

**BALLISTIC IMPACT BEHAVIOUR OF ALUMINIUM
ALLOY AA2014-T652 SUBJECTED TO RIGID AND
DEFORMABLE PROJECTILES**

PRINCE SHARMA



**DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MECHANICS
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
FEBRUARY 2017**

©Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2017

**BALLISTIC IMPACT BEHAVIOUR OF ALUMINIUM
ALLOY AA2014-T652 SUBJECTED TO RIGID AND
DEFORMABLE PROJECTILES**

by

PRINCE SHARMA

Department of Applied Mechanics

Submitted

in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

FEBRUARY 2017

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**Ballistic Impact Behaviour of Aluminium Alloy AA2014-T652 Subjected to Rigid and Deformable Projectiles**” being submitted by **Mr. Prince Sharma** to the **Indian Institute of Technology Delhi**, for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Mechanics Department is a record of original, bonafide research work carried out by him under our supervision and guidance. The thesis work, in our opinion, has reached the requisite standard fulfilling the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

The results contained in this thesis have not been submitted in part or in full, to any other University or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

(Dr. Puneet Mahajan)

Professor
Department of Applied Mechanics
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
New Delhi-110016
India

(Dr. Manjit Singh)

Distinguished Scientist & Director
Terminal Ballistics Research Laboratory
Defence R&D Organization (DRDO)
Chandigarh-160030
India

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisors Prof. Puneet Mahajan and Dr. Manjit Singh for their expert guidance, inspiration, support and continuous encouragement. Their intellectual and moral support at every stage of my research enabled me to complete my research work. I have been immensely benefitted from the vast experimental expertise of Dr. Manjit Singh in the field of high strain rate experiments and computational proficiency of Prof. Puneet Mahajan.

I am grateful to my research committee members, Prof. Sohail Ahmad, Prof. Naresh Bhatnagar and Dr. M K Singha for evaluating my work and providing me with invaluable suggestions. I would also like to express my thanks and gratitude to all the faculty members of Department of Applied Mechanics, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi for their kind help and support.

I am greatly obliged to my seniors in Terminal Ballistics Research Laboratory, Chandigarh Sh. T K Raychaudhuri, Dr. Amarjit Singh, