

11

AD-A143 249

TEXTILE BALLISTIC PERFORMANCE

(DATA BASE)

Final Technical Report

by

Professor J.W.S.Hearle
Dr.C.M.Leech
Dr.C.R.Cork

JUNE, 1984

EUROPEAN RESEARCH OFFICE

Unites States Army

London, England

Contract Number DAJA 37-82.C-0234

University of Manchester, Institute of Science and Technology
P.O. Box 88,
Sackville Street,
Manchester M60 1QD,
England.

Approved for Public Release; distribution unlimited.

DTIC FILE COPY

DTIC

JUL 19 1984

A

84 07 13 009

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	AD A143249	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Textile Ballistic Performance (DATA BASE)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Technical Report June 1984
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Professor J W S Hearle Dr C M Leech Dr C R Cork		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DAJA 37-82-C-0234
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS University of Manchester Inst. of Science & Technology, P.O.Box 88, Manchester M60 1QD		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 6.11.02A IT161102BH57-04
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS USARDSG-UK Box 65, FPO NY 09510		12. REPORT DATE June 1984
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 64
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Textile, Ballistic, Impact, Kevlar, Nylon, Finite element, Characteristics, Failure, multilayer, weave (woven).		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Nylon and Kevlar textiles are examined for their performance against impact by a lgm projectile, when subject to impact velocities up to 200 m/s. The textiles are of varying areal density, and of varying layer composition and their performance is examined theoretically and experimentally. The theoretical models have been previously developed and are the characteristic model, membrane finite element and a multilayer finite element; the experimental /cont'd.		

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

facility had also been previously established and this report is aimed at correlating the experimental and theoretical facilities and to establish a data base of results.

It was quickly found that the theoretical models favoured nylon over Kevlar for ballistic performance, whereas experimentally Kevlar is superior. It is also shown that the deformation process is correctly modelled and this then suggests that the fracture criterion must be reconsidered; possible fracture mechanisms to be included in textile failure criterion are stated for future consideration.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	1
Introduction	2
The Computational Investigation	2
The Experimental Investigation	5
Experimental Method	6
Experimental Results	7
Conclusion and Discussion of Computational Results	9
Computational Results	10
References	58
Appendix	59



Dist		OF	
A-1			

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Fig. No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1a	Carpet plot of V_{in} vs Area Density for nylon	12
1b	" " " " " " " " Kevlar	13
1c	V_{50} vs Fabric Weight for nylon	14
1d	" " " " " Kevlar	15
2a	Energy Absorbed vs Fabric Weight for nylon	17
2b	" " " " " " Kevlar	18
2c	" " " Area Density for nylon	19
2d	" " " " " " Kevlar	20
3a	" " " Impact Velocity for nylon	22
4a	Maximum Strain vs Fabric Weight for nylon	24
4b	" " " " " " Kevlar	25
5 (a-e)	Computed Response of nylon at various area densities	27 - 31
5(f-j)	" " " " at various impact velocities	32 - 36
5(k-o)	" " " Kevlar at various area densities	37 - 41
5(p-s)	" " " " at various impact velocities	42 - 45
6 a,b	Photographs of impact	47 - 48
6c	Height of Pyramid vs Time for nylon (Characteristics Model)	51
6d	Height of Pyramid vs Time for nylon (Membrane Model)	52
6e	Height of Pyramid vs Time for Kevlar (Characteristics Model)	53
6f	Height of Pyramid vs Time for Kevlar (Membrane Model)	54

<u>Fig. No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
6g	D vs Time for nylon	55
6h	D vs Time for Kevlar	56
6i	D vs Pyramid Height	57

ABSTRACT

Nylon and Kevlar textiles are examined for their performance against impact by a 1gm projectile, when subject to impact velocities up to 2000 m/s. The textiles are of varying areal density, and of varying layer composition and their performance is examined theoretically and experimentally. The theoretical models have been previously developed and are the characteristic model, membrane finite element and a multilayer finite element; the experimental facility had also been previously established and this report is aimed at correlating the experimental and theoretical facilities and to establish a data base of results.

It was quickly found that the theoretical models favoured nylon over Kevlar for ballistic performance, whereas experimentally Kevlar is superior. It is also shown that the deformation process is correctly modelled and this then suggests that the fracture criterion must be reconsidered; possible fracture mechanisms to be included in textile failure criterion are stated for future consideration.

