

SEP 2 1946

11664  
70

# NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

TECHNICAL NOTE

No. 1125

EFFECT OF RATIO OF RIVET PITCH TO RIVET DIAMETER  
ON THE FATIGUE STRENGTH OF RIVETED JOINTS  
OF 24S-T ALUMINUM-ALLOY SHEET

By Harold Crate, David W. Ochiltree,  
and Walter T. Graves

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory  
Langley Field, Virginia



Washington  
September 1946

NACA LIBRARY  
LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL  
LABORATORY  
Langley Field, Va.

## NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

## TECHNICAL NOTE NO. 1125

EFFECT OF RATIO OF RIVET PITCH TO RIVET DIAMETER  
ON THE FATIGUE STRENGTH OF RIVETED JOINTS  
OF 24S-T ALUMINUM-ALLOY SHEET

By Harold Crate, David W. Ochiltree,  
and Walter T. Graves

## SUMMARY

An extensive series of tests were conducted on riveted joints to determine the effect of rivet size and rivet pitch on the fatigue life of joints subjected to "prying" (combined tensile and bending) loads. For each sheet thickness tested, there appeared to be a value of the ratio of rivet pitch to rivet diameter that would ensure a near maximum of the ratio of fatigue strength to static ultimate strength for the joint.

## INTRODUCTION

Although rivets are normally designed to resist only shear loads, there are a number of applications in which rivets act under "prying" (combined tensile and bending) loads. In aircraft structures, such loads are frequently of an alternating nature and the rivets and other elements of the riveted joint are therefore subjected to fatigue failure. Common examples of riveted joints in which repeated applications of combined loads occur can be found in brackets, clip angles, and sheet-to-stiffener connections in which buckling of the sheet occurs.

In order to obtain information by which riveted joints can be proportioned to give best resistance to alternating prying loads and concurrently to meet static strength requirements, an extensive series of fatigue tests were run. The purpose of the present paper is to give the results of this investigation.

## SYMBOLS

|       |                                                                                             |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a     | depth of flange, inches                                                                     |
| b     | rivet offset, inches                                                                        |
| d     | rivet diameter, inches                                                                      |
| p     | rivet pitch (measured between rivet center lines), inches                                   |
| t     | sheet thickness, inches                                                                     |
| P     | tensile load on specimen, pounds                                                            |
| $P_f$ | fatigue load per rivet of the riveted joint for a given number of cycles to failure, pounds |
| $P_u$ | static ultimate strength per rivet of the riveted joint, pounds                             |

## TEST SPECIMENS AND TESTING PROCEDURE

The specimens consisted of two 24S-T aluminum-alloy strips of equal thickness riveted together through a bent-up flange with two round-head A17S-T aluminum-alloy rivets (fig. 1). Table 1 gives the nominal dimensions of each of the 20 groups of specimens tested. Dimensions varied were the sheet thickness  $t$ , the rivet diameter  $d$ , and the rivet pitch  $p$ . The effect of varying the rivet offset  $b$  was not investigated; however,  $b$  was kept as small as practicable in the construction of the specimens.

All specimens were tested with a complete reversal of load, from a given tensile load  $P$  (as shown in fig. 1) to an equal compressive load, in the fatigue machine shown in figure 2. The load on the specimen was determined by measuring the strains in the calibrated loading beam (marked A in fig. 2) by means of electrical resistance-type strain gages. Loads could be set within an estimated accuracy of 4 percent for low loads and 1 percent for high loads. A sensitive electronic limit switch stopped the test if the load

on the specimen dropped approximately 10 pounds. If such a drop in load occurred, the load on the specimen was then reset and the test continued until failure occurred. The failure was either a separation of the rivet shank between the sheets or the formation of visible cracks in the sheet along the rivet line.

For each group of specimens, static ultimate-strength tests were run. These tests were made in a hydraulic testing machine, which indicated loads with an accuracy of one-half of 1 percent. Flat "vee" grips were used in these static tests in order to reproduce the fixity applied by the grips used in the fatigue tests.

### TEST RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The average of four static ultimate-strength tests for each group of specimens is given in table 1.

In figure 3 the results of the fatigue tests for each group of specimens are presented in the form of conventional S-N curves, that is, curves of the number of cycles to failure against load per rivet. These S-N curves represent the basic fatigue data obtained for each group of specimens. It may be noted that the continuity of the S-N curves was not disrupted by a change from sheet to rivet failure.

