

AD

TECHNICAL REPORT ARCCB-TR-02003

**ADAPTIVE GUN BARREL VIBRATION ABSORBER**

**ANDREW LITTLEFIELD  
ERIC KATHE**

MARCH 2002



**US ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH,  
DEVELOPMENT AND ENGINEERING CENTER  
CLOSE COMBAT ARMAMENTS CENTER  
BENÉT LABORATORIES  
WATERVLIET, N.Y. 12189-4050**



APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

20020322 169

## **DISCLAIMER**

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.

The use of trade name(s) and/or manufacturer(s) does not constitute an official endorsement or approval.

## **DESTRUCTION NOTICE**

For classified documents, follow the procedures in DoD 5200.22-M, Industrial Security Manual, Section II-19, or DoD 5200.1-R, Information Security Program Regulation, Chapter IX.

For unclassified, limited documents, destroy by any method that will prevent disclosure of contents or reconstruction of the document.

For unclassified, unlimited documents, destroy when the report is no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

<b>1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)</b>		<b>2. REPORT DATE</b> March 2002	<b>3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED</b> Final	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> ADAPTIVE GUN BARREL VIBRATION ABSORBER			<b>5. FUNDING NUMBERS</b> AMCMS No. 6226.24.H191.1	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Andrew Littlefield and Eric Kathe				
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> U.S. Army ARDEC Benet Laboratories, AMSTA-AR-CCB-O Watervliet, NY 12189-4050			<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>  ARCCB-TR-02003	
<b>9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> U.S. Army ARDEC Close Combat Armaments Center Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000			<b>10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER</b>	
<b>11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b> Presented at the 10 <sup>th</sup> U.S. Army Gun Dynamics Symposium, Austin, TX, 23-26 April 2001. Published in proceedings of the symposium.				
<b>12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.			<b>12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE</b>	
<b>13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)</b>  Gun barrel vibrations lead to dispersion in the shot patterns. Thus, reducing these vibrations should lead to increased accuracy. Since the muzzle is the anti-node for all vibration modes and its vibrations have the greatest effect on shot dispersion, it is the obvious location to attempt to dampen the vibrations. A model of the gun barrel was created in MATLAB <sup>®</sup> and verified by modal impact testing. Modal impact testing was done for the barrel alone and for three different muzzle brake vibration absorber configurations. Significant reductions in muzzle vibrations were achieved using the vibration absorber. Methods of making the vibration absorber adaptive and models of such a system are presented.				
<b>14. SUBJECT TERMS</b> Vibration Absorber, Passive, Smart Structures, Gun Barrels, Accuracy, Vibration, Dynamics			<b>15. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 21	
			<b>16. PRICE CODE</b>	
<b>17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b> UL	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
MATLAB® MODEL.....	2
MODAL IMPACT TESTING .....	3
MATLAB® MODEL WITH VIBRATION ABSORBER.....	7
VIBRATION ABSORBER.....	9
COMPARISON.....	12
MATLAB® MODEL – VARIABLE STIFFNESS ABSORBER.....	13
MAKING THE ABSORBER ADAPTIVE.....	15
CONCLUSIONS.....	16
REFERENCES.....	18

### TABLES

1. Frequency Response Parameters from Modal Analysis.....	6
2. Frequency Response Parameters from Vibration Absorber Testing.....	11

### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. M242 barrel.....	2
2. Barrel geometry.....	2
3. Damped mode shapes and natural frequencies .....	3
4. Experimental setup.....	4
5. Plain barrel frequency response .....	5
6. Pole-zero map for plain barrel.....	5
7. Peak Amplitude Method.....	6

8.	Pro/Engineer <sup>®</sup> model of the vibration absorber .....	7
9.	Barrel geometry with eight-rod vibration absorber .....	8
10.	Damped mode shapes and natural frequencies for eight-rod absorber .....	9
11.	Damped mode shapes and natural frequencies for four-rod absorber.....	9
12.	Installed vibration absorber .....	10
13.	Vibration absorber frequency response.....	10
14.	Frequency response comparison .....	12
15.	Frequency response comparison from 0 to 100 Hz.....	13
16.	Pointing angle frequency response for different stiffness eight-rod absorbers .....	14
17.	Pointing angle frequency response for different stiffness four-rod absorbers .....	15

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the following individuals: Kenneth Olsen for his help in all phases of the work, John Keating and Robert Messier for their help in the test firing, and Matt Hentnik for his help in constructing the absorber.