Key words.

Textile, Ballistic, Impact, Kevlar, Nylon, Finite element, Characteristics, Failure, multilayer, weave (woven).

INTRODUCTION

This report uses previously established computational (ref,1,2,3,4) and experimental (ref.5) facilities at UMIST to generate a data bank for the behaviour of synthetic fibre textiles against ballistic impact.

The basic computational procedures used are firstly the method of characteristics which uses the propagational aspects in yarns to model the propagation of signals in yarn structure, namely textiles and secondly the finite element method which segments the plane of the textile into small elements and uses the principle of least action and the energy quantities to develop equations of motion for the element corners. This method is more appropriate for the detail of yarn crimp and for examining viscoelastic effects. The finite element method generates two codes, firstly the named membrane model which properly accounts for crimp and the multilayer-model which accounts for stacked textiles forming a layered structure.

The data basic was established using the following variable parameters.

- i) ballistic parameters (impact velocity, projectile mass).
- ii) Component parameters (yarn stress strain behaviour)
- iii) panel configuration (area density)
- iv) structure parameters (layer composition)

The experimental facilities previously developed consist of a cartridge gun used to launch a 1gm projectile, .22" cylindrical projectile. The impact velocity, and if penetration occurs, the exit velocity of the projectile can be measured, it is therefore possible to calculate the V_{50} or the energy absorption. In addition a multiframe photographic system has been developed in order to study the projectile deceleration dynamics and the configuration of the fabric during impact.

THE COMPUTATIONAL INVESTIGATION

The computer experiments were conducted on a bank of launch and textile data, for Kevlar and nylon; this data is summarised in Tables 1a, 1b and the three computer models drew on this data to yield fabric behaviour with time. From this the projectile kinematics (kinetic energy, velocity) and fabric deformation (indentation, strain, strain energy) are extracted and ultimately used to deduce the fabric survival or integrity and ballistic resistance. The results are presented in a following section.

Case No.	Model	Area den. gm./sq.	Impact vel m/s	Imp. energy joules	Exit vel. m/s	Res. energy joules	Contact time microsec.	Max. strain	% Energy abs.	% Energy left
1	characteristics	400	500	125	496	123.01	5	.032	1.59	98.41
2	characteristics	400	1000	500	998	498.00	2	.032	.40	99.60
3	membrane	400	1000	500	999	499.00	1.2	.032	.20	99.80
4	multi(3)-layer	400	1000	500	991	491.04	4	.032	1.79	98.21
5	characteristics	400	1500	1125	1498	1122.00	1.4	.032	.27	99.73
6	characteristics	400	2000	2000	1999	1998.00	1	.032	.10	99.90
7	membrane	400	2000	2000	1999	1998.00	.5	.032	.10	99.90
8	multi(3)-layer	400	2000	2000	1999	1998.00	2	.032	.10	99.90
9	characteristics	100	500	125	499	124.50	4	.032	.40	99.60
10	characteristics	500	500	125	496	123.01	4	.032	1.59	98.41
11	characteristics	1000	500	125	450	101.25	10	.032	19.00	81.00
12	membrane	1000	500	125	385	74.11	18	.032	46.71	59.29
13	multi(3)-layer	1000	500	125	483	116.64	10	.032	6.68	93.32
14	characteristics	1500	500	125	275	37.81	26	.032	69.75	30.25
15	characteristics	2000	500	125	0	.00	130	.029	100.00	.00
16	membrane	2000	500	125	0	.00	66	.024	100.00	.00
17	multi(3)-layer	2000	500	125	487	118.58	10	.032	5.13	94.87
18	membrane	3000	500	125	0	.00	65	.022	100.00	.00
19	multi(3)-layer	3000	500	125	497	123.50	9	.032	1.20	98.80
20	membrane	4000	500	125	0	.00	63	.021	100.00	.00
21	multi(3)-layer	4000	500	125	497	123.50	9	.032	1.20	98.80
22	membrane	1158	150	11.25	0	.00	108	.011	100.00	.00

BALLISTIC RESISTANCE OF SYNTHETIC CLOTH

Kevlar breaking strain=0.032 projectile mass=1gm.

