Effects of Different Projectile Nose Shapes on the Impact Performance of the Aluminium 2024 Thin Plate

Dlair O. Ramadan

Follow this and additional works at: https://polytechnic-journal.epu.edu.iq/home
Effects of Different Projectile Nose Shapes on the Impact Performance of the Aluminium 2024 Thin Plate

Abstract
In this study, the impact performance of the Al2024 thin plate target was determined through a numerical approach. Two different-nosed hard steel projectiles, including a blunt and a sphere, were used in order to obtain the ballistic impact of the target. ANSYS Autodyn was used to model a three-dimensional (3D) model that corresponds to a previous experimental study. The ballistic resistance of the target was numerically evaluated in terms of ballistic limit velocity, residual velocity, and energy absorption and compared at different incident angles such as 0°, 15°, and 30°. To validate the numerical outcomes, the Recht-Ipson model was used as a reference benchmark. The results of this investigation showed that when the incidence angle of a sphere-nosed projectile increased, the target's ballistic performance decreased. In contrast, the target's ballistic resistance against a blunt-nosed projectile was little affected by the impact angle. According to the findings, the simulation results are consistent with the published numerical and experimental outcomes.
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1. Introduction

Aluminium is widely regarded as the primary material in aircraft construction, although recent advancements have led to the utilisation of new alloys. Due to its ability to withstand the tensile forces that occur during operation, Al2024, as an alloy of aluminium, is used in the manufacturing of wing and fuselage structures [1]. In contemporary times, the significance of developing aircraft skin that can effectively withstand the impact of fragments or projectiles has become increasingly paramount.

The behaviour of metals when subjected to high-velocity impact loading can be accurately characterised by sophisticated computer codes developed for commercial purposes. These codes are equipped with sophisticated material models that enable a comprehensive understanding of the intricate behaviour involved in such scenarios. In ballistic impact issues, however, the material parameters required to simulate the consequences of elevated temperatures and high strain rates are frequently unavailable in the open literature [2,3]. In addition, there is a lack of in-depth research into numerical modelling and the evaluation of the impact of model parameters. Experimental methods are the backbone of the ballistics research community [4–6]. To identify the Al2024 target's ballistic limit with a thickness varying from 0.5 to 6.5 mm, Alfaro-Bou and Thomson [4] carried extensive ballistic experiments. The initial impact velocities of the plastic disc projectile range from 1 to 8 km/s, and its diameters are 6.4 and 9.5 mm, with masses of 10 and 30 mg, respectively. The different diameters and masses are due to the varying gun barrel inside diameter and diaphragm thickness. Levy and Goldsmith [7] as well as Goldsmith and Finnegan [5] conducted a set of experimental trials to examine the Al2024's ballistic resistance against oblique and normal
impacts with hard steel projectiles at initial velocities of up to 1 km/s. Ballistic tests were performed by Gogolowski and Morgan [6] utilising targets made of 2024 aluminium that had different thicknesses (1.27, 2.54, and 3.81 mm). These targets were treated to projectiles that were circular cylinders with various fineness ratios, length to diameter ratios (0.2 and 1), and fragment simulant projectiles. The observation was made that when the thickness of the plate target increased from 2.54 to 3.81 mm, there was a transition in the failure mode of the aluminium target plate from petaling to plugging.

Kelley and Johnson [8] investigated the ballistic response of various materials against a steel projectile with a sphere-nosed shape of 12.52 mm in diameter. The materials tested included 2024 aluminium with thicknesses of 1.6, 3.18 and 6.35 mm, as well as titanium, composite, and polycarbonate targets with a thickness of 6.35 mm. The ballistic limit and failure modes were investigated for each group of targets. The study concluded that 2024 aluminium exhibited excellent results. However, further data is required for composites, polycarbonate, and titanium.

Gupta et al. [9] did both experimental tests and computer simulations (ABAQUS) to find out how different nose shapes, such as ogive, hemispherical, and blunt, as well as impact velocities and target thicknesses, affected 1100-H12 aluminium alloy plates. Ogive-nosed projectiles have been found to be the most effective when used as thin-plate penetrators because of their high level of effectiveness. It was shown that blunt-nosed projectiles required the least energy to penetrate the target plates in the case of thicker plates. In comparison to the other two projectiles, the hemispherical-nosed projectiles had the greatest ballistic limit velocity.