## INTRODUCTION

Vibration of the gun barrel in rapid-fire systems leads to dispersion in the shot patterns. The wider the dispersion, the more rounds required to effect the desired damage on the enemy. An intuitive way to reduce this shot dispersion is to reduce the vibrations of the barrel. The end of the barrel is the anti-node for all vibration modes and its vibrations have the greatest affect on shot dispersion, so it is the obvious location to attempt to dampen the vibrations. This work focuses on doing just that.

The system under study in this work is the 25-mm M242 Bushmaster chain gun. It is part of the M2A3 and M3A3 Bradley Fighting Vehicle Systems and is designed to engage and defeat armored vehicles as well as provide suppression fire. When engaging armored enemy assets, such as armored personnel carriers, accuracy is extremely important. The M242 fires five different rounds, M791, M792, M793, M910, and M919, although only the M793 training round was used in the tests.

A gun barrel vibration absorber has previously been designed (ref 1) and tested (ref 2) for use on the 120-mm XM291 tank gun (ref 3). This design had the absorber as part of the gun's thermal shroud. The present effort (ref 4) differs in its unique location, application to rapid-fire gun systems, and its possible dual use as part of a fuse-setting system.

The vibration absorber being considered is of the proof mass actuator type and is mounted onto the muzzle brake. This allows for the absorber to be easily mounted and removed with the muzzle brake, while still acting at the barrel location of greatest vibration activity. Addition of the absorber reshapes the frequency response by moving the resonant modes and zeros. This shifting effectively rejects the vibrational energy. Also, the motion of the absorber enhances the dissipation of this energy.

First, the barrel is modeled in MATLAB<sup>®</sup> using a finite element approach (ref 5). The Euler-Bernoulli finite element technique is used to generate second-order equations-of-motion of the barrel as a nonuniform beam. These are then converted to the first-order state space domain and transformed into the frequency domain. Predictions for the mode shapes and resonant frequencies are generated. After completing the model, it is verified by performing modal impact testing on the barrel. These results are then used to fine-tune the model.

Testing of the barrel with different vibration absorbers is then conducted. Three different versions are used, the differences being the number of rods connecting the mass to the barrel. By varying the number of connecting rods, the stiffness, and thus the frequency, of the vibration absorber can be tuned.

For the vibration absorber to be adaptive, this tuning of its frequency should be accomplished without physically changing the rods. Ideally, this should be done autonomously or at worst, by selecting a setting from a list. As a first step, a MATLAB<sup>®</sup>

model for an absorber with adjustable stiffness will be presented. Possible ways of making the absorber truly adaptive will also be presented.

## MATLAB<sup>®</sup> MODEL

A finite element model of the barrel minus the vibration absorber was created in MATLAB<sup>®</sup>. Euler-Bernoulli beam approximations and Hermite-cubic interpolation functions are used to form the mass and stiffness matrices for the undamped second-order equations-of-motion by approximating the barrel, a continuous nonuniform beam, as a series of discrete elements. Continuity of lateral displacement and slope are imposed at the element boundaries. When assembled, these elements closely approximate the dynamics of the barrel (ref 5).

The geometry of the barrel is entered in 1-mm increments and any noncircular cross sections are smeared together to become circular. This smearing was done to the lugs near the breech end and to the rifling. The mass of the beam is calculated by adding the mass of each of these slices. The actual shape of the beam can be seen in Figure 1. The model's version of this can be seen in Figure 2.




Figure 1. M242 barrel.




Figure 2. Barrel geometry.

The barrel is just over 2-m long. The muzzle brake was approximated as two hollow cylinders with different interior diameters followed by a hollow cone. The diameters of the cylinders and cones were selected so that both mass and location of the center of gravity matched those of the muzzle brake. A Pro/Engineer<sup>®</sup> solid model of the muzzle break was used to verify the mass properties.



After the geometry has been entered, the barrel is automatically broken into a user-defined number of elements. Nodes are forced to exist at both ends of the barrel and anyplace where constraints are specified. The springs used to hang the barrel during modal testing were entered as constraints in this fashion. The spring constant for the springs was found by hanging weights on them and measuring the deflection.

