

1777

File cy

AD **A069670**

CONTRACT REPORT ARBRL-CR-00394

AN IMPROVED NONLINEAR DYNAMIC ANALYSIS
OF FLAT LAMINATED PLATES

Prepared by
University of Illinois
Aeronautical and Astronautical
Engineering Department
Urbans, Illinois

March 1979



US ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND
BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

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

Secondary distribution of this report by originating
or sponsoring activity is prohibited.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained
from the National Technical Information Service,
U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia
22161.

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.

*The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report
does not constitute indorsement of any commercial product.*

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER CONTRACT REPORT ARBRL-CR-00394	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) An Improved Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis of Flat Laminated Plates		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED FINAL 1 Jan 77 - 31 Dec 77
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Adam R. Zak Daniel W. Pillasch		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DAAD05-77-C-0722
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering Dep. University of Illinois Urbans, Illinois		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 1LL61102 AH43
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS USA Ballistic Research Laboratory, USA ARRADCOM Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005 (DRDAR-BL)		12. REPORT DATE MARCH 1979
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 31
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Dynamic Analysis Anisotropic elastic-plastic Plate analysis Finite element Elastic-visco-plastic		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) An improved finite element structural model has been developed for the dynamic analysis of flat laminated plates. This model is an extension of a model which has been developed and reported previously. The original model uses constant thickness quadrilateral elements to represent the shaped of the plate with the elements stacked in thickness direction to account for the material properties of each layer. The new model allows for orthotropic elastic-visco-plastic material response and it uses finite difference equations for the time integration technique. Simplifying approximation allows for the use of large time (continued)		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

increments in the finite difference equations for time integration.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	5
II. MODIFICATION FOR LARGE TIME INCREMENTS	6
Analysis.	6
Numerical Results & Conclusions	12
III. ORTHOTROPIC ELASTIC-PERFECTLY PLASTIC YIELD.	13
Analysis.	13
IV. VISCO-PLASTIC MODEL.	16
Analysis.	16
Numerical Example	21
V. CONCLUSIONS.	21
FIGURES.	22-25
TABLE.	26
DISTRIBUTION LIST.	27

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this investigation has been to improve a finite element program which performs three dimensional analysis for impulsively loaded laminated plates (acronym TIP)¹. This TIP program has a finite element model that uses the quadrilateral to define the shape of the element in the plane of the plate and then arranges a number of these elements through the thickness to describe the necessary number of material layers. Each layer then has its own material properties. The model is nonlinear since it allows for large plate deflections and for material yield effects. The original program only allowed for isotropic elastic-perfectly plastic solids. The dynamic equations are obtained by lumping the mass of the plate into the nodal points of the finite element model and then solving kinematic equations of motions by use of a finite difference technique. The improvements to the TIP program were to decrease the time that the program ran by use of large time increments in the finite-difference equations and to develop an orthotropic elastic-perfectly plastic analysis which was then further improved to include orthotropic elastic-visco-plastic analysis.

The limitations on the size of the integration time step are a direct result of the finite-element model which treats the plate as a lumped mass system where the individual masses are placed at the nodes. Consequently, as the numerical integration proceeds the masses move relative to each other, and if the integration time step is too large, an artificial oscillation was observed by examining the internal forces acting on each mass for successive time steps. When a relatively large time step is used these forces will change sign for each successive time step. The worst condition occurs in the thickness direction, since the masses will, in general, be separated by a much smaller distance in this direction. In addition to this, it has been observed from previous numerical results that the two inplane displacements vary relatively smoothly through the thickness and therefore, they are modified to vary linearly without restricting any shear deformation.

The orthotropic yield analysis uses the same technique that was used in the original TIP program with only the yield criterion changing. For the orthotropic elastic-perfectly plastic analysis, Hill's Yield Criterion² is used instead of von Mises Yield Criterion. Additional orthotropic yield stresses are also needed as additional input. For the elastic-visco-plastic analysis a strain rate dependence is

¹Zak, Adam R., "Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis of Flat Laminated Plates by the Finite Element Method," Final Report, Contract No. DAAD05-73-C-0197, University of Illinois, February, 1977.

²Hill, R., "The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity," Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1950.

introduced by use of an extension of the isotropic Bingham material³ to the orthotropic case.

II. MODIFICATION FOR LARGE TIME INCREMENTS

Analysis

In this analysis the in-plane (u and v) displacements are handled separately from the displacements through the thickness (w), but, both utilize the finite difference equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\Delta\}_{n+1} = & 2\{\Delta\}_n - \{\Delta\}_{n-1} \\ & + \beta h^2 [M]^{-1} \left[\{F_I\}_{n+1} + \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 2 \right) \{F_I\}_n + \{F_I\}_{n-1} \right] \\ & + \beta h^2 [M]^{-1} \left[\{F_E\}_{n+1} + \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 2 \right) \{F_E\}_n + \{F_E\}_{n-1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\{\Delta\}$ is the displacement matrix, β is the acceleration parameter, h is the time interval, $\{F_I\}$ is the internal force matrix, $\{F_E\}$ is the external force matrix, $[M]$ is the mass matrix, and the subscripts n , $n-1$, $n+1$ denotes time intervals.

