



Designation: D7766/D7766M – 23

Standard Practice for Damage Resistance Testing of Sandwich Constructions¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation D7766/D7766M; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This practice provides instructions for modifying laminate quasi-static indentation and drop-weight impact test methods to determine damage resistance properties of sandwich constructions. Permissible core material forms include those with continuous bonding surfaces (such as balsa wood and foams) as well as those with discontinuous bonding surfaces (such as honeycomb, truss cores and fiber-reinforced cores).

1.2 This practice supplements Test Methods [D6264/D6264M](#) (for quasi-static indentation testing) and [D7136/D7136M](#) (for drop-weight impact testing) with provisions for testing sandwich specimens. Several important test specimen parameters (for example, facing thickness, core thickness and core density) are not mandated by this practice; however, repeatable results require that these parameters be specified and reported.

1.3 Three test procedures are provided. Procedures A and B correspond to [D6264/D6264M](#) test procedures for rigidly-backed and edge-supported test conditions, respectively. Procedure C corresponds to [D7136/D7136M](#) test procedures. All three procedures are suitable for imparting damage to a sandwich specimen in preparation for subsequent damage tolerance testing in accordance with Test Method [D8287/D8287M](#) (compressive loading) and Practice [D8388/D8388M](#) (flexural loading).

1.4 In general, Procedure A is considered to be the most suitable procedure for comparative damage resistance assessments, due to reduced influence of flexural stiffness and support fixture characteristics upon damage formation. However, the selection of a test procedure and associated support conditions should be done in consideration of the intended structural application, and as such Procedures B and C may be more appropriate for comparative purposes for some applications.

1.5 *Units*—The values stated in either SI units or inch-pound units are to be regarded separately as standard. The

values stated in each system are not necessarily exact equivalents; therefore, to ensure conformance with the standard, each system shall be used independently of the other, and values from the two systems shall not be combined.

1.5.1 Within the text the inch-pound units are shown in brackets.

1.6 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety, health, and environmental practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

1.7 *This international standard was developed in accordance with internationally recognized principles on standardization established in the Decision on Principles for the Development of International Standards, Guides and Recommendations issued by the World Trade Organization Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Committee.*

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 *ASTM Standards:*²

[D792 Test Methods for Density and Specific Gravity \(Relative Density\) of Plastics by Displacement](#)

[D883 Terminology Relating to Plastics](#)

[D3171 Test Methods for Constituent Content of Composite Materials](#)

[D3878 Terminology for Composite Materials](#)

[D5229/D5229M Test Method for Moisture Absorption Properties and Equilibrium Conditioning of Polymer Matrix Composite Materials](#)

[D5687/D5687M Guide for Preparation of Flat Composite Panels with Processing Guidelines for Specimen Preparation](#)

[D6264/D6264M Test Method for Measuring the Damage Resistance of a Fiber-Reinforced Polymer-Matrix Composite to a Concentrated Quasi-Static Indentation Force](#)

[D7136/D7136M Test Method for Measuring the Damage Resistance of a Fiber-Reinforced Polymer Matrix Composite to a Drop-Weight Impact Event](#)

¹ This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee [D30](#) on Composite Materials and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee [D30.09](#) on Sandwich Construction.

Current edition approved May 1, 2023. Published June 2023. Originally approved in 2011. Last previous edition approved in 2016 as [D7766/D7766M – 16](#). DOI: 10.1520/D7766_D7766M-23.

² For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

D8287/D8287M Test Method for Compressive Residual Strength Properties of Damaged Sandwich Composite Panels

D8388/D8388M Practice for Flexural Residual Strength Testing of Damaged Sandwich Constructions

E6 Terminology Relating to Methods of Mechanical Testing

E122 Practice for Calculating Sample Size to Estimate, With Specified Precision, the Average for a Characteristic of a Lot or Process

E177 Practice for Use of the Terms Precision and Bias in ASTM Test Methods

E456 Terminology Relating to Quality and Statistics

E2533 Guide for Nondestructive Examination of Polymer Matrix Composites Used in Aerospace Applications

2.2 Other Documents:

CMH-17-3G Composite Materials Handbook, Volume 3—Polymer Matrix Composites: Materials Usage, Design and Analysis³

CMH-17-6 Composite Materials Handbook, Volume 6—Structural Sandwich Composites³

MIL-HDBK-728/1 Nondestructive Testing⁴

MIL-HDBK-731A Nondestructive Testing Methods of Composite Materials—Thermography⁴

MIL-HDBK-732A Nondestructive Testing Methods of Composite Materials—Acoustic Emission⁴

MIL-HDBK-733A Nondestructive Testing Methods of Composite Materials—Radiography⁴

MIL-HDBK-787A Nondestructive Testing Methods of Composite Materials—Ultrasonics⁴

3. Terminology

3.1 *Definitions*—Terminology **D3878** defines terms relating to high-modulus fibers and their composites, as well as terms relating to sandwich constructions. Terminology **D883** defines terms relating to plastics. Terminology **E6** defines terms relating to mechanical testing. Terminology **E456** and Practice **E177** define terms relating to statistics. In the event of a conflict between terms, Terminology **D3878** shall have precedence over the other terminologies.

