]

2.2.3 Model Comparison

Table 2.1 compares the calculated frequencies for the different dynamic models. Details of these calculations are performed in Appendix A. Although it may appear that the two degree of freedom model is a rather complex and elaborate approach to a relatively simple problem, Table 2.1 shows substantial differences in the calculated frequencies for the single degree of freedom models versus the two degree of freedom model. Because the frequencies are higher, the single degree of freedom models represent stiffer structures; therefore, to obtain a particular $K_f$ at the crack site a lower displacement would be calculated than for the two degree of freedom model. This fact has important implications on the overall design of the structure because the total travel of the end plate is limited by the air gap dimension under the bridge electrodes. This dimension is constrained by the fabrication process to at most about 12μm. In essence, accurate dynamic modeling of the device in this investigation is the key to obtaining the correct stress intensity at the crack initiation site given the limited travel of the end plate. It is the translational and rotational inertia forces of the end plate that must produce the
necessary displacements and stresses to initiate and propagate a subcritical crack through the material. Fatigue in brittle solids occurs only over a narrow range of stress intensity factors; therefore, careful design and accurate predictions of frequency and displacement is necessary for success.

2.2.4 Finite Element Modal Analysis

As explained in the previous section, accurate dynamic modeling of the structure is critical for success. In the derivation of the equations of motion for the cantilever system, two key assumptions were made which could have significant bearing on the accuracy of the model. First, the end plate was assumed to act as a rigid body, and second, a 2 degree of freedom Bernoulli/Euler model was assumed to be an adequate representation of the displacement of the uncracked beam. In fact, the end plate flexes a small amount, some shear deformation occurs in the beam, and the polynomial representing the beam displacement is more complex than assumed in Equations 2.1 and 2.2. Therefore, to verify the validity of the equations of motion, and to check the calculations performed in the design program, FTEST2.PAS, a finite element modal analysis of the structure was performed using ABAQUS. The dynamics of the end plate were analyzed separately to determine if additional degrees of freedom should be included in the equations of motion to account for the flexibility of the end plate. The input data lists and pertinent output data for the cantilever system and end plate are included in Appendix B.

Modal Analysis of End Plate

Figure 2.4 is a plot of the end plate mesh. The dimensions are identical to those shown in Figure 2.1. Four node shell elements model the silicon plate, and eight node brick elements model the gold counterweight. A Cartesian rectangular coordinate system is located on the centerline of the plate on the fixed edge as shown in Figure 2.4. Figures 2.5 through 2.7 display the first three modes of the end plate. The frequency of the first bending mode of the end plate determines whether or not the end plate can be treated as a rigid body in the dynamic analysis. If this frequency is at least a factor of 4 larger than the first mode of the plate and cantilever structure, the dynamics of the end plate can be ignored. The finite element analysis computes this first mode frequency to be 25.6 KHz which is a factor of 9 greater than the
Figure 2.4: End Plate Mesh
Figure 2.5: Mode 1 (Bending) $\omega_1 = 25.6$ KHz

Figure 2.6: Mode 2 (Torsion) $\omega_2 = 148.34$ KHz
first mode of the system, 2745 Hz. Given the large separation of the two frequencies in the frequency spectrum, the dynamics of the end plate will have negligible effect and can be ignored.

The FTEST2.PAS design program also computes the first mode of the end plate using beam theory and a single degree of freedom dynamic model. The model used in the program is similar to the one presented in Section 2.2.2 that includes rotational inertia. The design program computes a value of 28.5 KHz which is approximately 10% higher than the value computed from the finite element analysis. As expected, the single degree of freedom approach leads to a stiffer structure with a higher natural frequency; however, the level of accuracy obtained with the design program is sufficient to ensure that flexing of the end plate is not significant.

Modal Analysis Cantilever System

Figure 2.8 is a plot of the cantilever and plate system mesh. Thirteen two node beam elements model the cantilever. The model of the end plate remains unchanged. Figures 2.9 through 2.11 display the first three modes of the system. The first bending mode of the cantilever and end plate sys-
Figure 2.8: Mesh Plot of Cantilever and Plate System

Figure 2.9: Mode 1 (Bending) $\omega_1 = 2720$ Hz
Figure 2.10: Mode 2 (Bending) $\omega_2 = 10.3$ KHz

Figure 2.11: Mode 3 (Torsion) $\omega_3 = 21.0$ KHz
tem has a frequency of 2720 Hz which is within 1\% of the value, 2745 Hz, computed by the design program FTEST2.PAS. The second mode is a combination of bending in the xy plane and torsion about the x axis. The torsional component is small and occurs by dynamic coupling through the product of inertia Ixz. The cross product, Ixz, occurs because the center of gravity of the structure is located approximately 8.3\mu m above the x axis; therefore, motion in the xy plane couples into torsion about the x axis because the translational inertia forces acting at the center of mass acts through a lever arm with respect to the lengthwise axis of the beam. The bending frequency in the xy plane computed by the design program is 12.8 KHz which is 19\% higher than the frequency computed by ABAQUS, 10.3 KHz. The higher frequency is accounted for by two factors. First, a single degree of freedom model for bending is employed which is inherently stiffer than a multi degree of freedom model; and second, the torsional coupling is neglected. Although, the calculated value is somewhat high, the accuracy achieved with the design program is still adequate enough to ensure this mode occurs at a frequency approximately a factor of 4 greater than the first bending mode. The third mode is again a combination of torsion about the x axis and bending in the xy plane. Contrary to the second mode, the torsional component is large and the bending component small. The design program calculates a torsional frequency of 22.5 KHz, which is 7\% greater than the value, 21.0 KHz, computed by ABAQUS. Better accuracy is obtained in predicting this mode because the beam is prismatic (a constant cross section) so that torsion is accurately modeled by a single degree of freedom: the angular rotation of one cross section relative to the next. The difference in calculated frequency is again caused by neglecting the coupling into bending motion in the xy plane.

2.2.5 Nonlinear Dynamics

In Section 2.2.1, the equation of motion for the cantilever system, Equation 2.55, was derived including a rotational spring to account for the additional compliance of the pre-crack. However, this compliance behaves non-linearly. As the beam travels upward through the zero displacement position, the crack closes giving zero compliance for the rotational spring; likewise, as the crack opens, the compliance of the spring increases to its previous value. To analyze this problem, the equation of motion for the uncracked beam can be solved, and at the zero displacement position, use this solution as an ini-
tial condition for the equation of motion of the cracked beam system. When the cantilever returns to the zero displacement position, use the solution of the cracked beam dynamics as an input to the uncracked system, and so on until a steady state condition is reached. The frequency at this condition will be close to an average of the first mode frequencies of the two systems. This approach is purely numerical, and therefore, lacks the advantages of working with linear equations. Furthermore, insight is lost by not having simple mathematical expressions to examine. Rather, a quasi-linearization of the system is desirable such that Equation 2.55 can be corrected accordingly, then analyzed using standard linear modal analysis techniques.

Dynamic systems with nonlinear elements can be analyzed using "describing functions". The method has been extensively developed for nonlinear control systems which operate with nonlinearities such as relays, backlash, static friction, and actuator saturation [43]. It is assumed that given a periodic input to the system, the effects of the nonlinearities are smoothed out by feedback and the filtering of the controller and plant. Therefore, the output remains essentially periodic despite the nonlinearities.

To determine the effect of the nonlinear compliance of the pre-crack, the moment at any point in the beam is first computed.

\[
M_0(x, t) = EI \frac{\partial^2 v_a(x, t)}{\partial x^2} \quad (2.66)
\]

\[
= EI \frac{\partial^2 v_b(x, t)}{\partial x^2} \quad (2.67)
\]

Either equation above will suffice in computing \( M_0 \), for the second derivative of \( v_a \) and \( v_b \) are equal. Setting \( x = \ell_{ab} \) gives the moment at the crack site which can be written in vector notion as follows. Recall that \( \mathbf{U}(t) \) is the vector of generalized coordinates, \( v_1(t) \), \( v_2(t) \), and \( v_3(t) \).

\[
M_0(\ell_{ab}, t) = \left[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{2EI}{\ell_{ac}} & \frac{6EI}{\ell_{ac}} & 0
\end{array} \right] \mathbf{U}(t) \quad (2.68)
\]

Thus, the moment applied at the crack site is not a function of \( v_3 \), the degree of freedom associated with rotation at the pre-crack, rather, it is purely a function of the sinusoidal motion of the uncracked cantilever system. For the first mode, the moment applied at the pre-crack is written as follows.

\[
M_0(\ell_{ab}, t) = \left[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{2EI}{\ell_{ac}} & \frac{6EI}{\ell_{ac}} & 0
\end{array} \right] \phi_1 x_0 \sin(\omega t) \quad (2.69)
\]

\[
= M_0 \sin(\omega t) \quad (2.70)
\]
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where,

\[ U(t) \approx \phi_1 x_0 \sin(\omega t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.71)

This sinusoidal moment is the input to the nonlinear crack system as shown in Figure 2.12. The equation for \( C_\theta \), the crack compliance, is given by Murakami and is discussed in the chapter dealing with fatigue modeling [34]. From our earlier derivation of the equations of motion, by definition:

\[ C_\theta = \frac{1}{K_r} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.72)

and

\[ k_{33} = \frac{K_r}{\ell_{bc}^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.73)

The output of the nonlinear crack system is a truncated sine wave which can be expanded into a Fourier series.

\[ \theta(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \theta_n \exp^{in\omega t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.74)

\[ \theta(t) = C_\theta M_0 \left[ \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2} \sin(\omega t) \right) + \frac{2}{\pi} \left( \frac{\cos(2\omega t)}{3} + \frac{\cos(4\omega t)}{3 \cdot 5} + \frac{\cos(6\omega t)}{5 \cdot 7} + \cdots \right) \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.75)

The higher harmonics are assumed to be filtered by the inertia and damping of the system giving the following response.

\[ \theta(t) = C_\theta M_0 \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2} \sin(\omega t) \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.76)

Because the nonlinearity in the spring stiffness is unsymmetric, a static displacement, \( \theta_s \), is created which is a function of the applied load.

\[ \theta_s = -\frac{C_\theta M_0}{\pi} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.77)

From Equation 2.76, the coefficient of \( M_0 \sin(\omega t) \) is \( C_\theta /2 \) which represents the linear approximation of the nonlinear crack system; therefore, to linearize Equation 2.55, \( k_{33} \) is replaced with \( 2k_{33} \). Essentially, this linearization is nothing more than taking the average of \( C_\theta \) and 0. To test the validity of the
\[ M(t) = M \sin(\omega t) \]

\[ \theta(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \theta_n e^{in\omega t} \]

\[ \theta(t) \equiv MC_\theta \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2} \sin(\omega t) \right) \]

\[ C_\theta = 1/K_r \]

Figure 2.12: Nonlinear Compliance of Precrack
describing function approach the FTEST2.PAS design program was used to extract the first mode solutions for both the cracked beam system, \( C_\theta \neq 0 \), and the uncracked beam system, \( C_\theta = 0 \). The first mode equation for the uncracked system is

\[
\ddot{x} + c\dot{x} + k_1 x = f \sin(\omega t) \quad x > 0
\]  

(2.78)

and the cracked system equation is

\[
\ddot{x} + c\dot{x} + k_2 x = f \sin(\omega t) \quad x < 0
\]  

(2.79)

where,

\[
k_1 = 5.96 \times 10^9 \]  

(2.80)

\[
k_2 = 4.24 \times 10^9 \]  

(2.81)

\[
c = 18
\]  

(2.82)

\[
f = 0.001
\]  

(2.83)

These equations were integrated numerically using the trapezoidal rule in a program written in PASCAL called INTEGRAT.PAS. This program is included in Appendix F. At the zero crossing, the program selects the appropriate equation to integrate. The simulation was run for four time constants (approximately 0.7 seconds) so that an essentially steady condition was reached. The maximum and minimum amplitudes were then recorded, the frequency incremented, and the simulation run again for four time constants. The simulation routine was repeated until the resonant peak of the system was captured. Figure 2.13 is a plot of the frequency response for \( f=0.001 \). The frequency range of the sinusoidal driving force is 300 Hz, and 100 integration points were selected. Figure 2.14 is a plot of the frequency response for \( f=0.01 \). Both the AC and DC amplitudes are plotted. In both figures, the DC amplitude is in reality negative, but is shown as positive. The procedure for linearizing these two equations with describing functions is virtually identical to the method outlined above. The solution of the linearized equations at resonance is given below.

\[
x = \frac{f}{\omega_n} \left( \cos(\omega_n t) - \frac{2(k_1 - k_2)}{\pi(k_1 + k_2)} \right)
\]  

(2.84)
Figure 2.13: Nonlinear Simulation (f=0.001)
Figure 2.14: Nonlinear Simulation (f=0.01)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
 & SIDF & Simulation & \% Difference \\
\hline
AC amplitude & $7.7 \times 10^{-10}$ & $7.82 \times 10^{-10}$ & 1.5 \\
DC amplitude & $0.835 \times 10^{-10}$ & $0.662 \times 10^{-10}$ & 21 \\
Drive Frequency & 11372 Hz & 11243 Hz & 1.1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 2.2: SIDF - Direct Integration Comparison ($f=0.001$)

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
 & SIDF & Simulation & \% Difference \\
\hline
AC amplitude & $7.7 \times 10^{-9}$ & $7.82 \times 10^{-9}$ & 1.5 \\
DC amplitude & $0.835 \times 10^{-9}$ & $0.662 \times 10^{-9}$ & 21 \\
Drive Frequency & 11372 Hz & 11243 Hz & 1.1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 2.3: SIDF - Direct Integration Comparison ($f=0.01$)

\begin{equation}
\omega_n = \sqrt{\frac{k_1 + k_2}{2}}
\end{equation}

Table 2.2 compares the results of the simulation to the linearized solution. Table 2.3 compares the results of the simulation to the linearized solution with the forcing function, $f$, increased an order of magnitude. The nonlinear crack system, as it is modeled, does not create a frequency sensitivity to amplitude. In Tables 2.2 and 2.3, the error in the AC amplitude is small; however, the DC amplitude shows a difference of 20%. The DC term is approximately a factor of ten less than the AC amplitude, and therefore, does not contribute significant error to the total displacement, AC plus DC. In conclusion, even for low values of damping, linearizing with describing functions very accurately models the true nonlinear system.
2.3 Fluid Damping and Inertial Effects

In this section, expressions are derived that model the viscous damping and inertial forces exerted by the fluid on the silicon plate and beam.

As envisioned, the fatigue device will operate in an environmental control chamber allowing for testing in various gaseous environments at atmospheric pressure, or at vacuum. However, at atmospheric pressure, the small size of the device gives Reynolds numbers in the range of viscous fluid flow. Minimizing the viscous damping effects as much as possible is important in this experiment primarily because sufficient sinusoidal displacements must generated that apply tensile stresses to the crack site at values of 50 to 80% of the critical stress intensity factor. Under normal operation, the electrostatic driving forces should create only compressive stresses at the crack site which would make stress corrosion fatigue unlikely.

Low damping is anticipated with the device shown in Figures 2.1 and 2.2 because of the deep well etched beneath the device. The deep well configuration minimizes the viscous and inertial pressure forces exerted by the gas on the plate. Also, holes in the silicon plate are positioned below the bridge electrodes which minimize damping in this region by allowing the gas to flow more freely in and out of the confined area. Fluid inertia alters the resonant frequency of the device to an extent, but will not result in significant frequency variations unless large temperature excursions (> 10°C) are encountered that significantly change the density of air. Young's modulus also varies with temperature and will cause a slight frequency shift (≈ 1 Hz/°C). To minimize errors cause by temperature fluctuations, the device is mounted on a copper block that is temperature controlled to within 0.5°C.

In Equation 2.44, the terms Ξ₁, Ξ₂, and Ξ₃ are generalized forces associated with the nonconservative damping forces, the electrostatic driving force, and the inertial forces of the surrounding gas which appear as additional masses added to the total mass of the device. The virtual work of the generalized forces can be expressed as

\[ \delta W = \Xi_1 \delta v_1 + \Xi_2 \delta v_2 + \Xi_3 \delta v_3 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.86)

where \( \delta v_1, \delta v_2, \) and \( \delta v_3 \) are virtual displacements. In Figure 2.3, the damping forces acting on the silicon end plate consist of point loads applied at the center of pressure of the forcing and sensing electrodes, and the bottom side...
of the end plate. The damping force acting on the beam is a distributed load, and will be dealt with separately. The work of the point loads in Equation 2.86 can be written in terms of the driving electrode force, $F_T$; the viscous damping force of the driving electrode, $F_{D}^{T}$; the sensing electrode damping force, $F_{S}^{E}$; the end plate damping force, $F_{P}^{E}$; the fluid inertia force at the driving electrode, $F_{I}^{F}$; the sensing electrode inertia force, $F_{I}^{S}$; and the end plate inertia force, $F_{I}^{P}$.

$$
\delta W_{p} = (F_T - F_{D}^{T} - F_{I}^{T}) \left( \delta v_b + \frac{\partial \delta v_b}{\partial x} \ell_{cd} \right)_{x=t_{ac}} \\
- (F_{I}^{S} + F_{D}^{S}) \left( \delta v_b + \frac{\partial \delta v_b}{\partial x} \ell_{ce} \right)_{x=t_{ac}} \\
- (F_{I}^{P} + F_{D}^{P}) \left( \delta v_b + \frac{\partial \delta v_b}{\partial x} \ell_{cf} \right)_{x=t_{ac}}
$$

(2.87)

Substituting Equation 2.2 into Equation 2.87 gives the desired generalized forces of point loads.

$$
\Xi_{1p} = (F_T - F_{D}^{T} - F_{I}^{T}) \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) - (F_{I}^{S} + F_{D}^{S}) \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \\
- (F_{I}^{P} + F_{D}^{P}) \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{ac}} \right)
$$

(2.88)

$$
\Xi_{2p} = (F_T - F_{D}^{T} - F_{I}^{T}) \left( 1 + 3 \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) - (F_{I}^{S} + F_{D}^{S}) \left( 1 + 3 \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \\
- (F_{I}^{P} + F_{D}^{P}) \left( 1 + 3 \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{ac}} \right)
$$

(2.89)

$$
\Xi_{3p} = (F_T - F_{D}^{T} - F_{I}^{T}) \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) - (F_{I}^{S} + F_{D}^{S}) \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) \\
- (F_{I}^{P} + F_{D}^{P}) \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{bc}} \right)
$$

(2.90)

The following constants are defined.

$$
\eta_1 = \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{ac}} \right)
$$

(2.91)
\[
\eta_2 = \left(1 + \frac{3\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{ac}}\right) \\
\eta_3 = \left(1 + \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{bc}}\right) \\
\xi_1 = \left(1 + 2\frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{ac}}\right) \\
\xi_2 = \left(1 + 3\frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{ac}}\right) \\
\xi_3 = \left(1 + \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{bc}}\right) \\
\lambda_1 = \left(1 + 2\frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{ac}}\right) \\
\lambda_2 = \left(1 + 3\frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{ac}}\right) \\
\lambda_3 = \left(1 + \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{bc}}\right)
\]

The \(\xi_i\)'s, in equations 2.26 through 2.34, and the above definitions for the \(\eta_i\)'s, \(\xi_i\)'s, and \(\lambda_i\)'s are factors that effectively increase the contribution of the conservative and nonconservative forces acting at various points on the structure. These factors are a result of the lever arms created by the point of application of these forces with respect to point C, the beam tip, in Figure 2.3. With the above definitions, the generalized forces of the point loads can be rewritten as follows.

\[
\Xi_{1p} = (F_T - F_D^T - F_F^T)\eta_1 - (F_I^S + F_D^S)\xi_1 - (F_I^P + F_D^P)\lambda_1 \\
\Xi_{2p} = (F_T - F_D^T - F_F^T)\eta_2 - (F_I^S + F_D^S)\xi_2 - (F_I^P + F_D^P)\lambda_2 \\
\Xi_{3p} = (F_T - F_D^T - F_F^T)\eta_3 - (F_I^S + F_D^S)\xi_3 - (F_I^P + F_D^P)\lambda_3
\]

Equations for the damping and inertial forces of the fluid medium will now be developed for the case of one-dimensional fully developed viscous incompressible flow between parallel plates. The assumption of incompressibility is verified by computing the Mach number assuming a resonant frequency of 12 KHz and a plate displacement of \(10 \times 10^{-6} \text{ \mu m}\). The Mach number is the ratio of the velocity of the air surrounding the device to sonic velocity. Mach
numbers greater than 0.3 generally indicate that significant compressibility effects are present.

\[ M = \frac{V}{V_s} \quad (2.103) \]

where,

\[ M = \text{Mach number} \quad (2.104) \]
\[ V_s = 347.2 \text{ m/s: sonic velocity at } 80^\circ \text{ F} \quad (2.105) \]
\[ V = \omega v_f \text{ m/s: plate velocity} \quad (2.106) \]
\[ \omega = \text{rad/s: resonant frequency} \quad (2.107) \]
\[ v_f = \text{m/s: velocity of point f in Figure 2.3} \quad (2.108) \]

Consequently,

\[ M = 2.2 \times 10^{-3} \quad (2.109) \]

Given the low Mach number, compressibility of the air is negligible. Figure 2.15 defines the coordinate system and flow profile. The governing equation for incompressible viscous fluid flow, including the linear inertial component, is
as follows.

\[
\rho \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial P}{\partial x} + \mu \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}
\]  

(2.110)

where,

\[
\begin{align*}
  u(y, t) & = \text{fluid velocity: } \left( \frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}} \right) \\
  \rho & = \text{fluid density: } \left( \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^3} \right) \\
  P(x) & = \text{pressure: } \left( \frac{\text{N}}{\text{m}^2} \right) \\
  \mu & = \text{viscosity: } \left( \frac{\text{N} \cdot \text{s}}{\text{m}^2} \right)
\end{align*}
\]

Taking the Laplace transform of Equation 2.110 with respect to time gives

\[
\mu \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} - \rho su = \frac{\partial P}{\partial x}
\]  

(2.111)

Treating \( s \) as a constant, solutions for the homogeneous and particular solutions are superposed. The homogenous solution is as follows.

\[
u_h(s, y) = c_1 e^{\lambda y} + c_2 e^{-\lambda y}
\]  

(2.112)

where,

\[
\begin{align*}
  \lambda & = \sqrt{\frac{sp}{\mu}} \\
  c_1 & = \text{constant: (m)} \\
  c_2 & = \text{constant: (m)}
\end{align*}
\]

The particular solution is written as follows.

\[
u_p(s, x) = \frac{-1}{\rho s} \frac{\partial P}{\partial x}.
\]  

(2.113)

Combining and applying the boundary conditions, \( u(s, \pm h/2) = 0 \), gives the following equation.

\[
u(s, y) = \frac{1}{\rho s} \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\cosh \lambda y}{\cosh \left( \frac{\lambda h}{2} \right)} - 1 \right]
\]  

(2.114)
The flow rate is computed by integrating over the cross section of the channel.

\[ Q(s) = b \int_{-\frac{b}{2}}^{\frac{b}{2}} u(s,y) \, dy \]  

(2.115)

The solution for the flow rate is given below, where the plate width is \( b \) in meters.

\[ Q(s) = \frac{-bh}{\rho s} \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} \left[ 1 - \frac{\tanh \kappa}{\kappa} \right] \]  

(2.116)

where,

\[ \kappa = \frac{\lambda h}{2} \]  

(2.117)

Solving for the pressure gradient and integrating over the half length of the plate gives the pressure as a function of \( x \).

\[ P(x) = \frac{-s \rho \left( \frac{x}{2} - x \right)}{bh \left( 1 - \frac{\tanh \kappa}{\kappa} \right)} Q(s). \]  

(2.118)

Next, the pressure force acting on the plate is calculated by integrating over the entire length, \( \ell \), of the plate.

\[ F = 2b \int_0^\ell P(x) \, dx. \]  

(2.119)

Performing the integration gives a nonlinear expression for the force.

\[ F = \frac{-s \rho \ell^2}{4h \left( 1 - \frac{\tanh \kappa}{\kappa} \right)} Q(s) \]  

(2.120)

The following expression in Equation 2.120 is expanded and approximated.

\[ \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\tanh \kappa}{\kappa}} = \frac{3}{\kappa^2} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{2\kappa^2}{5} - \frac{17\kappa^4}{105} + \cdots \right) \right] + \left( \frac{2\kappa^2}{5} - \frac{17\kappa^4}{105} + \cdots \right)^2 + \cdots \]  

(2.122)

\[ \approx \frac{3}{\kappa^2} \left( 1 + \frac{2\kappa^2}{5} \right) \]  

(2.123)
Equation 2.123 is substituted into Equation 2.120.

\[
F(s) = -\frac{3s\rho\ell^2}{4h\kappa^2} \left( 1 + \frac{2\kappa^2}{5} \right) Q(s)
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.124)

where,

\[
\kappa^2 = \frac{h^2s\rho}{4\mu}
\]

To relate the flow rate to the displacement of the plate, \( v \), the conservation of mass is applied to the control volume shown in Figure 2.15.

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{c.v.} \rho dV + \int_{c.s.} \rho \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{n} dA = 0
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.125)

Performing the integration and applying the definition for the Laplace transform gives the flow rate as a function of \( s \).

\[
Q(s) = -\frac{\ell b}{2}(sh)
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.126)

Substituting the above into Equation 2.124 relates the force to the displacement of the plate.

\[
F(s) = \frac{3\mu b}{2} \left( \frac{\ell}{h} \right)^3 (sh) + \frac{3\rho\ell^3b}{20h}(s^2h)
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.127)

Using the following definitions, Equation 2.127 is transformed back to the time domain.

\[
sh = \frac{dh}{dt}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.128)

\[
s^2h = \frac{d^2h}{dt^2}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.129)

\[
h(t) = d_0 - v(t)
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.130)

\[
F(t) = -\left( \frac{3\mu b\ell^3}{2h^3} \right) \frac{dv}{dt} - \left( \frac{3\rho\ell^3b}{20h} \right) \frac{d^2v}{dt^2}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.131)

Equation 2.131 has two components: the first is the force due to viscous damping, and the second is an inertial force created by the air mass. The
coefficients of the two components can be used to estimate the total damping of the structure and the effective increase in structural mass. Simplified one-dimensional flow profiles can be assumed over various sections of the structure and summed together to get the total effect. Although the actual flow profile is multidimensional and quite complex, it is reasonable to assume the dominant damping terms result from squeeze film effects under the driving and sensing electrodes, and the pumping action of the end plate on the air mass entrained in the volume etched beneath the device. The air slots under the sensor electrode are relatively narrow and closely spaced; therefore, it is likely that a nearly unidimensional flow profile exists on the surface of the silicon plate between these slots. Inevitably, some gas will exit in other directions depending on the exact nature of the pressure distribution; however, by constraining the flow to one direction, and by assuming a fully developed flow profile, a higher pressure drop will be calculated resulting in a more conservative damping estimate than would be calculated from the exact solution. Without precise knowledge of the flow distribution about the edges of the structure, or under the bridge electrodes and in the well, conservative damping estimates are preferable.

The damping forces $F_D^T$, $F_D^S$, and $F_D^P$ are written as follows.

$$F_D^T = C_T \left( \dot{v}_b + \frac{\partial^2 v_b}{\partial x \partial t} \ell_{cd} \right) _{x=t_{ac}} \tag{2.132}$$

$$F_D^S = C_S \left( \dot{v}_b + \frac{\partial^2 v_b}{\partial x \partial t} \ell_{ce} \right) _{x=t_{ac}} \tag{2.133}$$

$$F_D^P = C_P \left( \dot{v}_b + \frac{\partial^2 v_b}{\partial x \partial t} \ell_{cf} \right) _{x=t_{ac}} \tag{2.134}$$

The inertial forces are calculated as follows.

$$F_I^T = M_T \left( \ddot{v}_b + \frac{\partial^3 v_b}{\partial x \partial t^2} \ell_{cd} \right) _{x=t_{ac}} \tag{2.135}$$

$$F_I^S = M_S \left( \ddot{v}_b + \frac{\partial^3 v_b}{\partial x \partial t^2} \ell_{ce} \right) _{x=t_{ac}} \tag{2.136}$$

$$F_I^P = M_P \left( \ddot{v}_b + \frac{\partial^3 v_b}{\partial x \partial t^2} \ell_{cf} \right) _{x=t_{ac}} \tag{2.137}$$
The damping constants: \( C_T \), \( C_S \), and \( C_P \); and air masses: \( M_T \), \( M_S \), \( M_P \) are derived from superposition of one dimensional flow profiles assumed over sections of the end plate. The form is based on the derivation of the damping and mass constants in Equation 2.131. Substituting Equation 2.2 into Equations 2.132 through 2.137 gives the following set of equations.

\[
\begin{align*}
F_D^T &= C_T \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_1 + C_T \left( 1 + 3 \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_2 + C_T \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.138) \\
F_D^S &= C_S \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_1 + C_S \left( 1 + 3 \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_2 + C_S \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.139) \\
F_D^P &= C_P \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_1 + C_P \left( 1 + 3 \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_2 + C_P \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.140) \\
F_I^T &= M_T \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_1 + M_T \left( 1 + 3 \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_2 + M_T \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{cd}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.141) \\
F_I^S &= M_S \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_1 + M_S \left( 1 + 3 \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_2 + M_S \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{ce}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.142) \\
F_I^P &= M_P \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_1 + M_P \left( 1 + 3 \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \ddot{v}_2 + M_P \left( 1 + \frac{\ell_{cf}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.143)
\end{align*}
\]

Using the definitions in Equations 2.91 through 2.99 the equations for the damping and inertial forces can be abbreviated as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
F_D^T &= C_T \eta_1 \ddot{v}_1 + C_T \eta_2 \ddot{v}_2 + C_T \eta_3 \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.144) \\
F_D^S &= C_S \xi_1 \ddot{v}_1 + C_S \xi_2 \ddot{v}_2 + C_S \xi_3 \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.145) \\
F_D^P &= C_P \lambda_1 \ddot{v}_1 + C_P \lambda_2 \ddot{v}_2 + C_P \lambda_3 \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.146) \\
F_I^T &= M_T \eta_1 \ddot{v}_1 + M_T \eta_2 \ddot{v}_2 + M_T \eta_3 \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.147) \\
F_I^S &= M_S \xi_1 \ddot{v}_1 + M_S \xi_2 \ddot{v}_2 + M_S \xi_3 \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.148) \\
F_I^P &= M_P \lambda_1 \ddot{v}_1 + M_P \lambda_2 \ddot{v}_2 + M_P \lambda_3 \ddot{v}_3 \quad (2.149)
\end{align*}
\]

Now that expressions for the damping and inertial forces of the fluid acting on the end plate have been derived, the distributed damping of the beam will be derived. The virtual work of the distribute damping is given as follows.

\[
\delta W_d = C_B \left( \int_0^{\ell_{ab}} \frac{\dot{v}_a(x,t) \delta v_a(x,t)}{\ell_{ab}} \, dx + \int_{\ell_{ab}}^{\ell_{ac}} \frac{\dot{v}_b(x,t) \delta v_b(x,t)}{\ell_{bc}} \, dx \right) \quad (2.150)
\]
where,

\[ C_B = 8 \mu b \]  

(2.151)

The damping coefficient, \( C_B \), is for viscous flow around a thin flat disk of diameter \( b \). The disk is oriented such that the flat side is perpendicular to the flow [18]. Although the beam is a rectangle, the disk approximation should be close. In any case, beam damping is expected to be small. For \( \ell_{ac} \gg \ell_{ab} \), the first integral in Equation 2.150 is small and can be neglected. The integration can then be carried out from 0 to \( \ell_{ac} \). Using Equation 2.2, the following approximation for the virtual work of the distributed damping of the beam is obtained.

\[
\delta W_d = \frac{C_B}{\ell_{ac}} \int_0^{\ell_{ac}} \left( \dot{v}_1 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^2 + \dot{v}_2 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^3 + \dot{v}_3 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \right) \\
\left( \delta v_1 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^2 + \delta v_2 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^3 + \delta v_3 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right) \right) dx
\]  

(2.152)

Performing the integration and simplifying gives the following set of generalized forces for the damping of the beam.

\[
\Xi_1d = C_B \left( \frac{\dot{v}_1}{5} + \frac{\dot{v}_2}{6} + \frac{\dot{v}_3}{4} \right) 
\]  

(2.153)

\[
\Xi_2d = C_B \left( \frac{\dot{v}_1}{6} + \frac{\dot{v}_2}{7} + \frac{\dot{v}_3}{5} \right) 
\]  

(2.154)

\[
\Xi_3d = C_B \left( \frac{\dot{v}_1}{4} + \frac{\dot{v}_2}{5} + \frac{\dot{v}_3}{3} \right) 
\]  

(2.155)

Equations 2.100 through 2.102 and Equations 2.153 through 2.155 are combined to give the total magnitude of the generalized forces. Using the expressions derived for the point forces, the damping matrix and an additional mass matrix are obtained.

\[
\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{C} \mathbf{\ddot{U}} - \delta \mathbf{M} \mathbf{\ddot{U}} 
\]  

(2.156)

where,

\[
\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_1 \\ \Xi_2 \\ \Xi_3 \end{bmatrix} 
\]  

(2.157)

\[
\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \end{bmatrix} F_T 
\]  

(2.158)
\[
\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix}
\eta_1^2 & \eta_1 \eta_2 & \eta_1 \eta_3 \\
\eta_1 \eta_2 & \eta_2^2 & \eta_2 \eta_3 \\
\eta_1 \eta_3 & \eta_2 \eta_3 & \eta_3^2
\end{bmatrix} C_T + \begin{bmatrix}
\xi_1^2 & \xi_1 \xi_2 & \xi_1 \xi_3 \\
\xi_1 \xi_2 & \xi_2^2 & \xi_2 \xi_3 \\
\xi_1 \xi_3 & \xi_2 \xi_3 & \xi_3^2
\end{bmatrix} C_S \\
+ \begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_1^2 & \lambda_1 \lambda_2 & \lambda_1 \lambda_3 \\
\lambda_1 \lambda_2 & \lambda_2^2 & \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \\
\lambda_1 \lambda_3 & \lambda_2 \lambda_3 & \lambda_3^2
\end{bmatrix} C_P + \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{1} \\
\frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{7} & \frac{1}{1} \\
\frac{1}{1} & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{3}
\end{bmatrix} C_B
\] (2.159)

\[
\delta \mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix}
\eta_1^2 & \eta_1 \eta_2 & \eta_1 \eta_3 \\
\eta_1 \eta_2 & \eta_2^2 & \eta_2 \eta_3 \\
\eta_1 \eta_3 & \eta_2 \eta_3 & \eta_3^2
\end{bmatrix} M_T + \begin{bmatrix}
\xi_1^2 & \xi_1 \xi_2 & \xi_1 \xi_3 \\
\xi_1 \xi_2 & \xi_2^2 & \xi_2 \xi_3 \\
\xi_1 \xi_3 & \xi_2 \xi_3 & \xi_3^2
\end{bmatrix} M_S \\
+ \begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_1^2 & \lambda_1 \lambda_2 & \lambda_1 \lambda_3 \\
\lambda_1 \lambda_2 & \lambda_2^2 & \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \\
\lambda_1 \lambda_3 & \lambda_2 \lambda_3 & \lambda_3^2
\end{bmatrix} M_P
\] (2.160)

The equation of motion can now be written as

\[
\dot{\mathbf{M}} \ddot{\mathbf{U}} + \mathbf{C} \ddot{\mathbf{U}} + \mathbf{K} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{P}
\] (2.161)

where,

\[
\dot{\mathbf{M}} = \mathbf{M} + \delta \mathbf{M}
\] (2.162)

In the next section, the electrostatic force will be linearized, and a corresponding stiffness matrix correction factor derived that accounts for the effects of a changing air gap on the electrostatic force.
2.4 Stiffness Matrix Correction

In the preceding sections, the equations of motion for the cantilever system were derived; however, an additional stiffness correction matrix arises that is subtracted from the stiffness matrix of the system. This matrix is a consequence of the inverse dependence of electrostatic driving force on the capacitance air gap, \( d_0 \). As the cantilever approaches the driving electrode on its upward travel, the magnitude of the electrostatic force increases displacing the cantilever further than it would travel otherwise (a corresponding decrease also occurs when the cantilever moves downward). The net effect is that of a negative spring. Equation 2.163 models the electrostatic force.

\[
F_T = \frac{\varepsilon_0 A_T V_T^2}{2d(t)^2} \tag{2.163}
\]

where,

\[
\varepsilon_0 = \text{permittivity of a vacuum: (coul}^2\text{N m}^{-2}\text{)}
\]

\( d(t) \) = variable air gap: (m)

\( V_T \) = driving voltage: (volts)

\( A_T \) = torquer electrode area: (m\(^2\))

Linearizing with respect to the fixed air gap dimension, \( d_0 \), gives

\[
F_T(V_T, d) = F_T(V_T, d_0) + \left( \frac{\partial F_T}{\partial d} \right)_{d=d_0} (d - d_0) \tag{2.164}
\]

\[
= \frac{\varepsilon_0 A_T V_T^2}{2d_0^2} - \frac{\varepsilon_0 A_T V_T^2}{d_0^2} (d - d_0) \tag{2.165}
\]

By definition

\[
d_0 - d(t) = v_b(\ell_{ac}) + \left( \frac{\partial v_b}{\partial x} \right)_{x=\ell_{ac}} \ell_{cd} \tag{2.166}
\]

\[
d_0 - d(t) = \eta_1 v_1 + \eta_2 v_2 + \eta_3 v_3 \tag{2.167}
\]

Defining

\[
V_T = V_{T0} \sin(\omega t) \tag{2.168}
\]
\[ F_0 = \frac{\epsilon_0 A_T V_{T0}^2}{4d_0^3} \]  
(2.169)

\[ \delta k = \frac{\epsilon_0 A_T V_{T0}^2}{2d_0^3} \]  
(2.170)

and substituting Equations 2.167, 2.168, 2.169, and 2.170 into Equation 2.165 gives

\[ F_T = [F_0 + \delta k(\eta_1 v_1 + \eta_2 v_2 + \eta_3 v_3)](1 - \cos 2\omega t) \]  
(2.171)

Refering back to Equation 2.156, the forcing vector, \( \mathbf{P} \), can be expanded as follows.

\[ \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_0 + \delta \mathbf{K}(t) \mathbf{U} \]  
(2.172)

where,

\[ \mathbf{P}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \end{bmatrix} F_0(1 - \cos 2\omega t) \]  
(2.173)

\[ \delta \mathbf{K}(t) = \delta \mathbf{K}(1 - \cos 2\omega t) \]  
(2.174)

The matrix correction factor is defined as follows.

\[ \delta \mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1^2 & \eta_1 \eta_2 & \eta_1 \eta_3 \\ \eta_1 \eta_2 & \eta_2^2 & \eta_2 \eta_3 \\ \eta_1 \eta_3 & \eta_2 \eta_3 & \eta_3^2 \end{bmatrix} \delta k \]  
(2.175)

\[ \delta \mathbf{K} = \eta \delta k \]  
(2.176)

The matrix equations of motion can be rewritten as follows.

\[ \dot{\mathbf{M}} \ddot{\mathbf{U}} + \mathbf{C} \dot{\mathbf{U}} + [\mathbf{K} - \delta \mathbf{K}(t)] \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{P}_0 \]  
(2.177)

Defining

\[ \dot{\mathbf{K}} = \mathbf{K} - \delta \mathbf{K} \]  
(2.178)

The equation of motion is again rewritten with the corrected stiffness matrix.

\[ \dot{\mathbf{M}} \ddot{\mathbf{U}} + \mathbf{C} \dot{\mathbf{U}} + \dot{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{P}_0 \]  
(2.179)

Without damping, Equation 2.177 has the form of the Mathieu equation where the stiffness matrix is time varying. Systems governed by Mathieu
equations have regions of stability and instability that depend on the magnitude of the time varying term. The system will be stable, provided the eigenvalues of the free vibration problem are positive and real; therefore, a stability boundary can be determined based on the maximum value of $\delta K(t)$. The term $(1 - \cos 2\omega t)$ determines the magnitude of $\delta K(t)$ by sinusoidally varying between 0 and 2 with an average value of 1. Using the maximum value, the stability condition is stated as follows: $|K - 2\delta K| > 0$, or, the system is guaranteed to be stable for all time if $K - 2\delta K$ is positive definite. For the uncracked beam, Equation 2.179 is $2 \times 2$, and the determinant is easily expanded algebraically giving the stability criteria directly as follows.

$$\delta k < \frac{k_{11}k_{22} - k_{12}^2}{2(\eta_1^2k_{11} + \eta_2^2k_{22} - 2k_{12}\eta_1\eta_2)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.180)

However, for the cracked beam Equation 2.179 is $3 \times 3$ and expanding the determinant is difficult. An alternative is to recast the criteria as an eigenvalue problem and solve for the stability condition numerically. The eigenvalue problem is stated and solved as follows.

$$K \phi = 2\delta k \eta \phi$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.181)

Defining,

$$\lambda = 2\delta k$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.182)

and

$$\eta = S S^T$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.183)

the eigenvalue problem is rewritten as

$$K \phi = \lambda S S^T \phi$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.184)

Defining

$$\psi = S^T \phi$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.185)

$$S^{-1} K (S^T)^{-1} \psi = \lambda \psi$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.186)

Defining

$$\dot{K} = S^{-1} K (S^T)^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.187)

Thus, the eigenvalue problem is rewritten in standard form as follows.

$$\dot{K} \psi = \lambda \psi$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.188)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOF</th>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lagrangian</td>
<td>$\omega_1 = 2546$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_2 = 95.6 \times 10^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_3 = 1.9 \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: T38 Modal Frequencies: $2\mu m$ Crack Length

$$(\hat{\mathbf{K}} - \lambda \mathbf{I})\psi = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.189)

Taking the smallest eigenvalue, $\lambda_1$, stability is ensured if the following is satisfied.

$$\delta k \leq \frac{\lambda_1}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.190)

In general, the elements of $\delta \mathbf{K}$ are much smaller than the corresponding terms in $\mathbf{K}$; therefore, stability is not expected to be an issue. The frequency, however, will change a small amount, but is accounted for by the stiffness matrix correction factor $\delta \mathbf{K}$ in Equation 2.179.

Equation 2.179 will be decomposed into modal form and solved for $3 \times 3$ cracked beam case. The structure will be driven at its first mode resonance. Because of the relatively large spread in second and third mode frequencies, as shown in Table 2.4, these higher modes will have negligible contribution to the total displacement; therefore, the first mode solution will be used as a baseline model for design and analysis. The first mode frequency in Table 2.4 is less than that shown in Table 2.1 in Section 2.2.3 because the additional rotational degree of freedom associated with the pre-crack is included. The values given in Table 2.4 were obtained by assuming the pre-crack extended $2\mu m$ downward into the beam $10\mu m$ from the fixed end. Proceeding as before, the eigenvalue problem is solved giving the frequencies and mode shapes. The modal matrix diagonalizes the mass and stiffness matrix, but not the damping matrix. To obtain decoupled equations, the off-diagonal damping terms are neglected.

$$\mathbf{\ddot{M}} \ddot{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{\ddot{C}} \ddot{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{\dddot{K}} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{\ddot{P}}_0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.191)

Equation 2.191 is a decoupled set of modal equations where,

$$\mathbf{\ddot{M}} = \mathbf{\Phi}^T \mathbf{\ddot{M}} \mathbf{\Phi}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.192)

$$\mathbf{\ddot{C}} = \mathbf{\Phi}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{\Phi} \quad (c_{ij} = 0 \text{ for } i \neq j)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.193)
\[ \dot{\mathbf{K}} = \Phi^T \mathbf{K} \Phi \]  
(2.194)

\[ \mathbf{U} = \Phi \mathbf{X} \]  
(2.195)

\[ \dot{\mathbf{P}}_0 = \Phi^T \mathbf{P}_0 \]  
(2.196)

\[ \Phi = [\phi_1 \, \phi_2 \, \phi_3] \]  
(2.197)

The eigenvectors are defined as follows.

\[ \phi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \beta_1 \\ \gamma_1 \end{pmatrix} \]  
(2.198)

\[ \phi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2 \\ \beta_2 \\ \gamma_2 \end{pmatrix} \]  
(2.199)

\[ \phi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_3 \\ \beta_3 \\ \gamma_3 \end{pmatrix} \]  
(2.200)

The forced solution of Equation 2.191 can be transformed back to the original generalized coordinates expressed as a superposition of the modal coordinates.

\[ \mathbf{U} = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \phi_i x_i(t) \approx \phi_1 x_1(t) \]  
(2.201)

The first mode equation is given by the first row and column of Equation 2.191 as follows.

\[ \ddot{m}_{11} \dddot{x} + \dot{c}_{11} \ddot{x} + \dddot{k}_{11} = p_1(t) \]  
(2.202)

where,

\[ p_1(t) = \phi_1^T \mathbf{P}_0 \]  
(2.203)

\[ = (\alpha_1 \eta_1 + \beta_1 \eta_2 + \gamma_1 \eta_3)(1 - \cos 2\omega t)F_0 \]  
(2.204)

Neglecting the static response, and dropping the modal notation, the forced solution is

\[ x(t) = \frac{-p_0 \cos(2\omega t - \phi)}{4m \left[(\frac{\omega_0}{2})^2 - \omega^2\right]^2 + \left(\frac{\omega}{2m}\right)^2} \]  
(2.205)
\[ \phi = \arctan \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_n^2 - \omega^2} \right) \] (2.206)

where,
\[ p_0 = (\alpha_1 \eta_1 + \beta_1 \eta_2 + \gamma_1 \eta_3) F_0 \] (2.207)

Driving the system at half the natural frequency, \( \omega = \frac{\omega_n}{2} \), resonates the system giving the following response.
\[ x(t) = \frac{-p_0 \sin(\omega_n t)}{\omega_n} \] (2.208)

Therefore, the system response is as follows.
\[ \mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \beta_1 \\ \gamma_1 \end{pmatrix} x(t) \] (2.209)

or,
\[ \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \beta_1 \\ \gamma_1 \end{pmatrix} x(t) \] (2.210)

Using Equations 2.2 and 2.1, the displacement at any point in the beam can be computed. For \( 0 \leq x \leq \ell_{ab} \)
\[ v_a(x, t) = \left[ \alpha_1 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^2 + \beta_1 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^3 \right] x(t) \] (2.211)

and for \( \ell_{ab} \leq x \leq \ell_{ac} \)
\[ v_b(x, t) = \left[ \alpha_1 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^2 + \beta_1 \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^3 + \gamma_1 \left( \frac{x - \ell_{ab}}{\ell_{bc}} \right) \right] x(t) \] (2.212)
Chapter 3

Control System and Electronics

3.1 Frequency Control System

In the previous sections, a dynamic model of the device was developed using a three degree of freedom approximation and Lagrange’s equations. Because the modal frequencies of the model are well separated in the frequency spectrum, the first mode solution accurately approximates the motion of the beam at or near the first mode; therefore, a reduced order single degree of freedom model can be used for control system design and analysis.