In analyzing the u and v displacements, it is assumed that they are linearly dependent through the thickness. This forces plane sections to remain plane.

This first assumption results in the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} u &= q_1 + zq_2 \\ v &= q_3 + zq_4 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where q_k , $k=1, 4$, are unknown coefficients called the transformed displacements and z is the distance in the z -direction of the node from the center of gravity. The importance of having z be the distance from the center of gravity will be discussed when the transformed mass matrix is discussed. In matrix notation equation (2) becomes:

³Cristescu, No., "Dynamic Plasticity," North Holland Publishing Company, 1967.

$$\{\Delta\} = [TF] \{q\} \quad (3)$$

where $\{q\}$ is the matrix of transformed displacements and $[TF]$ is the transformation matrix described below. Letting ℓ be the number of layers of material and $i=1, \ell+1$ be the nodal location in the thickness direction, the transformation matrix can be written as:

$$[TF] = \begin{bmatrix} [TF_1] \\ [TF_2] \\ \cdot \\ [TF_i] \\ \cdot \\ [TF_{\ell+1}] \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

where

$$[TF_i] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & Z_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & Z_i \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

and Z_i is the distance of node i from the center of gravity. $i=1$ is the node at the bottom of the plate and $i=\ell+1$ is the node at the top.

Since the displacements are written in terms of transformed displacements, then the forces should be written in terms transformed forces. Letting $\{f_E\}$ be the matrix of external forces corresponding to $\{q\}$, and $\{f_I\}$ be internal forces also corresponding to $\{q\}$, the theory of virtual work states:

$$d\{\Delta\}^T \{F_I\} = d\{q\}^T \{f_I\} \quad (6)$$

Transposing equation (3) yields:

$$\{\Delta\}^T = \{q\}^T [TF]^T \quad (7)$$

Substituting equation (7) into (6) yields:

$$d\{q\}^T [TF]^T \{F_I\} = d\{q\}^T \{f_I\} \quad (8)$$

Therefore:

$$\{f_I\} = [TF]^T \{F_I\} \quad (9)$$

Similarly:

$$\{f_E\} = [TF]^T \{F_E\} \quad (10)$$

Finding a transformed mass matrix $[m]$ starts with:

$$- [M] \{\ddot{\Delta}\} = \{F\}_{inertia} \quad (11)$$

By virtual work:

$$- d\{\Delta\}^T [M] \{\ddot{\Delta}\} = d\{\Delta\}^T \{F\}_{inertia} \quad (12)$$

$$- d\{q\}^T [m] \{\ddot{q}\} = d\{\Delta\}^T \{F\}_{inertia} \quad (13)$$

$$d\{\Delta\}^T [M] \{\ddot{\Delta}\} = d\{q\}^T [m] \{\ddot{q}\} \quad (14)$$

Substituting equations (3) and (7) into (14) yields:

$$d\{q\}^T [TF]^T [M] [TF] \{\ddot{q}\} = d\{q\}^T [m] \{\ddot{q}\} \quad (15)$$

Dividing out the unnecessary terms gives:

$$[m] = [TF]^T [M] [TF] \quad (16)$$

Now the reason for Z_i being the distance from the center of gravity will become apparent. The calculations are much simplified by the mass matrix being a diagonal matrix as is the case for the original mass matrix. The original mass matrix was:

$$[M] = \{M_j\} \quad (17)$$

where j varies over the total degrees of freedom.

Performing the matrix multiplication in equation (16) using equations (17), (4), and (5) produces

$$[m] = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i Z_i & 0 & 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i Z_i & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i Z_i^2 & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i Z_i & 0 \\ 0 & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i Z_i & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i Z_i \\ 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i Z_i & \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i Z_i^2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} M_i Z_i &= 0 \\ i &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

by definition of the center of gravity, thus causing [m] to be a diagonal matrix.

Referring to equation (1) the only element that still must be transformed is the deflections at past time intervals. From equation (3):

$$\{q\}_n = [TF]^{-1} \{\Delta\}_n \quad (20)$$

Rather than finding the inverse of the entire transformation matrix, it is only necessary to get the inverse of two of the submatrices in equation (4) since it is only necessary to solve for four unknowns. This is easily done by hand and results in:

$$\begin{bmatrix} TF_1 \\ TF_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{z_1}{z_1 - z_2} & 0 & \frac{z_1}{z_1 - z_2} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{z_1 - z_2} & 0 & -\frac{1}{z_1 - z_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - \frac{z_1}{z_1 - z_2} & 0 & \frac{z_1}{z_1 - z_2} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{z_1 - z_2} & 0 & -\frac{1}{z_1 - z_2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

Substituting the transformed quantities into equation (1) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \{q\}_{n+1} &= 2 \{q\}_n - \{q\}_{n-1} \\ &+ \beta h^2 [m]^{-1} \left[\{f_I\}_n + \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 2 \right) \{f_I\}_{n-1} + \{f_I\}_{n-2} \right] \\ &+ \beta h^2 [m]^{-1} \left[\{f_E\}_{n+1} + \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 2 \right) \{f_E\}_n + \{f_E\}_{n-1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

It should be noted that the internal transformed forces are displaced by one time increment. Because these forces are small, even at large time increments, this yields accurate results. Equation (22) is thus solved and equation (3) transforms the results to global displacements.