In figure 4 the data presented in figure 3 (tabulated in table 1) are replotted to show the variation of the ratio  $P_f/P_u$  with the ratio  $p/d$ ; where  $P_f$  is the fatigue load per rivet for a given number of cycles to failure,  $P_u$  is the static ultimate tensile strength per rivet,  $p$  is the rivet pitch, and  $d$  is the rivet diameter. The data are admittedly rather meager for the purpose of drawing general conclusions and therefore the uniqueness of the plot used for figure 4 cannot be confirmed. The parameters used in that figure, however, seem to offer a useful and consistent plot of the data at hand. The parameter  $P_f/P_u$ , which might be termed the "fatigue efficiency," provides a convenient means of comparing the fatigue strengths of joints designed to carry the same static load. The parameter  $p/d$  was chosen because the tests indicated that, for a given fatigue life and sheet thickness,  $P_f/P_u$

would be reasonably well-defined by the ratio  $p/d$ , independently of the absolute values of  $p$  and  $d$  used.

Inspection of the curves in figure 4 shows for each sheet thickness that there is an apparent optimum value of  $p/d$  for which  $P_f/P_u$  is a maximum. These optimum values of  $p/d$  for different sheet thickness are tabulated in table 2. Inspection shows very little variation of these optimum values of  $p/d$  with variation in the number of cycles to failure; therefore average values of  $p/d$  are also given in the table for each sheet thickness.

In figure 5 the average optimum values of  $p/d$  are plotted against sheet thickness. The points fall approximately on the straight line shown in the figure. Although insufficient tests were made to establish definitely the validity of this line, it seems reasonable to assume that this curve represents a near-optimum value of  $p/d$  for any sheet size within the range of tests.

Since, in a riveted joint, sheet thickness and rivet area per inch will usually be dictated by static-strength requirements, it is possible by use of figure 5 to choose a value of  $p/d$  that will ensure that the joint is well proportioned to resist alternating "prying" loads and will consistently meet the static strength requirements.

### CONCLUSIONS

The following tentative conclusions may be drawn from the tests to determine the effect of rivet pitch and rivet diameter on the fatigue life of joints of 24S-T aluminum-alloy sheet and A17S-T round-head rivets subjected to "prying" (combined tensile and bending) loads:

1. For each sheet thickness tested, there appeared to be a value of the ratio of rivet pitch to rivet diameter that would ensure a near maximum of the ratio of fatigue strength to static ultimate strength for the joint.

2. These optimum ratios of rivet pitch to rivet diameter were, for all practical purposes, independent of the number of cycles to failure.

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory  
National Advisory Committee For Aeronautics  
Langley Field, Va. March 25, 1946

TABLE 1.- TEST-SPECIMEN DATA


| Specimen group | Nominal dimensions        |                          |                       |                        |                           |       | Static ultimate strength per rivet $P_u$ (lb) (a) |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------|
|                | Sheet thickness $t$ (in.) | Rivet diameter $d$ (in.) | Rivet pitch $p$ (in.) | Rivet offset $b$ (in.) | Depth of flange $a$ (in.) | $p/d$ |                                                   |
| 1              | 0.091                     | 1/8                      | 5/8                   | 1/2                    | 3/4                       | 5.00  | 398                                               |
| 2              | .091                      | 5/32                     | 5/8                   | 5/8                    | 7/8                       | 4.00  | 552                                               |
| 3              | .091                      | 3/16                     | 5/8                   | 5/8                    | 7/8                       | 3.33  | 680                                               |
| 4              | .091                      | 1/4                      | 5/8                   | 3/4                    | $1\frac{1}{16}$           | 2.50  | 1160                                              |
| 5              | .064                      | 1/8                      | 1/2                   | 7/16                   | 3/4                       | 4.00  | 344                                               |
| 6              | .064                      | 1/8                      | 5/8                   | 7/16                   | 3/4                       | 5.00  | 346                                               |
| 7              | .064                      | 1/8                      | 3/4                   | 7/16                   | 3/4                       | 6.00  | 401                                               |
| 8              | .064                      | 1/8                      | 1                     | 7/16                   | 3/4                       | 8.00  | 388                                               |
| 9              | .064                      | 5/32                     | 5/8                   | 1/2                    | 7/8                       | 4.00  | 537                                               |
| 10             | .064                      | 5/32                     | 7/8                   | 1/2                    | 7/8                       | 5.60  | 505                                               |
| 11             | .064                      | 5/32                     | 1                     | 1/2                    | 7/8                       | 6.40  | 521                                               |
| 12             | .064                      | 3/16                     | 5/8                   | 1/2                    | 7/8                       | 3.33  | 604                                               |
| 13             | .040                      | 1/8                      | 5/8                   | 5/16                   | 9/16                      | 5.00  | 240                                               |
| 14             | .040                      | 1/8                      | 3/4                   | 5/16                   | 9/16                      | 6.00  | 261                                               |
| 15             | .040                      | 1/8                      | 7/8                   | 5/16                   | 9/16                      | 7.00  | 275                                               |
| 16             | .040                      | 1/8                      | 1                     | 5/16                   | 9/16                      | 8.00  | 306                                               |
| 17             | .032                      | 1/8                      | 5/8                   | 5/16                   | 9/16                      | 5.00  | 241                                               |
| 18             | .032                      | 3/32                     | 5/8                   | 5/16                   | 9/16                      | 6.67  | 158                                               |
| 19             | .032                      | 3/32                     | 13/16                 | 5/16                   | 9/16                      | 8.67  | 194                                               |
| 20             | .032                      | 3/32                     | 15/16                 | 5/16                   | 9/16                      | 10.00 | 196                                               |