The method of fatigue testing proposed in this experiment is based on continuous measurements of the natural frequency of the device as a crack propagates through the beam from an initiation site located near the base of the cantilever. An extension of the crack from the initiation site reduces the total stiffness of the structure and causes a downward shift in the natural frequency. To continuously maintain resonance, a control system is necessary that will automatically lock on the natural frequency and track it over the range of anticipated frequency shifts and crack tip velocities. The control system employed is a variation of a phase locked loop where a phase detector measures the difference in phase between the driving voltage applied to the forcing electrode and the output voltage of the sensor. The measured phase shift is compared to a reference value that corresponds to resonance and an appropriate command signal issued to a voltage controlled oscillator (VCO)
whenever the measured phase shift deviates from this reference. The VCO is directly connected to the forcing electrode of the device, and issues a constant amplitude voltage at a frequency that is linearly proportional to an input DC command voltage. In Section 2.4, it was shown that the force applied to the end plate is proportional to the square of the driving voltage. Squaring the driving voltage doubles the frequency of the force, shifts the phase 90°, and introduces a minus sign in the magnitude. At resonance, another phase shift of 90° is introduced; therefore, the driving voltage is \( V_{T0} \sin \left( \frac{\omega_0 t}{2} \right) \), and the response is \( -v_{s0} \sin(\omega_n t) \) where \( v_{s0} \) is the magnitude of the displacement of the end plate at the sensor electrode. For the moment the minus sign will be ignored. Assuming the response frequency is divided by two, the phase difference between input and output voltages of the device is 0°. This value of 0° is the reference phase the control system regulates.

At resonance, the displacement of the beam depends on the magnitude of the driving voltage, damping, and the natural frequency; therefore, changes in the natural frequency will cause the displacement to shift also. Ideally, the displacement should be held constant; however, in this experiment the frequency shift is anticipated to be small (≈ 500 Hz) compared to the resonant frequency of the device (≈ 5 KHz) so that displacement changes will be negligible; therefore, displacement control is not considered necessary. It should be noted that critical crack growth corresponding to brittle fracture occurs at the elastic wave velocity of the material. For pure silicon, this velocity is \( 8.6 \times 10^3 \text{ m/s} \) at room temperature. Under these circumstances, it is not possible for the control system to dynamically unload the beam quickly enough to arrest the crack. Therefore, the absence of dynamic fatigue or static fatigue in the test structure would be indicated by an instantaneous drop in frequency with no previous detectable shift.

The first step in the analysis is to determine the transfer function of the device that relates phase changes to perturbations in input frequency. In general, the relationship between phase and frequency for a single degree of freedom spring mass damper system in steady state harmonic motion is nonlinear involving an inverse tangent. Therefore, the system will be linearized about its natural frequency, and a linear approximation determined for small phase changes.
The transfer function for the system is as follows.

\[
H(s) = \frac{1}{m(s - P)(s - P^*)} \quad (3.1)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{m(s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_n s + \omega_n^2)} \quad (3.2)
\]

with the poles at

\[
P = -\zeta\omega_n \pm j\omega_n\sqrt{1 - \zeta^2} \quad (3.3)
\]

For \(\zeta \ll 1\) the pole locations are approximated as follows.

\[
P \cong -\zeta\omega_n \pm j\omega_n \quad (3.4)
\]

Graphically, Figure 3.1 shows the pole locations in vector form. Vectorally, the phase angle is expressed as follows.

\[
\angle H(s) = \angle(s - \bar{P}) - \angle(s - \bar{P}^*) \quad (3.5)
\]

where \(P^*\) is the complex conjugate of \(P\). Assuming the device has small transient responses about the natural frequency, the vector \(s\) can be represented in the s-plane as a summation of a small transient perturbation, \(\Delta s\), away from its steady state resonant frequency, \(\omega_n\).

\[
s = \Delta s + j\omega_n \quad (3.6)
\]

Defining

\[
\Phi(s) = \angle H(s) \quad (3.7)
\]

\[
\phi(s) = \angle(s - \bar{P}) \quad (3.8)
\]

\[
\phi^*(s) = \angle(s - \bar{P}^*) \quad (3.9)
\]

The phase of the system is as follows.

\[
\Phi(s) = -\phi(s) - \phi^*(s) \quad (3.10)
\]

For \(\zeta \ll 1\) and \(s \approx j\omega_n\), the phase angle of \(\phi^*(s)\) is approximately 90° and nearly constant.

\[
\phi^*(s) \approx \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (3.11)
\]
\[ \bar{p} \approx -\xi \omega_n \pm j\omega_n \text{ for } \xi << 1 \]

\[ \xi \omega_n = \frac{c}{2m} \]

\[ 2\Delta \omega = \omega - \omega_n \]

Figure 3.1: Vector Relationships in S-Plane
Dropping the vector notation, $\phi(s)$ is determined as follows.

\[
\sin \phi(s) = \frac{\text{Im}(s - P)}{s - P} \quad (3.12)
\]

\[
\text{Im}(s - P) = 2\Delta \omega \quad (3.13)
\]

\[
s - P = \Delta s + \zeta \omega_n \quad (3.14)
\]

For $\phi(s) \ll 1$, $\sin \phi(s) \approx \phi(s)$. Combining the above equations gives the following expression.

\[
\phi(s) = \frac{2\Delta \omega}{\Delta s + \zeta \omega_n} \quad (3.15)
\]

Note that in Figure 3.1 the output frequency of the VCO, $\omega$, is doubled because, as previously explained, the capacitive force is proportional to the VCO voltage squared which doubles the forcing frequency. The total linearized phase of the system is given below.

\[
\Phi(s) = -\frac{2\Delta \omega}{\Delta s + \zeta \omega_n} - \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (3.16)
\]

The phase deviation from resonance is defined as follows.

\[
\Delta \Phi(s) = \Phi(s) + \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (3.17)
\]

It follows that Equation 3.18 is a linear first order transfer function that models phase deviations of the device from resonance. As the input frequency is increased, the phase decreases.

\[
\Delta \Phi(s) = -\frac{2\Delta \omega}{\Delta s + \zeta \omega_n} \quad (3.18)
\]

Figure 3.2 shows the block diagram of the control system. For clarity, the $\Delta$'s on the phase angles have been dropped; thus, it is implied that the phase of the system to be controlled is a deviation from resonance. The minus sign on the plant transfer function has been transferred to the summing junction of the feedback loop and reference phase. Therefore, contrary to most servo controllers, this system is implemented with positive feedback because the sign inversion already occurs at the plant. The reference phase, $\Phi_{ref}$, is always maintained at zero regulating the output to zero. The compensator
$K_d = \frac{5}{2\pi}$  Phase detector gain (volts/rad)

$K(s) = K_f \frac{a+1}{s(b+1)}$  Type I lead compensator

$KVCO = 2000\pi$  VCO gain (rad/s/volt)

$G(s) = \frac{1}{s+\frac{c}{2m}}$  Plant transfer function (s)

$\Phi_{ref}(s)$  Reference phase (rad)

$\Phi(s)$  Measured phase (rad)

$N(s)$  Sensor noise

$\omega_n$  Natural frequency (rad/s)

$\Delta\omega_n$  Change in natural frequency (rad/s)

$m$  Mass (kg)

$c$  Damping constant (n/rad/s)

Figure 3.2: Control System Block Diagram
is type I lead which minimizes steady state errors and response time. The constants a and b in the compensator are computed to give a nominal closed loop bandwidth of 15 Hz, which gives good tracking over a sufficiently large frequency range providing ample data points. A high bandwidth controller would tend to introduce jitter in the output frequency of the VCO sacrificing measurement accuracy. The disturbance, $\Delta \omega_n$, is a change in natural frequency induced by fatigue cracking in the cantilever. The anticipated rate of crack propagation is modeled by a power law relation related to the stress intensity factor at the crack site. Such a disturbance, can be approximated as a ramp for subcritical cracking. Near fracture, however, the crack velocity will begin to change rapidly, resulting in a significant phase error. Initially, such a phase error will cause a decrease in the amplitude of motion of the cantilever tending to arrest the crack. At very large phase errors ($> 30^\circ$), enough nonlinearities are introduced in the system to cause the device to fall off resonance entirely. The system may reacquire lock, but failure would be imminent.
3.2 Sensing and Control Electronics

In section 3.1, a linearized plant transfer function was derived, and a frequency control system was presented which regulates phase perturbations about resonance to zero. Implementing the control system requires circuitry that will sense the motion of the cantilever, determine whether the device is on resonance, then correct the driving frequency accordingly. Figure 3.3, conceptualizes the sensing and torquing scheme. Sensing is accomplished by applying a known high frequency low amplitude carrier signal, $V_c$ (5 volts at 300 KHz), to the p type beam. The carrier signal is biased a negative amount, $V_b$ (−5 volts), so that the p-n junction is always reversed biased when the n type substrate is at ground potential. The reverse biasing prevents current from flowing from the beam into the substrate short circuiting the carrier signal. As the beam vibrates, the air gap of the capacitance bridge changes, thereby modulating the amplitude of the carrier signal. This signal is then amplified, demodulated, and filtered in the sensing circuit to give a voltage proportional to the amplitude of vibration of the beam at the frequency of the device. The control circuit compares the phase of the signal exiting the sensing circuit with that of the driving voltage. If the difference in phase between these signals deviates from the 0° reference, the control circuit issues an error signal, $V_e$, to the VCO adjusting the driving frequency thereby maintaining the device on resonance. The sensing and torquing electrodes are plated atop a gold printed circuit pattern, deposited on the chip in a previous photomask and metalization process, providing current pathways to large area bonding pads. Wire bonds extend from these pads to electrically isolated leads on the package containing the chip. The leads are in turn “plugged in” to a PC board containing the pre-amp.

The variable capacitor of the sensor bridge, $C(t)$, is on the input side of a low noise, high speed FET input op-amp. A 1 pf capacitor, $C_{fb}$, is in the feedback loop giving an output voltage, $V_o$, proportional to the ratio of the bridge capacitance to feedback capacitance multiplied by the carrier voltage. To clarify the operation of the device, simplified input/output relations are now derived. The capacitance of the sensor is

$$C(t) = \frac{\varepsilon_0 A_s}{d_0 - v_s(t)} \quad (3.19)$$
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where,

\[ v_s(t) = \text{plate displacement under sensor: (m)} \]
\[ = -v_{s0}\sin(\omega t) \]
\[ v_{s0} = (\xi_1 v_1 + \xi_2 v_2 + \xi_3 v_3) \frac{p_0}{c\omega_n} \]
\[ \epsilon_0 = \text{permittivity of a vacuum:} \left( \frac{\text{coul}^2}{\text{N} \cdot \text{m}^2} \right) \]
\[ d_0 = \text{fixed air gap: (m)} \]
\[ A_s = \text{sensor electrode area: (m}^2) \]

For large displacements, Equation 3.19 can be expanded into an infinite series.

\[ C(t) = \frac{\epsilon_0 A_s}{d_0} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0} \right) + \left( \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0} \right)^3 + \ldots \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.20)

The first term is a constant or nominal capacitance; the second is linear with displacement; subsequent terms are higher harmonics of decreasing magnitude. For small motions \( \left( \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0} \approx 0.1 \right) \), the bridge capacitance is essentially linear with the beam displacement.

\[ C(t) \approx \frac{\epsilon_0 A_s}{d_0} \left( 1 + \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.21)

If the frequency of the modulation envelope is approximately an order of magnitude less than the carrier frequency, the output voltage of the pre-amp is determined from the feedback rule for op-amps.

\[ V_0 = -\frac{C(t)}{C_{fb}} V_c \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.22)

Equation 3.22 does not hold for high envelope frequencies because the basic equation for conservation of current at the inverting input of the op-amp is nonlinear and Laplace transforms do not apply. However, if the magnitude of the carrier signal does not change significantly over one cycle of the carrier frequency, the bridge capacitance can be treated as a constant and Equation 3.22 holds for steady harmonic motion.
Substituting Equation 3.21 into Equation 3.22 gives an expression for the output voltage of the pre-amp for small displacements.

\[ V_0 = -\frac{\epsilon_0 A_s}{d_0 C_{fb}} \left( 1 + \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0} \right) V_c \]  

(3.23)

Next, the DC term in Equation 3.23 is blocked in a high pass filter and the resulting waveform boosted by a post amplifier. The carrier signal is then removed by a demodulator which multiplies the output signal of the post-amp by the original carrier signal. The result of this multiplication is a large separation of the device signal and carrier signal in the frequency spectrum. This separation allows the carrier to be attenuated by appropriate filters. The process is identical to AM radio reception. Eliminating the DC term in Equation 3.23 and multiplying by \( V_c \) and the post amp gain gives

\[ V_0 = -k_a \frac{C_0 v_s(t)}{C_{fb} d_0} V_c^2 \]  

(3.24)

where,

\[ V_c = V_0 \sin(\omega_c t) \]  

(3.25)

\[ C_0 = \frac{\epsilon_0 A_s}{d_0} \]  

(3.26)

\[ \omega_c = \text{carrier frequency: (rad/s)} \]

\[ k_a = \text{post amplifier gain: (volt/volt)} \]

The demodulated output is as follows.

\[ V_0 = \frac{k_a C_0 V_0^2}{C_{fb} d_0} v_{s0} \sin(\omega_n t) \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \cos(2\omega_c t) \right) \]  

(3.27)

The first term Equation 3.27 is directly proportional to \( v_s(t) \). The second is composed of two sidebands at \( 2\omega_c - \omega \) and \( 2\omega_c + \omega \). These higher harmonics are attenuated by a low pass active filter and do not contribute significantly to the filtered output. The resulting output equation is as follows.

\[ V_0 = -\frac{k_a C_0 V_0^2}{2C_{fb} d_0} v_s(t) \]  

(3.28)
The previous operations show how the demodulation works in principle; however, Equation 3.28 is not the correct expression because the resulting units are volts squared which is inconsistent with the output. In practice, the physical demodulator circuit component operates with its own transfer function specified by the manufacturer. Therefore, to account for the gain of the demodulator, the nominal capacitance of the sensor bridge, the air gap, and other amplifiers and filters in the circuit the output equation is written in terms of a sensor constant: \( k_s \) with units of volts/meter.

\[
V_0 = -k_s v_s(t) \quad (3.29)
\]

\[
k_s = k_d k_a k_f \frac{C_0 V_{e0}}{C_f d_0} \quad (3.30)
\]

where,

\[
k_d = \text{demodulator gain: (volt/volt)}
\]

\[
k_f = \text{filter gain: (volt/volt)}
\]

Equation 3.29 was derived for small motions; however, the same analysis procedure also applies for large displacements. In this case, Equation 3.20 is substituted into Equation 3.22 then demodulated and filtered. The result is a signal composed of multiple harmonics extending upward from the resonant frequency of the device.

\[
V_0 = -k_s v_s(t) \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0} \right) + \left( \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0} \right)^3 + \cdots \right] \quad (3.31)
\]

Figure 3.4 shows the effect of increasing plate displacement. The plotted function, \( y \), is identical in form to Equation 3.31 but unitless. Also, \( v(t) \) has a minus sign which is incorporated into the function \( y \). The amplitude ratio, \( a \), is defined at the amplitude of motion divided by the air gap dimension. Note that in Figure 3.4 the zero crossing remains unchanged in spite of the distortion caused by large plate displacements. This fact means the frequency control system is basically insensitive to the inherent nonlinearity of the sensing scheme. However fortunate this result may be, the above analysis was somewhat simplified. The sensor electrode has finite width making it sensitive to capacitance changes caused by pure rotation of the end plate.
\[ y = \frac{a \sin(\omega_n t)}{1 + a \sin(\omega_n t)} \]
\[ a = \frac{v_s \delta}{d_0} \]
\[ \omega_n = 2550 \text{ Hz} \]

Figure 3.4: Sensor Output Waveform
Therefore, both the angle and translational displacement of the end plate are required to fully account for the capacitance change. In section 2.2 it was shown that the translational and rotational degrees of freedom tend to act independently in deflecting the cantilever. A further complication arises because the sides of the sensor electrode radiate, or “fringe”, to the end plate. Therefore, some phase error is introduced by large plate displacements; however, the effects generally remain small except at very large displacements where the end plate is in close proximity (≈ 1μm) to the outermost edge of the sensor electrode. In any event, such phase errors depend on the amplitude of motion which remains nearly constant for small frequency shifts. Therefore, these errors can be compensated for by the setpoint of the control electronics. In general, complex expressions are required to evaluate capacitance fringing, especially if rotation is included. Although the design program, FTTEST.2.PAS, does not incorporate fringing or rotational effects, reasonably accurate predictions of sensor output are obtained. The previous discussion clarifies how the sensing scheme works and aids in interpreting the performance and output of the device.

Figure 3.5 is a time trace of the output waveform of the T38 test device at resonance. A torquing voltage of 10 volts is applied giving an amplitude ratio of 0.23 which can be roughly compared to the ratio of 0.25 presented in Figure 3.4. The correspondence in shape and the relative height of the peaks is close. Figure 3.6 is a power spectrum of the waveform shown in Figure 3.5. The cursor is centered on the resonant frequency of the device. Harmonics extend from the resonant frequency upward in consecutive multiples (ω₁, 2ω₁, 3ω₁, ...) as predicted by Equation 3.31. Figure 3.7 is a time trace of the device with a driving voltage of 5 volts applied giving an amplitude ratio of 0.06 which is well inside the linear range. Figure 3.7 shows the device approaching the limits of detectable motion as noise becomes evident at the peaks. The zero crossing, however, remains discernible so that the phase control system will continue operation without losing phase lock. A power spectrum of this waveform is shown in Figure 3.8. Only one additional harmonic is visible at twice the resonant frequency. The magnitude of this harmonic is approximately a factor of 10 less than that of the resonant peak, and therefore, contributes a negligible amount to the total output.

Figure 3.9 is a spectrum analysis of the T38 device with the cursor centered on the resonant frequency. The characteristics of the spectrum indicate the device behaves as a first order system with a phase shift of 90° at its first
mode resonant peak. Multiple peaks are not present indicating that spurious torsional modes or modes associated with flexing of the end plate are not present. The driving voltage was limited to 5 volts ensuring a linear sensor output. The curve fitting routine of the spectrum analyzer computed the poles of the system to be $-30.179 \pm 2550$ Hz. The calculated value of the real part of the pole is approximately -5 Hz, a factor of six less. The value given by the spectrum analyzer is too high, for the device could not produce measurable output with such high damping giving a torquing voltage of 5 volts. Furthermore, with such high damping the waveform shown in Figure 3.5 is not possible at 10 volts because sufficient displacement would not be generated to produce the nonlinearity. As shown in Figure 3.7, a significant level of noise is present when the device is driven with 5 volts. Noise has the effect of raising the magnitude of the flat portion of the spectrum thus flattening out the curve and consequently producing an overestimate of damping by the curve fitting routine.

Figures 3.10 through 3.12 are layouts of the actual circuits implemented. The pre-amp is housed inside the environmental control chamber as near as possible to the device to minimize parasitic capacitances that introduce noise. The preamp circuit components are protected from the humid atmosphere by conformal coating, and heat sinks to ground are provided to prevent overheating when operating in vacuum. The remainder of the circuit is outside the chamber mounted in standard aluminum chassis. The pre-amp, post-amp, and sensing circuit are fabricated on PC boards to minimize the sensitivity of the circuit to noise and electromagnetic interference.

The layout of the control circuit is shown in Figure 3.14. As discussed, the output frequency must be divided by two in order to compare phase. The divide by two flip-flop performs this division. The phase detector operates as an "exclusive or" gate by comparing the timing of the edges of the two input signals. The output is filtered and conditioned by the compensator and a DC signal proportional to the phase error is issued to the VCO. Figure 3.15 shows the device operating at resonance. The torquing voltage is the lower curve and is at half the frequency of the device shown directly above.

Data acquisition is accomplished by a Metabyte CTM05 frequency counter board mounted in a Dell 316 computer. Software drivers for this board were purchased but the algorithm used to compute frequency was inefficient and required substantial modifications to improve acquisition time and accuracy. The counter operates by counting the zero crossings of an input signal when
Figure 3.7: Sensor Waveform: Torquing Voltage = 5v
Figure 3.8: Power Spectrum: Torquing Voltage = 5v
the gate of the counter is high. In the original software, the gate time was set by the user and the device signal was routed to the input of the counter. Thirty to fortyfive seconds per measurement were required to accurately measure the resonant frequency of the device using this method. By dividing down the frequency of the device signal and routing it to the gate of the counter, the 1 MHz internal clock of the counter board could be used as the input signal. This method of frequency counting significantly improved acquisition time and accuracy. The modified code is included in Appendix E. The acquisition rate is approximately 5 samples per second with an accuracy of 0.5 Hz. Figure 3.13 shows the experimental setup.
Figure 3.10: Pre-amp and Post-amp
Figure 3.12: Instantaneous Amplitude and Peak Detection Circuitry
Figure 3.13: Experimental Setup
Figure 3.15: Controlled Response
Chapter 4

Fatigue Analysis

4.1 Theory

In the literature review, it was mentioned that static and dynamic stress corrosion fatigue measurements have been made on a number of ceramics including silicon. Figure 4.1 is a representation of static corrosion fatigue in silica glass as measured by Wiederhorn [45]. On the vertical axis is the crack tip velocity, \( \frac{da}{dt} \), and \( \sim n \) the horizontal axis is stress intensity, \( K_I \). The curve is divided into three regions: I, II, and III. Region I is the slow growth region where the crack tip velocity is exponentially related to the applied stress, and also depends on the corrosion reaction rate at the crack tip. Region II is the stress independent region where the velocity depends only on the rate of transport of water molecules to the crack tip. Increasing the applied stress in this region does not enhance crack growth. Region III is the fast growth region where the corrosion reaction is independent of the water content. Region III behavior is attributed more to the structure and intrinsic properties of the material rather than environmental conditions. A curve similar to Figure 4.1 was expected in this experiment.

Figure 4.2 was extracted from Wiederhorn article on subcritical crack growth in ceramics [45]. This curve clearly shows the three regions and the effect of increasing humidity. As the humidity level is increased, the region I and II curves are translated up with constant slope. Translating the curves in this manner is equivalent to raising the slope intercept on the vertical axis which can be interpreted as an increase in the corrosion reaction
Expected Results

\[ \frac{da}{dt} \]

\[ 10^{-11} \]
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I. Slow Growth Region
   (Depends on reaction rate at crack tip)

II. Stress Independent Region
   (Depends of rate of transport of water to crack tip)

III. Fast Growth Region
   (Independent of water content; depends on material properties alone)

Figure 4.1: Crack Velocity vs. Stress Intensity
rate at the crack tip. Note that in Figure 4.2 the lowest velocity measured was on the order of $1 \times 10^{-8}$ m/s. In another experiment, Wiederhorn and Johnson measured crack velocities in PYREX as low as $1 \times 10^{-12}$ m/s. With our apparatus, crack tip velocities can be measured on the order of $1 \times 10^{-14}$ m/s, which is two orders of magnitude better resolution than Wiederhorn and Johnson's measurements. The size of the micromechanical fatigue structure is on the order of what is generally considered the minimum crack size necessary to initiate fatigue in macro-scale specimens. Therefore, given the accuracy of the testing technique, measurements of extremely small crack extensions are possible over extended periods of time. Such measurements have not previously been reported in the literature.

Figures 4.3 and 4.4 were extracted from Bhaduri and Wang's article on stress corrosion fatigue in silicon [2]. Bhaduri and Wang used pre-cracked double torsion single crystal silicon specimens in load relaxation experiments. Figure 4.3 does not show any region I or II behavior in air at 10% humidity, but these regions are seen in Figure 4.4 when an electric potential is applied to the specimen. The slope of the fatigue curve in region III was also decreased by the presence of an electric field. Bhaduri and Wang do not definitively account for these effects and were unable to show how the presence of an electric potential enhances fatigue. However, other researchers are referenced who reported hardness decreases in semiconductor crystals when an electric potential is applied.

Gilman et al. conducted a series of experiments on germanium wafers with a microhardness indenter when a voltage potential of a few volts was applied across the crystal [44]. Gilman measured hardness decreases of 30-60% when the potential was applied at room temperature or below. This electromechanical effect was only seen when the indenter tip was in the proximity of measurable current density and a potential difference existed between the indenter tip and crystal. The electromechanical effect disappeared when the indenter was moved away from the region of significant current density and when the indenter tip and surface were at the same potential. The electromechanical effect appeared near the surface, extending only about 2 $\mu$m to 3 $\mu$m into the crystal and was confined to the plastic region surrounding the indenter. A strong temperature dependence was also measured. The largest hardness decreases occurred at low temperatures, $-196^\circ$C, with negligible decreases near 200$^\circ$C. High temperature indentation experiments conducted by Haasen and Hirsch showed that doped semiconductor materials have en-
Figure 4.2: Typical Stress Corrosion Fatigue Curve (Wiederhorn)
Figure 4.3: Fatigue of Silicon in Air at 10% Humidity
Figure 4.4: Fatigue of Silicon in Air with Electric Field
hanced dislocation motion, as opposed to undoped crystals, at temperatures near the ductile to brittle transition temperature (DBTT) [20] [16]. Hassen and Hirsch concluded that this enhanced dislocation mobility is caused by electrically charged “kinks” that bridge secondary Peierls potentials and migrate in the direction of the dislocation line given adequate thermal energy and applied stress. This theory has been explored by other researchers in the field and is generally accepted [37], [39], [25], [32]. In these high temperature indentation experiments, dislocation rosettes were revealed by etch pits extending to depths of several hundred microns; therefore, hardness reductions at these elevated temperatures are changes to the bulk properties of the crystal as opposed to Gilman’s observations which are surface effects. Given a high state of compressive stress under the indenter, and a plastic zone containing electrically charged dislocations, Gilman’s measurements are reasonable considering that it is likely electrostatic forces produced by the potential difference between the indenter tip and the surrounding plastic region would increase dislocation mobility. Gilman also measured crack lengths produced by the indentations with and without a 0.2 ma current flowing through the material. No change in the length of the cracks was measured indicating that fracture toughness is not affected by current. This fact perhaps has some connection to Pirouz’s observation that fracture toughness is not affected by either n or p doping [39]. Gilman summarizes his conclusions as follows:

1. Electromechanical effects were observed in other semiconductor crystals as well as germanium: Si, InSb, SiC.

2. The effect is reversible over a period of 60 seconds: when current is applied, hardness decreases; when the current is stopped, hardness returns to its normal value.

3. Changing polarity and reversing the direction of current flow has no effect.

4. 60 Hz AC potentials produced identical hardness reductions as DC levels.

5. Voltage levels between 0.1-60 volts produced the same hardness reductions except at small current densities where hardness continuously increased to the zero current value.
6. Identical results were produced with soldered indium contacts and spring loaded copper contacts

7. Similar results were obtained with insulated indenter heads and conducting indenter heads.

In light of Gilman’s experiments, Bhaduri and Wang may be seeing the electromechanical effect, however, this is unlikely for number of reasons. First, the plastic zone at the crack tip is small, much smaller than that associated with an indentation, and any potential across the plastic zone is a result of the resistivity of the material along the current path from one side of the crack to the other. This distance is very short giving a small potential difference. Second, the plastic zone is created by far field stresses acting at a singularity, not by a large external body of different potential acting locally in direct contact with the plastic zone. In Gilman’s experiment, a small current flowed out of the indenter through the plastic zone and into the substrate. Third, when the potential was applied, region II appeared which is normally associated with stress corrosion cracking indicating the fatigue mechanism is an accelerated corrosion reaction rather than dynamic effects such as dislocation motion. However, Bhaduri and Wang also measured decreases in slope in region III indicating that perhaps dynamic fatigue effects were present; however, without an adequate potential across the plastic zone, the electromechanical effect does not occur. In that case, increased dislocation motion must be strongly related to thermal activation. Just as a crack introduces a singularity in the elastic field, it also produces a singularity in the electric field. Therefore, an accelerated current flow around the crack tip is present which would induce a localized $i^2R$ heating. However, the temperatures generated by such a mechanism would have to be on the order of the DBTT for significant thermally activated dislocation motion to occur; therefore, enhanced dislocation motion caused by local crack tip heating is unlikely. Electrostatic forces across the crack tip opening can probably be ruled out for these forces are small and would act in compression tending to arrest the crack. A plausible explanation could be that an electrically induced surface charge on the crystal ionizes water in the environment releasing hydrogen and hydroxyl ions. These ions readily oxidize the surface of the silicon to silicon dioxide thereby increasing the corrosion reaction rate. Ghandhi discusses a room temperature oxidation method for silicon called anodic oxidation which involves applying an electric potential to a silicon
wafer in the presence of an electrolyte[15]. In this corrosion/oxidation theory, the surface of the silicon is oxidized to form a thin layer (~10 Å) of silicon dioxide which is susceptible to stress corrosion fatigue. Given a pre-crack and corresponding stress intensity of sufficient magnitude, the silicon dioxide is continuously attacked by water vapor in the environment thereby propagating a crack through the layer exposing more silicon. The exposed silicon is in turn oxidized then attacked by moisture propagating the crack further. This process of oxidation and cracking continues until failure. Michalske has developed a molecular model for stress corrosion cracking of silica [31]. In this model, silicon-oxygen-silicon bonds carry the stress of the external loads. These bonds are weakened by hydrogen atoms in the water molecule bonding to the oxygen atoms forming two Si-O-H molecules held together by a weak hydrogen bond. The hydrogen to hydrogen bond then ruptures propagating a crack into the material. Extending this process to silicon, the cleaved hydroxyl groups then release hydrogen and form a new monolayer of silica which is in turn attacked by both the released hydrogen and water vapor in the environment thus further weakening the silica structure[15]. Figure 4.5 illustrates the chemical reaction. The oxidation and corrosion mechanism just described still depends on the transport of water molecules to the crack tip; therefore, an enhanced corrosion and oxidation reaction produced by water and hydrogen should predominantly alter the fatigue curve in regions I and II. Region III, however, is insensitive to water content in the environment and reaction rates; therefore, to account for Bhaduri and Wang’s measured decrease in slope of region III, another mechanism must be at work. Wiederhorn et al. discusses electrostriction which is a likely candidate for Bhaduri and Wang’s observation[46]. This effect is observed for silica glass where small decreases in the slope of the da/dt vs. $K_1$ curve occur in Region III when the dielectric of the surrounding fluid is changed. Electrostrictive forces are generated when the silicon/oxygen bonds in SiO$_2$ are broken. Positive and negative charges build on the silicon and oxygen atoms, respectively, which produces an electrostatic closing force that in turn retards crack growth.

4.2 Modeling

In the previous section the mechanism of stress corrosion cracking was discussed. Modeling of fatigue involves mathematical expressions relating mea-
Figure 4.5: Stress Corrosion Mechanism of Si/SiO₂
sured crack tip velocities to a known stress intensity. Fatigue models generally fall into one of two categories: one, a power law model involving empirical constants that lump various effects together such as temperature, humidity, and reaction rate constants; two, a thermally activated model where the energy associated with extending a crack overcomes an initial activation energy. The power law model is written in one of two forms as follows.

\[ v = AK_I^n \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

or normalized with respect to the fracture toughness

\[ v = v_0 \left( \frac{K_I}{K_{tc}} \right)^n \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2)

where,

\[
\begin{align*}
v &= \text{crack tip velocity} \quad \text{m/s} \\
v_0 &= \text{experimental constant} \quad \text{m/s} \\
K_I &= \text{stress intensity factor} \quad \text{MN/m}^{3/2} \\
K_{tc} &= \text{fracture toughness} \quad \text{MN/m}^{3/2} \\
n &= \text{experimental constant}
\end{align*}
\]

The thermally activated model exponentially relates the crack velocity to a stress intensity, but also separates temperature, humidity, and the activation energy associated with the onset of the corrosion reaction [36].

\[ v = v_0 \exp \left( \frac{-E^* + bK_I}{RT} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.3)

where,

\[
\begin{align*}
v_0 &= ax_0 \left( \frac{m}{s} \right) \\
a &= \text{experimental constant} \\
x_0 &= \text{partial pressure of water} \quad \text{m}^2/	ext{N}
\end{align*}
\]
\[ f = \text{order of the chemical reaction} \]
\[ E^* = \text{zero stress activation energy} \left( \frac{\text{KJ}}{\text{mol}} \right) \]
\[ b = \text{experimental constant} \left( \frac{\text{m}^{5/2}}{\text{mol}} \right) \]
\[ R = \text{universal gas constant} \left( \frac{\text{N m}}{\text{mol}^\circ \text{K}} \right) \]
\[ T = \text{temperature} \left( ^\circ \text{K} \right) \]

For simplicity, the power law model will be used with the constants \( v_0, n, \) and \( K_f, \) to be determined experimentally. In Section 2.2 a rotational spring, \( K_r, \) of variable stiffness is used to model the crack. An expression for this stiffness and \( K_f \) is given by Murakami as follows [34].

\[ K_1 = k(a) M \quad (4.4) \]
\[ k(a) = \frac{6}{bh^2 \sqrt{\pi a f_1}} \quad (4.5) \]
\[ f_1 = 1.22 - 1.4\alpha + 7.33\alpha^2 - 13.08\alpha^3 + 14\alpha^4 \quad (4.6) \]
\[ \alpha = \frac{a}{h} \quad (4.7) \]

\[ M = K_r \theta \quad (4.8) \]
\[ K_r = \frac{1}{C_\theta(a)} \quad (4.9) \]
\[ C_\theta(a) = \frac{24}{Eb h^2} V_1 \quad (4.10) \]

\[ V_1 = 1.458 - 0.304\alpha - 0.924\alpha^2 + 48.34\alpha^3 - 123.5\alpha^4 + 120.5\alpha^5 \quad (4.11) \]
\[ \alpha = \frac{a}{h} \quad (4.12) \]

where

\[ C_\theta = \text{compliance of pre-crack at point B in Figure 2.3:} \left( \frac{1}{\text{n m}} \right) \]
\[ a = \text{crack length: (m)} \]
\[ E = \text{Young's modulus:} \left( \frac{\text{N}}{\text{m}^2} \right) \]
\[ K_I = \text{stress intensity: } \left( \frac{N}{m^{3/2}} \right) \]

\[ M = \text{moment applied at the crack site: } (N \text{ m}) \]

\[ h_b = h - a \text{ ligament thickness: } (m) \]

\[ h = \text{beam thickness: } (m) \]

\[ b = \text{beam width: } (m) \]

Murakami's equations for \( K_I \) and \( C_\theta(a) \) are valid for \( \alpha \leq 0.6 \) and \( \alpha \leq 0.7 \), respectively. Figure 4.6 shows the geometry of the pre-cracked bar with the applied moment. The thickness of the ligament is given by \( h_b \). For deep pre cracks where \( \alpha > 0.6 \), the following equation for the stress intensity is accurate to within 1\% [38].

\[ K_I = \frac{4M}{bh_b^{3/2}} \]  \( (4.13) \)

The compliance of the deep cracked bar can be computed mathematically by using the relation shown below [24].

\[ \frac{dC}{da} = \frac{2b}{E} \left( \frac{K_I}{M} \right)^2 \]  \( (4.14) \)

Substituting Equation 4.13 into Equation 4.14, and integrating from \( a_1 \) to \( a_2 \)

\[ \int_{a_1}^{a_2} dC = \frac{2b}{E} \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \left( \frac{K_I}{M} \right)^2 \, da \]  \( (4.15) \)

gives the following expression.

\[ C(a_2) - C(a_1) = \frac{16}{Eb} \left[ \frac{1}{(h - a_2)^2} - \frac{1}{(h - a_1)^2} \right] \]  \( (4.16) \)

By definition

\[ C(a_1) = \frac{16}{Eb(h - a_1)^2} \]  \( (4.17) \)

and,

\[ C(a_2) = \frac{16}{Eb(h - a_2)^2} \]  \( (4.18) \)

or more generally,

\[ C(a) = \frac{16}{Eb(h_b)^2} \]  \( (4.19) \)
Figure 4.6: Pre Cracked Bar

Table 4.1 is a comparison of Murakami’s equations for compliance and stress intensity to those of the deep cracked beam. \( \alpha \) is given in the left column; the center column is the ratio of the stress intensity computed using the deep cracked bar equation to Murakami’s; and the right column is the ratio of the compliances. As predicted, the stress intensities are nearly equal near \( \alpha = 0.6 \), and the compliances become close near \( \alpha = 0.7 \). In the FTEST2.PAS design program, these limits of accuracy are used to select either the deep cracked bar equations, or Murakami’s equations.

The frequency can now be determined for any precrack of length, \( a \), and any frequency shift given an incremental extension of the crack length, \( \delta a \). The design program, FTEST2.PAS, incorporates this computation. Using the T38 series device with an initial crack length of 2\( \mu \)m, and an incremental extension of 10\( nm \), the frequency shift is approximately 4 Hz. This shift translates to a frequency sensitivity of 2.5 \( nm/Hz \). Because the con-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\frac{K_{I,\text{Deep Crack}}}{K_{I,\text{Murakami}}}$</th>
<th>$\frac{C_{\theta,\text{Deep Crack}}}{C_{\theta,\text{Murakami}}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>0.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Comparison of Deep Cracked Bar to Murakami

trol system and sensing electronics are capable of maintaining the device on resonance to within $\pm 1$ Hz, a 2.5 nanometer crack extension is detectable. This resolution is possible because of the small size of the device. In general, the stiffness of a cantilever scales in direct proportion to the length while the mass scales by the length cubed. Therefore, as a structure is shrunk in size, the inertia forces become relatively small in comparison to the elastic restoring forces of the material. Minute changes in the stiffness of the structure now significantly affect the frequency.

Next, the time necessary to extend the crack an amount $\delta a$ will be derived. The stress intensity factor, $K_I$, shown in Equation 4.2 is composed of two parts: a constant static part, and a cyclic dynamic part. As shown in Section 2.2.5, the nonlinearity of the stiffness of the pre-crack results in a constant negative bias in displacement superposed with a cyclic component; therefore, the moment acting at the crack site is written as follows.

$$M_0(t) = M_0 \left( \frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2} \sin(\omega t) \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.20)

Rewriting Equation 4.2 with the above expression for the moment gives the following.

$$v = v_0 \left( \frac{K_{I0}}{K_{Ic}} \right)^n \left( \frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2} \sin(\omega t) \right)^n$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.21)

Where,

$$K_{I0} = k(a)M_0$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.22)
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Following the method outlined by Evans, an average crack tip velocity, $v_{\text{avg}}$, is defined for one cycle [9].

\[ v_{\text{avg}} = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T v(t) \, dt \quad (4.23) \]

Where,

\[ T = \frac{2\pi}{\omega_n} = \text{period of one cycle: (s)} \]

Substituting Equation 4.21 into Equation 4.23 gives the following expression.

\[ v_{\text{avg}} = v_0 \left( \frac{K_{f0}}{K_{fc}} \right)^n \left( \frac{1}{\pi} \right)^n \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left( 1 + \frac{\pi}{2} \sin(\omega_n t) \right)^n \, dt \quad (4.24) \]

Defining

\[ g = \frac{1}{\pi^n T} \int_0^T \left( 1 + \frac{\pi}{2} \sin(\omega_n t) \right)^n \, dt \quad (4.25) \]

The solution gives the following expression [9].

\[ g = \frac{1}{\pi^n} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{n!}{(n-2\ell)! \ell!^2} \left( \frac{\pi}{4} \right)^{2\ell} \quad (4.26) \]

Therefore, Equation 4.24 is rewritten with the correction $g$ to account for crack closure.

\[ v_{\text{avg}} = v_0 g \left( \frac{K_{f0}}{K_{fc}} \right)^n \quad (4.27) \]

Equation 4.27 is a quasi static fatigue model where the normalized velocity, $v_0$, is attenuated by a factor $g$ determined by computing the average extension of the crack tip for one cycle. For the T38 devices, $g$ is on the order of 0.01. With the average velocity of the crack tip determined, the time to failure can be computed by differentiating Equation 4.22 with respect to time and using the chain rule to substitute in Equation 4.27.

\[ \frac{dK_{f0}}{dt} = \left( \frac{dK_{f0}}{da} \right) \frac{da}{dt} \quad (4.28) \]

\[ \frac{dK_{f0}}{dt} = \left( \frac{dK_{f0}}{da} \right) v_{\text{avg}} \quad (4.29) \]
\[
\frac{dK_{10}}{dt} = \left( \frac{dK_{10}}{da} \right) v_0 g \left( \frac{K_{10}}{K_{Ic}} \right)^n
\]  

(4.30)

Separating variables and integrating gives the time required for the stress intensity factor to increase from an initial value, \( K_{10i} \), to a final value \( K_{10f} \).

\[
\int_{K_{10i}}^{K_{10f}} \frac{dK_{10}}{K_{10}^n} = \left( \frac{dK_{10}}{da} \right) \frac{v_0 g}{K_{Ic}^n} \int_0^\tau dt
\]

(4.31)

In the above equation, \( \frac{dK_{10}}{da} \), is assumed constant over the limits of integration. The design program, FTEST2.PAS computes this number directly given a pre-crack of known depth. Integrating Equation 4.31 gives the following equation.

\[
\left. \frac{K_{10}^{1-n}}{1-n} \right|_{K_{10i}}^{K_{10f}} = \left( \frac{dK_{10}}{da} \right) \frac{v_0 g \tau}{K_{Ic}^n}
\]

(4.32)

Defining

\[
\gamma = \frac{K_{10i}}{K_{10f}}
\]

(4.33)

and solving Equation 4.32 for \( \tau \) gives the following equation.

\[
\tau = \frac{K_{10i}(1 - \gamma^{n-1})}{(n - 1)v_0 g \left( \frac{K_{10}}{K_{Ic}} \right)^n \frac{dK_{10}}{da}}
\]

(4.34)

\[
\tau = \frac{K_{10i}(1 - \gamma^{n-1})}{(n - 1)v_{avg} \frac{dK_{10}}{da}}
\]

(4.35)

To compute the time to failure, \( K_{10f} \) is replaced with a stress intensity near the fracture toughness of silicon: \( K_{10f} \approx 95\% K_{Ic} \) at fracture. The exact value of the fracture toughness is not used because as the stress intensity approaches the fracture toughness of the material the velocity of crack propagation approaches the elastic wave speed of the material and Equation 4.35 is no longer valid.

Now that equations have been derived which relate compliance changes and time to incremental extensions of crack length, the FTEST2.PAS design program can be used to simulate the anticipated frequency shifts with time assuming that crack growth obeys the power law model previously described.
Chapter 5

Crack Initiation Methods

In the previous sections, it has been assumed that a pre-crack resembling that shown in Figure 4.6 exists in the structure. Some means of introducing a geometrically similar flaw, or pre-crack, that is both repeatable and controlled is necessary. The controlled flaw must meet three basic criteria for success: first, the flaw must be small compared to the scale of the structure so that a $K_I$ dominant field is generated; second, can be analytically characterized by a stress intensity; and third, must not cause uncontrolled breakage when the device is etched or wire bonded. Numerous alternatives are possible. Those with the greatest chance of success were attempted, and are explained in the following sections.

5.1 Micromachined V-notch

This method involves the fabrication process where KOH, a highly anisotropic etch, is used to etch downward along the $<111>$ crystallographic planes of the silicon until the two planes intersect forming a controlled V-notch in the top face of the beam. The radius of curvature at the root of the V must be small (less than $0.1\mu m$) so that a sizable stress concentration is developed which will exceed the cohesive strength of the crystal given a displacement that is within the allowable limits of travel of the end plate. This method was attempted with little success. The first attempt involved etching the V-notch as one of the last processing steps after the beam was diffused with boron. Although boron acts as an etch stop, anisotropic etching should still
cut along the $< 111 >$ planes but at a reduced rate. However, the rate was too low, making this method unattractive. The next attempt involved cutting the notch first in undiffused silicon then diffusing with boron. Although a notch was made, subsequent processing steps involving oxidation leached boron from the outermost layer of silicon so that during final etching the sharp notch was significantly rounded as shown in Figure 5.1. The last attempt involved cutting the notch first then depositing a silicon nitride layer over the notch to protect it from oxidation. However, processing difficulties were encountered with gold alloying into the silicon which destroyed the wafer. Given the limitations on available manpower in the CSDL microfabrication laboratory, and the processing difficulties encountered, the V-notch was abandoned. Conceptually, fabricating beams with a V-notch is possible; however, the process development time and trial runs required for success with this approach require a level of manpower that is not possible to provide. Furthermore, it is not a certainty that a stress concentration, even if it is large, will initiate subcritical cracking in silicon. Han and Tomozawa show that "blunt" cracks in silica glass do not exhibit slow crack growth, instead, crack initiation and propagation occur only when the applied stress is close to the failure stress of the material [17]. This failure stress is the stress necessary to fracture the material assuming the crack were "sharp". At this point, other methods for introducing a pre-crack were considered more viable than using processing techniques.

5.2 Scribing

Scribing was considered a viable alternative for introducing a pre-crack, or stress concentration, into the beam with the principle disadvantage being repeatability and crack characterizability. Tungsten carbide scribe probes were used with a probe station to generate a uniform scribe line across the diffused section of the beam. However, sufficient depth penetration of the scribe probe was not achieved. Scribed devices were etched and deflected on the probe station 20 – 30μm without breaking, indicating the lack of an adequate stress concentration. The smallest tip diameter available for scribe probes is approximately 2.5μm which is relatively large compared to the size of the structure so that the scribe lines must penetrate the surface of the silicon nearly to the depth of the beam. However, the probes break when
forces necessary for this level of penetration are applied. Figure 5.2 is a SEM photograph of a scribe line made with a scribe probe.

Misra and Finnie [33] studied in detail the scribing and subsequent fracturing of silicon wafers using both spherical points and diamond points. Their results indicate that a sharp scribe, such as a diamond, produces both lateral and median cracks in the substrate while a spherical scribe results in partial cone cracks extending from the surface downwards along the sides of the scribe line. Therefore, a diamond scribe was fitted to the end of a modified probe manipulator. This method is difficult because the diamond must be large enough that it can be glued to the end of a metal shank. Since the diamond is cleaved along its $<111>$ planes, a rather large shank diameter is necessary. The large diameter of the shank completely obscures the silicon chip on the microscope table from view. Therefore, the scribe must be positioned blind within several microns. This level of positioning accuracy would be difficult to achieve. Test scribe lines showed that significant surface damage was introduced and the scribe line was at best crude. The scribe appeared to skip along the surface, rather than dig in and cut, which introduced significant chipping and extraneous surface damage. Controlling depth, load, and positioning would be difficult without precise load and displacement servo control. Otherwise, this method has little hope of working in a satisfactory and repeatable way.

### 5.3 Nanoindenting

The nanoindenter is a servo controlled indenting machine used to evaluate the hardness and modulus of thin films several microns thick. The nanoindenter can apply loads up to 12 grams with a force resolution of $2 - 3 \mu N$ and a displacement accuracy of $2 - 3 \text{ nm}$. Nanoindenting is a reliable method for introducing repeatable controlled cracks into the beam. Surface damage is minimal, and uniform crack planes extend radially outward from the indentation site. Furthermore, the nanoindenter can be used to measure hardness, Young’s modulus, and force displacement curves of cracked or uncracked cantilevers. The principle drawback of the nanoindenter is the complex crack geometry created by the angles formed by the radial cracks with respect to the sides of the beam; furthermore, multiple indentations will be required to fully extend a pre-crack across the width of the beam which can result
Figure 5.1: Micromachined V-notch
Figure 5.2: Scribe Line
in a nonplanar crack face depending on the orientation of the indenter and the indentation pattern. Although the crack geometry is potentially complex, accurate results may be obtained with the simple closed form equations for the stress intensity and strain energy release rate presented in the previous sections if the cantilever is fully pre-cracked across the width to a uniform depth. Similar geometric difficulties are encountered when considering anisotropic bodies. Kanninen states that the effects of nonplanar crack extension in anisotropic bodies are usually ignored in deriving expressions for the strain energy release rate because of the mathematical difficulties involved [24]. Therefore, it is not uncommon to use simplified equations based on the assumptions of material isotropy and planar crack extension to model complex fracture behavior. The principle criteria in this investigation is that an adequate stress intensity is developed which will either initiate fatigue or fracture the material given the limited travel under the bridge electrode, and that a significant frequency drop result from the pre-crack followed by a measurable frequency shift if fatigue occurs.

