



Gap Formations in Simulations of SHPB Tests on Elastic Materials Soft in Shear

by M. N. Raftenberg and M. J. Scheidler

ARL-RP-272

September 2009

A reprint from Shock Compression of Condensed Matter – 2009, Proceedings of the Conference of the American Physics Society Topical Group on Shock Compression of Condensed Matter, Nashville, TN, 28 June–3 July 2009.

NOTICES

Disclaimers

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

Citation of manufacturer's or trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use thereof.

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

Army Research Laboratory

Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

ARL-RP-272

September 2009

Gap Formations in Simulations of SHPB Tests on Elastic Materials Soft in Shear

M. N. Raftenberg and M. J. Scheidler
Weapons and Materials Research Directorate, ARL

*A reprint from Shock Compression of Condensed Matter – 2009, Proceedings of the Conference of the
American Physics Society Topical Group on Shock Compression of Condensed Matter,
Nashville, TN, 28 June–3 July 2009.*

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) September 2009		2. REPORT TYPE Reprint		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) July 2008–July 2009	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Gap Formations in Simulations of SHPB Tests on Elastic Materials Soft in Shear			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) M. N. Raftenberg and M. J. Scheidler			5d. PROJECT NUMBER 622618H80		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Laboratory ATTN: RDRL-WMT-D Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER ARL-RP-272		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES <i>A reprint from Shock Compression of Condensed Matter – 2009, Proceedings of the Conference of the American Physics Society Topical Group on Shock Compression of Condensed Matter, Nashville, TN, 28 June–3 July 2009.</i>					
14. ABSTRACT The LS-DYNA code was applied to split Hopkinson pressure bar tests on a material at least two orders of magnitude stiffer in dilatation than in shear. Two constitutive models were applied, linear elasticity and a compressible form of Mooney-Rivlin elasticity. The latter was fitted to data from ballistic gelatin. The incident and transmission bars were aluminum. The nominal strain rate was 2500/s. Gaps appeared at the interfaces between the specimen and both bars. Unloading of the specimen and bars accompanied these gaps. The input-velocity rise time was varied to observe pulse shaping effects. Mesh sensitivity and contact-parameter sensitivity studies were performed.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS split Hopkinson pressure bar, ballistic gelatin, LS-DYNA, interfacial gaps					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 12	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Martin N. Raftenberg
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 410-278-3684

GAP FORMATIONS IN SIMULATIONS OF SHPB TESTS ON ELASTIC MATERIALS SOFT IN SHEAR

M. N. Raftenberg¹, M. J. Scheidler¹

¹*Impact Physics Branch, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground MD 21005*

Abstract. The LS-DYNA code was applied to split Hopkinson pressure bar tests on a material at least two orders of magnitude stiffer in dilatation than in shear. Two constitutive models were applied, linear elasticity and a compressible form of Mooney-Rivlin elasticity. The latter was fitted to data from ballistic gelatin. The incident and transmission bars were aluminum. The nominal strain rate was 2500/s. Gaps appeared at the interfaces between the specimen and both bars. Unloading of the specimen and bars accompanied these gaps. The input-velocity rise time was varied to observe pulse shaping effects. Mesh sensitivity and contact-parameter sensitivity studies were performed.

Keywords: split Hopkinson pressure bar, ballistic gelatin, LS-DYNA, interfacial gaps.

PACS: 62.20.D-, 83.60.-a, 83.60.Uv.

INTRODUCTION

The LS-DYNA code [1] was applied to axisymmetric finite-element simulations of split Hopkinson pressure bar (SHPB) tests on a material much less stiff in shear than in dilatation. This class has relevance to various biological materials and to their simulant, ballistic gelatin. The measurement of high-rate properties for such materials is challenging due to their small wave speeds and impedances. A recent report has documented progress in extending the SHPB technique to ballistic gelatin [2]. The original motivation for our computations was to study the degree to which equilibrium was achieved in these experiments. Both linear elasticity and a compressible form of Mooney-Rivlin elasticity were applied to the specimen. An unanticipated finding was the occurrence of separation gaps between the specimen and the aluminum bars and accompanying unloading of the specimen and bars.

THE MODEL

Constitutive Modeling

The aluminum incident and transmission bars were modeled with linear elasticity. Aluminum was assigned the density of 2700 kg/m³, Young's modulus of 68 GPa, and Poisson's ratio of 0.33.

The specimen was modeled as elastic with an initial density of 1000 kg/m³. First a compressible generalization of Mooney-Rivlin hyperelasticity ("CMR"), LS-DYNA model 27 [1,3], was applied. The strain energy per volume, W , is related to the three invariants of the right Cauchy-Green tensor, I , II , and III , by

$$W = A(I - 3) + B(II - 3) + C(III^{-2} - 1) + D(III - 1)^2 \quad (1)$$

Here, A , B , C , and D are constants related by

$$C = \frac{A}{2} + B \quad (2)$$

$$D = \frac{A(5\nu - 2) + B(11\nu - 5)}{2(1 - 2\nu)} \quad (3)$$

and ν is Poisson's ratio.

