LARGE DEFLECTIONS
OF AN
INFLATED CYLINDRICAL TENT

by

Edward W. Ross, Jr.

THE INFORMATION RECORDED HEREIN HAS BEEN APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE AND SALE: ITS DISCLOSURE IS UNRESTRICTED.

July 1968

Office of the Scientific Director

UNITED STATES ARMY
NATIONAL LABORATORIES
W.V.A.

AD 673714

45
This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

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

Citation of trade names in this report does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such items.

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.
LARGE DEFLECTIONS OF AN INFLATED CYLINDRICAL TENT

by

Edward W. Ross, Jr.

July 1968

Office of the Scientific Director
U. S. ARMY NATICK LABORATORIES
Natick, Massachusetts
FOREWORD

It has long been felt that the design of shelters could be improved by application of knowledge gained from structural mechanics methods. This paper is a significant contribution to this area and represents a first attempt to devise a realistic and usable model for simulating the behavior of an air-supported, single-wall tent. The results are in general agreement with observations of tent behavior in a wind and inspire confidence in the soundness of the approach.
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This report analyzes the large deformations of a cylindrical, inflated, single-wall tent due to wind pressure and is based on the membrane theory for large deflections but small strains. The tent cross-section is a sector of a circle in the undeformed position, and the wind is blowing on it in the broadside direction. The tent motion is taken as plane, and it is assumed that the wind pressure distribution is known in the deformed state. The problem is solved by numerical analysis and results are presented for the stress, deformed shape, aerodynamic resultants and anchor forces. The problem is of theoretical interest because the linear membrane theory does not have a unique solution for it, and also because it illustrates that the method of small deformations superposed on large is of little help when the large deformation is of inextensional type.
LARGE DEFLECTIONS OF AN INFLATED CYLINDRICAL TENT

1. Introduction

In recent years the use of pressure-supported structures has become attractive to aerospace and military equipment designers. The literature dealing with these problems includes work by Leonard, Brooks and McComb [1], Stein and Hedgepeth [2] and a book by Otto [3].

The present paper describes an investigation of the deflections suffered by a pressure-supported tent when subjected to a wind. The tent has the shape of a long sector of a cylinder, held down at the edges, and the wind is in the broadside direction (i.e., parallel to the ground and perpendicular to the axis of the cylinder). A right-handed cartesian coordinate system is chosen as shown in figure 1. If the tent is long enough it is reasonable that (except near the ends) the deformation will be in the x-y plane, possibly with a uniform z-stretch superposed.

We shall postulate that the tent material is perfectly flexible, i.e., it has zero bending stiffness. This means that it is unstable when either principal stress is negative, and we shall be concerned here only with the case where neither principal stress is negative. We assume further that the tent material is not highly elastic in tension, i.e., the strains are always small, and it is adequate to use a linear elastic law for an orthotropic material. Although the strains are small, the rotations and displacements may be large, and we shall employ large-deflection membrane theory in our analysis.

Initially, it is assumed that three kinds of loads act on the shell, external wind pressure, internal inflation pressure and gravity. If the wind is very
Figure 1. Orientation of Tent and Wind
weak, all these forces may be of comparable size, but, when the wind is at all strong, the pressure forces are much larger than the gravity forces, which may then be neglected.

The fundamental analysis of this problem is described in Section 2, and its final formulation as an integro-differential equation system is obtained in Section 3. A general solution in finite terms could not be obtained although a simple special case is solved in Section 3. Section 4 describes a numerical analysis of the problem which led to a computer program that produced the results described in Section 5. The paper concludes with the discussion of Section 6.
2. Analysis

We assume that the undeformed body is a portion of a cylindrical shell of constant thickness \( h \), whose middle surface is described by cylindrical coordinates \( a, \phi, Z \) which are related to the cartesian coordinates \( X, Y, Z \) of the undeformed snell by (see Figure 2a)

\[
X = a \sin \phi, \quad Y = -a \cos \phi.
\]

The cylindrical coordinates of the deformed middle surface, \( r, \phi, z \) are related to its cartesian coordinates \( x, y, z \) by (see Figure 2b)

\[
x = r \sin \phi, \quad y = -r \sin \phi.
\]

The deformation is assumed to carry the initially circular cylinder into a non-circular cylinder by means of a plane motion with a superposed uniform stretch*, and is defined by

\[
r = r(\phi), \quad \phi = \phi(\phi), \quad z = \lambda Z \quad (\lambda \text{ constant})
\]

