

NO-A098 533

ARMY AEROMEDICAL RESEARCH LAB FORT RUCKER AL F/G 5/5
VIBRATION IN A HELMET MOUNTED SIGHT (HMS) USING MECHANICAL LINK--ETC(U)
MAR 81 J C JOHNSON, D B PRISER, R W VERONA


UNCLASSIFIED

USAARL-81-3

ML

156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667

END
DATE
FILMED
6-81
DTIC



LEVEL

Sc
(13)

USAARL REPORT NO. 81-3



VIBRATION IN A HELMET MOUNTED SIGHT (HMS) USING MECHANICAL LINKAGE

AD A098533

DTIC FILE COPY

By
John C. Johnson
David B. Priser
Robert W. Verona

DTIC
MAY 5 1981
C

BIODYNAMICS RESEARCH DIVISION

March 1981

U.S. ARMY AEROMEDICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY
FORT RUCKER, ALABAMA 36362

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release:
Distribution Unlimited

USAARL

NOTICE

Qualified Requesters

Qualified requesters may obtain copies from the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC), Cameron Station, Alexandria, Virginia. Orders will be expedited if placed through the librarian or other person designated to request documents from DTIC.

Change of Address

Organizations receiving reports from the US Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory on automatic mailing lists should confirm correct address when corresponding about laboratory reports.

Disposition


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

Disclaimer


The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation. Citation of trade names in this report does not constitute an official Department of the Army endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial items.

Reviewed:


JERRY I. BAUGHER, MAJ, MSC
Director, Biodynamics Research
Division


ROGER W. WILEY, LTC, MSC
Chairman, Scientific Review
Committee

Released for Publication:


STANLEY C. KNAPP
Colonel, MC
Commanding

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER USAARL Report No. 81-3	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD A098 533	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Vibration in a Helmet Mounted Sight (HMS) Using Mechanical Linkage.		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report
7. AUTHOR(s) J. C. Johnson, D. B. Priser, and R. W. Verona		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS SGRD-UAD-IV U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory Fort Rucker, Alabama 36362		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Medical R&D Command Fort Detrick Frederick, Maryland 21701		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 6.27.77.A 3E162777A878 AD 132
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE March 1981
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 30
		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) vibration AH-1 (Cobra) helmet mounted sight flight helmets rotary wing (helicopter) spectral analysis Fourier analysis vision		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) See back of form.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

20. ABSTRACT

The purpose of this experiment was to determine the extent to which aircraft vibration was coupled to a crewman's flight helmet by the mechanical linkage of a helmet mounted sight (Fire Control Subsystem, Helmet Directed, XM128). Two variations of the SPH-4 flight helmet were tested: 1. SPH-4 with standard web suspension, 2. SPH-4 with a form-fit foam liner suspension. The system was tested in the front seat of an AH-1S "Cobra" helicopter. Five (5) flight conditions were used in the experiment: 1. hover, 2. 40kn, 3. 80kn, 4. 120kn, 5. standard left turn. Two conditions of the helmet mounted control linkage were tested: 1. connected, 2. disconnected. A triaxial accelerometer was mounted on top of the flight helmet to measure vibration. The data were analyzed using a fast Fourier transform analyzer and a desk-top computer. The following observations were made: 1. Both helmets vibrate more with the sight attached. 2. The response to the sight coupled vibration of the standard SPH-4 differed from that of the form-fit SPH-4. 3. The form-fit SPH-4 helmet vibrated more in a narrow band centered at about 30Hz. 4. The standard SPH-4 helmet vibrated more over a wide band of frequencies above 30Hz. Based on a review of published literature with respect to known or probable physiological problems related to the effects of vibration, we concluded that the significant increase in vibration of the helmet caused by the mechanical sight linkage may be expected to degrade pilot/gunner visual performance and hearing acuity, and increase fatigue rate to some extent. Insufficient data is currently available to predict the magnitude of performance degradation which could result from increases in helmet vibration.

