

New Design Formulae for Safety and Precision in the Fatigue Engineering of Mechanical Components and Structures

Nori V.S.N. Murthy*

Abstract

This paper introduces two new formulae, termed the Nori Fatigue Formulae, for determining the maximum allowable fatigue stress in mechanical components and structures with significant stress concentrations. These formulae will eliminate the usage of code-sensitive safety factors along with other factored values from the entire mechanical design engineering work, ranging from a safety pin to spacecraft. The first formula gives the maximum allowable fatigue stress in tension, and the second formula gives the maximum allowable fatigue stress in shear. These formulae are established by methodically using all the vital mechanical properties of steel – ultimate tensile strength (T), yield strength (Y), reduction of area (R), and elongation (E) – as obtained from the engineering stress–strain curve generated by the globally standardized tensile testing. This framework enables effective utilization of the vast amount of tensile- test databases already available worldwide, particularly reduction of area and elongation, for computing the maximum permissible fatigue stress of a given material in the given condition and application. Consequently, the proposed approach eliminates the need for generating additional experimental data, which often entails substantial investments of time and financial resources. Such a unified approach, previously unavailable, is essential in view of the divergent design philosophies and design factors adopted across international design codes, standards, and handbooks over time. To make this paper more comprehensive, several new formulae are provided in the Appendix-A for use in various design situations routinely encountered. Also provided additional applications for the formulae offered in the first two papers. Thus, this paper fully encompasses the previous two papers of this new-design-formulae series.

Keywords: Allowable stress, design factor, design stress, failure stress, fail-safe precise design, factor of safety, maximum allowable fatigue stress, maximum permissible stress, maximum safe stress, maximum working stress, safety margin

INTRODUCTION

Like humans and other forms of life - all the mechanical components, machines, and structures must die one day or the other. However, this stance will not exempt mechanical designers from their prime responsibility of ensuring the required level of safety, performance, durability, and cost-effectiveness, even though design engineering activity suffers several deficiencies, uncertainties, a great variety of component geometries, metals, manufacturing processes, heat treatments, load cycles, loading types, and service conditions [1-8]. Despite the best efforts by the engineering and research communities through new theories, approaches, and design philosophies, fatigue-caused failures and failure-caused tears have not disappeared. In addition to this despair, damage to society and investments has been increasing rapidly owing to the ever-increasing number of humans,

*Author for Correspondence

Nori VSN Murthy
E-mail: independentresearcher6@gmail.com

Consultant , R&D departments of BHPV (BHEL), India

Received Date: December 13, 2025

Accepted Date: January 05, 2026

Published Date: January 09, 2026

Citation: Nori VSN Murthy. New Design Formulae for Safety and Precision in the Fatigue Engineering of Mechanical Components and Structures. Trends in Mechanical Engineering & Technology. 2026; 16(1): 6–24p.

Galley Proof for Author's Review and Approval Only.

Except Journals Official Website.

Not for Distribution, Uploading, or Publication on Any Other Website (or Online Platform)

automobiles, aircrafts, machinery, structures, boilers, piping, and other equipment. In view of this agonizing situation, a new fatigue design approach is formulated to provide a scientifically convincing solution to this devastating problem that has been erasing the smiles of people innocently depending on the fatigue-failure-prone aircrafts, vehicles, machines, structures, and other tools that are surprisingly failing even within the stipulated guarantee period. To support society and industry, in this paper, new fatigue formulae called Nori Fatigue Formulae (NFF) for safe and precise design engineering work are presented, which also carry several other direct and indirect benefits [9-15]. NFF, created from the Nori Design Philosophy and Nori Material Philosophy, carries all the required potential for putting an enduring end to the fatigue failures identified by the world as early as 1829. Work in this direction has become necessary because human life losses and economic losses are escalating day by day and severely bothering the technological world since the birth of mechanical elements and machines. NFF can also be called Nori tire formulae because T, Y, R, and E are applied to derive these formulae [16-22].

Demandingly, these universally applicable formulae (NFF) ensure the most sought-after relationship between fatigue properties and the fundamental mechanical properties of steels and thus inspire the ready adoption by worldwide engineering communities, standards organizations, and international code authorities for mechanical design, materials, testing, inspection, validation, certification, reliability assurance, and public safety [23-27]. Primarily, NFF are developed (1) to eliminate the factor of safety (safety margins or design margins) from the design process, (2) to eliminate design problems and risks associated with the present practice of arriving at the maximum allowable fatigue stress through application of factor on a single property, such as ultimate tensile strength or yield strength, and (3) to eliminate the costs, time, complexities, problems related to the simulation of service loads and conditions, and other ambiguities of making S-N curves, S-N-P curves, P-P plots, or Q-Q plots [28-31].

CONTRIBUTIONS TO STRESS, STRAIN AND FATIGUE ENGINEERING

Fracture phenomena were studied, and it was stated that the strength of columns varies inversely as their lengths, but directly as some ratio of their cross sections. It was later observed that rods under tension had strength proportional to their cross-sectional area. The laws of elasticity were established, followed by the publication of the laws of motion. The theory of beams was developed through contributions that advanced structural understanding. The modulus of elasticity was introduced as a constant defining the stiffness of a material within the elastic limit. Equations for normal stresses in beams under bending were formulated. The concept of the “zero-line” of mechanical stress was determined, correcting earlier findings. A general theory of elasticity was then expressed in mathematical form and applied to construction. The terms “stress” and “strain” were introduced, with stress defined as pressure per unit area and strain as the ratio of change in length to original length. It was recognized that elastic modulus is a material property independent of the second moment of area, leading to the foundation of modern structural analysis. Poisson’s ratio was published. Fatigue failures due to repeated loading were identified, and early failure reports were documented. To prevent such failures and extend service life, twisted steel wire rope was invented and widely used. The first article on fatigue failures was published, along with the development of testing machines for wire ropes. The phenomenon of metal fatigue was further explained in lectures. The effect of stress concentrations was recognized through investigations of structural failures. Funding was later provided for studying the effects of load changes on iron structures to improve safety. The term “fatigue” was formally introduced in reports on mechanical failures. Finally, systematic fatigue testing methods were established.

The concept of endurance limit was introduced through reports on fatigue failure of railway axles. A mean stress equation using tensile strength was presented, followed by another similar approach also involving tensile strength. Microscopic cracks were identified as the origin of fatigue failures. The first version of a well-known book on strength of materials was published, and a definition for true strain (natural strain) was proposed. A log-log relationship for S-N curves was developed using earlier test data, leading to the introduction of a law describing fatigue behavior. The terminology of intensive and extensive properties for materials was introduced, along with another mean stress equation. Important

work on fracture mechanics was published, marking the birth of this field. Improvements in beam theory were presented, and earlier beam equations were corrected. An additional constraint known as the safe design region for fatigue limit and yield strength was introduced for ductile materials. A rule for cumulative damage was proposed and later promoted as a linear damage hypothesis for design purposes. Experiments on fretting fatigue were conducted for the first time. A mean stress approach based on yield strength was proposed. An English version of a major strength of materials text was published. A work-hardening theory was introduced. Finite fatigue life was discussed as a design goal. An end-quench test for evaluating hardenability was introduced. Fretting was identified as a mechanical process involving micro-slip. It was established that fretting reduces the fatigue strength of metals.