The other enforced node was at the location of the response accelerometer. This was to allow easy comparison between model and experiment. The mass of the accelerometer was also included and shows up as the dark circles in Figure 2.

Rayleigh proportional damping is used in the model. The values entered were determined in a previous report using this software for analyzing an XM291 gun barrel (ref 1). After performing an experimental modal analysis on the barrel, experimentally found values were used and the model was rerun. Only minor differences in the resonant frequencies were found.

After the required data were entered, the model was run and output generated. The software generates undamped and damped mode shapes and natural frequencies, a pole-zero plot of the eigenvalues, time response of the muzzle to a breech impulse, and a bode plot of the muzzle response, plus additional plots about the quality of the finite element analysis (FEA). In this case we are interested in the damped mode shapes and natural frequencies. These can be found in Figure 3.




Figure 3. Damped mode shapes and natural frequencies.

## MODAL IMPACT TESTING

After completion of the MATLAB<sup>®</sup> model, an experimental modal analysis was performed to validate the model. The barrel was hung from two springs to simulate a free-free condition. These springs were contained in the model as mentioned above.

This did not present a perfect free-free situation but there is more than an order of magnitude between the highest rigid body mode (1.27 Hz) and the lowest flexible mode (59.03 Hz) so this was deemed satisfactory. Additionally the springs are explicitly represented in the model.

The goal of the modal analysis was to generate a frequency response plot between a force at the breech and the response of the muzzle. For this study an impact was used as the force and the acceleration of the muzzle was the response. An HP 3566A PC Spectrum/Network Analyzer was used to calculate the frequency response. A PCB Impact Hammer with a Delrin tip delivered the impact. The 6-dB roll-off point of the tip was found to be 1.605 kHz. A PCB ICP Accelerometer measured the response. The ICP power supply and signal conditioning for both of these was provided by a PCB 12-Channel Rack Mounted Power Unit with a variable gain of 0 to 100 per channel. This setup can be seen in Figure 4.




Figure 4. Experimental setup.

The HP 3566A was set up with a bandwidth of 800 Hz, 3200 frequency lines, and force/exponential windowing. Uniform averaging was performed with a total of 16 averages being used per run. The gain was set to provide good signal strength. After each impact the data were checked for double hits and overloading of the accelerometer.

The frequency response for barrel can be seen in Figure 5. The first four modes are plainly visible. A collocated pole-zero pair causes the strange behavior of the second mode. Examination of a pole-zero plot from MATLAB<sup>®</sup> shows this same behavior. Figure 6 shows this plot for the first four modes and how there is a zero collocated with the second mode.




Figure 5. Plain barrel frequency response.




Figure 6. Pole-zero map for plain barrel.

The Peak Amplitude Method (ref 6) was used to extract the necessary modal parameters from these data. To determine the damping ratio of a peak, equations (1) and (2) were used.

$$\zeta = \frac{1}{2}\eta \quad (1)$$

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\omega_a^2 - \omega_b^2}{\omega_r^2} \quad (2)$$

where  $\zeta$  is the viscous damping ratio,  $\eta$  is the structural damping loss factor,  $\omega_r$  is the natural frequency of the peak, and  $\omega_a$  and  $\omega_b$  are the half-power points. These quantities can be seen in Figure 7.




Figure 7. Peak Amplitude Method.

Once  $\zeta$  has been found for at least two peaks, the proportional damping coefficients,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , can be found from the following formulas:

$$\alpha = -2 \frac{\omega_1 \omega_2 (\omega_1 \zeta_2 \sqrt{1 - \zeta_2^2} - \omega_2 \zeta_1 \sqrt{1 - \zeta_1^2})}{-\omega_1^2 + \omega_1^2 \zeta_2^2 - \omega_2^2 \zeta_1^2 + \omega_2^2} \quad (3)$$

$$\beta = \frac{-\alpha + \alpha \zeta_2^2 + 2 \zeta_2 \sqrt{1 - \zeta_2^2} \omega_2}{\omega_2^2} \quad (4)$$

Using these formulas the following data in Table 1 were found for the three tests shown in Figure 5.