The mixed (i.e., physical) middle surface strain components are

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_{\phi \phi} &= \frac{1}{r^2} \left[ \left( \frac{dr}{d\phi} \right)^2 \left\{ \frac{(r/a)^2}{\frac{1}{a} \frac{dr}{d\phi}} \right\} - 1 \right] \equiv \gamma_s \\
\gamma_{\phi z} &= \frac{1}{2}(\lambda^2 - 1) \equiv \gamma_z \\
\gamma_{z z} &= \gamma_{sz} = 0
\end{align*}
\]

*The possibility of this uniform stretch occurring in practice depends on the way in which the tent is held down at the edges.
Figure 2. (a) Coordinate System in the Undeformed Tent
(b) Coordinate System in the Deformed Tent
If $s$ is the deformed circumferential arc length and $\psi$ is the slope angle of the deformed circumferential arc, we have by geometry (Figure 3)

$$\frac{ds}{d\phi} = \left[ r^2 + \left( \frac{dr}{d\phi} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}$$

(3)

$$\psi = \phi - \Gamma$$

(4)

where

$$\Gamma = \text{arc tan} \left( r^{-1} \frac{dr}{d\phi} \right).$$

(5)

Also, if $R_s$ is the radius of curvature of the deformed circumferential arc,

$$\frac{1}{R_s} = \frac{d\psi}{ds}$$

(6)

and

$$\frac{ds}{d\phi} = r \sec (\psi - \psi).$$

(7)

The physical stress-resultants, $N_s$, $N_z$ and $N_{sz}$ in the deformed state obey the equilibrium conditions

$$\left( \frac{\partial N_s}{\partial z} \right) + \left( \frac{\partial N_{sz}}{\partial s} \right) = 0$$

(8)

$$\left( \frac{\partial N_{sz}}{\partial z} \right) + \left( \frac{\partial N_s}{\partial s} \right) = \rho gh \sin \psi(s)$$

(9)

$$\frac{N_s}{R_s} = P_1 - P_w + \rho gh \cos \psi(s)$$

(10)

where $\rho g$ is the weight density of the shell material, $P_1$ is the uniform internal pressure and $P_w(s)$ is the non-uniform wind pressure.

The constitutive relations are those for an orthotropic thin shell undergoing small strains,

$$\frac{N_s}{h} = C_1 Y_s + C_2 Y_z$$

(11)

$$\frac{N_z}{h} = C_2 Y_s + C_3 Y_z$$

(12)

$$\frac{N_{sz}}{h} = C_4 Y_{sz}$$

(13)

where $C_1$, $C_2$, $C_3$, $C_4$ are elastic constants.

The edge conditions express that the tent is held down at both edges during the deformation, i.e.

$$\begin{align*}
r(\phi_0) &= r(\phi_L) = a \\
\phi(\phi_0) &= \phi_0, \quad \phi(\phi_L) = \phi_L
\end{align*}$$

(14)
Figure 3. Geometry of the Deformed Tent
Equations (2) - (14) are the mathematical embodiment of the physical problem we wish to solve. They can be simplified slightly by using \( r_{sz} = 0 \), whence (13) and (8) imply

\[
\begin{align*}
N_{sz} &= 0 \\
N_z &= N_z(s)
\end{align*}
\]

If \( \phi \) is taken as the independent variable we may write the system as

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dr}{d\phi} &= r \tan (\phi - \psi) \\
\frac{d\phi}{d\phi} &= \left(\frac{r}{a}\right)(1 + 2y_z)^{1/2} \sec (\phi - \psi) \\
\frac{dN_s}{d\phi} &= \rho \gamma \sin \psi \sec (\phi - \psi) \\
\frac{dN_z}{d\phi} &= (P_i - \rho_u + \rho \gamma \cos \psi) \frac{r \sec (\phi - \psi)}{N_s}
\end{align*}
\]

together with the constitutive relations

\[
\begin{align*}
N_s/h &= C_1(v_2 + \nu \gamma_z), \\
N_z/h &= C_1(\nu \gamma_z + a \gamma_z)
\end{align*}
\]

and the boundary conditions (14). Here

\[
\nu = C_2/C_1, \quad \alpha = C_3/C_1,
\]

and the constant \( \gamma_z \), the uniform axial strain, is taken as known. The entire system is then a fourth order, non-linear ordinary differential equation system.