A method for hardenability calculation was proposed. An organization dedicated to the advancement of stress and strain analysis and related technologies was founded. Recommendations were made regarding the number of test specimens required for constructing S-N curves. The occurrence of adhesion in fretting contact was discovered. An equation was developed to explain fatigue crack growth in terms of plastic strain at the crack tip. A publication on stiffness and deflection of complex structures introduced the term “finite-element method” and provided its first comprehensive treatment. The concept of the stress-intensity factor was established, contributing significantly to fracture mechanics. Methods were proposed for predicting the growth rate of fatigue cracks. Experimental analysis introduced the crack opening displacement (COD) theory, followed by the development of the crack tip opening displacement (CTOD) concept. A formula for mean stress calculation was presented. Scientific investigation into fretting fatigue began. The J-integral concept was introduced to study elastic-plastic fracture mechanics. The rain-flow counting algorithm was developed for use with linear damage hypotheses. A general formulation for nonlinear elastic frames applicable to inelastic cases was proposed. Fretting was identified as a three-stage process, and explanations were provided for how plastic deformation at the crack tip can reduce fatigue crack growth rate due to a wedging effect. Structural specifications based on damage tolerance, assuming the existence of crack-like defects in critical areas, were introduced. A uniform material law was proposed based on extensive fatigue data. It was identified that many failures in gas turbine engines of military jet aircraft were due to high-cycle fatigue. A standard on Failure Mode and Effects Analysis was published. A new hardenability test and related methodologies, specifications, and terminology were introduced. Design formulae were developed for calculating maximum allowable design stress without using a factor of safety for non-fatigue conditions. Additional formulae were introduced for calculating maximum allowable fatigue stress without using a factor of safety for components and structures with insignificant stress-raisers.

Thus, the much-needed war waged by research and engineering communities on fatigue-caused catastrophic failures is fully energetic even today since the cost of fatigue failures reached 4% of GDP of a nation, in addition to countless loss of precious lives. Therefore, in consequence of every fatigue-caused accident, it became a routine practice, across the globe, to set up experimental and research programs related to fatigue. Looking from World War-II for technological revolutions, researchers and other investigating teams have generated vast amount of data, and by the turn of 20th century, the list of research publications and reports had crossed 100,000 on fatigue failures that killed thousands of people, and damaged investments running into billions of dollars. Unfortunately, this painful story is uninterruptedly running till date even though commendable efforts and considerable money is constantly going into the process of engineering, design verification, refinement of design philosophies, failure theories and fracture mechanics, manufacturing processes, inspection techniques, testing procedures and validation methods - for deriving safe and reliable design practices. As rightly established by numerous research studies - fatigue strength, by all means, must be kept below the yield strength of the material. But how much below has become the first tormenting question, how accurately we can arrive there became the second question, and how quickly we can arrive there became the third question. Obviously, the fourth and the biggest question that immediately arises will be - how to convince the global authorities on the methodology chosen to arrive at the maximum allowable fatigue stress (strength) of a given material in the given condition for a given application. These billion-dollar

questions have been standing upright in front of us, almost ever since 1829 - the year in which metal fatigue was identified, and subsequently regarded as a major threat to human life and investment.

THE COMPELLING NEED FOR FAILURE PREVENTION

Ever since the identification of fatigue failure and prevention of metal-fatigue, it has become the first and foremost demand of our rapidly growing technological world, as metal-fatigue possesses enormous potential to cause catastrophic failures that, in turn, cause agonizing human loss, investment loss, and other dire consequences in society. Further, these difficult-to-predict failures, in which the crack propagation rate can be as high as 2,500 m/s (i.e., 7.3 times the velocity of sound in air at room temperature), are demoralizing the scientific and engineering communities and decelerating technological and economic progress by severely reducing the morale of engineers and scientists. In view of these social and economic problems, the demand for a simple, effective, and efficient solution has become the most compelling need of the hour. *All said and done - prevention of fatigue failures is the only way, the easiest and surest, to arrest catastrophic failures along with their unbearable consequences - both on society and technological advancement. Since prevention is better than cure, and nothing in life is more valuable than life itself - assured reliability and surety for safety must alone form the two wings of the mechanical design engineering process.* Unfortunately, despite substantial efforts and huge investments of time and money, our technological world is still at a crossroads and eagerly waiting for a simple, logical, and scientifically convincing solution to this distressing problem, even though there is enough to be done in the areas of understanding fatigue mechanisms and material behavior under fluctuating stresses and changing environments that cannot be simulated in a laboratory to develop the data that is crucial for producing fatigue-failure-free designs.

GENERAL PROBLEMS OF THE DESIGNER.

Although humans inevitably make mistakes, they also strive for perfection. The mechanical design process invariably demands zero errors to eliminate fatigue-caused accidents. This in turn demands complete and error-free inputs, defect-free materials, zero stress-raisers, zero residual stresses, defect-free welding, defect-free heat treatment, flawless manufacturing (machining, forging, casting, rolling, etc.), zero overload, zero abuse, zero misuse, skillful operation, timely maintenance, complete and accurate data on service conditions, and so on. This list of designer needs and genuine aspirations virtually goes on endlessly. Unfortunately, none of these crucial factors are in the hands of the designer, yet the designer is under pressure to ensure all the required levels of safety, economy, performance, durability, reliability, timely and positive damage detectability, compactness, convenience, aesthetics, and profitability. In addition to this, failure mechanisms, which are sensitive to numerous parameters, have yet to be understood to the required extent by the scientific and research communities. All of this responsibility of the designer is in addition to various other important concerns, such as recyclability, environmental laws, compatibility, financial viability, and market demands. With these and several other designer problems in mind, we are certainly compelled to look at the other important sides, such as the material and manufacturing sides, to meet the safety and reliability requirements that the public has been demanding.

PROBLEMS FROM MATERIALS

Initially, it was merely assumed that the material was homogeneous and isotropic. Second, materials are seldom clean and defect-free. Third, the working stresses are rarely as predicted by the designer. Fourth, the strength (tensile strength, compressive strength, yield strength, shear strength, torsional strength, bending strength, etc.) measured in the laboratory is not a single property because the specimen is not subjected only to the visible forces, although we customarily call them tensile, compressive, shear, or bending forces, etc. From a fatigue perspective, the elastic region of the stress-strain curve governs performance, whereas the plastic region of the curve contributes to damage tolerance and protection against failure. Surprisingly, most high-strength steels, regarded as ductile in the uniaxial tensile test, fail in other tests without appreciable macroplastic deformation; this is often attributed to the difference in the micromechanism of separation of brittle and ductile fractures. Therefore, it is safe to design mechanical elements, machines, and structures with materials that offer adequate (Y/T ratio of 0.8165

maximum, rounded off to 0.8, as observed by the author) elastic deformation because ductility, a valuable measure of plastic deformation (yielding), must be maintained at a level that ensures safety against fatigue and other difficult-to-detect fracturing modes that result in catastrophic failures.