A depth penetration on the order of 400 nm in the boron diffused silicon is sufficient to generate radial cracks which extend outward from the vertices of an equilateral triangle formed by the three sided pyramidal diamond indenter tip. Figure 5.3 is a single indentation into the surface of an unetched T38 cantilever approximately 10 μm from the base. The indentation depth was approximately 460 nm and produced radial cracks approximately 2.7 μm long measured from the centroid of the triangle to the tip of the crack. The cantilever was subsequently etched then fractured at the indentation site by deflecting the tip of the end plate downward on the probe station. Figure 5.4 shows the cross section of the fracture surface and the nature of the pre-crack geometry as it extends into the beam. The three radial cracks form quarter ellipses joined along a common line that emanates from the centroid of the triangular indent downward at right angles to the surface. The length of this line is approximately 75% the length of the pre-cracks as measured along the surface of the cantilever as shown in Figure 5.3. The pre-cracked surface is clearly distinguishable from the remainder of the surface so that a precise measurement of the pre-crack depth can be made with a SEM obviating the need for any form of crack marking technique. The extent of the radial cracks is substantially increased by the additional tensile stress induced by the boron diffusion. This diffusion induced stress is removed when the device is etched and the structure is released from the substrate. The load versus
displacement curve associated with this indentation is shown in Figure 5.5.

Figure 5.6 shows the indenting process in more detail. As the indenter penetrates the surface of the silicon, the load correspondingly increases to a maximum specified by the user, or to a predetermined depth, \( h_{\text{total}} \), also specified by the user. The indentations performed in this experiment are load controlled so that the applied load, \( P \), is specified. The total depth is the sum of reversible elastic and irreversible plastic deformation [28].

\[
h_{\text{total}} = h_p + h_e \tag{5.1}
\]

The plastic depth, \( h_p \), is the depth the indenter head actually penetrates into the sample while the elastic depth, \( h_e \), is the depth the surface is deflected downward. As the indenter tip is withdrawn, the material expands to partially fill the void produced by the indenter. The initial relaxation is elastic, and if it is assumed that the surface area of the indenter tip in contact with the sample remains constant during this relaxation interval, the projected area on the surface of the sample also remains constant. Sneddon has developed a stiffness relation for a rigid flat cylindrical punch depressing a flat elastic surface as follows [40].

\[
P = \frac{2E}{1 - \nu^2} Ah_e \tag{5.2}
\]

Where,

\[
P \quad \text{applied load: (N)}
\]
\[
\nu \quad \text{Poisson's ratio}
\]
\[
A = \pi a^2 \quad \text{cross sectional area of punch: (m)}^2
\]
\[
a \quad \text{radius of punch: (m)}
\]
\[
h_e \quad \text{elastic depth: (m)}
\]

The nanoindenter can be modeled as a flat punch by equating the projected area of the indenter to \( A \) in Equation 5.3 [7]. Figure 5.7 shows the ideal geometry of the nanoindenter, and the projected area as a function of the plastic depth, \( h_p \). Sneddon assumed the punch is rigid; however, the diamond tip of the indenter has a finite stiffness which is accounted for by summing the stiffness of the diamond in series with the sample. Rewriting Equation 5.2
Figure 5.3: 500 nm Nanoindentation (Top View)
Figure 5.4: 500 nm Nanoindentation (Cross Sectional View)
Drift rate used to correct this data is: +0.000 nm/sec.
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Figure 5.5: Nanoindentation Curve (Load vs. Displacement)
Figure 5.6: Typical Nanodentation Curve
Figure 5.7: Ideal Nanoindenter Geometry
gives the following equation.

\[ P = 2E_r h_p \left( \frac{24.56}{\pi} \right)^{-1} h_e \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.3)

Where,

\[ E_r = \left( \frac{1 - \nu^2}{E} + \frac{1 - \nu_0^2}{E_0} \right)^{-1} \]

\[ E = \text{Young's modulus of the sample} \]
\[ \nu = \text{Poisson's ratio of the sample} \]
\[ E_0 = \text{Young's modulus of the diamond indenter} \]
\[ \nu_0 = \text{Poisson's ratio of the diamond indenter} \]

Differentiating Equation 5.3 with respect to \( h_e \) gives the slope of the tangent shown in Figure 5.6.

\[ \frac{dP}{dh_e} = 2E_r h_p \left( \frac{24.56}{\pi} \right)^{1/2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.4)

Equation 5.4 can be used to compute Young's modulus [7]. As mentioned, the nanoindenter is useful for several purposes: pre-cracking, obtaining hardness and the modulus of elasticity, estimating the fracture toughness, compliance testing, and break testing. In the following subsections nanoindenting results for hardness, Young's modulus, fracture toughness, and compliance of an etched device are presented.

### 5.3.1 Hardness and Young's Modulus for Silicon

Figure 5.8 is a diagram of showing two arrays of 500 nm deep indentations. Indentations 31 through 39 were performed in the boron diffused region of an unetched T38 cantilever, and indentations 45 through 49 were in the undiffused region. The purpose of this experiment was to determine if any differences exist in Young's modulus or hardness for the doped versus undoped regions. The raw data is contained in Appendix C. Table 5.1 compares the average values of hardness and Young's modulus for the doped and undoped regions. Young's modulus agrees to within 0.2% for both the diffused and undiffused regions; however, the hardness in the diffused region is 5% greater. The higher hardness in the p type diffused silicon versus the n type substrate
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doped</th>
<th>Undoped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h$ (Pa)</td>
<td>$1.62 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$1.54 \times 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E$ (Pa)</td>
<td>$1.59 \times 10^{11}$</td>
<td>$1.59 \times 10^{11}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Hardness and Young’s Modulus for Si

is consistent with Pirouz’s hardness measurements where dislocation motion was found to be greater in n type silicon than doped p type[39]. Pirouz’s measured hardness values agree within 10% of the nanoindenter values; however, a direct comparison is not possible because the lowest temperature Pirouz measured hardness was 200°C whereas the nanoindentation was at room temperature.

5.3.2 Fracture Toughness of Silicon Using the Nanoindenter

An estimate of the fracture toughness can be made using Figures 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5. The loading and unloading cycle of the indentation was performed at a constant loading rate of $800 \mu N s^{-1}$; therefore, crack initiation would indicated by a horizontal jog in the curve. Referring to Figure 5.5, the loading curve appears to be free of jogs while the unloading curve shows a significant step discontinuity in displacement indicating crack formation and significant extension. Two types of crack systems develop from an indentation: median or radial cracks which develop on loading and are extended on unloading, and lateral cracks which develop on unloading only. The plane of the median/radial crack system is perpendicular to the surface while the lateral system is parallel [30]. Figure 5.4 shows the system to be the median/radial system; therefore, crack initiation occurred during loading, but was small and was not measured by the nanoindenter, and a large measurable crack extension occurred on unloading. Lawn et al. has shown that the residual stresses on unloading provide the primary driving force for the median/radial system to fully develop into the half penny configuration [26]. The tensile stress resulting from the boron diffusion also contributes to the driving force for crack extension, and is accounted for by superposing the stress intensity of a half penny subject to a uniform far field stress with that of the residual stress. These stress intensities are summed and equated to the fracture
toughness.

\[ K_{IC} = \chi_r \frac{P^*}{c^{3/2}} + \sigma_0 \sqrt{\pi c \psi} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.5)

Where,

\[ \chi_r = 0.069 \]
\[ P^* = 31 \text{mN} = \text{maximum load applied by the indenter} \]
\[ c = 2.7 \mu m = \text{equilibrium crack length} \]
\[ \sigma_0 = 1.957 \times 10^8 \frac{\text{N}}{\text{m}^2} = \text{diffusion stress} \]
\[ \psi = 0.66 \]

The constant, \( \chi_r \), was experimentally determined by Lawn and Evans through a series of indentation experiments on silicon [26]. The quantity, \( \psi \), is a geometric factor dependent on the half width of the elliptical crack, depth of the crack, and beam thickness [38]. The stress due to the boron diffusion is calculated as follows [27].

\[ \sigma_0 = \frac{\beta E C_s}{(1 - \nu) C_{Si}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.6)

\[ \beta = \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{r_B}{R_{Si}} \right)^3 \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.7)

Where,

\[ E = 1.59 \times 10^{11} \frac{\text{N}}{\text{m}^2} = \text{Young's modulus} \]
\[ C_s = 1 \times 10^{20} / \text{cm}^3 = \text{surface concentration of boron} \]
\[ C_{Si} = 5 \times 10^{22} / \text{cm}^3 = \text{concentration of silicon atoms} \]
\[ \beta = \text{Lattice contraction coefficient} \]
\[ r_B = 0.98 \AA = \text{Atomic radius of boron atom} \]
\[ r_{Si} = 1.17 \AA = \text{Atomic radius of silicon atom} \]
\[ \nu = 0.33 = \text{Poisson's ratio of silicon} \]

With the diffusion stress known, \( K_{IC} \) is computed as \( 8.58 \times 10^5 \frac{\text{N}}{\text{m}^{3/2}} \) which is close to the value of \( 8.2 \times 10^5 \frac{\text{N}}{\text{m}^{3/2}} \) reported by Chen and Leipold [5]. Equation 5.5 is used in the design program FTEST2.PAS to estimate the depth of the pre-crack generated by the nanoindenter.
5.3.3 Compliance Test

The nanoindenter is a load and displacement sensing instrument; therefore, it is possible to use the nanoindenter to obtain a measurement of the stiffness of a released cantilever. A finite element analysis can then be used to compare measured versus calculated values of stiffness. The stiffness of the cantilever computed in the FTEST2.PAS design program is based on the conservative assumption that the cross section of the beam is an ellipse. In fact, the true cross section is more similar to a half ellipse with rounded corners. Therefore, to account for this cross section accurately, the cantilever was modeled with ABAQUS using 8 node brick elements distributed along a parabola defined by the total width and maximum thickness. The value for Young’s modulus used in ABAQUS was $1.59 \times 10^{11}$ N/m$^2$ which corresponds to the average value computed by the nanoindenter in Table 5.1. Poisson’s ratio was assumed to be 0.33 [47].

A T38 series device was etched, then statically deflected by the nanoindenter 25 $\mu$m from the fixed end. The sample was subsequently potted in Lucite, then polished to obtain the true cross section. Figure 5.9 is a top view of the cantilever that was deflected by the nanoindenter, and Figure 5.10 is the cross section. Figure 5.11 is the cross section of the finite element model of the beam, and Figure 5.12 is the mesh plot of the cantilever. Figure 5.13 is a side view of the deflected cantilever mesh. The total width of the beam and thickness of the beam, as measured in Figure 5.10, is 10 $\mu$m and 3.0 $\mu$m, respectively. Figure 5.14 is the load versus displacement plot generated by the nanoindenter as the beam was deflected. The slope of this curve is the stiffness which is calculated by the nanoindenter to be 452.68 N/m$^2$. The calculated stiffness was determined from ABAQUS by applying a load in the z direction at the center end node of the cantilever. A load of 0.5 mN produced a tip displacement of 1.214 $\mu$m; therefore, the stiffness determined from ABAQUS is 411.86 N/m$^2$. The two numbers agree within 10%. In the finite element analysis, it was assumed that silicon is isotropic and homogeneous. However, single crystal silicon is anisotropic and a matrix of elastic constants are used to relate the components of stress to strain. Throughout the dynamic and fatigue modeling of the device, it has been assumed the silicon can be treated as an isotropic homogeneous material. This assumption of homogeneity is valid to the extent that significant dynamic coupling, through the stiffness matrix, was not observed with the spectrum analysis of
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the generation 1 device. The spectrum analysis indicates that the device acts as a single degree of freedom spring, mass, damper system at the first mode resonance. Spurious torsional modes, or out of plane bending modes, were not apparent. Furthermore, given the geometry of a particular device, the frequency and amplitude predicted by the dynamic model correlates closely to the measured values. Therefore, it is likely the principle error in the compliance measurement is the ability of the nanoindenter to accurately position the indenter head precisely 25μm from the base. At best, this positioning accuracy is ±1μm. This test demonstrates the feasibility of break testing pre-cracked devices with the nanoindenter.
Figure 5.9: Top View of T38 Cantilever
Figure 5.10: Cross Section of T28 Cantilever
Figure 5.11: Mesh Plot of T38 Cross Section
Figure 5.12: Mesh Plot of T38 Cantilever
Figure 5.13: Displaced Mesh of T38 Cantilever
Figure 5.14: Load vs. Displacement of T38 Cantilever
Chapter 6

Generation 1 Fatigue Testing (T38 Series)

On August 6 and 7, 1990 several devices were nanoindented at AT&T. One of these devices, designated as the 091890 device, was indented with two side by side indentations 400 nm deep with a 5 μm separation. The location and orientation of the indentations is shown in Figure 6.1. The two indentations produced an elliptical crack 2 μm deep and 8 μm long as shown in Figure 6.2. The device was cycled at maximum amplitude for approximately 1 week. No fatigue was observed. The device was remounted for transport to AT&T where the nanoindenter was used to statically deflect the device until fracture recording both load and displacement. The fractured surface was then photographed with the SEM then sectioned and polished to reveal the true cross section. The computed fracture toughness agrees closely with the measurements; however, the compliance does not. A detailed account of the fatigue and break test follows.

6.1 091890 Fatigue Test

Fatigue testing of the 400 nm double indented device, 091890, commenced on August 23, 1990. The starting natural frequency, recorded in air, was 2070 Hz with a driving voltage of 5 volts. Normally, the uncracked device has a frequency of approximately 2500 Hz; therefore, the device does in fact experience a significant frequency drop caused by the pre-crack indicating
Figure 6.1: Indentation Pattern for 091890 Device
Figure 6.2: Elliptical Crack Geometry
the validity of the experimental technique. Unfortunately, the bridge electrodes of the uncracked devices fell off because of bad metal adhesion so that a comparison of cracked to uncracked device frequencies could not be made. Devices from the same chip are virtually identical and such a frequency comparison would be useful to determine the precise extent of the pre-crack. However, the frequency resolution can be conservatively estimated by assuming a pre-crack of 2 microns and a frequency drop of 500 Hz giving a resolution of 250 Hz/micron. Because the control system can maintain the device on resonance with an accuracy of 1 Hz, a 4 nm crack extension should be detectable with this device. This estimated resolution is close to the theoretical value of approximately 2.5 nm/Hz.

The frequency of the device in air is sensitive to the amplitude of motion. With a driving voltage of 5 volts, the frequency is 2070 Hz; at 11 volts, the frequency is 2040 Hz. Although the absolute level shifts from one test to the next, once a level is established, the relative changes remain small, approximately 0.5 Hz for stable quasi-linear operation. Therefore, overall measurement accuracy is not lost. A number of factors contribute to the sensitivity of frequency to amplitude: nonlinear damping, air mass loading, electrostatic attraction, nonlinearities in the sensor readout, and the variable stiffness of the beam. At low amplitudes the effects are small but still contribute some error to the frequency measurement, particularly from mass loading and nonlinear damping. These combined effects make it difficult to obtain the same starting frequency in air; therefore, baseline frequency measurements are taken in vacuum with a Hewlett-Packard frequency counter at constant test conditions. The test conditions are as follows.

1. $T_d = 30^\circ C$ (device temperature)
2. $P = 200$ mTorr (chamber pressure)
3. $E_d = 1$ volt (down sensor voltage)

The recorded variables, shown for a measurement on 9/11/90, are:

1. $\omega_v = 2076$ Hz (device frequency)
2. $T_a = 25^\circ C$ (ambient air temperature)
3. $E_u = 1$ v (up sensor voltage)
4. $V_0 = 1$ v (driving voltage)

Initially, the device was cycled at low amplitude with a torquing voltage of 5 volts, however, low amplitude motion produced no measurable frequency shift. Therefore, the voltage was incrementally increased until the maximum was reached. The maximum limit, approximately 15 volts, is where the device cannot be driven at higher amplitudes without hitting the bridge electrodes.

After driving the device at high amplitudes for approximately 1 week no frequency shifts were recorded. The device temperature was maintained at 30°C at 75% relative humidity throughout this testing period. The absence of fatigue is perhaps to be expected, considering the stress intensity at the crack site is approximately 3% of the $K_{IC}$ (this value was confirmed by the break test in the next section). Values of 60% to 70% are more typical of what is required to initiate fatigue. At this point, the operating temperature was raised to 100°C in order to lower the activation energy of any temperature dependencies of the corrosion mechanism. After 4 days no shift was recorded, and on 9/18/90 the temperature was raised to 150°C which is near the limit of the temperature control system.

On 9/20/90 it was noted the device amplitude decreases significantly as the temperature is raised. The decrease is attributed to increased damping caused by an increase in the viscosity of the air. At first, the decrease was thought to be caused by thermal breakdown of the pn junction of the device which would result in leakage currents shorting the carrier signal to ground. However, this possibility was eliminated by applying the carrier signal to the beam with the driving voltage off. The output of the pre-amp/post-amp was monitored continuously as the device temperature rose from 30 to 150°C. No change in carrier amplitude was detected. The pn junction was later tested with a curve tracer on the probe station and showed the usual current versus voltage characteristic of a diode. Short circuits across the electrodes were also checked by applying DC voltages to the torquer and sensor electrodes with the curve tracer. Unfortunately, during this testing the device "snapped" to the electrode and excessive current was applied to the structure melting the center portion of the beam. In light of this mishap, a new procedure was adopted for checking continuity with the curve tracer involving a large series resistance. The proximity of the pre-crack to the substrate apparently created enough of a heat sink such that the device did not melt at this point. The device was reinstalled in the test chamber and continued to function but
at a higher baseline frequency of 2257 Hz. Apparently, the cross section of the beam became more square increasing the stiffness accordingly.

After cycling at high amplitude for 24 hrs at 150°C, the frequency was recorded at 2257 Hz on 9/21/90; virtually unchanged from the previous day. Testing resumed, and after 6 consecutive days (9/27/1990 - 10/2/1990) at the maximum amplitude at 150°C, no change in frequency was recorded. At this point it was decided to stop testing.

Given the absence of any frequency shift with this sample, it is fair to say that subcritical crack growth in micromechanical devices does not occur at stress intensity values less than 3% of $K_{IC}$.

### 6.2 091890 Break test

After the fatigue test, the device was removed from the package, remounted for nanoindentation, and transported to AT&T. The nanoindenter was successfully used to statically deflect the cantilever until failure. The load versus displacement curve for the break test is shown in Figure 6.3. The fracture surface was photographed with the SEM at Draper Laboratory as shown in Figure 6.4. The chip was then potted in Lucite and polished such that the true cross section of the cantilever was revealed as shown in Figure 6.5. Sectioning the device is necessary because the SEM exaggerates the dimensions of the cantilever and crack surface when viewed at an angle. Therefore, obtaining a true cross section of the cantilever allows the photos of the fracture surface to be approximately scaled to the correct dimensions.

The software package NASCRAAC was employed to compute the stress intensity of the elliptical crack geometry in order to include the effects of finite width. Equation 6.1 was also used to compute the stress intensity for an elliptical crack in an infinite slab as a comparison to the NASCRAAC values [38].

$$K_I = \frac{2.4M\sqrt{\pi c}}{h^2 b}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.1)

where,

\begin{align*}
M &= 2.25 \times 10^{-10} \text{ Nm} \\
h &= 3 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m} \\
b &= 10 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}
\end{align*}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>$K_I$</th>
<th>$%K_{IC}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASCRAC A</td>
<td>20795</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>31718</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eq. 6.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>15054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: $K_I$ for Elliptical Crack

$$c = 2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}$$

Given the dimensions of the 091890 device, the true cross section of the cantilever, the location, depth, and geometry of the indentation, Table 6.1 gives the computed values for $K_I$ at points A and B in Figure 6.2.

NASCRC gives the maximum stress intensity applied at point B in Figure 6.2 at 3\% of the fracture toughness of silicon, $K_{IC} = 1 \text{ MN/m}^{3/2}$. This value is far below the level necessary to initiate fatigue. Values on the order of 60 to 70\% of $K_{IC}$ are typical of static fatigue experiments with ceramics. The moment necessary to fracture the device is found by dividing $M$ by 3\%.

$$M_f = \frac{M}{0.03}$$

$$= 7.5 \times 10^{-9} \text{ Nm}$$ (6.2)

In reference to the break test, the load necessary to statically fracture the cantilever can be found by dividing the failure moment, $M_f$, by the lever arm of the applied load. The nanoindenter deflected the cantilever 15$\mu$m from the indentation site, and the indentation site was located 10$\mu$m from the fixed end of the cantilever. See Figure 6.1. This translates into a failure load of 0.50 $mN$. Figure 6.3 shows the device failing at 0.38 $mN$ (0.53 - 0.15 mN). The calculated value is 19\% greater than measured. Some error is attributed to the procedure by which the nanoindenter is programed to “find” the surface, and finite thickness effects. Finite width effects were shown to be significant; therefore, finite thickness effects are likely to be significant also.

When an indentation site is specified, the nanoindenter first moves the sample horizontally under the indenter head using precision x-y stepping motors to a position 50$\mu$m from the indentation site. The nanoindenter then makes a coarse surface find which positions the entire indentation head
assembly close to the surface of the sample using a stepping motor in the z-direction. Within the indentation head assembly is the indenter head which is independently controlled in the z-direction via a precision voice coil. The indenter head is a diamond point mounted on a cylindrical metal shaft that is suspended by leaf springs to the head assembly. It is the precise control of the current flowing through this coil that gives the nanoindenter its force/displacement accuracy. After the coarse surface find, the z-motor is shut off and the nanoindenter picks up the indenter head using the voice coil and moves 25\(\mu\text{m}\) closer to the target then rests on the surface allowing the stepping motors to cool, and the machine components to come to thermal equilibrium. Next, the nanoindenter moves above the indentation site and begins lowering from a height of 20\(\mu\text{m}\) until the indenter head is 1\(\mu\text{m}\) from the surface. At this point, the nanoindenter enters the search mode and begins lowering the indenter head at a rate of 10 \(\text{nm/s}\) while continuously measuring its own spring stiffness. These values of stiffness are referred to as the approach data. When the indenter head contacts the surface the stiffness of the sample is combined in parallel with the leaf springs of the nanoindenter and the total stiffness increases until it is a factor of four greater than the stiffness of the nanoindenter. The nanoindenter has now found the surface. The load and displacement settings are zeroed, the approach data purged except for the last 17 points, and the indentation cycle begins. The difficulty arises because the pre-cracked cantilever has a stiffness of 266 \(N/m\) which is only a factor of 3.3 greater than the nanoindenter stiffness, 80 \(N/m\). Therefore, the cantilever is deflected some amount before the nanoindenter realizes it is on the surface so that the curve shown in Figure 6.3 under estimates the actual load applied to the device. Figures 6.7 and 6.6 are regression curves of the actual data saved from the nanoindenter. The approach data has only 17 points but shows no significant transition in spring stiffness from 80 \(N/m\) to 266 \(N/m\); therefore, the “knee” of the curve was not captured and the actual load applied to the device is not known with certainty. After consultation with the inventor of the nanoindenter, the software driving the machine was modified to save several hundred data points of the approach data which was adequate to capture the true surface contact point.

The break test result is still encouraging because the error is only 19\%, not an order of magnitude which would indicate a drastic error. Also, the stiffness of the cracked cantilever was close to the prescribed factor of 4; therefore, the actual load applied to the device must be close to the measured value. The
fracture was purely brittle with no rounding of the curve near the failure load indicating the absence of plastic deformation. Lastly, the method of break testing can be made to work.

Although the load required for failure correlates within 19% of the NASCRAC analysis, the slope of the curve shown in Figure 6.3 does not correlate with the calculated change in stiffness as predicted by fracture mechanics theory. Substituting Equation 6.1 into Equation 4.14 and integrating from 0 to a gives the rotational compliance of the crack.

\[ C(a) = \frac{(2.4a)^2 \pi}{h^4 b E} \] \hspace{1cm} (6.3)

The crack compliance is then related to the displacement of the cantilever at the point of application of the load by defining an equivalent spring stiffness, \( K_c \).

\[ K_c = \frac{1}{C(a)L_a^2} \] \hspace{1cm} (6.4)

where \( L_a \) is the lever arm of the applied load with respect to the indentation.

\( C(a) = 5.26 \times 10^5 \ (N \ m)^{-1} \)

\( L_a = 15 \times 10^{-6} \ m \)

\( K_c = 8.5 \times 10^3 \ N/m^{3/2} \)

\( K_c \) is then added in series with the stiffness of the uncracked beam to give the total stiffness of the cracked cantilever, \( K_T \). The stiffness of the uncracked beam was measured directly with the nanoindenter by deflecting an uncracked beam at the same location as the cracked beam. See Section 5.3.3. The measured stiffness was \( K_{uc} = 452 \ N/m \); therefore, the nanoindenter found the surface accurately, and Figure 5.14 accurately represents the actual loads and displacements applied to the cantilever. The total stiffness of the cracked cantilever is as follows.

\[ K_T = \frac{K_cK_{uc}}{K_c + K_{uc}} \] \hspace{1cm} (6.5)

\[ = 429 \ N/m \]

The stiffness of the pre-cracked cantilever, however, is 266 \( N/m \) which indicates that \( K_c \) should be on the order of 646 \( N/m \) which is a factor of 13 less than the calculated value of \( 8.5 \times 10^3 \). Note however, that Equation 6.1 does not account for finite width or thickness effects; therefore, the value for \( K_c \) would be conservative.
Figure 6.3: Load vs. Displacement to Failure
Figure 6.4: Fracture Surface
Figure 6.5: Cross Section of Cantilever
Figure 6.6: Load Data

The graph shows a linear relationship between load (mN) and displacement (nm). The regression equation is:

\[ L = 0.147848 + 0.000235 \times d \]

The error is 0.000431 and the coefficient of determination \( R^2 \) is 0.99999.
Figure 6.7: Approach Data
6.3 Conclusions of Generation 1 Fatigue Testing

Subcritical crack growth was not measured with the T38, or generation 1, devices. The absence of measurable crack growth is attributed to the design of the device which limited the maximum stress intensity at the crack site to approximately 3% of $K_I$ which is insufficient to initiate fatigue. The generation 1 device design has the following limitations.

1. In the preliminary design stage, the dynamic model of the device incorporated two degrees of freedom for the cracked beam structure leading to a design that was too compliant. A three degree of freedom model was then employed to give a better prediction of the first mode frequency. ABAQUS was used to verify the model. These results were presented in Section 2.2.

2. The beam cannot be fully cracked across the width without failing during etching and rinsing. Calculations show that the surface tension of water trapped in the void below the end plate of the device will cause failure during etching and rinsing.

3. The footings for the sensor electrode, torquer electrode, and counterweight are too closely spaced to achieve uniformity in the photoresist spacer layer. This layer produces the air gap between the end plate and bridge electrodes. Therefore, the air gap dimension cannot be maximized with respect to the required displacement of the beam. This limitation includes devices produced with thicker beams with the generation 1 design.

Because of the limitations described above, (particularly the air gap dimension), the fatigue device must be redesigned and a new mask set issued. The next chapter describes the new generation 2 device design.
Chapter 7

Generation 2 Fatigue Testing
(N141 Series)

7.1 New Device Features

As explained in the last section, the design of the generation 1 devices (T38 series) led to a structure that was too compliant. With these devices, it was not possible to apply a stress intensity at the crack site high enough to initiate slow crack growth. Therefore, the test structure was redesigned greatly increasing the stiffness so that high stresses could be applied at the crack site. As mentioned in Section 2.1, the cantilever configuration has many advantages. Therefore, rather than abandon this concept, the design was optimized. The goal of the redesign effort was to produce a device that could be repeatably pre-cracked with the nanoindenter across the full width of the cantilever, etched, rinsed, packaged, and ultrasonically wire bonded without failure. Following wire bonding, the device must be capable of being broken with the drive electronics given a maximum clearance of 12μm beneath the electrodes. This redesign effort was entirely successful. The principal design changes are enumerated as follows.

1. The separation of the counterweight and sensor electrode was increased from 30 to 100 microns, and the separation between the sensor and torquer electrodes was increased from 30 to 40 microns. The electrode footings were also spaced further apart, from 200 to 400 microns. These changes allowed a thick photoresist spacer layer, approximately 12 mi-
rons, to be spun onto the wafer thereby maximizing the air gap. The electrode footings and counterweight produce step changes in the height of the photoresist which act as boundary conditions on the flow properties of the resist and round somewhat during the postbake destroying uniformity in the air gap dimensions. The postbake is a processing step that cures the photoresist by removing trapped solvents through baking in an oven. Therefore, adequate separation is necessary for uniform coverage at the required thickness.

2. The increased separation of the electrodes and counterweight correspondingly increased the size of the silicon paddle and raised the damping. The higher damping was offset by carefully setting the spacing of the electrode footings which determine the size of the etch window. The 400 micron spacing created a deep well depth beneath the device sufficient to cut damping about a factor of 3 from the generation 1 design. This increase in footing separation was limited by buckling of the electrodes during the low temperature 360°C adhesion bake. This bake is a standard processing step that improves metal to metal adhesion, and metal to oxide adhesion.

3. In addition to lower damping, the deep well design reduces liquid surface tension forces which were identified as the primary cause of failure during the drying step after etching and rinsing. The liquid evaporates from the well last producing negative pressure forces under the paddle which suck the paddle downward causing premature failure. Although the larger paddle area increased this pressure force, the depth of the well had a proportionally greater effect in reducing it from the previous design.

4. The beam was shortened a factor of 2, from 130 microns to 75, and the beam thickness increased from 3 to 8 microns. These design modifications created a much stiffer structure so that high stress intensities could be developed at the crack site given the limited travel under the bridge electrodes. The thick beam allows the cantilever to be fully pre-cracked across the width while leaving a large ligament, about 4 microns thick, which is necessary to prevent failure during etching and rinsing. The length of the beam was limited to 75 microns to retain
adequate clearance for the nanoindenter to indent the base of the cantilever without striking the torquer bridge electrode. The thickness of the beam was also limited to approximately 8 microns by the diffusion time, and to ensure the nanoindenter can indent the beam to the required depth without exceeding the maximum load capability.

5. The height of the gold counterweight was maintained at 15 microns which allowed for easy fabrication. Plating heights greater than 15 microns would not provide adequate clearance for the nanoindenter to indent the cantilever given a 12 micron air gap and a 75 micron beam length. This plating height is also great enough to prevent buckling of the bridge electrodes during the 360°C sinter. A large plating height, however, is desirable to the extent that less voltage is required to drive the structure to a given amplitude at resonance. Furthermore, a lower device frequency means that a lower carrier frequency can be used reducing phase shift at the pre and post amplifiers.

6. Given a stiffer structure, the resonant frequency increased from 3 KHz to 12 KHz which was high enough that the carrier frequency had to be moved from 100 KHz to 300 KHz. Raising the carrier frequency caused too much phase shift at the single stage post-amp creating excessive signal attenuation after demodulation. Therefore, the front end amplifiers were redesigned with a low noise pre-amp and a two stage, high speed post-amp. The carrier signal level was raised from 1 volt to 5 volts improving the signal to noise ratio which was reduced by the large air gap. The stiff structure required torquing voltages of approximately 100 volts so that a step-up transformer was added. However, with the transformer operating at 12 KHz excessive phase shift was added in the torquing circuit, therefore, a phase adjust pot was added to the control circuit allowing the device to be set exactly on resonance. The torquing voltage is limited to less than 300 volts to prevent dielectric breakdown of the field oxide which will cause the torquer electrode to short to the substrate.

7. The bond pads were relocated further from the device to minimize vibration transmission to the device from ultrasonic wire bonding. The electrode footing size was also increased to maximize bridge metal adhesion. Poor adhesion was a constant problem with the generation 1
devices. Because of the large electrode footings and long metal lines to the bond pads, capacitance to the substrate was sufficient that a carrier null circuit at the 2nd stage post-amp was added. See Figure 3.10. The null circuit canceled the static carrier signal prior to demodulation reducing the filtering requirements in the sensor circuit.

Figure 7.1 and Figure 7.2 are schematic diagrams of the redesigned fatigue structure. Figure 7.3 is a SEM photo of an actual generation 2 device.

7.2 102491 Fatigue Test

From 9/30/91 to 10/5/91 several generation 2 devices were nanoindentated at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Of these devices, several were successfully etched, rinsed, packaged and wire bonded for testing. One of these devices, the 102491 device, was nanoindentated with 5 indents at 50 mN with a 4.7μm spacing between indents. The orientation of these indents is shown in Figure 7.4. Testing began on 10/24/91. The relative humidity at the device was approximately 75%. This device, and all other subsequent devices, exhibited similar crack growth behavior. Initially, the frequency drops rapidly with crack velocities on the order of $1.0 \times 10^{-9}$ m/s, then the velocity exponentially decreases to levels on the order of $1.0 \times 10^{-13}$ m/s. Step increases in stress intensity produce the same characteristic fast transient followed by the frequency leveling off. Eight test runs were recorded for the 102491 device, failure occurred on the ninth run. At the start of each run, the voltage was increased producing a step change in stress intensity, followed by the corresponding frequency drop and leveling off. Frequency measurements were continued until further changes were small. Figure 7.5 is the first test run of the 102491 device. Figure 7.6 is the last 2000 seconds of the first run with a linear regression curve fit to the data. From the regression curve, the crack velocity in the slow region is approximately $8.4 \times 10^{-13}$ m/s. Figure 7.7 is the second test run after a step increase in stress intensity. Figure 7.8 is the last 5000 seconds of the second run. Appendix D contains the frequency data for all seven recorded runs of the 102491 device. These runs are condensed and tabulated in Table 7.1 and plotted in Figure 7.9. The lowest crack velocity measured was $8.1 \times 10^{-15}$ m/s; however, considerable error exists in the regression analysis. The frequency may have been dropping, but at a rate that was not detectable given the accuracy of the measuring technique.
Figure 7.1: Generation 2 Fatigue Device (Top View)
Figure 7.2: Generation 2 Fatigue Device (Side View)
Figure 7.3: Generation 2 Fatigue Device (SEM Photo)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>ω₀</th>
<th>ω₀</th>
<th>Δω</th>
<th>V₀</th>
<th>Kᵢ</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>da</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hz</td>
<td>Hz</td>
<td>Hz</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>MN/m³/²</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11101</td>
<td>11082</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>8.4 × 10⁻¹³</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11080</td>
<td>11062</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.82 × 10⁻¹³</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11062</td>
<td>11056</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>8.1 × 10⁻¹⁵</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11057</td>
<td>11055</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.89 × 10⁻¹²</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11057</td>
<td>11051</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>5.25 × 10⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11053</td>
<td>11050</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.55 × 10⁻¹³</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11054</td>
<td>11049</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5.9 × 10⁻¹³</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11050</td>
<td>11049</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.7 × 10⁻¹²</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: 102491 Data: Runs 1 - 8

Improvements in the sensing electronics, particularly the thermal stability of the VCO, should allow for precise measurements of velocities on the order of 10⁻¹⁵ m/s or better.

The characteristic of the fatigue curve is contrary to what was expected given the work of Bhaduri & Wang and Wiederhorn [2][45]. Figure 7.10 is a frequency versus time simulation of the 102491 assuming that crack growth obeys the power law model previously described. The constants used in this model were extracted from Bhaduri & Wang and the FTEST2.PAS design program was used for the simulation.

The initial fast growth region is thought to be a combination of the crack front equilibrating and the intrinsic nature of the observed rate limiting mechanism. The initial series of indentations tends to produce an irregular crack front which then smooths out to a uniform depth across the width of the cantilever. Crack front jumping, or stable fracturing, has been measured in the fast growth region indicating the presence of irregularities in the crack front where locally high stress intensities exceed the fracture toughness. A jump appears as an instantaneous step decrease in frequency in an otherwise smooth monotonically decreasing frequency versus time curve. Following the fast growth region, the velocities in the slow growth region all appear to be relatively on the same order of magnitude regardless of the stress intensity. This behavior suggests that crack growth is independent of stress intensity after the initial transient has occurred.
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7.3 110291 Fatigue Test

The 110291 device was indented with the 102491 device at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. This device had 5 indentations at 60 mN with a 5.5 micron spacing between indentations. This device exhibited the usual fast growth characteristic and the frequency leveling; however, unlike previous devices, the 110291 device was cycled to failure. The calculated starting stress intensity was near the fracture toughness so that a small increase in crack length could cause failure. The frequency versus time curve is shown in Figure 7.11. Figure 7.12 is the fracture surface viewed from an angle of approximately 50° from the vertical. The fracture surface appears as the lower half-ellipse which is lighter in color than the adjacent material. By decreasing the viewing angle to 35.3°, the plane will coincide with the < 111 > plane. Figure 7.13 shows the same fracture surface viewed from an angle of 30° from the vertical. The fracture line, at the time of failure, is clearly visible with uniform depth across the width. The indentation load and baseline starting frequency approximately correlates to the depth of the fracture line. The 130 Hz frequency shift translates to a crack extension of approximately 0.27μm which is equivalent to 1/16" in Figure 7.12. A relatively uniform crack front appears to have been generated by the successive nanoindentations which suggests that the initial fast growth transient recorded with this device could be an accurate representation of the rate limiting mechanism without substantial effects from the crack front equilibrating. However, some irregularities must be present in this initial crack front, for it is very unlikely a perfectly uniform crack front can be generated with successive nanoindentations. The extent to which these minor irregularities affect the fast growth transient is not known.

7.4 011092 Fatigue Test

In this experiment the effect of a dry versus humid environment was examined. The 011092 device was nanoindented at Oak Ridge between 9/30/91 and 10/5/91 with 6 indentations at 50 mN with a 3.7μm spacing between indents. The device was dried to the extent possible by baking for 48 hours at 155°C (the limit of the temperature control system) in the test chamber which was continuously purged with dry N₂ (< 3 ppm H₂O). Following the
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drying, the temperature was reduced to $30^\circ C$, and the test begun. Again, the initial rapid transient occurred followed by the frequency leveling. Figure 7.14 is the frequency versus time data for the first run. Note that a low value of stress intensity, $\approx 10\% K_{1c}$ ($K_{1c} = 1\, MN/m^{1.5}$), produced a significant change in frequency. Following the frequency leveling in the first run, the torquing voltage was increased, thereby, raising the stress intensity to approximately 40% of the fracture toughness. This increase was necessary to obtain a relatively noise free output voltage assuring accurate frequency measurements. Again, a rapid initial frequency drop occurred followed by the typical leveling. The device was allowed to resonate until the frequency remained constant for a period of approximately 48 hrs, then moisture was introduced into the environment. Figure 7.15 shows the effect of adding moisture. The frequency immediately dropped in a manner similar to an increase in stress intensity then leveled off to what appears to be a constant downward slope corresponding to a velocity of $2.75 \times 10^{-13}$ m/s. Over the next 5 days the frequency decreased a total of 42 Hz and the velocity decreased to approximately $4 \times 10^{-14}$ m/s which is near the limit of resolution of the experiment. Accurate measurements below a threshold of approximately $1 \times 10^{-14}$ are not possible for extended periods of time because of thermal drift in the electronics.

7.5 Generation 2 Static Break Test

From 9/30/91 to 10/5/91 several generation 2 devices, without bridge electrodes, were nanoindented at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. These devices were etched then remounted and transported back to Oak Ridge for break testing. The nanoindenter was used to statically deflect the cantilevers until failure recording both load and displacement. To ensure the contact point of the nanoindenter and beam was captured, the software controlling the surface find procedure of the nanoindenter was modified to save the last 200 points of the approach data. The purpose of this series of tests was to determine if the load to failure and compliance are being accurately computed by the design program, FTEST2.PAS. The DS3B2 device was fully pre-cracked across the width of the cantilever with an array of six indentations at an indentation load of 45 mN with a $4\mu m$ spacing between indents. The 45 mN indentation load corresponds to an indentation depth of approximately
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3.3\(\mu\text{m}\). Figure 7.16 shows the fracture surface of the cantilever viewed from an angle of 70° from the vertical. Figure 7.17 shows the fracture surface viewed from a shallow angle of 20° from the vertical. The fracture line is clearly visible in this photo, and is essentially straight except for minor irregularities from the indentations. A similar uncracked device designated as DS3A1 was also deflected so that the uncracked compliance could be used in conjunction with the cracked beam compliance to determine the compliance of the pre-crack alone. Figure 7.18 shows the layout of the two devices and the corresponding cross section. Figure 7.19 is the load versus displacement curve of the uncracked device and Figure 7.20 is the load versus displacement curve of the cracked device. Note that in each case the “knee” of the curve was captured; therefore, the true load applied to the device is known with accuracy. The experimental values of crack compliance and fracture toughness will now be computed and compared to those obtained from Murakami’s equations [34]. To compute the uncracked compliance, the compliance of the DS3A1 device is used and corrected for the difference in length.

\[
K_{uc} = 6082 \left( \frac{24.9}{25.7} \right)^3
\]

\[
K_{uc} = 5530 \text{ N/M}
\]  

(7.1) \hspace{1cm} (7.2)

Next, the rotational stiffness at the crack site is computed using the value for the uncracked stiffness and the cracked beam stiffness.

\[
K_r = L_a^2 \left( \frac{K_c K_{uc}}{K_{uc} - K_c} \right)
\]

\[
K_r = 3.534 \times 10^{-6} \text{ Nm}
\]  

(7.3) \hspace{1cm} (7.4)

The stiffness computed using Murakami’s equations gives: \(K_r = 3.48 \times 10^{-6} \text{ Nm}\) which is 2% less than measured. The fracture toughness is computed as follows.

\[
K_{1C} = k(a)M_f
\]

\[
M_f = P_f L_a
\]  

(7.5) \hspace{1cm} (7.6)

\(P_f\) is the failure load recorded by the nanoindenter: \(P_f = 2.129 \text{ mN}\) from Figure 7.20. This failure load gives \(K_{1C} = 0.71 \text{ MN/m}^{3/2}\) which is approximately 30% less than the reported value of 1 MN/m\(^{3/2}\) given in the literature. It is likely the lower value is attributed to the fact the cross section
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of the cantilever is angled and rounded somewhat as shown in Figure 7.18. Murakami's equations were derived for a bar of rectangular cross section; therefore, a higher stress intensity would be computed because the ligament thickness of the angled section is small near the edges.

The results of the break test confirm the validity of the equations being used in the FTEST2.PAS design program to the extent that gross errors are not apparent. Fracture is $K_1$ controlled. Compliance is accurately modeled, therefore, frequency shifts are accurately correlated to crack extensions. The compliance of the pre-crack is linear. This fact is important because nonlinear spring effects, such as hardening, will create an undesirable frequency sensitivity to amplitude. Such nonlinearities are not present; however, the spring stiffness cannot be measured in the reverse direction. In some devices, particularly those that may not be fully pre-cracked, a frequency sensitivity to amplitude has been measured. A 25 Hz per volt sensor output was measured for the 102591 device. It is possible some hardening effects are present on the upswing as the crack closes and compresses the surrounding silicon. If the damage zone created by the nanoindentations has a nonlinear stiffness characteristic that depends on amplitude, a frequency sensitivity to amplitude will be introduced. In general, for fully pre-cracked beams, a strong frequency sensitivity to amplitude has not been measured.

7.6 020392 Fatigue Test

The 020392 device was nanoindented at Oak Ridge between 9/30/91 and 10/5/91. This device had 6 indentations at 55 mN with a 4μm spacing between indents. To verify that fracture can be initiated with a $K_1$ controlled load following extended fatigue, the 020392 device was cycled for 3 days then fractured with the drive electronics recording both displacement and applied voltage. In the first run, the device exhibited the usual fast growth fatigue characteristic followed by the frequency leveling. The stress intensity was approximately 0.45 MN/m$^{3/2}$, and the velocity in the slow growth region was approximately $2.14 \times 10^{-14}$m/s. In the second run, the torquing voltage was increased raising the stress intensity to 0.61 MN/m$^{3/2}$. Again the usual fast transient was observed with the corresponding leveling. Although the resolution was poor, a velocity in the slow growth region was measured to be approximately $2.4 \times 10^{-15}$ m/s. Figures 7.21 and 7.22 are the frequency
versus time plots of the data. In the last run, the voltage was increased until failure recording both sensor output and torquing voltage. Using the FTEST2.PAS design program and careful measurements of the device geometry with a microscope and filar, the failure displacement corresponds to a fracture toughness of 0.67 MN/m\(^{3/2}\). This number is close to the value of 0.71 MN/m\(^{3/2}\) recorded during the static break test with the nanoindenter. The significance of this result indicates that extended cycling does not reduce the stress intensity dramatically, and therefore, rules out two possible explanations for the rate limiting process. The first explanation is crack tip blunting whereby the crack tip rounds to the extent that a \(K_I\) dominant stress field is no longer obtained, and consequently, causes the corrosion mechanism to slow or stop. The second explanation is that the crack extends and changes its geometry in a manner that causes the stress intensity to decrease, and again, causes the corrosion mechanism to slow or stop. These explanations are unlikely for two reasons: first, the total frequency shift for runs 1 and 2 corresponds to a crack extension of 19 nm which would not appreciably affect the pre-crack geometry; second, much larger displacements than measured would have been required to fracture the devices if either of these mechanisms were operating. Therefore, the rate limiting process observed in these experiments should not be interpreted as a reduction in stress intensity.

### 7.7 Observations of Generation 2 Fatigue Testing

The principal observations of these experiments are as follows.

1. Nano scale crack growth in heavily boron doped single crystal silicon micromechanical devices has been measured. Crack extensions on the order of 200 to 300 nm have been measured with a resolution of approximately 1 part in 100. These extensions are on the order of 20 to 30 times the 10 to 20 Å oxide film that forms when freshly cleaved silicon is exposed to a moist room temperature environment.