We now put the equations into dimensionless form. If \( \rho_a \) and \( U \) are the mass density and free-stream velocity of the air, respectively, we set

\[
\begin{align*}
r &= \alpha R, \\
N_s &= hC_1n_s, \\
N_z &= hC_1n_z \\
P_i &= q_1(1/2)\rho_a U^2, \\
P_u &= q_u(1/2)\rho_a U^2, \\
\eta &= a \frac{\rho_u^2}{2hC_1}, \\
\zeta &= \frac{apg}{C_1}
\end{align*}
\]
The equations become

\[ \frac{dR}{d\phi} = R \tan (\phi - \psi) \]
\[ \frac{d\psi}{d\phi} = R(1 + 2y_s)^{-1/2} \sec (\phi - \psi) \]
\[ \frac{dn_s}{d\phi} = \zeta \sin \psi \sec (\phi - \psi) \]
\[ \frac{d\psi}{d\phi} = [n(q_1 - q_w) + \zeta \cos \psi] R \sec (\phi - \psi) / n. \]
\[ n_s = y_s + \nu y_z, \quad n_2 = \nu y_s + \alpha y_z \]

and the boundary conditions are

\[ R(\phi_0) = R(\phi_L) = 1 \]
\[ \psi(\phi_0) = \nu, \quad \psi(\phi_L) = \nu \]

We may identify \( \zeta \) and \( \eta \) as dimensionless parameters measuring the ratios of pressure forces and gravity forces, respectively, to elastic forces.
\section*{High Wind Approximation}

In a test run on a tent model in a wind tunnel \cite{4} the numbers were

\begin{align*}
\eta C_1 &= 250 \text{ lb/in.}, \quad a = 10.5 \text{ in.} \\
\omega &= 60 \text{ miles/hr} = 1056 \text{ in./sec} \\
\epsilon_{a U}^2 / 2 &= 0.064 \text{ lb/in.}^2 \\
\rho gn &= 2.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ lb/in.}^2
\end{align*}

whence from (21)

\[ \zeta = 1.2 \times 10^{-5}, \quad \eta = 2.67 \times 10^{-3}. \] (28)

These values are typical of the cases where the wind is high. Since these are the most severe cases against which the tent must be designed, we shall concentrate most of our attention on them. For these cases we see that

\[ \zeta \ll \eta \ll 1, \]

and therefore we may neglect the terms involving \( \zeta \) in (24) and (25). We call this the high-wind approximation.

With this approximation (24) and (26) imply that \( n_z, n_x, y_z \) are all independent of \( \varphi \). Moreover, from (23) and (27) we obtain

\[ \int_{\phi_0}^{\phi_L} (d\phi/d\varphi) d\varphi = (1 + 2y_z)^{-1/2} \int_{\phi_0}^{\phi_L} x \sec (\varphi - \psi) d\varphi = \phi_L - \phi_0. \]

Thus, since the strain is small, we get finally

\[ y_z = (\phi_L - \phi_0)^{-1} \int_{\phi_0}^{\phi_L} [R \sec (\varphi - \psi) - 1] d\varphi. \] (29)

Then the basic system reduces to

\[ d\rho / d\varphi = R \tan (\varphi - \psi) \] (30)

\[ d\psi / d\varphi = (\eta / n_z)(q_j - q_w) R \sec (\varphi - \psi) \] (31)
\[ \begin{align*}
K(\phi_o) &= R(\phi_L) = 1 \\
n_s &= \nu\gamma_z + (\phi_L - \phi_o)^{-1} \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} [\kappa \sec (\phi - \phi) - 1] d\phi.
\end{align*} \] (32) (33)

This is now a second-order integro-differential equation system for the functions \( K(\phi), \psi(\phi) \) and the constant \( n_s \). When this system has been solved, the function \( \psi(\phi) \) can be found by quadrature,

\[ \psi = \psi_o + (1 - \gamma_s) \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi} \kappa \sec (\phi - \psi) d\phi. \] (34)

We see from (34) that \( \psi(\phi) \), which completes the definition of the deformation, can be separated as follows

\[ \psi = \psi_1 + \psi_s \]

where

\[ \psi_1 = \psi_o + \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi} [R(3) \sec (\psi(3) - \psi(3))] d\phi \]

\[ \psi_s = -\gamma_s \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi} \kappa(3) \sec (\psi(3) - \psi(3)) d\phi. \]

\( \psi_1 \) defines a deformation without strain (an inextensional deformation) and \( \psi_s \) defines the very small deformation associated with the strain.