Accession For	
NTIS GFA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
A. B. C. D. E. F. G. H. I. J. K. L. M. N. O. P. Q. R. S. T. U. V. W. X. Y. Z. AA. AB. AC. AD. AE. AF. AG. AH. AI. AJ. AK. AL. AM. AN. AO. AP. AQ. AR. AS. AT. AU. AV. AW. AX. AY. AZ. BA. BB. BC. BD. BE. BF. BG. BH. BI. BJ. BK. BL. BM. BN. BO. BP. BQ. BR. BS. BT. BU. BV. BW. BX. BY. BZ. CA. CB. CC. CD. CE. CF. CG. CH. CI. CJ. CK. CL. CM. CN. CO. CP. CQ. CR. CS. CT. CU. CV. CW. CX. CY. CZ. DA. DB. DC. DD. DE. DF. DG. DH. DI. DJ. DK. DL. DM. DN. DO. DP. DQ. DR. DS. DT. DU. DV. DW. DX. DY. DZ. EA. EB. EC. ED. EE. EF. EG. EH. EI. EJ. EK. EL. EM. EN. EO. EP. EQ. ER. ES. ET. EU. EV. EW. EX. EY. EZ. FA. FB. FC. FD. FE. FF. FG. FH. FI. FJ. FK. FL. FM. FN. FO. FP. FQ. FR. FS. FT. FU. FV. FW. FX. FY. FZ. GA. GB. GC. GD. GE. GF. GH. GI. GJ. GK. GL. GM. GN. GO. GP. GQ. GR. GS. GT. GU. GV. GW. GX. GY. GZ. HA. HB. HC. HD. HE. HF. HG. HH. HI. HJ. HK. HL. HM. HN. HO. HP. HQ. HR. HS. HT. HU. HV. HW. HX. HY. HZ. IA. IB. IC. ID. IE. IF. IG. IH. II. IJ. IK. IL. IM. IN. IO. IP. IQ. IR. IS. IT. IU. IV. IW. IX. IY. IZ. JA. JB. JC. JD. JE. JF. JG. JH. JI. JJ. JK. JL. JM. JN. JO. JP. JQ. JR. JS. JT. JU. JV. JW. JX. JY. JZ. KA. KB. KC. KD. KE. KF. KG. KH. KI. KJ. KK. KL. KM. KN. KO. KP. KQ. KR. KS. KT. KU. KV. KW. KX. KY. KZ. LA. LB. LC. LD. LE. LF. LG. LH. LI. LJ. LK. LL. LM. LN. LO. LP. LQ. LR. LS. LT. LU. LV. LW. LX. LY. LZ. MA. MB. MC. MD. ME. MF. MG. MH. MI. MJ. MK. ML. MM. MN. MO. MP. MQ. MR. MS. MT. MU. MV. MW. MX. MY. MZ. NA. NB. NC. ND. NE. NF. NG. NH. NI. NJ. NK. NL. NM. NO. NP. NQ. NR. NS. NT. NU. NV. NW. NX. NY. NZ. OA. OB. OC. OD. OE. OF. OG. OH. OI. OJ. OK. OL. OM. ON. OO. OP. OQ. OR. OS. OT. OU. OV. OW. OX. OY. OZ. PA. PB. PC. PD. PE. PF. PG. PH. PI. PJ. PK. PL. PM. PN. PO. PP. PQ. PR. PS. PT. PU. PV. PW. PX. PY. PZ. QA. QB. QC. QD. QE. QF. QG. QH. QI. QJ. QK. QL. QM. QN. QO. QP. QQ. QR. QS. QT. QU. QV. QW. QX. QY. QZ. RA. RB. RC. RD. RE. RF. RG. RH. RI. RJ. RK. RL. RM. RN. RO. RP. RQ. RR. RS. RT. RU. RV. RW. RX. RY. RZ. SA. SB. SC. SD. SE. SF. SG. SH. SI. SJ. SK. SL. SM. SN. SO. SP. SQ. SR. SS. ST. SU. SV. SW. SX. SY. SZ. TA. TB. TC. TD. TE. TF. TG. TH. TI. TJ. TK. TL. TM. TN. TO. TP. TQ. TR. TS. TT. TU. TV. TW. TX. TY. TZ. UA. UB. UC. UD. UE. UF. UG. UH. UI. UJ. UK. UL. UM. UN. UO. UP. UQ. UR. US. UT. UU. UV. UW. UX. UY. UZ. VA. VB. VC. VD. VE. VF. VG. VH. VI. VJ. VK. VL. VM. VN. VO. VP. VQ. VR. VS. VT. VU. VW. VX. VY. VZ. WA. WB. WC. WD. WE. WF. WG. WH. WI. WJ. WK. WL. WM. WN. WO. WP. WQ. WR. WS. WT. WU. WV. WW. WX. WY. WZ. XA. XB. XC. XD. XE. XF. XG. XH. XI. XJ. XK. XL. XM. XN. XO. XP. XQ. XR. XS. XT. XU. XV. XW. XX. XY. XZ. YA. YB. YC. YD. YE. YF. YG. YH. YI. YJ. YK. YL. YM. YN. YO. YP. YQ. YR. YS. YT. YU. YV. YW. YX. YY. YZ. ZA. ZB. ZC. ZD. ZE. ZF. ZG. ZH. ZI. ZJ. ZK. ZL. ZM. ZN. ZO. ZP. ZQ. ZR. ZS. ZT. ZU. ZV. ZW. ZX. ZY. ZZ.	
Dist	Special
A	

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

PREFACE

The specialized talents and dedicated efforts of many technicians and administrative personnel went to complete this study. The authors appreciate their efforts.

Appendixes A through D, the detailed data analyses procedures and the graphic presentations of the vibration spectra, were printed under separate cover. Titles of the four appendixes are:

Appendix A. Table of Identification Numbers and File Number
for Vibration Data Processed onto 5 1/2" Diskettes
and Digital Cassette Tape

Appendix B. Data Analysis and Control Software

Appendix C. Helmet Acceleration Spectra

Appendix D. Difference in Helmet Acceleration Spectra

These appendixes are available upon request from:

Commander
U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory
ATTN: Scientific Information Center
P.O. Box 577
Ft. Rucker, AL 36362

Human subjects participated in these studies after giving their free and informed volunteer consent. Investigators adhered to AR 725 and USAAMRLC Reg 70-25 on Use of Volunteers in Research.

