

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER	
ADA801177	
CLASSIFICATION CHANGES	
TO:	unclassified
FROM:	confidential
LIMITATION CHANGES	
TO: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	
FROM: Distribution authorized to DoD only; Administrative/Operational Use; 25 JUN 1947. Other requests shall be referred to National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC. Pre-dates formal DoD distribution statements. Treat as DoD only.	
AUTHORITY	
NACA res. abstracts no. 114 dtd 22 Apr 1957; NASA TR Server website	

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

3 1176 00003 4109

UNCLASSIFIED
RESTRICTED



RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

JUN - 1947

WIND-TUNNEL INVESTIGATION OF BOMB-BAY CONFIGURATIONS INTENDED
TO MINIMIZE THE TUMBLING OF LIGHT-WEIGHT BOMBS

By

Richard E. Kuhn and Edward C. Polhamus
Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory
Langley Field, Va.

CLASSIFICATION CHANGED

CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

This document contains classified information affecting the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, USC 8031 and 8032. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law. Information so classified may be imparted only to persons in the military and naval services of the United States, and to civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government who have a legitimate interest therein, and to United States citizens of known loyalty and discretion who of necessity must be informed thereof.

NACA R7-112 E010201

Authority of J. W. Craskey Date 1/14/57
MAY 11/13/54

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

WASHINGTON
June 25, 1947

CLASSIFICATION CHANGED

TO UNCLASSIFIED UNAVAILABLE

By authority of R. E. Kuhn
Date 4-8-57
NB 4-30-57

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

RESTRICTED
UNAVAILABLE

NACA LIBRARY
LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL
LABORATORY
Langley Field, Va.

~~RESTRICTED~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

WIND-TUNNEL INVESTIGATION OF BOMB-BAY CONFIGURATIONS INTENDED
TO MINIMIZE THE TUMBLING OF LIGHT-WEIGHT BOMBS

By Richard E. Kuhn and Edward C. Polhamus

SUMMARY

An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 300 MPH 7- by 10-foot tunnel to determine what modifications could be made to conventional bomb bays to reduce the tumbling difficulties experienced with light-weight bombs. The investigation consisted mainly of photographic studies of the trajectory and attitude of $\frac{1}{10}$ -scale dynamic models of 100-pound bombs as they dropped from various bomb-bay configurations together with tuft studies of the flow in and around these bomb-bay configurations.

The investigation indicated that there is a definite region of reversed flow inside the bomb bay which must be weakened or destroyed if good drops are to be obtained. The most satisfactory configuration tested consisted of a bomb bay divided into compartments in conjunction with a deflector plate ahead of the bomb bay. Satisfactory bomb drops were also obtained by opening only a small hole in the bomb bay directly below the bomb to be dropped. On the basis of the satisfactory drops obtained with spherical bombs, it appears that bombs whose drag changes least with attitude will give the most satisfactory drops.

INTRODUCTION

An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 300 MPH 7- by 10-foot tunnel to determine what modifications to conventional bomb-bay designs are necessary to insure satisfactory drops with light-weight (100 lb) bombs. It has been reported that light-weight bombs frequently described erratic initial trajectories when dropped at relatively high bombing speeds (of the order of 300 miles per hour and greater). This behavior, apart from precluding accurate bombing, sometimes resulted in the bombs hitting each other and causing explosions.

~~RESTRICTED~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

The present investigation consisted of a photographic study of the trajectories described by small model bombs as they were released from a simulated bomb bay in a fuselage model. The tests were conducted at two tunnel speeds and the effects of various deflectors, separators, door arrangements, and bomb-bay modifications were investigated. In addition, tuft studies were made of the flow in and around the bomb bay and static pressure fluctuations were measured at two points in the bomb bay for some of the bomb-bay configurations investigated.

SYMBOLS

C_D	drag coefficient $\left(\frac{\text{Drag}}{qS} \right)$
S	wing area, 11.65 square feet
q	dynamic pressure $\left(\frac{1}{2} \rho V^2 \right)$ pounds per square foot
ρ	density of air, slugs per cubic foot
V	velocity of air, feet per second

MODEL AND APPARATUS

The tests were conducted in the Langley 300 MPH 7- by 10-foot tunnel.