Table 1a

Case No.	Model	Area den. gr./m.sq.	Impact vel m/s	Imp. energy joules	Exit vel. m/s	Res. energy joules	Contact time microsec.	Max. strain	% Energy abs.	% Energy left
1	Characteristics	400	100	5	0	0	.00	.146	100.00	.00
2	Characteristics	400	300	45	280	33.80	35	.24	24.89	75.11
3	Characteristics	400	400	80	379	71.82	n.a.	.24	10.22	89.78
4	Characteristics	400	500	125	485	117.61	16	.24	5.91	94.09
5	Characteristics	400	1000	500	994	494.02	7	.24	1.20	98.80
6	membrane	400	1000	500	998	498.00	3	.24	.40	99.60
7	multi(3)-layer	400	1000	500	132	11.55	2.5	.24	97.69	2.31
8	Characteristics	400	2000	2000	1997	1994.00	3.8	.24	.30	99.70
9	membrane	400	2000	2000	1999	1998.00	1.5	.24	.10	99.90
10	multi(3)-layer	400	2000	2000	220	24.20	6	.24	98.79	1.21
11	Characteristics	100	500	125	497	123.50	14	.24	1.20	98.80
12	Characteristics	200	500	125	492	121.03	n.a.	.24	3.17	96.83
13	Characteristics	500	500	125	480	115.20	16	.24	7.84	92.16
14	Characteristics	600	500	125	464	107.65	n.a.	.24	13.88	86.12
15	Characteristics	800	500	125	433	93.74	n.a.	.24	25.00	75.00
16	Characteristics	1000	500	125	350	61.25	40	.24	51.00	49.00
17	membrane	1000	500	125	390	76.05	24	.24	39.16	60.84
18	multi(3)-layer	1000	500	125	153	11.70	57	.24	90.64	9.36
19	Characteristics	1100	500	125	0	.00	n.a.	n.a.	100.00	.00
20	Characteristics	1500	500	125	0	.00	130	.19	100.00	.00
21	Characteristics	2000	500	125	0	.00	135	.17	100.00	.00
22	membrane	2000	500	125	0	.00	175	.196	100.00	.00
23	multi(3)-layer	2000	500	125	487	118.58	25	.24	5.13	94.87
24	membrane	3000	500	125	0	.00	134	.187	100.00	.00
25	multi(3)-layer	3000	500	125	490	120.05	25	.24	3.96	96.04
26	membrane	4000	500	125	0	.00	86	.184	100.00	.00
27	multi(3)-layer	4000	500	125	491	120.54	14	.24	3.57	96.43
28	Characteristics	100	150	11.25	0	.00	n.a.	n.a.	100.00	.00
29	Characteristics	100	300	45	292	42.63	n.a.	.24	5.26	94.74
30	Characteristics	200	100	5	0	.00	n.a.	n.a.	100.00	.00
31	Characteristics	800	400	80	0	.00	n.a.	n.a.	100.00	.00
32	Characteristics	800	1500	1125	1462	1068.72	n.a.	.24	5.00	95.00
33	membrane	1158	150	11.25	0	.00	263	.067	100.00	.00
34	Characteristics	1500	700	245	0	.00	n.a.	.24	100.00	.00
35	Characteristics	1500	1000	500	949	450.30	n.a.	.24	9.94	90.06
36	Characteristics	1500	1500	1125	1470	1080.45	n.a.	.24	3.96	96.04
37	Characteristics	2000	1000	500	0	.00	n.a.	n.a.	100.00	.00

Table 1b

THE EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

The experimental program was designed to obtain data on the V_{50} (the velocity at which 50% of projectiles are defeated) and the energy absorption of multilayer nylon and Kevlar fabrics. In order that the experimental work should be as directly comparable to the computer models the projectile was chosen to be a blunt nosed cylinder rather than the chisel nosed fragment simulator more generally used. In addition the fabric has a fixed boundary in the computational model and is likewise clamped in the experimental case.

Apart from the V_{50} and the energy absorption there are secondary output parameters concerned with the mechanism of the projectile fabric interaction. Examples of these parameters are

- i) projectile deceleration and the applied force;
- ii) stress and strain distribution within the fabric;
- iii) the position of the transverse wave;
- iv) the time to failure.