Although this time lag is acceptable for the in-plane displacements, it is not acceptable for the w displacements. The reason for this is the external force is being applied in the w direction, thus making these internal forces more reactive to larger time intervals. In order to account for the change in the internal force a model was sought to couple the deflections through the thickness.

In finding a model to represent what happens through the thickness, it is necessary to see what the unknowns are. From equation (1) the unknowns are $\{\Delta\}_{n+1}$ and $\{F_I\}_{n+1}$. All the other terms are known. In

order to predict what $\{F_I\}_{n+1}$ is, it is necessary to couple the deflections through the thickness and to assume all strains small when compared to the strain in the w-direction. This can be done by letting:

$$\{F_I\}_{n+1} = \{F_I\}_n + \{\Delta F_I\}_{n+1} \quad (23)$$

where $\{\Delta F_I\}_{n+1}$ is the change of the internal force between time intervals. The deflection in the w direction is then coupled by the model shown in Figure 1. This model assumes the stiffness between the nodal points in the thickness direction is much greater than the stiffness between in-plane nodal points. As long as the external force is in the w direction this is a good assumption.

From Figure 1:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta F_{I_{i,n+1}} = & k_i \left[(\Delta_{i+1,n+1} - \Delta_{i,n+1}) - (\Delta_{i+1,n} - \Delta_{i,n}) \right] \\ & - k_{i-1} \left[(\Delta_{i,n+1} - \Delta_{i-1,n+1}) - (\Delta_{i,n} - \Delta_{i-1,n}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where i refers to the nodal location through the thickness and n refers to the time increment. The predicted stiffness (k_i) is gotten from the orthotropic properties (C_{ij} , $i=1,6$, $j=1,6$). In matrix notation:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \sigma_x \\ \sigma_y \\ \sigma_z \\ \sigma_{xy} \\ \sigma_{xz} \\ \sigma_{yz} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} & C_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ C_{21} & C_{22} & C_{23} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ C_{31} & C_{32} & C_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & C_{44} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & C_{55} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & C_{66} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \epsilon_x \\ \epsilon_y \\ \epsilon_z \\ \epsilon_{xy} \\ \epsilon_{xz} \\ \epsilon_{yz} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (25)$$

Using the assumption that all strains are small when compared to the strain in the w-direction yields

$$\sigma_z = C_{33} \epsilon_z \quad (26)$$

This gives the stiffness for a unit cube equal to C_{33} .
Therefore:

$$k_i = \frac{C_{33i} \text{Area}_i}{t_i} \quad (27)$$

where t_i is the thickness of layer i , Area_i is the area used to compute the mass of the nodal point, and C_{33i} is the orthotropic property of the quadrilateral that the node lies in.
Letting:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta'_{i,h+1} = & 2 \Delta_{i,n} + \Delta_{i,n-1} \\ & + \frac{\beta h^2}{M_i} \left[F_{I_{i,n}} + \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 2 \right) F_{I_{i,n}} + F_{I_{i,n-1}} \right] \\ & + \frac{\beta h^2}{M_i} \left[F_{E_{i,n+1}} + \left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 2 \right) F_{E_{i,n}} + F_{E_{i,n-1}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

and substituting equations (23) and (28) into (1) produces:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{i,n+1} = & \Delta'_{i,n+1} + \frac{\beta h^2}{M_i} \left[k_i \left(\Delta_{i+1,n+1} - \Delta_{i,n+1} \right) \right. \\ & - k_{i-1} \left(\Delta_{i,n+1} - \Delta_{i-1,n+1} \right) - k_i \left(\Delta_{i+1,n} - \Delta_{i,n} \right) \\ & \left. + k_{i-1} \left(\Delta_{i,n} - \Delta_{i-1,n} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the only unknowns are the deflections at time $n+1$. This produces $i=l+1$ (l is the number of layers) number of simultaneous equations which can be solved for.

Numerical Results and Conclusions

The modified computer program was applied to the dynamic plate problem for which BRL experimental data is available, and which was analyzed by the original computer program.