**Table 1. Frequency Response Parameters from Modal Analysis**

Plain Barrel with Muzzle Brake				
Peak	Magnitude	Frequency	Coherence	$\zeta$
	dB (g/lb <sub>f</sub> )	Hz		
1	-10.870	60.25	0.9990	0.0456
2	-24.710	167.25	0.9543	0.0361
3	-10.008	304.50	0.9306	
4	-9.117	448.25	0.9314	
$\alpha$ (s-1)	28.428			
$\beta$ (s)	4.293E-05			

Comparison of these data with Figure 3 shows that the model predicted a stiffer system than was experimentally found. The higher in frequency one goes, the more divergent the model and reality become. We are concerned with low frequencies though, and the match between the model and experiment is very good for the first two modes. It is only off by about 1 Hz for these modes. This small amount of error is within what was seen from different runs and could be due to the accelerometer mounting and cabling

and/or the nonideal connections of the support springs. The measured  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  were put back into the model to see if it would improve results, but no appreciable difference was found.

## **MATLAB<sup>®</sup> MODEL WITH VIBRATION ABSORBER**

Now that the model has been validated for plain barrel, it must be modified to include the vibration absorber. The vibration absorber is a proof mass actuator that mounts to the muzzle brake. It consists of a 4.037-lb (1.831-kg) mass, suspended from spring rods that are attached to a collar, which is in turn press-fitted onto the standard muzzle break. The rods are one-fourth inch (6.35 mm) in diameter and extend 5.8 inches (147.32-mm) from the collar to the mass.

There are three configurations of the vibration absorber: one with eight rods; another with four, the two middle ones removed top and bottom; and the last with two rods oriented diagonally. Only the eight- and four-rod versions were modeled, using the same number of nodes and enforced node locations as the plain barrel. The absorber's mounting collar was included by increasing the barrel's outer diameter in that area until the correct mass was added. Since the vibration absorber mounts to the muzzle brake, as before a Pro/Engineer<sup>®</sup> model was used to ensure that mass and center of gravity location were correct for the entire assembly. Figure 8 shows the model.




Figure 8. Pro/Engineer<sup>®</sup> model of the vibration absorber.

The connecting rods were treated as springs, and thus by the standard approximation for a spring with mass, one-third of their mass was added to the absorber mass and two-thirds was added to the barrel as a lumped mass. The location of the lumped mass was adjusted so that the center of gravity of the rods and absorber mass together was positioned as in the actual assembly.

The MATLAB<sup>®</sup> model allows for a mass and stiffness to be entered for a vibration absorber. The mass was a combination of the absorber mass and one-third of the rod mass. The stiffness of the absorber was found experimentally by assuming a cantilevered condition between the rods and the mounting collar and then performing a beam bending test. The natural frequencies were found to be 41 and 29 Hz for the eight- and four-rod versions, respectively.

The geometry used by the model for the eight-rod absorber can be seen in Figure 9. The dark area near the muzzle brake is the mass of the accelerometer as before plus the distributed mass of one-third of the connecting rods. The only difference between the eight-rod and four-rod versions of the model is the mass of the rods. For the four-rod version the nonbeam mass drops to 0.41947-kg.




Figure 9. Barrel geometry with eight-rod vibration absorber.

As with the plain barrel, the models were run once all required data were entered. Damped mode shapes and natural frequencies were recovered along with bode plots and pole-zero maps. The damped mode shapes and natural frequencies can be seen in Figures 10 and 11. The circle at the end of the barrel represents the vibration absorber.




Figure 10. Damped mode shapes and natural frequencies for eight-rod absorber.




Figure 11. Damped mode shapes and natural frequencies for four-rod absorber.

## VIBRATION ABSORBER

Now that we have a model including the vibration absorber, modal analyses were done on the different vibration absorber configurations. The barrel orientation and accelerometer placement were kept the same as the last plain barrel test. This ensured that any changes in the frequency response should be directly attributable to the vibration absorber and not changes in test setup.

Three configurations of the vibration absorber were tested: one with eight rods; another with four, the two middle ones removed top and bottom; and the last with two rods oriented diagonally. The four- and eight-rod versions were modeled in the previous section. The installed eight-rod absorber can be seen in Figure 12.