In some cases an alternative formulation of (33) may be helpful. Since \( n_z \) is independent of \( \phi \), we have

\[ F_z = \nu c_1 n_z (\phi_L - \phi_o) \]

where \( F_z \) is the total axial force. Then we may rephrase (33) in terms of \( F_z \) rather than \( \gamma_z \) with the aid of (26),

\[ n_s = \frac{\nu F_z}{\kappa m c_1 (\phi_L - \phi_o)} + \frac{(a-v^2)}{a(\phi_L - \phi_o)} \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} \kappa \sec (\phi - \psi) d\phi. \] (35)

In some practical cases information about \( F_z \) may be more readily sustainable than information about \( \gamma_z \) and (35) will be more convenient than (33). We
notice that the parameter \( a \) which measures the degree of fabric anisotropy, enters into the final system only through (35).

We may obtain three useful identities between the pressure distribution and the tensile forces at the edges by taking various definite integrals of the equilibrium equation (31). These identities merely represent the conditions of overall equilibrium of forces and moments. To find the first two we multiply (31) by \( \cos \psi \) and \( \sin \psi \), respectively, and integrate from \( \phi_o \) to \( \phi_L \), obtaining

\[
n_s (\sin \psi_L - \sin \psi_o) = \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} (q_i - q_w) R \cos \psi \sec (\phi - \psi) d\phi
\]

\[
n_s (\cos \psi_o - \cos \psi_L) = \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} (q_i - q_w) R \sin \psi \sec (\phi - \psi) d\phi
\]

The third identity is found as follows: Multiply (31) by \( R \sin (\phi - \psi) \) and integrate from \( \phi_o \) to \( \phi_L \),

\[
n_s \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} R(d\psi/d\phi) \sin (\phi - \psi) d\phi = \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} (q_i - q_e) R^2 \tan (\phi - \psi) d\phi
\]

We have

\[
R(d\psi/d\phi) \sin (\phi - \psi) = [R \cos (\phi - \psi)]/(d\phi) - \cos (\phi - \psi) [d\phi/d\phi]
\]

The last term vanishes because of (30), and so we obtain

\[
n_s [\cos (\phi_L - \psi_L) - \cos (\phi_o - \psi_o)] = \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} (q_i - q_e) R^2 \tan (\phi - \psi) d\phi
\]

We may express the horizontal and vertical force resultants and the overturning moment resultants (see Figure 4) due to the wind pressure and inflation.
Figure 4: Sign Conventions for Pressure Force and Moment Resultants
pressure on the deformed tent at

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
V_w \\
H_w
\end{bmatrix} = \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} R q_w \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \psi \\
\sin \psi
\end{bmatrix} \sec (\phi - \psi) d\phi
\]  (39)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
V_i \\
H_i
\end{bmatrix} = - \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} R q_i \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \psi \\
\sin \psi
\end{bmatrix} \sec (\phi - \psi) d\phi
\]  (40)

\[
M_w = \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} R^2 q_w \tan (\phi - \psi) d\phi
\]  (41)

\[
M_i = - \int_{\phi_o}^{\phi_L} R^2 q_i \tan (\phi - \psi) d\phi
\]  (42)

Further, the vertical and horizontal components of the restraining forces at
the upwind edge, \( \phi_o \), and the downwind edge, \( \phi_L \), are respectively

\[V_u = n_s \sin \psi_o, \quad V_D = n_s \sin (2\pi - \psi_L) = - n_s \sin \psi_L\]  (43)

\[H_u = - n_s \cos \psi_o, \quad H_D = n_s \cos (2\pi - \psi_L) = n_s \cos \psi_L\]  (44)

Then the relations (36) - (38) may be written

\[V_u + V_D = n (V_i + V_w)\]  (45)

\[H_u + H_D = n (H_i + H_w)\]  (46)

\[V_u \sin \phi_o + V_D \sin \phi_L - H_u \cos \phi_o - H_D \cos \phi_L = n (M_w + M_i)\]  (47)
These definitions are useful in describing the forces acting on the tent during its deformation.