The model used in this investigation consisted of a fuselage supported by a rectangular wing. The fuselage did not represent any particular airplane but was merely a fairing around the bomb bay. A photograph of the model mounted in the Langley 300 MPH 7- by 10-foot tunnel is presented in figure 1 and the principal dimensions of the model are presented in figure 2. The basic bomb-bay modifications investigated are presented in figure 3. These modifications were made by inserting wooden blocks in the original configuration. The various deflectors, separators, and door arrangements investigated are presented in figures 4, 5, and 6, respectively.

For the bomb-drop tests $\frac{1}{10}$ -scale dynamically similar models of a 100-pound general-purpose bomb (fig. 7) were dropped from the bomb bay

into a net which can be seen in figure 1. Preliminary tuft studies indicate that this net did not appreciably affect the flow within about 18 inches of the model. The relations of reference 1 were used to compute the weight and moments of inertia of the $\frac{1}{10}$ -scale model bombs which were ballasted with lead to bring these quantities and the center of gravity to the correct magnitude and position. The bombs were held in the bomb bay by small electro-magnetic bomb shackles (fig. 3) operated from a 12-volt storage battery. The bombs were released by breaking the magnetic circuit and the bomb trajectories were recorded by a still camera in conjunction with two Strobolux lights. The Strobolux lights were set to flash 2400 times per minute so the time between two bomb images on the picture is one-fortieth of a second.

The fluctuation of the static pressures within the bomb bay were measured at two points in the bomb bay. These orifices can be seen on figure 8 and their locations are given in figure 2. The time history of the pressure fluctuations was picked up by an electrical pressure transmitter and recorded by an NACA film recorder.

TESTS

In order to have the trajectories of the $\frac{1}{10}$ -scale model bombs simulate those of the full-scale bombs, it is necessary that the model bombs be dropped at tunnel speeds which correspond to the full-scale flight speed according to the relations of reference 1. For the $\frac{1}{10}$ -scale bombs used in these tests the relationship between the tunnel speed, equivalent flight speed, and the scale of the bombs is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Velocity (flight)} &= \frac{\text{Velocity (tunnel)}}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &= 3.16 \text{ Velocity (tunnel)} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$N = \text{Scale of bomb (1/10)}$$

The majority of the tests were conducted at a tunnel speed of 142 miles per hour, corresponding to a flight velocity of 450 miles per hour. Some of the tests, however, were made at a tunnel speed of 47.5 miles per hour, corresponding to a flight velocity of 150 miles per hour.

The angle of attack of the fuselage was held constant at 0° for all tests. The different configurations tested are tabulated in table I. For most configurations two bombs were dropped simultaneously; one from the front shackle and one from the rear and usually three or four drops were made from each configuration. Typical photographic time histories of some of the bomb drops are presented in figure 9. Unless otherwise stated, all the drops were made at an equivalent flight speed of 450 miles per hour. In these pictures the rebound of the bomb from the net can be seen and should not be confused with the actual drop.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the drop tests for each configuration investigated are summarized in figure 10. For each configuration presented, the direction and nature of the air flow within the bomb bay is depicted as well as the bomb trajectories. The symbols and conventions employed in the presentation are defined in one of the two sketches preceding configuration 1. The other sketch presents the ideal trajectory of a bomb as calculated on the assumption that the bomb maintains zero angle of attack as it leaves the bomb bay. For these computations a bomb drag coefficient of 0.195 was assumed, corresponding to the measured minimum drag coefficient of a 300-pound bomb (reference 2). The "ideal" trajectory can be used effectively in judging the merits of the various configurations investigated. Unless otherwise stated, all the results presented in figure 10 were obtained at an equivalent flight speed of 450 miles per hour.

Configuration 1 presents a more or less conventional bomb-bay configuration. The erratic behavior of the bombs dropped from the rear of the bomb bay is immediately evident. However, reducing the simulated airspeed from 450 to 150 miles per hour reduced the tumbling and divergence to the point where consistently good drops could be secured from either bomb position. The improvement with reduced airspeed has also been noticed in flight. Lowering the bomb shackle altered the behavior but it was still not satisfactory.

It can be seen that for almost all configurations for which tuft studies were made, there is a definite flow reversal which causes the bombs to tumble and which therefore must be destroyed or weakened in order to obtain consistently good drops. Opening only a small hole in the bomb bay for the bombs to drop through resulted in some fairly satisfactory drops (configuration 3). This solution, however, would necessitate making the doors of the bomb bay in small sections and only opening those sections under the bombs to be dropped and would possess the objectionable feature of precluding salvo-type bombing.

Attaching deflectors to the fuselage ahead of the bomb bay with no other alteration did not improve conditions appreciably. It can be seen that in many configurations the bombs were actually carried forward from their release position while still inside the bomb bay and then blown back as they emerged.