Figure 12. Installed vibration absorber.

The same testing procedure outlined above was used. The rods were removed with the absorber in place so as to minimize any test setup changes between the runs. The absorber was aligned such that the flats of the muzzle brake were parallel to the floor. This is the normal firing position for the cannon. The results of the testing can be seen in Figure 13.




Figure 13. Vibration absorber frequency response.

A couple of points are obvious from the plot. First, the major difference between the different configurations is the amount the first peak of the plain barrel is shifted. As fewer rods are installed in the absorber, and thus the absorber stiffness decreases, the first peak moves to progressively lower frequencies. Not only the amount of shift but also the magnitude of the first peak appears to vary with absorber stiffness. At first glance, it appears that the eight- and four-rod vibration absorbers have the same magnitude, with the two-rod having a lower magnitude. This will be discussed more when numbers are culled from the data. Lastly, the higher frequency peaks appear to have been largely unchanged.



If the absorber's frequency had coincided with the first peak exactly, the peak would have been removed and its energy shifted into the new peaks on either side of it (ref 7). However, we do not have this case so the absorber pushes the peak to a higher frequency. Had the absorber's frequency been above that of the barrel's first mode, then it would have pushed the peak to a lower frequency. The additional pole-zero added by the absorber can be seen in the small resonance before the first peak. As stated earlier, the strange response at the barrel's second mode is due to a collocated pole-zero pair.

In order to draw more detailed conclusions and to compare to the nonvibration absorber results, actual numbers must be removed from the results. The same Peak Amplitude Method was used to pull out these data. The results of this analysis can be seen below in Table 2. The peaks are numbered to coincide with the ones in Table 1, with peak 0 being the absorber's own peak.

**Table 2. Frequency Response Parameters from Vibration Absorber Testing**

<b>Full Vibration Absorber</b>			
<b>Peak</b>	<b>Magnitude</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Coherence</b>
	<b>dB (g/lb<sub>f</sub>)</b>	<b>Hz</b>	
0	-28.642	38.50	0.9937
1	-10.614	71.25	0.9991
2	-29.886	168.50	0.9887
3	-9.323	307.00	0.9139
4	-9.513	456.25	0.8915
<b>Half Vibration Absorber</b>			
<b>Peak</b>	<b>Magnitude</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Coherence</b>
	<b>dB (g/lb<sub>f</sub>)</b>	<b>Hz</b>	
0	-27.683	31.25	0.9998
1	-10.793	64.50	1.0000
2	-27.711	169.75	0.9993
3	-6.541	304.00	0.8724
4	-6.054	460.75	0.8821
<b>Quarter Vibration Absorber</b>			
<b>Peak</b>	<b>Magnitude</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Coherence</b>
	<b>dB (g/lb<sub>f</sub>)</b>	<b>Hz</b>	
0	-29.940	25.50	0.9996
1	-13.033	62.50	0.9995
2	-24.251	169.50	0.9777
3	-8.395	304.75	0.8640
4	-6.412	458.50	0.8528

From these numbers, it is apparent that the less stiff (i.e., fewer rods) the vibration absorber is, the lower it shifts the first frequency of the barrel. For the higher frequency peaks, it appears that the differences seen are due to errors in the data. As far as magnitude goes, there appears to be some contradictory data. It appears that the half-absorber produces larger magnitude gains than the full, but that the quarter-absorber produces smaller ones. This could be due to the fact that the quarter-absorber no longer has the same cantilever boundary conditions as the other two.

Comparison of these data with Figures 10 and 11 shows that the model overall predicted a stiffer system than was experimentally found; although the mode of the vibration absorber itself was found to be higher than predicted. This may be due to the way its stiffness was found. The higher in frequency one goes, the more divergent the model and reality become. We are primarily concerned with low frequencies though, and the match between the model and experiment is very good for the first three modes. It is only off by about 1 Hz for these modes. This small amount of error is within what was seen from different runs and could be due to the accelerometer mounting and cabling and/or the nonideal connections of the support springs.

## COMPARISON

Now that we have looked at the barrel by itself and with a vibration absorber separately, it is time to compare the two directly. Figure 14 shows the frequency response of the plain barrel and the three vibration absorber configurations. Figure 15 shows a close-up view of the first mode of the barrel.