The system (30), (31) can be written in the form of a single, second-order differential equation by solving (31) for $R$ and inserting the result in (30). We get

$$d^2(\sin \Gamma)/d\phi^2 - G d(\sin \Gamma)/d\phi + \sin \Gamma = -\cos \Gamma,$$  \hspace{1cm} (48)

where

$$G = G(\phi) = d[\log (\eta_1 - \eta_2)]/d\phi,$$  \hspace{1cm} (49)

and $R$ can be found from

$$R = [\cos \Gamma + d(\sin \Gamma)/d\phi] \eta_s/\eta(\eta_1 - \eta_2).$$  \hspace{1cm} (50)

Equation (48) is still in general non-linear and is awkward because of the singularity where $\eta_1 = \eta_2$, see (45). For purposes of numerical analysis the system (30), (31) is more convenient. However, (48) - (50) is useful for finding approximate solutions in certain special cases.

First, if the total pressure, $\eta_1 - \eta_2$, is constant, then $G = 0$, and (48) can be solved very easily. Some complications still remain due to the non-linearity of (50). If, in addition, $\sin \Gamma$ is small enough so that $\cos \Gamma \approx 1$, the system can easily be solved for $R$ and $\sin \Gamma$, and the results inserted in (33) or (35) to evaluate $n_s$. Some care is required in these manipulations, but for the case

$$\phi_L = 2\pi - \phi_0, \quad \Gamma_2 = 0, \quad a = 1$$

we obtain, using (35), the results
\[ R = 1 + C (\cos \phi_0 - \cos \phi) \]
\[ \sin \Gamma = -C \sin \phi \]
\[ n_S = \frac{n (q_i - q_w)}{1 - C \cos \phi_0} \]
\[ C = \frac{n (\pi - \phi_0)(q_i - q_w)}{(1 - v^2)(\pi - \phi_0) \cos \phi_0 + \sin \phi_0} \]

Apart from this simple solution, the interro-differential equation systems (30) - (32) and (33) or (35) seem intractable with purely analytical methods, and recourse was had to numerical analysis at this point.
Numerical Analysis

The computer program for solving the systems (30) - (32) and (35) is based on the following procedure, assuming that we know the function \( q_\omega(\phi) \) and the constants \( \phi_0, \phi_L, n_s, q_i, v, \Gamma_z \) and \( a \). A trial value is chosen for \( n_s \). The second-order differential equation system (30) - (32) is solved, using the trial value of \( n_s \). The solutions for \( R(\phi) \) and \( \psi(\phi) \) are then substituted into either (33) or (35) and a new value of \( n_s \) is obtained, which is compared with the trial value. If the two do not agree, a new trial value is used and the procedure repeated until agreement is obtained. When agreement has been reached, the function \( \delta(z) \) is found by a numerical integration and various quantities of physical interest, \( V_1, V_w, H_1, H_w, M_1, M_w, V_D, H_4 \) and \( H_{ij} \) are also calculated.

The boundary value problem posed by the differential equation system (30) - (32) was solved by repeated use of the second-order Runge-Kutta procedure for a pair of first-order equations, as described, for example, in [5]. A trial-and-error procedure was needed because the boundary conditions were of two-point type. Various values were tried for \( \psi(\phi_0) \) until one was obtained that generated a solution having \( R(\phi_0) = 1 \). This process was systematized by use of an iterative procedure to produce rapid (but not sure) convergence to the solution having \( R(\phi_0) = 1 \).

The accuracy of the program was tested in various ways. For a uniform pressure distribution, numerical results were compared with (51) and gave satisfactory agreement, but this was not a severe test of the computation scheme. A more stringent procedure was to make successive refinements of the mesh for a pressure distribution typical of a broadside wind on the tent. Since \( |r_s| \ll 1 \), and \( n_s \) is obtained in (33) by integrating quantities, \( R \) and \( v \), that are not small, a good
A deal of cancellation takes place in calculating \( n_s \). This suggests that the stability of \( n_s \) is a sensitive test of the accuracy of the entire computation. Several such tests were made. For example, using the values

\[
\begin{align*}
\phi_o &= 60^\circ, \quad \phi_L = 2\pi - \phi_o = 300^\circ, \quad \eta = 0.267 \times 10^{-2} \\
\alpha &= 1, \quad \nu = 0.3, \quad q_i = 0.5
\end{align*}
\]

and taking for \( q_w(\phi) \) a distribution typical of a broadside wind, the following results were obtained from calculations with \( K \) mesh points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( K )</th>
<th>( n_s )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.002776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.002749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.002742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of \( n_s \) is quite stable in this example, and several similar tests gave like results.