It is of great interest to compare these outputs with observations of actual impact either to confirm computer prediction or in order to indicate where improvements in the simulation can be made.

There is currently a lack of published data on woven fabrics in this area. Notable exceptions are the independent work of Maheux⁶, Roylance⁷ and Morrison⁸. Roylance has observed photographically the transverse impact of a single layer of nylon fabric at velocities between 116 and 537 m/sec and provides data on the position of the transverse wave (cone radius) as a function of time for the lowest impact velocity.

Morrison has applied multi-flash silhouette photography to observe the response to impact of Kevlar fabrics incorporated in composite structures. These results have been compared to that of the fabric alone. Morrison uses data from single layer impact to determine the development of the pyramid deformation with time, and goes on to predict the partition of energy within the fabric during impact.

The aim of the present work was to extend this work to produce i) directly comparable results between Kevlar and nylon, and ii) information on the effect of the number of layers on the above mentioned parameters.

The above listed output parameters cannot all be measured either easily or directly. It was therefore decided that the current work should concentrate on the parameters which

could be measured photographically. These are :

- i) the position of the pyramid apex as a function of time;
- ii) the position of the transverse wave front, also a function of time;
- iii) the time to failure.

The first parameter approximates to the projectile position. From these results the apex velocity and the transverse wave velocity can be calculated.

For the purpose of the present experimental work, two experimental variables were chosen, namely :

- i) the area density of the multi-layered fabric;
- ii) The fabric material.

In terms of end use the aim is always to optimise the latter in order to minimise the former.

EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

Multi-layered samples were prepared such that the overall fabric weight was as close as possible to 1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000 g m⁻².

One Kevlar (351 g m⁻²) and one nylon (241 g m⁻²) fabric were tested. The nominal impact velocity was 500m s⁻¹.

The test method was as follows :-

An opaque screen was illuminated by a series of three light flashes of short duration. A still camera was located facing the screen. The camera was aimed along the plane of the back surface of the fabric at right angles to the direction of flight of the projectile. The camera was opened in a dark room and the lights were triggered by a circuit breaker just before impact. The actual times of each flash were recorded as a trace of light intensity against time on a transient recorder using a photodiode. The actual times of the flashes were found to differ from the times set on the delay box. This was attributed to delays inherent in the lights. The aim was to provide data at 10 μ s intervals and also at 20 μ s or 40 μ s interval if penetration did not occur before the last flash.

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Typical photographs obtained by the above method are shown in figures 6a, b. In figure 6a the silhouette of the pyramid of deformation is shown at approximately 10, 20, 30 and 40 μ s after impact. Figure 6a (A to G) are nylon of nominal area density of 2000, 3000 and 4000 g m^{-2} respectively, whilst D,E,F,G shows corresponding photographs of Kevlar.

No results were obtained for nylon at 1000 g m^{-2} as penetration occurred too quickly after impact, and as will be explained below, at least two images are required in order to normalise results.

In figure 6b similar photographs of penetration are displayed; here, however, the deformations are shown up to the time of penetration, if this occurs.

All the multi-flash photographs are shown to the same scale. The minor divisions in the scale were of the order of millimeters, and the observed deformations were of the order of centimetres.

From these photographs and others the following were determined:

- i) the pyramid height above the surface of the last layer (h),
- ii) The distance between the left and right transverse wave front (D)

The time measured by the experiment was the time after the triggering of the electronic system by the projectile. Due to minor variations in impact velocity and also because of the change in the position of the last fabric layer due to variations in the sample thickness, results from different tests on different samples cannot be immediately compared. In order to overcome this problem the measured times normalised such that the instant of first movement of the last layer was equal to t_0 . This was accomplished by assuming an approximate constant velocity of apex, between the times of the first two light flashes (giving results h_1 , t_1 and h_2 , t_2). The normalised time t_n was for any time t was found by

$$t_n = t + K$$

where
$$K = t_1 - \frac{h_1(t_1 - t_2)}{(h_1 - h_2)}$$

The results for nylon and Kevlar are shown as plots of pyramid height v time in figures 6 c, e respectively.

No measurable deceleration was seen for the nylon data so the data points were statistically fitted to a straight line. It is not, however, assumed that no deceleration occurs, just that the deceleration is too small to be observable. Indeed, table 2

Area Density (g m^{-2})	Velocity (m s^{-1})
1928	382
2892	341
4097	277

TABLE 2

shows the average velocity of the apex during the observable projectile-fabric interaction. This shows a reduction in mean interaction velocity with increased area-density.

