STP-NU-041

UPDATE AND IMPROVE SUBSECTION NH – ALTERNATIVE SIMPLIFIED CREEP-FATIGUE DESIGN METHODS

Prepared by:

Tai Asayama

Japan Atomic Energy Agency

ASME STANDARDS TECHNOLOGY, LLC

Date of Issuance: March 31, 2011

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the ASME Standards Technology, LLC (ASME ST-LLC).

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Neither ASME, ASME ST-LLC, the author nor others involved in the preparation or review of this report, nor any of their respective employees, members or persons acting on their behalf, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe upon privately owned rights.

Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation or favoring by ASME ST-LLC or others involved in the preparation or review of this report, or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of the authors, contributors and reviewers of the report expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of ASME ST-LLC or others involved in the preparation or review of this report, or any agency thereof.

ASME ST-LLC does not take any position with respect to the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any items mentioned in this document, and does not undertake to insure anyone utilizing a publication against liability for infringement of any applicable Letters Patent, nor assumes any such liability. Users of a publication are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, is entirely their own responsibility.

Participation by federal agency representative(s) or person(s) affiliated with industry is not to be interpreted as government or industry endorsement of this publication.

ASME is the registered trademark of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

No part of this document may be reproduced in any form,
in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise,
without the prior written permission of the publisher.

ASME Standards Technology, LLC
Three Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016-5990

ISBN No. 978-0-7918-3364-3

Copyright © 2011 by
ASME Standards Technology, LLC
All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword x

Executive Summary xi

1 INTRODUCTION 1

2 PREREQUISITES FOR EVALUATION 2

2.1 Evaluated Data 2

2.2 Representation of Material Properties 2

2.3 Prediction Using Time Fraction Rule 2

3 OUTLINE AND PREDICTABILITY OF NEWLY PROPOSED CREEP-FATIGUE EVALUATION METHODS 7

3.1 Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method 7

3.2 Strain Range Separation Method 25

3.3 Approach for Pressure Vessel Applications 42

3.4 Hybrid Method of Time Fraction and Ductility Exhaustion 58

3.5 Simplified Model Test Approach 72

4 POTENTIAL TO DEPLOYING THE METHODS INVESTIGATED TO ASME-NH 79

4.1 Evaluation of Creep-Fatigue Life Predictability of the Methods Investigated in Short-Term and Long-Term Regions 79

4.2 Evaluation of Basic Potential of the Methods Investigated 98

4.3 Evaluation of Extendibility of the Methods Investigated 102

4.4 Evaluation of Applicability of the Methods Investigated to ASME-NH 103

4.5 Recommendations 104

5 CONCLUSIONS 106

References 107

Appendix 1 - Creep fatigue experiment data of Mod.9Cr-1Mo 109

Acknowledgments 111

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Additive Stress in the Rupture Curve 28

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - Creep Rupture Data at 450-600C 2

Figure 2 - Fatigue Data and Design Fatigue Curves at 550C 3

Figure 3 - Static and Cyclic Stress-Strain Curves at 550C 3

Figure 4 - Creep-Fatigue Data at 500C 4

Figure 5 - Creep-Fatigue Data at 550C 4

Figure 6 - Creep-Fatigue Data at 600C 5

Figure 7 - Creep-Fatigue Data at 550C (Stress Controlled Tests) 5

Figure 8 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life with Time Fraction Rule 6
Figure 9 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life with Time Fraction Rule 6
Figure 10 - Relation between Creep Rupture Time and Fracture Elongation 10
Figure 11 - Relation between Inelastic Strain Rate and Creep Rupture Elongation at 500C 10
Figure 12 - Relation between Inelastic Strain Rate and Creep Rupture Elongation at 550C 11
Figure 13 - Relation between Inelastic Strain Rate and Creep Rupture Elongation at 600C 11
Figure 14 - Relation between Temperature and Tensile Fracture Elongation 12
Figure 15 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Ductility Exhaustion Method 12
Figure 16 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by Ductility Exhaustion Method 13
Figure 17 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method 13
Figure 18 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method 14
Figure 19 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method 14
Figure 20 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method 15
Figure 21 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method 15
Figure 22 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method 16
Figure 23 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life with Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method for Stress Controlled Tests 16
Figure 24 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method for Stress Controlled Tests 17
Figure 25 - Ratio of Predicted Life to Observed Life against Hold Time 17
Figure 26 - Life Reduction Coefficient as a Function of Pure Fatigue Life when p is 0.1 18
Figure 27 - Life Reduction Coefficient as a Function of Pure Fatigue Life when p is 0.5 18
Figure 28 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method for Compressive Hold Tests 19
Figure 29 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method for Compressive Hold Tests 19
Figure 30 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method 20
Figure 31 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Modified Ductility Exhaustion Method 20
Figure 32 - Observed and Predicted Tensile Fracture Elongation δ_0 at 550℃ 21
Figure 33 - Comparison of Estimation of Creep Damage between MDEM and DEM 21
Figure 34 - Comparison of Estimation of Creep Damage between MDEM and DEM 22
Figure 35 - Comparison of Creep-Fatigue Life between MDEM and TFR at 500C 22
Figure 36 - Comparison of Creep-Fatigue Life between MDEM and TFR at 550C 23
Figure 37 - Comparison of Creep-Fatigue Life between MDEM and TFR at 600C 23
Figure 38 - Ratio of Creep-Fatigue Life Predicted by MDEM to that Predicted by TFR at 500C 24
Figure 39 - Ratio of Creep-Fatigue Life Predicted by MDEM to that Predicted by TFR at 550C 24