Figure 14. Frequency response comparison.




Figure 15. Frequency response comparison from 0 to 100 Hz.

Examining Figure 14, the two most obvious changes are the shifting of the first mode and the lessening of the zero around 150 Hz. The higher modes do not appear changed at all. Figure 15 shows the shifting of the first mode more clearly and how the two-rod version is able to reduce the magnitude of the first mode.

Comparing Tables 1 and 2, one can see that these observations are borne out. The second and higher modes are hardly shifted, if at all, while the first one is shifted by as much as 11 Hz. This shifting is what allows the absorber to dampen the system's vibrations. If the system resonance can be shifted away from the disturbance, then the vibrations will be reduced.

As stated previously, the inclusion of a vibration absorber shifts the modes around it away from its own mode. This accounts for the shifts seen in the barrel's first mode. As part of this shift, the absorber can also take energy from the peak it shifts. If the absorber's mode were coincident with one of the system resonances, then it would have split the mode and its energy into two smaller resonances.

The two-rod absorber is the only one that has an appreciable effect on the magnitude of the barrel's first mode. It reduces the magnitude by almost 3 dB. Due to its different boundary conditions though, this may not be as beneficial as it first seems. It could be that it is shifting energy from the vertical plane to the horizontal. Without further testing, it cannot be determined if this drop in the magnitude of the vertical response is beneficial or detrimental to system performance. An increase in horizontal motion would not be beneficial.

## MATLAB® MODEL – VARIABLE STIFFNESS ABSORBER

As a first step toward an adaptive absorber, it must be determined if any advantages could be achieved by adjusting the stiffness of the vibration absorber. If the same level of performance gains were achievable with a fixed stiffness vibration absorber, then there would be no need to undertake making the absorber adaptive. To

undertake this study, the absorber models created earlier were rerun with different values used for the absorber's stiffness. Being able to change the stiffness while leaving the other properties the same would allow for the absorber to be tuned for various operating conditions.

Frequency response functions for the pointing angles of the muzzle were calculated for different configurations. The configurations included the absorbers as tested, with their stiffness increased by a factor of 3, and with their stiffness decreased by a factor of 3. Additionally, a defeated version of the eight-rod absorber was modeled. The defeated absorber models the absorber as simply a mass on the end of the barrel. This allows us to see whether the changes in the frequency response are simply due to the additional mass.

Figure 16 shows the results for the eight-rod absorber variant and Figure 17 does the same for the four-rod absorber variant. It is apparent from these figures that the ability to change the stiffness can greatly affect the response of the system. By increasing the stiffness of the four-rod, we can make it perform similar to the eight-rod. Conversely, by decreasing the stiffness of the eight-rod, we can make it perform like the four-rod one. All of these changes though only affect the response greatly below 100 Hz. Above that, they all perform similarly and appear as versions of the defeated absorber shifted to higher frequencies.




Figure 16. Pointing angle frequency response for different stiffness eight-rod absorbers.




Figure 17. Pointing angle frequency response for different stiffness four-rod absorbers.

The best version of the absorber depends upon the operating conditions. Careful inspection of the figures shows that each has a range of frequencies over which is offered a significantly reduced response when compared to the defeated absorber. The eight-rod version of the absorber has been fired and shown to cut shot dispersion in half (ref 8). However, this was under only one set of operating conditions. Looking at the responses, it is apparent that there are areas where the other absorbers outperform the eight-rod absorber. Thus if the operating conditions change to an area where an eight-rod absorber with a different stiffness is superior, being able to change this stiffness would yield an increase in performance.

## MAKING THE ABSORBER ADAPTIVE

Now that we have seen that performance gains can be achieved by making the absorber adaptive, how can this actually be accomplished? In the previous section we changed the stiffness of the absorber to effect the desired change in frequency. In the laboratory experiments, we changed the stiffness by removing rods. Obviously, this is not a satisfactory way to make the absorber adaptive. For the absorber to be adaptive, the stiffness change should be accomplished rapidly and without need for gross mechanical modifications like removing rods.