The research carried out by Buyuk et al. [10] involved the execution of ballistic experiments utilizing spherical projectiles on 2024 aluminium targets with different thicknesses, namely 1.58, 3.17, and 6.35 mm. The experimental ballistic limit was found for targets with thicknesses of 1.58 mm, 3.17 mm, and 6.35 mm, resulting in corresponding values of 122, 213, and 411 m/s, respectively. The aforementioned findings were effectively replicated through the utilization of finite-element simulations, showing a notable level of approval between both simulated and experimental outcomes. The performance of numerical simulations is discussed, with a particular emphasis on material characterization, mesh sensitivities, and material model parameters. It has been noticed that refinement of the mesh simply does not always result in better results in simulations with ballistic limits. This is because the interrelated factors involved in the simulation need to be carefully considered and calibrated. It was also pointed out that due to the failure mode transition changing failure and deformation using only one set of parameters is difficult. The authors Hub et al. [11] conducted experiments and a 2D numerical study to find out what the ballistic limit of Al2024_T3 with a thickness of 1.2 mm is against a projectile of 9 mm caliber pistol. In terms of residual velocities, there was a significant correlation between the numerical simulations and the experimental findings. In two separate experiments, Jones and Paik [12,13] conducted estimations on the perforation energy of aluminium plates. These estimations were based on the plates’ exposure to low and intermediate impact velocities. The researchers utilized a range of empirical equations for their analysis. The findings of the study demonstrate that empirical equations have considerable importance when it comes to initial design objectives, and for the final design process, they could be sufficient in some cases.

A series of experiments were implemented by Zhan et al. [14] to investigate the impact properties of stiffened target plates when impacted by a projectile with an ogival-nosed shape. The projectiles employed in the experiment studies had beginning velocities that varied from 546 to 618 m/s. Nine different sites were used to assess the ballistic resistance of stiffened targets, and the results show strong agreement with the suggested mathematical model. Senthil et al. [15] conducted numerical simulations using the ABAQUS software to examine the ballistic impact behaviour of aluminium plates with 1 mm in thickness when exposed to ogive-tipped steel projectiles. The projectile was 15 mm in diameter and 55 g in mass. It was determined that there is a strong correlation between high-impact velocities and the existing experimental data, whereas the results were found to be underestimated at low-impact velocities.

Gara et al. [16] investigated the influence of varying impact angles ranging from 50 to 900 m/s on the impact performance of Al2024 against steel projectile. They found that the AI 2024 target exhibits the most effective energy absorption behaviour when subjected to ballistic limit velocities.

Few studies have looked examined how different constitutive models and model parameters affect ballistic reactions. Aircraft structural components including the wings, shear webs and fuselage are frequently made out of the 2024-T3 aluminium alloy. This particular alloy is chosen for its ability to provide the necessary stiffness and strength that are crucial in these applications. Aerospace structures experience various types of loads throughout their
service life, ranging from static to shock, impact, and vibration. Therefore, it is important to investigate how their structural materials respond to impact from various incident angles. There is limited availability of numerical investigations on the impact performance of the 2024 aluminium alloy at varying incident angles in the literature. The current study involved conducting numerical investigations on a 2024 aluminium plate subjected to two different noses, including a sphere and a blunt-nosed hard steel projectile with a diameter of 12.7 mm at different incident angles such as 0°, 15°, and 30°. The simulation was conducted using the ANSYS Autodyne and the Johnson–Cook elasto-viscoplastic material model, which is widely available in the literature. The numerical results obtained were then compared to the outcomes of the experiments reported in [5,7].

2. Numerical modelling

ANSYS Autodyne was used to create three-dimensional models of the target and two different-nosed projectiles, including spheres and blunts. As previously stated, the plate target was modelled using Al2024, while the projectile nose was modelled using steel. The materials utilised for both the target and projectile were obtained from the Autodyne material library and the material parameters were modified to those used by [18]. Because of the homogeneity of the target and projectiles, and to reduce processing time, the projectiles and target were modelled as quarter models with symmetric boundary conditions, as shown in Figure 1. Figure 2 shows the isometric and the side views of both the target and projectiles. The finite element simulation of the object being targeted and the two different projectiles were designed based on the geometries implemented in Levy and Goldsmith's study [7]. It's worth mentioning that Levy and Goldsmith employed three different projectiles, including sphere, blunt, and hemispherical, however the hemispherical was not included in the current study because it was outside of our focus.

Owing to their superior rigidity as compared to the thin-plate aluminium target, the projectiles were considered to have a rigid body in this study. Levy and Goldsmith verified that no lasting deformation of the projectile was detected in any of their studies. In this work, the deformable body was modelled as a circular target with certain dimensions, measuring 119.4 mm in diameter and 1.27 mm in thickness. The blunt-nose projectile had a total length and a shank diameter of 40.35 and 12.7 mm, respectively. The sphere had the same diameter (12.7 mm) [7].

The thin plate targets were divided into three distinct parts: a contact region (impact zone) and two non-contact regions, in order to speed up the computational time required for the analysis. In the contact region between the projectiles and the targets, the targets were meshed with incredibly small elements. In contrast, in the two areas where no contact was made, the aspect ratio grew larger as one moved farther from the impact point (See Figure 3). Fixed boundary constraints were applied at the periphery of the target.