In general, the program worked well although poor initial guesses for \( \psi(\phi_o) \) or \( n_s \) sometimes caused it to fail. This difficulty could be evaded by changing the initial guesses. A different stumbling block is encountered when \( \psi - \phi = \pi/2 \) at some point. At these points there is a singularity in the differential equation system (30) and (31), which is caused by the use of \( \phi \) as independent variable (see (7)). If this singularity is to occur, the deflections must be very large, far larger than could be tolerated in use. This singularity did occur in some extreme cases among the calculations described in the next Section.
3. Results for Several Cases

The program was used to calculate deflections, strains and other quantities of physical interest for a cylindrical tent with parameters as given in (28).

The values \( v = .1, f \varepsilon = v \) (no net longitudinal force) and \( a = 1 \) (isotropic tent material) were used.

Two different functions were used for the wind pressure distribution \( q_w(\theta) \).

The main one (see Figure 5), called (I), was determined by making pressure measurements around the tent during wind tunnel tests. It is important to notice that the wind tunnel tests were conducted with rather high inflation pressures, \( q_i \), so that the deformations were fairly small. Since the wind pressure distribution depends on the deformed shape (i.e., there is coupling between the fluid flow problem and the elastic deformation problem), this wind pressure distribution may not be an accurate approximation to the true one when the inflation pressure is low.

The second wind pressure distribution, designated as (II), is a discontinuous, purely hypothetical one, given by

\[
q_w = 0.8 \quad 60^\circ \leq \theta < 150^\circ \\
q_w = -0.8 \quad 300^\circ \leq \theta > 150^\circ .
\]

Although this has the same general shape as the experimental wind pressure distribution, it is very different in detail, and there is no reason to expect the results to be similar.

All these calculations were carried out with 96 mesh points, for a range of \( q_i \):

\[
\begin{align*}
0 \leq q_i &\leq 2.5 \quad \text{for (I)} \\
0.3 \leq q_i &\leq 2.5 \quad \text{for (II)}
\end{align*}
\]
Figure 5. Two Pressure Distributions Assumed in the Calculations
When the distribution (II) was tried for $0 \leq q_i < 0.3$, the calculation could not be completed owing to the fact that $q_i$ took the value $r/2$ at some points. The results of the calculations that were completed are shown in Figures 6 - 11 as graphs of various parameters plotted against $q_i$. Since the maximum deformation magnitude decreases when $q_i$ increases, we may regard $q_i$ as an inverse measure of the magnitude of deformation. When $q_i \gg \max q_i(\phi)$, the results should agree with the constant pressure, small deflection results (51).

We see from Figure 6 that the tensile stress, $n_s$, is almost linearly dependent on $q_i$ and is not affected much by the change in pressure distributions. The edge angle on the upwind side, $\theta(\phi)$, decreases non-linearly as $q_i$ increases, especially when $q_i$ is small. Also, it is greater for Distribution (II) than for (I). The wind resultants, $V_w$, $H_w$ and $M_w$, which are shown in Figure 7, are sensitive to changes in the wind pressure distribution (i.e., the results for (I) and (II) differ substantially) but not especially so to changes in $q_i$. The vertical resultant of the inflation pressure, $V_J$, is also graphed in Figure 7 and increases linearly with $q_i$, being scarcely affected by the wind distribution. $n_I$ and $M_I$ are negligible compared with $H_w$ and $M_w$, and are not shown.

The deformed tent radii, $R(\phi)$, for the two wind distributions are plotted in Figures 8 and 9. Also, the actual deformed shapes in several different cases are displayed in Figure 10.

For the discontinuous pressure distribution, (II), it is easy to derive certain conclusions that serve as partial checks on the computed results. First, for
Figure 6. Tensile Stress $\sigma_\theta$, and Upwind Edge Angle, $\psi_\theta$, for Wind Pressure Distribution (I) and (II) as Functions of $q_i$. 

$10^2 \sigma_\theta$
Small deformations

\[ \psi = \psi, \quad k - 1 \]

we may obtain the wind pressure resultants by inserting the pressure distribution (II) given by (52), into (39) and (41). We obtain

\[ V_w = .8, \quad \eta_w = .0(1 + \sqrt{2}) = 2.15, \quad \zeta_w = 0 \] (53)

Second, the inflation pressure resultants are found similarly to be

\[ V_i = 2q_i \sin \theta_0 = \sqrt{2} \gamma \]

\[ \xi_i = \zeta_i = 0. \] (54)

Figure 7 shows that the small-deflection estimate (54) for \( V_i \) remains very accurate even for large deflections (i.e., small \( q_i \)). As far as can be determined from Figure 7, \( \gamma_w(II), \eta_w(II) \) and \( \zeta_w(II) \) all approach the limiting values given by (53) as \( q_i \) becomes large. Finally, we know from (10) that the deformed shape of the tent is made up of two arcs of circles joined smoothly at the ray \( \phi = 120^0 \) and passing through the points \( \kappa = 1 \) at \( \phi = 60^0 \) and \( 30^0 \). The shape shown in Figure 10 is seen to have this property with good accuracy.

