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INTRODUCTION

Suppression of liquid propellant sloshing in rocket tanks has largely been accomplished by means of various arrangements of fixed baffles and "floating can" type devices (1). * Another interesting type of suppression device is that of a "lid" which essentially constrains the liquid surface to remain plane and normal to the longitudinal axis of the tank; such a device must, of course, move with the liquid as the tank drains so as to remain always just in contact with the liquid free surface.

The purpose of the investigation reported here was to obtain data on the effectiveness of such floating lid devices in suppressing liquid sloshing in rigid cylindrical tanks having a conical bottom. The test facilities and procedures employed were essentially those described in our earlier publication (1). The lids themselves were fabricated from solid plates rigidly supported on three dynamometer arms, in order to obtain data on the liquid forces acting directly on the lids, and had diameters of approximately 99, 85, and 67% of the tank diameter (Figure 1).

* Numbers in parenthesis refer to the References given at the end of the paper.
The support system was clamped to the tank so that the lids barely touched the surface of the undisturbed liquid which, in these tests, were water, methylene bromide, and methylene chloride. Each lid-liquid combination was tested at various excitation amplitudes and frequencies.

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Measured data for the total force response resulting from translational excitation of amplitude $X_0$ with the three different lids is given in Figures 2 - 17. The data is presented in terms of dimensionless force amplitude and phase angle $\phi$ as a function of the dimensionless frequency parameter $\omega d/A$, where $d$ is the tank diameter, $h$ is the liquid depth, and $A$ is the axial acceleration, as employed previously (1). Data for the lid having a diameter 99% of that of the tank is given in Figures 2 - 7 and shows that almost infinite damping of the total force response is provided at all liquid depths, there being virtually no peaking of the force curve. Such a linear variation of force response with the square of the frequency corresponds precisely, of course, with the results of theoretical predictions for a liquid
with the free surface constrained to remain plane and normal to the longitudinal axis of the tank. The 85% lid (Figures 8 - 13) appears to introduce damping with a magnitude approximately equivalent to that provided by the conical ring fixed baffle type of suppressors (1). Although actual damping coefficients have not been calculated. The peak magnitude is seen to vary with both liquid viscosity and excitation amplitude as the liquid first mode resonant frequency is increased from $w^2d/a = 3.6$ with no lid to $w^2d/a = 5.0$ with lid. The 67% lid introduces very little damping, as evidenced by the magnitude of the peak forces (Figures 14 - 17). The liquid first mode resonant frequency however, appears to be slightly increased over that with no lid.

The orientation of the dynamometers attached to the lids for the purpose of obtaining data on the liquid forces acting on the lid is shown in Figure 18. One more or less representative plot of the forces on the lid is shown in Figure 19. Most of the lid dynamometer data is somewhat questionable because of instrumentation difficulties and therefore this data is presented only to show orders of magnitude and frequency response trends.
Total force response data from similar tests with the excitation provided by pitching about the liquid c.g. is shown in Figures 20 - 33. Data for the 99% lid is given in Figures 20 - 24, and shows similar trends to that for the tests with translational excitation. The theoretical curves shown in some of these figures correspond to an ideal liquid with no suppression device (1), as a matter of general interest. The 85% lid data (Figures 25 - 29) and the 67% lid data (Figures 30 - 33) also show trends very similar to that for the tests with translational excitation.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of these tests would seem to lead to the following general conclusions:

1. Floating lid type devices having a diameter of 85%, or more, of the tank diameter are quite effective in providing increased damping of the peak total force response. A 67% lid provides almost no damping at all.

* Other studies of sloshing characteristics in rigid cylindrical tanks undergoing pitching motions are given in (2) and (3).
2. The peak force responses with the 85% lid decrease with increasing excitation amplitude, but increase slightly with increasing equivalent Reynolds' number of the test liquid. This is accompanied by a pronounced increase in the liquid first mode resonant frequency.

3. The forces acting directly on the lids appear to be rather large so that such devices may well prove to involve significant weight penalties for the damping provided.
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Figure 1. Simulated Lid- and Support Assembly
Figure 2.
TOTAL FORCE RESPONSE WITH FLOATING LID
CONICAL BOTTOM, 99% LID, h/d = 0.785

\[ \frac{F}{\rho g^{3/2} \delta^{1/3}} = 1.970 \cdot 10^6 \]

Figure 3.
TOTAL FORCE RESPONSE WITH FLOATING LID
CONICAL BOTTOM, 99% LID, h/d = 0.505

\[ \frac{F}{d^2 \rho V^3} = 0.686 \cdot 10^6 \]

\[ c_{623} = 0.23 \]

\[ c_{623} = 0.739 \]

\[ \text{EXPERIMENTAL - } X_0/d = 0.00417 \]
Figure 7

TOTAL FORCE RESPONSE WITH FLOATING LID
CONICAL BOTTOM, 99% LID, $h/d = 0.505$

Experimental: $\frac{F}{V_0} = 0.0083$

Experimental: $\frac{F}{V_0} = 0.0044$
TOTAL FORCE RESPONSE WITH FLOATING LID
CONICAL BOTTOM, 85% LID, h/d = 0.785

\[ \frac{f}{\rho d^2 U^3 \sqrt{g}} = 0.686 \times 10^8 \]

EXPERIMENTAL - x/d = 0.00417
TOTAL FORCE RESPONSE WITH FLOATING LID
CONICAL BOTTOM, 85% LID, h/d = 0.785

Figure 9.
TOTAL FORCE RESPONSE WITH FLOATING LID
CONICAL BOTTOM, 85% LID, \( h/d = 0.505 \)
\[ \frac{f_{	ext{exp}}}{f_{	ext{theor}}} = 0.686 \times 10^{-6} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Experimental} - \frac{X}{d} = 0.00417
\end{array} \]
Figure 14.
Figure 15.
TOTAL FORCE RESPONSE WITH FLOATING LID
CONICAL BOTTOM, 67% LID, h/d = 0.595

\[ F = 1.97 \times 10^6 \]

The graph shows the total force response with a floating lid for a conical bottom, with a lid coverage of 67% and a height to diameter ratio of 0.595. The force is plotted on a logarithmic scale against a parameter \( e^{2/h} \). The data points indicate the experimental force response at two different values of \( e_x/d \): 0.00833 and 0.00417.

Figure 17.
NOTE: FORCE ACTING UPWARD ON DYNAMOMETERS IS ASSUMED POSITIVE.

Figure 18.
Figure 19.
Figure 21.
FORCE RESPONSE WITH 99% LID

\[ \frac{M_a}{M} = 0.505 \]

\[ m = 1.970 \times 10^6 \]

Figure 24.
FORCE RESPONSE WITH 85\% LID

h/d = 0785

\(\frac{\delta^4 u v^2}{\mu} = 1970 \times 10^6\)

Figure 25.
FORCE RESPONSE WITH 67% LID

\( h/d = 0.595 \)

\( \frac{F}{\rho \omega^2 d} = 0.686 \times 10^6 \)

Figure 31.
Figure 33.

FORCE RESPONSE WITH 57% LID

CONICAL BOTTOM, \( h/M = 0.505 \)

THEORETICAL - ZERO DAMP

EXPERIMENTAL - \( q = 0.0118 \)