In calculations applying CMR, A and B were set to 12 and 28 kPa, respectively, in order to produce a stiffness intermediate between uniaxial-stress measurements reported in [2] at strain rates of 1/s and 2500/s. Constant ν was set to 0.49999 to produce an initial bulk modulus four orders of magnitude greater than the shear modulus. In calculations applying linear elasticity, Young's modulus was fixed at 430 kPa and Poisson's ratio ν was varied.

Geometry and Meshing

All simulations were 2D axisymmetric. The specimen's initial thickness and radius were 1.45 and 6.35 mm, respectively, the dimensions used in [2]. The bars had a 12.8-mm radius. The incident and transmission bars had lengths of 768 and 256 mm, respectively, or 30 and 10 times their diameter, respectively.

All finite element meshes were composed of four-node quadrilaterals. In the bars, all elements were 100- μ m squares. In most of our calculations, the specimen's elements were initially rectangular, having radial and axial dimensions of 25 and 50 μ m, respectively. Several calculations were performed with different specimen meshes to observe convergence.

Boundary Conditions

Interactions between the specimen and the bars was governed by a penalty-based contact algorithm, LS-DYNA's "2D Automatic Surface-to-Surface" [1,3]. The algorithm's key parameters are SFACT, a scale factor applied to the penalty force stiffness, and VDC, a viscous damping coefficient in percent of critical damping. The defaults of 1 and 10, respectively, were used in all calculations from which results are shown. Parameters SFACT and VDC were varied in other calculations to examine convergence.

The outer radii of the bars and specimen were stress-free. At the input end of the incident bar, axial velocity was prescribed in the form

$$v_z(t) = \begin{cases} v_0 \cdot \frac{t}{t_R} & ; \quad 0 \leq t < t_R \\ v_0 & ; \quad t \geq t_R \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Here, t is time. Rise time t_R was assigned the values 1 and 25 μ s to explore effects of pulse shaping. The value 1.81 m/s was applied to v_0 to achieve a nominal strain rate of 2500/s across the specimen. At the far end of the transmission bar, LS-DYNA's "2D Non-Reflecting" boundary condition [1,3] was applied.

Results and Discussion

Calculations with Compressible Mooney-Rivlin

Let Δ_{S-IB} denote the axial separation between the specimen and the incident bar at the centerline, $r = 0$. Let Δ_{S-TB} denote the axial separation between the specimen and the transmission bar at $r = 0$. Let λ_z denote the specimen's nominal axial stretch ratio, defined as the distance between the incident and transmission bars at $r = 0$. Figure 1 shows results for these quantities vs. time for $t_R = 1 \mu$ s. At $r = 0$, the longitudinal wave in the incident bar arrived at the specimen interface at 126 μ s. By 165 μ s, the specimen has pulled away from the incident bar, thereby producing a non-zero Δ_{S-IB} . By 166 μ s, the specimen has begun to lag behind the transmission bar, leading to a non-zero Δ_{S-TB} . Three distinct intervals can be discerned in Fig. 1. The first interval occurs between 165 and about 280 μ s and corresponds to a λ_z range of 0.97 and 0.68. In this interval Δ_{S-IB} remains non-zero and attains a 38- μ m peak value, and Δ_{S-TB} is intermittently non-zero and attains a peak of 3 μ m. Both gaps remain closed in the brief second interval. The third interval extends from about 185 to 325 μ s and corresponds to a range of 0.67 to 0.57 for λ_z . During the third interval, Δ_{S-IB} and Δ_{S-TB} are of similar amplitudes and attain peak values of 43 and 39 μ m, respectively.

Figure 2 compares Δ_{S-IB} for $t_R = 1$ and 25 μ s. Pulse shaping has decreased the size of the gaps. The peak value in Fig. 2 has decreased from 43 to 3 μ m. However, even these small-amplitude gaps

were accompanied by stress unloading in the specimen and in the bars. This can be seen in Fig. 3, which compares Δ_{S-TB} with axial stress σ_{zz} in the specimen element and in the bar element closest to the S-TB interface at $r = 0$ for $t_R = 25 \mu\text{s}$. The initial compressive pulses that arrived in both bars at about $150 \mu\text{s}$ were reduced to zero when the gap, of only $1.2 \mu\text{m}$ amplitude, formed at $184 \mu\text{s}$. Thereafter, intermittent gap closings were accompanied by resumptions in compressive stress.