In contrast to the nylon data the Kevlar curves are concave downward reflecting an observable deceleration.

In both figures 6c,d,e,f, the cut off of the curve indicates that penetration occurs. No cut-off is observed for the 3861 g m^{-2} Kevlar as penetration did not occur.

Figures 6g, h are plots of the distance of the transverse wave from the centre of impact ($D/2$) against time. There are no theoretical curve fits available but the plots are included for the sake of completeness.

This distance is measured along the warp direction such that the distance D corresponds to the pyramid diagonal. As before the nylon data has been fitted to straight lines. The similarity between figures either 6c and 6h suggests a linear relation between the pyramid height and width of the base. Figure 6i shows that this is indeed the case for both nylon and Kevlar. The ratio between the base and height being greater for Kevlar. There are also small differences in this relation dependent on the number of layers.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION OF COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS.

The numerical results predict that nylon is better than Kevlar, which is in contradiction to experiments.

Three possible explanations surface

1. The analysis and computation is in error
2. The fabric properties are wrong
3. The failure criteria is incorrect.

The first two explanations seem unlikely in view of the agreement observed in Figures 6 c,d,e,f. Significant discrepancy is obvious not in the curve, but in the ending of the curve, namely the break point which is delayed in the computation model beyond the experimental results. The exception to this is the lower area density Kevlar textiles ($<1000 \text{ g/m}^2$), when the computation and experiments are in quite good agreement.

The probable cause for the lack of agreement, is the definition of failure criteria. Kevlar fibres have been assumed to break at 0.032 strain and nylon at 0.24 strain. These are the quoted static fibre strain values and have been incorporated as a textile failure criteria (including the effect of crimp). These criteria will have to be re-evaluated in the light of the above, and it would appear that other effects beside straight tension failure of fibres are present when the textile fails.

They can be

- a) early fibre failure due to strain rate (Viscoelastic)
- b) premature failure in nylon due to local heating
- c) cutting
- d) bending, due to decrimping and flexure

for fibre failure and

- e) accentuated stretch due to structure bending
- f) yarn opening to allow projectile to proceed
- g) fibre finishes to inhibit load equalisation

for the textile 'failure'.

Obviously these questions cannot be answered here but do suggest the need for a more detailed study of the localised phenomenon. It is suggested here that since fibre rate behaviours are known point (a) can be considered in an iterative or empirical manner. Also the correlation of experimental and computation results can be used to give a

measure of the fibre failure criteria when used in a structure , at high strain rates and against localised impact. This correlation and reverse criterion estimates were shown in the Appendix.

In conclusion it follows that

- a) fibre tensile strength as obtained in a static test is of little use as a criterion for these fibres when used in a structure, at high rates of straining and in a localised impact.
- b) the fibres need to be stiff and light (favouring Kevlar) so that as much of the textile structure is effective in the impact as possible (large cone area).
- c) the fibre should be rough to give forth good fibre to fibre contact and thus sharing the impact over the structure and secondly to resist the opening force which is presented during impact especially by ogival or pointed projectiles.
- d) they should be of low tex so that their flexure in crimp and in the impact process does not give rise to much higher strains (from bending).
- e) consideration should be given to the effects of thermodynamic energy and how temperature rise influences stiffness.
- f) resistance to cutting and crushing by the projectile must be considered again in the light of the above lack of agreement in the terminal phase between experimental observation and computer models based upon static tensile fibre strength.

COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS

The three models used in predicting the performance of ballistic textiles are as follows :

- a) The characteristics model uses the yarn material properties (mass and stiffness) and the yarn direction to determine the propagation of signals through the textile; there is no crimp or thickness modelling and it is expected that for fast events this model would be quite accurate.
- b) the membrane model which, based upon finite element theory can account in detail for the yarn path through the textile (crimp); however the model since it uses finite element theory cannot usefully predict high speed events since stress wave propagation is not accurately accounted for.

c) The multi-layer (finite element) model accounts for the layers (in this case, three) which are stacked together and can relatively slide and individually fail; because the structure thickness is now included this model should work well at lower speeds since at higher speeds the contacting layer can deform and indeed fail before the other layers have even started to move. This model would be used for thick structures with bending stiffness at lower velocities.