HURDLES IN FATIGUE DESIGN

Even though all the possible design care, technologically advancing materials (with better control on crack propagation), modern testing methods, and best overall efforts are continuously reaching new heights - failures do occur due to:

1. Design deficiency arising from unpredictable loads and loading conditions that cause undue stress, strain, deformation, local tensile stress, and local plastic strain.
2. Design inputs that are erroneously assessed and extracted from various design codes, standards, handbooks, textbooks, and research publications.
3. Test data and failure theories, such as maximum normal stress theory (Rankine theory), maximum shearing stress theory (Tresca–Guest theory), maximum normal strain theory (St. Venant’s theory), total strain theory (Beltrami theory), distortion energy theory (Huber–Von-Mises Hencky–s theory), Mohr’s failure theory, Griffith theory, Marco–Starkey cumulative damage theory, Henry cumulative damage theory, Gatts cumulative damage theory, Marin cumulative damage theory, Larson–Miller theory, Manson–Hafered theory, Corten–Dolan cumulative damage theory, Goodman’s linear relationship, Gerber’s parabolic relationship, Soderberg’s linear relationship, the elliptical relationship, and Manson’s double linear damage rule, that are sensitive to numerous assumptions and often subjected to limitations.
4. Strain amplitude versus fatigue life relations,
5. geometric intricacies, unavoidable stress raisers, varying material properties and defects, including defect type, size, location, orientation, and material cleanliness.
6. Non-uniformity in grain size, chemical composition, microstructure, macrostructure, welding heat input, and heat-affected zone (HAZ) properties
7. Effect of residual and other unspecified elements and compounds in steel,
8. Effect of furnace charge elements,
9. Effect of steel-slag reactions,
10. Effect of billet size and reduction ratios,
11. Effects of nonzero mean stress and nonzero mean strain,
12. Effect of loading rates on material properties,
13. Relationship between directional fatigue properties and direction of loading, as well as the influence of multiaxial stress states
14. Influence of residual-stress-effect and temperature-effect on design stress,
15. Extreme levels of strength, hardness and hardness-differentials,
16. Manufacturing imperfections, such as those resulting from heat treatment and finishing operations, arising from uncontrollable and inconsistent activities.
17. Work-hardening and its varying behaviors,
18. Unpredictable effect of combined stress,
19. Varying residual stresses (mechanical, metallurgical, and thermal) resulting from numerous manufacturing processes
20. Unstable ratio of residual stresses to applied stresses,
21. Unavoidable variations i.e. inconsistency in dimensions and fits due to permissible tolerances,
22. Undetected, unrecorded and ignored deviations from specified design / drawing limits,
23. Unnoticed assembly defects,
24. Testing deficiencies (problems in simulating real service-load/cycles and environment)
25. Inspection errors and instrument errors,
26. Operation and maintenance defects,
27. fluctuating time-temperature-stress controlled material conditions,
28. Records of quality rating/defect-level-rating that are not person-insensitive etc.

STRESS-RAISERS AND THEIR INEVITABILITY

In effect - every defect in the material is a stress-raiser, and defect-less material, in the real world, is a myth. Similarly design without a stress-raiser is a myth since section changes, bolt holes, rivet holes, threaded holes, slots, grooves, keyways, splines, welding, machining, heat treatment, etc., are unavoidable. Also, manufacturing without causing a stress-raiser is a myth. Thus, stress-raisers can surely be regarded as inevitable. Regrettably, no single person or cause can be pinpointed for lapses and failures that surface during investigations; hence, corrective actions. In a nutshell - design, manufacturing, testing, inspection, validation, and reliability assurance are the processes filled with endless uncertainties and limitations of widely varying degrees. Thus, the question of safety and reliability becomes as complex as complex can be since the design engineering process is directly linked with human life loss and investment loss. For this reason, the process of design demands - a new, simple, and effective approach for efficient and early elimination of fatigue failures that occupy nearly 95% of all mechanical service failures. Here, it is heartbreaking to note that the USA, in 1982, placed the cost of fatigue failures at \$119 billion per year, i.e., 4% of its then national income, and today it stands at \$907 billion per year. Owing to these and several other difficulties with safety margins that are also frequently subjected to changes, the author has developed Nori Fatigue Formulae for ensuring the required level of safety against fatigue failures and also to eliminate the factor of safety (FOS), which too is resulting in disagreements, under-designs, and over-designs that are attracting a host of other serious problems from multiple angles. Ever since the introduction of structural, boiler, pressure vessel, nuclear, piping, automobile, and other mechanical design codes and standards by the reputed international standards organizations (ASME, SAE, ASCE, API, BSI, ASTM, DIN, GOST, CEN, ISO, EN, JIS, BIS, GB, etc.) for systematic engineering and safety, the methodology chosen by the design codes (application of a factor of safety or safety margin either on UTS or on Yield or on both) for arriving at the maximum allowable stress has become the topic for disagreements and debates, and therefore bothering the worldwide design engineering community. This situation has finally led to repeated revision of codes and standards, since the factor of safety applied in the design process has a direct impact on safety, weight, size, cost, service life, and economy. Looking at the difficulties associated with the factored values of maximum allowable stress; the safety margins are different at different times for a given design code and also different for different design codes at any given time. The latter problem caused more concern than the former, which is fairly accepted since it is viewed as necessary by expert committees and also justified by the improvements taking place from time to time in design analysis, steel manufacturing technology, and inspection methodology. But the second problem, which deserves to be viewed as really serious, is unable to be absorbed by the design community in general and by the sensible group in particular because the concern is the lack of uniformity among the international design codes and standards. Thus, revision of the factor of safety, change of design philosophy, and lack of uniformity among international design codes and standards became the causes of worry since these problems have direct and indirect effects on international trade, manufacturing practices, and economic progress, even though safety for human life and investment are of prime importance.

THE KEY PROBLEM IN THE FIELDS OF MECHANICAL, STRUCTURAL AND FATIGUE ENGINEERING

The question of where to operate a given material under given conditions for a given application has become the most bothersome question since the birth of the systematic mechanical design engineering process. Against the backdrop of this mammoth problem, researchers and failure investigators have observed that nearly 55% to 60% of aircraft components and structures have failed under fatigue, in addition to 14% under overload. Considering boilers for a similar scenario, 80% of fire-tube boilers and 28% of water-tube boilers have been reported to fail due to fatigue. Henceforth, Nori Fatigue Formulae will serve as an effective and efficient solution for the global design engineering community. In addition, NFF ensures peace of mind to all those traveling for long hours in ground and off-the-ground equipment.

A REVIEW REQUEST FOR ADDRESSING A LONG-STANDING SAFETY PROBLEM

In view of the proposed safety cap on the Y/T ratio, the author requests international safety and design code authorities to review high-strength ISO bolt classes, such as 10.9, 12.9, and non-ISO grades like

14.9, 16.9, as well as high-strength and ultra-high-strength steels such as BS: EN: 10025-6 grades S620, S690, S890, S960, and non-ISO grades like S1100, S1300, etc., because the Y/T ratio of these HSLA steels, ultra-high-strength steels, and several other routinely used steels is rapidly approaching unity and posing considerable problems to fabrication activity, in addition to presenting a significant threat to public safety. In addition, the sensitivity to stress concentrations varies directly with the strength of the material. Furthermore, fracture toughness, which decreases with increasing tensile strength, also justifies the proposed safety cap (both Y/T and E/R at a maximum of 0.8) along with several other reasons. In recent years, the use of high-strength materials has been increasing steeply; therefore, a separate committee is warranted to review high-strength materials.