2. The fatigue mechanism is a fundamentally rate limiting process. Starter pre-cracks do not exponentially grow with stress intensity ultimately causing failure. However, failure can be caused if the starting stress
020392 Run 1
Averaged data

\[ \text{wi} = 10714 \text{ Hz} \]
\[ \text{wf} = 10710 \text{ Hz} \]
\[ \text{dw} = -3.63 \text{ Hz} \]
\[ \text{da} = 9 \text{ nm} \]
\[ K_1 = 0.45 \text{ MN/m}^{(1.5)} \]
\[ \frac{\text{da}}{\text{dw}} = 2.5 \text{ nm/Hz} \]
\[ \text{Slope} = -8.3\times10^{-6} \text{ Hz/s} \]
\[ V = 2.1\times10^{-14} \text{ m/s} \]

Figure 7.21: 020392 Run 1
020392 Run 2

\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_i &= 10712 \text{ Hz} \\
\omega_f &= 10708 \text{ Hz} \\
\Delta\omega &= -4 \text{ Hz} \\
K_1 &= 0.61 \text{ MN/m}^{(1.5)} \\
\text{Slope} &= -9.6 \times 10^{-7} \text{ Hz/s} \\
\frac{\text{da}}{\Delta\omega} &= 2.5 \text{ nm/Hz} \\
\text{da} &= 10 \text{ nm}
\end{align*}
\]

\[V = 2.4 \times 10^{-15} \text{ m/s}\]

Figure 7.22: 020392 Run 2
intensity is very near the fracture toughness. Initially, crack growth occurs rapidly with velocities on the order of $1.0 \times 10^{-9}$ m/s, but exponentially decays to velocities that cannot be accurately measured. The lower bound on accurate measurements is approximately $1.0 \times 10^{-14}$ m/s.

3. Step increases in stress intensity cause similar fast growth transients followed by the exponential leveling off. Step changes in the moisture content also produce fast growth transients, similar in character to those obtained by increases in stress intensity alone, followed by a decaying velocity.

4. The crack growth characteristics are repeatable. Similar fatigue characteristics have been observed in separate devices from the same wafer, and with separate devices from a different wafer processed independently.

5. Similar rate limiting crack growth behavior has been observed in devices with resonant frequencies of 7 KHz and 12 KHz respectively, and stress intensities varying from $30\%K_{IC}$ to $97\%K_{IC}$. High stress intensities do not alter the rate limiting process, or introduce an exponentially increasing crack velocity. Failure, when it occurs, is instantaneous.

6. The observed fatigue crack growth appears to be induced by corrosive species in the environment, especially water. A step increase in humidity, from $\approx 0\%$ to $\approx 75\%$ RH, produced a distinctive fast crack growth transient followed by a long decay in crack velocity. The crack extensions are on the order of 50 times the thickness of the 20 to 40 angstrom silica layer initially present indicating that a corrosion/oxidation mechanism, similar to that previously described, does operate for a finite period of time.

7. The exponentially decreasing crack velocity in the fast region may be intrinsic to the rate limiting mechanism rather than just the crack front equilibrating. The crack extension obtained in the 110291 test is too small to substantially change the uniformity of the starting crack front. However, the precise extent to which minor irregularities in the crack front affect fast crack growth is unknown. Crack front jumping,
which are clearly distinguishable step changes in frequency, have been measured in the fast region. These step changes are probably the crack front equilibrating.

8. Crack growth in the slow growth region appears to be independent of stress intensity as observed in the experiments with the 102491 device. Table 7.1 shows crack velocities in the slow growth region are on the order of $1.0 \times 10^{-13}$ m/s even though the stress intensities differ significantly.

9. Fracture mechanics applies on a micro-scale. The static break tests of the generation 2 devices gives reasonable correlation with the predicted failure load, and good correlation with compliance. No rounding in the load versus displacement curve was measured suggesting the absence of measurable plastic deformation.

10. The rate limiting process is not caused by a reduction in stress intensity. Following extended cycling, the dynamic break test of the 020392 device correlates with the predicted failure displacement assuming $K_1$ controlled fracture. Crack tip blunting, or other $K_1$ reducing mechanisms, do not appear to occur to a significant extent.
Chapter 8

Summary

This experiment was conceived and executed for two purposes: first, to introduce and demonstrate a novel fatigue testing technique particularly suited for micromechanical testing; and second, to utilize the technique in an experimental investigation of nano scale fracture and fatigue of silicon based micro electro-mechanical devices. The technique has been proven: micromechanical designers and material scientists now have a vehicle through which micron size test structures processed in various ways can be fractured and fatigued in a range of environments, temperatures, and pressures. New information and insight into the failure mechanisms of single crystal silicon micromechanical devices has been obtained and presented.

The initial objective of the experiment was to design and construct a micromechanical fatigue test structure, and the associated systems, such that the required experimental data could be obtained. The cantilever structure was chosen for simplicity of fabrication and the relatively straightforward dynamic modeling. An accurate model of the device, and the pre-crack, is important as an analytical aid in designing the device for optimal performance, and in the analysis of predicted and measured frequency shifts during operation. Many tradeoffs were necessary both in the electronics and in the mechanics of the device to achieve a successful design. The critical tradeoffs are enumerated as follows.

1. Noise in the sensing electronics was a major consideration in designing the interface electronics and in setting the electrode air gap dimensions. A large signal to noise is desirable so that the zero crossings of the sensor
output signal can be precisely determined. The signal to noise ratio is defined as the sensor output voltage, assuming zero noise, divided by the RMS sensor output assuming the device is not moving and only noise is present. The smaller the air gap, the higher the signal to noise ratio; however, small air gaps limit the travel of the end plate and the stress at the crack site. Large air gaps, $> 12\mu m$, are limited by the fabrication process.

2. Low resonant frequencies, $\approx 3KHz$, are desirable because the frequency of the carrier signal can be kept near 100 KHz which minimizes phase shift in the post amplifiers. This phase shift translates into signal attenuation following demodulation, and therefore, reduces the signal to noise ratio. However, a low resonant frequency implies that the structure is compliant; consequently, large displacements are required to generate adequate stress at the crack site. Again, the air gap limits the total travel of the end plate.

3. The thickness of the cantilever is limited by the boron diffusion time. A thick beam is desirable because a large ligament thickness is possible at the crack site making the structure resistant to unintentional failure caused by surface tension forces during etching and rinsing, or vibration transmission from ultrasonic wirebonding. However, a very long diffusion time severely weakens the field oxide mask by destroying the dielectric properties of the oxide and by creating pin holes. An inevitable consequence of a thick beam is a stiff structure which requires a large driving voltage to obtain adequate stress at the crack site and an acceptable signal to noise ratio. Voltages that are too high break down the weakened oxide, particularly at the pin holes, resulting in the electrodes shorting to the substrate. A 13 hour diffusion results in a beam thickness of approximately $8\mu m$. Based on experience, a $1\mu m$ field oxide subjected to this boron diffusion can withstand 100 volts indefinitely about 50% of the time.

4. To generate adequate stress at the crack site, given the displacement constraint at the bridge electrodes, a stiff structure is necessary. Aside from increasing the thickness, the length of the beam can be shortened. However, clearance for the nanoindenter must be maintained at the bridge electrodes. Given a maximum plating height of $15\mu m$ and a
maximum electrode air gap of $12 \mu m$, the length is limited to no less than $75 \mu m$. The same cautions about excessive voltage and signal to noise ratio apply.

5. The plating height of the counterweight and bridge electrodes is limited by the fabrication process to approximately $15 \mu m$. Larger plating heights are possible, but require more complex processing. Maximizing the plating height is desirable because the resonant frequency is reduced, and the voltage necessary to drive the device to a given amplitude at resonance is reduced. A further advantage is an increase in the stiffness of the bridge electrodes which eliminates buckling during the low temperature $360^\circ C$ sinter. This sinter is a standard processing step that improves metal adhesion.

Other tradeoffs and modeling tasks were important such as the dynamics associated with flexing of the end plate, torsional modes, out of plane bending modes, bridge electrode vibration, and especially damping. Low viscous damping at atmospheric pressure is necessary for two reasons. First, a predominately AC displacement must be generated so that large tensile stresses are applied at the crack site. At resonance, the AC amplitude depends inversely on damping. Second, low driving voltages, $< 100$ volts, prevents accumulative damage to the oxide and minimizes the DC force that pulls the plate toward the electrode (recall that the electrostatic force depends on the voltage squared). Therefore, modeling and minimizing damping is important. To accomplish these tasks, and perform the tradeoffs, numerous repetitive calculations are involved; therefore, a design program was written in PASCAL incorporating all aspects of modeling and analysis. This program is designated as FTEST2.PAS.

Finite element modeling of the structure and numerical simulations of the crack nonlinearity proved the accuracy of the equations being used in the design program. Break tests and compliance measurements with the nanoindenter also verified that the equations being used to compute the rotational stiffness of the crack and the stress intensity are not introducing gross errors. Therefore, a high degree of confidence exists in correlating the frequency data to crack extension, and in determining the accuracy of the measurement technique. Uncracked devices have been continuously run for periods up to 1 week with frequency shifts less than 1 Hz which indicates the stability of the sensing system.
Two important parameters are determined from the FTEST2.PAS design program in determining the fatigue history of a device: crack extension, $\delta a$, and stress intensity, $K_I$. The total length of the pre-crack can be determined in several ways: the baseline frequency of the cracked device, the indentation load of the nanoindenter, and measurements from SEM photos of the fracture surface once the experiment is complete. However, the crack extensions measured are too small for adequate resolution with the SEM, and therefore, must determined from the frequency data using the dynamic model. $K_I$ is also determined from the dynamic model and the measured amplitude of motion. The method of computing $\delta a$, $K_I$, and the measurement error is now summarized.

To analyze a particular device, the geometry is first determined by measuring all dimensions of the device. Planar dimensions are those specified on the photomask and are accurately measured with the microscope and filar. The actual planar dimensions are approximately 3 to 5 $\mu m$ greater than the photomask dimensions because during processing the boron diffusion occurs outward, as well as downward into the silicon. Air gap dimensions and plating heights are determined by depth of field measurements with the microscope. The thickness of the device is determined from a test wafer diffused simultaneously with the device wafer. After diffusion, the test wafer is stained to reveal the extent of the boron diffusion then etched. An accurate measurement of the etch stop depth is made with the microscope and filar. The exact thickness of the device under test cannot be measured until the experiment is complete and the device cross sectioned for SEM analysis; however, etch stop depths generally do not vary by more than 5% on a given wafer.

The measured dimensions of the device are input to the design program including the nanoindentation load which can be related to the pre-crack depth through Equation 5.5 or post SEM analysis of the fracture surface. The natural frequency and amplitude of motion of the pre-cracked device is then measured and correlated to the dynamic model.

The stress intensity is computed by first determining the moment applied at the crack site. The moment is computed from the polynomial which approximates the beam deflection and the first mode solution of the dynamic model.

$$v_b(x, t) = v_1(t) \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^2 + v_2(t) \left( \frac{x}{\ell_{ac}} \right)^3 + \theta(x - \ell_{ab}) \quad \ell_{ab} \leq x \leq \ell_{ac} \quad (8.1)$$
\[ M_0(x, t) = EI \frac{\partial^2 v(t, x)}{\partial x^2} \quad (8.2) \]

\[ M_0(\ell_{ab}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2EI}{c_{ac}} & \frac{6EI}{c_{ac}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}(t) \quad (8.3) \]

\( \mathbf{U}(t) \) is the vector of generalized coordinates, \( v_1(t), v_2(t), \) and \( v_3(t). \) These coordinates are determined from the first mode solution of the equations of motion.

\[ \mathbf{M} \ddot{\mathbf{U}} + \mathbf{C} \dot{\mathbf{U}} + \mathbf{K} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{P}_0 \quad (8.4) \]

The displacement vector is a superposition of the three modes of the system model. Because the structure is driven at the first mode resonance, the first mode solution accurately approximates the true motion of the structure. The higher modes in the 2D Lagrangian model are spurious. Recall that a 3D finite element analysis shows that the next two modes are out of plane bending and torsion which was not included in the dynamic analysis.

\[ \mathbf{U} = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \phi_i x_i(t) \approx \phi_1 x_1(t) \quad (8.5) \]

Dropping the subscripts, the solution of the system at the first mode resonance in steady harmonic motion is given as follows.

\[ x(t) = \frac{-p_0 \sin(\omega_n t)}{\omega_n} \quad (8.6) \]

Therefore, the moment is computed as follows.

\[ M_0(\ell_{ab}, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2EI}{c_{ac}} & \frac{6EI}{c_{ac}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \phi_1 \frac{-p_0 \sin(\omega_n t)}{\omega_n} \quad (8.7) \]

Using either Murakami's equation or the deep cracked beam equation the stress intensity is computed as follows.

\[ K_1 = k(a) \quad (8.8) \]

The accuracy of the equation for \( M_0 \) is contingent on the natural frequency, \( \omega_n \); the damping, \( c; \) and the forcing function, \( p_0. \) The natural frequency is measured directly with the frequency counter and accurately correlates with the dynamic model. The accuracy of the model was verified by linear finite element analysis, nonlinear numerical simulations, and the compliance data.
from the break tests with the nanoindenter. The equation for the forcing function, \( p_0 \), is given below.

\[
p_0 = \phi_1^T \eta \frac{\epsilon_0 A TV_{T0}^2}{4d_0^2}
\]  

(8.9)

where,

\[
\epsilon_0 = \text{permittivity of a vacuum: } \left( \frac{\text{coul}^2}{\text{N m}^2} \right)
\]

\[
d_0 = \text{air gap: } (\text{m})
\]

\[
V_{T0} = \text{magnitude of driving voltage: } (\text{volts})
\]

\[
A_T = \text{torquer electrode area: } (\text{m}^2)
\]

\[
\eta = \text{vector of length ratios defined in Section 2.3}
\]

The driving voltage, \( V_{T0} \), is measured directly with a digital volt meter. The electrode area, \( A_T \), is specified by the mask dimension and can be measured with the microscope and filar. Therefore, the accuracy of \( p_0 \) depends primarily on the air gap dimension, \( d_0 \). The air gap is approximately 12\( \mu \text{m} \) and can be measured to \( \pm 1 \mu \text{m} \) using depth of field.

Because the pre-crack introduces additional damping that is difficult to characterize, the principal uncertainty in determining \( M_0 \) is the damping constant, \( c \). Therefore, this parameter is adjusted in the model until the measured sensor output agrees with the calculated value. The expression for the sensor output is given by Equation 3.31 and is restated below.

\[
V_0 = -k_s \frac{v_s(t)}{1 - \frac{v_s(t)}{d_0}}
\]  

(8.10)

where,

\[
V_0 = \text{sensor output: } (\text{volts})
\]

\[
k_s = \text{sensor constant: } (\text{volts/m})
\]

\[
v_s(t) = -v_{s0} \sin(\omega t) \text{ plate displacement under sensor: } (\text{m})
\]

\[
v_{s0} = \xi^T \phi_1 \frac{p_0}{\omega_n}
\]

\[
\xi = \text{a vector of length ratios defined in Section 2.3}
\]
The sensor constant can be determined experimentally by measuring the output of the post amplifiers for the zero displacement position of the device, and by inputting known test signals into the sensing electronics and measuring the output. Therefore, the sensor output is a measure of the same parameters that determine the moment. The accuracy also depends on the air gap, $d_0$. The sensor output voltage error is determined by differentiating $V_0$ with respect to $d_0$ and normalizing. Performing this differentiation and simplifying gives the following expression for the error in the displacement measurement.

$$\frac{dV_0}{V_0} = \frac{3\delta d_0}{d_0 - v_s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.11)

$\delta d_0$ is the uncertainty in the air gap dimension. For $\delta d_0 = 1\mu m$, $d_0 = 12\mu m$, and $v_s = \pm 4\mu m$, the error in the displacement measurement is 37% as the end plate nears the electrode, and 19% on the downswing. The downswing measurements were used in calibrating the damping at the crack site. The error analysis indicates that $M_0$ and $K_f$ are known with an accuracy of approximately 20%. However, the amplitude at failure and the driving voltage at failure are two additional pieces of information that can be used with the dynamic model to calibrate the range of values of $K_f$ applied to the device during the test runs. Based on values reported in the literature, fracture in silicon occurs when $K_{fc} = 1$ MN/m$^{3/2}$. The data from the static break tests indicate that fracture occurs when $K_f = 0.71$ MN/m$^{3/2}$ as computed using Murakami's equation. However, this equation was developed for a rectangular beam with a constant ligament thickness, and therefore, probably underestimates the true stress intensity near the ends where the ligament thickness is smaller. Because all of the devices have similar crack geometries, beam cross sections, and indentation depths, Murakami's equation can be used with some degree of confidence to calibrate how close a particular device is to fracture. The results of the dynamic break test of the 020392 device demonstrate the correlation of predicting fracture using the dynamic model and Murakami's equation to the value obtained from the break test. The two numbers for $K_f$ agreed within 7%. Therefore, given the geometry of the device to measurement accuracy, the resonant frequency, the driving voltage at failure, the amplitude at failure, and the break test data as a reference point for determining when $K_{fc}$ is exceeded, the dynamic model using Murakami's equation provides an estimate of the true stress intensity of approximately 10% to not more than 20%.
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The crack extension, $\delta a$, is computed by incrementing the crack length in the equation for the compliance of the pre-crack, $C_0(a)$, then solving for the frequency directly from the modal analysis in the design program. Damping, air gap dimensions, voltages, amplifiers, demodulator and filter gains are not involved in this computation. The accuracy of calculating the exact amount of crack extension is determined by how accurately Murakami's equation, or the deep cracked beam equation, models compliance; and the accuracy of the dynamic model. The break test data indicates that Murakami's equation for compliance is modeled with an accuracy of 2%. Finite element analysis and numerical simulations also verified the equations of motion used to model the structure are accurate. Therefore, the calculated values of crack extension are believed to be a close approximation of the true extensions. To correlate crack extension to frequency with greater precision requires extensive modeling of the true crack geometry using finite elements or other suitable modeling software. It should be noted that the actual crack advance is not measured. Before and after crack length measurements are not possible with the cantilever geometry, and post failure SEM analysis does not have the resolution necessary to unmistakably determine the geometry of the crack advance; therefore, an assumed crack advance would also be involved in using finite element analysis.
Chapter 9

Conclusions and Recommendations

Slow crack growth in heavily boron doped single crystal silicon has been unmistakably measured. The fatigue characteristic is a fundamentally rate limiting process that is affected by the presence of a corrosive species in the environment. Water which is both aggressive and ubiquitous in most operating environments has been shown to dramatically increase crack growth in single crystal silicon micromechanical devices. Failure can be caused by crack extension, and therefore, is an issue in assessing the reliability of a silicon based micromechanical device. Fracture mechanics theories apply on a microscale; however, theories governing crack growth rates and mechanisms may need to be rethought. Fatigue crack growth in silicon and silica macroscale double torsion specimens exhibit classical static fatigue crack growth where crack velocity exponentially depends on $K_I$; however, this does not appear to be the case for silicon on a micro-scale.

The exact nature and cause of the rate limiting process remains unresolved. The issue is complex and requires extensive study and alternative avenues of experimentation to determine the controlling factor. Three major categories of study are enumerated and discussed as follows.

1. Surface chemistry effects:
   
   (a) Kinetics of crack growth in silica.
   
   (b) Kinetics of oxide formation.
2. Crack closure effects.

3. Size effects.

Surface chemistry effects are present and do play a role enhancing static stress corrosion fatigue of silicon. The experimental data of the 011092 device exhibited a strong sensitivity to moisture in the environment which, we postulate, is caused by a corrosion/oxidation mechanism whereby a crack propagates through the surface silica layer exposing fresh silicon that is then instantly oxidized and subjected to chemical attack propagating the crack further. A rate limiting process is observed; however, by assuming the chemical kinetics of crack growth in silica and oxide formation are mutually exclusive processes that cannot occur simultaneously, one is faced with the ambiguity of sustained macro-scale static fatigue of silicon [2]. A size effect is implicated, however, it is not certain at this point that this, or some other rate limiting mechanism, is the controlling factor. The two possibilities, crack closure and size effects, should be rigorously examined.

A size effect is present if the laws governing static fatigue crack growth are fundamentally different on a micro-scale than on a macro-scale. To eliminate the complexity of the chemical kinetics associated with oxide formation, a micromechanical fatigue device can be constructed from pure SiO₂. The fabrication processes for silica micromechanical devices exist, and a candidate design is discussed in the next section. Fatigue of silica glasses has been extensively studied and a large body of literature is available concerning the kinetics of crack growth in macro-scale silica specimens. Therefore, a solid framework for comparison of macro versus micro static fatigue is established. To unambiguously determine if a size effect is present, the device should be designed such that only tensile stresses are applied to the crack site so that no crack closure occurs. If a rate limiting process occurs in the silica device, a size effect has been established and this becomes the focus of the research. If, on the other hand, micro-scale static fatigue replicates macro-scale fatigue, then a dynamic fatigue experiment should be the next step where the two crack faces come into contact. If a rate limiting process occurs, then one has established that crack closure causes the static fatigue process to cease. If no rate limiting process is measured, then crack closure is not an issue.

If no rate limiting mechanisms are found with the pure silica devices, we proceed as before with identical silicon structures. The first experiments involve large static loads where the two crack faces do not come into contact.
If a rate limiting process is observed, the issue is one of understanding the chemical kinetics at the crack tip on a micro-scale. Experiments utilizing highly controlled environments, and if feasible, in situ experiments utilizing surface chemistry analysis such as Auger can be considered. Because macro-scale fatigue of silicon has been demonstrated, a size effect that is unique to silicon may be established. However, additional macro-scale static fatigue experiments are also probably in order to verify that silicon does in fact exhibit macro-scale fatigue. If no rate limiting process is observed in the micromechanical structure, dynamic fatigue experiments where the crack faces come into contact should attempted next. By elimination, a rate limiting process should be observed. The differences and ambiguities between the silica and silicon devices would need further study.

The resolution of this experimental technique has allowed for the measurement of crack extensions on the order of 2 to 3 nanometers and crack growth velocities as low as $1.0 \times 10^{-14}$ m/s. No other experimental techniques or measurements reported in the known body of literature has matched the resolution and accuracy obtained. Prior to this thesis, virtually nothing was known about fracture or fatigue on a micro-scale, nor had any experimental techniques been developed to address the reliability of micromechanical devices from a unified standpoint with the level of sophistication necessary to produce meaningful results. This research has accomplished both these goals, and represents an important advance in obtaining new insight into the fatigue and fracture characteristics of silicon based micromechanical devices. The experimental technique has been proven to be an accurate and viable approach that can be extended to polysilicon, silica, and metal structures.

Although the cantilever was a successful concept, a number of limitations have been identified and are listed below.

1. Crack length and extension cannot be measured directly with a microscope, rather, these variables are inferred from the indentation load, initial frequency, subsequent frequency shifts, and post failure SEM examination.

2. The capacitance air gap cannot be measured directly and is constrained by the fabrication process to about 12\(\mu\)m; therefore, the maximum amplitude of the device is limited by a process constraint rather than a design specification and some uncertainty exists in determining the actual amplitude of the device during operation.
3. The pre-crack is generated by a series of indentations which does not produce a uniform crack front and introduces damage at the surface of the cantilever. The damage zone may be responsible for a frequency sensitivity to amplitude, and the nonuniform crack front makes it difficult to attribute the fast growth transient exclusively to the crack front equilibrating, or to an intrinsic property of the rate limiting mechanism.

4. The beam is not rectangular in cross section; therefore, given a constant indentation depth, the ligament thickness varies across the width of the cantilever producing a variable stress intensity. Modeling this variation is not simple.

5. DC loads cannot be applied to the structure that will put the pre-crack in a constant state of tension. A fatigue experiment utilizing resonant frequency measurements where the two crack faces do not come into contact is not possible.

Figure 9.1 is the plan view of a new fatigue/fracture test structure which avoids the problems described above and is considered an advance over the current cantilever design. The structure is a Y shaped resonant device with two tines extending from a central beam cantilevered over the substrate, or, in the case of boron doped single crystal silicon a well. The thickness is on the order of 1\( \mu \text{m} \) or less and the excitation is in plane. Counterweights are positioned at the ends of the tines which lower the natural frequency and provide surface area for electrostatic forcing. The advantages are described as follows.

1. The pre-crack length and crack extension can be directly measured with a microscope and filar. \textit{In situ} experiments with Auger or SEM may be possible because a plan view of the crack is possible.

2. A single nanoindentation can generate a crack of uniform depth through the entire thickness of the structure without introducing residual surface damage, or additional cracks, following etching. Time on the nanoindenter is also greatly reduced. The crack can be accurately characterized with handbook equations.

3. The thickness of the structure is small enough that alternative materials requiring a deposition process can be used for fabrication: polysilicon, nickel, tungsten, silica.
4. Finite element modeling of the structure, particularly the crack using singular elements, is greatly simplified through the use of 2D plane stress elements.

5. The total allowable deflection of the tines is determined by the photo mask dimensions that are controlled by the designer, not a process limitation.

6. The air gap spacing for the sensor and torquer can be measured directly with a microscope and filar, rather than inferred from optical depth of field and electrical measurements.

7. The thickness of the structure is small enough that precise thickness measurements can be made with the Nanospec.

8. DC electrostatic forces can be applied to the structure such that fatigue experiments that do not cause the crack faces to come into contact are possible.

Dynamically, the Y shaped structure is more of a challenge to model than the simple cantilever and probably will not have the same frequency sensitivity to crack growth. Modal analysis and optimization is again the key to good performance. Despite a likely reduction in frequency sensitivity, this design can be fully characterized with simple and highly accurate measurement techniques introducing very little uncertainty in interpreting frequency shifts as crack growth. Finally, because the mode of operation is in-plane, the baseline frequency of this structure will likely be high, \( \approx 25 \text{ KHz} \); therefore, phase shift in the post amplifiers may cause excessive signal attenuation. Further refinements in the sensing electronics will probably be necessary. Long term thermal stability of the system could be improved by designing and building a stable VCO. Alternatively, self resonant AC control schemes that do not require a VCO and DC signals could be explored. Fatigue experiments that do not put the crack faces into contact should be possible. A high DC voltage, approximately 300 volts, could be applied to the electrodes summed with an AC tickle voltage that resonates the structure enough to pick off the zero crossings of the response. High speed measurements of the resonant frequency, approximately 100 Hz acquisition rate, are possible with the more elaborate HP frequency counters with the GPIB interface. This
Figure 9.1: Generation 3 Design
technique utilizes the advantages of measuring frequency, eliminates the dynamic nonlinearity of the pre-crack, and allows the effects of crack closure to be examined with regard to the rate limiting process.
Appendix A

Frequency Calculation

In this section, frequencies are calculated for the 2 degree of freedom dynamic model and single degree of freedom models. The computations were performed with the aid of the design program, FTEST2.PAS, using the T38 structure as the baseline model. The design program is the primary modeling and analysis tool for this experiment. A copy of the code is included in Appendix G.7.

A.1 Two Degree of Freedom Model

\[ \omega_1 = \sqrt{\frac{A - (A^2 - 4B)^{1/2}}{2}} \]
\[ = \frac{2745 \text{ Hz}}{2} \]
\[ \omega_2 = \sqrt{\frac{A + (A^2 - 4B)^{1/2}}{2}} \]
\[ = \frac{102153 \text{ Hz}}{2} \]

where,

\[ A = \frac{k_{11}m_{22} + k_{22}m_{11} - 2m_{12}k_{12}}{m_{11}m_{22} - m_{12}^2} \]
\[ = 4.123 \times 10^{11} \]
\[ B = \frac{k_{11}k_{22} - k_{12}^2}{m_{11}m_{22} - m_{12}^2} \]
\[ = 1.226 \times 10^{20} \]

\[
k_{11} = 3.986
k_{12} = 5.978
k_{21} = 5.978
k_{22} = 11.96
\]

\[
m_{11} = 1.290 \times 10^{-8}
m_{12} = 1.717 \times 10^{-8}
m_{21} = 1.717 \times 10^{-8}
m_{22} = 2.286 \times 10^{-8}
\]

A.2 Single Degree of Freedom (Translational)

\[
K_c = \frac{3EI}{\ell_{ac}^3 (1 + \frac{3\ell_{ca}}{2\ell_{ac}})}
\]

\[
= 1.233 \frac{N}{m}
\]

\[
\omega_c = \sqrt{\frac{K_c}{M}}
\]

\[
= 4554 \text{ Hz}
\]

where,

\[
E = 1.59 \times 10^{11} \frac{N}{m^2}
\]

\[
I = 1.377 \times 10^{-23} \text{ m}^4
\]

\[
\ell_{ac} = 1.3 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}
\]

\[
\ell_{ca} = 1.235 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}
\]

\[
M = 1.506 \times 10^{-9} \text{ kg}
\]
A.3 Single Degree of Freedom (Rotational)

\[ \bar{I}_A = M (\ell_{cgy} + \ell_{ac})^2 + \bar{I} \]
\[ = 1.102 \times 10^{-16} \text{ kg m}^2 \]

\[ K_\theta = \frac{3 EI}{\ell_{ac}} \left( \frac{1 + \frac{\ell_{cgy}}{\ell_{ac}}}{1 + \frac{3\ell_{cgy}}{2\ell_{ac}}} \right) \]
\[ = 4.062 \times 10^{-8} \]

\[ \omega_\theta = \sqrt{\frac{K_\theta}{\bar{I}_A}} \]
\[ = 3246 \text{ Hz} \]

where,

\[ \bar{I} = 9.111 \times 10^{-19} \text{ kg m}^2 \]
Appendix B

Finite Element Modal Analysis

The following sections contain the ABAQUS input files for modal analysis of the generation 1 and 2 devices.
B.1 Generation 1 Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODE</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
1, 2, 15, 14, 1
*ELG, ELSET=COL1
1, 1, 13, 12, 12, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
13, 15, 28, 27, 14
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
14, 16, 29, 28, 15
*ELSET, ELSET=TOR1
13, 14
*ELCOPY, ELEMENT SHIFT=2, OLD SET=TOR1, NEW SET=TOR2, SHIFT NODES=5
*ELCOPY, ELEMENT SHIFT=2, OLD SET=TOR2, NEW SET=TOR3, SHIFT NODES=5
*ELSET, ELSET=COL2
TOR1, TOR2, TOR3
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
19, 28, 41, 40, 27
*ELGEN, ELSET=COL3 4
19, 2, 13, 12, 12, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
43, 54, 67, 66, 53
*ELGEN, ELSET=TOPCOL5
43, 1, 13, 13, 6, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=STRI3
49, 59, 73, 72
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
50, 60, 74, 73, 59
*ELGEN, ELSET=BOTCOL5
50, 1, 13, 14, 6, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELSET, ELSET=COL5
TOPCOL5, 49, BOTCOL5
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
56, 67, 81, 80, 66
*ELGEN, ELSET=COL6
56, 1, 7, 14, 7, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
63, 81, 95, 94, 80
*ELGEN, ELSET=TOPCOL7
63, 1, 13, 13, 6, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=STRI3
69, 87, 100, 86
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
70, 88, 101, 100, 87
*ELGEN, ELSET=BOTCOL7
70, 1, 13, 13, 6, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELSET, ELSET=COL7
TOPCOL7, 69, BOTCOL7
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
76, 95, 108, 107, 94
*ELGEN, ELSET=COL8_9
76, 2, 13, 12, 12, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELSET, ELSET=SIPL
COL1, COL2, COL3_4, COL5, COL6, COL7, COL8_9
*MATERIAL, NAME=SILICON
*DENSITY
2.3E-15
*ELASTIC, TYPE=ISO
0.159, 0.33
*SH ELL SECTION, ELSET=SIPL, MATERIAL=SILICON
2.9
*BOUNDARY
1000, 1, 6
*NSET, NSET=HG, GENERATE
96, 104
*NSET, NSET=IG, GENERATE
109, 117
*NSET, NSET=JG, GENERATE
122, 130
*NSET, NSET=BOTGOLD
HG, IG, JG
*MCOPY, CHANGE NUMBER=100, OLDSET=BOTGOLD, NEW SET=TOPGOLD, SHEET
*ELEMENT, TYPE=C3D8
178, 97, 110, 109, 96, 197, 210, 209, 196
*ELGEN, ELSET=GOLDM
178, 2, 13, 12, 8, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*MATERIAL, NAME=GOLD
*DENSITY
1.93E-14
*ELASTIC, TYPE=ISO
8E-2, 0.3
*SOLID SECTION, ELSET=GOLDM, MATERIAL=GOLD
*NODE
1000, -130, 0, 0
*NODE
1012, -10, 0, 0
*NGEN, NSET=BEAMNODE
1000, 1012, 1
*ELMEN, TYPE=B31
200, 1000, 1001
*ELGEN, ELSET=BEAMEL
200, 12, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=B31
213, 1012, 7
*BEAM GENERAL SECTION, SECTION=GENERAL
26.19, 0, 0, 13.77, 0, 216.5, 51.78
0, 1, 0
0.159, 0.051, 1.2E-6, 0.0
*MPC
12, 7, 1012, 20
*PLOT
*VIEWPOINT
1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1
*DRAW, HIDE
*NSET, NSET=MODEOUT
1000, 1005, 1010, 7, 20, 33, 46, 59, 100, 113, 126
*STEP, LINEAR=NEW
*FREQUENCY
3, 1000000
*FILE FORMAT, ASCII
*NODE PRINT, GLOBAL=YES, LASTMODE=3, NSET=MODEOUT
U
*PLOT
*VIEWPOINT
1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1
*DISPLACED, HIDE
U
*PLOT
*VIEWPOINT
0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1
*DISPLACED, HIDE
U
*VIEWPOINT
0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1
*DISPLACED
U
*END STEP
*HEADING
-ENDPLATE
*NODE
1,0,60,0
*NODE
13,0,-60,0
*NGEN,NSET=A
\[1,13,1\]
*NCOPY,CHANGE NUMBER=13,OLDSET=A,SHIFT,NEW SET=B
5,5,0,0
0,0,0,0,0,1.0,0
*NCOPY,CHANGE NUMBER=13,OLDSET=B,SHIFT,NEW SET=C
8,0,0
0,0,0,0,0,1.0,0
*NCOPY,CHANGE NUMBER=13,OLDSET=C,SHIFT,NEW SET=D
3.5,0,0
0,0,0,0,0,1.0,0
*NCOPY,CHANGE NUMBER=13,OLDSET=D,SHIFT,NEW SET=E
15,0,0
0,0,0,0,0,1.0,0
*NODE
\[79,47,-60,0\]
*NODE
78,47,-49,0
*NODE
77,47,-41,0
*NODE
76,47,-31,0
*NODE
75,47,-23,0
*NODE
74,47,-13,0
*NODE
73,47,-5,0
*NODE
72,47,5,0
*NODE
71,47,13,0
*NODE
70,47,23,0
*NODE
69,47,31,0
*NODE
68,47,41,0
*NODE
67,47,49,0
*NODE
66,47,60,0
*NSET,NSET=F,G,GENERATE
\[66,79,1\]
*NCOPY,CHANGE NUMBER=14,OLDSET=F,SHIFT,NEW SET=G
20,0,0
0,0,0,0,0,1.0,0
*NCOPY,CHANGE NUMBER=41,OLDSET=E,SHIFT,NEW SET=H
65,0,0
0,0,0,0,0,1.0,0
*NCOPY,CHANGE NUMBER=13,OLDSET=H,SHIFT,NEW SET=I
30,0,0
0,0,0,0,0,1.0,0
*NCOPY,CHANGE NUMBER=13,OLDSET=I,SHIFT,NEW SET=J
30,0,0
0,0,0,0,0,1.0,0
*ELEMENT,TYPE=S4R
1,2,15,14,1
*ELGEN,ELSET=COL1
1,1,13,12,12,1,1,1,1,1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
13, 15, 28, 27, 14
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
14, 16, 29, 28, 15
*ELSET, ELSET=TOR1
13, 14
*ELCOPY, ELEMENT SHIFT=2, OLD SET=TOR1, NEW SET=TOR2, SHIFT NODES=5
*ELCOPY, ELEMENT SHIFT=2, OLD SET=TOR2, NEW SET=TOR3, SHIFT NODES=5
*ELSET, ELSET=COL2
TOR1, TOR2, TOR3
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
19, 28, 41, 40, 27
*ELGEN, ELSET=COL3_4
19, 2, 13, 12, 12, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
43, 54, 67, 66, 53
*ELGEN, ELSET=TOPCOL5
43, 1, 13, 13, 6, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
49, 59, 73, 72
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
50, 60, 74, 73, 59
*ELGEN, ELSET=BOTCOL5
50, 1, 13, 14, 6, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELSET, ELSET=COL5
TOPCOL5, 49, BOTCOL5
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
56, 67, 81, 80, 66
*ELGEN, ELSET=COL6
56, 1, 7, 14, 7, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
63, 81, 95, 94, 80
*ELGEN, ELSET=TOPCOL7
63, 1, 13, 13, 6, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
69, 87, 100, 86
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
70, 88, 101, 100, 87
*ELGEN, ELSET=BOTCOL7
70, 1, 13, 13, 6, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELSET, ELSET=COL7
TOPCOL7, 69, BOTCOL7
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
76, 95, 108, 107, 94
*ELGEN, ELSET=COL8_9
76, 2, 13, 12, 12, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELSET, ELSET=SIPL
COL1, COL2, COL3_4, COL5, COL6, COL7, COL8_9
*MATERIAL, NAME=SILICON
*DENSITY
2.3E-15
*ELASTIC, TYPE=ISO
0.159, 0.33
*SHELL SECTION, ELSET=SIPL, MATERIAL=SILICON
2.9
*BOUNDARY
A, 1, 6
*NSET, NSET=HG, GENERATE
96, 104
*NSET, NSET=IG, GENERATE
109, 117
*NSET, NSET=JG, GENERATE
122, 130
*NSET, NSET=BOTGOLD
HG, IG, JG
*NCOPY, CHANGE NUMBER=100, OLDSET=BOTGOLD, NEW SET=TOPGOLD, SHIFT
,0,15
,0,0,0,0,1,0
ELEMENT, TYPE=C3D8
78,97,110,109,96,197,210,209,196
ELGEN, ELSET=GOLDM
78,2,13,12,8,1,1,1,1,1
MATERIAL, NAME=GOLD
DENSITY
.93E-14
ELASTIC, TYPE=ISO
E-2,0.3
SOLID SECTION, ELSET=GOLDM, MATERIAL=GOLD
PLOT
VIEWPOINT
,1,1,0,0,1
DRAW, HIDE
NSET, NSET=MODEOUT
,20,33,46,59,100,113,126
STEP, LINEAR=NEW
FREQUENCY
,100000
FILE FORMAT, ASCII
NODE PRINT, GLOBAL=YES, LASTMODE=3, NSET=MODEOUT
PLOT
VIEWPOINT
,1,1,0,0,1
DISPLACED, HIDE
PLOT
VIEWPOINT
,1,0,0,0,1
DISPLACED, HIDE
END STEP
B.2 Generation 2 Analysis
## FEA OF NEW DEVICE

### MODAL FREQUENCY COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>FEA</th>
<th>FTEST2</th>
<th>% DIFF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.073</td>
<td>13.438</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.569</td>
<td>42.955</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>74.468</td>
<td>85.736</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In plane bending.
2. Out of plane bending (unmodeled in Lagrangian)
3. Torsion (unmodeled in Lagrangian)
GEN2
*NODE
1, 75, 75, 0
*NODE
11, 75, -75, 0
*NODE
177, 315, 75, 0
*NODE
187, 315, -75, 0
*NGEN, NSET=A1
1, 11, 1
*NGEN, NSET=B1
177, 187, 1
*NFILL, NSET=C1
A1, B1, 16, 11
*NCOPY, CHANGE NUMBER=200, OLD SET=C1, SHIFT, NEW SET=D1
0, 0, 15
75, 75, 0, 75, 75, 15, 0
*ELEMENT, TYPE=S4R
1, 1, 2, 13, 12
*ELGEN, ELSET=PLATE
1, 10, 1, 1, 16, 11, 10, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=C3D8
161, 134, 135, 146, 145, 334, 335, 346, 345
*ELGEN, ELSET=CW
161, 8, 1, 1, 4, 11, 8, 1, 1, 1
*NODE
401, 0, 0, 0
*NODE
411, 75, 0, 0
*NGEN, NSET=E
401, 411, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=B32
200, 401, 402, 403
*ELGEN, ELSET=CANT1
200, 4, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1
*ELEMENT, TYPE=B32
204, 409, 410, 6
*ELSET, ELSET=CANT
CANT1, 204
*BOUNDARY
401, 1, 6
*MPC
1, 6, 410, 17
*BEAM GENERAL SECTION, SECTION=GENERAL, DENSITY=2.3E-15, ELSET=CANT
502.7, 0, 0, 3141.6, 0, 502.7, 1733.3
0, 0, 1
0.159, 0.051, 1.2E-6, 0
*SHELL SECTION, ELSET=PLATE, MATERIAL=SI
8
*SOLID SECTION, ELSET=CW, MATERIAL=AU
*MATETAL, NAME=SI
*DENSITY
2.3E-15
*ELASTIC, TYPE=ISO
0.159, 0.33
*MATERIAL, NAME=AU
*DENSITY
1.93E-14
*ELASTIC, TYPE=ISO
8E-2, 0.3
*PLOT
*VIEWPOINT
0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0
*DRAW
Appendix C

Nanoindenter
Hardness/Modulus Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pt.</th>
<th>Depth Total (nm.)</th>
<th>Depth Plastic (nm.)</th>
<th>Load (mN)</th>
<th>Area (nm²)</th>
<th>E (kg/mm²)</th>
<th>H (kg/mm²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>438.49</td>
<td>287.78</td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>2360853.53</td>
<td>16222.252</td>
<td>1711.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>437.61</td>
<td>286.32</td>
<td>40.82</td>
<td>2330594.28</td>
<td>16429.895</td>
<td>1745.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>439.95</td>
<td>293.64</td>
<td>40.16</td>
<td>2451122.56</td>
<td>16310.898</td>
<td>1638.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>440.48</td>
<td>290.02</td>
<td>40.13</td>
<td>2395186.54</td>
<td>15990.131</td>
<td>1675.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>438.77</td>
<td>290.34</td>
<td>40.07</td>
<td>2400088.80</td>
<td>16197.713</td>
<td>1669.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>439.98</td>
<td>294.15</td>
<td>40.11</td>
<td>2459071.70</td>
<td>16319.424</td>
<td>1631.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>438.42</td>
<td>291.58</td>
<td>39.70</td>
<td>2419222.74</td>
<td>16148.067</td>
<td>1640.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>439.93</td>
<td>295.02</td>
<td>40.04</td>
<td>2472560.40</td>
<td>16354.547</td>
<td>1619.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>440.01</td>
<td>296.35</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>2493348.62</td>
<td>16103.454</td>
<td>1577.596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

439 < AVE.

AVERAGES OF (E) & (H) =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16230.710</th>
<th>1656.621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Standard deviation =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>137.556</th>
<th>50.356</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Error =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.05%</th>
<th>3.04%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Diamond # 3  \[ A(F) = 18.5 \cdot D^2 + 205.3 \cdot D^{3/2} + (-603 \cdot U) + 0 \cdot D^{0.5} + 0 \]

File name: T38_H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pt.</th>
<th>Depth Total (nm.)</th>
<th>Depth Plastic (nm.)</th>
<th>Load (mN)</th>
<th>Area (nm^2)</th>
<th>E (kg/mm^2)</th>
<th>H (kg/mm^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>430.43</td>
<td>290.55</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>2403347.46</td>
<td>16076.673</td>
<td>1651.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>439.13</td>
<td>295.04</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>2472895.25</td>
<td>16289.302</td>
<td>1604.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>440.34</td>
<td>295.25</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>2476114.68</td>
<td>16121.433</td>
<td>1600.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>439.43</td>
<td>293.00</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>2441237.87</td>
<td>16040.580</td>
<td>1619.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>441.03</td>
<td>297.70</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>2514612.59</td>
<td>16233.318</td>
<td>1578.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>439.73</td>
<td>295.13</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>2474268.13</td>
<td>16198.765</td>
<td>1602.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>441.58</td>
<td>299.21</td>
<td>39.51</td>
<td>2538422.02</td>
<td>16191.266</td>
<td>1556.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>440.79</td>
<td>303.11</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>2600249.59</td>
<td>16531.302</td>
<td>1514.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>441.77</td>
<td>302.47</td>
<td>38.97</td>
<td>2590144.47</td>
<td>16151.778</td>
<td>1504.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>440.02</td>
<td>307.40</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td>2669305.19</td>
<td>16785.332</td>
<td>1458.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

440 <AVE.