Figure 40 - Ratio of Creep-Fatigue Life Predicted by MDEM to that Predicted by TFR at 600C 25

Figure 41 - Formulation of Manson-Coffin Type Relation $N_p = A_p\left(\Delta\varepsilon_p\right)^{\alpha_p}$ at 550C..... 29

Figure 42 - Formulation of Manson-Coffin Type Relation $N_p = A_p\left(\Delta\varepsilon_p\right)^{\alpha_p}$ at 600C..... 29

Figure 43 - Formulation of Manson-Coffin Type Relation $N_c = A_c\left(\Delta\varepsilon_c\right)^{\alpha_c}$ at 550C..... 30

Figure 44 - Formulation of Manson-Coffin Type Relation $N_c = A_c\left(\Delta\varepsilon_c\right)^{\alpha_c}$ at 600C..... 30

Figure 45 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by SRS Method 31

Figure 46 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by SRS Method..... 31

Figure 47 - Comparison of Pure Cyclic Creep Life Determined by Curve Fitting and that Determined by Numerical Integration of Creep Damage at 550C 32

Figure 48 - Comparison of Pure Cyclic Creep Life Determined by Curve Fitting and that Determined by Numerical Integration of Creep Damage at 600C 32

Figure 49 - Difference of Yield Stress between Static and Cyclic Stress-Strain Relations at 550C 33

Figure 50 - Difference of Yield Stress between Static and Cyclic Stress-Strain Relations at 600C 33

Figure 51 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by SRS Method (Case-1)..... 34

Figure 52 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by SRS Method (Case-2)..... 34

Figure 53 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by SRS Method for Stress Controlled Tests (Case-1 and 2) 35

Figure 54 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by SRS Method (Case-1) 35

Figure 55 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by SRS Method Shown in Normal Scale (Case-1) 36

Figure 56 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by SRS Method (Case-2) 36

Figure 57 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by SRS Method Shown in Normal Scale (Case-2) 37

Figure 58 - Comparison of Creep-Fatigue Life between SRS (Case-1) and TFR at 550C 37

Figure 59 - Comparison of Creep-Fatigue Life between SRS (Case-2) and TFR at 550C 38

Figure 60 - Comparison of Creep-Fatigue Life between SRS (Case-1 and Case-2) and TFR at 600C 38

Figure 61 - Ratio of Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by SRS Method to that Predicted by TFR at 550C 39

Figure 62 - Ratio of Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by SRS Method to that Predicted by TFR at 600C 39

Figure 63 - Effect of Additive Stress on Stress Relaxation Behavior (Example-1) 40

Figure 64 - Effect of Additive Stress on Stress Relaxation Behavior (Example-2) 40

Figure 65 - Effect of Additive Stress on Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life 41

Figure 66 - Comparison of N_p, N_c, and N_f (Case-2, 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5%) 41

Figure 67 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life with T_r=$N_{f_obs.}$x t_H (Case-1) 47

Figure 68 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated with T_r=$N_{f_obs.}$x t_H (Case-1) 47