CPT J. C. Johnson is presently assigned to Letterman Army Institute of Research, Presidio of San Francisco, CA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
List of Illustrations	4
List of Tables	4
Introduction	5
Materials	7
Methods	11
Results	13
Discussion	16
Conclusions	20
References	21
Appendix	23

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>FIGURE</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1. A Visually Coupled System (VCS).	5
2. Mechanical Linkage	6
3. The Data Collection System.	7
4. Exterior of the SPH-4 Helmet.	8
5. Mounting Detail of Accelerometers.	9
6. Orientation of Measurement Axes for Helmet Accelerometer. .	11
7. Data Analysys System.	12
8. Sample Helmet Acceleration Spectra	15
9. Sample Standard Helmet Difference Spectra	17
10. Sample Form-fit Helmet Difference Spectra	17

LIST OF TABLES

1. Parameter Setting for Nicolet 660 TM Spectrum Analyzer.	10
2. Helmet Vibration Levels (Root Mean Square Average, m/s ²) for Each Condition Evaluated.	14

INTRODUCTION

This report was written to document our findings, that a mechanical helmet mounted sight (HMS) linkage significantly increased helmet vibration during flight in an AH-1S Cobra. The report was specifically requested by Commander, Frankfort Arsenal (DA, SARFA-FCW-W, 11549Z Aug 76, TWX), and is a complete analysis of the data provided to them in a preliminary report (TRADOC, ATMAS-CBT Jul 76).

A visually coupled system (VCS) is a closed loop control technique by which a mechanical system (e.g. gun, missile, rocket launcher) tracks a target by following the visual tracking movements of the operator (Verona, Johnson, Jones, 1979). See Figure 1. Such a system, the "Fire Control Subsystem, Helmet Directed, XM128" (DA TM, 1975), is used in the S Model AH-1 Cobra attack helicopter.




FIGURE 1. A visually coupled system (VCS).

Two methods are available for providing head tracking information to the fire control computer: contact or non-contact. In a contact system a mechanical linkage connects the helmet to the airframe (reference) and detects relative position of the helmet by measuring perturbations of the mechanical linkage, Figure 2. In the non-contact system, helmet position is measured by electro-optical, electromagnetic or other transducers which sense perturbation in a well defined reference field within the aircraft. The non-contact sensing systems have the advantage of not physically coupling the head of the operator to the airframe. The mechanical systems are less complex and less expensive. The cost and technical complexity of non-contact systems are known. The physiological effects of connecting the head to the airframe by a mechanical system are unknown. The purpose of this paper is to provide information on the possible physiological hazards and performance decrements which may be induced in the HMS user by aircraft vibration transmitted through a mechanical

sight linkage. By providing this data, we aid the designer of helmet mounted sight systems by giving him an idea of the physiological cost of using a mechanically linked system. He may then balance the physiological cost of a system against the expense of a non-contact system. Consideration of this information along with other factors will enable him to select the most efficient and effective system.




FIGURE 2. Mechanical linkage.

The purpose of this experiment was to determine the extent to which aircraft vibration was coupled to the helmet by the mechanical linkage of the Fire Control Subsystem, Helmet Directed, XM128. We addressed two specific questions:

- a. Does the mechanical sight linkage increase vibration at the head of the operator?
- b. Is there a difference in helmet vibration level between sling suspension (SPH-4) and form-fit helmet?

We answered these questions by recording vibration of each helmet, during flight in an AH-1S aircraft under a variety of flight conditions, with HMS connected and disconnected. The resulting data were converted to spectra and total root mean square average accelerations were calculated. Values of acceleration for the connected and disconnected sight conditions were then compared. Results showed that the vibration at the helmet was always greater with the sight linkage connected.

MATERIALS

In the AH-1S, a mechanical system (DA 1975) is used to acquire head tracking information from the gunner. The system (Figure 2) consists of a helmet sight assembly which is fastened to the SPH-4 flight helmet, and a linkage assembly which connects the helmet to the aircraft and allows for head movement. Head sighting angle is measured by resolvers at the articulation points of the linkage assembly.

The data collection system is shown in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. The data collection system.

The SPH-4 helmet used in the study is shown on the head of the volunteer in Figure 4. The black block at the apex of the helmet (A) is the attachment point for the linkage assembly of the system. The white block (B) is a 1/2" cube of aluminum to which three Endeeco™ Model 226C accelerometers are attached. The mounting plate (C) of the helmet sight assembly and the sight reticle (D) are also shown. Low noise coaxial cables connect the accelerometers to the charge amplifiers (not shown).

* All registered Trade Marks are defined in the Appendix.



FIGURE 4. Exterior of the SPH-4 Helmet.