AVERAGES OF (E) & (H) = 16262.055 1569.112
Standard deviation = 229.121 59.799
Error = 1.41% 3.81%
Appendix D

102491 Frequency Data
102491 run 1
Theory

\[ w_i = 11200 \, \text{Hz} \]
\[ K_1 = 0.735 \, \text{MN/m}^{1.5} \]
\[ V_0 = 65 \, \text{v} \]
\[ V = 4 \times 10^{-4} (K_1/K_{1c})^{40} \, \text{m/s} \]

At controller bandwidth:
\[ dw = -188 \, \text{Hz} \]
\[ t = 561 \, \text{sec} \]
102491 run 1
average data

$w_i = 11101 \text{ Hz}$
$w_f = 11082 \text{ Hz}$
$K_1 = 0.31 \text{ MN/m } ^{1.5}$
$V_0 = 65 \text{ v}$
$da = 70 \text{ nm}$

$V = 8.4 \times 10^{-13} \text{ m/s}$
102491 run 1
Last 2000 seconds

slope = -2.4e-4 Hz/s
da/dw = 3.5 nm/Hz
V=8.4e-13 m/s
102491 run 2
averaged data

\[ V = 1.82 \times 10^{-13} \text{ m/s} \]

\[ wi = 11080 \text{ Hz} \]
\[ wf = 11062 \text{ Hz} \]
\[ K1 = 0.44 \text{ MN/m}^{1.5} \]
\[ V0 = 78 \text{ V} \]
\[ da = 63 \text{ nm} \]
102491 Run 2
Last 5000 seconds

Slope = -5.2e-5 Hz/s
da/dw = 3.5 nm/Hz
V = 1.82e-13 m/s

Avg. data
Regression
102491 run 3
averaged data

$wi = 11062 \text{ Hz}$

$wf = 11056 \text{ Hz}$

$K1 = 0.52 \text{ MN/m}^{1.5}$

$V0 = 84.5 \text{ v}$

$da = 21 \text{ nm}$

$V = 8.1e-15 \text{ m/s}$
102491 Run 3
Last 6000 seconds

slope = -2.3e-6 Hz/s
da/dw = 3.5 nm/Hz
V = 8.1e-15 m/s

Avg. data
Regression
102491 run 4
averaged data

Slope = -5.4e-4 Hz/s
da/dw = 3.5 nm/Hz
V = 1.89e-12 m/s

wi = 11057 Hz
wf = 11055 Hz
K1 = 0.60 MN/m^1.5
V0 = 91 V
da = 7 nm

Avg. data
Regression
102491 run 5
averaged data

\[ \begin{align*}
\omega_i &= 11057 \text{ Hz} \\
\omega_f &= 11051 \text{ Hz} \\
K_1 &= 0.69 \text{ MN/m}^{1.5} \\
V_0 &= 97.5 \text{ v} \\
da &= 21 \text{ nm}
\end{align*} \]
102491 Run 5
Last 15,000 seconds

Slope = 1.5e-5 Hz/s
\( \frac{da}{dw} = 3.5 \text{ nm/Hz} \)
\( V = 5.25e-14 \text{ m/s} \)
102491 run 6
averaged data

Slope = -1.3e-4 Hz/s
da/dw = 3.5 nm/Hz
V = 4.55e-13 m/s

wi = 11053 Hz
wf = 11050 Hz
K1 = 0.78 MN/m^1.5
V0 = 104 V
da = 10.5 nm
102491 run 7
averaged data

wi = 11054 Hz
wf = 11049 Hz
K1 = 0.87 MN/m^1.5
V0 = 110.5 v
da = 17.5 nm
102491 Run 7

Slope = -1.7e-4 Hz/s
da/dw = 3.5 nm/Hz
V = 5.9e-13 m/s
Appendix E

FMEAS2.PAS

The FMEAS2.PAS program is the data acquisition program that commands the CTM05 frequency counter board to measure frequency and elapsed time. The system operates in three modes. In the first mode, the frequency is measured and averaged over twenty samples. The average frequency is then compared to a baseline average frequency recorded at the start of the test run. If the measured average frequency differs from the baseline average frequency by less than 1.5 Hz no data is stored on disk. When the frequency shift exceeds 1.5 Hz, the system then operates in mode two where the average frequency is continuously written to the disk. If the frequency shift is greater than 1.5 Hz and the rate of change greater than 1 Hz per average sample, the system operates in mode three where each instantaneous frequency measurement is written to the disk.
program fmeas2;
uses
dos,
crt,
fproc2,
fdrv2;

label 99;

begin(main program)
   initialize;
   if not quit then
      repeat
         begin(continuous frequency measurements)
            n:=n+1;
            j:=j+1;
            i:=i+1;
            rel_time:=rel_time+sample_rate;
            if ((j=jmax) and not quit) then calibrate(sample_rate);

            ctm05_measure_freq(freq[i],quit);
            if quit then goto 99;

            if (not averaging) and (not stream_data) then
               writeln('not writing',freq[i]:15:2);
            if averaging then
               writeln('averaging data',freq[i]:15:2);
            if stream_data then
               begin
                  writeln('streaming data',freq[i]:15:2);
                  dw:=freq[i]-freq0;
                  writeln(outfile,n:13,' ,rel_time:13,freq[i]:15:2,dw:15:2);
                  nline:=nline+1;
               end;

            if (keypressed and (readkey='r')) then
               begin
                  writeln('------------------------FREQUENCY RESET------------------------');
                  reset:=true;
               end;

            (check frequency shift and rate of change)
            favg:=favg+freq[i];
            if i = imax then
               begin
                  favg:=favg/imax;
                  df:=favg-favg0;
                  dw:=favg-freq0;
                  if reset then
                     begin
                        dw:=0;
                     end;
         end;
      end;
end;
df:=0;
favg0:=favg;
freq0:=favg;
reset:=false;
writeln(outfile,
'----------------------FREQUENCY RESET-----------------------------');
writeln(outfile,n:13,' ',rel_time:13,favg:15:2,dw:15:2);
nline:=nline+2;
end;
if n = imax then
begin
  df:=0;
favg0:=favg;
writeln(outfile,n:13,' ',rel_time:13,favg:15:2,dw:15:2);
nline:=nline+1;
end;

if (abs(dw) > (1.5)1) and (abs(df) < 1.0(0.2)) then
begin
  averaging:=true;
  if not stream_data then
  begin
    writeln(outfile,n:13,' ',rel_time:13,favg:15:2,dw:15:2);
nline:=nline+1;
  end;
end
else averaging:=false;

if (abs(df) > 1.0(0.2)) and (abs(dw) > 1.5(1)) then
stream_data:=true
else stream_data:=false;

i:=0;
favg0:=favg;
favg:=0;
end; (if i = imax)

if nline >= 3000 then
begin
  nline:=0;
close(outfile);
  filenum:=filenum+1;
  open_data_file(filename,filenum);
end;
end;{continuous measurement}
99: until (keypressed and (readkey=stop)) or quit;

quit:=true;
{get total elapsed time from counters 1 and 2}
read_time_line(quit,t);
(add footer to last data file)
write(outfile,
'--------------------------------------------------');
write(outfile,'Test Stopped: ');
print_timeanddate;
write('V0 = ');
readln(V0);
write('Td = ');
readln(Td);
write('Ta = ');
readln(Ta);
write('Ed = ');
readln(Ed);
write('Eu = ');
readln(Eu);
write(outfile,'Test Conditions: ');
write(outfile,'V0 = ',V0, ' v');
write(outfile,'Td = ',Td, ' degC');
write(outfile,'Ta = ',Ta, ' degC');
write(outfile,'Ed = ',Ed, ' v');
write(outfile,'Eu = ',Eu, ' v');
write(outfile,'Total Samples = ',n:13);
write(outfile,'Elapsed Time = ',t:13);
write(outfile,'Sample Rate = ',1/sample_rate:10:3);
write(outfile,'Data Files = ',filename,'0', ' - ', filename,filenum);
close(outfile);
chdir('..');
end.(main program)
unit fproc2;
interface
uses
  fdrv2,
  dos,
  crt;

const
  fmax = 8.5;
  smax = 1/fmax;
  imax = 10;
  jmax = 1000;
  stop = 'q';

{max sample rate [samples/s]}
{starting sample time [sec/sample]}
{number of samples to average}
{number of samples until time line checked}

{GLOBAL VARIABLES}

var
  reset,
  quit,
  averaging,
  stream_data:boolean;
  n:longint;
  filenum,
  nline,
  i,
  j,
  error:integer;
  accum_counts:word;
  gate_interval
    freq:array[1..imax] of real;
    df,
    favg0,
    favg,
    freq0,
    dw,
    rel_time,
    t,
    t0,
    dt,
    sample_rate:real;
  outfile:text;
  V0,
  Td,
  Ta,
  Ed,
  Eu:string;
  filename:string[12];

procedure calibrate(var sample_rate:real);
procedure print_timeanddate;

procedure initialize;

procedure open_data_file(filename:string; filenum:integer);

implementation
procedure print_timeanddate;
const
  $10 = ' ';                   {skip 10 spaces}

var
  hour, min, sec, sec100, dayofweek, day, month, year: word;
  dayname: string[9];

begin
  gettime(hour, min, sec, sec100);
  getdate(year, month, day, dayofweek);
  case dayofweek of
    1: dayname := 'Monday';
    2: dayname := 'Tuesday';
    3: dayname := 'Wednesday';
    4: dayname := 'Thursday';
    5: dayname := 'Friday';
    6: dayname := 'Saturday';
    0: dayname := 'Sunday';
  end;
  writeln(outfile, 'Date = ', dayname, ',', month, '/', day, '/', year);
  writeln(outfile, $10, 'Time = ', hour, ':', min, ':', sec);
end; {timeanddate}

procedure open_data_file(filename:string; filenum:integer);
const
  appen = '.dat';

var
  filenamec: string;
begin
  str(filename, filenamec);
  filename := filename + filenamec + appen;
  assign(outfile, filename);
  rewrite(outfile);
end;

procedure initialize;
var
  rnum, {run number}
  dnum: string, {device number}
  ioeerr: word;
begin {initialize}
  {initialize global variables and indices}
  sample_rate:=smax;
  rel_time:=0;
  dw:=0;
  filenum:=0;
  nline:=0;
  n:=0;
  favg:=0;
  i:=0;
  j:=0;
  reset:=false;
  stream_data:=false;
  averaging:=false;
  quit:=false;
  error:=0;
  filename:='TEST';

  {initialize ctm05_board and check for errors}
  ctm05_init(error);
  if error > 0 then quit:=true
else
  begin {check for frequency measurement errors}
    ctm05_freq_error(error);
    if error > 0 then quit:=true
else
  begin {initialize output file}
    write('Device # = ');
    readln(dnum);
    write('Run # = ');
    readln(rnum);
    mkdir(dnum+'_'+rnum);
    chdir(dnum+'_'+rnum);
    writeln('Return to start.');
    readln;
    open_data_file(filename,filenum);
    writeln(outfile,'Device number = ',dnum);
    writeln(outfile,'Run number = ',rnum);
    writeln(outfile,
      '------------------------------------------------');
  {set time and date of run}
    write(outfile,'Test started: ');
    print_timeanddate;
    writeln(outfile,
      '------------------------------------------------');
    writeln(outfile,
      ' sample number     time [s]     freq [hz]     dw [hz]');
writeln(outfile,
'---------------------------------------------------------------');

{start time line on counters 1 and 2}
start_time_line(t);

{set baseline frequency}
ctm05_measure_freq(freq0,quit);
if not quit then
begin
  writeln(outfile,n:13,' ','rel_time:13,freq0:15:2,dw:15:2);
nline:=nline+1;
end;
end; {initialize output file}
end; {check for frequency measurement error}
end; {initialize}

procedure calibrate(var sample_rate:real);
begin {calibrate}
  if n=jmax then t0:=0;
  read_time_line(qut,t);
  dt:=t-t0;
  t0:=t;
  if dt > 0 then sample_rate:=dt/jmax;
  j:=0;
end;

begin {initialization}
  end.
unit fdriv2;
interface
Uses
crt,
dos;

procedure ctm05_init(var err_code: integer);
procedure ctm05_freq_error(var err_code: integer);
procedure ctm05_measure_freq(var freq: real; var quit: boolean);
procedure start_time_line(var seconds: real);
procedure read_time_line(quit: boolean; var seconds: real);

implementation
const
  board_num_err = 2;
  base_adr_err = 3;
  interrupt_level_err = 4;
  counter_num_err = 5;
  fout_div_err = 6;
  fout_source_err = 7;
  comp2_err = 8;
  compl_err = 9;
  tod_err = 10;
  gate_ctrl_err = 11;
  count_edge_err = 12;
  count_source_err = 13;
  special_gate_err = 14;
  reload_err = 15;
  count_repeat_err = 16;
  count_type_err = 17;
  count_dir_err = 18;
  output_ctrl_err = 19;
  counter_command_err = 20;
  select_counter_err = 21;
  counter_data_err = 22;
  digout_data_err = 23;
  count_err = 24;
  start_ipo_err = 25;
  gate_interval_err = 26;
  signal_source_err = 27;

type
  ctm05_gv_type = record
data_reg,
command_reg,
digin_reg,
digout_reg,
iflg: integer;
end;

var
  board_num,
  base_adr,
  ctm05}
fout_div,
  fout_source,
  comp2,
  comp1,
tod,
gate_interval,
signal_source:integer;
ctm05_gv: array[0..3] of ctm05_gv_type;

function check_range(test_val, low_val, high_val: integer): boolean;
var
  temp: boolean;
begin
  if (test_val >= low_val) and (test_val <= high_val) then temp := false
  else temp := true;
  check_range := temp;
end;

procedure ctm05_at_delay;
begin
end;

procedure ctm05_print_error(err_code: integer);
var
  es: string[80];
begin
  if (err_code = 0) then es := 'No error';
  es := 'CTM05 driver not initialized (0-5)';
  es := 'Base address of CTM05 out of range ($100 - $3fc)';
  es := 'Interrupt level out of range (2-7)';
  es := 'Counter number out of range (1-5)';
  es := 'Fout divider ratio error in ctm05_init (0-15)';
  es := 'Fout source error in ctm05_init (0-15)';
  es := 'Compare 2 disable/enable error in ctm05_init (0-1)';
9: es := 'Compare 1 disable/enable error in ctm05_init (0-1)';
10: es := 'Time of data mode control error in ctm05_init (0-3)';
11: es := 'Gate control error in ctm05_set_counter_mode_reg (0-7)';
12: es := 'Count edge error in ctm05_set_counter_mode_reg (0-1)';
13: es := 'Count source error in ctm05_set_counter_mode_reg (0-15)';
14: es := 'Disable special gate error in ctm05_set_counter_mode_reg (0-1)';
15: es := 'Reload error in ctm05_set_counter_mode_reg (0-1)';
16: es := 'Count once/count repetitively error in ctm05_set_counter_mode_reg (0-1)';
17: es := 'Binary count/ BCD count error in ctm05_set_counter_mode_reg (0-1)';
18: es := 'Count down/up error in ctm05_set_counter_mode_reg (0-1)';
19: es := 'Output control error in ctm05_set_counter_mode_reg (0-5 but not 3)';
20: es := 'Command error in ctm05_multiple_counter_control (1-6)';
21: es := 'Select counter error in ctm05_multiple_counter_control (0-1)';
22: es := 'Output data error in ctm05_cset (32768 to 32767)';
23: es := 'Output data error in ctm05_bins (0-255)';
24: es := 'Count error in ctm05_store_on_interrupt (1-32767)';
25: es := 'Start ipo error in ctm05_store_on_interrupt (0-1)';
26: es := 'Gate interval error in ctm05_store_on_interrupt (1-32767)';
27: es := 'Signal source error in ctm05_store_on_interrupt (1-15)';
end;{end case err_code}
writeln(es);
end;{ctm05_print_error}

procedure ctm05_init(var err_code: integer);

var
  temp: word;

begin{ctm05_init}
  if check_range(board_num,0,3) then err_code := board_num_err
  else
    if check_range(base_adr,$100,$3fc) then err_code := base_adr_err
    else
      if check_range(fout_div,0,15) then err_code := fout_div_err
      else
        if check_range(fout_source,0,15) then err_code := fout_source_err
        else
          if check_range(comp2,0,1) then err_code := comp2_err
          else
            if check_range(comp1,0,1) then err_code := comp1_err
            else
              if check_range(tod,0,3) then err_code := tod_err
              else
                with ctm05_gv[board_num] do

begin{with ctm05_gv}

{set values of i/o ports}
\texttt{data\_reg := base\_adr;} \\
\texttt{command\_reg := base\_adr + 1;} \\
\texttt{digin\_reg := base\_adr + 2;} \\
\texttt{digout\_reg := base\_adr + 3;}

{set to master mode register to 1100101011110000 base 2; \\
51952 base 10; p.9 ctm05 manual}
\texttt{mm15 = 1: bcd division} \\
\texttt{mm14 = 1: disable data pointer control} \\
\texttt{mm13 = 0: 0 8 bit data bus} \\
\texttt{mm12 = 0: fout on} \\
\texttt{mm11 - mm8: 1010; fout\_div shl 8; fout\_div = 10} \\
\texttt{mm7 - mm4: 1111; fout\_source shl 14;} \\
\texttt{fout\_source = 15 = f5 = 100 hz} \\
\texttt{mm3 = 0: comparator 2 disabled} \\
\texttt{mm2 = 0: comparator 1 disabled} \\
\texttt{mm1 - mm0 = 00: time of day disabled}

\texttt{temp := $c000 or (fout\_div shl 8) or (fout\_source shl 4) or} \\
\texttt{(comp2 shl 3) or (comp1 shl 2) or tod;}

\texttt{port[command\_reg] := $FF;} \quad \texttt{\{master reset\}}
\texttt{cmt05\_at\_delay;}
\texttt{port[command\_reg] := $17;} \quad \texttt{\{load master mode register\}}
\texttt{cmt05\_at\_delay;}
\texttt{port[data\_reg] := lo(temp);} \quad \texttt{\{write first 8 bytes of temp\}}
\texttt{cmt05\_at\_delay;}
\texttt{port[data\_reg] := hi(temp);} \quad \texttt{\{write second 8 bytes of temp\}}

\texttt{err\_code := 0;}
\texttt{iflg := 0;}
\texttt{end;} \{with ctm05_gv\}

\texttt{if err\_code > 0 then}
\texttt{begin}
\texttt{writeln('INITIALIZATION ERROR:');}
\texttt{ctm05\_print\_error(err\_code);}
\texttt{end;}
\texttt{end;} \{ctm05\_init\}

\texttt{procedure ctm05\_freq\_error(var err\_code:integer);}
\texttt{begin}
\texttt{if check\_range(board\_num,0,3) then err\_code := board\_num\_err}
\texttt{else}
\texttt{if check\_range(gate\_interval,1,32767) then err\_code := gate\_interval\_err}
\texttt{else}
\texttt{end;}
\texttt{end;}
if check_range(signal_source,1,15) then err_code := signal_source_err;
if err_code > 0 then
begin
  writeln('FREQUENCY MEASUREMENT ERROR:');
  ctm05_print_error(err_code);
end;
end;

procedure ctm05_measure_freq(var freq:real; var quit:boolean);
label 99;
const
  stop='q';
var
  accum_counts,
  temp: word;

begin{ctm05_measure_freq}
  with ctm05_gv[board_num] do
  begin{with ctm05_gv}
    {counter 4}
    {write to mode register of counter 4: p.12 ctm05 manual}
    port[command_reg] := $4;
    cmt05_at_delay;
    {write gating control, count source selection, count control, and
    output
      control to counter 4}
    {write lo byte first: $22=34=00100010
      - special gate disabled
      - reload from load
      - count repetatively
      - binary count
      - count down
      - tc toggled}
    port[data_reg] := $22;
    cmt05_at_delay;
    {write hi byte:$4 = 4 = 00000100
      - no gating  000
      - count on rising edge of source 4 (pin 15 on
        D connector: this will be the measured frequency input 00100}
    port[data_reg] := $4;
    cmt05_at_delay;
    {write gate_interval (100 ms) to counter 4 load register}
    port[command_reg] := $c;
    cmt05_at_delay;
    port[data_reg] := lo(gate_interval);
cmt05_at_delay;
port[datan_reg] := hi(gate_interval);
cmt05_at_delay;

{Load and arm counter 4}
port[command_reg] := $68;
cmt05_at_delay;

{Set counter 5 mode register}
port[command_reg] := $5;
temp := (signal_source shl 8) or $8029; {signal_source = 11 = 1mhz}
{counter 5 mode register set to:1000101100101001
- counter counts on high level of gate 5;
- output of counter 4 (pin 32) hard wired to counter 5 gate (pin 12)
- counts on rising edge of 1mhz source
- special gate disabled
- reload from load
- count repetatively
- binary count
- count up
- output active at high tc pulse}
port[datan_reg] := lo(temp);
cmt05_at_delay;
port[datan_reg] := hi(temp);
cmt05_at_delay;

{counter 5 load register}
port[command_reg] := $d;

{initializing counter 5 load register to zero}
port[datan_reg] := 0;
cmt05_at_delay;
port[datan_reg] := 0;
cmt05_at_delay;

{waiting for counter 4 tc toggled output to go hi}
repeat
until ((port[command_reg] and $10) = $10 or
   (keypressed and (readkey = stop)));
if port[command_reg] and $10 <> $10 then
begin
   quit:=true;
goto 99;
end;

{waiting for counter 4 tc toggled output to go lo}
repeat
until ((port[command_reg] and $10) <> $10) or
(keypressed and (readkey = stop));
if port[command_reg] and $10 = $10 then begin
  quit:=true;
  goto 99;
end;

{load and arm counter 5}
port[command_reg] := $70;
cmt05_at_delay;

{waiting for counter 4 output to go hi}
repeat
  until ((port[command_reg] and $10) = $10) or
         (keypressed and (readkey = stop));
  if port[command_reg] and $10 <> $10 then begin
    quit:=true;
    goto 99;
  end;
end;

{waiting for counter 4 output to go lo}
repeat
  until ((port[command_reg] and $10) <> $10) or
         (keypressed and (readkey = stop));
  if port[command_reg] and $10 = $10 then begin
    quit:=true;
    goto 99;
  end;
end;

{save counter 5 count in hold register}
port[command_reg] := $b0;
cmt05_at_delay;

{data pointer at counter 5 hold register}
port[command_reg] := $15;
cmt05_at_delay;

{reading counter 5 hold register; lo byte first}
accum_counts := port[data_reg];
accum_counts := accum_counts or (port[data_reg] shl 8);
freq:=gate_interval*1e6/(accum_counts);
end;{with ctm05_gv}
99: end;{ctm05_measure_freq}

procedure start_time_line(var seconds:real);
begin
with ctm05_gv[board_num] do
begin

seconds:=0;

{write to counter 1 mode register}
port[command_reg]:=51;

counter 1 mode p.12 ctm05 manual:
- high level gate 5 100
- count on rising edge 0
- 100 hz freq. source (f5) 1111
- special gate disabled 0
- reload from load 0
- count repetatively 1
- binary count 0
- count down 0
- output active at TC 000 }

cmt05_at_delay;
port[data_reg]:=lo($8F20);
cmt05_at_delay;
port[data_reg]:=hi($8F20);

{set load register of counter 1 to 6000}
cmt05_at_delay;
port[command_reg]:=9;
cmt05_at_delay;
port[data_reg]:=lo(6000);
cmt05_at_delay;
port[data_reg]:=hi(6000);

{write to counter 2 mode register}
cmt05_at_delay;
port[command_reg]:=2;

{set counter 2 mode:
- no gating 000
- count on rising edge 0
- output of counter 1 0000
- special gate disabled 0
- reload from load 0
- count repetatively 1
- binary count 0
- count up 1
- no output 000}

cmt05_at_delay;
port[data_reg]:=lo($28);
cmt05_at_delay;
port[data_reg]:=hi($28);
cmt05_at_delay;

{load counter 2 with zero}
port[command_reg]:=$A;
cmt05_at_delay;
port[data_reg]:=0;
cmt05_at_delay;
port[data_reg]:=0;

{load and arm counters 1 and 2}
cmt05_at_delay;
port[command_reg]:=$63;
end;
end; {start_time_line}

procedure read_time_line(quit:boolean;var seconds:real);
var
  minutes:real;
  min,
  sec:word;
begin
  with ctm05_gv[board_num] do
  begin
    sec:=0;
    min:=0;
    minutes:=0;
    seconds:=0;

    {disarm and save counters 1 and 2 in hold register}
    if quit then port[command_reg]:=$83
    else port[command_reg]:=$A3;

    {read seconds from counter 1}
cmt05_at_delay;
port[command_reg]:=$11;
cmt05_at_delay;
sec:=port[data_reg];
cmt05_at_delay;
sec:=sec or (port[data_reg] shl 8);
seconds:=sec;

    {read minutes from counter 2}
port[command_reg]:=$12;
cmt05_at_delay;
min:=port[data_reg];
cmt05_at_delay;
min:=min or (port[data_reg] shl 8);
minutes:=min;
seconds:=(6000-seCONDS)/100+60*minutes;
end;
end; {stop_time_line}

begin {initialization}
clrscr;
board_num := 0;
base_adr := $310;
fout_div := 10;
fout_source := 15;
comp1 := 0;
comp2 := 0;
tod := 0;
gate_interval := 600;
ctr 5 (set by ctr 4)}
{gate_interval=10 for 100 ms gate interval for
ctr 5 (set by ctr 4)}
devices {run 061891})
{use a gate interval of 200 for 8 micron thick
use a gate interval of 100 for 7 micron
1 mhz signal source to ctr 5}
devices run 040991)
signal_source := 11;
end.

{734 decimal}

{100 Hz}
program avg;
uses
dos,
crt;

const
nmax=1000;

var
option:char;
filecheck:pathstr;
dirname,
file_dir,
orig_dir,
file_no,
in_filename,
out_filename:string;
infile,
outfile:text;
i,
j,
k,

fileno:integer;
nsample:longint;
k1,
dadt,
f,

t,
dw:array[1..nmax] of double;

navg,
klavg,
dadtavg,
favg,
tavg,
davg:double;

begin
clrscr;
write('Choose option. ');
write('1 = Average a series of raw data files (TEST0, TEST1,...)');
write('2 = Average a K1 vs da/dt date file');
write('3 = Quit program');
repeat
  option:=readkey;
until option in ['1','2','3'];
case option of
  '1':begin
    clrscr;
write('Directory of files to average = '); 
readln(dirname);
gendir(0,orig_dir);
if (orig_dir = 'C:\') or (orig_dir = 'D:\') then 
  file_dir:=orig_dir+dirname 
else 
  file_dir:=orig_dir+'\'+dirname;
chdir(file_dir);
write('Base file name of input = '); 
readln(in_filename);
write('Starting file number = '); 
readln(j);
write('Ending file number = '); 
readln(k);
write('Output data file name = '); 
readln(out_filename);
assign(outfile,out_filename);
rewrite(outfile);
write('Number of points to average = '); 
readln(n);
if n > nmax then 
begin 
  writeln('Max number of points to average is ',nmax:10); 
  writeln('n = ',nmax); 
  n:=nmax; 
end;
for fileno:=j to k do 
begin 
  str(fileno,file_no);
  filecheck:=fsearch(in_filename+file_no+'.dat',file_dir);
  if filecheck = '' then writeln('File ',in_filename+file_no:10, 
    ' does not exist in this directory'); 
  if filecheck <> '' then 
begin 
    assign(infile,in_filename+file_no+'.dat');
    reset(infile);
crlscr;
    writeln('Working on ',in_filename+file_no+'.dat'); 
    repeat 
      begin 
        i:=0;
        favg:=0;
        tavg:=0;
        dwavg:=0;
        navg:=0;
        repeat 
          begin 
            i:=i+1;
            readln(infile,nsample,t[i],f[i],dw[i]); 
            if ioreturn = 106 then 
begin 

i:=i-1;
readln(infile);
end
else
begin
  favg:=favg+f[i];
  tavg:=tavg+t[i];
  dwavg:=dwavg+dw[i];
  navg:=navg+nsample;
end;
end;
until (i=n) or eof(infile);
if i > 0 then
begin
  favg:=favg/i;
  tavg:=tavg/i;
  dwavg:=dwavg/i;
  navg:=navg/i;
  writeln(outfile,navg:15,' ',tavg:15,{:favg:15}dwavg:15:2);
end;
end;
until eof(infile);
close(infile);
end;{for fileno=j to k}
close(outfile);
chdir(orig_dir);
writeln;
writeln(‘Finished’);
end;{case option of 1}
’2’:begin
  clrscr;
  write(‘File name of input = ‘);
  readln(in_filename);
  getdir(0,file_dir);
  filecheck:=fsearch(in_filename,file_dir);
  if filecheck = ‘‘ then
  begin
    writeln(‘File ‘,in_filename:12,
      ‘ does not exist in directory’,file_dir);
    halt;
  end;
  assign(infile,in_filenames);
  reset(infile);
  write(‘Output data file name = ‘);
  readln(out_filename);
  assign(outfile,out_filename);
  rewrite(outfile);
  write(‘Number of points to average = ‘);
  readln(n);
  if n > nmax then
begin
  writeln('Max number of points to average is ',nmax:10);
  writeln('n = ',nmax);
  n:=nmax;
end;
repeat
begin
  i:=0;
  klavg:=0;
  dadtavg:=0;
  repeat
    begin
      i:=i+1;
      readln(infile,k1[i],dadt[i]);
      if ioreresult = 106 then
        begin
          writeln('Incorrect numeric format on input. ');
          close(infile);
          close(outfile);
          erase(outfile);
          halt;
        end
      else
        begin
          klavg:=klavg+k1[i];
          dadtavg:=dadtavg+dadt[i];
        end;
    end;
  until (i=n) or eof(infile);
if i > 0 then
begin
  klavg:=klavg/i;
  dadtavg:=dadtavg/i;
  writeln(outfile,klavg:15,dadtavg:15);
end;
end; {repeat}
until eof(infile);
close(infile);
close(outfile);
writeln;
writeln('Finished');
end; {case option 2}
'3':begin
  end;
end; {case}
end.
Appendix F

INTEGRAT.PAS

The program INTEGRAT.PAS numerically integrates a second order differential equation using the trapezoidal rule. This program was used to compute the frequency response of the cracked and uncracked first mode equations of motion of the cantilever beam system. The results of this simulation were compared to the solutions obtained from linearizing the equations of motion using describing functions.
program integrat;
uses
  dos,
  crt;

const
  nptsmax=200;

var
  k1,
  k2,
  c,
  m,
  f,
  xmin,
  xmax,
  wdf,
  dw,
  w1,
  w2,
  w,
  wi,
  wf:extended;
  tin,
  tfin,
  npts,
  i:integer;
  omega,
  fdriv,
  umax,
  umin:array[1..nptsmax] of double;
  outfile:text;

procedure newmark;
var
  tf,
  t,
  n:longint;
  dt,
  alpha,
  delta,
  a0,
  a1,
  a2,
  a3,
  a4,
  a5,
  a6,
  a7,
  ft,
fhat,
k,
khat,
x,
xd,
xdd,
fx,
fxd,
txd,
txdd:double;
stopi,
stopf:boolean;

begin
dt:=pi/(200*w);
npts:=100;
dw:=0.3*2*pi;
w:=w-npts/2*dw;

assign(outfile,'intg.sim');
rewrite(outfile);
writeln(outfile,'fdriv',',','omega',',','umax',
',','umin');

{integration constants}
delta:=0.5;
alpha:=0.25;
a0:=1/(alpha*sqr(dt));
a1:=delta/(alpha*dt);
a2:=1/(alpha*dt);
a3:=1/(2*alpha)-1;
a4:=delta/alpha-1;
a5:=dt/2*(delta/alpha-2);
a6:=dt*(1-delta);
a7:=delta*dt;

{initial conditions}
tx:=0;
txd:=0;
txdd:=0;
k:=k1;

{newmark integration}
tf:=trunc((8*m/c)/dt);
for i:=1 to npts do begin
  clrsr;
  writeln(npts:2,','npts-i:2);
  xmax:=0;
  xmin:=0;
  stopi:=false;
  stopf:=false;

for t:=0 to tf do
begin
  khat:=k+a0*m+a1*c;
  ft:=f*sin(w*t*dt);
  fhat:=ft+m*(a0*tx+a2*txd+a3*txdd)+
        c*(a1*tx+a4*txd+a5*txdd);
  x:=fhat/khat;
  xdd:=a0*(x-tx)-a2*txd-a3*txdd;
  xd:=txd+a6*txdd+a7*txdd;
  if x >= 0 then k:=k1 else k:=k2;
  if t >= tf-3*(trunc(2*pi/(w*dt))) then
    begin
      if x > xmax then xmax:=x;
      if x < xmin then xmin:=x;
      if (not stopi) and (tx < 0) and (x > 0) then
        begin
          tin:=t;
          stopi:=true;
        end;
      if (not stopf) and (tx > 0) and (x < 0) then
        begin
          tfin:=t;
          stopf:=true;
        end;
    end;
  tx:=x;
  txdd:=xd;
  xdd:=xd;
  fdriv[i]:=w/(2*pi);
  omega[i]:=1/(2*abs(tfin-tin)*dt);
  umax[i]:=xmax;
  umin[i]:=xmin;
  w:=w+dw;
  writeln(outfile,fdriv[i]:15,' ',omega[i]:15,
             ' ',umax[i]:15,' ',umin[i]:15);
end;
end;

procedure sim_non;
var
  x10,
  x20,
  dx1,
  x1,
  x2,
  p1,
  p2,
  pd1,
  pd2,
\[ t, \]
\[ \phi_1, \]
\[ \phi_2, \]
\[ w_1, \]
\[ w_2, \]
\[ a_1, \]
\[ a_2, \]
\[ b_1, \]
\[ b_2, \]
\[ \alpha_1, \]
\[ \beta_1, \]
\[ \alpha_2, \]
\[ \beta_2, \]
\[ \delta_1, \]
\[ \delta_2, \]
\[ \gamma_1, \]
\[ \gamma_2, \text{ extended; } \]
\[ n: \text{ long int; } \]

begin
\[
\phi_1 := \arctan((c/m*w)/(\sqrt(w_1)-\sqrt(w)));
\]
if \( \phi_1 < 0 \) then \( \phi_1 := \pi + \phi_1; \)
\[
\phi_2 := \arctan((c/m*w)/(\sqrt(w_2)-\sqrt(w)));
\]
if \( \phi_2 < 0 \) then \( \phi_2 := \pi + \phi_2; \)
\[
w_1 := \sqrt{(\sqrt(w_1)-\sqrt(c/(2*m))};
\]
\[
w_2 := \sqrt{(\sqrt(w_2)-\sqrt(c/(2*m))};
\]

{IC at \( t=0 \)}
\[
a_1 := f/m*(c/(2*m*w_1d)*\sin(\phi_1)-w/w_1d*\cos(\phi_1))/
\quad \sqrt{(\sqrt(w_1)-\sqrt(w))}+\sqrt{(c/m*w)}; \]
\[
b_1 := f/m*\sin(\phi_1)/\sqrt{(\sqrt(w_1)-\sqrt(w))}+\sqrt{(c/m*w)}; \]
\[
a_2 := 0; \]
\[
b_2 := 0; \]
\[
n := 0; \]
\[
x_10 := 0; \]

{IC at \( t=n*pi/w \)}
repeat
begin
\[ n := n + 1; \]
\[ t := n*pi/w; \]
\{ \]
\[
\begin{align*}
  pl_1 &= f/m*\sin(w*t-\phi_1)/\sqrt{(\sqrt(w_1)-\sqrt(w))}+\sqrt{(c/m*w)}; \\
  pl_2 &= f/m*\sin(w*t-\phi_2)/\sqrt{(\sqrt(w_2)-\sqrt(w))}+\sqrt{(c/m*w)}; \\
  if \ odd(n) \ then \\
  begin
  pl_1 &= f/m*\sin(\phi_1)/\sqrt{(\sqrt(w_1)-\sqrt(w))}+\sqrt{(c/m*w)}; \\
  pl_2 &= f/m*\sin(\phi_2)/\sqrt{(\sqrt(w_2)-\sqrt(w))}+\sqrt{(c/m*w)}; \\
  pd_1 &= -f/m*w*\cos(\phi_1)/\sqrt{(\sqrt(w_1)-\sqrt(w))}+\sqrt{(c/m*w)}; \\
  pd_2 &= -f/m*w*\cos(\phi_2)/\sqrt{(\sqrt(w_2)-\sqrt(w))}+\sqrt{(c/m*w)}; \\
  end
\end{align*}
\}
end
else
begin
pl1:=-f/m*sin(phil)/sqrt(sqr(sqr(w1)-sqr(w))+sqr(c/m*w));
p21:=-f/m*sin(phi2)/sqrt(sqr(sqr(w2)-sqr(w))+sqr(c/m*w));
pd1:=f/m*w*cos(phil)/sqrt(sqr(sqr(w1)-sqr(w))+sqr(c/m*w));
pd2:=f/m*w*cos(phi2)/sqrt(sqr(sqr(w2)-sqr(w))+sqr(c/m*w));
end;

{pd1:=f/m*w*cos(w*t-phil)/sqrt(sqr(sqr(w1)-sqr(w))+sqr(c/m*w)); }
{pd2:=f/m*w*cos(w*t-phi2)/sqrt(sqr(sqr(w2)-sqr(w))+sqr(c/m*w)); }

alpha1:=exp(-c/(2*m*t)*sin(w1*d*t));
beta1:=exp(-c/(2*m*t)*cos(w1*d*t));
delta1:=exp(-c/(2*m*t)*w1d*cos(w1*d*t)-c/(2*m)*exp(-c/(2*m*t))*sin(w1*d*t));
gamma1:=-c/(2*m)*exp(-c/(2*m*t)*cos(w1*d*t)-w1d*exp(-c/(2*m*t))*sin(w1*d*t));

alpha2:=exp(-c/(2*m*t)*sin(w2*d*t));
beta2:=exp(-c/(2*m*t)*cos(w2*d*t));
delta2:=exp(-c/(2*m*t)*w2d*cos(w2*d*t)-c/(2*m)*exp(-c/(2*m*t))*sin(w2*d*t));
gamma2:=-c/(2*m)*exp(-c/(2*m*t)*cos(w2*d*t)-w2d*exp(-c/(2*m*t))*sin(w2*d*t));

if odd(n) then
begin
{b2:=(delta2*(p1-p2)+alpha2*(pd1-pd2)-
 beta1*delta2*b1+alpha2*delta1*a1+alpha2*gamma1*b1) /
 (alpha2*gamma2-delta2*beta2);}

a2:=(gamma2*(p1-p2)-beta2*(pd1-pd2));
a2:=a2+(alpha1*gamma2*a1+beta1*gamma2*b1-
 delta1*beta2*a1-beta2*gamma1*b1);
a2:=a2/(alpha2*gamma2-delta2*beta2);
a2:=-p2*gamma2-beta2*(pd1-pd2+a1*delta1+b1*gamma1))/(alpha2*gamma2-
 delta2*beta2);
b2:=(p2*delta2+alpha2*(pd1-pd2+a1*delta1+b1*gamma1))/(alpha2*gamma2-
 delta2*beta2);
end
else
begin
{a1:=(gamma1*(alpha2*a2+beta2*b2+p2-p1)-
 beta1*(delta2*a2+gamma2*b2+pd2-pd1))/(alpha1*gamma1-beta1*delta1);
b1:=-(delta1*(alpha2*a2+beta2*b2+p2-p1)+
 alpha1*(delta2*a2+gamma2*b2+pd2-pd1))/(alpha1*gamma1-
 beta1*delta1);} 
a1:=-p1*gamma1+beta1*(pd2-pd1+a2*delta2+b2*gamma2))/(alpha1*gamma1-
 delta1*beta1);
b1:=(p1*delta1+gamma1*(pd2-pd1+a2*delta2+b2*gamma2))/(alpha1*g, mma1-
 delta1*beta1);
end;
end;
x1:=(p1+alpha1+beta1;
x2:=(p2+alpha2+beta2;
if n=trunc(w1*8*m/(pi*c)) then
begin
  x10:=x1;
end;
until n = trunc(w1*8*m/(pi*c));
x10:=x1;
end;

begin
  f:=1e-3;
m:=1;
c:=18;
k1:=5.96e9;
k2:=4.24e9;
wdf:=sqrt((k1+k2)/(2*m));
w1:=sqrt(k1/m);
w2:=sqrt(k2/m);
w:=11245*2*pi;

newmark;
{sim_non;}
end. {end mainprogram}
Appendix G

FTEST2.PAS Design Program

The FTEST2.PAS design program is an integral part of this thesis. The program computes the dynamic, electrical, and fatigue properties of the device and serves as the principle modeling tool of the experiment for data reduction and analysis. Subsections of this part of the appendix include the input files for the generation 1 design, and the 091890, 102491, 110291, 011092, 020392 devices.
G.1 Generation 1: T38.inp
10.000  1  lab length of segment ab [mic]
120.000  2  lbc length of segment bc [mic]
2.000  3  x1 edge clearances [mic]
30.000  4  x2 distance between torquer and sensor plates [mic]
30.000  5  x3 distance between sensor plate and plate 2 [mic]
120.000  6  lpy width of plate [mic]
8.000  7  lhx length of hole at torquer [mic]
30.000  8  lhly width of at torquer hole [mic]
8.000  9  lh3y length of hole at sensor [mic]
45.000 10  lbh3y loc of cg of hole 3 [mic]
27.000 11  lbh4y loc of cg of hole 4 [mic]
9.000 12  lbh5y loc of cg of hole 5 [mic]
60.000 13  lp2x length of tip mass [mic]
80.000 14  lp2y width of tip mass [mic]
15.000 15  lp2z thickness of tip mass [mic]
0.000 16  lplz thickness of plate mass [mic]
11.500 17  b0 width of beam at point a (fixed end) [mic]
11.500 18  bb width at V-notch [mic]
2.900 19  h thickness of beam [mic]
1.000 20  hb V-notch depth [mic]
15.000 21  ltx length of torquer [mic]
20.000 22  lsx length of sensor [mic]
6.400 23  ds0s distance from sensor elec. to plating [mic]
6.400 24  do0 distance from torquer elec. to plateing [m]
5.5E-0013 25  cfb feedback capacitance [f]
1.000 26  vexc excitation voltage on sensor [v]
0.0100 27  da crack length [mic]
0.0500 28  rtip tip radius of V-notch [mic]
15.0000 29  wservo servo bandwidth [hz]
10.0000 30  v0 applied torquer voltage [v]
70.0000 31  h0p plate airgap [mic]
1.0000 32  vbias sensor bias voltage [v]
  2 33  ndof # DOF of analysis (2 or 3)
  0 34  failure simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)
  0 35  fatigue simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)
0.0004 36  vsio2 crack velocity [m/s]
32.0000 37  nsi02 fatigue constant

New file created on:
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G.2 091890.inp
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>1 lab length of segment ab [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.000</td>
<td>2 lbc length of segment bc [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3 x1 edge clearances [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>4 x2 distance between torquer and sensor plates [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>5 x3 distance between sensor plate and plate 2 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.000</td>
<td>6 lpy width of plate [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>7 lh1x length of hole at torquer [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>8 lh1y width of at torquer hole [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>9 lh3y length of hole at sensor [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.000</td>
<td>10 lbh3y loc of cg of hole 3 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.000</td>
<td>11 lbh4y loc of cg of hole 4 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>12 lbh5y loc of cg of hole 5 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.000</td>
<td>13 lp2x length of tip mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.000</td>
<td>14 lp2y width of tip mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>15 lp2z thickness of tip mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>16 lplz thickness of plate mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>17 b0 width of beam at point a (fixed end) [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>18 bb width at V-notch [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>19 h thickness of beam [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>20 hb V-notch depth [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>21 ltx length of torquer [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>22 lsx length of sensor [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>23 d0s distance from sensor elec. to plating [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>24 d0t distance from torquer elec. to plateing [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5E-0013</td>
<td>25 cfb feedback capacitance [f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>26 vexc excitation voltage on sensor [v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>27 da crack length [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>28 rtip tip radius of V-notch [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>29 wervo servo bandwidth [hz]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>30 v0 applied torquer voltage [v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0000</td>
<td>31 h0p plate airgap [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>32 vbias sensor bias voltage [v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33 ndof # DOF of analysis (2 or 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>34 failure simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35 fatigue simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>36 vsi02 crack velocity [m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0000</td>
<td>37 nsi02 fatigue constant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New file created on:  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lab length of segment ab [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lbc length of segment bc [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x1 edge clearances [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x2 distance between torquer and sensor plates [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x3 distance between sensor plate and plate 2 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>lpy width of plate [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>lhix length of hole at torquer [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>lhly width of at torquer hole [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>lh3y length of hole at sensor [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>lbh3y loc of cg of hole 3 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>lbh4y loc of cg of hole 4 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>lbh5y loc of cg of hole 5 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>lp2x length of tip mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>lp2y width of tip mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>lp2z thickness of tip mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>lp1z thickness of plate mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>b0 width of beam at point a (fixed end) [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>bb width at V-notch [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.300</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>h thickness of beam [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>hb V-notch depth [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ltx length of torquer [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>lsx length of sensor [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>d0s distance from sensor elec. to plating [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>d0t distance from torquer elec. to plateing [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0E-012</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>cfb feedback capacitance [f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>vexc excitation voltage on sensor [v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>da crack length [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>rtip tip radius of V-notch [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>wservo servo bandwidth [hz]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.0000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>v0 applied torquer voltage [v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.0000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>h0p plate airgap [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>vbias sensor bias voltage [v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>ndof # DOF of analysis (2 or 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>failure simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>fatigue simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>vsi02 crack velocity [m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>nsi02 fatigue constant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New file created on: Date of run: Friday 2/14/1992 Time of run: 2:7:15
G.4  110291.inp
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>lab length of segment ab</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.000</td>
<td>lbc length of segment bc</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>xl edge clearances</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>x2 distance between torquer and sensor plates</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>x3 distance between sensor plate and plate 2</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.000</td>
<td>lpy width of plate</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>lh1x length of hole at torquer</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>lh1y width of at torquer hole</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>lh3y length of hole at sensor</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.000</td>
<td>lbh3y loc of cg of hole 3</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.000</td>
<td>lbh4y loc of cg of hole 4</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>lbh5y loc of cg of hole 5</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>lp2x length of tip mass</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.000</td>
<td>lp2y width of tip mass</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>lp2z thickness of tip mass</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>lp1x thickness of plate mass</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>b0 width of beam at point a (fixed end)</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>bb width at V-notch</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.300</td>
<td>h thickness of beam</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>hb V-notch depth</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>ltx length of torquer</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>l3x length of sensor</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>d0s distance from sensor elec. to plating</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>d0t distance from torquer elec. to plateing</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0E-0012</td>
<td>cfb feedback capacitance [f]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>vexc excitation voltage on sensor [v]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>da crack length</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>rtip tip radius of V-notch</td>
<td>mic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>wservo servo bandwidth [hz]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.0000</td>
<td>v0 applied torquer voltage [v]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.0000</td>
<td>h0p plate airgap [mic]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>vbias sensor bias voltage [v]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ndof # DOF of analysis (2 or 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>failure simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>fatigue simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>vsi02 crack velocity [m/s]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0000</td>
<td>nsi02 fatigue constant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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13.000 1  lab length of segment ab [mic]
60.000 2  lab length of segment bc [mic]
15.000 3  x1 edge clearances [mic]
40.000 4  x2 distance between torquer and sensor plates [mic]
100.000 5  x3 distance between sensor plate and plate 2 [mic]
162.000 6  lpy width of plate [mic]
0.000 7  lh1x length of hole at torquer [mic]
30.000 8  lh1y width of at torquer hole [mic]
0.000 9  lh3y length of hole at sensor [mic]
45.000 10  lbh3y loc of cg of hole 3 [mic]
27.000 11  lbh4y loc of cg of hole 4 [mic]
9.000 12  lbh5y loc of cg of hole 5 [mic]
70.000 13  lp2x length of tip mass [mic]
130.000 14  lp2y width of tip mass [mic]
16.000 15  lp2z thickness of tip mass [mic]
0.000 16  lplz thickness of plate mass [mic]
20.000 17  b0 width of beam at point a (fixed end) [mic]
17.000 18  bb width at V-notch [mic]
8.300 19  h thickness of beam [mic]
4.700 20  hb V-notch depth [mic]
15.000 21  ltx length of torquer [mic]
15.000 22  lax length of sensor [mic]
12.500 23  d0s distance from sensor elec. to plating [mic]
12.500 24  d0t distance from torquer elec. to plateing [m]
1.08-0012 25  cfb feedback capacitance [f]
5.000 26  vexc excitation voltage on sensor [v]
0.0100 27  da crack length [mic]
0.0500 28  rtip tip radius of V-notch [mic]
15.0000 29  w servo servo bandwidth [hz]
87.0000 30  v0 applied torquer voltage [v]
75.0000 31  h0p plate airgap [mic]
1.0000 32  vbias sensor bias voltage [v]
3 33  ndof # DOF of analysis (2 or 3)
0 34  failure simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)
0 35  fatigue simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)
0.0004 36  vsi02 crack velocity [m/s]
40.0000 37  nsi02 fatigue constant

New file created on:
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G.6  020392.inp
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lab length of segment ab [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lbc length of segment bc [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x1 edge clearances [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x2 distance between torquer and sensor plates [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x3 distance between sensor plate and plate 2 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>lpy width of plate [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>lh1x length of hole at torquer [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>lhly width of at torquer hole [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>lh3y length of hole at sensor [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>lbh3y loc of cg of hole 3 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>lbh4y loc of cg of hole 4 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>lbh5y loc of cg of hole 5 [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>lp2x length of tip mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>lp2y width of tip mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>lp2z thickness of tip mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>lp1z thickness of plate mass [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>b0 width of beam at point a (fixed end) [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>bb width at V-notch [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>h thickness of beam [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.300</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>hb V-notch depth [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ltx length of torquer [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>lsx length of sensor [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>d0s distance from sensor elec. to plating [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.500</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>d0t distance from torquer elec. to plateing [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0E-0012</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>cfb feedback capacitance [f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>vexc excitation voltage on sensor [v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>da crack length [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>rtip tip radius of V-notch [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>wservo servo bandwidth [hz]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>v0 applied torquer voltage [v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.0000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>h0p plate airgap [mic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>vbias sensor bias voltage [v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>ndof # DOF of analysis (2 or 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>failure simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>fatigue simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>vsi02 crack velocity [m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>nsi02 fatigue constant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New file created on:
Date of run: Thursday 2/13/1992             Time of run: 20:5:42
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