Figure 69 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life with T_r=2x10^4 hours (Case-2) 48
Figure 70 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated with T_r=2x10^4 hours (Case-2) 48
Figure 71 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life with T_r=fatigue life x t_H (Case-3) 49
Figure 72 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated with T_r=fatigue life x t_H (Case-3) 49
Figure 73 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life with T_r=1x10^6 hours (Case-4) 50
Figure 74 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated with T_r=1x10^6 hours (Case-4) 50
Figure 75 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life with T_r=1x10^6 hours and $\beta = 2$ 51
Figure 76 - Creep-Fatigue Damage with T_r=1x10^6 hours and $\beta = 2$ 51
Figure 77 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life under Stress Controlled Conditions (Case-2) 52
Figure 78 - Creep-Fatigue Damage under Stress Controlled Conditions (Case-2) 52
Figure 79 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life under Stress Controlled Conditions (Case-3) 53
Figure 80 - Creep-Fatigue Damage under Stress Controlled Conditions (Case-3) 53
Figure 81 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life under Stress Controlled Conditions (Case-4) 54
Figure 82 - Creep-Fatigue Damage under Stress Controlled Conditions (Case-4) 54
Figure 83 - Relationship between Hold Time and Number of Cycles to Failure (β = 2) 55
Figure 84 - Relationship between Hold Time and Number of Cycles to Failure (β = 4) 55
Figure 85 - Relationship between Hold Time and Number of Cycles to Failure (T_r=1x10^6 hours) 56
Figure 86 - Relationship between Hold Time and Number of Cycles to Failure (β = 2) 56
Figure 87 - Cyclic Stress-Strain Relations and Effects of Hold Time on Them 57
Figure 88 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Interaction (T_r=1x10^5 hours) 57
Figure 89 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Interaction (T_r=1x10^6 hours) 58
Figure 90 - Creep Rupture Ductility at Various Temperatures 60
Figure 91 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method, k=0 60
Figure 92 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method, k=0.25 61
Figure 93 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method, k=0.5 61
Figure 94 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method, k=0.75 62
Figure 95 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method, k=1 62
Figure 96 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by Hybrid Method, All Conditions 63
Figure 97 - Relation between k and Standard Deviation of Life Prediction 63
Figure 98 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method, k=0.33 64
Figure 99 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by Hybrid Method, All Conditions 64
Figure 100 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method, k=0 65

Figure 101 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method, k=0.5 65
Figure 102 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method, k=1 66
Figure 103 - Relation between k and Standard Deviation of Life Prediction 66
Figure 104 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated by Hybrid Method 67
Figure 105 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method under Stress Control, k=0 67
Figure 106 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method under Stress Control, k=0.5 68
Figure 107 - Observed and Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method under Stress Control, k=1 68
Figure 108 - Creep-Fatigue Damage Calculated By Hybrid Method under Stress Controlled Conditions 69
Figure 109 - Comparison of Creep-Fatigue Life at Various Strain Ranges at 500C 69
Figure 110 - Comparison of Creep-Fatigue Life at Various Strain Ranges at 550C 70
Figure 111 - Comparison of Creep-Fatigue Life at Various Strain Ranges at 600C 70
Figure 112 - Ratio of Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method to that Predicted by TFR at 500C 71
Figure 113 - Ratio of Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method to that Predicted by TFR at 550C 71
Figure 114 - Ratio of Predicted Creep-Fatigue Life by Hybrid Method to that Predicted by TFR at 600C 72
Figure 115 - SMT Methodology 76
Figure 116 - 4 Bar Model 77
Figure 117 - Stepped Bar Test Specimen 77
Figure 118 - Notched Bar Specimen 77
Figure 119 - Stepped Bar Test Results 78
Figure 120 - Notched Bar Test Results 78
Figure 121 - Proposed SMT Specimen, q ≈ 3.7 78
Figure 122 - Parameter for Creep Rupture Time 80
Figure 123 - Parameter for Creep Rupture Elongation 80
Figure 124 - Parameter for Creep Rupture Ductility 81
Figure 125 - Parameter for Tensile Elongation 81
Figure 126 - Parameter for Cyclic Stress-Strain Curve 82
Figure 127 - Parameter for Stress Relaxation Behavior 82
Figure 128 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Time to Rupture) 83

Figure 129 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Time to Rupture) 83

Figure 130 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Time to Rupture) 84

Figure 131 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Time to Rupture) 84

Figure 132 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Creep Rupture Elongation)....85

Figure 133 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Creep Rupture Elongation)....85

Figure 134 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Creep Rupture Elongation)....86

Figure 135 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Creep Rupture Elongation)....86

Figure 136 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Tensile Rupture Elongation)....87

Figure 137 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Tensile Rupture Elongation)....87

Figure 138 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Tensile Rupture Elongation)....88

Figure 139 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Tensile Rupture Elongation)....88

Figure 140 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Initial Stress of Relaxation)....89

Figure 141 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Initial Stress of Relaxation)....89

Figure 142 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Initial Stress of Relaxation)....90

Figure 143 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Initial Stress of Relaxation)....90

Figure 144 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Steady State Creep Rate)....91

Figure 145 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Steady State Creep Rate)....91

Figure 146 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Steady State Creep Rate) 92

Figure 147 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Steady State Creep Rate) 92

Figure 148 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Creep Strain Equation)..... 93

Figure 149 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Creep Strain Equation)..... 93

Figure 150 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Creep Strain Equation)..... 94

Figure 151 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Creep Strain Equation)..... 94