NORI FATIGUE FORMULAE (NFF)

The proposed NFF-1&2 can successfully eliminate terms such as factor of safety or safety margin from the entire design engineering activity because the worldwide design community is not fully convinced with the factored values of maximum allowable stress or maximum permissible stress. For this, NFF is interlinked and applied to all four basic and derived material properties (tensile strength, yield strength, elongation, reduction of area, yield-to-tensile ratio, elastic constants, etc.) to calculate the maximum allowable fatigue stress of any given steel under any given condition, because all four fundamental properties have unique significance and reveal the overall history of the material. Most importantly, the primary properties (T-Y-R-E) are obtained from the standardized stress-strain curve and are also used to calculate the material's elastic constants, which are used in a host of mechanical design engineering works. For the purpose of distinguishing the maximum allowable fatigue stress, calculated using the proposed Nori Fatigue Formulae, it is termed as NMAFS (Nori Maximum Allowable Fatigue Stress). NMAFS can be calculated effortlessly and accurately using the following formulae: The units for NMAFS are the same as those for the tensile and yield strengths. Additional uses of these formulae are provided in Appendix A.

$$NMAFS_{in\ tension} = \frac{Y^4.E}{T^3.R} \quad (1)$$

$$NMAFS_{in\ shear} = \frac{Y^5.E}{T^4.R} \quad (2)$$

T is the ultimate tensile strength in MPa, PSI, KSI, etc. Y is the 0.2% offset yield strength in MPa, PSI, KSI, etc. R is the reduction in area, percentage.

E is the elongation in 50.8mm (2-inch), percentage.

Y/T is the yield-to-tensile ratio, which is a dimensionless quantity.

E/R is known as the nori ductility ratio (ratio of the percentage of elongation to the percentage of reduction in area), which is a dimensionless quantity.

For example, the maximum allowable fatigue stress in tension (for the design of components and structures with significant stress raisers) for steel A (tensile strength =876 MPa (127 KSI), yield strength =731 MPa (106 KSI), elongation: 20%, and reduction of area: 60%) is 142 MPa (20.54 KSI). Similarly, for the same material, the maximum allowable fatigue stress in shear (for the design of components and structures with significant stress raisers) is 118 MPa (17.14 KSI). Notably, this value of 118 MPa (17.14 KSI) is exactly equal to the value obtained using the ASME methodology. Thus, excitingly - ASME methodology and Nori methodology are found complementary to each other. However, the NMAFS calculated herein provides stress values that are unequivocally designer- and code-insensitive. Further details of the comparison and differences between the two methodologies are provided in Appendices B, C, and D.

ELEMENTS OF NORI FATIGUE FORMULAE (NFF)

Both directly and indirectly, for the calculation of the maximum allowable fatigue stress of a given material under the condition, the NFF interlinks and involves all the parts of the uniaxial engineering

stress–strain curve, all the regions under the curve, structure-sensitive and structure-insensitive mechanical properties, and elastic and plastic deformations, as all these factors are essential for safety, economy, under-design control, and over-design control, since fatigue strength is not a single property like toughness.

Tensile Strength (T)

The ultimate tensile strength (UTS) or tensile strength (T) is synonymous with the globally established uniaxial tensile test. It is an intensive and structure-sensitive property. It is the highest point (the maximum load a metal can withstand before fracture) of stress on the stress–strain diagram, that is, the point up to which the deformation is uniform. It is the only fundamental mechanical property that the uniform material law (UML) uses for the development of the strain–life curve. It is an appreciated and well-established indicator of hardness (the resistance offered by the molecules of the material against separation by the penetrating action of the external object). It is effortlessly computable, economically measurable, and easily reproducible. It is the most prominent part of the material specification readily obtainable for all materials under all conditions, unlike the yield strength. It is a quick check for material conformance and a valid design parameter for brittle materials, as many materials do not exhibit a clear yield strength. Moreover, Goodman and several other eminent researchers have methodically related the endurance limit (fatigue limit) to the tensile strength. Gerber and Goodman used the tensile strength in their mean stress equations. It is a critical parameter in metal-forming processes because brittleness causes rupture. Globally, many steels and heat treatment conditions are designated by their tensile strength. Importantly, research has correlated tensile strength with the speed of crack propagation. Therefore, this unique and widely used basic mechanical property must be allowed to rule the global material specifications, even though the yield strength has recently gained importance based on logical reasoning.

Yield Strength (Y)

For ductile materials, the yield point is the endpoint for elastic behavior and the beginning point for plastic behavior on the stress–strain curve; that is, below this point, the material returns to its original shape, and beyond this point, the material does not return to its original shape because it undergoes permanent deformation or plastic deformation. For this reason, mechanical, structural, and bolted-joint engineering use this point as the upper limit to avoid catastrophic failures and associated accidents, loss of life, and loss of investment. Thus, the yield point is a well-defined and widely used strength parameter, a structure-sensitive property, the upper practical limit of load that can be applied without significant deformation (i.e., Hooke's law ending point), a useful measure of resistance to plastic deformation, the most critical property for metalworking, and the limiting elastic strength in all practical engineering applications. Unfortunately, the tensile strength and yield strength cannot be related; however, the ratio of yield to tensile (Y/T) or tensile to yield (T/Y) is important for bending, rolling, and forging operations. Steel researchers, heat treaters, mechanical designers, fabricators, metallurgists, materials engineers, and processing communities use this ratio. On the stress–strain diagram, the stress corresponding to a strain of 0.002 is termed as the yield stress, even though other strain values are used. The Hall–Petch equation relates the yield strength to the grain diameter.

Reduction of Area (R)

A structure-sensitive property, a better-rated ductility parameter resulting from the most complicated triaxial stress state of the necking process, the most important measure of deformation required to produce fracture, the first valuable measure of ductility that carries unusual significance, a sensible parameter for the evaluation of quality and structural variations in the material, a valued parameter (reduction of area in the through-thickness direction, that is, Z-direction) used to correlate resistance to lamellar tearing, a parameter that is rapidly gaining special attention owing to its relatively lower value in the through-thickness (short-transverse) direction compared to the longitudinal or transverse directions, and finally, a sure and simple candidate for effective feedback for process improvements. Although the values of elongation and reduction of area serve as valuable measures of ductility and toughness, they represent entirely different types of material behavior, which are important to

mechanical and civil engineering designers, as well as material property designers. Owing to the complexity in the process of necking, reduction of area and elongation cannot be related; similarly, tensile strength and yield strength can not be related. Thus, material research communities are forced to deal separately with these four fundamental mechanical properties (tensile strength, yield strength, elongation, and reduction of area).

Elongation (E)

A globally standardized and easily measurable measure of ductility, a significant parameter offering two different modes (uniform elongation before necking and localized elongation during the process of necking), a structure-sensitive property, the percentage of plastic strain before fracture, a noble indicator of strain-hardening capacity, a second valuable measure of ductility, and a dependable indicator of toughness – the higher the elongation, the higher the toughness and ductility, an important parameter for bending and shaping operations. Keeping all other failure-causing parameters constant, ductility can be applied readily and safely as an effective tool for the prevention of catastrophic failures because ductility is more of a quality than a single property. Supporting this view, research on the crashworthiness of vehicles and aircraft has steadily narrowed down to elongation as a promising risk-reducing parameter. Thus, ductility should be as high as possible. Conversely, it must be recognized that the higher the ductility, the higher the component size and weight, and the lower the overall economy – because the maximum allowable stress will be proportionately small. Therefore, the inclusion of both ductility parameters (elongation and reduction in area) is essential in the material design (mechanical property design) process, as ductile failure is the most sought-after failure mode for mechanical and structural designers. Interestingly, these ductility parameters also serve as effective quality control measures and steel processing conditions. Because ductility is grain-size- and structure-sensitive, it will also serve as a scientific, logical, and profitable tool for fine-tuning mechanical properties during steel manufacturing, finishing, and heat treatment.