3. Results and discussion

In this work, the ballistic performance of a thin, circular aluminium 2024 plate target is numerically evaluated under normal and oblique impacts with projectiles made of blunt and sphere-nosed hard steel. At 0°, 15°, and 30° impact angles, the target's ballistic resistance was investigated in terms of its ballistic limit velocity, the projectile's kinetic energy, absorbed energy by the targets, and residual velocity. The following subsections present the findings of this study.

3.1. Model validation

The current numerical model, which was built using ANSYS Autodyne, was validated by comparing the plate target's ballistic limit against the normal impact of a projectile with a blunt and spherical-nosed shape to that obtained numerically using ABAQUS/Explicit by [18], which had already been validated with experimental results obtained by [7]. The validation results are shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5. The maximum error percentage between the two models for the sphere and blunt-nosed projectile results was calculated and found to be 6 % and 13 %, respectively. This confirms the good agreement between the present and numerical results of [18].

3.2. Effects of varying obliquities

The effect of varying impact angles on the Al2024 thin plate target against the impact of a sphere and a blunt projectile was studied through numerical investigation after the simulation's precision at a normal impact angle was confirmed with Senthil et al. [18]. It was assumed that the projectiles' mass, target span, and impact velocity would be the same as those used by Levy and Goldsmith [7]. The impact angle, or obliquity, was varied at 0°, 15°, and 30°, while the thickness of the target remained fixed at 1.27 mm. The results of the varying obliquities for
the sphere and blunt-nosed projectiles are shown in Figures 6 and 7, respectively. The findings are also given, in more detail, in Tables 1 and 2. The study observed a decline in the ballistic performance of the Al2024 target when subjected to a sphere-nosed projectile as the impact angle of the projectile increased. While the impact angle had minimal effect on the target’s ballistic resistance against a blunt-nosed bullet.

3.3. Evaluation of ballistic limit

After conducting a comparative study of the numerical data, a comprehensive evaluation of Al2024’s ballistic resistance was undertaken. The ballistic limit was computed numerically using ANSYS Autodyn and theoretically using a model previously proposed by Recht and Ipson [19]. Numerical simulations were performed for the sphere-nosed and blunt projectiles at the predicted impact velocities to estimate the ballistic limit. The residual projectile velocity associated with a certain impact velocity was determined using the Recht-Ipson model presented in the equation below. Tables 1 and 2 provide the impact and residual velocities of both projectiles that were obtained in computational simulations and in the Recht-Ipson model.
\[ V_r = a \left( V_i^p - V_{bl}^p \right)^{1/p} \]  

Where \( V_r \) is the residual velocity, \( a \) and \( p \) are the Recht-Ipson model constants, which are equal to 1 and 2, respectively. \( V_i \) and \( V_{bl} \) are the initial and ballistic limit velocities, respectively.

The ballistic limit velocity, or \( V_{50} \), may be calculated by taking the average of the greatest projectile velocity that does not cause perforation and the minimum projectile velocity that results in total target perforation. The ballistic limit velocity may increase or decrease depending on the projectile's...
geometrical shape and the value of the impact velocity. For example, the numerical results indicate that the ballistic limit velocity of a sphere is greater in comparison to that of a blunt object. In this investigation, the $V_{50}$ for the 1.27 mm-thickness Al2024 plate target against the normal impact of projectiles with a blunt and spherical-nose was determined to be 33.5 and 128.5 m per second, respectively. Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that the target exhibits the greatest resistance to penetration when subjected to a spherical projectile in comparison to a blunt-nosed projectile.

Table 3 compares the numerical data on the ballistic limit velocity for the blunt and spherical-nosed projectiles. The study determined the ballistic limits against a sphere-nosed projectile for three different obliquity angles: $0^\circ$, $15^\circ$, and $30^\circ$, which were found to be 128.5, 85, and 77.5 m/s, respectively. Hence, it was revealed from Figure 8
that the ballistic limit exhibited a reduction of 31% and 38% at obliquities of 15° and 30°, respectively, compared to the case of normal incidence. It was determined that the ballistic limit velocities of the target when hit by a blunt-nosed projectile at 0°, 15°, and 30° were 33.5, 30.9, and 30.4 m/s, respectively. As shown in Figure 8, the reduction in ballistic performance from the normal angle to 15° and 30° obliquities was negligible, 7.76% and 9.25%, respectively.

Figures 9–14 show the computed impact and residual velocity data points and the corresponding Recht-Ipson fit for 1.27 mm thick targets against blunt and sphere nose projectiles at different incident angles.