In the original analysis, before the modifications described here were incorporated, the maximum time step which could be used without numerical instability was 0.25 microseconds (μs). In the modified program time step as large as 10 μs was used. Figures 2 to 4 contain some typical results. Figure 2 shows the results for a time step of 2.5 μs and Figure 3 has similar results for 5 μs . Figure 4 contains the results for a variable time step calculation where 1 μs integration interval was used for time from 0 to 10 μs , followed by a time step of 5 μs from 10 μs to 60 μs , and finally 10 μs time step for time of 60 μs to 100 μs . The results show the plate center deflection as a function of time for the bottom and the top of the plate. These results are compared with the results from the HEMP solution and the experimental data which are only given for the bottom of the plate. The different time steps were used in order to compare the effect of these on the accuracy. It can be observed that the results for the time step of 2.5 μs , Figure 2, compare more closely with the experimental data than the results for 5 μs , Figure 3. The results for a variable time step, Figure 4, seem to give even more accurate results and compare quite well with the HEMP calculations and the experimental data. It may be mentioned that the results for large time steps introduce artificial errors due to large distortion of the pressure load and, therefore, the errors may not all be due to numerical integration. However, the main conclusion is that the method has been made quite stable and large integration steps can be used.

III. ORTHOTROPIC ELASTIC-PERFECTLY PLASTIC YIELD

Analysis

The orthotropic analysis follows the same idea as in the isotropic analysis, but it uses Hill's yield criterion and needs more input as far as yield stresses are concerned. These yield stresses are in the six orthotropic directions and are referred to as Y_{ij} ($i = 1, 3$ and $j = 1, 3$). Before seeing the yield criterion, the following constants are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Y}_{11} &= \frac{1}{Y_{11}^2} - \frac{1}{Y_{22}^2} - \frac{1}{Y_{33}^2} \\ \bar{Y}_{22} &= \frac{1}{Y_{22}^2} - \frac{1}{Y_{11}^2} - \frac{1}{Y_{33}^2} \\ \bar{Y}_{33} &= \frac{1}{Y_{33}^2} - \frac{1}{Y_{11}^2} - \frac{1}{Y_{22}^2}\end{aligned}\tag{30}$$

Then the yield criterion can be written as:

$$f(\sigma_{ij}) = \frac{\sigma_{11}^2}{Y_{11}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{22}^2}{Y_{22}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{33}^2}{Y_{33}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{12}^2}{Y_{12}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{13}^2}{Y_{13}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{23}^2}{Y_{23}^2} \quad (31)$$

$$+ \bar{Y}_{11}\sigma_{22}\sigma_{33} + \bar{Y}_{22}\sigma_{11}\sigma_{33} + \bar{Y}_{33}\sigma_{11}\sigma_{22} = 1$$

The total stress at t_{n+1} is:

$$\sigma_{ij_{n+1}}^T = \sigma_{ij_n} + d\sigma_{ij_{n+1}}^T \quad (32)$$

The strain increment is divided into elastic (ϵ^e) and plastic (ϵ^p) strain.

$$d\epsilon_{ij} = d\epsilon_{ij}^e + d\epsilon_{ij}^p \quad (33)$$

The flow rule is written in the following manner:

$$d\epsilon_{11}^p = d\lambda \left(\frac{\sigma_{11}}{Y_{11}^2} + \frac{\bar{Y}_{22}\sigma_{33} + \bar{Y}_{33}\sigma_{22}}{2} \right) = d\lambda T_{11} \quad (34)$$

$$d\epsilon_{22}^p = d\lambda \left(\frac{\sigma_{22}}{Y_{22}^2} + \frac{\bar{Y}_{11}\sigma_{33} + \bar{Y}_{33}\sigma_{11}}{2} \right) = d\lambda T_{22}$$

$$d\epsilon_{33}^p = d\lambda \left(\frac{\sigma_{33}}{Y_{33}^2} + \frac{\bar{Y}_{11}\sigma_{22} + \bar{Y}_{22}\sigma_{11}}{2} \right) = d\lambda T_{33}$$

$$d\epsilon_{12}^p = d\lambda \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\gamma_{12}^2} = d\lambda T_{12}$$

$$d\epsilon_{13}^p = d\lambda \frac{\sigma_{13}}{\gamma_{13}^2} = d\lambda T_{13}$$

$$d\epsilon_{23}^p = d\lambda \frac{\sigma_{23}}{\gamma_{23}^2} = d\lambda T_{23}$$

where T_{ij} is defined by Equation (34). This could be written as:

$$d\epsilon_{ij}^p = d\lambda T_{ij} \quad (35)$$

The orthotropic elastic relation used to evaluate the trail stress is:

$$d\sigma_{ij}^T = C_{ijkl} d\epsilon_{kl} \quad (36)$$

This is substituted into Equation (32) and that result is substituted into Equation (31). Similar to the previous analysis if $f(\sigma_{ij}^T) \leq 1$, then $\sigma_{ijn+1}^T = \sigma_{ijn+1}^T$, but if $f(\sigma_{ij}^T) > 1$ plastic flow has occurred.