Yield-to-Tensile Ratio (Y/T, the ratio of strength parameters)

It is a recognized indicator of the safety margin and is a well-recognized measure of ductility and toughness. In addition, it is a simple method for stating the ability of plastic deformation. An investigation by the author revealed that a material meets all the designer requirements, such as safety, reliability, weight effectiveness, size effectiveness, and cost effectiveness, if the yield-to-tensile ratio (YTR) is maintained at or below 0.80 (precisely 0.8165). Incidentally, SAE/ISO bolt property classes 4.8, 5.8, 6.8, 8.8, and 9.8 support this observation. To ensure safety, some national construction codes specify 1.25 as the minimum requirement for the T/Y ratio (this equals 0.8 Y/T). This code requirement also supports the proposal by the author, because the larger the ratio (T/Y), the greater the energy absorption capacity before failure, that is, an adequate warning before failure. Most importantly, the YTR indicates the distribution pattern of the given material; that is, in what ratio is the material used. For example, an YTR of 0.8 indicates that 80% of the material's potential is used for the development of strength (yield strength), and the remaining 20% is used for the development of ductility. Recently, the YTR is steadily becoming a specification requirement in many global standards and assessment documents. If the thrust is higher for economy, the higher the YTR, the higher the economy. For this, SAE/ISO bolt property classes 10.9, 12.9, and HSLA structural steels, such as S890 and S960, serve as examples.

Ratio of Elongation-to-Reduction of Area (E/R, the ratio of ductility parameters)

To ensure safety, through ductility, the latest development is to use the ratio of strength parameters, that is, Y/T, as a specification requirement. However, this vital measure will bear fruit only when corroborated with the other ductility parameter, that is, E/R. Hence, to further assure safety, E/R must also be included in steel specifications because it is equally important for safety and will serve as a guaranteed reinforcement for ductility, as ductility is the most sought-after ability to deform plastically without fracturing. Therefore, NFF installed adequate ductility through this double check to safeguard against sudden failures because ductility also supports the redistribution of stresses. Additionally, adequate ductility is indispensable for the prevention of lamellar tearing in relatively thicker members.

For understandable reasons, mechanical designers continue to suffer from inadequate and inaccurate design inputs along with materials and manufacturing processes that cannot be defect-free to the extent required in the foreseeable future. To safely and prudently accommodate these genuine problems, we need materials with sufficient ability of forgiveness (ductility), that is, materials with adequate capability to flow plastically before fracturing. Thus, ductility must be given the responsibility of playing the crucial role of protecting from catastrophic failures, accidents, loss of life, and loss of investment arising from inadequate and erroneous design inputs, notches and other stress-raisers, material defects, manufacturing defects, testing deficiencies, and inspection errors. Therefore, the inclusion of all ductility parameters (reduction of area, elongation, E/R, and Y/T) is essential for the design of materials, machines, and structures because ductile failure is the most preferred failure mode by designers. Interestingly, these ductility parameters, hitherto unapplied in mechanical and material design processes, also serve as effective quality control measures. The adoption of this concept readily grants everlasting relief to mechanical designers and provides permanent shielding to society and investment against brittle failures. By all means, coming to us in four different forms (E, R, Y/T, and E/R) - ductility at an adequate level can alone eliminate these no-warning failures. Since ductility is also grain-size sensitive, this structure-sensitive property will serve as an effective tool for property modifications during material balancing activity. For the purpose of this research, the ratio of elongation to reduction of area (E/R) is termed as the Nori Ductility Ratio (NDR) and applied in NMAFS-1 and 2. Beneficially and eventually, the material in the given condition offers the best combination of safety, reliability, performance, durability, weight effectiveness, size effectiveness, and cost effectiveness if the NDR, that is, E/R, is maintained at 0.8 (0.8165 is the maximum limit proposed by the author) with a minimum elongation of 27% in 2-in. Thus, for safely housing the aforementioned problems, the designer certainly needs an all-time helping hand, that is, a material with sufficient capacity of forgiveness (ductility, that is, Y/T and E/R at 0.8 maximum, and elongation at 27% minimum), since the material with adequate ability to flow plastically before fracturing plays a key role in protecting from catastrophic failures and thus accidents, loss of life, and loss of investment.

ADVANTAGES OF NORI FATIGUE FORMULAE (NFF)

Most importantly, NFF can drastically reduce fatigue testing time and costs and provide a common platform for the worldwide design engineering and materials engineering communities to achieve absolute uniformity in design, which is essential for reducing new product developments, facilitating rapid industrial growth, strengthening the global economy, and promoting international trade. Interestingly, the proposed NFF remains the same across all units of measure, product forms, heat treatment, finishing, and surface roughness conditions. Henceforth, the maximum allowable fatigue stress in tension and in shear will be decided by the steel itself and not by the designers, design codes, or standards. This desirable feature of NFF assures the worldwide design engineering communities and places them on a common, logical, convenient, and scientifically convincing platform—the dream desire of the author since 1973. Consequently, the unpleasant debates and disagreements arising from factored values of maximum allowable stress are eliminated because NFF will allow the material to indicate its maximum allowable stress, which will be safe and economical. Thus, for the first time, Nori Fatigue Formulae removed human involvement and successfully enabled the material to communicate its maximum allowable fatigue strength clearly in terms of its safe application in design calculations. Therefore, steel and alloy designers can confidently apply Nori Fatigue Formulae to maximize the strength, ductility, safety, and economy of present and future alloys. As a result, the world also enjoys efficient conservation of natural resources. NFF evaluates and balances even the weld metal and heat-affected zone (HAZ) properties. It is hoped that the Nori Fatigue Formulae, together with the rational and logical philosophy on which it is built, will be readily adopted by national and international standards organizations and authorities in the fields of safety, materials, and design codes and standards, as well as by research centers, educators, and authors of machine design textbooks and handbooks. Such adoption would promote the common cause of uniformity, a rational and unified approach, simplicity, rapid progress, and hassle-free international trade.

Since mechanical design process, to a large extent, is the application of mechanical properties of materials (steels), for the first time - two fundamental strength properties (tensile and yield), two ductility parameters (elongation and reduction of area), yield- to-tensile ratio (an extremely valuable material characteristic steadily entering steel specifications) and another important material characteristic (Nori Ductility Ratio i.e. E/R) are included in the design process to eliminate the present and future problems of mechanical design process, and for installing safe and steady technological progress against catastrophic failures of equipment like vehicles, railroad equipment, boilers, pressure vessels, process piping, ropeways, aircrafts, ships, etc., including movement- supporting bridges and other structures. As we know, to avoid accidents, a good driver must necessarily allow the mistakes of others; similarly, the materials we use must be kind-hearted so that the material will forgive the inevitable design problems, material defects, manufacturing errors, and inspection mistakes for safeguarding us against catastrophic failures and accidents. For this, the ductility of the material must be adequate to safeguard against sudden failures. Thus, the forgiveness (ductility) of the material is used as the bedrock of the new design philosophy called the Nori design philosophy. This viewpoint is strongly supported by the above-cited design, material, and manufacturing problems that cannot be eliminated in the foreseeable future. Moreover, similar to toughness, fatigue strength is not a single property. It has been repeatedly found that the fatigue strength of a given steel under given conditions is essentially the combined strength of all the fundamental properties (T, Y, R, and E) and the derived ones, such as Y/T and E/R. Thus, NFF purposefully involved all six elements to utilize their prominence and uniqueness.