- A. Linkage attachment point
- B. Accelerometer block
- C. Sight mounting plate
- D. Sight reticle

The EndevcoTM Model 2226C piezoelectric accelerometers were chosen for their small size and low mass. The frequency response of the accelerometers was $\pm 5\%$ (1 dB) from 3 Hz to 6 KHz. The total weight of the test fixture (3 accelerometers plus the aluminum block) was 47.1 g. Mounting detail is shown in Figure 5. Accelerometers were affixed to the aluminum block and the block to the sight connector using cyano acrylate cement. The model 5001 KIAG-SWISSTM charge amplifier used to condition the output of each accelerometer has a frequency response of .16 Hz to 100 KHz ± 3 dB. The Hewlett-PackardTM Model 3960 tape recorder with which we recorded our data has a passband of DC 1250 Hz ± 3 dB at the selected tape speed of 3 3/4 ips. Thus the overall frequency response of the system was 3 Hz to 1250 Hz limited by the accelerometer at the low end of the spectrum and by the tape recorder at the upper end.




FIGURE 5. Mounting detail of accelerometers.

The data analysis system is shown in Figure 7, p. 12.

The parameter list for the Nicolet 660TM spectrum analyzer is shown in Table 1, p. 10.

Spectral data was stored by the 160CTM data recorder on 5 1/2" standard diskettes. File identification numbers for the spectral data stored on diskettes are listed in Appendix A (available upon request). The recorded spectral data were further reduced using a Hewlett-Packard 9824STM computer. Software to perform the analysis and to control the 160CTM on the IEEE-488* bus is documented in Appendix B (available upon request). The program for extracting data from the 160CTM was written by Nicolet Scientific Corp. The programs for performing analysis functions were written by the authors.

* IEEE-488 bus is an interface system defined by IEEE Standard Digital Interface for Programmable Instrumentation, 1978, New York: Institute for Electrical and Electronic Engineers.

TABLE 1
PARAMETER SETTING FOR NICOLET 660™ SPECTRUM ANALYZER

PARAMETER	SETTING
MODE	1K CH A-B FFT
FUNCTION	RMS SPECTRUM
AVERAGE	SUM (N = 128)
CHANNEL A INPUT	1.0 VOLTS
	AC COUPLED (-3 dB @ 0.5 Hz)
	NORMAL MODE
CHANNEL B INPUT	1.0 VOLTS
	AC COUPLED (-3 dB @ 0.5 Hz)
	NORMAL MODE
CAPTURE CONTROL	CONTINUOUS (HANNING WINDOW)
FREQUENCY RANGE	2000 Hz (.2 SEC WINDOW)

METHODS

DATA COLLECTION

Triaxial linear accelerations were measured at the apex of the gunner's helmet. Orientation of the measurement axis is shown in Figure 6.




FIGURE 6. Orientation of measurement axes for helmet accelerometer.

Two helmet configurations were evaluated, standard sling suspension SPH-4 aviator helmet and a modified SPH-4 helmet with a form-fit polyurethane foam liner. A volunteer subject was seated in the front (gunner) seat of an AH-1S aircraft. For the first flight the subject was fitted with an SPH-4 medium sized flight helmet modified by addition of a form-fitted, leather-covered, polyurethane foam liner in place of the standard sling suspension. The volunteer started the recording of vibration data and made verbal annotations of flight conditions during the recording. Approximately 120 seconds of data were collected in each of five flight conditions: Hover (50 ft), 40 kn, 80 kn, 120 kn and standard left turn. During the first half of the 120 second data block the gunner linkage assembly was connected to the helmet. During the last half of the data record the assembly was disconnected from the helmet. For the second flight the volunteer replaced the form-fit SPH-4 with a standard SPH-4

flight helmet having a sling suspension. The data collection sequence was repeated with this second helmet.

DATA ANALYSIS

Analog acceleration data from the inflight recording were transformed using Fourier analysis. The analysis system is shown in Figure 7. This analysis yielded a function of frequency and amplitude for each block of data. From this transformed data we obtained information on the dynamic behavior of each helmet system.




FIGURE 7. Data analysis system.

Since the Nicolet 660TM used to perform the fast Fourier transform had two analysis channels, acceleration channels Z and X were analyzed first followed by channels Z and Y. We used redundancy of the Z acceleration data as a check on the reproducibility of the data between analyses.

The analysis bandwidth selected was 0.5 to 2000 Hz. This bandwidth was chosen in order to have sufficient resolution (5.0 Hz) and sufficient range to measure vibration in the lower audio range. The length of the data window at this bandwidth is 0.2 seconds. Since the amount of clean data on each flight condition and helmet-sight condition was about 30 seconds, 128 samples (windows) were transformed and the Fourier coefficients arithmetically averaged. Thus, approximately 26 seconds of raw data were analyzed

to produce each Fourier transform. The Fourier coefficients which make up the transformed data were scaled by the Nicolet 660TM to compensate for the hanning window used to truncate the analog data and to compensate for the effective noise bandwidth of the analysis. The ordinate of the spectra presented in this report represents root-mean-square (RMS) average acceleration in units of m/s^2 . After processing, the raw Fourier coefficients and the compensation data were stored on 5½ inch floppy disketts using a Nicolet 160CTM data recorder.