Inserting Equation (33) into (36) and that result into (32) gives:

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}^T - C_{ijkl} T_{kl} d\lambda \quad (37)$$

Letting $\bar{T}_{ij} = C_{ijkl} T_{kl}$, Equation (37) becomes

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}^T - \bar{T}_{ij} d\lambda \quad (38)$$

Substituting Equation (38) into (31) gives:

$$d\lambda = \frac{C}{B + \sqrt{B^2 - AC}} \quad (39)$$

where:

$$A = \frac{\bar{T}_{11}^2}{Y_{11}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{22}^2}{Y_{22}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{33}^2}{Y_{33}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{12}^2}{Y_{12}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{13}^2}{Y_{13}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{23}^2}{Y_{23}^2} + \bar{Y}_{11} \bar{T}_{22} \bar{T}_{33} \quad (40)$$

$$+ \bar{Y}_{22} \bar{T}_{11} \bar{T}_{33} + \bar{Y}_{33} \bar{T}_{11} \bar{T}_{22}$$

$$B = \frac{\bar{T}_{11} \sigma_{11}^T}{Y_{11}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{22} \sigma_{22}^T}{Y_{22}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{33} \sigma_{33}^T}{Y_{33}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{13} \sigma_{13}^T}{Y_{13}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{12} \sigma_{12}^T}{Y_{12}^2} + \frac{\bar{T}_{23} \sigma_{23}^T}{Y_{23}^2}$$

$$+ \bar{Y}_{11} \left(\frac{\bar{T}_{22} \sigma_{33}^T + \bar{T}_{33} \sigma_{22}^T}{2} \right) + \bar{Y}_{22} \left(\frac{\bar{T}_{11} \sigma_{33}^T + \bar{T}_{33} \sigma_{11}^T}{2} \right)$$

$$+ \bar{Y}_{33} \left(\frac{\bar{T}_{11} \sigma_{22}^T + \bar{T}_{22} \sigma_{11}^T}{2} \right)$$

$$C = f(\sigma_{ij}^T) - 1$$

This $d\lambda$ is substituted into Equation (38) to give the total stress. In all cases this breaks down to the isotropic case when using appropriate yield stress. After programming, the same results were produced for an isotropic example as were produced in the isotropic elastic-plastic analysis.

IV. VISCO-PLASTIC MODEL

Analysis

In this analysis it is assumed that the strain is divided into elastic ($d\epsilon^e$) and visco-plastic ($d\epsilon^{vp}$) strain.

$$d\epsilon = d\epsilon^e + d\epsilon^{vp} \quad (41)$$

Using Hill's Flow Rules, Equation (35) is modified to be:

$$d\epsilon_{ij}^{vp} = d\lambda T_{ij} \quad (42)$$

It should be noted that the visco-plastic strain changes satisfy incompressibility condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 d\epsilon_{ii}^{vp} = 0 \quad (43)$$

The quantities T_{ij} represent six independent quantities and they can be arranged in a matrix form and then can be related to a stress matrix as follows:

$$\{T\} = [B] \{\sigma\} \quad (44)$$

where:

$$[B] = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{Y_{11}^2} & \frac{\bar{Y}_{33}}{2} & \frac{\bar{Y}_{22}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\bar{Y}_{33}}{2} & \frac{1}{Y_{22}^2} & \frac{\bar{Y}_{11}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\bar{Y}_{22}}{2} & \frac{\bar{Y}_{11}}{2} & \frac{1}{Y_{33}^2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{Y_{12}^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{Y_{13}^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{Y_{23}^2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (45)$$

By comparing the flow rule in equation (42) to an isotropic case it can be noted that the quantities T_{ij} have the same role as the deviatoric stresses and ϵ_{ij}^{vp} strains as the deviatoric strains. In fact, it may be noted that equation (42) reduces in the limit to the isotropic case. Consequently, following the procedure developed for isotropic Bingham material, the strain rate dependence is introduced by defining $\{T^F\}$

$$\{T^F\} = \{T\} + \eta \{\dot{\epsilon}^{vp}\} \quad (46)$$

where η represents viscous coefficient, and $\{T\}$ is the quantity which satisfies the yield criterion.

By using Equation (44) we define:

$$\{\sigma^F\} = [B]^{-1} \{T^F\} \quad (47)$$

If no plastic yield has occurred the viscoplastic strain increment is zero. So we begin this analysis with a trial incremental stress where:

$$\{d\sigma^T\} = [C] \{d\epsilon\} \quad (48)$$

and $[C]$ is the orthotropic relationship between stress and strain. Equation (48) is inserted into Equation (32) and this is inserted into the yield criterion in Equation (31). If yield does not occur, the trial stress is equal to σ^F . However, if yield does occur then Equations (46) and (47) must be used to calculate σ^F as follows: From Equation (41) and (48):

$$\{d\sigma^F\} = [C] \{d\epsilon\} - [C] \{d\epsilon^{vp}\} \quad (49)$$

Then as in Equation (32):

$$\{\sigma^F\} = \{\sigma^T\} - [C] \{d\epsilon^{vp}\} \quad (50)$$

Multiplying Equation (46) by $[B]^{-1}$ and using Equation (47) in (46) one gets:

$$\{\sigma^F\} = \{\sigma\} + \eta [B]^{-1} \{\dot{\epsilon}^{vp}\} \quad (51)$$

From Equation (50) and (51), when solving for $\{\sigma\}$ one finds:

$$\{\sigma\} = \{\sigma^T\} - [C] \{d\epsilon^{vp}\} - \eta [B]^{-1} \{\dot{\epsilon}^{vp}\} \quad (52)$$