The edge-restraint forces, from which the ground anchor forces can be estimated, are shown in Figures 11 and 12. These forces should be related to the tent resultants by (45) - (47), and it can be seen that this is true with good accuracy. For example, for the distribution (II) and \( q_i = .3 \) (which is an extreme case) we have

\[ V_u = .1337, \quad V_D = .1010, \quad \eta_u = .3841, \quad \zeta_D = .2033 \]

\[ V_i = .4630, \quad V_w = .3707, \quad \xi_i = .002, \quad \zeta_w = 1.436, \]

\[ \zeta_i = -.0.02, \quad \zeta_w = -.6260 \]
and therefore

\[ V_u + V_D = .235, \quad n(V_i + V_w) = .222 \]

\[ H_u + H_D = .388, \quad n(H_i + H_L) = .383 \]

\[ V_u \sin \phi_o + V_D \sin \phi_L - H_u \cos \phi_o - H_D \cos \phi_L = -.168 \]

\[ n(M_w + M_l) = -.167 \]

We conclude that the program is sufficiently accurate for engineering purposes.
Figure 7. Wind Force and Moment Resultants and Vertical Inflation Force as Functions of $q_i$
Figure 8. Deformed Tent Radius, $R$, as a Function of $\phi$ for Wind Pressure Distribution (I) and Various Inflation Pressures, $q_i$
Figure 9. Deformed Tent Radius, \( R \), as a function of \( \phi \) for Discontinuous Wind Pressure Distribution (II) and Two Inflation Pressures, \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \).
Figure 10. Deformed Shapes for the Two Wind Pressure Distributions and Inflation Pressure $q_i = 0.3$
Figure 11. Vertical Components of Edge Restraint (Ground Anchor) Forces as Functions of $q_i$ for the Two Wind Pressure Distributions.
Figure 17: Horizontal Components of Edge Restraint (Ground Anchor) Forces as Functions of $q_1$ for the Two Wind Pressure Distributions

$H_x^{(I)}$, $H_y^{(I)}$, $H_x^{(II)}$, $H_y^{(II)}$
Discussion

There are several aspects of this problem that are worth further discussion.

First, it is important to understand what has been done in this analysis and how it is related to the practical problem of predicting tent behavior. The central point is that we have taken the wind-pressure in the deformed state as known. From it we have calculated the deformed shape, under the kinematic assumptions (1). In attempting to use these results in practice, we face the obstacle of not knowing the wind-pressure distribution in the deformed state. To analyze the problem completely, we need to know the wind-pressure distribution for every reasonable deformed state (in this connection see the comments of Truesdell and Noll [4]), a severe requirement in view of the fact that turbulent separation occurs for most tent shapes. Moreover, experiments [4] show that at sufficiently low inflation pressures the tent executes a large lateral vibration. To analyze these cases we must also consider inertia forces in the tent and possibly also in the fluid. From these remarks it should be clear that, while this paper presents necessary and useful information about tent deformation, a great deal remains to be done before a practically satisfactory prediction of tent behavior is possible.

Second, it is necessary to be careful about our interpretation of the small deflection results in this problem. We assume that the tent is in the undeformed state, with circular cylindrical shape, in the complete absence of gravity and pressure forces. If gravity alone acts, the tent will, of course, collapse immediately, and the analysis of the system (24) - (27) with $\eta = 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ would show this by predicting $\eta_0 < 0$ for some portion of the shell. If
gravity and inflation pressure are both operative, but there is no wind, then the tent will undergo only small deflections from its undeformed shape, provided the inflation pressure, $n_{ij}$, is above a certain minimum value, such that $n_{s} > 0$ everywhere. We may denote this deformed state, which the tent assumes in calm air, by $\delta SC$. Now, when a high wind is turned on, the tent undergoes such large deformations that the deformations associated with $\delta SC$ are negligible by comparison, as are the gravity forces. This is the basis on which the system (50) - (53) was derived. When we now make a small deflection analysis of this system to get (51), we must remember that gravity forces have been neglected. The actual deformations that occur, when the wind and inflation pressures are very low, are not accurately given by (51), and as the wind velocity approaches zero, (51) does not approach the solution $\delta SC$.