Difference functions were calculated from the stored data for each of the flight conditions. Difference functions, $A[F]$, are result of point by point subtraction of the disconnected sight spectrum from the connected sight spectrum.

$$A[F] = A_c[F] - A_d[F] \quad (1)$$

$A_c[F]$ is the magnitude of vibration acceleration as a function of frequency with the sight connected to the helmet.

$A_d[F]$ is the magnitude of vibration acceleration as a function of frequency with the sight disconnected.

RESULTS

A total root mean square (RMS) helmet acceleration for each condition is presented in Table 2, p.14. The resultant RMS acceleration is the vector magnitude of the RMS acceleration for each of the three (X, Y, Z) orthogonal linear accelerometer axes. It is expressed quantitatively as A_T in equation 2.

$$A_T = (A_x^2 + A_y^2 + A_z^2)^{1/2} \quad (2)$$

where A_x is the RMS average (over time) of the vibration acceleration in the X axis; A_y , for the Y axis; and A_z , for the Z axis.

Typical example vibration spectra for the form-fit and standard SPH-4 helmet are shown in Figure 8. Also shown in Figure 8 are the vibration spectra for connected versus disconnected condition of the helmet sight.

The X, Y, and Z axes exhibited similar trends in response to the helmet-sight variables. A complete set of vibration spectra is presented as Appendix C (available upon request).

TABLE 2
HELMET VIBRATION LEVELS (ROOT MEAN SQUARE AVERAGE, M/S²) FOR EACH CONDITION EVALUATED

HELMET	SIGHT CONDITION	AXIS	FLIGHT PROFILE				
			HOVER 50 FT	40 KN	80 KN	120 KN	LEFT TURN
STD SPH-4	CONNECTED	X	.75466	.85209	1.76160	1.6411	1.58976
		Y	.44230	.61447	1.21277	1.42111	1.76677
	Z	Z	.76511	.79482	1.71849	1.64996	1.90948
		RESULTANT	1.16	1.32	2.74	2.73	3.05
STD SPH-4	DISCONNECTED	X	.37520	.29734	.35943	.46822	.44839
		Y	.17778	.16719	.17695	.23235	.25591
	Z	Z	.28439	.31921	.35118	.46783	.42373
		RESULTANT	0.50	0.47	0.53	0.70	0.67
FORM FIT	CONNECTED	X	.48323	1.4478	.88968	1.69056	2.30703
		Y	.44955	1.04494	.79133	1.17285	1.91915
	Z	Z	.56322	1.19556	.82938	1.39338	1.78555
		RESULTANT	0.87	2.15	1.45	2.48	3.49
FORM FIT	DISCONNECTED	X	.35470	.35916	.36969	.41699	.39302
		Y	.29448	.32260	.27315	.34842	.39435
	Z	Z	.37996	.44937	.38890	.58295	.56643
		RESULTANT	0.60	0.66	0.60	0.80	0.79




FIGURE 8. Sample Helmet Acceleration Spectra

DISCUSSION

The first question we must answer is whether the connected sight condition caused more helmet vibration than the non-connected condition. Table 2 shows that for every case the helmet with sight connected experienced more vibration than the helmet without sight connected (Table 2 p. 14). The magnitude of the difference is shown (in percent) in Table 3.

TABLE 3
INCREASE IN HELMET VIBRATION WITH THE HELMET SIGHT CONNECTED
(SHOWN IN PERCENT)

HELMET TYPE	FLIGHT PROFILE				
	HOVER	40 kn	80 kn	120 kn	LEFT TURN
SPH-4	132%	181%	417%	290%	355%
FORM-FIT	45	226	142	210	342

The second question we have to address is which helmet was "better" for use with the HMS system. There are significant differences in the responses of the two different helmet types to the sight induced vibration. In order to evaluate these we calculated and plotted the point for point differences between the spectra for each helmet with and without the sight connected. Two of these difference graphs are presented in Figure 9 and 10 for the standard SPH-4 and form-fit SPH-4 helmets respectively. A complete set of difference graphs is included for all test conditions in Appendix D (available upon request).

Note that in the case of the standard SPH-4 helmet the total vibration was spread over a wide band with the peak value of acceleration being 0.4 m/s^2 at a frequency of approximately 130 Hz. The form-fit helmet experienced vibrations which had a narrower but higher peak at a lower frequency: 0.8 m/s^2 at 30 Hz. The amplitudes of the primary peaks change depending upon flight profile. The shape of the spectra and the frequencies of the primary peaks remain approximately the same. Thus, the standard SPH-4 helmet experienced increased vibrations over a broad band of frequencies. The form-fit SPH-4 helmet experienced increased accelerations in a much narrower band in the vicinity of 30 Hz.




FIGURE 9. Sample Standard Helmet Difference Spectra




FIGURE 10. Sample Form-fit Helmet Difference Spectra

In summary our observations are:

1. Both helmets vibrate more with the sight attached.
2. The response to the sight coupled vibration of the standard SPH-4 differed from that of the form-fit SPH-4.
3. The form-fit SPH-4 helmet vibrated more in a narrow band centered at about 30 Hz.
4. The standard SPH-4 helmet vibrated more over a wide band of frequencies above 30 Hz.