Figure 1. Gap amplitudes at the S-IB and S-TB interfaces at $r = 0$ and nominal axial stretch ratio vs. time for Compressible Mooney-Rivlin and $t_R = 1 \mu\text{s}$.




FIGURE 2. Gap amplitude at the S-IB interface at $r = 0$ vs. time for Compressible Mooney-Rivlin and $t_R = 1$ and $25 \mu\text{s}$.

Such unloading in the bar and specimen as observed in Fig. 3 would invalidate the processing procedure usually applied to SHPB data [4]. Axial stress σ_{zz} is usually assumed to be uniform throughout the specimen and is related to the strain ε_{zz} measured on the outer surface of the transmission bar by

$$\sigma_{zz} = \frac{A_B}{A_S} E \varepsilon_{zz} \quad (5)$$

Here, E is Young's modulus of the bars, and A_B and A_S are the cross-sectional areas of the bars and specimen, respectively. However, the presence of the S-TB gap implies that the contact area is less than the entire cross-sectional area as assumed in the derivation of eq. 5. Also, the surface unloading in Fig. 3 propagates into the interior of the specimen and delays the occurrence of a uniform state of stress.

The Δ_{S-IB} and Δ_{S-TB} values in Figs. 1, 2 and 3 are small relative to each specimen-element's initial axial-radial dimensions of $25 \times 50 \mu\text{m}$. Two other element sizes, 50×100 and $12.5 \times 12.5 \mu\text{m}$, were therefore applied to study convergence. Figure 4 shows that, for $t_R = 1 \mu\text{s}$, the Δ_{S-IB} results have substantially converged during the first interval, between 165 and $280 \mu\text{s}$. Mesh convergence has not been demonstrated for many aspects of the results, but the degree of convergence in Fig. 4 supports the existence of the gap phenomenon.




Figure 3. Axial stresses on both sides of the S-TB interface and gap amplitude at this interface, all at $r = 0$, vs. time for Compressible Mooney-Rivlin and $t_R = 25 \mu\text{s}$.

Convergence with respect to the contact parameters was also studied. The simulation with $t_R = 1 \mu\text{s}$ was repeated with SFACT equal to 0.1 and 10 and with VDC equal to 20. Again, substantial convergence was demonstrated for Δ_{S-IB} during the first interval, but other aspects of the solution have not fully converged.

Calculations with Linear Elasticity

We applied linear elasticity to the specimen. Young's modulus was fixed at 430 kPa and Poisson's ratio ν was varied. The results for Δ_{S-IB} for $t_R = 25 \mu\text{s}$ are shown in Fig. 5. This corresponds to a nearly fixed shear modulus and varied bulk modulus. No gaps were detected at either interface for a ν of 0.48 or less. The largest peak values (with respect to time) for both Δ_{S-IB} and Δ_{S-TB} were observed with a ν of 0.4990. Peak values diminished when ν was increased further.

Figure 6 contains a mesh plot for $\nu = 0.49900$ at 286 μs . The values for both Δ_{S-IB} and Δ_{S-TB} exceed the specimen element dimensions. This observation further supports the assessment that the gap phenomenon is not entirely an artifact of meshing.

CONCLUSIONS

We have not found any explicit mention of the gap phenomenon in the SHPB literature, either experimental or computational. Each of our specimen materials had a shear modulus much smaller than its bulk modulus, an impedance much less than that of the aluminum bars, and was purely elastic. It is not yet clear which of these properties was/were essential in producing the gaps.

REFERENCES

1. Livermore Software Technology Corporation, LS-DYNA Keyword User's Manual, Volume II, Version 971, May 2007.
2. Moy, P., et al., "Dynamic Response of an Alternative Tissue Simulant Physically Associating Gels (PAG)", ARL report, ARL-RP-136, 2006.
3. Hallquist, J. O., LS-DYNA Theory Manual, 2006.
4. Gray, G. T., III, "Classic Split-Hopkinson Pressure Bar Testing", ASM Handbook V. 8, 2000, 462-476.




Figure 4. Gap amplitude at the S-IB interface at $r = 0$ vs. time for Compressible Mooney-Rivlin, $t_R = 1 \mu\text{s}$, and three different specimen meshes.




Figure 5. Gap amplitude at the S-IB interface at $r = 0$ vs. time for $t_R = 25 \mu\text{s}$ and linear elastic specimens with a Young's modulus of 430 kPa and various Poisson ratios.




Figure 6. Mesh plot at 286 μs for the linear elastic specimen with a Poisson's ratio of 0.49900, a Young's modulus of 430 kPa and for $t_R = 25 \mu\text{s}$. The centerline is on the left and the incident bar is at the bottom.