CONCLUSION

NFF have been thoroughly studied for their built-in features and have been extensively verified. It has been found that NFF can be easily and readily adopted in all design areas (highly critical, critical, subcritical, and noncritical/general engineering applications), hitherto adopting various approaches, methodologies, safety factors, design tools, and design philosophies. Hence, the author requests the international design code authorities, national and international standards organizations, authors of handbooks and textbooks, researchers of mechanical and structural engineering, safety authorities, teaching communities, and international trade authorities for early review and adoption of NFF so that fatigue-caused failures, failure-caused accidents, investment losses, and loss of human life can quickly reach the most sought-after infinitesimal levels, as well as for the rapid globalization of markets for manufacturers and nations working with a particular design code or methodology. To sum up - appearing as a simple parameter, the maximum allowable stress of the design engineering activity is silently controlling the global economy (by affecting product economics), public safety (by affecting product reliability), and consumption of natural resources. Therefore, the importance and role of this design parameter need no elaboration. Finally, NFF will effectively reduce the consumption of natural resources and eliminate the crisis and search for new resources by optimizing product size, weight, and durability. If future technology measures the elastic or proportionality limit precisely, yield (Y) can be replaced by the elastic limit or proportionality limit in the NFF. For the purpose of this research, the author defined mechanical design engineering as "Understanding the consequences of loads and loading patterns, whether mechanical or thermal, for the given material in the given condition, and for the given application." Although this paper ends here, Appendix A is provided to make this paper comprehensive and to provide additional applications of the formulae provided in the first two papers (Calculate Allowable Stress, Quit Factor of Safety - Nori VSN Murthy, 2013, see reference 61, and Formulae for Safe Design Against Fatigue Failures, (Part-I) - Nori VSN Murthy, 2016, see reference 65).

Competing Interests

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The author confirms that the data supporting the findings of this study are available in this article.

Co-Authors, Affiliations, and Funding

No co-authors, no affiliations, and no funding from any individual or institution. The author is a self-financed independent research scientist working for a common cause.

Expression of Gratitude

The author sincerely expresses his deep sense of gratitude to all failure analysts, authors, failure investigators, editors, and design code authorities for their valuable contributions to understanding the mechanical behavior of metals, fatigue failures, fracture mechanics, design philosophies, failure theories, material data, case histories, investigation reports, and other related technical details. Due to space constraints, the author sincerely apologizes for not being able to mention all the names of contributors. Further, the author expresses his gratitude to Google and other websites for providing valuable information related to numerous fatigue-caused accidents that have buried countless people and investments. Lastly, the author deeply mourns for all the untimely departed souls and their family members affected by fatigue-caused accidents, and for those who lost their investments and livelihoods.

Acknowledgements

This work is gratefully dedicated to Dr. George E. Totten for his pioneering contributions to the understanding of materials and their behavior, and for shaping me into a successful researcher.

REFERENCES

1. Roberts-Austen WC. An introduction to the study of metallurgy. 1st ed. London: Charles Griffin and Company; 1891. p. 292
2. Shank ME. A critical survey of brittle failure in carbon plate steel structures other than ships. Report serial no. SSC-65. Publisher: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council; 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington (DC) 20418: Dec 01, 1953.
3. Brownell LE, Young EH. Process equipment design. 1st ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1959.
4. Weibull W. Fatigue testing and analysis of results. 1st ed. London: Pergamon Press; 1961.
5. Linnert GE. Welding metallurgy. Vol. I–II. 3rd ed. USA: American Welding Society; Middletown, Ohio, USA, 1965.
6. Grover HJ. Fatigue of aircraft structures. Naval Air Systems Command, Washington DC., 20402, BMI: 1966.
7. Fisher JW, Frank KH, Hirt MA, McNamee BM. Effect of weldments on the fatigue strength of steel beams. Report no. 334.2. Bethlehem (PA): Lehigh University Institute of Research; 1969 Sep.
8. Spotts MF. Design of machine elements. Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice-Hall Inc.; 1971.
9. SAE. Technical report on fatigue properties. SAE J1099. SAE Information Report 197502; 1975 Feb 01.
10. Shigley JE. Mechanical engineering design. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.; 1977. 3rd edition.
11. Lakhtin YM. Engineering physical metallurgy and heat treatment. Moscow: Mir Publishers; 1979.
12. Collins JA. Failure of materials in mechanical design: analysis, prediction and prevention. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.; 1981.
13. Bernstein ML, Zaimovsky VA. Mechanical properties of metals. Moscow: Mir Publishers; 1983.
14. Timoshenko SP. History of strength of materials, Maple Press Company, New York, PA, 1983.
15. Wulpi DJ. Understanding how components fail. USA: American Society of Metals; 1985.
16. Boyer HC. Fatigue testing. Atlas of fatigue curves. USA: ASM International, 1986.
17. Ullman DG. Mechanical design failure analysis. 1st ed. New York: Marcel Dekker Inc.; 1986.
18. Ross RB. Handbook of metal treatments and testing. 2nd ed. London: Chapman and Hall Ltd.; 1988.
19. Dieter GE. Mechanical metallurgy. SI metric ed. London/New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company; 1988.
20. Boardman B. Fatigue resistance of steels. In: ASM Handbook. Vol. 1. Materials Park (OH): ASM International; 1990. p. 673-688.
21. Schlitz W. A history of fatigue. Eng Fract Mech. 1996;54(2): p. 263-300.
22. Murthy NVSN. A hardenability test proposal. In: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Quenching and the Control of Distortion; 1996 Nov 4-7; Cleveland (OH). p. 123-131.

23. ASM International. Fatigue and fracture. ASM Handbook. Vol. 19. Materials Park (OH): ASM International; 1996.
24. Pascual FG, Meeker WQ. Estimating fatigue curves with random fatigue-limit mode. Ames (IA): Iowa State University; Publisher: American Statistical Association and the American Society for Quality, Technometrics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 1999, Vol. 41, No.4, p. 277-289.
25. Ullman DG. The mechanical design process. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.; 1997.
26. Murthy NVSN. Noriq – an universal and ideal quenchant. In: Proceedings of the 1st International Automotive Heat-Treating Conference; 1998 Jul 13-15; Mexico, p. 227-232.
27. Ritchie RO. Mechanisms of fatigue-crack propagation in ductile and brittle solids. Int J Fract. 1999;100:55-83.
28. Bachmann H., Problems relevant to poor ductility properties of European reinforcing steel. In: 12th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering; Auckland, New Zealand, 2000 Feb 4; p.1-9.
29. Nori VSN Murthy, A Quenchant Discovery Breeding Many Inventions, Proceedings of the ASM Heat Treating Society, 4th International Conference on Quenching and the Control of Distortion, Beijing, China, 20-23 May 2003, p. 243-246
30. Nori VSN Murthy, Calculate Allowable Stress-Quit Factor of Safety, Proceedings of the 27th ASM Heat Treating Society Conference, Indianapolis, USA. This paper provided formulae applicable for the calculation of maximum allowable stress for the general design of components and structures, DOI:10.31399/asm.cp.ht2013p0029, 16-18 September, 2013, p. 29-35
31. Nori VSN Murthy, Formulae for Safe Design Against Fatigue Failures, 23rd IFHTSE Congress, Savannah, Georgia, USA, published by ASM International, Ohio, USA through their website <https://asm.confex.com/asm/ifhtse16/webprogram/Paper41348.html>. This paper provided two vital formulae applicable for calculation of maximum allowable fatigue stress for the design of components and structures with insignificant stress-raisers, April 18-21, 2016, p. 1-8

APPENDIX A

Summary of formulae for various mechanical and structural design applications with varying conditions (Formulae for safe design of components and structures subjected to various kinds of loads, load cycles and design considerations. These formulae are provided here not only to make this paper comprehensive but also to provide convenience to the mechanical designer.)