3.4. Energy absorption analysis

Metals are termed isotropic since their characteristics are the same in all directions. Penetration refers to embedding the projectile into the target, whereas perforation refers to passing the bullet fully through the target. Perforation and penetration models are based on compatibility and conservation laws. The kinetic energy of the bullet is transferred to the plate target when it collides with it. Deforming the target, which consists of stretching, petalling, plugging, and bending, consumes some of the energy [17,20]. Other energies are released as heat and light. The remainder of the energy is transmitted as kinetic energy to the fragments. It is quite difficult to measure or determine each of these energies. In this study, the energy absorption in the projectile was neglected due to insignificant deformations observed during impact. The quantitative evaluation of the energy being absorbed by the Al2024 thin plate target was conducted by numerical simulation in this study.
The classification of elements can be divided into two categories: eroded and uneroded elements. The total energy, denoted as $E_{\text{total}}$, is expressed by the following equation [21]:

$$E_{\text{total}} = (E_k + E_i)_{\text{eroded}} + (E_k + E_i)_{\text{uneroded}}. \quad (2)$$

Where $E_k$ is kinetic energy and $E_i$ is internal energy. The kinetic energy that the sphere and blunt bullet lose and the internal rise in the target are shown in Figures 15 and 16, respectively. The results revealed that the increase in internal energy within the target was approximately equivalent to the amount of kinetic energy acquired by the target.

### Table 1. Numerical results of ballistic limit for thin plate target impacted with sphere-nosed projectile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact velocity (m/s)</th>
<th>Obliquity 0°</th>
<th>15°</th>
<th>30°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual velocity (m/s)</td>
<td>Residual velocity (m/s)</td>
<td>Residual velocity (m/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numerical results</td>
<td>Recht-Ipson model results</td>
<td>Numerical results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>427.15</td>
<td>431.41</td>
<td>430.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>266.23</td>
<td>260.22</td>
<td>270.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>243.94</td>
<td>237.73</td>
<td>249.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>210.59</td>
<td>203.02</td>
<td>219.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.58</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>125.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>88.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Numerical results of ballistic limit for thin plate target impacted with blunt nosed projectile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact velocity (m/s)</th>
<th>Obliquity 0°</th>
<th>15°</th>
<th>30°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual velocity (m/s)</td>
<td>Residual velocity (m/s)</td>
<td>Residual velocity (m/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numerical results</td>
<td>Recht-Ipson model results</td>
<td>Numerical results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>441.899</td>
<td>448.7513231</td>
<td>444.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>264.896</td>
<td>267.9136988</td>
<td>265.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>235.367</td>
<td>237.6504786</td>
<td>236.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>154.726</td>
<td>156.4536673</td>
<td>156.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>119.171</td>
<td>120.427364</td>
<td>121.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>38.2267</td>
<td>42.60739372</td>
<td>35.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.7268</td>
<td>37.11805491</td>
<td>29.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Ballistic limit velocities at various obliquities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projectile nose shape</th>
<th>Obliquity (°)</th>
<th>Ballistic limit, m/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>15°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 8. Comparison of ballistic limit velocity obtained from the numerical analysis for blunt and sphere nosed projectile.
Figure 9. Ballistic limit for the target impacted at normal obliquity with sphere-nosed projectile.

Figure 10. Ballistic limit for the target impacted at 15° obliquity with sphere-nosed projectile.

Figure 11. Ballistic limit for the target impacted at 30° obliquity with sphere-nosed projectile.

Figure 12. Ballistic limit for the target impacted at normal obliquity with blunt-nosed projectile.

Figure 13. Ballistic limit for the target impacted at 15° obliquity with blunt-nosed projectile.

Figure 14. Ballistic limit for the target impacted at 30° obliquity with blunt-nosed projectile.
Figure 15. Energies versus time for target impacted with sphere-nosed projectile at a) 0°, b) 15° and c) 30° obliquities.

Figure 16. Energies versus time for target impacted with blunt-nosed projectile at a) 0°, b) 15° and c) 30° obliquities.
4. Conclusions

The main goal of the current study was to evaluate the impact performance of the Al2024 target against blunt and sphere-nosed projectiles at varying impact angles of 0°, 15°, and 30°. The evaluation was conducted through a numerical study using ANSYS Autodyn, and the results were compared with previous experimental and numerical studies. The most obvious finding to emerge from this study is that the target has the greatest ballistic limit against sphere projectiles, followed by projectiles with blunt projectiles. At normal incident impact, the ballistic limit of a sphere projectile was approximately 117% greater than that of a blunt projectile. However, this difference decreased with increasing incident angle, where the value decreased to 93% and 87% at 15° and 30° impact angles, respectively. The results indicated that the increase in internal energy within the target was roughly equivalent to its kinetic energy.
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