This type of application lends itself to active materials. Materials such as shape memory alloys (SMAs), piezoceramics, or other induced-strain actuators are designed for such applications. If only a few natural frequencies and large changes in stiffness are desired, then the SMAs are a natural choice. If a range of natural frequencies is desired, then piezoceramics may be a better choice. Piezoelectrics also may be useful for eliminating high-frequency modes.

The type of actuator utilized depends upon the desired change. The perfect solution may actually contain different types of actuators all working together. The previous section showed the types of changes that could be achieved by increasing or decreasing the stiffness by a factor of three. The changes were concentrated in the low-frequency (below 100 Hz) regime. If these types of changes are desired, then SMAs become a logical choice as their Young's modulus can change by a factor of three when going from martensite to austenite (ref 9).

There are a couple of different ways in which SMAs can be used to make the absorber adaptive. The most direct way would be to replace the existing spring rods with hybrid SMA rods. The core of the rods would be stainless and would be just large enough to withstand the axial loads. The rest of the rod would be SMA and would take care of the bending loads. Thus when activated, an immediate factor of three in the modulus of the rods could be achieved. Since the stiffness of the rods is directly proportional to its Young's modulus, this would translate directly into an increase in stiffness.

Another possible way of using SMAs to achieve a stiffness change would be in the connections between the spring rods and the collar. If SMA inserts were used as part of the connection, they could be used to loosen or tighten the connection. If the connection were loosened, then the rods would be able to deflect more for a given applied force. Conversely, if the connection were tightened, the rods would deflect less. Since the stiffness of the absorber can be viewed as how far the rods will deflect under a given load, a change in the connection would manifest itself as a change in the apparent stiffness of the absorber.

The SMAs are bistable, so they are most useful when there are only two desired operating points, the base one being when the SMA is in its martensite phase and the second when it is in its austenite phase. For the M242 there are two operating speeds, so this does not appear to pose a problem. However, if more than two operating points were desired, then it might be possible to achieve them by only operating some of the SMA actuators. This is something that would have to be considered during the design of the absorber.

## CONCLUSIONS

This report has shown the effect of mounting a vibration absorber to the muzzle brake of an M242 Bushmaster. A MATLAB<sup>®</sup> model of the barrel was developed and then verified by performing modal impact testing upon the actual barrel. Good agreement was found between the model and experimental data.

After modeling and testing the plain barrel, a vibration absorber was modeled and tested to find its effects upon the barrel's frequency response. Two different configurations were modeled, while three were tested. As with the plain barrel, good agreement was found between the model and reality. It was found that the absorber

shifted the first resonant frequency of the barrel higher in frequency and that the two-rod version of the absorber reduced the magnitude of the response by 3 dB.

It was shown that changing the absorber's stiffness could change its frequency response. The best version of the absorber depends upon the operating conditions. Through the use of active materials, the absorber could be made adaptive and thus able to handle different operating conditions without physically changing the absorber's configuration.

Overall, it was shown that by mounting a proof mass type actuator on the muzzle brake, the performance of the gun system could be increased. Since this is a part of the barrel meant to be screwed on and off, this allows for very easy mounting without affecting the rest of the gun system.

An additional advantage of mounting the absorber to the muzzle is that its mass ring may be combined with a muzzle fuse set device (ref 10). Previously a drawback of such devices was that they increased the weight affixed to the muzzle brake. Combining it with the absorber allows for its additional mass to be used to improve the gun's accuracy.