By using Equation (42) it is easily shown that:

$$\{\dot{\epsilon}^{vp}\} = \left\{ \frac{d\epsilon^{vp}}{dt} \right\} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \{d\epsilon^{vp}\} = \frac{d\lambda}{\Delta t} \{T\} \quad (53)$$

Substituting (42) and (53) into (52) produces:

$$\{\sigma\} = \{\sigma^T\} - d\lambda[C]\{T\} - \frac{\eta d\lambda}{\Delta t} [B]^{-1} \{T\} \quad (54)$$

Defining another variable $\{\bar{T}\}$:

$$\{\bar{T}\} = [C] \{T\} \quad (55)$$

We use the inverse of Equation (44) and Equation (55) in (54) which produces:

$$\{\sigma\} = \{\sigma^T\} - d\lambda \left(\{\bar{T}\} + \frac{\eta}{\Delta t} \{\sigma^T\} \right) \quad (56)$$

The question in a dynamic problem always arises as to what value of stress is used for the flow rule. In this formulation the stress used in the flow rule is approximated by the trail stress. A closer approximation can be formed by doing an iterative loop on this equation, but little difference is found in the solution when this is done.

The $\{\sigma\}$ stress formed here in Equation (56) is substituted into the yield condition and $d\lambda$ is solved for.

This gives the relation:

$$Ad\lambda^2 - 2Bd\lambda + C = 0 \quad (57)$$

where letting:

$$T_{ij}^* = \bar{T}_{ij}^T + \frac{\eta}{\Delta t} \sigma^T \quad (58)$$

$$A = \frac{T_{11}^{*2}}{Y_{11}^2} + \frac{T_{22}^{*2}}{Y_{22}^2} + \frac{T_{33}^{*2}}{Y_{33}^2} + \frac{T_{12}^{*2}}{Y_{12}^2} + \frac{T_{13}^{*2}}{Y_{13}^2} + \frac{T_{23}^{*2}}{Y_{23}^2} \quad (59)$$

$$+ \bar{Y}_{22} T_{11}^* T_{33}^* + \bar{Y}_{11} T_{22}^* T_{33}^* + \bar{Y}_{33} T_{11}^* T_{22}^*$$

$$\begin{aligned}
B = & \frac{T_{11}^* \sigma_{11}^T}{Y_{11}^2} + \frac{T_{22}^* \sigma_{22}^T}{Y_{22}^2} + \frac{T_{33}^* \sigma_{33}^T}{Y_{33}^2} + \frac{T_{12}^* \sigma_{12}^T}{Y_{12}^2} + \frac{T_{13}^* \sigma_{13}^T}{Y_{13}^2} + \frac{T_{23}^* \sigma_{23}^T}{Y_{23}^2} \\
& + \bar{Y}_{11} \left(\frac{T_{22}^* \sigma_{33}^T + T_{33}^* \sigma_{22}^T}{2} \right) + \bar{Y}_{22} \left(\frac{T_{11}^* \sigma_{33}^T + T_{33}^* \sigma_{11}^T}{2} \right) \\
& + \bar{Y}_{33} \left(\frac{T_{22}^* \sigma_{11}^T + T_{11}^* \sigma_{22}^T}{2} \right) \quad (60)
\end{aligned}$$

$$C = f(\sigma_{ij}^T) - 1 \quad (61)$$

where $f = 1$ is the yield function.
Therefore, from Equation (57)

$$d\lambda = \frac{2B \pm \sqrt{(2B)^2 - 4AC}}{2A} \quad (62)$$

Since $d\lambda \rightarrow 0$ as $C \rightarrow 0$ the minus sign must be used. Multiplying top and bottom by $B + \sqrt{B^2 - AC}$ produces:

$$d\lambda = \frac{C}{B + \sqrt{B^2 - AC}} \quad (63)$$

This value of $d\lambda$ is then substituted into Equation (56). By using Equations (51), (42), and (44)

$$\{\sigma^F\} = \left(1 + \frac{\eta d\lambda}{\Delta t} \right) \{\sigma\} \quad (64)$$

Equation (64) is used in the modified computer program to calculate the actual stress state in finite-elements.

Numerical Example

The example used to check out the changes in the program was a three layer laminated plate⁴. The top and bottom layer was 1020 steel, 1.27 cm and 1.27 cm thick, respectively. The middle layer was 2040 aluminum .635 cm thick. Values for the viscosity for each material were estimated to be:

298.86 pascal-sec

18.73 pascal-sec

The results for this example are given in Table 1. Table 1 compares with the vertical displacement at the center of the plate of both for the original elastic-plastic and the new elastic-viscoplastic models. It can be seen that for short periods of time the viscous effects are small, but for later times the effect is more pronounced. As expected, the effect of viscosity is to stiffen the plate.

The effect of the viscous material properties do not appreciably alter the dynamic response of steel and aluminum materials. However, this conclusion may not be true for other materials, such as for example, composites, which may exhibit larger viscosity.