Interpretation of the results of this experiment must be somewhat limited due to the paucity of data collected. To do a complete biodynamics evaluation of the head and helmet vibration question would have required a much larger instrumentation package. Under ideal circumstances we might have measured head, aircraft and helmet accelerations as well as neck muscle stress data on several subjects. However, available equipment, aircraft space, power limitations and funding restricted us to a maximum of four data channels, hence the single triaxial helmet accelerometer. Aircraft availability limited the number of subjects to one.

Recognizing these limitations, we give the following explanation of the results leaving empirical verification for a time when a full-scale evaluation can be performed. The fact that both helmets experienced substantial increases in vibration when the linkage assembly was connected suggests several physiological consequences. The increase in vibration will result in increased exposure of the head to vibration. The effects of the increase may be twofold. First, Okada (1971) and Kile* have shown a synergistic link between vibration and acoustic noise in producing hearing loss. Furthermore, a large body of research documented by Griffin and Lewis (1978) and Guignard (1972) indicates that vibration can cause decrements in visual performance. Additionally, work by Homma (1972) and Marsden (1969) indicate a correlation between vibration and muscle stimulation. This has been corroborated in this laboratory by Johnson (1978). Thus, increased vibration of the head may be expected to result in a visual acuity decrement, a possible increased risk of hearing damage, and an increase in muscular stress in the neck.

The second question which we ask after enumerating the probable effects of increased vibration is: Which helmet, SPH-4 or form-fit, minimizes the adverse effect of vibration? We really have insufficient

* Kile, J.E., Wurzbach, W.F. 1979. Temporary threshold shifts induced by vibration stimulation. Unpublished paper from Kile, Department of Speech, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, Wisconsin.

data to answer that question. We will limit our discussion to differences in helmet dynamics and to guidance for future studies. Each helmet had the same outer shell but differed in mechanism for coupling the shell to the head. The standard SPH-4 helmet has a sling (cloth strap) suspension which joins the shell loosely to the head. The straps have considerable elasticity and allow more relative movement of the head within the shell than is allowed by the form-fit helmet. The form-fit helmet, as the name implies, is foamed in place on the head of the individual using a polyurethane foam. This creates a liner which closely conforms to the contours of the head of the individual. The foam is characterized by low elasticity and allows little relative motion of the head and shell.

The head is more tightly coupled to the shell in the form-fit helmet than in the sling suspension helmet. Therefore, we would expect the dynamic mass of the head helmet system to be greater for the form-fit helmet than for the standard sling suspension helmet. The higher the dynamic mass of an object, the lower acceleration one would measure for a given input force. If we make the assumption that the sight bar delivers a constant vibratory force to the helmet then it follows that the more loosely the shell is coupled to the head (lower dynamic mass) the higher will be the measured acceleration at the helmet. This assumption could explain the increase in broad band acceleration measured in the SPH-4 but not found in the form-fit helmet.

Rigidity of the coupling of the helmet and head will affect the wearer of the helmet in two ways. The more rigid the coupling is, the greater the vibration transmitted to the head will be. Secondly, if the helmet is loosely coupled relative motion between the head (eye) and the helmet mounted sight is increased. In the first case, physiological problems are maximized. In the second case, visual tracking ability may be impaired.

The large peak near 30 Hz in the vibration difference data from the form-fit helmet (Figure 10) is puzzling. This may be a result of the interaction between seat transmitted vibration and sight transmitted vibration. Laing (1974) showed that the transmissibility of vibration to the pilot in the AH-1 gunner's seat is near 1.0 for vibratory stimuli of 30 Hz. Furthermore, there is significant vibration in the 30 Hz range in an AH-1 aircraft (Laing 1974). Thus it is reasonable to assume that the head of the volunteer may have been experiencing 30 Hz vibration at the time this data was collected. It is unlikely that this 30 Hz peak is an artifact. The reason for the pronounced increase in 30 Hz vibration with the form-fit helmet but not with the standard helmet is not found in the data which we collected. Additional data to include head and body vibration as well as helmet vibration is needed to ascertain the cause for the difference in the helmet vibration characteristics.

CONCLUSIONS

The mechanical linkage of helmet to airframe by a helmet mounted sight system significantly increased vibration levels measured at the apex of the helmet. The magnitude of the increase in the range was 45% to 417%. The increase in vibration due to sight connection was experienced by both a standard SPH-4 flight helmet (sling suspension) and by a modified SPH-4 helmet having a form-fitted polyurethane foam liner. The standard SPH-4 helmet experienced increased vibration in a broad spectrum above 30 Hz (nominal). The form-fit SPH-4 helmet experienced increased vibration with a pronounced peak at 30 Hz (nominal) and less higher frequency vibration than the standard SPH-4.

The significant increase in vibration of the helmet caused by the mechanical sight linkage may be expected to degrade pilot/gunner visual performance to some extent. Detrimental effects on fatigue rate and hearing due to vibration may also occur. Insufficient data is currently available to predict the magnitude of performance degradation which could result from increases in helmet vibration.