266
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program ftest2;
uses
crt,
dos,
init2,
matrix2,
dyn2,
frac2,
elec2,
menu2,
out2;

var
  hits_torquer,
  hits_sensor:boolean;

label start;

begin {Ftest.pas}
  while rerun do
  begin {while rerun do}
    start: dynamics(vc,thetac);
    hits_sensor:=false;
    dimension_check(vc,thetac,v3static,hits_sensor,hits_torquer);
    if hits_sensor then
      begin
        clrscr;
        writeln('WARNING: PLATE HITS SENSOR');
        writeln('d0smin = ',d0smin/clgth:10:3);
      end;
    if hits_torquer then
      begin
        clrscr;
        writeln('WARNING: PLATE HITS TORQUER');
        writeln('d0tmin = ',d0tmin/clgth:10:3);
      end;
    if hits_torquer or hits_sensor then
      begin
        readln;
        clrscr;
        reinitialize;
        goto start;
      end;
    sensoroutput(vc,thetac,eoutu,eoutd);
    control(ndof,epole);
    fracture_analysis;
  end
end
run_menu;
end; {while rerun do}
end. {Ftest.pas}
unit init2;
interface
uses
crt,
dos;

cst
rheir=1.2;
rhos=2.3e3;
rheO=1.93e4;
rheim=8.602e3;
em=2.2063e11;
esi=1.59e11;
csi=1e20;
csi=5e22;
rb=0.98;
r=a=1.17;
num=0.33;
eau=8.0e10;
dEdt=1.1e8;
dGdt=1.5e7;
alphas=2.5e-6;
alphau=14.2e-6;
gs=5.1e10;
crlth=1.0e-6;
e0=8.85e-12;
ka=1.0;
kle=1e6;
kle=9.0e5;
kle=9.5e5;
pctk=1.0;
sigma=esii*0.0206;
gamma=73e-3;
gamma=22.1e-3;
muair=1.81e-5;
agrat=9.8;
im=37;
nsys=3;
nsub=2;
gvac=1e4;
Pamb=1.01356e5;
Ta=360;
Tw=300;
vbsi=6e8;
tsi=0.5e-6;

density of air [kg/m^3]
density of silicon [kg/m^3]
density of gold [kg/m^3]
density of nickel [kg/m^3]
Modulus of elasticity of Si [N/m^2]
Modulus of elasticity of Au [N/m^2]
determined by UTRC nonindenting
surface concen. of boron [atoms/cm^3]
concen. of Si atom sites [atoms/cm^3]
atomic radius of boron [angstroms]
atomic radius of Si atom sites [angstroms]
Poisson's ratio of silicon

Modulus of elasticity of Au [N/m^2]

(temp sens of Youngs mod. n/(m^2*C))

(temp sens of torsional mod. n/(m^2*C))

(thermal coeff of exp. of silicon /deg C)

(thermal coeff of exp. of gold /deg C)

Torsional modulus of Si [N/m^2]

(conversion factor [m/mic])

(permittivity of a vacuum [coul^2/n*m^2])

(dielectric of air)

crit. stress factor <111> [N/m^3(3/2)]

crit. stress factor <110> [N/m^3(3/2)]

crit. stress factor <100> [N/m^3(3/2)]

(\% final stress intensity factor)

(fraction stress of Si whiskers reported
by Eisner to be 2.06% of E)

(surface tension H20 [n/m])

(surface tension methanol [n/m])

(viscosity of air [n*sec/m^2])

(acceleration due to gravity [m/sec^2])

(number of inputs on data file)

(size of dynamic system matrices)

(size of substructure matrices)

(Q in vacuum; determine from spectrum anal)

(atmospheric pressure [n/m^2])

(process sinter temp [deg C])

(TC wire bond temp [deg C])

(break down voltage of SiO2 [V/m])

(SiO2 thick. under bridge electrodes [m])
type

piece=(p,p1,p2,h1s,h2s,h3s,h4s,h5s,h6s,h7s,h8s,
h1a,h2a,h3a,h4a,h5a,h6a,h7a,h8a); {plate,plating1,plating2,
holes 1 through 5}

dim=(x,y,z);

sysmat= array[1..nsys,1..nsys] of double;

sysvec= array[1..nsys] of double;

var

Icl,
Pind,
x1,
x2,
x3,
lab,
lbc,
lbg,
lac,
lbd,
lag,
lpx,
lpy,
lh1x,
lh1y,
lh3y,
lbh3y,
lbh4y,
lbh5y,
lplz,
lp2x,
lp2y,
lp2z,
kvco,
kf1,
kp,
gp,
repole,
impole,
repolevac,
impolevac,
k,
k,
wservo,
verror,
verrormax,
verrorf,
a,
b, d0t, d0s, d0smin, d0tmin, dcurl, dcurlt, ht, hs, h0t, h0s, h0p, b0, bb, h, hb, ww, ltx, lty, lbt, lsx, lsy, lbx, lby, lab, sr, c_kies, c_mura, c_paris, c_ellip, c_dc, krb1, da, ktor, krp, dk1da, dkldaf, dkldactl, rtip, kadc, kakis, kaellip, kamur, klf, klcc, [n/m^3/2]}

{typel filter pole, rad/s}
{dist. from torquerele. to si plate [m]}
{dist. from sensor elec. to si plate [m]}
{minimum sensor airgap [m]}
{minimum torquer airgap [m]}
{curl displacement at sensor [m]}
{curl displacement at torquer [m]}
{torquer airgap corrected for v3static, [m]}
{sensor airgap corrected for v3static, [m]}
{dist. between plating and torquer elec. [m]}
{dist. between plating and sensor elec. [m]}
{dist. between plate and bottom of well [m]}
{width of beam @ pt. a (fixed end) [m]}
{thickness of beam at v-notch [m]}
{thickness of beam [m]}
{th. of beam @ pt.b (str. concen.) [m]}
{width of V-notch [m]}
{length of torquer [m]}
{width of torquer [m]}
{length to torquer c.g. [m]}
{length of sensor [m]}
{width of sensor [m]}
{length to sensor c.g. [m]}
{area moment of inertia of beam at v-notch [m^4]}
{stiffness ratio of plate to beam}
{crack compliance Kies 1/(n*m)}
{crack compliance Murakami 1/(n*m)}
{crack compliance Paris 1/(n*m)}
{elliptical crack compliance 1/(n*m)}
{deep crack compliance 1/(n*m)}
{rotational stiffness of v-notch w.r.t. point c [n*m/rad]}
{incremental crack length [m]}
{torsional stiffness of beam, [n*m/rad]}
{composite rot. stiff. of plate [n*m/rad]}
{sensitivity of stress intensity factor to crack length [n-m^5/2]}
{rate of change of kl at failure [n/m^5/2]}
{rate of chg of kl at bandwidth [n/m^5/2]}
{tip radius of v-notch [m]}

{final stress intensity 95% kl11 (n/m^3/2]}
{kl11 corrected for crack dyanmics}
kli,
k1,
pctk1c,
pctk1cl,
pctk1ctl,
vsi02,
nsi02,

dwctl,
dactl,
vctl,
thetactl,
dwctl,
[rad/s^2]
dwtdmax,
rormax [rad/s^2]
dwf,
dafr,
tf,
ta,

tctl,
vct,
thetaclf,
dwdf,
pctsf,
mt,
mb,
dw,
dwtd,
wax,
wzz,
[rad/s]
wp,
krbr,
wbr,
[rad/s]
vbr,
bvcr,
Tmax,
thetaact,
vact,
v3act,
spring, [m]
v3,
vcr,
\text{thetac, \quad \text{vcmax, \quad \text{thetacmax, \quad sigmab, \quad momb, \quad mombf, \quad mombst, \quad [n*m]}}}
\text{f0, \quad \text{v0, \quad vbd, \quad v0c, \quad v0vac, \quad v0f, \quad vbias, \quad vcfail, \quad thetacfail, \quad vsnap, \quad delcu, \quad delcd, \quad c0, \quad vexc, \quad eoutu, \quad eoutd, \quad cfb:double; \quad lb, \quad l:array[piece,dim] of double; \quad Iac, \quad krc, \quad Ip:array[dim,dim] of double; \quad E, \quad rho, \quad m:array[piece] of double; \quad klc, \quad \text{[N/m]}}
\text{lcg:array[dim] of double; \quad zeta, \quad eta, \quad xi, \quad lambda, \quad ma, \quad mac, \quad k, \quad kc, \quad phi, \quadphinorm, \quad phivac, \quad phinormvac,}
\text{\{angle at point c [m]\}}
\text{\{max deflection at pt c [m]\}}
\text{\{max deflection at pt c [m]\}}
\text{\{far field stress at point b [n/m^2]\}}
\text{\{moment applied at point b [n*m]\}}
\text{\{failure momonet at b [n*m]\}}
\text{\{moment at point b due to surf. tension}}
\text{\{magnitude of torquer load [n]\}}
\text{\{applied torquer voltage [v]\}}
\text{\{siC2 break-down voltage [v]\}}
\text{\{fracture voltage [v]\}}
\text{\{applied torquer voltage in vacuum [v]\}}
\text{\{failure voltage [v]\}}
\text{\{sensor bias voltage [v]\}}
\text{\{failure displacement at point c [m]\}}
\text{\{failure angle at point c [rad]\}}
\text{\{snap voltage, [v]\}}
\text{\{upward delta capacitance [f]\}}
\text{\{downward delta capacitance [f]\}}
\text{\{nominal capacitance zero displacement [f]\}}
\text{\{excitation voltage on sensor [v]\}}
\text{\{sensor output upward travel [v]\}}
\text{\{sensor output downward travel [v]\}}
\text{\{feedback capacitor [f]\}}
\text{\{dim. array of pieces wrt pt.c [m]\}}
\text{\{dim. array of pieces [m]\}}
\text{\{area moment of beam about x,y,x axis [m^4]\}}
\text{\{rot. stiff. of beam at c about x,y,z [N*m]\}}
\text{\{inertia matrix of end plate [kg*m^2]\}}
\text{\{Young’s modulus [n/m^2]\}}
\text{\{density array [kg/m^3]\}}
\text{\{mass array of end plate [kg]\}}
\text{\{linear stiffness of beam in x,y,z at c}}
\text{\{center of gravity of end plate [m]\}}
\text{\{lever arm matrix of cg\}}
\text{\{"""torquer\}}
\text{\{lever arm matrix of sensor\}}
\text{\{lever arm matrix of plate\}}
\text{\{mass matrix\}}
\text{\{stiffness matrix\}}
\text{\{corrected stiffness matrix\}}
\text{\{modal matrix of kc and mac\}}
\text{\{normalized modal matrix of kc and mac\}}
\text{\{modal matrix of ma and k\}}
\text{\{normalized vacuum modal matrix\}}
c:sysmat;  \{damping matrix\}
mhat, \{modal mass matrix of mac\}
khat, \{modal stiff matrix of kc\}
chats, \{modal damping matrix\}
phats, \{modal load vector of p0\}
omega, \{frequency vector of mac and kc [rad/s]\}
omegavac, \{frequency vector of ma and k [rad/s]\}
etavvec, \{vector of lever arms for torquerc\}
xtvec, \{vector of lever arms for sensor\}
P0:sysvec; \{loading vector\}
filevar:array[1..nimp] of double; \{input variable array\}
fati_sim, \{flag to run fatigue simulation\}
fail_sim, \{flag to run a failure simulation\}
rerun:boolean; \{flag to rerun program\}
option:char; \{output options\}
frac, \{input for a failure simulation\}
fati, \{input for a fatigue simulation\}
ndof:integer; \{number of degrees of freedom\}

procedure reinitialize;
procedure initialize;
procedure indata;
function thetacurl(lgth,gap:double):double;
function deld0(lgth,gap:double):double;
procedure dimension_check(v,theta,v3static:double;
    var hits_selec,hits_telec:boolean);

implementation
function tan(deg:double):double;
begin
    deg:=deg*pi/180;
    tan:=sin(deg)/cos(deg);
end;

function thetacurl(lgth,gap:double):double;
begin
    thetacurl:=2*(3.0e-4)*lgth/gap; \{rad\}
end;

function deld0(lgth,gap:double):double;
begin
    deld0:=3.0e-4*sqr(lgth)/gap; \{9.597e-5 is theoretical value\}
end;

procedure dimension_check(v,theta,v3static:double;
    var hits_selec,hits_telec:boolean);
var
dcurlt,
dcurls:double;
begin
{compute min allowable airgap based on max. deflection}
dcurlt:=delt0(lac+lbt+x/2,h);
dcurls:=delt0(lac+lbsl+lsx/2,h);
dt0min:=v+vcs+(theta+theta+theta+theta)*x1+ltx+dcurlt;
dt0min:=v+vcs+(theta+theta+theta+theta)*x1+x2+ltx+lsx+dcurls;
if dt0min>=d0s then hits_selec:=true
else hits_selec:=false;
if dt0min>=d0t then hits_telec:=true
else hits_telec:=false;
end;

procedure indata;
const
 current_dir='c:\jcon\progs\fracture\ftest_2';
var
 filecheck:pathstr;
 filename:string;
 infile:text;
 n:integer;
begin {indata}
 clrscr;
 writeln('Specify input filename.');
 repeat
  readln(filename);
  until filename <> ' ';
 filecheck:=fsearch(filename,current_dir);
 if filecheck=' ' then
  begin
   writeln(filename,' not found in this directory.');
   halt;
  end
 else
  begin
   assign(infile,filename);
   reset(infile);
   n:=0;
   repeat
    begin
     n:=n+1;
     readln(infile,filevar[n]);
    end;
   until n=nimp;
   close(infile);
  end;
end; {indata}
procedure initialize;
begin {initialize}
  {preliminary initialization}
  lab:=filevar[1]*clgth;
  lbc:=filevar[2]*clgth;
  x1:=filevar[3]*clgth;
  x2:=filevar[4]*clgth;
  x3:=filevar[5]*clgth;
  lpy:=filevar[6]*clgth;
  lh1x:=filevar[7]*clgth;
  lh1y:=filevar[8]*clgth;
  lh3y:=filevar[9]*clgth;
  lhh3y:=filevar[10]*clgth;
  lhh4y:=filevar[11]*clgth;
  lhh5y:=filevar[12]*clgth;
  lp2x:=filevar[13]*clgth;
  lp2y:=filevar[14]*clgth;
  lp2z:=filevar[15]*clgth;
  lp1z:=filevar[16]*clgth;
  b0:=filevar[17]*clgth;
  bb:=filevar[18]*clgth;
  h:=filevar[19]*clgth;
  hb:=filevar[20]*clgth;
  ltx:=filevar[21]*clgth;
  lsx:=filevar[22]*clgth;
  d0s:=filevar[23]*clgth;
  d0t:=filevar[24]*clgth;
  cfb:=filevar[25];
  vexc:=filevar[26];
  da:=filevar[27]*clgth;
  rtip:=filevar[28]*clgth;
  wsmv0:=filevar[29]*2*pi;
  v0:=filevar[30];
  h0p:=filevar[31]*clgth;
  vbias:=filevar[32];
  ndof:=trunc(filevar[33]);
  frac:=trunc(filevar[34]);
  fati:=trunc(filevar[35]);
  vsl02:=filevar[36];
  nsl02:=filevar[37];

if (ndof <> 2) and (ndof <> 3) then
begin
  writeln(‘ERROR IN ASSIGNMENT OF NDOF: NDOF RESET TO 3’);
  ndof:=trunc(3.0);
  filevar[31]:=ndof;
readln;

end;

if (frac <> 0) and (frac <> 1) then begin
  writeln('ERROR IN ASSIGNMENT OF FRAC: FRAC RESET TO 0');
  frac:=0;
  filevar[32]:=0;
end;

if (ndof = 3) and (frac = 1) then fail_sim:=true else begin
  fail_sim:=false;
  frac:=0;
end;

if (ndof = 3) and (fati = 1) then fati_sim:=true else begin
  fati_sim:=false;
  fati:=0;
end;

if ndof = 3 then begin
  {check precrack dimensions}
  if hb <= da then begin
    writeln('WARNING: hb <= da, da reset to da:=0.1*hb');
    da:=0.1*hb;
    readln;
  end;
  if da<=0 then begin
    writeln('WARNING: da <= 0, da reset to da:=0.1*hb');
    dr:=0.1*hb;
    readln;
  end;
end;

{compute dielectric breakdown voltage}
vbd:=vbdsi02*tsi02;
if v0 >= vbd then begin
  writeln('WARNING: DIELECTRIC BREAKDOWN AT BRIDGE ELECTRODE');
  readln;
  clrscr;
end;
{compute nanoindenter clearance}
I_{cl} = (l_{bc} + x_{l} - lp_{2z} \cdot \tan(35\{30\})) \cdot \tan(90-65.3) - (d_{0t} + lp_{2z});
if I_{cl} <= 0 then
  begin
    writeln('WARNING: NANOINDENTER DOES NOT CLEAR BRIDGE ELECTRODE');
    readln;
    clrscr;
  end;

{stress intensity initialization \[n/m^{(3/2)}\]}
k_{1cc} := k_{1c11} / (1/\pi + 1/2);
k_{1f} := p_{ctk1cf} \cdot k_{1cc};

{torquer initialization}
l_{ty} := lp_{y};
l_{btx} := lt_{x}/2 + x_{1};

{sensor initialization}
l_{sx} := lp_{y};
l_{bsx} := x_{1} + x_{2} + lt_{x} + ls_{x}/2;

{beam dimensions}
l_{bd} := l_{bc} + l_{btx};
l_{ac} := l_{ab} + l_{bc};

{airgap correction due to curling}
h_{0t} := d_{0t} - del_{d0}(l_{ac} + l_{btx}, h);
h_{0s} := d_{0s} - del_{d0}(l_{ac} + l_{bsx}, h);
h_{t} := h_{0t};
h_{s} := h_{0s};

{silicon plate initialization}
l_{[p,x]} := x_{1} + x_{2} + x_{3} + lt_{x} + ls_{x} + lp_{2x};
l_{[p,y]} := lp_{y};
l_{[p,z]} := h;
l_{b[p,x]} := l_{[p,x]} / 2;
l_{b[p,y]} := 0.0;
l_{b[p,z]} := 0.0;

{plate 1 initialization}
l_{[p1,x]} := l_{[p,x]};
l_{[p1,y]} := l_{[p,y]};
l_{[p1,z]} := lp_{1z};
l_{b[p1,x]} := l_{[p,x]} / 2;
l_{b[p1,y]} := 0.0;
l_{b[p1,z]} := (l_{[p1,z]} + l_{[p,z]}) / 2;
{plate 2 initialization}
l[p2,x]:=lp2x;
l[p2,y]:=lp2y;
l[p2,z]:=lp2z;
lb[p2,x]:=x1+x2+x3+1tx+1sx+1[p2,x]/2;
lb[p2,y]:=0.0;
lb[p2,z]:(1[p2,z]+1[p,z])/2;

{hole 1 initialization}
l[h1s,x]:=lh1x;
l[h1s,y]:=lh1y;
l[h1s,z]:=l[p,z];
l[h1a,x]:=lh1x;
l[h1a,y]:=lh1y;
l[h1a,z]:=l[p1,z];
lb[h1a,x]:=1tx/2+x1;
lb[h1a,y]:(1[p,y]-2*l[h1a,y])/6+1[h1a,y]/2;
lb[h1a,z]:(1[h1s,z]+1[h1a,z])/2;
lb[h1s,x]:=1tx/2+x1;
lb[h1s,y]:(1[p,y]-2*l[h1s,y])/6+1[h1s,y]/2;
lb[h1s,z]:=0;

{hole 2 initialization}
l[h2s,x]:=lh1x;
l[h2s,y]:=lh1y;
l[h2s,z]:=l[p,z];
l[h2a,x]:=lh1x;
l[h2a,y]:=lh1y;
l[h2a,z]:=l[p1,z];
lb[h2a,x]:=lb[h1a,x];
lb[h2a,y]:=lb[h1a,y];
lb[h2a,z]:(1[h2s,z]+1[h2a,z])/2;
lb[h2s,x]:=lb[h1s,x];
lb[h2s,y]:=-lb[h1s,y];
lb[h2s,z]:=0;

{hole 3 initialization}
l[h3s,x]:=lsx;
l[h3s,y]:=lh3y;
l[h3s,z]:=l[p,z];
l[h3a,x]:=lsx;
l[h3a,y]:=lh3y;
l[h3a,z]:=l[p1,z];
lb[h3s,x]:=lbsx;
lb[h3s,y]:=lbh3y;
lb[h3s,z]:=0;
lb[h3a,x]:=lbsx;
lb[h3a,y]:=lbh3y;
lb[h3a,z] := (l[h3a,z] + 1[h3a,z]) / 2;

{hole 4 initialization}
l[h4s,x] := l[h3s,x];
l[h4s,y] := l[h3s,y];
l[h4s,z] := l[h3s,z];
l[h4a,x] := l[h3a,x];
l[h4a,y] := l[h3a,y];
l[h4a,z] := l[h3a,z];
lb[h4s,x] := lb[h3s,x];
lb[h4s,y] := lbh4y;
lb[h4s,z] := 0;
lb[h4a,x] := lb[h3a,x];
lb[h4a,y] := lbh4y;
lb[h4a,z] := (l[h4a,z] + l[h4s,z]) / 2;

{hole 5 initialization}
l[h5s,x] := l[h3s,x];
l[h5s,y] := l[h3s,y];
l[h5s,z] := l[h3s,z];
l[h5a,x] := l[h3a,x];
l[h5a,y] := l[h3a,y];
l[h5a,z] := l[h3a,z];
lb[h5s,x] := lb[h3s,x];
lb[h5s,y] := lbh5y;
lb[h5s,z] := 0;
lb[h5a,x] := lb[h3a,x];
lb[h5a,y] := lbh5y;
lb[h5a,z] := (l[h5a,z] + l[h5s,z]) / 2;

{hole 6 initialization}
l[h6s,x] := l[h3s,x];
l[h6s,y] := l[h3s,y];
l[h6s,z] := l[h3s,z];
l[h6a,x] := l[h3a,x];
l[h6a,y] := l[h3a,y];
l[h6a,z] := l[h3a,z];
lb[h6s,x] := lb[h3s,x];
lb[h6s,y] := -lb[h5s,y];
lb[h6s,z] := 0;
lb[h6a,x] := lb[h3a,x];
lb[h6a,y] := -lb[h5a,y];
lb[h6a,z] := (l[h6a,z] + l[h6s,z]) / 2;

{hole 7 initialization}
l[h7s,x] := l[h3s,x];
l[h7s,y] := l[h3s,y];
l[h7s,z] := l[h3s,z];
\begin{verbatim}
1[h7a,x]:=1[h3a,x];
1[h7a,y]:=1[h3a,y];
1[h7a,z]:=1[h3a,z];
lb[h7s,x]:=lb[h3s,x];
lb[h7s,y]:=-lb[h4s,y];
lb[h7s,z]:=0;
lb[h7a,x]:=lb[h3a,x];
lb[h7a,y]:=-lb[h4a,y];
lb[h7a,z]:=(1[h7s,z]+1[h7a,z])/2;

{hole 8 initialization}
1[h8s,x]:=1[h3s,x];
1[h8s,y]:=1[h3s,y];
1[h8s,z]:=1[h3s,z];
lb[h8a,x]:=1[h3a,x];
lb[h8a,y]:=1[h3a,y];
lb[h8a,z]:=1[h3a,z];
lb[h8s,x]:=lb[h3s,x];
lb[h8s,y]:=-lb[h3s,y];
lb[h8s,z]:=0;
lb[h8a,x]:=lb[h3a,x];
lb[h8a,y]:=-lb[h3a,y];
lb[h8a,z]:=(1[h8a,z]+1[h8s,z])/2;

{density initialization}
rho[p]:=rhosi;
rho[p1]:=rhoau;
rho[p2]:=rhoau;
rho[h1s]:=rho[p];
rho[h1a]:=rho[p1];
rho[h2s]:=rho[p];
rho[h2a]:=rho[p1];
rho[h3s]:=rho[p];
rho[h3a]:=rho[p1];
rho[h4s]:=rho[p];
rho[h4a]:=rho[p1];
rho[h5s]:=rho[p];
rho[h5a]:=rho[p1];
rho[h6s]:=rho[p];
rho[h6a]:=rho[p1];
rho[h7s]:=rho[p];
rho[h7a]:=rho[p1];
rho[h8s]:=rho[p];
rho[h8a]:=rho[p1];

{Young's Modulus initialization}
E[p]:=esi;
E[p1]:=eau;
\end{verbatim}
procedure p-intvar1;
begin
  writeln(filevar[1]:10:3, 'lab length of segment ab [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[2]:10:3, 'lbc length of segment bc [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[3]:10:3, 'x1 edge clearances [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[4]:10:3, 'x2 distance between torquer and sensor plates [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[5]:10:3, 'x3 distance between sensor plate and plate 2 [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[6]:10:3, 'lpy width of plate [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[7]:10:3, 'lhx length of hole at torquer [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[8]:10:3, 'lhly width of at torquer hole [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[9]:10:3, 'lh3y length of hole at sensor [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[10]:10:3, 'lbh3y loc of cg of hole 3 [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[11]:10:3, 'lbh4y loc of cg of hole 4 [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[12]:10:3, 'lbh5y loc of cg of hole 5 [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[13]:10:3, 'lp2x length of tip mass [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[14]:10:3, 'lp2y width of tip mass [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[15]:10:3, 'lp2z thickness of tip mass [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[16]:10:3, 'lp1z thickness of plate mass [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[17]:10:3, 'b0 width of beam at point a (fixed');
end;[mic']);
writeln(filevar[18]:10:3, 'bb width at V-notch [mic]');
end;{printvar1}

procedure printvar2;
begin
  writeln(filevar[19]:10:3, 'h thickness of beam [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[20]:10:3, 'hb V-notch depth [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[21]:10:3, 'ltx length of torquer [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[22]:10:3, 'lxz length of sensor [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[23]:10:3, 'doa distance from sensor elec. to plating [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[24]:10:3, 'dot distance from torquer elec. to plating [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[25]:10, 'cfb feedback capacitance [f]');
  writeln(filevar[26]:10:3, 'vexc excitation voltage on sensor [v]');
  writeln(filevar[27]:10:4, 'da crack length [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[28]:10:4, 'rtip tip radius of V-notch [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[29]:10:4, 'wservo servo bandwidth [hz]');
  writeln(filevar[30]:10:4, 'v0 applied torquer voltage [v]');
  writeln(filevar[31]:10:4, 'h0p plate airgap [mic]');
  writeln(filevar[32]:10:4, 'vbias sensor bias voltage [v]');
end;
writeln(trunc(filevar[33]):10,’
3’); writeln(trunc(filevar[34]):10,’no’);
writeln(trunc(filevar[35]):10,’no’);
writeln(filevar[36]:10,’vsio2 crack velocity [m/s]’);
writeln(filevar[37]:10:2,’nsio2 fatigue constant’);
end; {printvar2}

procedure reinitalize;
var
 varno:string[2];
 varsel:0..nimp;
 code:integer;
 quitinitial:boolean;

 procedure printhead;
 begin
 writeln(‘ Value Var No. Description’);
 writeln(‘-----------------------------------’);
 writeln(‘’);
 end;

 begin {reinitialize}
 quitinitial:=false;
 clrscr;
 repeat {until quitinitial=true}
 repeat {until varno=0}
 printhead;
 printvar1;
 writeln(‘Select Var No. or 0 to quit’);
 repeat
 readln(varno);
 val(varno,varsel,code);
 until (varsel in [0..nimp]) and (code=0);
 if varsel in [1..nimp] then
 begin
 writeln(‘Enter new variable value.’);
 readln(filevar[varsel]);
 end;
 clrscr;
 until varno=’0’;
 repeat
 printvar2;
 writeln(‘Select Var No. or 0 to quit’);
 repeat
 readln(varno);
val(varno, varsel, code);
until (varsel in [0..nimp]) and (code=0);
if varsel in [1..nimp] then
begin
  writeln('Enter new variable value.');
  readln(filevar[varsel]);
end
else quitinitial:=true;
clrscr;
until varno='0';
until quitinitial;
initialize;
end;  {reinitialize}

begin
  rerun:=true;
  indata;
  initialize;
end.
unit mains2;
interface
uses
crt,
dos,
init2;

procedure massandinertia;
procedure stiffness;
function varstiff(da:double):double;
function power(num,n:double):double;

implementation
function power(num,n:double):double;
begin
  power:=exp(n*ln(num));
end;

procedure massandinertia;
procedure masscalc;
var
  n:piece;
  cx,
  cy,
  cz:double;

function mass(rho,lgth,width,thick:double):double;
begin
  mass:=rho*lgth*width*thick;
end;

begin{masscalc}
  cx:=0;
  cy:=0;
  cz:=0;
  mt:=0;
  for n:=p to h8a do
  begin
    m[n]:=mass(rho[n],l[n,x],l[n,y],l[n,z]);
    if n in [h1s..h8a] then m[n]:=-1*m[n];
    mt:=mt+m[n];
    cx:=cx+m[n]*lb[n,x];
    cy:=cy+m[n]*lb[n,y];
    cz:=cz+m[n]*lb[n,z];
  end;
  lcg[x]:=cx/mt;
  lcg[y]:=cy/mt;
end;
\[ \text{lcg}[z] := cz/mt; \]
\[ \text{lag} := \text{lac} + \text{lcg}[x]; \]
\[ \text{lbg} := \text{lbc} + \text{lcg}[x]; \]
\[ \text{mb} := \text{mass}(\text{rhosi}, \text{lac}, b0, h)/\text{lac}; \]
end; \{ \text{masscalc} \}

procedure inertiacalc;

\textit{type}
\[ \text{inertia} = \text{array}[\text{piece}, \text{dim}, \text{dim}] \text{ of double}; \]
\textit{var}
\[ \text{Ic}: \text{inertia}; \]
\[ \text{alpha, beta}: \text{dim}; \]
\[ \text{n}: \text{piece}; \]

procedure Icomp(n:piece; mi, lx, ly, lz, a, b, c:double; var Ic:inertia);
begin
\[ \text{Ic}[n,x,x] := 1/12*mi*(sqr(ly)+sqr(lz))+mi*(sqr(b)+sqr(c)); \]
\[ \text{Ic}[n,x,y] := -mi*a*b; \]
\[ \text{Ic}[n,x,z] := -mi*a*c; \]
\[ \text{Ic}[n,y,x] := \text{Ic}[n,x,y]; \]
\[ \text{Ic}[n,y,y] := 1/12*mi*(sqr(lx)+sqr(lz))+mi*(sqr(a)+sqr(c)); \]
\[ \text{Ic}[n,y,z] := -mi*b*c; \]
\[ \text{Ic}[n,z,x] := \text{Ic}[n,x,z]; \]
\[ \text{Ic}[n,z,y] := \text{Ic}[n,y,z]; \]
\[ \text{Ic}[n,z,z] := 1/12*mi*(sqr(lx)+sqr(ly))+mi*(sqr(a)+sqr(b)); \]
end;

begin\{inertiacalc\}
\{initialize end plate inertia\}
for alpha := x to z do
for beta := x to z do Ip[alpha, beta] := 0;

\{compute inertias of end plate components\}
for n := p to h8a do
begin
Icomp(n, m[n], 1[n,x], 1[n,y], 1[n,z], lcg[x]-lb[n,x], lcg[y]-lb[n,y],
\[ \text{lcg}[z]-\text{lb}[n,z], \text{Ic}; \]
for alpha := x to z do
for beta := x to z do
Ip[alpha, beta] := Ip[alpha, beta] + Ic[n, alpha, beta];
end;

\{correct masses and inertias\}
for n := h1s to h8s do
begin
for alpha := x to z do
for beta := x to z do
Ic[p, alpha, beta] := Ic[p, alpha, beta] + Ic[n, alpha, beta];
end;
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m[p]:=m[p]+m[n];
end;

for n:=h1a to h8a do
begin
  for alpha:=x to z do
    for beta:=x to z do
      Ic[p1, alpha, beta]:=Ic[p1, alpha, beta]+Ic[n, alpha, beta];
      m[p1]:=m[p1]+m[n];
  end;
end; {inertialcalc}

begin{massandinertia}
  masscalc;
  inertialcalc;
end;{massandinertia}

procedure stiffness;
var
  Aac,
  ktor1,
  ktor2,
  Icorr:double;

function areainertia(h:double):double;
{areainertia computes area moment of inertia per unit width
  of a prismatic beam}
begin
  areainertia:=(1/12*h*h*h);
end;

function tan(thetadeg:double):double;
begin
  tan:=sin(thetadeg*pi/180)/cos(thetadeg*pi/180);
end;

function EIC(h1,h2,E1,E2:double):double;
var
  I1,
  I2,
  c,
  cl,
  c2,
  zeta,
  con1,
  con2:double;
begin
  I1:=areainertia(h1);
I2:=areainertia(h2);
c:=(sqr(h1)+2*E2/E1*h1*h2+E2/E1*sqr(h2))/
   (2*(h1+E2/E1*h2));
c1:=c/h1;
c2:=c/h2;
zeta:=h1/h2;
con1:=4-12*c1+12*sqr(c1);
con2:=4+12*sqr(zeta)+12*zeta-
   24*c*h1/sqr(h2)-12*c/h2+12*sqr(c/h2);
Elc:=El*Il*con1+E2*I2*con2;
end;

procedure plate stiff;
var
  l1, {length of spring 1}
  l2, { " " " 2}
  l3, { " " " 3}
  l4, { " " " 4}
  l5, { " " " 5}
  le1, {lever arm spring 1}
  le2, { " " " 2}
  le3, { " " " 3}
  le4, { " " " 4}
  le5, { " " " 5}
  b1, {width of spring 1}
  b2, { " " " 2}
  b3, { " " " 3}
  b4, { " " " 4}
  b5, { " " " 5}
  k1, {stiffness of spring 1 [n/m]}
  k2, { " " " 2 " " }
  k3, { " " " 3 " " }
  k4, { " " " 4 " " }
  k5, { " " " 5 " " }
kto, {total plate stiffness [n/m]}
EI:double;
{composite plate stiffness per width [n*m^-2/m]}

function krot(li,bi,lei:double):double;
begin
  if (li<=0) or (lei<=0) then krot:=le20
  else
    krot:=EI*bi/(sqr(lei)*li);
end;

function klin(li,bi,lei:double):double;
begin
  if li<=0 then klin:=le20
  else
klin:=EI*bi/(li*li*li*(lei/li+sqr(lei/li)+1/3));
end;

begin {platestiff}
{compute stiffness per unit width}
if lbz=0 then EI:=E[p]*areainertia(l[p,z])
else EI:=E[p]*C(l[p,z],l[p1,z],E[p],E[p1]);

{compute spring const 1}
l1:=lbtx-l[hs,x]/2;
b1:=l[p,y];
le1:=lclg[x]-(lbtx-l[hs,x]/2);
k1:=krot(l1,b1,le1);

{compute spring const 2}
l2:=l[hs,x];
b2:=l[p,y]-l[hs,y]-l[h2s,y];
le2:=lclg[x]-(lbtx+l[hs,x]/2);
k2:=krot(l2,b2,le2);

{compute spring const 3}
l3:=x2+(lbtx-l[hs,x])/2;
b3:=l[p,y];
le3:=lclg[x]-(lbx-lsx/2);
k3:=klin(l3,b3,le3);

{compute spring const 4}
l4:=lsx;
b4:=l[p,y]-l[h3s,y]-l[h4s,y]-l[h5s,y]-l[h6s,y]-l[h7s,y]-l[h8s,y];
le4:=lclg[x]-(lbx+lsx/2);
k4:=klin(l4,b4,le4);

{compute spring const 5}
if x3=0 then k5:=1.0e20
else
begin
if lclg[x]<(lb[p2,x]-l[p2,x]/2) then
begin
  l5:=lclg[x]-(lbx+lsx/2);
  le5:=0;
end;
if lclg[x]>(lb[p2,x]-l[p2,x]/2) then
begin
  l5:=x3;
  le5:=lclg[x]-(lb[p2,x]-l[p2,x]/2);
end;
if lclg[x]=(lb[p2,x]-l[p2,x]/2) then
begin

end;
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15 := x3;
le5 := 0;
end;
b5 := l[p,y];
k5 := klin(15, b5, le5);
end;

{compute total linear stiffness at c.g. point g}
ktot := 1/(1/k1+1/k2+1/k3+1/k4+1/k5);

{compute stiffness ratio}
sr := ktot/klc[z];

{compute composite rotational stiffness of end plate wrt. pt. c}
kpr := ktot*sqr(lcg[x]);
end; {platestiff}

procedure dof2;
var
kc,
kth,
Ith,
wc,
wth,
k11,
k12,
k22,
m11,
m12,
m22,
z1,
z2,
z3,
z4,
a,
b,
w1a,
w2a: double;
begin
z1 := 1+2*lcg[x]/lac;
z2 := 1+3*lcg[x]/lac;
z3 := 2*lcg[z]/lac;
z4 := 3*lcg[z]/lac;
k11 := 4*E[p]*Iac[y,y]/(lac*lac*lac);
k12 := 6*E[p]*Iac[y,y]/(lac*lac*lac);
k22 := 12*E[p]*Iac[y,y]/(lac*lac*lac);
m11 := mt*(sqr(z1)+sqr(z3))+4*Ip[y,y]/sqr(lac)+mb*lac/5;
\begin{verbatim}
ml2:=mt*(z1*z2+z3*z4)+6*Ip[y,y]/sqr(lac)+mb*lac/6;
m22:=mt*(sqr(z2)+sqr(z4))+9*Ip[y,y]/sqr(lac)+mb*lac/7;
a:=(k11*m22+k22*m11-2*m12*k12)/(m11*m22-sqr(ml2));
b:=(k11*k22-sqr(k12))/(m11*m22-sqr(ml2));
kc:=k12/(1+3*lcg[x]/(2*lac));
kth:=krc[y]*y*(1+lcg[x]/lac)/(1+3*lcg[x]/(2*lac));
Ith:=mt*sqr(lcg[x]+lac)+Ip[y,y];

wla:=sqrt((a-sqrt(sqr(a)-4*b))/2)/(2*pi);
w2a:=sqrt((a+sqrt(sqr(a)-4*b))/2)/(2*pi);
wc:=sqrt(kc/mt)/(2*pi);
wth:=sqrt(kth/Ith)/(2*pi);
end; {2dof}

procedure beam_inertia(var I:double; btemp,htemp:double);
var
 I1,
a1,
y1,
I2,
a2,
y2,
ybar:double;

procedure Ie(var I1,a1,y1:double);
var
 a,
b,
I:double;

begin {Ie}
a:=btemp/2;
b:=htemp;
a1:=pi*a*b/2-2*a*b*(sqr(3)/8+pi/12);
y1:=2*a*sqr(b)/3*power(0.75,1.5)/a1;
I:=pi*a*power(b,3)/8-2*a*power(b,3)*(sqr(3)/32-power(3,1.5)/64+pi/48);
I1:=I-a1*sqr(y1);
end;

procedure It(var I2,a2,y2:double);
var
 h,
a,
b:double;

begin {It}
h:=htemp/2;
b:=btemp;
\end{verbatim}
\[ a := b - 2 \cdot h \cdot \tan(13.5) \]
\[ a := b \cdot \sqrt{0.75} \]
\[ a2 := h \cdot (a+b)/2 \]
\[ y2 := h^2/(2 \cdot (a+b)/(3 \cdot (a+b)) \]
\[ I2 := \text{power}(h, 3) \cdot (\text{sqr}(a)+4 \cdot a \cdot b + \text{sqr}(b))/(36 \cdot (a+b)) \]
end;

begin \{beam\_inertia\}
\[ Ie(I1, a1, y1) \]
\[ It(I2, a2, y2) \]
\[ ybar := (y1 \cdot a1 + y2 \cdot a2)/(a1 + a2) \]
\[ I := (I1 + a1 \cdot \text{sqr}(ybar-y1)) + (I2 + a2 \cdot \text{sqr}(ybar-y2)) \]
end;

begin \{stiffness\}
{compute area moments of inertia of rectangular beam and V-notch [m^4]}
\[ Icorr := 12 \cdot (9 \cdot \text{sqr}(pi)-64)/(144 \cdot pi) \]
\[ Iac[y,y] := \text{areainertia}(h) \cdot b0 \]
\[ Iab := \text{areainertia}(bb) \cdot b0 \]
{compute linear spring constant of beam between pts. a & c [n/m]}
\[ klc[z] := 3 \cdot E[p] \cdot Iac[y,y]/(Iac[lac]*lac) \]
{rectangle}
\[ klc[z] := 3 \cdot E[p] \cdot Iac[y,y]/Icorr/(Iac[lac]*lac) \]
{half ellipse}

{area moment of inertias for full ellipse [m^4]}
\[ Aac := pi \cdot b0 \cdot h \]
\[ Iac[y,y] := pi/64 \cdot h^3 \cdot h \cdot b0 \]
\[ Iac[z,z] := pi/64 \cdot b0 \cdot b0^2 \cdot b0^2 \cdot h \]
\[ Iac[x,x] := pi/64 \cdot b0 \cdot h \cdot (\text{sqr}(b0)+\text{sqr}(h)) \]
\[ Iab := pi/64 \cdot h \cdot h \cdot b0 \cdot bb \]
\[ \text{beam\_inertia}(Iac[y,y], b0, h) \]
{trapezoid about y axis}
{area of ellipse [m^2]}
{inertia for ellipse about y axis}
{inertia for ellipse about z axis}
{inertia for ellipse about x axis}
{inertia for ellipse about y at pt B}
{inertia for 1/4 ellipse and linear spring stiffness of beam with elliptical x-sec in x,y,z [N/m]}
\[ klc[z] := 3 \cdot E[p] \cdot Iac[y,y]/(Iac[lac]*lac) \]
\[ klc[y] := 3 \cdot E[p] \cdot Iac[z,z]/(Iac[lac]*lac) \]
\[ klc[x] := E[p] \cdot Aac/lac \]
{rotational spring stiffness of beam with elliptical x-sec about x,y,z [N*m]}
\[ krc[z,z] := klc[y] \cdot \text{sqr}(lac) \]
\[ krc[y,y] := klc[z] \cdot \text{sqr}(lac) \]
krc[x,x]:=1/3*gsi*b0*h*h*h/lac; \{thin rec.
strip\}
krc[x,x]:=pi*gsi/(16*lac)*power(b0*h,3)/(sqr(b0)+sqr(h)); \{ellipse\}

\{compute rotational spring constant of v-notch at point b [n*m]\}
krbl:=E[p]*Iab/hb*tan(54.74)*sqr(h)/(sqr(h)-sqr(hb)); \{V-notch\}
krbl:=E[p]*Iab/(2*Iab); \{necked beam\}
krbl:=E[p]*Iab/h*le6; \{solid beam\}

\{compute plate stiffness\}
plate stifff;

\{algebraic computation of frequencies for 2dof system\}
dof2;
end; \{stiffness\}

function varstiff(da:double):double;
function krb(da:double):double;
\{rot stiffness as a function of crack length da\}
var
v1,
sa,
alpha,
\{dimless parameter in Kies eqn\}
delcomp:dcouble; \{change in compliance of V-notch\}

begin
\{compliance based on Kies equation\}
\{factor of -3/2 dropped; see Rice 3/15 p.6 of frac. mech. notes\}
alpha:=(hb-da)/h;
c_kies:=sqr(4.12)/(E[p]*bb*sqr(h))*
(1/sqr(alpha)+power(alpha,4)/2-3/2);
c_kies:=sqr(4.12)/(E[p]*bb*sqr(h))*
(1/sqr(alpha)+power(alpha,4)/2);

\{compliance based on asymptotic approx of deep crack in beam\}
\{factor of -1 dropped; see Rice 3/15 p.6 of frac. mech. notes\}
c_dc:=16/(E[p]*bb*sqr(h))*(1/sqr(alpha)-1);
c_dc:=16/(E[p]*bb*sqr(h))*(1/sqr(alpha));

\{compliance based on elliptical crack\}
c_ellip:=2.25*sqr(6*0.6*(h-hb+da))*pi/(bb*power(h,4)*E[p]); \{factor of 2.25 comes from comparison between NASCRA and elliptical
crack in an infinite slab for run 061891 geometry\}

\{compliance from Y. Murakami p.11 vol.1, Stress Intensity Factors
Handbook, Pergamon Press 1987\}
\{valid for alpha <= 0.7\}
alpha:=(h-hb+da)/h;
if alpha <= 0.7 then
begin
  v1:=1.458-0.304*alpha-0.924*sqr(alpha)+48.34*power(alpha,3)-
      123.5*power(alpha,4)+120.5*power(alpha,5); 
  c_mura:=24/(E[p]*b0*sqr(h))*v1;
  delcomp:=c_mura;
end
else delcomp:=c_dc;

{compliance based on empirical formula's from Paris}
{1% accuracy for any alpha}
alpha:=(h-hb+da)/h;
sa:=sqr(alpha/(1-alpha))*(5.93-19.69*alpha+37.14*sqr(alpha)
    -35.84*power(alpha,3)+13.12*power(alpha,4));
c_paris:=24/(b0*sqr(h)*E[p])*sa;

  krb:=2/(delcomp + 1/krb1); {change 2 to 0.5 for conserv. est.}
end;

begin {varstiff}
  varstiff:=krb(da)/sqr(lbc);
end; {varstiff}

begin
end.
unit matrix2;
interface
uses
  init2,
  crt,
  dos;

procedure initialize_matrices;
procedure stiffnessmatrix(da:double; var k:sysmat);
procedure correct_massmatrix(ma:sysmat; var mac:sysmat);
procedure correct_stiffnessmatrix(v0,vexc,vbias:double;
                               k:sysmat; var kc:sysmat);

implementation
uses
  dyn2,
  elec2,
  mains2;

var
  l1,      {length of area 1}
  l2,
  l3,
  l4,
  l5,
  l6,
  l7,
  lcd,
  lce,
  lcf,
  zeta1,
  zeta2,
  zeta3,
  zeta4,
  zeta5,
  zeta6,
  eta1,
  eta2,
  eta3,
  x11,
  x12,
  x13,
  lambda1,
  lambda2,
  lambda3:double;

procedure corrmatrix;
begin{correlation}
  \text{zeta}[1,1] := \text{sqr}(\text{zeta1});
  \text{zeta}[1,2] := \text{zeta1} \ast \text{zeta2};
  \text{zeta}[1,3] := \text{zeta1} \ast \text{zeta3};
  \text{zeta}[2,1] := \text{zeta1} \ast \text{zeta2};
  \text{zeta}[2,2] := \text{sqr}(\text{zeta2});
  \text{zeta}[2,3] := \text{zeta2} \ast \text{zeta3};
  \text{zeta}[3,1] := \text{zeta1} \ast \text{zeta3};
  \text{zeta}[3,2] := \text{zeta2};
  \text{zeta}[3,3] := \text{sqr}(\text{zeta3});

  \text{eta}[1,1] := \text{sqr}(\text{eta1});
  \text{eta}[1,2] := \text{eta1} \ast \text{eta2};
  \text{eta}[1,3] := \text{eta1} \ast \text{eta3};
  \text{eta}[2,1] := \text{eta1} \ast \text{eta2};
  \text{eta}[2,2] := \text{sqr}(\text{eta2});
  \text{eta}[2,3] := \text{eta2} \ast \text{eta3};
  \text{eta}[3,1] := \text{eta1};
  \text{eta}[3,2] := \text{eta2} \ast \text{eta3};
  \text{eta}[3,3] := \text{sqr}(\text{eta3});