These models have been run for nylon and Kevlar for a series of impact velocities and fabric weights. The accompanying tables 1a and 1b summarise the fabric performance by considering exit velocity (and its derivative, residual energy, energy absorption) contact time (to break or stop) and the maximum strain encountered in the fibres.

The results of the computational models are presented in the following manner for both nylon A and Kevlar.


Firstly a carpet plot Fig. 1a,b axes being impact velocity and area density; on these plots each case is entered, a point indicating that the projectile is stopped and a cross indicates that the fabric has failed. Also shown is the divide between stopping and penetration as estimated from a fit to existing experimental data.

Generally it is seen that the computer predictions give an upper value for the necessary impact velocities for a given textile structure (area density); it is also seen that more data is needed in the vicinity of the experimental data fit for the multilayer model since every prediction resulted in textile failure. This indeed may be the better model to use, although initially it was not thought to be as accurate as the characteristic or membrane models.

Without exception each prediction showed that nylon performed better than Kevlar from the point of stopping; however in comparable cases when both materials stopped the projectile Kevlar stopped it quicker (more deceleration). This is a consequence of the fact that Kevlar is stiffer and breaks at lower strain. Thus the energy absorbed may be less in the breaking cases, but in the stopping case the stiffness gives a faster arrest.

The divide between the break and stopping cases (crosses and dots) give a curve for the extraction of the V_{50} against area density.


The figures 1c,d show the extrapolation of V_{50} against area density using interpolation of the latter graphs.




V_{50} v Fabric weight

Fig. 1c

Kevlar



Figures 2a, to d show the energy absorbed plotted against area density for different impact velocities; when the projectile has stopped there is 100% energy absorption and thus at those points the graph is parallel to the fabric weight axis; the poor performance of Kevlar as predicted by the multilayer model is shown in Fig.2d by those points lying near the horizontal axis. These point do lie below the experimental fit and more data at lower velocities are now suggested. Fig.2c also shows the poor predicted performance as indicated by the multilayer model, in this case for nylon.



Energy v fabric weight




Fig. 2b¹⁶




Fig. 2c






Fig. 2d

Figure 3a, shows the energies absorbed plotted against impact velocities for different material densities for nylon: Data does not presently exist for Kevlar. This together with figure 2a can yield the V_{50} for each material since this is attained from the corner of the curve; obviously for low velocity the projectile is stopped and 100% energy is absorbed whereas at higher velocities the projectile passes through the fabric and emerges with lower velocity.




Energy v impact velocity

Figure 4a, b shows the variation of maximum strain and projectile velocities at break for an impact velocity of 500 m/s for different fabric weights; for small fabric weights the maximum strain is the breaking strain of nylon and Kevlar respectively and the velocity at break is close to the impact velocity. For heavy materials the velocity at break falls off but the strain at break must still be the breaking strain. For heavier materials which stop the projectile the maximum strain must be less than the breaking strain. In the first part of these curves (penetration) it is useful to look at the velocity at break whereas in the later part (stopping) it is sensible to look at the maximum strain. These results have been obtained from the characteristics model.



Maximum strain and break velocity vs fabric weight








Maximum strain and break velocity vs fabric weight

Figures 5a-e show for an impact velocity of 500 m/s and different fabric weights (Nylon, 100, 500, 1000, 1500 and 2000 gm/m²) the variation of projectile velocity, displacement and energy and fabric fibre strain and tension with time for nylon.

Figure 5f-j show again for nylon, area densities 400 gm/m², the same behaviour for different impact velocities (100, 300, 500, 1000 and 2000 m/s.)






Fig. 5k-o; shows for Kevlar the same information for an impact velocity 500 m/s and for different fabric weights (100, 500, 1000, 1500 and 2000 gm/m²).

Fig. 5 p-s; again for Kevlar shows the effect of different impact speed (500, 1000, 1500 and 2000) on fabric weight 400 gm/m².