V. CONCLUSIONS

By certain modifications to the TIP computer program it has been possible to increase the incremental time step used in the finite difference time integration. However, even with these modifications, the stresses still oscillate in the thickness direction. It is quite feasible that if the oscillations of the stress can be reduced, further increase in time interval will be possible with an appropriate increase in numerical stability.

The inclusion in the analysis and the computer program of the orthotropic yield criterion and the visco-plastic material response has been successfully accomplished. The viscous effects, however, have been found to be small in the case of one numerical example which uses aluminum and steel materials.

⁴Majerus, J.N., and Knapp, R.R., "Dynamic Behavior of Multi-Layered Plate Due to an Intense Impulsive Load," Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Mechanical Behavior of Materials, Boston, Mass., August, 1976.




Figure 1. Model representing the predicted stiffness in the thickness direction




Figure 2. Numerical results for time increment of 2.5 μ s




Figure 3. Numerical results for time increment of 5.0 μ s




Figure 4. Numerical results for variable time increments of 1.0, 5.0 and 10.0 μ s

TABLE 1

Comparison of Results from the Elastic-Plastic
and Elastic-Visco-Plastic Models Using Variable
Time Steps (see Figure 4)

<u>Time</u>	<u>Vertical Plate Displacement (cm) for Elastic-Plastic Model</u>	<u>Vertical Plate Displacement (cm) for Elastic-Visco- Plastic Model</u>
10	-.285747	-.3158007
20	-.666216	-.6348882
30	-.9870059	-.898324
40	-1.277305	-1.1402441
50	-1.5436494	-1.3339216
65	-1.9010985	-1.5438323
75	-2.1077580	-1.6701541
85	-2.2934676	-1.8299201
95	-2.4730964	-1.9608596
105	-2.6440384	-1.9884898

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
12	Commander Defense Documentation Center ATTN: DDC-DDA Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	1	Commander US Army Aviation Research and Development Command ATTN: DRS-AV-E 12th and Spruce Streets St. Louis, MO 63166
4	Director Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency ATTN: Tech Info Dr. E. Blase Mr. T. Bament Dr. G. Sigman 1400 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209	1	Director US Army Air Mobility Research and Development Laboratory Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035
1	Deputy Under Secretary of Defense Tactical Warfare Programs ATTN: Mr. R. Moore The Pentagon, Room 3E1044 Washington, DC 20310	1	Commander US Army Electronics Research and Development Command Technical Support Activity ATTN: DELSD-L Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
1	Deputy Under Secretary of Defense Rsch and Advanced Technology ATTN: Mr. R. Thorkildsen The Pentagon, Room 3D1089 Washington, DC 20310	1	Commander US Army Communications Rsch and Development Command ATTN: DRDCO-PPA-SA Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
1	Director Defense Nuclear Agency ATTN: MAJ Spangler Arlington, VA 22209	2	Commander US Army Missile Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDMI-R DRDMI-RBL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809
1	Commander US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command ATTN: DRCDMD-ST, N. Klein 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	1	Commander US Army Missile Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDMI-YDL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809
		1	Commander US Army Tank Automotive Research & Development Cmd ATTN: DRDTA-UL Warren, MI 48090

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
2	Commander US Army Armament Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAR-TSS Dover, NJ 07801	1	Assistant Secretary of the Army (R&D) ATTN: Asst for Research Washington, DC 20310
3	Commander US Army Armament Research and Development Command ATTN: Mr. E. Barrieres Dr. J. T. Frasier Dr. E. Bloore Dover, NJ 07801	1	Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (R&D) Department of the ARMy Washington, DC 20310
1	Commander US Army Armament Materiel and Readiness Command ATTN: DRSAR-LEP-L, Tech Lib Rock Island, IL 61299	1	HQDA (DAMA-ARP) Washington, DC 20310
2	Project Manager Division Air Defense Gun ATTN: DRCPM-ADG, Mr. R. Smith Mr. S. Spaulding Dover, NJ 07801	1	HQDA (DAMA-MS) Washington, DC 20310
6	Commander US Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center ATTN: DRXMR-T, Mr. J. Bluhm Dr. D. Roulance Dr. A.F. Wilde Dr. J. Mescall DRXMR-ATL Dr. F. Larson Watertown, MA 02172	1	Commander US Army Research Office ATTN: Dr. E. Saibel P. O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park NC 27709
1	Director US Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: ATAA-SL, Tech Lib White Sands Missile Range NM 88002	1	Commander US Army Advanced BMD Technology Center ATTN: BMDATC-M, Mr. P. Boyd P.O. Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807
		1	Office of Naval Research ATTN: Code ONR 439, N. Perrone Department of the Navy 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217
		2	Chief of Naval Research Department of the Navy ATTN: Code 427 Code 470 Washington, DC 20325