One modification that was tried in an attempt to improve the dropping characteristics of light-weight bombs was to fair out the rear end of the bomb bay to weaken the reverse flow. This alteration (designs C and D) did not in itself materially help matters. However, attaching a perforated deflector 6 inches ahead of the bomb bay and extending the doors forward to the deflector in combination with bomb-bay design "C" (configuration 35) seemed to have some merit. In the interest of expediency this modification was accomplished by inserting a block of the proper shape in the rear of the bomb bay rather than alter the model itself. It will be noted that with this arrangement the bomb bay is considerably shortened but it was felt that this would have a negligible effect on the qualitative results obtained.

One of the most effective configurations investigated consisted of dividing the bomb bay into small cells, each cell large enough for one vertical string of bombs. This modification, in conjunction with a perforated deflector (configuration 11), resulted in the most satisfactory drops. The tests indicate that these cells should have solid walls to be most effective. Although the doors were off in this configuration, tests of other configurations with and without doors indicate that the doors should have little effect.

Any bomb possessing a considerable amount of stability will tumble somewhat when immersed in a strong turbulent flow. Large changes in the attitude of the bomb associated with this tumbling will cause large variations in drag which will greatly affect the path of the bomb. It is of interest to note that spherical bombs drop satisfactorily from either of the bomb positions (configuration 20). The spherical bombs used for these tests were solid steel balls and were about twice as heavy as the $\frac{1}{10}$ -scale model bombs but it is believed that the fact that the drag of a sphere does not change with its attitude is the factor most responsible for the excellent drops obtained.

For some of the configurations, records were made of the fluctuations of the static pressure at two points in the bomb bay (fig. 2) and the results are presented in table I. The installation of cells in the bomb bay (configuration 10) considerably reduced the amplitude of these fluctuations, especially in the rear of the bomb bay.

Drag measurements were also made on some of the configurations and the drag coefficients are presented in table I. These drag coefficients

are based on the wing area of 11.65 square feet; the drag coefficient of the model with the bomb bay closed is 0.035 and the drag coefficient of the wing alone is 0.028. Attaching deflectors ahead of the bomb bay materially increased the drag. However, a wedge-shaped deflector gave the smallest increase in drag.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of wind-tunnel tests of various bomb-bay configurations, the following conclusions are indicated:

1. There was a definite region of reversed flow inside the bomb bay of conventional design and it was this reversed flow which caused the light-weight bombs to tumble as they dropped.
2. Satisfactory drops were obtained by opening only a small door in the bomb bay for the bombs to drop through instead of opening the entire bottom of the bomb bay.
3. The most satisfactory configuration tested consisted of a bomb bay divided into compartments in conjunction with a deflector plate ahead of the bomb bay.
4. The satisfactory results obtained with spherical bombs indicate that bombs whose drag changes least with attitude will give the most satisfactory drops.

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics
Langley Field, Va.

REFERENCES

1. Scherberg, Max, and Phode, R. V.: Mass Distribution and Performance of Free Flight Models. NACA TN No. 260, 1927.
2. Baals, Donald D., and Smith, Norman F.: Aerodynamic Tests of an M-31 Bomb in the 8-Foot High-Speed Tunnel. NACA MR, Aug. 25, 1942.

TABLE I. - TABLE OF BOMB-BAY CONFIGURATIONS TESTED AND RESULTS OBTAINED

Configu- ration no.	Configuration				Drag coef- ficient C_D	Static pressure fluctuation in bomb bay			
	Bomb bay (fig. 3)	Deflector (fig. 4) ¹	Separators (fig. 5)	Doors (fig. 6)		Front orifice		Rear orifice	
						Amp. ²	r ³	Amp. ²	r ³
1	A	-	-	A	0.044	4.2	28	17.5	42
2	A	-	-	Off	0.044	6.0	19		
3	A	-	-	D					
4	A	-	A	A	0.045	5.2		12.0	46
5	A	C-0	A	A					
6	A	-	B	A	0.046	4.5	21		
7	A	A-6	B	A					
8	A	B-6	B	A					
9	A	C-0	B	A					
10	A	-	C	Off	0.043	3.2		9.3	49
11	A	B-0	C	Off					
12	A	-	D	Off					
13	A	B-0	D	Off					
14	A	B-0	E	Off					
15	A	A-0	-	A					
16	A	A-3	-	A					
17	A	A-6	-	A					
18	A	A-12	-	A					
19	A	B-0	-	A	0.061	3.2		13.3	34
20	A	B-3	-	A					
21	A	B-6	-	A	0.059	4.4		18.6	36
22	A	B-6	-	Off	0.059	3.7		17.9	34
23	A	B-12	-	A					
24	A	C-0	-	A	0.055	3.8	28	21.4	32

¹The drag coefficient of the model with the bomb bay closed is $C_D = 0.035$.