3.2 Definitions of Terms Specific to This Standard:

3.2.1 If the term represents a physical quantity, its analytical dimensions are stated immediately following the term (or letter symbol) in fundamental dimension form, using the following ASTM standard symbology for fundamental dimensions, shown within square brackets: $[M]$ for mass, $[L]$ for length, $[T]$ for time, $[\theta]$ for thermodynamic temperature, and $[nd]$ for non-dimensional quantities. Use of these symbols is restricted to analytical dimensions when used with square brackets, as the symbols may have other definitions when used without the brackets.

3.2.2 *dent depth, d $[L]$, n* —residual depth of the depression formed by an indenter after removal of applied force during a quasi-static indentation test, or by an impactor after the impact

event during a drop-weight impact test. The dent depth shall be defined as the maximum distance in a direction normal to the face of the specimen from the lowest point in the dent to the plane of the indented or impacted surface that is undisturbed by the dent.

3.2.3 *nominal value, n* —a value, existing in name only, assigned to a measurable property for the purpose of convenient designation. Tolerances may be applied to a nominal value to define an acceptable range for the property.

3.2.4 *recorded contact force, F $[MLT^{-2}]$, n* —the force exerted by the indenter on the specimen during a quasi-static indentation test, or by the impactor on the specimen during a drop-weight impact test, as recorded by a force indicator.

3.2.5 *tip, n* —the portion or component of the indenter or impactor which comes into contact with the test specimen first during a quasi-static indentation or drop-weight impact test.

3.3 Symbols:

3.3.1 E —potential energy of impactor prior to drop

3.3.2 t —thickness of impacted sandwich facing

4. Summary of Practices

4.1 *Procedure A*—In accordance with Test Method **D6264/D6264M**, but with a sandwich specimen, perform a quasi-static indentation test of a rigidly-backed specimen. Damage is imparted through an out-of-plane, concentrated force applied by slowly pressing a displacement-controlled hemispherical indenter into the face of the specimen. The damage resistance is quantified in terms of the resulting size, location and type of damage in the specimen.

4.2 *Procedure B*—In accordance with Test Method **D6264/D6264M**, but with a sandwich specimen, perform a quasi-static indentation test of an edge-supported specimen. Damage is imparted through an out-of-plane, concentrated force applied by slowly pressing a displacement-controlled hemispherical indenter into the face of the specimen. The damage resistance is quantified in terms of the resulting size, location and type of damage in the specimen.

4.3 *Procedure C*—In accordance with Test Method **D7136/D7136M**, but with a sandwich specimen, perform a drop-weight impact test of an edge-supported specimen. Damage is imparted through an out-of-plane, concentrated impact using a drop weight with a hemispherical striker tip. The damage resistance is quantified in terms of the resulting size, location and type of damage in the specimen.

5. Significance and Use

5.1 This practice provides supplemental instructions that allow Test Methods **D6264/D6264M** (for quasi-static indentation testing) and **D7136/D7136M** (for drop-weight impact testing) to determine damage resistance properties of sandwich constructions. Susceptibility to damage from concentrated out-of-plane forces is one of the major design concerns of many structures made using sandwich constructions. Knowledge of the damage resistance properties of a sandwich panel is useful for product development and material selection.

³ Available from SAE International (SAE), 400 Commonwealth Dr., Warrendale, PA 15096, <http://www.sae.org>.

⁴ Available from U.S. Army Materials Technology Laboratory, Watertown, MA 02471.

5.2 Sandwich damage resistance testing can serve the following purposes:

5.2.1 To establish quantitatively the effects of facing geometry, facing stacking sequence, facing-to-core interface, core geometry (cell size, cell wall thickness, core thickness, etc.), core density, core strength, processing and environmental variables on the damage resistance of a particular sandwich panel to a concentrated quasi-static indentation force, drop-weight impact force, or impact energy.