Figure 152 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Elastic Follow-Up Parameter)..... 95

Figure 153 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep-Fatigue Life at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Elastic Follow-Up Parameter)..... 95

Figure 154 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.3% (Parameter: Elastic Follow-Up Parameter)..... 96

Figure 155 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage at 550C, $\Delta\varepsilon_t$ =0.5% (Parameter: Elastic Follow-Up Parameter)..... 96

Figure 156 - Creep-Fatigue Life Prediction of Experimental Results by Various Methods 97

Figure 157 - Extrapolation of Creep-Fatigue Life Prediction to Longer Terms..... 97

Figure 158 - Comparison of Regression Line between Inelastic Strain Rate and Rupture Elongation at Each Temperature 100

Figure 159 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage by DDS at 550C, 0.3% 101

Figure 160 - Relationship between Hold Time and Creep Damage by RCC-MR at 550C, 0.3%..... 101

FOREWORD

This document is the result of work resulting from Cooperative Agreement DE-FC07-05ID14712 between the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and ASME Standards Technology, LLC (ASME ST-LLC) for the Generation IV (Gen IV) Reactor Materials Project. The objective of the project is to provide technical information necessary to update and expand appropriate ASME materials, construction and design codes for application in future Gen IV nuclear reactor systems that operate at elevated temperatures. The scope of work is divided into specific areas that are tied to the Generation IV Reactors Integrated Materials Technology Program Plan. This report is the result of work performed under Task 10 titled "Update and Improve Subsection NH – Alternative Simplified Creep-Fatigue Design Methods."

ASME ST-LLC has introduced the results of the project into the ASME volunteer standards committees developing new code rules for Generation IV nuclear reactors. The project deliverables are expected to become vital references for the committees and serve as important technical bases for new rules. These new rules will be developed under ASME's voluntary consensus process, which requires balance of interest, openness, consensus and due process. Through the course of the project, ASME ST-LLC has involved key stakeholders from industry and government to help ensure that the technical direction of the research supports the anticipated codes and standards needs. This directed approach and early stakeholder involvement is expected to result in consensus building that will ultimately expedite the standards development process as well as commercialization of the technology.

ASME has been involved in nuclear codes and standards since 1956. The Society created Section III of the Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, which addresses nuclear reactor technology, in 1963. ASME Standards promote safety, reliability and component interchangeability in mechanical systems.

Established in 1880, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) is a professional not-for-profit organization with more than 127,000 members promoting the art, science and practice of mechanical and multidisciplinary engineering and allied sciences. ASME develops codes and standards that enhance public safety, and provides lifelong learning and technical exchange opportunities benefiting the engineering and technology community. Visit www.asme.org for more information.

The ASME Standards Technology, LLC (ASME ST-LLC) is a not-for-profit Limited Liability Company, with ASME as the sole member, formed in 2004 to carry out work related to newly commercialized technology. The ASME ST-LLC mission includes meeting the needs of industry and government by providing new standards-related products and services, which advance the application of emerging and newly commercialized science and technology and providing the research and technology development needed to establish and maintain the technical relevance of codes and standards. Visit www.stllc.asme.org for more information.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Five newly proposed promising creep-fatigue evaluation methods were investigated. Those are 1) modified ductility exhaustion method, 2) strain range separation method, 3) approach for pressure vessel application, 4) hybrid method of time fraction and ductility exhaustion, and 5) simplified model test approach.

The outlines of those methods are presented first, and predictability of experimental results of these methods is demonstrated using the creep-fatigue data collected in STP-NU-013 [2] and STP-NU-018 [3]. All the methods (except the simplified model test approach which is not ready for application) predicted experimental results fairly accurately. On the other hand, predicted creep-fatigue life in long-term regions showed considerable differences among the methodologies. These differences come from the concepts each method is based on.

All the new methods investigated in this report have advantages over the currently employed time fraction rule and offer technical insights that should be thought much of in the improvement of creep-fatigue evaluation procedures.

The main points of the modified ductility exhaustion method, the strain range separation method, the approach for pressure vessel application and the hybrid method can be reflected in the improvement of the current time fraction rule. The simplified model test approach would offer a whole new advantage including robustness and simplicity which are definitely attractive but this approach is yet to be validated for implementation at this point.

Therefore, this report recommends the following two steps as a course of improvement of NH based on newly proposed creep-fatigue evaluation methodologies. The first step is to modify the current approach by incorporating the partial advantages the new methods offer, and the second step is to replace the current method by the simplified model test approach when it has become technically mature enough.

The recommendations are basically in line with the work scope of the Task Force on Creep-Fatigue of the Subgroup on Elevated Temperature Design of the Standards Committee of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Committee Section III.