<sup>a</sup> Average of four tests.

TABLE 2.- FATIGUE-TEST RESULTS

| Number of<br>cycles to<br>failure | Optimum values of $b/d$ for<br>maximum values of $P_f/P_u$ |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                                   | $t=0.091$                                                  | $t=0.064$ | $t=0.040$ | $t=0.032$ |
| $2 \times 10^3$                   | 3.1                                                        | 5.5       | 6.0       | 7.6       |
| $5 \times 10^3$                   | 3.1                                                        | 5.4       | 6.2       | 7.6       |
| $1 \times 10^4$                   | 3.0                                                        | 5.3       | 6.3       | 7.7       |
| $5 \times 10^4$                   | 2.9                                                        | 5.4       | 6.4       | 7.7       |
| $1 \times 10^5$                   | 2.8                                                        | 5.3       | 6.5       | 7.7       |
| $1 \times 10^6$                   | 2.7                                                        | 5.5       | 6.0       | 7.2       |
| Average                           | 2.9                                                        | 5.4       | 6.2       | 7.6       |

NATIONAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS



NATIONAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Figure 1.- Test specimen.






Figure 2.- Fatigue testing machine.




(a) Specimens of 0.091-inch 24S-T aluminum-alloy sheet with round-head A17S-T rivets.

Figure 3.- S-N curves.




(b) Specimens of 0.064-inch 24S-T aluminum-alloy sheet with round-head Al7S-T rivets.



(b) Concluded.


NATIONAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Figure 3.- Continued.



(c) Specimens of 0.040-inch 24S-T aluminum-alloy sheet with round-head A17S-T rivets.

Figure 3.-Continued.



(d) Specimens of 0.032-inch 24S-T aluminum-alloy sheet with round-head A17S-T rivets.

Figure 3.-Concluded.




Figure 4.- Variation of ratio of fatigue strength to ultimate tensile strength of joint with ratio of rivet pitch to rivet diameter.




Figure 5.- Variation of optimum ratio of rivet pitch to rivet diameter with sheet thickness.

**TITLE:** Effect of Ratio of Rivet Pitch to Rivet Diameter on the Fatigue Strength of Riveted Joints of 24S-T Aluminum-alloy Sheet

**AUTHOR(S):** Crate, Harold; Ochiltree, D. W.; Graves, W. T.

**ORIGINATING AGENCY:** National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

**PUBLISHED BY:** Same

**ATI- 7546**

**REVISION**

**none**

**ORIG. AGENCY NO.**

**TN-1125**

**PUBLISHING AGENCY NO.**

| DATE     | DOC. CLASS. | COUNTRY | LANGUAGE | PAGES | ILLUSTRATIONS                |
|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------|------------------------------|
| Sept '48 | Unclass.    | U.S.    | Eng.     | 16    | photo, tables, diagr. graphs |

**ABSTRACT:**

Tests were conducted on riveted joints to determine the effect of rivet size and rivet pitch on the fatigue life of joints subjected to combined tensile and bending loads. For each sheet thickness tested, there appeared to be a value of the ratio of the rivet pitch to the rivet diameter that would ensure a maximum of the ratio of fatigue strength to ultimate strength for the joint. These optimum ratios of rivet pitch to rivet diameter were, for all practical purposes, independent of the number of cycles to failure.

**DISTRIBUTION:** Request copies of this report only from Originating Agency

**DIVISION:** Stress Analysis and Structures (7)

**SECTION:** Structural Testing (4)

**SUBJECT HEADINGS:** Joints, Riveted - Stresses (54103.6)

**ATI SHEET NO.:** R-7-4-4

Air Documents Division, Intelligence Department  
Air Materiel Command

**AIR TECHNICAL INDEX**

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base  
Dayton, Ohio