5.2.2 To compare quantitatively the relative values of the damage resistance parameters for sandwich constructions with different facing, core or adhesive materials. The damage response parameters can include dent depth, damage dimensions and location(s), indentation or impact force magnitudes, impact energy magnitudes, as well as the force versus time curve.

5.2.3 To impart damage in a specimen for subsequent damage tolerance tests, such as Test Method **D8287/D8287M** and Practice **D8388/D8388M**.

5.2.4 Quasi-static indentation tests can also be used to identify a specific sequence of damage events (only the final damage state is identifiable after a drop-weight impact test).

5.3 The properties obtained using these practices can provide guidance in regard to the anticipated damage resistance capability of sandwich structures with similar materials, geometry, stacking sequence, and so forth. However, it must be understood that the damage resistance of a sandwich structure is highly dependent upon several factors including geometry, thickness, stiffness, mass, support conditions, and so forth.

5.3.1 Significant differences in the relationships between force/energy and the resultant damage state can result due to differences in these parameters. For example, properties obtained using edge-supported specimens would more likely reflect the damage resistance characteristics of a sandwich panel away from substructure attachments, whereas rigidly-backed specimens would more likely reflect the behavior of a panel local to substructure which resists out-of-plane deformation. Similarly, edge-supported impact test specimen properties would be expected to be similar to those of a sandwich panel with equivalent length and width dimensions, in comparison to those of a panel significantly larger than the test specimen, which tends to divert a greater proportion of the impact energy into elastic deformation.

5.3.2 Procedure A (quasi-static indentation using a rigidly-backed specimen) is considered to be the most suitable procedure for comparison of the damage resistance characteristics of sandwich panels of varying material, geometry, stacking sequence and so forth. This is because the rigid backing plate resists out-of-plane deformation of the specimen, such that the sandwich flexural stiffness and support geometry have less influence on damage initiation and growth behavior than in edge-supported tests. However, it should be noted that damage resistance behavior observed using rigidly-backed specimens may not strictly translate to edge-supported applications. For example, sandwich constructions using cores with high compression stiffness or strength, or both (for example, balsa wood) may exhibit superior performance in rigidly-backed tests, but that performance may not strictly translate to

edge-supported tests in which the core shear stiffness, core shear strength and sandwich panel flexural stiffness have greater influence upon the test results. Consequently, it is imperative to consider the intended assessment and structural application when selecting a test procedure for comparative purposes, and as such the use of Procedures B and C may be more appropriate for some applications.

5.3.3 For some structural applications, the use of a rigidly-backed specimen in drop-weight impact testing may be appropriate. Specific procedures for such testing are not included in this practice, but the general approach detailed for Procedure C may be useful as guidance material when conducting such assessments. Such tests should be performed in consideration of the implications of using rigidly-backed support conditions, such as their effect upon contact forces and sandwich deformation under impact, as well as the potential for damage to the test apparatus.

5.4 The standard indenter and impactor geometries have blunt, hemispherical tips. Historically, these tip geometries have generated a larger amount of internal damage for a given amount of external damage, when compared with that observed for similar indentations or impacts using sharp tips. Alternative indenter and impactor geometries may be appropriate depending upon the damage resistance characteristics being examined. For example, the use of sharp tip geometries may be appropriate for certain facing penetration resistance assessments.

5.5 Some testing organizations may desire to use these practices in conjunction with a subsequent damage tolerance test method (such as Test Method **D8287/D8287M** or Practice **D8388/D8388M**) to assess the residual strength of specimens containing a specific damage state, such as a defined dent depth, damage geometry, damage location, and so forth. In this case, the testing organization should subject several specimens, or a large panel, to multiple indentations or impacts, or both, at various energy levels using these practices. A relationship between force or energy and the desired damage parameter can then be developed. Subsequent residual strength tests in accordance with Test Method **D8287/D8287M** or Practice **D8388/D8388M** can then be performed using specimens damaged using an interpolated energy or force level that is expected to produce the desired damage state.

6. Interferences

6.1 The response of a sandwich specimen to an out-of-plane force or impact is dependent upon many factors, such as facing material, facing thickness, facing ply thickness, facing stacking sequence, facing surface flatness, facing-to-core adhesive material, adhesive thickness, core material, core geometry (cell size, cell wall thickness, core thickness, etc.), core density, facing void content, adhesive void content, environment, panel geometry, impactor mass, tip geometry, ratio of tip diameter to core cell size, impact velocity, impact energy, and boundary conditions. Consequently, comparisons cannot be made between sandwich constructions unless identical test configurations, test conditions, and sandwich panel configurations are used. Damage resistance properties may vary based upon the processing and build sequence (e.g., precured/bonded versus co-cured facings).