²The average double amplitude of the pressure fluctuation in percent of the dynamic pressure (q).

³The frequency of the pressure fluctuation in cycles per second.

NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

TABLE I- TABLE OF BOMB-BAY CONFIGURATIONS - Concluded

Configu- ration no.	Configuration				Drag ¹ coef- ficient C_D	Static pressure fluctuation in bomb bay			
	Bomb bay (fig. 3)	Deflector (fig. 4)	Separators (fig. 5)	Doors (fig. 6)		Front orifice		Rear orifice	
						Amp. ²	f^3	Amp. ²	f^3
25	A	C-6	-	A	0.057	5.3			
26	A	C-6	-	Off	0.056	3.5		24.0	34
27	A	C-12	-	Off				21.4	33
28	B	-	-	B	0.043	5.5			
29	B	B-6	-	B					
30	B	B-6	-	Off					
31	C	-	-	B	0.044	2.8			
32	C	-	-	Off					
33	C	B-0	-	B					
34	C	B-6	-	B	0.054	2.8			
35	C	B-6	-	C					
36	C	B-6	-	Off	0.056	3.2			
37	C	C-0	-	B					
38	C	C-6	-	B	0.059	5.1			
39	C	C-6	-	C	0.049	6.0			
40	C	C-12	-	B					
41	D	-	-	D	0.044	2.3			
42	D	-	-	Off					
43	D	B-0	-	Off					
44	D	B-6	-	B	0.055	4.2			
45	D	C-6	-	B	0.054	5.5			
46	D	C-6	-	Off					
47	D	D	-	Off					
48	D	E	-	Off					

¹The drag coefficient of the model with the bomb bay closed is $C_D = 0.035$.

²The average double amplitude of the pressure fluctuation in percent of the dynamic pressure (q).

³The frequency of the pressure fluctuation cycles per second.






Figure 1.- Front view of bomb bay model and net mounted in the 300 MPH 7- by 10-foot tunnel.




NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Figure 2.- Details of bomb bay model.



NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS


Figure 3.-Details of bomb bay
designs investigated.



Pos. of deflectors A, B, & C			a
A-0	B-0	C-0	0
A-3	B-3		3"
A-6	B-6	C-6	6"
A-12	B-12	C-12	12"


NATIONAL ADVISORY
 COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Figure 4. - Drawing showing details and positions of the various deflectors tested.



NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS


Figure 5.- Drawing of bomb bay separators.



A	Front and Rear Doors
B	Front Doors only
C	Front Doors Extended
D	Small opening in bomb bay

Figure 6.- Various door arrangements tested.

Weight : 0.1016
 Moment of inertia
 about lateral axis
 0.00313 slug in² (app.)



NATIONAL ADVISORY
 COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Figure 7 :- Drawing of 0.10 scale model of
 100lb general purpose bomb.



Figure 8.- View of interior of bomb bay showing magnetic bomb shackles and pressure orifices.



Configuration 1 Bomb Bay A

Doors A

Figure 9.- Representative pictures of drops.



Configuration 1	Bomb Bay	A
	Doors	A

Tunnel speed reduced to simulate a bombing speed of 150 mph.

Figure 9.- Continued.



Configuration 3	Bomb Bay	A
	Doors	D

Figure 9.- Continued.



Configuration 5	Bomb Bay	A
	Deflector	C-O
	Separator	A
	Doors	A

Figure 9.- Continued.



Configuration 11


Bomb Bay A

Deflector B-O

Separators C

Doors off

Figure 9.- Continued.




Configuration 20

Bomb Bay A

Deflector B-3

Doors A

Spherical bombs




Wind off

Figure 9.- Continued.



Configuration 24	Bomb Bay	A
	Deflector	C-O
	Doors	A

Figure 9.- Continued.









Configuration 35

Bomb Bay C

Deflector B-6

Doors C

Figure 9.- Concluded.




NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Figure 10.— Results of bomb drops and tuft studies


Fig. 10 cont.