## REFERENCES

1. Kathe, E., "Design and Validation of a Gun Barrel Vibration Absorber," *Proceedings of the 67<sup>th</sup> Shock and Vibration Symposium: Volume 1*, Monterey, CA, 18-22 November 1996, Published by SAVIAC, pp. 447-456.
2. Kathe E., "A Gun Barrel Vibration Absorber for Weapon Platforms Subject to Environmental Vibrations," *AIAA Paper No. 98-1846, A Collection of Technical Papers – 39<sup>th</sup> AIAA/ASME/ASCE/AHS/ASC Structures, Structural Dynamics, and Materials Conference and Exhibit and AIAA/ASME/AHS Adaptive Structures Forum*, 1998, pp. 1284-1294.
3. Kathe, E., "Gun Barrel Vibration Absorber," U.S. Patent 6167794, January 2001.
4. Kathe, E., "Muzzle Brake Vibration Absorber," U.S. Patent Application Serial Number 09/898.376, filed 5 July 2001.
5. Kathe, E., "MATLAB<sup>®</sup> Modeling of Non-Uniform Beams Using the Finite Element Method for Dynamic Design and Analysis," ARDEC Technical Report ARCCB-TR-96010, Benet Laboratories, Watervliet, NY, April 1996.
6. Ewins, D.J., *Modal Testing: Theory, Practice, and Application*, Research Studies Press, Ltd., Baldock, England, 2000.
7. den Hartog, J.P., *Mechanical Vibrations*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1956.
8. Kathe, E., "Lessons Learned on the Application of Vibration Absorbers for Enhanced Cannon Stabilization," *Proceedings of the Ninth U.S. Army Symposium on Gun Dynamics*, ARDEC Technical Report ARCCB-SP-99015 (E. Kathe, Ed.), Benet Laboratories, Watervliet, NY, November 1998, pp. 10.1-15.
9. "A State of the Art Assessment of Active Structures," NASA Technical Memorandum 107861, September 1992.
10. Freymond, P.H., and Buckley, A., "Programmable Fuzing for Tube Launched Ammunition," *NDIA 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Gun and Ammunition Symposium*, Williamsburg, VA, May 2000.



---

TECHNICAL REPORT INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
TECHNICAL LIBRARY ATTN: AMSTA-AR-CCB-O	5
TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS & EDITING SECTION ATTN: AMSTA-AR-CCB-O	3
OPERATIONS DIRECTORATE ATTN: SIOWV-ODP-P	1
DIRECTOR, PROCUREMENT & CONTRACTING DIRECTORATE ATTN: SIOWV-PP	1
DIRECTOR, PRODUCT ASSURANCE & TEST DIRECTORATE ATTN: SIOWV-QA	1

NOTE: PLEASE NOTIFY DIRECTOR, BENÉT LABORATORIES, ATTN: AMSTA-AR-CCB-O OF ADDRESS CHANGES.

---

---

TECHNICAL REPORT EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>		<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFO CENTER ATTN: DTIC-OCA (ACQUISITIONS) 8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD STE 0944 FT. BELVOIR, VA 22060-6218	2	COMMANDER ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL ATTN: SIORI-SEM-L ROCK ISLAND, IL 61299-5001	1
COMMANDER U.S. ARMY ARDEC ATTN: AMSTA-AR-WEE, BLDG. 3022 AMSTA-AR-AET-O, BLDG. 183 AMSTA-AR-FSA, BLDG. 61 AMSTA-AR-FSX AMSTA-AR-FSA-M, BLDG. 61 SO AMSTA-AR-WEL-TL, BLDG. 59 PICATINNY ARSENAL, NJ 07806-5000	1 1 1 1 1 2	COMMANDER U.S. ARMY TANK-AUTMV R&D COMMAND ATTN: AMSTA-DDL (TECH LIBRARY) WARREN, MI 48397-5000  COMMANDER U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY ATTN: DEPT OF CIVIL & MECH ENGR WEST POINT, NY 10966-1792	1
DIRECTOR U.S. ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY ATTN: AMSRL-DD-T, BLDG. 305 ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21005-5066	1	U.S. ARMY AVIATION AND MISSILE COM REDSTONE SCIENTIFIC INFO CENTER ATTN: AMSAM-RD-OB-R (DOCUMENTS) REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35898-5000	2
DIRECTOR U.S. ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY ATTN: AMSRL-WM-MB (DR. B. BURNS) ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21005-5066	1	COMMANDER U.S. ARMY FOREIGN SCI & TECH CENTER ATTN: DRXST-SD 220 7TH STREET, N.E. CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22901	1
COMMANDER U.S. ARMY RESEARCH OFFICE ATTN: TECHNICAL LIBRARIAN P.O. BOX 12211 4300 S. MIAMI BOULEVARD RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-2211	1		

---

NOTE: PLEASE NOTIFY COMMANDER, ARMAMENT RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND ENGINEERING CENTER,  
BENÉT LABORATORIES, CCAC, U.S. ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE AND ARMAMENTS COMMAND,  
AMSTA-AR-CCB-O, WATERVLIET, NY 12189-4050 OF ADDRESS CHANGES.

---