REFERENCES

- Department of the Army. 1975. *Operator, organizational, direct support and general support maintenance manual (including repair parts and special tools list and depot maintenance repair parts and special tools) for fire control subsystem, helmet directed XM128, 1270-000-122-9449*. Washington, DC: Dept of the Army. TM 9-1270-212-14.
- Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, PA. (SARFA-FCW-W). (TWX to USAARL) 11954Z Aug 76. *Clinical evaluation of the helmet directed fire control subsystem, XM-128*. Located in Biodynamics Division file, USAARL.
- Griffin, M. J., and Lewis, C. H. 1978. A review of the effect of vibration on visual acuity and continuous manual control. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*. 56(3):383-413.
- Guignard, J. C., and King, P. F. 1972. *Aeromedical aspect of vibration and noise*. London: Technical Editing and Reproduction Ltd. NATO/AGARD. AGARDograph #151.
- Homma, S., Kanda, K. and Watanabe, S. 1971. Tonic vibration reflex in human and monkey subjects. *Journal of Physiology (Japan)*. 21:419-430.
- Johnson, J. C. 1978. Comparison of analysis techniques for electromyographic data. *Aviation Space and Environmental Medicine*. 49(1 pt 1):14-18.
- Laing, E. J. and Weand, A. E. 1974. *Vibration and temperature survey; production AH-1G helicopter*. Edwards Air Force Base, CA: U.S. Army Aviation Systems Test Activity. USAASTA Project No. 70-15-5.
- Marsden, C. D., Meadows, J. C. and Hodgson, H. J. F. 1969. Observations of the reflex response to muscle vibration in man and its voluntary control. *Brain*. 92:829-846.
- Okada, A., Yamamura, K. and Minami, M. 1971. Temporary hearing loss induced by noise and vibration. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 51(4 pt 2):1240-1248.
- Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Combat Arms, Test Agency, Fort Hood, TX. (ATMAS-CBT). (TWX from USAARL). July 1976. *Mechanical energy transfer through mechanical sight linkage*. Located in Biodynamics Div file, USAARL.
- Verona, R. W., Johnson, J. C. and Jones, H. 1979. *Head aiming tracking accuracy in a helicopter environment*. Ft Rucker, AL: U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory. USAARL Report No. 79-9.

10-4

APPENDIX

REGISTERED TRADE MARKS

Endevco Model 2226C accelerometer, Division of Becton, Dickinson & Co., Rancho Viejo Rd, San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675.

Hewlett-Packard, 1501, Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304.

Model 3960 tape recorder
Model 9825S desktop computer
Model 7225A plotter

KIAG Swiss, Model 5001 charge amplifier, Kistler Instrumente AG, CH 8408, Winterthur, Switzerland.

Nicolet Scientific Corporation, 245 Livingston Street, Northvale, NJ 07647.

Model 660 fast Fourier transform analyzer
Model 160C data recorder

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION

Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	Aeromechanics Laboratory US Army Research & Technology Labs Ames Research Center, M/S 215-1 (12) Moffett Field, CA 94035 (1)
Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering ATTN: Military Assistant for Medical and Life Sciences Washington, DC 20301	Sixth United States Army ATTN: SMA Presidio of San Francisco, California 94129 (1)
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences 4301 Jones Bridge Road Bethesda, MD 20014	Director Army Audiology & Speech Center Walter Reed Army Medical Center Forest Glen Section, Bldg 156 (1) Washington, DC 20012 (1)
Commander US Army Medical Research and Development Command ATTN: SGRD-SI (Mrs. Madigan) Fort Detrick Frederick, MD 21701	Harry Diamond Laboratories Scientific & Technical Information Offices 2800 Powder Mill Road (5) Adelphi, MD 20783 (1)
Redstone Scientific Information Center ATTN: DRDMI-TBD US Army Missile R&D Command Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809	US Army Ordnance Center & School Library, Bldg 3071 ATTN: ATSL-DOSL Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD (1) 21005 (1)
US Army Yuma Proving Ground Technical Library Yuma, AZ 85364	US Army Environmental Hygiene Agency Library, Bldg E2100 (1) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010 (1)
US Army Aviation Engineering Flight Activity ATTN: DAVTE-M (Technical Library) Edwards AFB, CA 93523	Technical Library Chemical Systems Laboratory (1) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010 (1)
US Army Combat Developments Experimentation Command Technical Library HQ, USACDEC Box 22 Fort Ord, CA 93941	