NACA RM No. L7D11




Configuration 3

Bomb bay A
Doors D




Configuration 4

Bomb bay A
Separators A
Doors A




Configuration 5

Bomb bay A
Deflector C-0
Separators A
Doors A




Configuration 6

Bomb bay A
Separators B
Doors A




Configuration 7

Bomb bay A
Deflector A-6
Separators B
Doors A




Configuration 8

Bomb bay A
Deflector B-6
Separators B
Doors A



Configuration 9

Bomb bay A
Deflector C-0
Separator B
Doors A




Configuration 10

Bomb bay A
Separators C
Doors off


Figure 10 - Continued

NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS




Configuration 11

Bomb bay A
Deflector B-0
Separators C
Doors off




Configuration 12

Bomb bay A
Deflector D
Separators off
Doors off




Configuration 13

Bomb bay A
Deflector B-0
Separators D
Doors off




Configuration 14

Bomb bay A
Deflector B-0
Separators E
Doors off




Configuration 15

Bomb bay A
Deflector A-0
Doors A




Configuration 16

Bomb bay A
Deflector A-3
Doors A



Configuration 17


Bomb bay A
Deflector A-6
Doors A




Configuration 18

Bomb bay A
Deflector A-12
Doors A


Figure 10.- Continued




Configuration 19 Bomb bay A
Deflector B-0
Doors A




Configuration 20 Bomb bay A
Deflector B-3
Doors A




Configuration 20 Bomb bay A
Deflector B-3
Doors A
Spherical bombs




Configuration 21 Bomb bay A
Deflector B-6
Doors A




Configuration 22 Bomb bay A
Deflector B-6
Doors off




Configuration 23 Bomb bay A
Deflector B-12
Doors A



Configuration 24 Bomb bay A
Deflector C-0
Doors A




Configuration 25 Bomb bay A
Deflector C-6
Doors A




Configuration 26

Bomb bay A
Deflector C-6
Doors off




Configuration 27

Bomb bay A
Deflector C-12
Doors off




Configuration 28

Bomb bay B
Doors B




Configuration 29

Bomb bay B
Deflector B-6
Doors B




Configuration 30

Bomb bay B
Deflector B-6
Doors off




Configuration 31

Bomb bay C
Doors B




Configuration 32

Bomb bay C
Doors off




Configuration 33


Bomb bay C
Deflector B-0
Doors B




Configuration 34 Bomb bay C
Deflector B-6
Doors B




Configuration 35 Bomb bay C
Deflector B-6
Doors C




Configuration 36 Bomb bay C
Deflector B-6
Doors off




Configuration 37 Bomb bay C
Deflector C-0
Doors B




Configuration 38 Bomb bay C
Deflector C-6
Doors B










Configuration 39 Bomb bay C
Deflector C-6
Doors C



Configuration 40 Bomb bay C
Deflector C-12
Doors B



Configuration 41 Bomb bay D
Doors B



NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Figure 10 - Concluded

ATI-71 156

CONFIDENTIAL

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics,
Langley Aeronautical Lab., Langley Air Force Base,
Va. (L7D11)

**WIND-TUNNEL INVESTIGATION OF BOMB-BAY
CONFIGURATIONS INTENDED TO MINIMIZE THE
TUMBLING OF LIGHT-WEIGHT BOMBS (NACA RM),
by Richard E. Kuhn and Edward C. Polhamus.**

25 June 1947. 29 pp.

UNCLASSIFIED

I. Kuhn, Richard E.

II. Polhamus, Edward C.

(Not abstracted)

DIVISION: Ordnance and Armament (22)
SECTION: Bombing Systems (8)
DISTRIBUTION: U. S. Military Organizations receive
copies from ASTIA-DSC. Others route requests to
ASTIA-DSC thru AMC, Wright-Patterson Air Force
Base, Dayton, O. Attn: NACA.

When this card has served its purpose, it may
be destroyed in accordance with AFM 203-1, Army

Regulation 203-1, Army

CONFIDENTIAL
ARMED SERVICES TECHNICAL INFORMATION AGENCY
DOCUMENT SERVICE CENTER

X-1145

CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
BY AUTHORITY OF ~~Special Agent in Charge~~
BY ~~[Signature]~~
DATE ~~10 Apr 57~~

Classification ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
or changed to

AUTH: NACA Res. Abstracts No. ¹¹⁴ ~~56~~ dtd
By ~~[Signature]~~ 22 Apr 57
Signature and Grade

Date ~~16 Apr 57~~ 9 May 57 met