1	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in tension, for general design of components and structures under (1) dead / static / steady loads, (2) fewer duty cycles (3) low pressure and non-coded equipment, and (4) where fatigue and stress-raisers are not design considerations.	$\gamma^2 \cdot E \div T \cdot R$
2	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in shear, for general design of components and structures under (1) dead / static / steady loads, (2) fewer duty cycles, (3) low pressure and non-coded equipment, and (4) where fatigue and stress-raisers are not design considerations.	$\gamma^3 \cdot E \div T^2 \cdot R$
3	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable fatigue stress, in tension, for components and structures - where fatigue is a design consideration, but not the stress-raisers i.e. stress-raisers are considered insignificant.	$\gamma^3 \cdot E \div T^2 \cdot R$
4	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable fatigue stress, in shear, for components and structures - where fatigue is a design consideration, but not the stress-raisers i.e. stress- raisers are considered insignificant.	$\gamma^4 \cdot E \div T^3 \cdot R$
5	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable fatigue stress, in tension, for components and structures – where, both fatigue and stress-raisers are design considerations.	$\gamma^4 \cdot E \div T^3 \cdot R$
6	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable fatigue stress, in shear, for components and structures – where, both fatigue and stress-raisers are design considerations.	$\gamma^5 \cdot E \div T^4 \cdot R$
Basis the criticality rating (non-critical, subcritical, critical and extremely critical) of components and structures - the formula for maximum allowable stress will be as follows.		
7	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in tension, for design of components and structures that are considered non-critical.	$\gamma^2 \cdot E \div T \cdot R$
8	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in shear, for design of components and structures that are considered non-critical.	$\gamma^3 \cdot E \div T^2 \cdot R$

9	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in tension, for design of components and structures that are considered subcritical i.e. the criticality level is medium.	$Y^3 \cdot E \div T^2 \cdot R$
10	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in shear, for design of components and structures that are considered subcritical i.e. the criticality level is medium.	$Y^4 \cdot E \div T^3 \cdot R$
11	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in tension, for design of components and structures that are considered critical. i.e. the degree of criticality is high.	$Y^4 \cdot E \div T^3 \cdot R$
12	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in shear, for design of components and structures that are considered critical i.e. the degree of criticality is high.	$Y^5 \cdot E \div T^4 \cdot R$
13	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in tension, for design of components and structures that are extremely critical i.e. the degree of criticality is highest.	$Y^5 \cdot E \div T^4 \cdot R$
14	Nori Formula for calculation of maximum allowable stress, in shear, for design of components and structures that are extremely critical i.e. the degree of criticality is highest.	$Y^6 \cdot E \div T^5 \cdot R$

NOTES FOR APPENDIX A

The maximum allowable stress obtained from the above universally applicable formulae (1 to 14) can be used directly in the design process. These formulae are applicable to all steels, in all conditions and product forms, and are valid for any system of units. These formulae can be selected based on the application/criticality level for safeguarding the people and the investment against catastrophic failures being caused by under-design, metal-fatigue and mechanical-property imbalances. The above formulae will also eliminate over-design that obviously causes overweight, oversize, over-cost, and over-consumption of natural resources. The above formulae are applicable to all the T-Y-R-E values obtained for all test directions (longitudinal, transverse, and short-transverse), offset yield values, test temperatures, gauge lengths, stress-raiser severity factors, notch sensitivity factors, and surface roughness conditions arising from different manufacturing processes and component geometries. The maximum allowable stress, as given by the above formulae, can be increased—thereby reducing component size, weight, and cost—by applying the principles of the Nori Steel Triangle, the Nori Material Laws, and the Nori Unified Material Ratio, derived from the Nori Material Philosophy, since these ensure that, for a given steel and a given ductility level, the allowable stress is maximized.

APPENDIX B

Comparison of maximum allowable stress values given by ASME methodology and NORI formula (Maximum allowable stress for design of components and structures where both fatigue and stress-raisers are design considerations)

Steel	Tensile strength (UTS), MPa (KSI)	0.2% offset Yield Strength, MPa (KSI)	Reduction in area (%)	Elongation in 2-inch i.e. 50.80 mm (%)	Maximum Allowable Fatigue Stress (shear) as per Nori Formula, MPa (KSI)	Maximum Allowable Fatigue Stress (shear) as per ASME Methodology, MPa (KSI)	Difference between ASME stress value, and the value given by Nori Formula
	T	Y	R	E			
Steel-A	876 (127)	731 (106)	60	20	118 (17.15)	118 (17.15)	The difference is theoretically insignificant, and practically zero.
Steel-B	2206 (320)	1731 (251)	11	5	298 (43.19)	298 (43.20)	
Steel-C	1600 (232)	1420 (206)	49	12	216 (31.36)	216 (31.32)	
Steel-D	634 (92)	517 (75)	69	26	86 (12.48)	86 (12.42)	
Steel-E	965 (140)	827 (120)	58	17	131 (18.99)	130 (18.90)	
Steel-F	669 (97)	559 (81)	30	10	91 (13.13)	90 (13.10)	
Steel-G	731 (106)	565 (82)	31	15	98 (14.21)	99 (14.31)	
Steel-H	2013 (292)	1682 (244)	36	12	273 (39.65)	272 (39.42)	

NOTES FOR APPENDIX B

Design methodology

According to the ASME design code, the permissible fatigue stress (shear stress) for components with stress raisers (for example, shafts with keyways, holes, threaded holes, splines, etc.) is 30% of the yield strength in tension or 18% of the ultimate tensile strength, whichever is minimum $\times 0.75$. This proven computation methodology was applied to steels A to L to calculate the maximum allowable

Galley Proof for Author's Review and Approval Only.

Not for Distribution, Uploading, or Publication on Any Other Website (or Online Platform) Except Journals Official Website.

stress. The Nori Formula used for calculating the comparable stress is: $Y^5 \cdot E \div T^4 \cdot R$, please see serial No. 6 in Appendix-A.

Discussion

The ASME methodology considers two strength parameters (ultimate tensile strength and yield strength) and applies one parameter (offering the minimum value) with multiplying factors (safety factors/safety margins) to compute the maximum permissible stress. In contrast, the Nori formula applies all four basic parameters (T, Y, R, and E, that is, both the strength parameters and both the ductility parameters). In addition to these four parameters, the Nori formula applies both ductility ratios (Y/T and E/R). Importantly, the Nori formula does not involve numbers and digits that are prone to reviews, changes, debates, and disagreements. Thus, the Nori formula delivers higher accuracy for stress values by incorporating at least six parameters, unlike the ASME approach, which relies on one. This significant improvement in design efficiency benefits global engineering through safer and more efficient designs.