  \text{xi}[1,1] := \text{sqr}(\text{xi1});
  \text{xi}[1,2] := \text{xi1} \ast \text{xi2};
  \text{xi}[1,3] := \text{xi1} \ast \text{xi3};
  \text{xi}[2,1] := \text{xi1} \ast \text{xi2};
  \text{xi}[2,2] := \text{sqr}(\text{xi2});
  \text{xi}[2,3] := \text{xi2} \ast \text{xi3};
  \text{xi}[3,1] := \text{xi1};
  \text{xi}[3,2] := \text{xi2} \ast \text{xi3};
  \text{xi}[3,3] := \text{sqr}(\text{xi3});

  \text{lambda}[1,1] := \text{sqr}(\text{lambda1});
  \text{lambda}[1,2] := \text{lambda1} \ast \text{lambda2};
  \text{lambda}[1,3] := \text{lambda1} \ast \text{lambda3};
  \text{lambda}[2,1] := \text{lambda1} \ast \text{lambda2};
  \text{lambda}[2,2] := \text{sqr}(\text{lambda2});
  \text{lambda}[2,3] := \text{lambda2} \ast \text{lambda3};
  \text{lambda}[3,1] := \text{lambda1};
  \text{lambda}[3,2] := \text{lambda2} \ast \text{lambda3};
  \text{lambda}[3,3] := \text{sqr}(\text{lambda3});

  \text{etavec}[1] := \text{eta1};
  \text{etavec}[2] := \text{eta2};
  \text{etavec}[3] := \text{eta3};

  \text{xivec}[1] := \text{xi1};
  \text{xivec}[2] := \text{xi2};
  \text{xivec}[3] := \text{xi3};
procedure massmatrix(var ma:sysmat);
begin(massmatrix)
    ma[1,1]:=mt*(sqr(zeta1)+sqr(zeta4))+4*Ip[y,y]/sqr(lac)+mb*lac/5;
    ma[1,2]:=mt*(zeta1*zeta2+zeta4*zeta5)+6*Ip[y,y]/sqr(lac)+mb*lac/6;
    ma[1,3]:=mt*(zeta1*zeta3+zeta4*zeta6)+2*Ip[y,y]/(lac*1bc)+mb*lac/4;
    ma[2,2]:=mt*(sqr(zeta2)+sqr(zeta5))+9*Ip[y,y]/sqr(lac)+mb*lac/7;
    ma[2,3]:=mt*(zeta2*zeta3+zeta5*zeta6)+3*Ip[y,y]/(lac*1bc)+mb*lac/5;
    ma[3,3]:=mt*(sqr(zeta3)+sqr(zeta6))+Ip[y,y]/sqr(lbc)+mb*lac/3;
    ma[2,1]:=ma[1,2];
    ma[3,1]:=ma[1,3];
    ma[3,2]:=ma[2,3];
end;{massmatrix}

procedure correct_massmatrix(ma:sysmat; var mac:sysmat);
var
    dm:sysmat;
    i,j:integer;
    dmcg,
    dmt,
    dms,
    dmp:double;

procedure massconst;
const
    mcg=2;
var
    vol:double;

function airmass1(width,lgth,gap:double):double;
begin
    airmass1:=3*rhoair*lgth*lgth*lgth*width/(20*gap);
end;

function airmass2(width,lgth,gap:double):double;
begin
    airmass2:=3*rhoair*lgth*lgth*lgth*width/(5*gap);
end;

begin {massconst}
    vol:=1[p,x]*1[p,y]*1[p,z]+1[p2,x]*1[p2,y]*1[p2,z];
    dmcg:=mcg*rhoair*vol;
    dmt:=2*airmass1(1[hls,y],(ltx-1[hls,x])/2,h0t)+
         2*airmass1(1[h2s,y],(ltx-1[h2s,x])/2,h0t)+
         airmass1((1[p,y]-1[hls,y]-1[h2s,y]),ltx,h0t);

    dms:=vol-dmt;
end;
dms := airmass1(lsx,11,h0s) + airmass1(lsx,12,h0s) + airmass1(lsx,13,h0s) +
      airmass1(lsx,14,h0s) + airmass1(lsx,15,h0s) + airmass1(lsx,16,h0s) +
      airmass1(lsx,17,h0s);

  dmp := airmass2(l[p,y], l[p,x], h0p);
end; {massconst}

begin {correct_massmatrix}
  massconst;
  for i := 1 to nsys do
    for j := 1 to nsys do
      begin
                   zeta[i,j] * dmcm;
        mac[i,j] := ma[i,j] + dm[i,j];
      end;
  end;

procedure stiffnessmatrix(da: double; var k: sysmat);
begin
  k[1,1] := 4 * E[p] * Iac[y,y] / (lac * lac * lac);
  k[1,2] := 6 * E[p] * Iac[y,y] / (lac * lac * lac);
  k[1,3] := 0;
  k[2,1] := k[1,2];
  k[2,2] := 12 * E[p] * Iac[y,y] / (lac * lac * lac);
  k[2,3] := 0;
  k[3,1] := k[1,3];
  k[3,2] := k[2,3];
  k[3,3] := varstiff(da);                 {see unit mainstiff.pas}
end;

procedure correct_stiffnessmatrix(v0, vexc, vbias: double;
                                   k: sysmat; var kc: sysmat);
var
  i, j: integer;
  dkt,
  dks: double;

begin
  deltak(v0, vexc, vbias, dkt, dks);
  for i := 1 to nsys do
    for j := 1 to nsys do
end;

procedure loadvector(v0: double);
var
  f0s: double; {sensor force [n]}
  i: integer;

begin
  torqueforce(v0,f0);
  f0s:=0;
  for i:=1 to nsys do
    p0[i]:=etavec[i]*f0+xivec[i]*f0s;
  end;

procedure dampmatrix;
var
  cb,
  ct,
  cs,
  cp,
  cc:double;
  cbeam:array[1..nsys,1..nsys] of double;
i,j:integer;

procedure dampconst;
  function dampc(b, l, a, v: double): double;
  begin
    dampc:=3*b*l*sqr(a)*muair/(v*v*v);
  end;
  
  function damp0(width: double): double;
  begin
    damp0:=8*muair*width;
  end;
  
  function damp1(width, lngth, gap: double): double;
  begin
    damp1:=1.5*muair*width*lngth*lngth*lngth/gap/gap/gap;
  end;
  
  function damp2(width, lngth, gap: double): double;
  begin
    damp2:=6*muair*width*lngth*lngth*lngth/gap/gap/gap;
  end;

begin {dampconst}
  cb:=damp0(b0);

  if l[hls,x] < 0.25*h0t then ct:=damp1(l[p,y],ltx,h0t)
  else
    ct:=2*damp1(l[hls,y],(ltx-l[hls,x])/2,h0t)+
    2*damp1(l[h2s,y],(ltx-l[h2s,x])/2,h0t)+
    damp1((l[p,y]-l[hls,y]-l[h2s,y]),ltx,h0t);

  if l[h3s,y] < 0.25*h0s then cs:=damp1(l[p,y],lsx,h0s)
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else
  csi:=damp1(1sx,11,h0s)+damp1(1sx,12,h0s)+damp1(1sx,13,h0s)+
       damp1(1sx,14,h0s)+damp1(1sx,15,h0s)+damp1(1sx,16,h0s)+
       damp1(1sx,17,h0s);

  cp:=damp2(1[p,y],1[p,x],h0p);

  cc:=0; {dampc(bb,lbc,h-hb,abs(v3));}
end; {dampconst}

begin{dampmatrix}
  dampconst;

  {beam damping matrix}
  cbeam[1,1]:=1/5;
  cbeam[1,2]:=1/6;
  cbeam[1,3]:=1/4;
  cbeam[2,1]:=1/6;
  cbeam[2,2]:=1/7;
  cbeam[2,3]:=1/5;
  cbeam[3,1]:=1/4;
  cbeam[3,2]:=1/5;
  cbeam[3,3]:=1/3;

  for i:=1 to nsys do
    for j:=1 to nsys do
      c[i,j]:=eta[i,j]*ct+xi[i,j]*cs+lambda[i,j]*cp+cbeam[i,j]*cb;
  c[3,3]:=c[3,3]+cc;
end; {dampmatrix}

procedure initialize_matrices;
begin{matrices}
  {compute mass inertia and stiffness from unit mainstif.pas}
  massandinertia;
  stiffness;

  {compute lengths of lever arms}
  lcd:=lbtx;
  lce:=lbsx;
  lcf:=lb[p,x];

  {compute lever arm ratios}
  zeta1:=1+2*lgc[x]/lac;
  zeta2:=1+3*lgc[x]/lac;
  zeta3:=1*lgc[x]/lbc;
  zeta4:=2*lgc[z]/lac;
  zeta5:=3*lgc[z]/lac;
  zeta6:=lgc[z]/lbc;
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etal1:=1+2*lcd/lac;
eta2:=1+3*lcd/lac;
eta3:=1+lcd/lbc;

xi1:=1+2*lce/lac;
xi2:=1+3*lce/lac;
xi3:=1+lce/lbc;

lambda1:=1+2*lcf/lac;
lambda2:=1+3*lcf/lac;
lambda3:=1+lcf/lbc;

{compute lengths of areas 1-7 on sensor}
l1:=l[p,y]/2-(lb[h3s,y]+l[h3s,y]/2);
l2:=(lb[h3s,y]-l[h3s,y]/2)-(lb[h4s,y]+l[h4s,y]/2);
l3:=(lb[h4s,y]-l[h4s,y]/2)-(lb[h5s,y]+l[h5s,y]/2);
l4:=(lb[h5s,y]-l[h5s,y]/2)+(-lb[h6s,y]-l[h6s,y]/2);
l5:=(lb[h7s,y]-l[h7s,y]/2)-(-lb[h6s,y]+l[h6s,y]/2);
l6:=(lb[h8s,y]-l[h8s,y]/2)-(-lb[h7s,y]+l[h7s,y]/2);
l7:=l[p,y]/2-(-lb[h8s,y]+l[h8s,y]/2);

corrmatrix;
massmatrix(ma);
stiffnessmatrix(da,k);
loadvector(v0);
dampmatrix;
end; {initialize_matrices}

begin
end.
Compiler directive for 8087 double precision mode
unit modal2;
interface
uses
crt,
dos,
init2;

procedure EVP(mass, stiff, damp: sysmat; load: sysvec; np: integer;
var evvec: sysmat; var eval, chat, phat: sysvec);

procedure statics(k: sysmat; p: sysvec; var ustatic: sysvec; np: integer);
procedure normalize(phi: sysmat; np: integer; var phinorm: sysmat);
procedure modal_matrix(m, k, c, phinorm: sysmat; p: sysvec; np: integer;
var mhat, khat, chat, phat: sysvec);

implementation
const
  npmax=5;

type
glnnpn = ARRAY [1..npmax, 1..npmax] OF double;
glnp = ARRAY [1..npmax] OF double;

PROCEDURE jacobi(VAR a: glnnpn; n: integer; VAR d: glnp;
  VAR v: glnnpn; VAR nrot: integer);

{note: This procedure solves the standard EVP: (A-d*I)V=0.
  a is n by n symmetric real matrix;
  d is vector containing eigenvalues;
  V is n by n modal matrix.}

LABEL 99;
CONST
  nmax=100;

VAR
  j, i, ip, i: integer;
  thresh, theta, tau, t, sm, s, h, g, c: double;
  b, z: ARRAY [1..nmax] OF double;
BEGIN
  FOR ip := 1 to n DO BEGIN
    FOR iq := 1 to n DO BEGIN
      v[ip, iq] := 0.0
    END;
    v[ip, ip] := 1.0
  END;
  FOR ip := 1 to n DO BEGIN
    b[ip] := a[ip, ip];
  END;
d[ip] := b[ip];
z[ip] := 0.0
END;
nrot := 0;
FOR i := 1 to 50 DO BEGIN
  sm := 0.0;
  FOR ip := 1 to n-1 DO BEGIN
    FOR iq := ip+1 to n DO BEGIN
      sm := sm+abs(a[ip,iq])
    END
  END
  IF (sm = 0.0) THEN GOTO 99;
  IF (i < 4) THEN thresh := 0.2*sm/sqr(n)
  ELSE thresh := 0.0;
  FOR ip := 1 to n-1 DO BEGIN
    FOR iq := ip+1 to n DO BEGIN
      g := 100.0*abs(a[ip,iq]);
      IF ((i > 4) AND ((abs(d[ip])+g) = abs(d[ip]))
          AND ((abs(d[iq])+g) = abs(d[iq]))) THEN
        a[ip,iq] := 0.0
      ELSE IF (abs(a[ip,iq]) > thresh) THEN BEGIN
        h := d[iq]-d[ip];
        IF ((abs(h)+g) = abs(h)) THEN BEGIN
          t := a[ip,iq]/h
        END ELSE BEGIN
          theta := 0.5*h/a[ip,iq];
          t := 1.0/(abs(theta)+sqr(1.0+sqr(theta)));
          IF (theta < 0.0) THEN t := -t
        END;
      END;
      c := 1.0/sqr(1+sqr(t));
      s := t*c;
      tau := s/(1.0+c);
      h := t*a[ip,iq];
      z[ip] := z[ip]-h;
      z[iq] := z[iq]+h;
      d[ip] := d[ip]-h;
      d[iq] := d[iq]+h;
      a[ip,iq] := 0.0;
    END
    FOR j := ip+1 to iq-1 DO BEGIN
      g := a[j,i];
      h := a[j,i];
      a[j,i] := g-s*(h+g*tau);
      a[j,i] := h+s*(g-h*tau)
    END;
  END
  FOR j := ip+1 to iq-1 DO BEGIN
    g := a[ip,j];
    h := a[j,i];
    a[ip,j] := g-s*(h+g*tau);
a[j,iq] := h+s*(g-h*tau)
END;
FOR j := iq+1 to n DO BEGIN
  g := a[ip,j];
  h := a[iq,j];
  a[ip,j] := g-s*(h+g*tau);
  a[iq,j] := h+s*(g-h*tau)
END;
FOR j := 1 to n DO BEGIN
  g := v[j,ip];
  h := v[j,iq];
  v[j,ip] := g-s*(h+g*tau);
  v[j,iq] := h+s*(g-h*tau)
END;
nrot := nrot+1
END
END
END
END
FOR ip := 1 to n DO BEGIN
  b[ip] := b[ip]+z[ip];
  d[ip] := b[ip];
  z[ip] := 0.0
END;
writeln('pause in routine JACOBI');
writeln('50 iterations should not happen'); readln;
99:
END;

procedure matrixmultiply(var c:glnnpn; a, b:glnnpn; np:integer);
{This procedure multiplies two n by n matrices: a*b=c}
var
  l,m,i,j:integer;
  {array indices}
begin
  for m:=1 to np do
    begin
      for l:=1 to np do
        begin
          c[l,m] := 0;
          for j:=1 to np do
            c[l,m] := c[l,m] + a[l,j]*b[j,m];
        end;
    end;
end;
procedure transpose(var a:glnnpn; b:glnnpn; np:integer);
var
  i,j:integer;
begin
{a = b^T}
for j:=1 to np do
begin
   for i:=1 to np do a[i,j]:=b[j,i];
end;
end;

procedure matrixdefine(a:sysmat; var b:glnnpn; np:integer);
var
   i,j:integer;
begin
   for i:=1 to npmax do
      for j:=1 to npmax do
         if (i > np) or (j > np) then b[i,j]:=0
         else b[i,j]:=a[i,j];
end;

procedure vectordefine(a:sysvec; var b:glnnpn; np:integer);
var
   i,j:integer;
begin
   for i:=1 to npmax do
      for j:=1 to npmax do
         if (i > np) or (j > 1) then b[i,j]:=0
         else b[i,1]:=a[i];
end;

procedure nullglnnpn(var null:glnnpn);
var
   i,j:integer;
begin
   for i:=1 to npmax do
      for j:=1 to npmax do
         null[i,j]:=0;
end;

procedure nullglnp(var null:glnp);
var
   i:integer;
begin
   for i:=1 to npmax do
      null[i]:=0;
end;

procedure nullsys(var null:sysmat);
var
   i,j:integer;
begin

for i:=1 to nsys do
  for j:=1 to nsys do
    null[i,j]:=0;
end;

procedure nullsysvec(var null:sysvec);
var
  i:integer;
begin
  for i:=1 to nsys do
    null[i]:=0;
end;

procedure EVP(mass, stiff, damp:sysmat; load:sysvec; np:integer;
               var evect:sysmat; var eval, chat, phat:sysvec);

{This procedure solves the generalized EVP (K-d*M)phi=0.
  phi^T*M*phi=I, modal matrix normalized wrt. mass matrix;
  phi^T*K*phi=D, D is diagonal containing E-values}

var
  null, {zero matrix}
  m, {mass matrix}
  k, {stiffness matrix}
  c, {damping matrix}
  p, {loading matrix}
  dum, {dummy matrix: k*(s^T)^(-1)}
  vm, {eigenvectors of m}
  s, {definition of s: s=vm*em^(-1/2)}
  sinv, {inverse of s: s^(-1)}
  strans, {transpose of s: s^T}
  stransinv, {inverse of transpose of s: (s^T)^(-1)}
  kcurl, {standard form of k: s^(-1)*k*(s^T)^(-1)}
  vcurl, {eigenvectors of kcurl}
  ccurl, {modal damping matrix npmax by npmax}
  pcurl, {modal loading matrix}
  phitrans, {transpose of eigenvectors}
  phi:glnpnp; {matrix of eigenvectors}
  em, {eigenvalues of m}
  ecurl:glnp; {eigenvalues of kcurl}
  nrotcurl, {# rotations on kcurl}
  nrotm, {# rotations on m}
  i,j:integer;

PROCEDURE eigsort(VAR d: glnp; VAR v: glnnpn; n: integer);
{note: This procedure sorts eigenvalues and corresponding
eigenvalues in descending order via

VAR
k, j, i: integer;
p: double;
BEGIN
FOR i := 1 to n-1 DO BEGIN
k := i;
p := d[i];
FOR j := i+1 to n DO BEGIN
IF d[j] >= p THEN BEGIN
k := j;
p := d[j]
END
END;
IF (k <> i) THEN BEGIN
d[k] := d[i];
d[i] := p;
FOR j := 1 to n DO BEGIN
p := v[j, i];
v[j, i] := v[j, k];
v[j, k] := p
END
END
END
END;

begin(EVP)
matrixdefine(mass, m, np);
matrixdefine(stiff, k, np);
matrixdefine(damp, c, np);
vectordefine(load, p, np);
nullglnpnp(null);
{decompose mass matrix and find square root: m=vm*em*vm^T=s*s^T}
jacobi(m, np, em, vm, nrotm);
s:=vm;
stransinv:=vm;
for j:=1 to np do
begin
for i:=1 to np do
begin
s[i, j]:=vm[i, j]*sqrt(em[j]);
stransinv[i, j]:=vm[i, j]/sqrt(em[j]);
end;
end;
{compute s^(-1) and s^T}
transpose(strans,s,np);
transpose(sinv,stransinv,np);

{compute kcurl}
matrixmultiply(dum,k,stransinv,np);
matrixmultiply(kcurl,sinv,dum,np);

{decompose kcurl into modal form: kcurl=vcurl*ecurl*vcurl^T}
jacobi(kcurl,np,ecurl,vcurl,nrotdcurl);

{compute modal matrix: phi=(s^T)^(-1)*vcurl}
matrixmultiply(phi,stransinv,vcurl,np);

{zero superfluous elements}
for i:=1 to npmax do
  for j:=1 to npmax do
    begin
      if (i > np) or (j > np) then phi[i,j]:=0;
      if i > np then ecurl[i]:=0;
    end;

{sort E-values and E-vectors}
eigrt(ecurl,phi,np);

for i:=1 to nsys do
  begin
    for j:=1 to nsys do evec[i,j]:=phi[i,j];
    eval[i]:=ecurl[i];
  end;

{compute modal damping matrix neglecting off diagonal terms}
phitrans:=null;
dum:=null;
ccurl:=null;
pcurl:=null;
transpose(phitrans,phi,np);
matrixmultiply(dum,c,phi,np);
matrixmultiply(ccurl,phitrans,dum,np);
for i:=1 to nsys do chat[i]:=ccurl[i,i];

{compute modal load vector}
matrixmultiply(pcurl,phitrans,p,np);
for i:=1 to nsys do phat[i]:=pcurl[i,1];
end;{EVP}

procedure statics(k:sysmat; p:sysvec; var ustatic:sysvec; np:integer);
var
  i, j,
nrot: integer;
evalinv,
eval: glnp;
uteam,
ptemp,
null,
dum,
transevec,
evec,
ktempinv,
ktemp: glnpnp;
kinv: sysmat;

begin
  nullglnp(eval);
  nullglnp(evalinv);
  nullglnpnp(null);
evec:= null;
  utemp:=null;
  ktempinv:=null;
  transevec:=null;

  matrixdefine(k, ktemp, np);
  vectordefine(p, ptemp, np);
  jacobi(ktemp, np, eval, evec, nrot);
  transpose(transevec, evec, np);

  for i:= 1 to np do
    for j:= 1 to np do
      dum[i, j]:= transevec[i, j] / eval[i];

  matrixmultiply(ktempinv, evec, dum, np);
  matrixmultiply(utemp, ktempinv, ptemp, np);
  for i:= 1 to np do
    begin
      for j:= 1 to np do kinv[i, j]:= ktempinv[i, j];
      ustatic[i]:= utemp[i, 1];
    end;
  end;

procedure normalize(phi: sysmat; np: integer; var phinorm: sysmat);
var
  i, j: integer;
  mag: double;

begin{normalize}
nullsys(phinorm);
for j:=1 to np do
begin
  mag:=0;
  for i:=1 to np do
    mag:=mag + sqr(phinorm[i,j]);
  mag:=sqrt(mag);
  for i:=1 to np do
   phinorm[i,j]:=phinorm[i,j]/mag;
end;
end; {normalize}

procedure modal_matrix(m,k,c,phinorm:sysmat; p:sysvec; np:integer;
                        var mhat,khat,chat,phat:sysvec);

var
  i,j:integer;
  dum,
  mtemp,
  ktemp,
  ctemp,
  ptemp,
  phitemp,
 phinormtemp,
  phinormtemptrans,
  mhattemp,
  khattemp,
  chattemp,
  phattemp;glnpnp;

begin{modal_matrix}
  nullsysvec(mhat);
  nullsysvec(khat);
  nullsysvec(chat);
  nullsysvec(phat);
  nullglnpnp(dum);

  matrixdefine(m,mtemp,np);
  matrixdefine(k,ktemp,np);
  matrixdefine(c,ctemp,np);
  matrixdefine(phinorm,phinormtemp,np);
  vectordefine(p,ptemp,np);
  transpose(phinormtemptrans,phinormtemp,np);

  matrixmultiply(dum,mtemp,phinormtemp,np);
  matrixmultiply(mhattemp,phinormtemptrans,dum,np);

  matrixmultiply(dum,ktemp,phinormtemp,np);
  matrixmultiply(khattemp,phinormtemptrans,dum,np);

end{modal_matrix}
matrixmultiply(dum, ctemp,phinormtemp,np);
matrixmultiply(chattemp,phinormtemptrans,dum,np);

matrixmultiply(phattemp,phinormtemptrans,ptemp,np);
for i:=1 to np do
 begin
 mhat[i]:=mhattemp[i,i];
 khat[i]:=khattemp[i,i];
 chat[i]:=chattemp[i,i];
 phat[i]:=phattemp[i,1];
 end;
end;{modal_matrix}

begin
end.
unit dyn2;
interface
uses
crt,
init2,
dos;

procedure dynamics(var vc,thetac:double);

procedure structure(m,k,c:sysmat; p:sysvec; n:integer; verror:double;
var phi:sysmat; var omega:sysvec;
var vx1,thetax1,v3static1,momx2,sigmax2,
repole,impole:double);

implementation
uses
elec2,
modal2,
mains2,
matrix2;

var
svec,
unvec,
vvec,
thetavec:sysvec;

procedure bridge_analysis;
const
cx=125e-6;
{cx=40e-6; design 1}

var
EA,
pt,
pcm,
mbr,
lx,
EI:double;

begin
{bridge electrode frequency}
if 1[p2,z]<0 then
begin
lx:=l[p,y]+2*cx;
EI:=1/12*ltx*power(1[p2,z],3)*E[p2];
mbr:=rho[p2]*ltx*l[p2,z];
wbr:=22.4/sqr(lx)*sqrt(EI/mbr);
vbr:=f0/l[p,y]*power(1x,4)/(384*EI);
kbr:=48*EI/power(1x,3);

{bridge electrode buckling}
par:=4*sqr(pi)*EI/sqr(lx);
EA:=l[p2,z]*1tx*E[p2];
pt:=(alphaau-alphasi)*Tsin*EA;
bucr:=par/pt;
Tmax:=par/((alphaau-alphasi)*EA);
end
else
begin
  wbr:=0;
vbr:=0;
bucr:=0;
  Tmax:=0;
end;
end; {bridge_analysis}

procedure other_freq;
var
  kzz,
  Izz,
  r1,
  r2:double;
begin {other_freq}
  {end plate frequency}
  r1:=sqr(lcg[x])+sqr(lcg[z]);
  r2:=sqr(lcg[y])+sqr(lcg[z]);
  wp:=sqr(krp/(mt*sqr(r1)+Ip[y,y])); {rad/s}

  {torsional frequency about x axis}
  wxx:=sqr(krc[x,x]/(mt*sqr(r2)+Ip[x,x])); {rad/s}

  {rotational frequency about z axis}
  kzz:=krc[z,z]*(1+lcg[x]/lac)/(1+3*lcg[x]/(2*lac));
  Izz:=mt*sqr(lcg[x]+lac)+Ip[z,z];
  wzz:=sqr(kzz/Izz); {rad/s}
end; {other_freq}

procedure indentation;
const
  Pac=60e-3;
  phi=0.66;
  ksi=0.069;
var
c, s0, beta, delta:double;

begin
c:=h-hb;
beta:=1-power(rb/rsi,3);
s0:=beta*esi*cs/((1-nusi)*csi);
Pind:=(klc111-s0*sqrt(pi*c)*phi)/ksi*power(c,1.5);
{c:=0;
{repeat
{ c:=c+h/1000;
{ delta:=klc111-ksi*Pac/power(c,1.5)-s0*sqrt(pi*c)*phi;
{until abs(delta) < 0.01*klc111
{c:=0;
end;

procedure vectors(x1,x2:double);
begin
{displacement vectors at x1}
vvec[1]:=sqr(x1/lac);
vvec[2]:=power(x1/lac,3);
vvec[3]:=(x1-lab)/lbc;
thetavec[1]:=2*x1/sqr(lac);
thetavec[2]:=3*sqr(x1)/power(lac,3);
thetavec[3]:=1/lbc;

{moment and stress vectors at x2}
mvec[1]:=2*e[p]*Iac[y,y]/sqr(lac);
mvec[2]:=6*e[p]*Iac[y,y]*x2/power(lac,3);
mvec[3]:=0;
svec[1]:=mvec[1]*h/(2*Iac[y,y]);
svec[2]:=mvec[2]*h/(2*Iac[y,y]);
svec[3]:=mvec[3]*h/(2*Iac[y,y]);
end;

procedure structure(m,k,c:sysmat; p:sysvec; n:integer; verror:double;
var phi:sysmat; var omega:sysvec;
var vxl,thetaxl,v3static1,momx2,sigmax2,
repol,impol:double);

var
i,j:integer;
chat, phat,
omegasqr:sysvec;
x:double;
begin {structure}
  EVP(m,k,c,p,n,phi,omegasqr,chat,phat);
  if chat[n]=0 then
    begin
      x:=phat[n]*qvac/omegasqr[n];
      chat[n]:=sqrt(omegasqr[n])/qvac;
    end
  else
    x:=phat[n]/(sqrt(omegasqr[n])*chat[n])/sqrt(1+sqr(verror/2));
    vx1:=0;
    thetax1:=0;
    momx2:=0;
    sigmax2:=0;
    for i:=1 to n do
      begin
        vx1:=vx1+vvec[i]*phi[i,n];
        thetax1:=thetax1+thetavec[i]*phi[i,n];
        momx2:=momx2+mvec[i]*phi[i,n];
        sigmax2:=sigmax2+svec[i]*phi[i,n];
      end;
    vx1:=vx1*x;
    thetax1:=thetax1*x;
    momx2:=momx2*x;
    sigmax2:=sigmax2*x;
    if n = 3 then
      begin
        v3:=phi[3,n]*x;
        v3static1:=-2/(pi*k[3,3]*lbc)*momx2;
      end
    else
      v3static:=0;
  {v3static:=0.0001e-6;}
  omega:=omegasqr;
  for i:=1 to n do
    begin
      if omegasqr[i] > 0 then omega[i]:=sqrt(omegasqr[i])
        else omega[i]:=0;
    end;
  repole:=-chat[n]/2;
  impole:=sqrt(omegasqr[n]-sqr(chat[n]/2));
end; {structure}

procedure vacuum(m,k:sysmat; n:integer; var phivac:sysmat;
               var omegavac:sysvec; var v0vac,repolevac,impolevac:double);
  var
  i,j:integer;
  kctemp,
c:sysmat;
vac_const,
vcvac,
thetaacvac,
v3staticvac,
mombvac,
sigmab:ac:double;

begin
for i=1 to n do
for j=1 to n do c[i,j]:=0;
correct_stiffnessmatrix(0, vexc, vbias, k, kctemp);
structure(m, kctemp, c, p0, n, 0, phivac, omegavac, vcvac, thetaacvac, v3staticvac,
mombvac, sigmabvac, repolevac, impolevac);
vac_const:=vc/vcvac;
vcvac:=vc;
thetaacvac:=thetaacvac*vac_const;
sigmabvac:=sigmabvac*vac_const;
mombvac:=mombvac*vac_const;
v3staticvac:=v3staticvac*vac_const;
v0vac:=v0*sqrt(vac_const);
end;

procedure staticanalysis(kc:sysmat; p0:sysvec; n:integer);
var
i,j:integer;
sigmabstatic,
ustatic:sysvec;

begin
statics(kc, p0, ustatic, n);{see modal.pas}
vstatic:=0;
thetaacstatic:=0;
for i=1 to n do
begin
vstatic:=vstatic + ustatic[i]*vvec[i];
thetaacstatic:=thetaacstatic + ustatic[i]*thetavec[i];
end;
vstatic:=vstatic+v3static;
thetaacstatic:=thetaacstatic+v3static/lbc;
end;

procedure stability_check(n:integer);
var
dktor,
dksens:double;
kctemp,
evectemp:sysmat;
chattemp,
phattemp,
evaltemp:sysvec;

begin
  correct_stiffnessmatrix(0,vexc,vbias,k,kctemp);
  EVP(k,eta,c,p0,n,evectemp,evaltemp,chattemp,phattemp);
  deltak(1.0,0,0,dktor,dkseps);
  vsnap=sqrt(1/(dktor*2*evaltemp[1]));
end;

procedure dynamics(var vc,thetac:double);
var
  error,
  dt,
  ds,
  dti,
  dsi:double;
begin
  if ndof = 2 then
    begin
      initialize_matrices;
      vectors(lac,lab);
      correct_massmatrix(ma,mac);
      correct_stiffnessmatrix(v0,vexc,vbias,k,kc);
      structure(mac,kc,c,p0,ndof,0,phi,omega,vc,thetac,v3static,momb,sigmab,
               repole,impole);
    end
  else
    begin
      dti:=0;
      dsi:=0;
      v3:=0;
      repeat
        initialize_matrices;
        vectors(lac,lab);
        correct_massmatrix(ma,mac);
        correct_stiffnessmatrix(v0,vexc,vbias,k,kc);
        structure(mac,kc,c,p0,ndof,0,phi,omega,vc,thetac,v3static,momb,sigmab,
                   repole,impole);
        dt:=(lbtex/lbc+1)*v3static;
        ds:=(lbsx/lbc+1)*v3static;
        error:=abs((dt-dti)/dt);
        ht:=h0t-dt;
        hs:=h0s-ds;
        dti:=dt;
        dsi:=ds;
        until error < 1e-3;
end;
normalize(phi,ndof,phinorm);
modal_matrix(mac,kc,c,phinorm,p0,ndof,mhat,khat,chat,phat);
vacuum(ma,k,ndof,phivac,omegavac,v0vac,repolevac,impolevac);
normalize(phivac,ndof,phinormvac);
staticanalysis(kc,p0,ndof);
stability_check(ndof);
other_freq;
bridge_analysis;
indentation;
end; {dynamics}

begin
  verror:=0;
end.
{\$N+}{compiler directive for 8087 double precision mode}
unit frac2;
interface
uses
crt,
init2,
dos;

procedure fracture_analysis;

implementation
uses
e'c2,
modal2,
mains2,
dyn2,
matrix2;

var
  mhat0,
khat0,
  chat0,
  phat0,
  omega0:sysvec;
  phi0norm,
  phi0,
  k0,
  k0c:sysmat;
  sigmab0,
  repole0,
  impole0,
  thetac0,
  vc0,
  v3static0,
  momb0:double;

function fac(num:integer):double;
var
  i:integer;
  p:double;
begin
  if (num=0) or (num=1) then fac:=1
  else begin
    p:=num;
    for i:=num downto 2 do
      begin
        p:=p*(i-1);
      end
  end
end;
function ka(da:double):double;  \{Kies equation without moment\}
var
  f1,
  alpha:double;
begin
  \{stress intensity based on Kies Eqn\}
  alpha:=(hb-da)/h;
  kakies:=4.12/(bb*sqrt(h*h*h))*
    sqrt(1/(alpha*alpha*alpha)-alpha*alpha*alpha);

  \{for alpha <= 0.6 stress intensity from Murakami p.11 vol 1\}
  \{for alpha > 0.6 asymptotic expansion for deep cracked beam\}
  if alpha <= 0.6 then
    begin
      f1:=1.122-1.4*alpha+7.33*sqr(alpha)-13.08*power(alpha,3)+
        14.0*power(alpha,4);
      ka:= 6/(bb*sqr(h))*sqrt(pi*(h-hb+da))*f1;
      kamur:= 6/(bb*sqr(h))*sqrt(pi*(h-hb+da))*f1;
    end
  else
    begin
      ka:=4/(bb*power(hb-da,3/2));
      kadc:=4/(bb*power(hb-da,3/2));
    end;

end;

{stress intensity based on elliptical crack in infinite slab; factor of 1.5 from NASCRAC comparison}
kaellip:=1.5*0.4*6*sqr(pi*(h-hb+da))/(bb*sqr(h));
end;

procedure stressintensity(da,moment:double; var kl:double);
beg
  kl:=1.5*ka(da)*moment;
  \{factor of 1.5 accounts for break test data at Oak Ridge: 11/17/91-11/23/91\}
end;

procedure crackvelocity(var vavg:double; nexp:double; kli:double);
var
  gamma,
  vavg_s,
  g:double; \{average static velocity [m/s]\}
\{dynamic velocity scale factor\}
procedure velocity_corr1;
var
  m,
  n:longint;
begin {velocity_corr1}
  n:=round(nexp);
  if odd(n) then
    begin {n is odd}
      m:=1;
      g:=1;
      for m:=1 to trunc((n-1)/2) do g:=g*2*m/(2*m+1);
      g:=g/pi;
    end {n is odd}
  else
    begin {n is even}
      m:=1;
      g:=1;
      for m:=1 to trunc(n/2) do g:=g*(2*m-1)/(2*m);
      g:=g/2;
    end; {n is even}
end; {velocity_corr1}

procedure velocity_corr2;
var
  l,m,n:integer;
  c1,c2,c3,c4:double;
begin {velocity_corr2}
  g:=0;
  m:=round(nexp/2);
  n:=round(nexp);
  c1:=fac(n);
  for l:=0 to m do
    begin
      c2:=power(pi/4,2*l);
      c3:=fac(n-2*l);
      c4:=sqr(fac(l));
      g:=g+c2/(c3*c4);
    end;
  g:=g*c1/power(pi,n);
end; {velocity_corr2}
begin {crackvel}
  gamma:=k1l/k1c111;
  velocity_corr2;
  vavg:=vsi02*power(gamma,nexp)*g;
vavgs:=vsi02*power(gamma,nexp);
end; {crackvel}

procedure cracktime(kli,klf,dkl1a,nexp:double;var tau:double);
{note: tau given in hrs}
var
  vi,
  gamma:double;
begin
  crackvelocity(vi,nexp,kli);
  gamma:=kli/klf;
  tau:=kli/(vi*dkl1a*(nexp-1))*(1-power(gamma,nexp-1));
  tau:=tau/(3600);
end; {cracktime}

procedure frac_param(n:integer; nexp:double);
var
  hits_torquer,
  hits_sensor:boolean;

  procedure zero_frac_param;
  begin
  end;
begin {frac_param}
  if n = 2 then
  begin
    ta:=0;
    tf:=0;
    dw:=0;
    dwdt:=0;
    dkl1a:=0;
    v0c:=0;
    verror:=0;
    kl:=0;
    kli:=0;
    pctlci:=0;
    pctlc:=0;
    momb0:=momb;
  end
  else
  begin {fracture analysis}
    stiffnessmatrix(0,k0);
    correct_stiffnessmatrix(v0,vexc,vbias,k0,k0c);
    structure(mac,k0c,c,p0,n,0,phi0,omega0,vc0,
                theta0,v3static0,momb0,sigmab0,repole0,impole0);
    dw:=impole-impole0;
    stressintensity(da,momb,k1);
  end
end
stressintensity(0,momb0,kli);
pctklc:=k1/k1cc;
pctklci:=k1i/k1cc;
dklda:=(k1-k1i)/da+(momb-momb0)/da;
dklda:=(k1-k1i)/da;
v0c:=sqrt(1/pctklci)*v0;
mombf=momb*k1cl1l/k1;
if (pctklc > 1) or (pctklci > 1) then
begin
  ta:=0;
  tf:=0;
  dwdt=dwdtmax;
  verror=verrormax;
  clrscr;
  writeln('DEVICE FAILED INSTANTaneously');
  readln;
end
else
begin
  hits_torquer:=false;
  hits_sensor:=false;
  dimension_check(vc/pctklci,thetac/pctklci,v3static/pctklci,
               hits_sensor,hits_torquer);
  if hits_sensor then
  begin
    clrscr;
    writeln('CANNOT BREAK DEVICE WITH DRIVE ELECTRONICS: PLATE HITS
SENSOR.');
    readln;
  end;
  if hits_torquer then
  begin
    clrscr;
    writeln('CANNOT BREAK DEVICE WITH DRIVE ELECTRONICS: PLATE HITS
TORQUER.');
    readln;
  end;
  cracktime(k1i,k1,dklda,nexp,ta);
  cracktime(k1i,klf,dklda,nsi02,tf);
  dwdt:=dw/(ta*3600);
  velocity_error(dwdt,verror);
end;
end;{failure analysis}
end; {frac_param}

procedure fatigue_sim(m,c:sysmat;p:sysvec;n:integer);
const
  inc=1.0e-8;
tol=1e-4;
narray=1000;

var
  filename:string;
in_filename,
out_filename:text;
t,
f:array[0..narray] of double;
i,
imax:integer;
kl,
kic,
phi:sysmat;
chati,
phati,
omegai:sysvec;
vci,
thetai,
vstatici,
mombi,
repolei,
dt,
df,
wl,
w2,
dadt,
da,
da0,
kl,
sigmabi:double;

begin
  clrscr;
  writeln('Input file name = ');
  readln(filename);
  assign(in_filename,filename);
  reset(in_filename);
i:=0;
  while not eof(in_filename) or (i = narray) do
    begin
      i:=i+1;
      readln(in_filename,t[i],f[i]);
      f[i]:=f[i]*2*pi;
      end;
  close(in_filename);
  writeln('Output file name = ');
  readln(filename);
assign(out_filename, filename);
rewrite(out_filename);
imax:=i;
t[0]:=0;
f[0]:=0;
da0:=0;
da:=inc;
for i:=1 to imax do
begin
dt:=t[i]-t[i-1];
w2:=impole0+f[i];
df:=f[i];
repeat
begin
da:=da-inc*(f[i]-df)/sqrt(sqr(f[i])+sqr(dw));
stiffnessmatrix(da,ki);
correct_stiffnessmatrix(v0,vexc,vbias,ki,kic);
structure(mac,kic,c,p0,ndof,0,phi,omega,vci,
        theta,v3statici,mombi,sigmbi,repolei,w1);
df:=w1-w2;
end;
until abs((f[i]-df)/f[i]) < tol;
stressintensity(da,mombi,kli);
dacl:=(da-da0)/dt;
{writeln(out_filename,kli:15,' ',dacl:15);}
writeln(out_filename,t[i]:15,' ',da:15);
{writeln(out_filename,kli:15,' ',da:15);}
da0:=da;
crlscr;
writeln(imax-i:5);
end; {for i:=1 to imax}
close(out_filename);
end; {fatigue_sim}

procedure fail_param(np:integer; nexp:double);
var
    quit_sim:char;
    hits_torquer,
    hits_sensor,
    exceeds_bandwidth:boolean;
    n:integer;
    nmax,
    vi0,
    v1,
    k1,
    k10,
    t,
    w1,
wi0,
di,
di0,
inc,
dwdti,
dkidi,
vci,
thetaci,
v3statici,
sigmabi,
mombi,
repoli,
impoli,
eoutu0,
eoutui,
eoutd0,
eoutdi:double;
ki,kic,phii:sysmat;
omegai:sysvec;
outfile:text;
filename:string[12];

begin
clrscr;
writeln('Fracture simulation: q to quit, return to start.');
quit_sim:=readkey;
if quit_sim='q' then exit;
clrscr;
writeln('Specify fracture simulation output file or return to screen');
readln(filename);
if filename=' ' then filename:='CON';
assign(outfile,filename);
rewrite(outfile);
clrscr;
writeln(outfile,
'  time [sec]  freq [hz]  dw [hz]  eoutd [volts]');
nmax:=100;
nmax:=tf*3600*5;  { # samples = failure time * sample rate}
inc:=hb/nmax;
n:=0;
wi0:=0;
k10:=k1i;
di0:=0;
tf:=0;
error:=0;
hits_sensor:=false;
exceeds_bandwidth:=false;
crackvelocity(vi0,nexp,k10);
sensoroutput(vc0, thetac0, eoutu0, eoutd0);
writeln(outfile, tf:15:5, impole0/(2*pi):15:5, w10/(2*pi):15:5, eoutd0:15:5);
repeat
  n:=n+1;
  di:=di0+n*inc;
  stiffnessmatrix(di, ki);
  correct_stiffnessmatrix(v0, vexc, vbias, ki, kic);
  structure(mac, kic, c, p0, np, verror, phi, omegai, vci,
                thetaci, v3statici, mombi, sigmabi, repolei, impolei);
  dimension_check(vci, thetaci, v3statici, hits_sensor, hits_torquer);
  wi:=impolei-impole0;
  stressintensity(di, mombi, kl);
  dkldi:=(k1-k10)/inc;
  cracktime(k10, k1, dkldi, nexp, t);
  t:=t+3600;
  tf:=tf+t;
  dwdti:=(wi-wi0)/t;
  velocity_error(dwdti, verror);
  if (not hits_sensor) and (not hits_torquer) then
    sensoroutput(vci, thetaci, eoutui, eoutdi)
  else
    begin
      eoutui:=0;
      eoutdi:=0;
    end;
writeln(outfile, tf:15:5, impolei/(2*pi):15:5, wi/(2*pi):15:5, eoutdi:15:5);