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 DEFENSE TECHNICAL
(PDF INFORMATION CTR
only) DTIC OCA
8725 JOHN J KINGMAN RD
STE 0944
FORT BELVOIR VA 22060-6218

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RESEARCH LAB
IMNE ALC HRR
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1197

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RESEARCH LAB
RDRL CIM L
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1197

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RESEARCH LAB
RDRL CIM P
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1197

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

1 DIR USARL
RDRL CIM G (BLDG 4600)

<u>NO. OF</u> <u>COPIES</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>COPIES</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
3	INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED TECH S BLESS S SATAPATHY S LEVINSON 3925 WEST BRAKER ST STE 400 AUSTIN TX 78759-5316	1	UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM MECHANICAL ENGRG D LITTLEFIELD HOEN ENGR BLDG 1530 3RD AVE S BIRMINGHAM AL 35294-4440
3	SOUTHWEST RSRCH INST C A ANDERSON J WALKER K DANNEMANN 6220 CULEBRA RD DRAWER 28510 SAN ANTONIO TX 78228-0510	1	PURDUE UNIVERSITY ARNTCS & ASTRONAUTICS W CHEN 701 W STADIUM AVE W LAFAYETTE IN 47907-2045
4	SOUTHWEST RSRCH INST G JOHNSON T HOLMQUIST S BEISSEL C GERLACH 5353 WAYZATA BLVD MINNEAPOLIS MN 55416-1340	1	UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI MECHANICAL ENGRG A RAJENDRAN 201 CARRIER HALL UNIVERSITY MS 38677
1	INTERNATIONAL RSRCH ASSOC D ORPHAL 4450 BLACK AVE STE E PLEASANTON CA 94566-6145	2	WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY BIOMEDICAL ENGRG C BIR K-H YANG 818 W HANCOCK DETROIT MI 48201
2	JOHNS HOPKINS UNIV MECHL ENGRG K T RAMESH K HEMKER 223 LATROBE HALL 3400 N CHARLES ST BALTIMORE MD 21218-2682	3	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO MECHL AND ARSPC ENGRG M MEYER S NEMAT-NASSER V NESTERENKO 9500 GILMAN DR LA JOLLA CA 92093-0411
1	JOHNS HOPKINS UNIV CIVIL ENGRG L GRAHAM-BRADY 210 LATROBE HALL 3400 N CHARLES ST BALTIMORE MD 21218-2682	1	UNIVERSITY OF UTAH MECHANICAL ENGRG R BRANNON 50 S CENTRAL CAMPUS DR SALT LAKE CITY UT 84112
1	LIVERMORE SOFTWARE TECHLGY CORP M JENSEN 7374 LAS POSITAS RD LIVERMORE CA 94550	1	BROWN UNIVERSITY ENGRG DIV R CLIFTON 182 HOPE ST PROVIDENCE RI 02912
		2	AIR FORCE RSRCH LAB RWMW J L JORDAN L CHHABILDAS 101 WEST EGLIN BLVD EGLIN AFB FL 32542

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

4 SANDIA NATIONAL LABS
M R BAER MS 0836
S SILLING MS 1322
E S HERTEL MS 1185
P A TAYLOR MS 1160
PO BOX 5800
ALBUQUERQUE NM 97185

C RANDOW
J SOUTH
RDRL WMM D
E CHIN
C FOUNTZOULAS
RDRL WMS
T JONES
RDRL WMT

1 SANDIA NATIONAL LABS
T J VOGLER
PO BOX 969
LIVERMORE CA 94551-0969

P BAKER
RDRL WMT A
E HORWATH
J HOUSKAMP
C KRAUTHAUSER
S SCHOENFELD

7 LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LAB
B CLEMENTS
E N BROWN
E MAS
T MASON
P RAE
D DATTELBAUM
M MURPHY
PO BOX 1663
LOS ALAMOS NM 87545

RDRL WMT
C HOPPEL
RDRL WMT B
R BITTING
D FOX
R GUPTA
S KUKUCK
RDRL WMT C
T BJERKE
M FERREN-COKER

1 LAWRENCE LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LAB
D GOTO
PO BOX 808
LIVERMORE CA 94551-0808

S SCHRAML
K KIMSEY
D SCHEFFLER
RDRL WMT D

1 APPLIED RSRCH ASSOC
SOUTHWEST DIV
D E GRADY
4300 SAN MATEO BLVD NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87110

S BILYK
D CASEM
J CLAYTON
N GNIAZDOWSKI
Y HUANG
M KIM
R KRAFT
B LOVE
M RAFTENBERG
M SCHEIDLER
T WEERASOORIYA
K ZIEGLER

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

42 DIR USARL
RDRL CIH C
J CAZAMIAS
P CHUNG
D GROVE
RDRL WM
J SMITH
RDRL WMM B
M BERMAN
D HOPKINS
A FRYDMAN
G GAZONAS
M MINNICINO
B POWERS

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.