Observation

The above comparison (Appendix B) indicates that the difference between the two methodologies (ASME and NORI methodologies) is as small as can be, and thus prompts the ready adoption by all national and international design code authorities.

Conversion of units

1 KSI = 6.89476 MPa, 1 PSI = 0.00689476 MPa, 1 KSI = 1000 PSI, 1 MPa = 145.038 PSI, 1 MPa = 0.145038 KSI

APPENDIX C							
Comparison of maximum allowable stress values given by ASME methodology and Nori formula (Maximum allowable stress for design of components and structures where fatigue is a design consideration, but not stress-raisers i.e. the effect of stress-raisers is considered insignificant)							
Steel	Tensile strength (UTS), MPa (KSI)	0.2% offset Yield Strength, MPa (KSI)	Reduction in area (%)	Elongation in 2-inchi.e. 50.80 mm (%)	Maximum Allowable Fatigue Stress (shear) as per Nori Formula, MPa (KSI)	Maximum Allowable Fatigue Stress (shear) as per ASME Methodology, MPa (KSI)	Difference between ASME stress value, and the value given by Nori Formula
	T	Y	R	E			
Steel-a	1351 (196)	1207 (175)	60	17	243 (35.29)	243 (35.28)	The difference is theoretically insignificant, and practically zero.
Steel-b	1393 (202)	1089 (158)	27	13	251 (36.40)	251 (36.36)	
Steel-c	565 (82)	448 (65)	35	16	102 (14.80)	102 (14.76)	
Steel-d	786 (114)	655 (95)	64	24	142 (20.62)	142 (20.52)	
Steel-e	448 (65)	331 (48)	59	36	81 (11.79)	81 (11.70)	
Steel-f	827 (120)	724 (105)	69	21	148 (21.41)	149 (21.60)	
Steel-g	972 (141)	827 (120)	58	20	176 (25.51)	175 (25.38)	
Steel-h	552 (80)	414 (60)	35	20	100 (14.46)	99 (14.40)	

NOTES FOR APPENDIX C

Design Methodology

According to the ASME design code, the permissible fatigue stress (shear stress) for components with stress raisers (for example, shafts with keyways, holes, threaded holes, splines, etc.) is 30% of the yield strength in tension or 18% of the ultimate tensile strength, whichever is minimum. This computational methodology was applied to steels A to L to calculate the maximum allowable stress. The Nori Formula used for calculating the comparable stress is: $Y^4 \cdot E \cdot T^3 \cdot R$; please see serial No. 4 in Appendix-A.

Galley Proof for Author's Review and Approval Only.

Not for Distribution, Uploading, or Publication on Any Other Website (or Online Platform) Except Journals Official Website.

Discussion

The ASME methodology considers two strength parameters (ultimate tensile strength and yield strength) and applies one parameter (offering the minimum value) with multiplying factors (safety factors/safety margins) to compute the maximum permissible stress. In contrast, the Nori formula applies all four basic parameters (T, Y, R, and E, that is, both the strength parameters and both the ductility parameters). In addition to these four parameters, the Nori formula applies both ductility ratios (Y/T and E/R).

Importantly, the Nori formula does not involve numbers and digits that are prone to reviews, changes, debates, and disagreements.

Thus, the Nori formula delivers higher accuracy for stress values by incorporating at least six parameters, unlike the ASME approach, which relies on one. This significant improvement in design efficiency benefits global engineering by providing safer and more efficient designs.

Observation

The above comparison (Appendix C) indicates that the difference between the two methodologies (ASME and NORI methodologies) is as small as can be, and thus prompts the ready adoption by all national and international design code authorities.

Conversion of Units

1 KSI = 6.89476 MPa, 1 PSI = 0.00689476 MPa, 1 KSI = 1000 PSI, 1 MPa = 145.038 PSI, 1 MPa = 0.145038 KSI

APPENDIX D		
Comparison between ASME methodology and NORI methodology		
No.	ASME methodology for arriving at the maximum permissible stress value.	NORI methodology for arriving at the maximum permissible stress value.
1	Considers only two parameters (ultimate tensile strength, and yield strength) and apply just one (the minimum value). This yields a design efficiency of 1/6, or 16.67%.	To enhance safety, performance, and precision in engineering, applied six parameters: two strength parameters (T and Y), two ductility-related parameters (R and E), and two vital ratios (T/Y and E/R). This approach achieves full design efficiency (6/6, or 100%).
2	Relies on numerical values prone to review, revision, debate, and disagreement.	Avoids numerical values entirely, eliminating such issues.
3	The accuracy of maximum allowable stress value depends on human judgment, designer experience, source reliability, and the factor of safety (FOS).	There is no human involvement. As such, there is no scope for this kind of issue.
4	Final stress values remain sensitive to sources and designer choices due to varying FOS.	No scope for this kind of problem.
5	The FOS varies due to code revisions – differing over time within codes and across codes at any given time. This variability frustrates global design communities and equipment users.	Formulae given in Appendix-A will eliminate all these problems since FOS is eliminated. Desirably and indisputably - the material is made to speak in explicitly clear terms about its capacity i.e., maximum permissible stress.
6	Applying factors of safety typically results in under-design or overdesign, rarely achieving precise design. Under-design exposes society to risks such as loss of life and investment from premature or catastrophic failures. Conversely, overdesign increases weight, cost, size, and natural resource consumption unnecessarily.	Since the material is speaking in clear terms and offering maximum allowable stress values with no scope for debates and disagreements - precise designs are by default, and there is no room for overdesign, under-design, premature failures, catastrophic failures, and their ever-associated consequences on society, product economics, and natural resources.
7	Non-uniform design stress values, due to varying FOS, result in inconsistent product sizes for the same parameters.	Due to the absolute uniformity in the design-stress values - sizes will remain the same for components and products designed across the globe.

8	Due to varying allowable stress values, globalization of markets became sluggish and problematic.	Absolute uniformity in design stress values could accelerate market globalization. This, in turn, fosters rapid growth in the global economy.
9	Periodic revision of design codes and standards for fine-tuning factors of safety is an ongoing process that consumes considerable time and money. Such revisions also cause concern within the industry, as it is affected whenever design codes are updated.	This problem is eliminated as the factor of safety is eliminated from the design process. Upon adoption, UMR serves as an efficient and reliable factor of safety.
10	Revalidation of existing equipment due to revisions in the FOS is a tedious process that consumes significant time and money. In many cases, it may impose decommissioning of the equipment, thereby resulting in financial loss to the user.	These and several other problems and financial losses are eliminated since FOS is eliminated.
11	No mention about values (T-Y-R-E) obtained in other test directions like transverse and short transverse, i.e., through thickness.	Formulae given in Appendix-A are common for test values taken in the all the test directions like longitudinal, transverse, and short transverse.
12	Changes to material parameters such as R, E, Y/T, and E/R do not affect the maximum allowable stress value. This misleads mechanical and materials designers.	Any change, however small it may be, made in any of the six parameters, will alter the maximum allowable stress value. This feature is a must for absolute precision in design engineering.

Galley Proof for Author's Review and Approval Only.

Not for Distribution, Uploading, or Publication on Any Other Website (or Online Platform)
 Except Journals Official Website.