The remaining comments have to do with the relation between this problem and the general theory of thin shells.

It is interesting that the linear membrane theory version of this problem does not have a unique solution for the displacements because the edge fixity implies conditions of vanishing normal displacement. Such conditions lead to non-uniqueness within linear membrane theory (see Novozhilov [7]). Thus, although the stress, $n_{s}$, given by (51), agrees as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ with the stress obtained from linear membrane theory, there is no unique, linear solution with which to compare the deflections of (51).

The similarity of this problem to that for curved rods might lead us to expect that a theory for plane, initially curved rods, similar to the one given in Love [6], would be useful here. Such is not the case, for in that theory the rods are assumed to deform without extension while the extension plays an
important part in the analysis of this problem. We have already pointed out
that the complete motion consists of a small extensional deformation together
with a possibly large inextensional deformation. Although the extensional
deformation is small, it is absolutely crucial because it determines the stress
through the constitutive relation.

Finally, one might also hope to treat the problem by means of the theory of
small deformations superposed on large, as described by Green, Rivlin and Shield
[9], Green and Lema [10], or for elastic membranes, Shield and Cunelussien
[11]. The natural procedure here consists of trying to find the large inexten-
sional deformation first and then superposing the small extensional deformation.
This does not work because the theory supposes that the stresses associated with
the small deformation are small compared with the stresses of the large deforma-
tion, while exactly the opposite is the case here. Another way of looking at it
is that in this theory we imagine the large deformation as determined by condi-
tions of equilibrium with the initially applied loads, and the theory fails be-
cause the large inextensional deformation causes no stresses and therefore cannot
be in equilibrium with any applied loads. In fact the large, inextensional de-
formation is determined by its interaction with the small extensional deformation,
and the two cannot be found separately.
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o. Appendix: Nomenclature

a  
Undeformed tent radius (in.)

C  
Constant, occurring in (51)

Cj  
j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, elastic constants (lb/in.2)

FZ  
Total axis force (lb) on tent

hW, hZ  
Dimensionless horizontal forces on deformed tent due to wind and inflation pressures, respectively

hu, hD  
Dimensionless horizontal restraint forces at upwind and downwind edges of tent, respectively

δ  
Thickness of tent fabric (in.)

N  
Number of mesh points used in numerical integration

dW, hi  
Dimensionless moment of the deformed tent, about the axis, due to wind and inflation pressures, respectively

hS, hZ, hSZ  
Physical stress resultants in fabric (lb/in.)

ns, nz  
Dimensionless physical stress resultants in tangential and axial directions, respectively, see (21)

Pi, PW  
Pressure due to inflation and wind (lb/in.2).

qi, qw  
Dimensionless inflation and wind pressure, see (21)

R  
Dimensionless radius of deformed tent, see (21)

r  
Radius of deformed tent (in.)

Rs  
Radius of curvature of deformed tent (in.), see (6)

s  
Deformed circumferential arc length (in.)

u  
Free stream wind velocity (in./sec)

VW, Vi  
Dimensionless vertical forces on deformed tent due to wind and inflation pressures, respectively
Dimensionless vertical restraint forces at upwind and downwind edges of tent, respectively.

Dimensionless measure of degree of anisotropy, see (20).

Dimensionless physical strain components, see (2).

Dimensionless parameter measuring ratio of gravity forces to elastic forces.

Dimensionless parameter measuring ratio of pressure forces to elastic forces.

Poisson Ratio.

Mass density of air (lb - sec²/in.⁴).

Weight density of tent fabric (lb/in.³).

Cylindrical angle in undeformed tent.

Cylindrical angle in deformed tent.

Cylindrical angles at upwind and downwind edges of tent, respectively.

Slope angle of deformed tent.
This report analyzes the large deformations of a cylindrical, inflated, single-wall tent due to wind pressure and is based on the membrane theory for large deflections but small strains. The tent cross-section is a sector of a circle in the undeformed position, and the wind is blowing on it in the broadside direction. The tent motion is taken as plane, and it is assumed that the wind pressure distribution is known in the deformed state. The problem is solved by numerical analysis and results are presented for the stress, deformed shape, aerodynamic resultants and anchor forces. The problem is of theoretical interest because the linear membrane theory does not have a unique solution for it, and also because it illustrates that the method of small deformations superposed on large is of little help when the large deformation is of unextensional type.
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