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
3	Commander Naval Air Systems Command ATTN: AIR-604 Washington, DC 20360	3	Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: Code TX, Dr. W. G. Soper Code G-35 W. Elliott W. H. Wishard Dahlgren, VA 22448
2	Commander Naval Air Systems Command ATTN: Code AIR-310 Code AIR-350 Washington, DC 20360	2	Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center Silver Spring, MD 20910
3	Commander Naval Ordnance Systems Command ATTN: ORD-9132 Washington, DC 20360	1	Commander Naval Weapons Center ATTN: Code 45, Tech Lib China Lake, CA 93555
1	Commander Naval Ordnance Systems Command ATTN: Code ORD-0332 Washington, DC 20360	4	Commander Naval Weapons Center ATTN: Code 4057 Code 4011, Dr. E. Lundstrom Code 3813, Mr. M. Backman Code 3835, R.G.S. Sewell China Lake, CA 93555
2	Commander Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville Warminster, PA 18974	2	Commander Naval Research Laboratory ATTN: Mr. W. J. Ferguson Dr. F. Rosenthal Washington, DC 20375
1	Commander Naval Missile Center Point Mugu, CA 93041	1	Superintendent Naval Postgraduate School ATTN: Dir of Lib Monterey, CA 93940
1	Commander & Director David W. Taylor Naval Ship Research & Development Ctr Bethesda, MD 20084	1	USAF (AFRDDA) Washington, DC 20330
1	Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: Tech Lib, DX-21 Dahlgren, VA 22448	1	AFSC (SDW) Andrews AFB Washington, DC 20331
		1	US Air Force Academy ATTN: Code FJS-RL (NC) Tech Lib Colorado Springs, CO 80940

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	ADTC/DLJW (LTC J. Osborn) Eglin AFB, FL 32542	4	Director Lawrence Livermore Laboratory ATTN: Mr. M. Wilkins Dr. C. Godfrey Dr. G. Goudreau Dr. R. Werne P. O. Box 808 Livermore, CA 94550
1	AFWL (SUL) Kirtland AFB, NM 87116		
1	AFAL (AVW) Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1	Aeronautical Research Associates of Princeton, Inc. 50 Washington Road Princeton, NJ 08540
1	AFFDL (FDT Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433		
1	AFLC (MMWMC) Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1	AVCO Systems Division ATTN: Dr. W. Reinecke 201 Lowell Street Wilmington, MA 01887
1	AFML/LLN (Dr. T. Nicholas) Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433		
2	ASD (XROT, Gerald Bennett; ENFTV, Martin Lentz) Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1	Battelle Columbus Labs ATTN: Mr. J. Backofen 505 King Avenue Columbus, OH 43201
1	Headquarters National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546	1	Computer Code Consultants ATTN: Mr. W. Johnson 1680 Camino Redondo Los Alamos, NM 87544
1	Director National Aeronautics and Space Administration Langley Research Center Langley Station Hampton, VA 23365	1	General Electric Company Reentry and Environmental Sys Document Distribution Center ATTN: D. Coceano P. O. Box 7722 Philadelphia, PA 19101
1	Director National Aeronautics and Space Administration Manned Spacecraft Center ATTN: Lib Houston, TX 77058	1	President General Research Corporation ATTN: Lib McLean, VA 22101
1	Director Jet Propulsion Laboratory ATTN: LIB (TD) 4800 Oak Grove Drive Pasadena, CA 91103	1	Pacific Technical Corporation ATTN: Dr. F. K. Feldmann 460 Ward Drive Santa Barbara, CA 93105

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Sandia Laboratories ATTN: Dr. L. Bertholf Albuquerque, NM 87115	1	University of Dayton University of Dayton Research Institute ATTN: Mr. H. F. Swift Dayton, OH 45405
1	Science Applications, Inc. ATTN: G. Burghart 201 W. Dyer Road (Unit B) Santa Ana, CA 92707	1	University of Denver Denver Research Institute ATTN: MR. R. F. Recht 2390 S. University Boulevard Denver, CO 80210
1	Shock Hydrodynamics ATTN: Dr. L. Zernow 4710 Vineland Avenue North Hollywood, CA 91602	1	University of Illinois Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering Department Prof. A. R. Zak Urbana, IL 61801
1	Systems, Science & Software ATTN: Dr. R. Sedgwick P. O. Box 1620 La Jolla, CA 92037		<u>Aberdeen Proving Ground</u>
1	Drexel Institute of Technology Wave Propagation Rsch Center ATTN: Prof. P. Chou 32nd & Chestnut Streets Philadelphia, PA 19104		Dir, USAMSAA ATTN: Dr. J. Sperrazza DRXSY-MP, H. Cohen Cdr, USATECOM ATTN: DRSTE-SG-H
4	Southwest Research Institute Dept of Mechanical Sciences ATTN: Dr. U. Lindholm Dr. W. Baker Dr. P. H. Francis A. Wenzel 8500 Culebra Road San Antonio, TX 78228		Dir, Wpns Sys Concepts Team, Bldg. E3516, EA ATTN: DRDAR-ACW
1	University of California Los Alamos Scientific Lab ATTN: Dr. R. Karpp P. O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, NM 87545		
2	University of California Los Alamos Scientific Lab ATTN: Dr. J. M. Walsh Tech Lib P. O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, NM 87545		