US Army Materiel Systems Analysis Agency ATTN: Reports Distribution Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	Chief Benet Weapons Laboratory LCWSL, USA ARRADCOM ATTN: DRDAR-LCB-TL (1) Watervliet Arsenal Watervliet, NY 12189 (1)
Director Biomedical Laboratory Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010	US Army Research & Technology Labs Propulsion Laboratory MS 77-5 (1) NASA Lewis Research Center Cleveland, OH 44135 (1)
HQ, First United States Army ATTN: AFKA-MD (Surgeon's Ofc) Fort George G. Meade, MD 20755	US Army Field Artillery School Library (1) Snow Hall, Room 16 Fort Sill, OK 73503 (1)
Director Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: DRDAR-TSB-S (STINFO) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	US Army Dugway Proving Ground Technical Library (2) Bldg 5330 Dugway, UT 84022 (1)
US Army Research & Development Technical Support Activity Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703	US Army Materiel Development & Readiness Command (1) ATTN: DRCSG 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333 (1)
CDR/DIR US Army Combat Surveillance & Target Acquisition Laboratory ATTN: DELSC-D Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703	US Army Foreign Science & Technology Center ATTN: DRXST-IS1 (1) 220 7th St., NE Charlottesville, VA 22901 (1)
US Army Avionics R&D Activity ATTN: DAVAA-O Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703	Commander US Army Training & Doctrine (1) Command ATTN: ATCD Fort Monroe, VA 23651 (2)
US Army White Sands Missile Range Technical Library Division White Sands Missile Range New Mexico 88002	Commander US Army Training & Doctrine (1) Command ATTN: Surgeon Fort Monroe, VA 23651 (1)

US Army Research & Technology Labs Structures Laboratory Library NASA Langley Research Center Mail Stop 266 Hampton, VA 23665	(1)	Commander US Army Health Services Command ATTN: Library Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234	(1)
Commander 10th Medical Laboratory ATTN: DEHE (Audiologist) APO New York 09180	(1)	Superintendent US Army Academy of Health Sciences ATTN: Library Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234	(1)
Commander US Army Natick R&D Command ATTN: Technical Librarian Natick, MA 01760	(1)	Commander US Army Airmobility Laboratory ATTN: Library Fort Eustis, VA 23604	(1)
Commander US Army Troop Support & Aviation Materiel Readiness Command ATTN: DRSTS-W St. Louis, MO 63102	(1)	Air University Library (AUL/LSE) Maxwell AFB, AL 36112	(1)
Commander US Army Aviation R&D Command ATTN: DRDAV-E P.O. Box 209 St. Louis, MO 63166	(1)	US Air Force Flight Test Center Technical Library, Stop 238 Edwards AFB, CA 93523	(1)
Director US Army Human Engineering Laboratory ATTN: Technical Library Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	(1)	US Air Force Armament Development & Test Center Technical Library Eglin AFB, FL 32542	(1)
Commander US Army Aviation Research & Development Command ATTN: Library P.O. Box 209 St. Louis, MO 63166	(1)	US Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT/LDE) Bldg 640, Area B Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	(1)
		US Air Force Aerospace Medical Division School of Aerospace Medicine Aeromedical Library/TSK-4 Brooks AFB, TX 78235	(1)
	(1)	Director of Professional Services HQ, USAF/SGES Bolling AFB Washington, DC 20332	

Human Engineering Division Air Force Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory ATTN: Technical Librarian Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433 (1)	US Navy Naval Air Development Center Technical Information Division Technical Support Department Warminster, PA 18974 (1)
US Navy Naval Weapons Center Technical Library Division Code 2333 China Lake, CA 93555 (1)	Human Factors Engineering Division Aircraft & Crew Systems Technology Directorate Naval Air Development Center Warminster, PA 18974 (1)
US Navy Naval Aerospace Medical Institute Library Bldg 1953, Code 012 Pensacola, FL 32508 (1)	US Navy Naval Research Laboratory Library Shock & Vibration Information Center Code 8404 Washington, DC 20375 (1)
US Navy Naval Submarine Medical Research Lab Medical Library, Naval Submarine Base Box 900 Groton, CT 06340 (1)	Director of Biological & Medical Sciences Division Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217 (1)
Director Naval Biosciences Laboratory Naval Supply Center, Bldg 844 Oakland, CA 94625 (1)	Commanding Officer Naval Medical R&D Command National Naval Medical Center Bethesda, MD 20014 (1)
Naval Air Systems Command Technical Library AIR 950D Rm 278 Jefferson Plaza II Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20351 (1)	Commanding Officer Naval Biodynamics Laboratory P.O. Box 29407 Michoud Station New Orleans, LA 70129 (1)
US Navy Naval Research Laboratory Library Code 1433 Washington, DC 20375 (1)	FAA Civil Aeromedical Institute ATTN: Library Box 25082 Oklahoma City, OK 73125 (1)

Department of Defence
R.A.N. Research Laboratory
P.O. Box 706
Darlinghurst, N.S.W. 2010
Australia

Canadian Society of Avn Med
c/o Academy of Medicine, Toronto
ATTN: Ms. Carmen King
288 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V8

COL F. Cadigan
DAO-AMLOUS B
Box 36, US Embassy
FPO New York 09510

MSHA
Information Center Library
P.O. Box 25367
Denver, CO 80225

DCIEM/SOAM
MAJ J. Soutendam (Ret.)
1133 Sheppard Avenue West
P.O. Box 2000
Downsview, Ontario
M3M 3B9

Staff Officer, Aerospace Medicine
RAF Staff
British Embassy
3100 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

Dr. E. Hendler
Code 6003
Naval Air Development Center
Warminster, PA 18974

(1)

(1)

(1)

(1)

6-