Nylon - A
 $V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$
 $\rho = 100 \text{ g/m}^2$
 $M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$
 $B.S. = 0.24$

Fig5 (a-e)



Nylon






$$V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 500 \text{ g/m}^2$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$

$$B.S. = 0.24$$

(b)



Nylon






$$V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 1000 \text{ g/m}^2$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$

$$B.S. = 0.24$$

(c)



Nylon






$$V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 1500 \text{ g/m}^2$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$

$$\text{B.S.} = 0.24$$

(d)



Nylon

$$V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 2000 \text{ g/m}^2$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$

$$\text{B.S.} = 0.24$$

(e)









Fig.5(f-j)



Nylon






$$V_0 = 300 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 400 \text{ g/m}^2$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$






$$B.S. = 0.24$$

(g)



Nylon
 $V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$
 $\rho = 400 \text{ g/m}^2$
 $M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$
 $B.S. = 0.24$

(h)



Nylon






$$V_0 = 1000 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 400 \text{ g/m}^2$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$

$$B.S. = 0.24$$

(i)



Nylon

$$V_0 = 2000 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 400 \text{ g/m}$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$

$$\text{B.S.} = 0.24$$

(j)









Fig. 5 (k-o)



Kevlar






$$V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 500 \text{ g/m}^{-2}$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$

$$\text{B.S.} = 0.032$$

(L)



Kevlar






$$V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 1000 \text{ g/m}$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$

$$\text{B.S.} = 0.032$$

(m)



Kevlar






$$V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 1500 \text{ g/m}^2$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$






$$\text{B.S.} = 0.032$$

(n)



Kevlar
 $V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$
 $\rho = 2000 \text{ g/m}^2$
 $M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$
 $B.S. = 0.032$

(o)



Kevlar






$$V_0 = 500 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 400 \text{ g/m}^2$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$






$$\text{B.S.} = 0.032$$

Fig. 5(p-s)



Kevlar
 $V_0 = 1000 \text{ m/s}$
 $\rho = 400 \text{ g/m}^2$
 $M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$
 $B.S. = 0.032$

(q)



Kevlar






$$V_0 = 1500 \text{ m/s}$$

$$\rho = 400 \text{ g/m}^2$$

$$M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$$

$$B.S. = 0.032,$$

(r)



Kevlar
 $V_0 = 2000 \text{ m/s}$
 $\rho = 400 \text{ g/m}^2$
 $M_0 = 1 \text{ g}$
 $B.S. = 0.032$

(s)

Figures 6 a, b show typical multiframe views of fabrics under impact. The photographs show a side view of impact; the projectile travels from bottom to top in each case. The minor divisions visible in figure 6a(c) are 0.5mm.

Figures 6c,d,e,f, show the variation in pyramid height with time for both nylon (figs.6a and 6b) and for Kevlar (figs.6c and 6d). These experimental results are compared to the characteristics model (figs.6c and 6e) and to the membrane model (figs.6d and 6f).

The observed failure of the fabric is shown by the termination of the experimental plot. Similarly the theoretical failure points are also shown.


Figure 6 g, h are plots of the distance of the traverse wave from the centre of impact vs time.

Fig. 6i is a plot of pyramid height vs the traverse wave displacement. These are shown to be related linearly.

Legend for Figure 6a (overleaf)

Side views of impacted fabrics at 10, 20, 30 and 40 μ s after impact.



Normal Area Density (g m ⁻²)	Nylon	Kevlar
1000		D
2000	A	E
3000	B	F
4000	C	G




A




B





D



E




F



Legend for Figure 6b (overleaf)

Side views of impacted fabrics at various times after impact chosen to show penetration (the 4000 g m⁻² Kevlar was not penetrated).

Nominal Area Density (g m ⁻²)	Nylon	Kevlar
1000		D
2000	A	E
3000	B	F
4000	C	G




A




D



E




B




F





Pyramid height against time for multi-layered nylon




Pyramid height against time for multi-layered nylon

$$V_0 = 500 \text{ ms}^{-1}$$

Characteristics model


2000 gm⁻²




Experimental

Failure 1000 gm⁻²


Pyramid height against time for multi-layered kevlar




Pyramid height against time for multi-layered kevlar



Transverse wave displacement against time for multi-layered nylon Fig.6(g)



Transverse wave displacement against time for multi-layered kevlar Fig. 6(h) 56



Transverse wave displacement against pyramid height Fig.6(i)