{The following is a direct integration scheme}
{crackvelocity(vi, nexp, kl); }
{viavg:=(vi+vi0)/2; }
{t:=inc/viavg; }
{dvi:=(vi-vi0)/vi0; }
{if dvi > 0.05 then inc:=inc*0.5; }

if (abs(verrorf) > verrormax) and (exceeds_bandwidth = false) then
begin
  exceeds_bandwidth:=true;
  vct1:=vci;
  thetact1:=thetaci;
  tct1:=tf/3600;
  dwct1:=wi;
  dact1:=di;
  pckt1ct1:=k1/k1cc;
  dkldact1:=dkldi;
  dwdctct1:=dwdti;
  writeln(outfile,
         '------------------------CONTROLLER BANDWIDTH EXCEEDED------------------------');
end;
wi0:=wi;
k10:=k1;
v10:=vi;
until (k1/k1f > 1.0) or (n=nmax) or (keypressed and ('q'=readkey)) or
  (hits_sensor and hits_torquer and (exceeds_bandwidth=false))
close(outfile);
if filename='CON' then readln;
tf:=tf/3600;
vcf:=vcf;
thetaacf:=thetaci;
dkldaf:=dkldi;
dwtf:=dwdti;
dwf:=wi;
daf:=di;

if ((k1/k1f > 1) or (n=nmax)) and (hits_sensor = false) and
  (exceeds_bandwidth = false) and (hits_torquer = false) then
  begin
    tctl:=tf;
vctl:=vcf;
    thetactl:=thetacf;
dkldactl:=dkldaf;
dwctl:=dwf;
dactl:=daf;
    pctxctl:=k1f/k1cc;
dwtdctl:=dwtf;
  end;

if (exceeds_bandwidth = false) and (hits_sensor or hits_torquer) then
  begin
    writeln;
    if hits_sensor then
      begin
        writeln('WARNING: PLATE HAS STRUCK SENSOR ELECTRODE WITHOUT');
        writeln('EXCEEDING CONTROLLER BANDWIDTH');
      end;
    if hits_torquer then
      begin
        writeln('WARNING: PLATE HAS STRUCK TORQUER ELECTRODE WITHOUT');
        writeln('EXCEEDING CONTROLLER BANDWIDTH');
      end;
  readln;
tctl:=tf;
vctl:=vcf;
thetactl:=thetacf;
dkldactl:=dkldaf;
dwctl:=dwf;
dactl:=daf;
pctklctl:=k1/klcc;
dwtdtctl:=dwdtf;
end;
end;{fail_param}

procedure stress_concentration;
var
    pstatic,
    momf,
    smax,
    kf:double;
begin
    Kf:=1+0.68*sqrt((h-hb)/rtip)-0.31*power((h-hb)/rtip,0.25);
    smax:=Kf*momb0*hb/(2*Iab);
    pctsf:=smax/sigmaf*100;
    momf:=sigmaf*Kf*(2*Iab)/hb;
    vcfail:=vc0*momf/momb0;
    thetacfail:=thetac0*momf/momb0;
    v0f:=v0*sqrt(momf/momb0);
end;

procedure etch_fail;
var
    fst,
    delp,
    ap:double;
begin
    ap:=l[p,x]*l[p,y];
    delp:=2*gamma_h20/h0p;
    fst:=delp*ap;
    mombst:=fst*(lbc+lb[p,x]);
    if mombst > mombf then
begin
    writeln('FAILURE IN ETCH');
    readln;
    clrscr;
end;
end;

procedure fracture_analysis;
begin
    frac_param(ndof,nsi02);
    if ndof=3 then etch_fail;
    stress_concentration;
    if fail_sim then
begin
    
end;
clrscr;
fail_param(ndof,nsi02);
end;
if fati_sim then
begin
clrscr;
fatigue_sim(mac,c,p0,ndof);
end;
end;

begin
end.
begin
  a0t:=ltx*lty;
  a1:=l[hls,x]*l[hls,y];
  a2:=l[h2s,x]*l[h2s,y];
  zeta1:=l[hls,x]/ht;
  zeta2:=l[h2s,x]/ht;
  ff0:=s0*a0t*sqr(v0)/(4*sqr(ht));
  ff1:=ff(v0,ht,a1,zeta1);
  ff2:=ff(v0,ht,a2,zeta2);
\text{torquer force without fringe effects}
\{\text{areator:=ltx*lty-l[h1s,x]*l[h1s,y]-l[h2s,x]*l[h2s,y];}\}
\{f0:=a0*areator*sqr(v0)/(4*sqr(ht));\}
\{dk:=2*f0/d0\}
end;

procedure deltak(v0,vexc,vbias:double; var dk, dks:double);
var
  a0t, \{total torquer area \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  a0s, \{total sensor area \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  a1, \{area of hole 1 \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  a2, \{area of hole 2 \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  a3, \{area of hole 3 \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  a4, \{area of hole 4 \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  a5, \{area of hole 5 \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  a6, \{area of hole 6 \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  a7, \{area of hole 7 \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  a8, \{area of hole 8 \([\text{m}^2]\)\}
  zeta1, \{ = l[h1s,x]/ht\}
  zeta2, \{ = l[h2s,x]/ht\}
  zeta3, \{ = l[h3s,y]/h0s\}
  zeta4, \{ = l[h4s,y]/h0s\}
  zeta5, \{ = l[h5s,y]/h0s\}
  zeta6, \{ = l[h6s,y]/h0s\}
  zeta7, \{ = l[h7s,y]/h0s\}
  zeta8, \{ = l[h8s,y]/h0s\}
  dk0t, \{stiffness correction based on a0t \([\text{n/m}]\)\}
  dk1, \{stiffness correction based on a1 \([\text{n/m}]\)\}
  dk2, \{stiffness correction based on a2 \([\text{n/m}]\)\}
  dk0s, \{stiffness correction based on a0s \([\text{n/m}]\)\}
  dk3, \{stiffness correction based on a3 \([\text{n/m}]\)\}
  dk4, \{stiffness correction based on a4 \([\text{n/m}]\)\}
  dk5, \{stiffness correction based on a5 \([\text{n/m}]\)\}
  dk6, \{stiffness correction based on a6 \([\text{n/m}]\)\}
  dk7, \{stiffness correction based on a7 \([\text{n/m}]\)\}
  dk8:double;

function ff(v,h,a,zeta:double):double;
begin
  ff:=a0*a*sqr(v)/(2*pi*sqr(h))*arctan(zeta/2);
end;

function dk(v,h,a,zeta:double):double;
begin
  dk:=2*ff(v,h,a,zeta)/h+
\[ e_0 \cdot s^2 \cdot (v) \cdot a / (4 \cdot \pi \cdot \text{power}(h,3)) \cdot zeta / (1 + \sqrt{zeta / 2}) \]

end;

begin \{ \text{deltak} \}
  a_{0t} := l_t \cdot x \cdot l_t \cdot y;
  a_{0s} := l_s \cdot x \cdot l_s \cdot y;
  a_1 := l_{hs,x} \cdot l_{hs,y};
  a_2 := l_{hs,y} \cdot l_{hs,y};
  a_3 := l_{hs,y} \cdot l_{hs,y};
  a_4 := l_{h4s,x} \cdot l_{h4s,y};
  a_5 := l_{h5s,x} \cdot l_{h5s,y};
  a_6 := l_{h6s,x} \cdot l_{h6s,y};
  a_7 := l_{h7s,x} \cdot l_{h7s,y};
  a_8 := l_{h8s,x} \cdot l_{h8s,y};

  zeta_{11} := l_{hs,x} / h_t;
  zeta_{22} := l_{hs,x} / h_t;
  zeta_{33} := l_{hs,y} / h_s;
  zeta_{44} := l_{h4s,y} / h_s;
  zeta_{55} := l_{h5s,y} / h_s;
  zeta_{66} := l_{h6s,y} / h_s;
  zeta_{77} := l_{h7s,y} / h_s;
  zeta_{88} := l_{h8s,y} / h_s;

  d_{k0s} := e_0 \cdot a_{0s} / (2 \cdot \sqrt{h_s} \cdot h_s) \cdot (\sqrt{v_{exc}} + 2 \cdot \sqrt{v_{bias}});
  d_{k3} := d_{k3} \cdot (\sqrt{v_{exc}} + 3 \cdot zeta_3) + 2 \cdot d_{k3} \cdot (v_{bias} + a_3, zeta_3);
  d_{k4} := d_{k4} \cdot (\sqrt{v_{exc}} + 4 \cdot zeta_4) + 2 \cdot d_{k4} \cdot (v_{bias} + a_4, zeta_4);
  d_{k5} := d_{k5} \cdot (\sqrt{v_{exc}} + 5 \cdot zeta_5) + 2 \cdot d_{k5} \cdot (v_{bias} + a_5, zeta_5);
  d_{k6} := d_{k6} \cdot (\sqrt{v_{exc}} + 6 \cdot zeta_6) + 2 \cdot d_{k6} \cdot (v_{bias} + a_6, zeta_6);
  d_{k7} := d_{k7} \cdot (\sqrt{v_{exc}} + 7 \cdot zeta_7) + 2 \cdot d_{k7} \cdot (v_{bias} + a_7, zeta_7);
  d_{k8} := d_{k8} \cdot (\sqrt{v_{exc}} + 8 \cdot zeta_8) + 2 \cdot d_{k8} \cdot (v_{bias} + a_8, zeta_8);
  d_{ks} := d_{k0s} \cdot d_{k3} \cdot d_{k4} \cdot d_{k5} \cdot d_{k6} \cdot d_{k7} \cdot d_{k8};

  d_{k0t} := e_0 \cdot a_{0t} / (2 \cdot \sqrt{h_t} \cdot h_t) \cdot (\sqrt{v_0} + \sqrt{v_{exc}});
  d_{k1} := d_{k1} \cdot (v_0, h_t, a_1, zeta_1) + d_{k1} \cdot (v_{exc}, h_t, a_1, zeta_1);
  d_{k2} := d_{k2} \cdot (v_0, h_t, a_2, zeta_2) + d_{k2} \cdot (v_{exc}, h_t, a_2, zeta_2);
  d_{kt} := d_{k0t} \cdot d_{k1} \cdot d_{k2};
end; \{ \text{deltak} \}

procedure torqueconstant;
begin
  k_t := 2 \cdot f_0 / v_0;
end;

procedure sensoroutput(v, theta: double; var eoutu, eoutd: double);

  function cap0(area, gap: double): double;
  begin
end;}
cap0:=e0*area/gap;
end;

procedure sensor_model_1(var delcu, delcd, c0: double);
var
cu,
cd,
gup,
gdn,
areaseasens,
width,
x11,
x22: double;

{airgap for pos. v [m]}
{airgap for neg. v [m]}
{sensor plate area [m^2]}
{width of sensing area [m]}
{dist. to inner edge of sensor [m]}
{dist. to outer edge of sensor [m]}

function capup(width, theta, gap, x1, x2: double): double;
begin
  capup:=e0*width/theta*ln((gap-theta*x1)/(gap-theta*x2));
end;

function capdn(width, theta, gap, x1, x2: double): double;
begin
  capdn:=e0*width/theta*ln((gap+theta*x2)/(gap+theta*x1));
end;

begin{model_1}
gup:=hs-v;
gdn:=hs+v;

{compute location of sensor plate wrt pt. c}
x11:=lbsx-lsx/2;
x22:=lbsx+lsx/2;

width:=lsy-1[h3s,y]-1[h4s,y]-1[h5s,y]-1[h6s,y]-1[h7s,y]-1[h8s,y];
areaseasens:=lsx*width;
cu:=capup(width, theta, gup, x11, x22);
cd:=capdn(width, theta, gdn, x11, x22);
c0:=cap0(areaseasens, hs);

delcu:=cu-c0;
delcd:=cd-c0;
end;{model_1}

procedure sensor_model_2(var delcu, delcd, c0: double);
var
  areaseasens,
gup,
gdn,
cu,
cd,
c3u,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 3}
c3d,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 3}
c4u,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 4}
c4d,
  {edge capac. neg. v [f] for hole 4}
c5u,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 5}
c5d,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 5}
c6u,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 6}
c6d,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 6}
c7u,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 7}
c7d,
  {edge capac. neg. v [f] for hole 7}
c8u,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 8}
c8d,
  {edge capac. pos. v [f] for hole 8}
c30,
  {nominal capac. v=theta=0 [f] for hole 3}
c40,
  {nominal capac. v=theta=0 [f] for hole 4}
c50,
  {nominal capac. v=theta=0 [f] for hole 5}
c60,
  {nominal capac. v=theta=0 [f] for hole 6}
c70,
  {nominal capac. v=theta=0 [f] for hole 7}
c80: double;
  {nominal capac. v=theta=0 [f] for hole 8}

function edjcap(lghth, s, gap: double): double;
begin
  edjcap := 2*e0/\pi*lghth*(s/gap*arctan(s/(2*gap)) -
                     ln(1+0.25*sqr(s/gap)));
end;

begin{model_2}
gup := hs-(v+theta*1bsx);
gdn := hs+(v+theta*1bsx);
areasens := lxs*1sy;

{compute total upward sensor capacitance}
cu := cap0(areasens, gup);

{correct sensor capacitance for decrease due to holes 3,4,5,6,7,8}
c3u := edjcap(lxs, l[h3s,y], gup);
c4u := edjcap(lxs, l[h4s,y], gup);
c5u := edjcap(lxs, l[h5s,y], gup);
c6u := edjcap(lxs, l[h6s,y], gup);
c7u := edjcap(lxs, l[h7s,y], gup);
c8u := edjcap(lxs, l[h8s,y], gup);
cu := cu-(c3u+c4u+c5u+c6u+c7u+c8u);

{compute total downward sensor capacitance}

cd := cap0(areasens, gdn);

{correct sensor capacitance for decrease due to holes 3,4,5,6,7,8}
c3d:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs3,y],gdn);
c4d:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs4,y],gdn);
c5d:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs5,y],gdn);
c6d:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs6,y],gdn);
c7d:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs7,y],gdn);
c8d:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs8,y],gdn);
cd:=cd-(c3d+c4d+c5d+c6d+c7d+c8d);

{compute total nominal capacitance}
c0:=cap0(areasens,hs);

{compute sensor capacitance decrease due to holes 3,4,5,6,7,8}
c30:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs3,y],hs);
c40:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs4,y],hs);
c50:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs5,y],hs);
c60:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs6,y],hs);
c70:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs7,y],hs);
c80:=edjcap(lsx,1[hs8,y],hs);
c0:=c0-(c30+c40+c50+c60+c70+c80);

delcu:=cu-c0;
delcd:=cd-c0;
end; {model_2}

procedure counterweight_cap;
var
  cp0, {nominal cap. to counter weight [f]}
  delcpu,{change in cap. " " " up [f]}
  delcpd,{ " " " " " " " " " dn " }
  a1u,{calculation constants}
  a2u, { " " }
  a1d, { " " }
  a2d, { " " }
  a3, { " " }
  a4:double;
  { " " }
  function tan(x:double):double;
  begin
    tan:=sin(x)/cos(x);
  end;

begin{counterweight}
  if 1[p2,z] > hs then
  begin
    a1u:=x3-(hs-vc)*tan(pi/6);
    a2u:=x3-(2*1[p2,z]-hs+vc)*tan(pi/6);
    a1d:=x3-(hs+vc)*tan(pi/6);
  

endif;
end;
a2d:=x3-(2*l[p2,z]-hs-vc)*tan(pi/6);
a3:=x3-(2*l[p2,z]-hs)*tan(pi/6);
a4:=x3-hs*tan(pi/6);
if (alu > 0) and (a2u > 0) and (ald > 0) and (a2d > 0) and (a3 > 0) and (a4 > 0) then
begin
  delcpu:=e0*1[l[y]]/(2*tan(pi/6))*ln(alu/a2u*a3/a4);
  delcpd:=e0*1[l[y]]/(2*tan(pi/6))*ln(ald/a2d*a3/a4);
  cp0:=e0*1[l[y]]/(2*tan(pi/6))*ln(a4/a3);
end
else
begin
  delcpu:=0;
  delcpd:=0;
  cp0:=0;
end;
end; {counterweighth}

procedure sensconst(var delcu,delcd:double);
const
  rem=26;       {transistor dynamic ammitter resistance at 25 degC}
var
  RL,         {load resistance to ground, ohms}
  Re,         {gain adjust, ohms}
  kmod,       
kamp,
kfs:double;
begin
  RL:=3000;    {3K nominal value choosen}
  Re:=1000;   {1K   "   "   "   }
  kmod:=0.637*RL/(Re+2*rem);
  kfs:=20;
  kamp:=100   {old post amp: kamp=17};
  eoutu:=-1*(delcu)/cfb*vexc*kmod*kamp*kfs;
  eoutd:=-1*(delcd)/cfb*vexc*kmod*kamp*kfs;
end; {sensconst}

begin {sensor output}
  {sensor_model_1(delu,delcd,c0);}
  sensor_model_2(delu,delcd,c0);
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sensconst(delcu,delcd);
end; {sensor output}

procedure velocity_error(dwtdouble; var verror:double);
begin
  verror:=dwtd/verror_const;
end;

procedure control(np:integer; pole:double);
const
  zeta=0.6; {damping ratio of closed loop system}
var
  phaseplant, {phase of plant at wc, rad}
  phasemargin, {required c.l. phase margin, rad}
  phasemax, {required phase lead of compensator, rad}
  magcomp, {magnitude of compensator pole and zero at wc}
  magsys, {magnitude of system at wc}
  eta, {ratio of b/a}
  cl, {calculation const}
  wn, {natural frequency of c.l. system, rad/s}
  wc:double;

begin {control}
  {compute system and plant gains}
  pole:=abs(pole);
  kvco:=2*pi*1.0e3; {vco gain: wavetek, rad/(s*volt)}
  kd:=5/(2*pi); {gain of phase detector, volts/rad}
  gp:=2*kvco*kd; {system gain}
  kp:=2/pole; {dc plant gain}
  cl:=sqrt(2-4*sqrt(zeta)+4*power(zeta,4));
  wn:=wservo/sqrt(1-2*sqrt(zeta)+cl);
  wc:=wn*sqrt(1-2*sqrt(zeta));
  phaseplant:=-pi/2-arctan(wc/pole);
  phasemargin:=100*zeta*pi/180;
  phasemax:=phasemargin-(pi+phaseplant);

  {compute type 1 compensator pole and zero}
  eta:=(1+sin(phasemax))/(1-sin(phasemax));
  a:=round(wc/sqrt(eta));
  b:=round(sqrt(wc)/a);

  {compute compensator gain}
  magcomp:=sqrt((sqrt(wc/a)+1)/(sqrt(wc/b)+1))/wc;
  magsys:=gp/sqrt(sqrt(wc)+sqrt(pole));
  kfl:=1/(magcomp*magsys);

  {determine system performance}
verror\_const:=k\_f1*gp;
verror\_max:=\pi/6;
dwdt\_max:=verror\_max*verror\_const;
en\_control

begin
end
end.
unit menu2;
interface
uses
crt,
dos,
out2,
init2;

procedure run_menu;
procedure change_output;

implementation
const
  sk10 = '   ';
var
  quitmenu:boolean;
  faildat,
  outfile:text;
  filename:string[12];
  prn_dim,
  prn_dyn,
  prn_ctl1,
  prn_elec,
  prn_frac,
  print_short,
  print_long:boolean;

procedure change_output;
var
  quit_change,
  stop:boolean;
  num,
  format:char;

begin{change output}
  quit_change:=false;
  repeat
    clrscr;
    writeln('Set Output Format');
    write('S - short table format',sk10);
    if print_short then writeln('yes') else writeln('no');
    write('L - long table format ',sk10);
    if print_long then writeln('yes') else writeln('no');
    writeln('C - change long table');
    writeln('Q - quit menu');
    begin
    .repeat
format:=readkey;
  until (format in ['s','l','c','q'])
end;
crlscr;
case format of
  'a':begin
    print_short:=not print_short;
    end;
  'l':begin
    print_long:=not print_long;
    end;
  'c':begin
    stop:=false;
    repeat
      begin
        writeln('Select output of long table');
        write('1 - Dimensions ','sk10);
        if prn_dim then writeln('yes') else writeln('no');
        write('2 - Dynamics ','sk10);
        if prn_dyn then writeln('yes') else writeln('no');
        write('3 - Electrical ','sk10);
        if prn_elec then writeln('yes') else writeln('no');
        write('4 - Control ','sk10);
        if prn_ctl then writeln('yes') else writeln('no');
        write('5 - Fracture parameters ','sk10);
        if prn_frac then writeln('yes') else writeln('no');
        writeln('6 - Quit selection');
      repeat
        num:=readkey;
        until num in ['l'..'6'];
      case num of
        '1':prn_dim:=not prn_dim;
        '2':prn_dyn:=not prn_dyn;
        '3':prn_elec:=not prn_elec;
        '4':prn_ctl:=not prn_ctl;
        '5':if ndof=3 then prn_frac:=not prn_frac;
        '6':stop:=true;
      end;
    end;
crlscr;
  end;
  until stop;
end; {case of 'c'}
'q':begin
  quit_change:=true;
end;
end; {case table of}
  until quit_change;
end; {change_output}
procedure print_output(var outfile:text);
begin
  clrscr;
  print_heading(outfile);
  if print_short then print_short_table(outfile);
  if print_long then
    begin
      if prn_dim then print_dimensions(outfile);
      if prn_dyn then print_dynamics(outfile);
      if prn_elec then print_electrical(outfile);
      if prn_ctl then print_control(outfile);
      if prn_frac then print_fracture(outfile);
      if fail_sim then print_simulation(outfile);
    end;
  if option = 'd' then print_comments(outfile);
end;

procedure run_menu;
begin {run_menu}
  quitmenu:=false;
  if ndof = 2 then prn_frac:=false;
  while not quitmenu do
    begin
      clrscr;
      writeln('Choose output option.‘);
      writeln('S = screen’);
      writeln('P = printer’);
      writeln('D = disk’);
      writeln('Q = quit program’);
      writeln('R = rerun with new input values’);
      writeln('N = generate new input file’);
      writeln('F = rerun with new input file’);
      writeln('C = change format’);
    begin
      repeat
        option:=readkey;
        until option in ['s','p','d','q','r','n','c','f']
    end;
    case option of
      's':begin
        assign(outfile,'CON’);
        rewrite(outfile);
        print_output(outfile);
        close(outfile);
      end;
      'p':begin
        assign(outfile,'PRN’);
      end;
end;
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rewrite(outfile);
print_output(outfile);
close(outfile);
end;
'd':begin
  writeln('Specify output filename.');
  repeat
    readln(filename);
    until filename <> '';
  assign(outfile,filename);
  rewrite(outfile);
  print_output(outfile);
  close(outfile);
end;
'q':begin
  quitmenu:=true;
  rerun:=false;
end;
'r':begin
  quitmenu:=true;
  reinitialize;
end;
'n':begin
  writeln('Specify new input filename.');
  repeat
    readln(filename);
    until filename <> '';
  assign(outfile,filename);
  rewrite(outfile);
  print_var(outfile);
  writeln(outfile);
  writeln(outfile,'New file created on:');
  print_timeanddate(outfile);
  print_comments(outfile);
  close(outfile);
end;
'c':begin
  change_output;
end;
'f':begin
  quitmenu:=true;
  indata;
  initialize;
end;
end; {case option of}
end; {while not quitmenu do}
end; {run_menu}
begin
    print_short:=true;
    print_long:=false;
    prn_dim:=true;
    prn_dyn:=true;
    prn_elec:=true;
    prn_ctl:=true;
    if ndof = 3 then prn_frac:=true;
    if ndof = 2 then prn_frac:=false;
end.
unit out2;
interface
uses
crt,
dos,
init2,
dyn2,
elec2;

procedure print_short_table(var outfile:text);
procedure print_dimensions(var outfile:text);
procedure print_dynamics(var outfile:text);
procedure print_electrical(var outfile:text);
procedure print_control(var outfile:text);
procedure print_fracture(var outfile:text);
procedure print_heading[var outfile:text];
procedure print_comments(var outfile:text);
procedure print_var(var outfile:text);
procedure print_timeanddate(var outfile:text);
procedure print_simulation(var outfile:text);

implementation
const
  s10='        ';
s5='   ';

var
  i,j:integer;

procedure stopscroll;
var
  wait:char;
begin
  if option='s' then begin
    repeat
      wait:=readkey;
      until wait<>'', clrscr;
  end;
end;  {stopscroll}

procedure skipline(var outfile:text; n:integer);
var
  i:integer;
begin
  if option='p' then
begin
  for i:=1 to n do
    writeln(outfile);
  end;
end;

procedure print_dimensions(var outfile:text);
begin
  writeln(outfile, 'DIMENSIONS');
  writeln(outfile, '---------------------------------------------------------------');
  writeln(outfile, 'BEAM');
  writeln(outfile, 'Beam Length s5,'s5,'lac s5,'[mic]',s5,lac/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'Beam Width s5,'b0 s5,'[mic]',s5,b0/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'Beam Thick. s5,'h s5,'[mic]',s5,h/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile);
  writeln(outfile, 'V-NOTCH');
  writeln(outfile, 'V-notch loc. s5,'lab s5,'[mic]',s5,lab/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'V-notch th. s5,'hb s5,'[mic]',s5,hb/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'V-notch width s5,'bb s5,'[mic]',s5,bb/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'Crack lgth s5,'da s5,'[mic]',s5,da/clgth:15:4);
  writeln(outfile, 'tip radius s5,'rtip s5,'[mic]',s5,rtip/clgth:15:4);
  writeln(outfile);
  writeln(outfile, 'SILICON PLATE');
  writeln(outfile, 'Plate Length s5,'l[p,x]',s5,'[mic] s5,l[p,x]/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'Plate width s5,'l[p,y]',s5,'[mic] s5,l[p,y]/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'Plate thick s5,'l[p,z]',s5,'[mic] s5,l[p,z]/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'CG x s5,'[mic] s5,lb[p,x]/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'CG y s5,'[mic] s5,lb[p,y]/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'CG z s5,'[mic] s5,lb[p,z]/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'Plate 1');
  writeln(outfile, 'length s5,'l[p1,x]',s5,'[mic] s5,l[p1,x]/clgth:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 'width s5,'l[p1,y]',s5,'[mic] s5,l[p1,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'thick ','s5,'l[p1,z]','s5,'][mic]

writeln(outfile,s5,'CG x
','s5,'lb[p1,x]','s5,''][mic]','s5,lb[p1,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'CG y
','s5,'lb[p1,y]','s5,''][mic]','s5,lb[p1,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'CG z
','s5,'lb[p1,z]','s5,''][mic]','s5,lb[p1,z]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,

Plate 2');
writeln(outfile,s5,'length
','s5,'l[p2,x]','s5,''][mic]
writeln(outfile,s5,'width
','s5,'l[p2,y]','s5,''][mic]
writeln(outfile,s5,'thick
','s5,'l[p2,z]','s5,''][mic]
writeln(outfile,s5,'CG x
','s5,'lb[p2,x]','s5,''][mic]','s5,lb[p2,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'CG y
','s5,'lb[p2,y]','s5,''][mic]','s5,lb[p2,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'CG z
','s5,'lb[p2,z]','s5,''][mic]','s5,lb[p2,z]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile);

Airgap');
writeln(outfile,s5,'Sensor gap 
','s5,'d0s
writeln(outfile,s5,'Torquer gap 
','s5,'d0t
writeln(outfile,s5,'Min sense gap 
','s5,'d0smin
writeln(outfile,s5,'Min tor. gap 
','s5,'d0tmin
writeln(outfile,s5,'Nom. Tor gap 
','s5,'h0t
writeln(outfile,s5,'Nom. Sen gap 
','s5,'h0s
writeln(outfile,s5,'Act. Tor gap 
','s5,'ht
writeln(outfile,s5,'Act. Sen gap 
','s5,'hs
writeln(outfile,s5,'Plate gap 
','s5,'h0p
writeln(outfile,s5,'length
writeln(outfile,s5,'width
TORQUER');
writeln(outfile,s5,'ltx
writeln(outfile,s5,'lty
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writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lbtx’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lbtx/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,
’
,
’,s5,’lax’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lax/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’width
,’s5,’lxy’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lxy/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,
’,s5,’lbsx’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lbsx/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile);
stopscroll;
writeln(outfile,
’
, HOLE DIMENSIONS’);
writeln(outfile,s5,’Hole 1’);
writeln(outfile,s5,’ Lgth ’,s5,’l[hls,x]
,’s5,’l[hls,y]
,’s5,’[mic]’,s5,l[hls,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’ width ’,s5,’l[hls,y]
,’s5,’[mic]’,s5,l[hls,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lb[hls,x]’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lb[hls,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lb[hls,y]’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lb[hls,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’Hole 2’);
writeln(outfile,s5,’ Lgth ’,s5,’l[h2s,x]
,’s5,’l[h2s,y]
,’s5,’[mic]’,s5,l[h2s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’ width ’,s5,’l[h2s,y]
,’s5,’[mic]’,s5,l[h2s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lb[h2s,x]’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lb[h2s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lb[h2s,y]’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lb[h2s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’Hole 3’);
writeln(outfile,s5,’ Lgth ’,s5,’l[h3s,x]
,’s5,’l[h3s,y]
,’s5,’[mic]’,s5,l[h3s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’ width ’,s5,’l[h3s,y]
,’s5,’[mic]’,s5,l[h3s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lb[h3s,x]’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lb[h3s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lb[h3s,y]’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lb[h3s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’Hole 4’);
writeln(outfile,s5,’ Lgth ’,s5,’l[h4s,x]
,’s5,’l[h4s,y]
,’s5,’[mic]’,s5,l[h4s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’ width ’,s5,’l[h4s,y]
,’s5,’[mic]’,s5,l[h4s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lb[h4s,x]’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lb[h4s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lb[h4s,y]’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lb[h4s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,’
,’s5,’lbtx’,s5,’[mic]’,s5,lbtx/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,
’
, SENSORS’);
writeln(outfile,s5,'Hole 5');
writeln(outfile,s5,' Lgth ','s5,','l[h5s,x]
','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h5s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,' wdth ','s5,','l[h5s,y]
','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h5s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'l[h5s,x]','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h5s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'l[h5s,y]','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h5s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile);
skipline(outfile,5);
writeln(outfile,s5,'Hole 6');
writeln(outfile,s5,' Lgth ','s5,','l[h6s,x]
','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h6s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,' wdth ','s5,','l[h6s,y]
','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h6s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'l[h6s,x]','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h6s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'l[h6s,y]','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h6s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,s5,'Hole 7');
writeln(outfile,s5,' Lgth ','s5,','l[h7s,x]
','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h7s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,' wdth ','s5,','l[h7s,y]
','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h7s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'l[h7s,x]','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h7s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'l[h7s,y]','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h7s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,s5,'Hole 8');
writeln(outfile,s5,' Lgth ','s5,','l[h8s,x]
','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h8s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,' wdth ','s5,','l[h8s,y]
','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h8s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'l[h8s,x]','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h8s,x]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile,s5,'l[h8s,y]','s5,','mic'],s5,','l[h8s,y]/clgth:15:2);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,

procedure prn_mass_inertia(var outfile: text);
begin
    writeln(outfile, 'Mass');
    writeln(outfile, 350)
s5,'Si plate mass        ',',s5,'m[p]   ',',s5,'[kg]                ',',s5,m[p]:15;
write1n(outfile,       s5,'Au plate mass       ',',s5,'m[p1]  ',',s5,'[kg]                ',',s5,m[p1]:15;
write1n(outfile,       s5,'Au bar mass         s5,'m[p2]  ',',s5,'[kg]                ',',s5,m[p2]:15;
write1n(outfile,       s5,'beam mass           ',',s5,'mb      ',',s5,'[kg]                ',',s5,mb*lac:15);
write1n(outfile,       s5,'plate mass           ',',s5,'mt      ',',s5,'[kg]                ',',s5,mt:15);
write1n(outfile,       s5,'End Plate CG         ',',s5,'lcg[x]  ',',s5,'[mic]                ',',lcg[x]/clgth:15:2);
write1n(outfile,       s5,'                                        ',',lcg[y]/clgth:15:2);
write1n(outfile,       s5,'                                        ',',lcg[z]/clgth:15:2);
write1n(outfile,'Inertia');
write1n(outfile,       s5,'x-axis                ',',s5,'Ixx     ',',s5,'[kg*m^2]          ',',s5,Ip[x,x]:13);
write1n(outfile,       s5,'y-axis                ',',s5,'Iyy     ',',s5,'[kg*m^2]          ',',s5,Ip[y,y]:15);
write1n(outfile,       s5,'z-axis                ',',s5,'Izz     ',',s5,'[kg*m^2]          ',',s5,Ip[z,z]:15);
end; {prn_mass_inertia}

procedure print_dynamics(var outfile:text);
beg1n (prndynamics)
    writeln(outfile,
        'DYNAMICS');
    writeln(outfile,
        'Mode shapes and frequencies: ndof = ',ndof:1,s5,'Frequency [hz]':20);
    writeln(outfile,'Air');
    for j=1 to nsys do begin
        write(outfile,s5,'mode ',4-j:1);
        for i=1 to nsys do begin
            write(outfile,phinorm[i,j]:10:4);
            writeln(outfile,s10,omega[j]/(2*pi):10:2);
        end;
    writeln(outfile);
    writeln(outfile,'Vacuum');
    for j=1 to nsys do begin
        write(outfile,s5,'mode ',4-j:1);
        for i=1 to nsys do write(outfile,phinormvac[i,j]:10:4);
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writeln(outfile,s10,omegavac[j]/(2*pi):10:2);
end;
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'real pole     ',s5,'repole     ',s5,'[hz]     ',s5,repole/(2*pi):15:3);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'imag pole     ',s5,'impole     ',s5,'[hz]     ',s5,impole/(2*pi):15:3);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Tip Displ at c ',s5,'vc        ',s5,'[mic]     ',s5,vc/clgth:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Tip Rot. at c ',s5,'thetac    ',s5,'[deg]     ',s5,thetac*180/pi:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Static Tip Disp',s5,'vcstatic',s5,'[mic]     ',s5,vcstatic/clgth:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Static Tip Rot',s5,'thetacstatic',s5,'[deg]     ',s5,thetacstatic*180/pi:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'tors. freq    ',s5,'wxx       ',s5,'[hz]     ',s5,wxx/(2*pi):15:2); stopscroll;
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'mode 1 z-axis ',s5,'wzz       ',s5,'[hz]     ',s5,wzz/(2*pi):15:2);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'plate freq    ',s5,'wp        ',s5,'[hz]     ',s5,wp/(2*pi):15:2);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'bridge freq   ',s5,'wbr       ',s5,'[hz]     ',s5,wbr/(2*pi):15:2);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,'Vacuum');
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'real pole     ',s5,'repolevac ',s5,'[hz]     ',s5,repolevac/(2*pi):15:3);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'imag pole     ',s5,'impolevac ',s5,'[hz]     ',s5,impolevac/(2*pi):15:3);
writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Static beam stiffness x',s5,'klc[x]':10, '[n/m]':10,s5,klc[x]:15);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Static beam stiffness y',s5,'klc[y]':10, '[n/m]':10,s5,klc[y]:15);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Static beam stiffness z',s5,'klc[z]':10, '[n/m]':10,s5,klc[z]:15);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Bridge stiffness x   ',s5,'kbr':10, '[n/m]':10,s5,kbr:15);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Plate/beam stiff. ratio',s5,'sr':10, '[ ]':10,s5,sr:15:2);
writeln(outfile,
  s5,'Static bridge disp   ',s5,'vbr':10, '[mic]':10,s5,vbr/1a-6:15:4); stopscroll;
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procedure print_simulation(var outfile: text);
begin
  writeln(outfile,'Fracture parameters at controller bandwidth');
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'displ at c , s5, 'vctl , s5, '[mic] , s5, 'vctl/clgst:15:3;
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'rot at c , s5, 'thetactl , s5, '[deg]
    , s5, 'thetactl*180/pi:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'crack lgth , s5, 'dactl , s5, '[mic] , s5, 'dactl/clgst:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'freq shift , s5, 'dwctl , s5, '[hz]
    , s5, 'dwctl/(2*pi):15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'freq rate , s5, 'dwtctl , s5, '[hz/s]
    , s5, 'dwtctl/(2*pi):15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'time to dactl , s5, 'tctl , s5, '[hrs] , s5, 'tctl:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, '% kcll , s5, 'pcktclctl , s5, '[ ] , s5, 'pcktclctl:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'crack stability' , s5, 'dkldactl , s5, '[n/m^(5/2)]
    , s5, 'dkldactl:10:4);
  writeln(outfile);
  writeln(outfile,'Fracture Parameters at failure');
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'displ at c , s5, 'vcf , s5, '[mic] , s5, 'vcf/clgst:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'rot at c , s5, 'thetacf , s5, '[deg]
    , s5, 'thetacf*180/pi:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'crack lgth , s5, 'daf , s5, '[mic] , s5, 'daf/clgst:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'freq shift , s5, 'dfw , s5, '[hz]
    , s5, 'dfw/(2*pi):15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'freq rate , s5, 'dwtf , s5, '[hz/s]
    , s5, 'dwtf/(2*pi):15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'velocity error , s5, 'verrorf , s5, '[deg]
    , s5, 'verrorf*180/pi:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, 'time to daf , s5, 'tf , s5, '[hrs] , s5, 'tf:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    s5, '% kcll , s5, 'pcktclcf , s5, '[ ]
    , s5, 'pcktclcf:15:3);
s5,'crack stability',s5,'dk1daf ',s5,'[n/m^(5/2)] ',s5,dk1daf:10:4);
stopscroll;
end;

procedure print_fracture(var outfile:text);
begin
  writeln(outfile,
    'CRACK COMPLIANCE PARAMETERS');
  writeln(outfile,
    '------------------------------------');
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Kies ',s5,'c_kies':10,'[n/m]':10,s5,c_kies:15);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Murakami ',s5,'c_mura':10,'[n/m]':10,s5,c_mura:15);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Paris ',s5,'c_paris':10,'[n/m]':10,s5,c_paris:15);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Deep crack ',s5,'c_dc':10,'[n/m]':10,s5,c_dc:15);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Elliptical ',s5,'c_ellip':10,'[n/m]':10,s5,c_ellip:15);
  writeln(outfile);
  writeln(outfile,
    '------------------------------------');
  writeln(outfile,'Stress Concentration Parameters');
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'V-notch ratio ',s5,'hb/h ',s5,'[ ] ',s5,hb/h:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Notch radius ',s5,'rtip ',s5,'[mic] ',s5,rtip/clgth:15:4);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Failure Displ. ',s5,'vcfail ',s5,'[mic] ',s5,vcfail/clgth:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Failure Rot ',s5,'thetacfail',s5,'[def] ',s5,thetacfail*180/pi:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'% frac stress ',s5,'pctsf ',s5,'[ ] ',s5,pctsf:15:3);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Fail voltage ',s5,'v0f ',s5,'[v] ',s5,v0f:15:3);
  writeln(outfile);
  writeln(outfile,'Stress Intensity Parameters');
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'Kic ',s5,'k1c111 ',s5,'[n/m^(3/2)] ',s5,k1c111:15);
  writeln(outfile,
    '',s5,'initial k1 ',s5,'k1i ',s5,'[n/m^(3/2)] ',s5,k1i:15):
  writeln(outfile,
    '------------------------------------');
procedure print_electrical(var outfile: text);
begin
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'final kl
e5, 'k1f
e5, '[n/m^(3/2)]
e5, klf:15);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'inst. kl
e5, 'k1
e5, '[n/m^(3/2)]
e5, k1:15);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'Klc
e5, 'pctklc
e5, '[ ]
e5, 100*pctklc:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'Kcf
e5, 'pctkcf
e5, '[ ]
e5, 100*pctkcf:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'kaellip
e5, 'kaellip
e5, '[1/m^(5/2)]
e5, kaellip:15);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'Crack lgth
e5, 'da
e5, '[mic]
e5, da/clgth:15:4);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'Crack Stability'
e5, 'dk1/da
e5, '[n/m^(5/2)]
e5, dk1/da:15);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'freq shift
e5, 'dw
e5, '[hz]
e5, dw/(2*p:):15:4);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'freq rate
e5, 'dwdt
e5, '[hz/s^2]
e5, dwdt/(2*pi:):15:4);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'Time to failure'
e5, 'tf
e5, '[hrs]
e5, tf:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'Time to da
e5, 'ta
e5, '[hrs]
e5, ta:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'Crack velocity'
e5, 'vs102
e5, '[m/s]
e5, vs102:15);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'Fatigue const'
e5, 'ns102
e5, '[ ]
e5, ns102:15:2);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'Frac Voltage'
e5, 'v0c
e5, '[v]
e5, v0c:15:3);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'nano clear'
e5, 'Icl
e5, '[mic]
e5, Icl/clgch:15:3);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'nano load'
e5, 'Pind
e5, '[mN]
e5, Pind*1e3:15:3);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'moment at b'
e5, 'momb
e5, '[n*m]
e5, momb:15);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'fail mom at b'
e5, 'mombf
e5, '[n*m]
e5, mombf:15);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'st mom at b'
e5, 'mombst
e5, '[n*m]
e5, mombst:15);
  writeln(outfile, 's5, 'etch fail ratio'
e5, 'mst/mf
e5, '[ ]
e5, mst/mf:15:2);
end; {print_fracture}
```plaintext
writeln(outfile,
        '------------------------------------------');
writeln(outfile,
        'Sensor Volt dn ', 5, 'eoutd ', 5, '[v] ', 5, 'eoutd:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'Sensor Volt up ', 5, 'eoutu ', 5, '[v] ', 5, 'eoutu:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'Delta Cap up ', 5, 'delcu ', 5, '[f] ', 5, 'delcu:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'Delta Cap dn ', 5, 'delcd ', 5, '[f] ', 5, 'delcd:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'Nominal Cap ', 5, 'c0 ', 5, '[f] ', 5, 'c0:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'Feedback Cap ', 5, 'cfb ', 5, '[f] ', 5, 'cfb:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'Torquer Voltage ', 5, 'v0 ', 5, '[v] ', 5, 'v0:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'Snap Voltage ', 5, 'vsnap ', 5, '[v] ', 5, 'vsnap:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'Brk dwn Voltage ', 5, 'vbd ', 5, '[v] ', 5, 'vbd:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'max bridge temp ', 5, 'Tmax ', 5, '[deg C] ', 5, 'Tmax:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'sinter temp ', 5, 'Tsin ', 5, '[deg C] ', 5, 'Tsin:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
        'TC bond temp ', 5, 'Twb ', 5, '[deg C] ', 5, 'Twb:15:3);
writeln(outfile);
end; {print_electrical}

procedure print_control(var outfile:text);
begin
    writeln(outfile,
        '------------------------------------------');
    writeln(outfile,
        'vco gain ', 5, 'kvco ', 5, '[rad/(s*v)] ', 5, 'kvco:15:3);
    writeln(outfile,
        'phase det. gain ', 5, 'kd ', 5, '[volts/rad] ', 5, 'kd:15:3);
    writeln(outfile,
        'd.c. plant gain ', 5, 'kp ', 5, '[s] ', 5, 'kp:15:3);
    writeln(outfile,
        'system gain ', 5, 'gp ', 5, '[1/s] ', 5, 'gp:15:3);
    writeln(outfile,
        'plant pole ', 5, 'repole ', 5, '[1/s] ', 5, 'repole:15:3);
    writeln(outfile,
        'servo bandwidth ', 5, 'wservo ', 5, '[hz] ', 5, 'wservo/(2*pi):15:3);
```
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writeln(outfile);
writeln(outfile,s5,'Type 1 lead compensator');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'filter gain ',s5,'kf1 ',s5,'[1/s] ',s5,'kf1:15:3');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'filter zero ',s5,'a ',s5,'[rad/s] ',s5,'a:15:2');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'filter pole ',s5,'b ',s5,'[rad/s] ',s5,'b:15:2');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'velocity error ',s5,'verror ',s5,'[rad] ',s5,'verror:15:4');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'max vel. error ',s5,'verrormax',s5,'[rad] ',s5,'verrormax:15:4');
stopscroll;
end; {print_control}

procedure print_short_table(var outfile:text);
begin {short table}
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Tip Displ. ',s5,'vc ',s5,'[mic] ',s5,'vc/clgth:15:2');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Tip Rot. ',s5,'thetac ',s5,'[deg] ',s5,'thetac*180/pi:15:3');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'min airgap ',s5,'d0smin ',s5,'[mic] ',s5,'d0smin/clgth:15:3');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'airgap ',s5,'d0s ',s5,'[mic] ',s5,'d0s/clgth:15:3');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Torq Volt ',s5,'v0 ',s5,'[v] ',s5,'v0:15:3');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Frac Voltage ',s5,'v0c ',s5,'[v] ',s5,'v0c:15:3');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Sensor Volt up ',s5,'eoutu ',s5,'[mv] ',s5,'eoutu*1e3:15:2');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Sensor Volt dn ',s5,'eoutd ',s5,'[mv] ',s5,'eoutd*1e3:15:2');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'mode 1 ',s5,'w1 ',s5,'[hz] ',s5,'omega/(2*pi):15:3');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'freq shift ',s5,'dw ',s5,'[hz] ',s5,'dw/(2*pi):15:3');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Crack lgth ',s5,'da ',s5,'[mic] ',s5,'da/clgth:15:4');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Time to da ',s5,'ta ',s5,'[hrs] ',s5,'ta:15:2');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Time to failure',s5,'tf ',s5,'[hrs] ',s5,'tf:15:2');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'% initial k1 ',s5,'pcta1ci ',s5,'[ ] ',s5,'pcta1ci:15:3');
writeln(outfile,
s5,'Crack Stability',s5,'dkl/d1 ',s5,'[n/m^((5/2))]',s5,'dkl/d1:15');
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writeln(outfile,
   's5,'s5,pctsf ',s5,'[ ] ',s5,pctsf:15:2);
writeln(outfile,
   's5,'Crack velocity 's5,'vs102 ',s5,'[m/s] ',s5,vs102:15);
writeln(outfile,
   's5,'Fatigue const 's5,'nsi02 ',s5,'[ ] ',s5,nsi02:15:2);
writeln(outfile,
   's5,'nano clear 's5,'Icl ',s5,'[mic] ',s5,Icl/clgth:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
   's5,'nano load 's5,'Pind ',s5,'[mN] ',s5,Pind*1e3:15:3);
writeln(outfile,
   's5,'max temp 's5,'Tmax ',s5,'[deg C] ',s5,Tmax:15:3);

procedure print_var(var outfile:text);
begin
  writeln(outfile,filevar[1]:10:3,' 1 lab length of segment ab
  writeln(outfile,filevar[2]:10:3,' 2 lbc length of segment bc
  writeln(outfile,filevar[3]:10:3,' 3 x1 edge clearances [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[4]:10:3,' 4 x2 distance between torquier and
    sensor plates [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[5]:10:3,' 5 x3 distance between sensor plate
    and plate 2 [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[6]:10:3,' 6 lpy width of plate [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[7]:10:3,' 7 lhlx length of hole at torquier
    [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[8]:10:3,' 8 lhly width of at torquier hole
    [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[9]:10:3,' 9 lh3y length of hole at sensor
    [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[10]:10:3,'10 lhb3y lcc of cg of hole 3
    [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[11]:10:3,'11 lhb4y lcc of cg of hole 4
    [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[12]:10:3,'12 lhb5y lcc of cg of hole 5
    [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[13]:10:3,'13 lp2x length of tip mass [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[14]:10:3,'14 lp2y width of tip mass [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[15]:10:3,'15 lp2z thickness of tip mass
    [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[16]:10:3,'16 lplz thickness of plate mass
    [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[17]:10:3,'17 b0 width of beam at point a
    (fixed end) [mic]');
  writeln(outfile,filevar[18]:10:3,'18 bb width at V-notch [mic]');
end; {short table}
writeln(outfile,filevar[19]:10:3,' 19 h thickness of beam [mic]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[20]:10:3,' 20 hb V-notch depth [mic]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[21]:10:3,' 21 ltx length of torquer [mic]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[22]:10:3,' 22 lax length of sensor [mic]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[23]:10:3,' 23 d0s distance from sensor elec.
to plating [mic]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[24]:10:3,' 24 d0t distance from torquer elec.
to plating [m]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[25]:10,' 25 cfb feedback capacitance [f]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[26]:10:3,' 26 vexc excitation voltage on sensor [v]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[27]:10:4,' 27 da crack length [mic]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[28]:10:4,' 28 rtip tip radius of V-notch [mic]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[29]:10:4,' 29 wservo servo bandwidth [hz]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[30]:10:4,' 30 v applied torquer voltage [v]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[31]:10:4,' 31 h0p plate airgap [mic]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[32]:10:4,' 32 vbias sensor bias voltage [v]').
writeln(outfile,trunc(filevar[33]):10,' 33 ndof # DOF of analysis (2 or 3)').
writeln(outfile,trunc(filevar[34]):10,' 34 failure simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)').
writeln(outfile,trunc(filevar[35]):10,' 35 fatigue simulation (1 = yes, 0 = no)').
writeln(outfile,filevar[36]:10:4,' 36 vsio2 crack velocity [m/s]').
writeln(outfile,filevar[37]:10:4,' 37 nsio2 fatigue constant').
end; {printvar}

procedure print_timeanddate(var outfile:text);
var
  hour, min, sec, sec100, dayofweek, day, month, year:word;
  dayname:string[9];
beginn
getime(hour,min,sec,sec100);
gedate(year,month,day,dayofweek);
case dayofweek of
  1: dayname:=’Monday’;
  2: dayname:=’Tuesday’;
  3: dayname:=’Wednesday’;
  4: dayname:=’Thursday’;
  5: dayname:=’Friday’;
  6: dayname:=’Saturday’;
  0: dayname:=’Sunday’;
end;
write(outfile,’Date of run: ’,dayname,’ ’,month,’/’,day,’/’,year);
writeln(outfile,sec10,’Time of run: ’,hour,’;’,min,’;’,sec);
end; {timeanddate}
procedure print_heading(var outfile: text);
begin
    print_timeanddate(outfile);
    writeln(outfile, 'OUTPUT SUMMARY');
    writeln(outfile, '-------------------------------------------------------');
    writeln(outfile,
    '-------------------------------------------------------');
    writeln(outfile, '----------------------------------');
    writeln(outfile, '----------------------------------');
    writeln(outfile, '----------------------------------');
end;

procedure print_comments(var outfile: text);
var
    line: string;

begin
    if (option= 'p') or (option= 'd') or (option= 'n') then
        begin
            writeln('Comments:');
            writeln(outfile, '-------------------------------------------------------');
            while not eoln do
                begin
                    readln(line);
                    writeln(outfile, line);
                    writeln(outfile, line);
                end;
            end;
        end;
end;

begin
end.
æ
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