REFERENCES

- 1 Mansell, J. 'Ballistic Impact of Woven Fabrics' Ph.D thesis submitted to the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (1981).
- 2 Adeyefa, A. 'Mechanics of Single and Multi-layer Synthetic Textiles Subjected to High Velocity Impact' Ph.D thesis submitted to the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (1982).
- 3 Leech, C.M., Hearle, J.W.S., and Mansell, J. 'A Variational Model for the Arrest of Projectiles by Woven Cloth and Nets' J.Text.Inst., Vol.70, Nov.1979, pp.469-477.
- 4 Leech, C.M. and Adeyefa, A. 'Dynamics of Cloth Subjected to Ballistic Impact Velocities' Computers and Structures, Vol.15, No.4, 1982.
- 5 Cork, C.R. 'Aspects of Ballistic Impact onto Woven Textile Fabrics' Ph.D thesis submitted to the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (1983).
- 6 Maheux, C.R., Stewart, G.M., Petterson, D.R., Odell, F.A. Dynamics of body armour materials under high speed impact. Part I. Army Chemical Centre, Maryland, OCT, 1957.
- 7 Roylance, D., Wilde, W, Tocci, G., Ballistic Impact of Textile Structures, Textile Research Journal, Jan 1973.
- 8 Morrison, C.E., Bowyer, W.H. Factors Affecting Ballistic Impact Resistance of Kevlar 49 Reinforced Composites, Fulmer Research Laboratories Ltd., Stoke Poges, Slough, England, Contract No. A93B/189, (1980).

APPENDIX

Calculation of Kevlar strain so that the characteristics model would fail in order to give a resultant energy loss corresponding to that found experimentally.

Area Density (g m ⁻²)	Energy Loss(J) (Experimental) ΔE	Projectile Energy at penetration (J) 125 - ΔE	Strain
500	20.1	105	>0.050
1000	36.9	88.1	*0.0375
1500	53.9	71.4	*0.031
2000	70.4	54.6	*0.26
			highly uncertain large oscillations

* occurs after MAXIMUM OF STRAIN

The values for 1000 and 1500 fall close to those expected. This is reflected in figure 2d where the 1000 gm⁻² and 1500 gm⁻² results for the characteristics model do agree with the experimental results.

Again now for nylon strain (see fig.2c)

Area Density	(ΔE)	(125 - ΔE)	Strain
500 gm ⁻²	8.53	116.5	0.24
1000	17	108	0.205
1500	25.5	99.5	0.185
2000	34.0	91	0.170

Here experimental agrees with computational only at 500g m⁻². This is reflected in the above table where the breaking strain is 0.24. At higher area densities the model is grossly wrong.

The weakness of nylon could be due to either :

1. The melting of the yarns due to friction or to
2. The pushing aside of yarns by the projectile. Recent studies of damage to penetrated fabrics has shown that the number of broken yarns decreases as the projectile proceeds through the assembly.

e.g.	LAYER	No. of Weft yarns broken	
	1	3	
	2	3	
	3	2	Projectile diameter =
	4	2	4.6 yarns
	5	1	
	6	1	
	7	1	

The effect of a yarn unloading from the projectile is as if the yarn had broken at a lower strain. This latter effect could also explain the ballistic inferiority of Kevlar compared to the Kevlar model, at high area densities (see figure 2d).

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	AD A143249	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
Textile Ballistic Performance (DATA BASE)	Final Technical Report June 1984	
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s)	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
Professor J W S Hearle Dr C M Leech Dr C R Cork	DAJA 37-82-C-0234	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
University of Manchester Inst. of Science & Technology, P.O.Box 88, Manchester M60 1QD	6.11.02A IT161102BH57-04	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE	
USARDSG-UK Box 65, FPO NY 09510	June 1984	
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES	
	64	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)	
	Unclassified	
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
Textile, Ballistic, Impact, Kevlar, Nylon, Finite element, Characteristics, Failure, multilayer, weave (woven).		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
Nylon and Kevlar textiles are examined for their performance against impact by a lgm projectile, when subject to impact velocities up to 200 m/s. The textiles are of varying areal density, and of varying layer composition and their performance is examined theoretically and experimentally. The theoretical models have been previously developed and are the characteristic model, membrane finite element and a multilayer finite element; the experimental /Cont'd.		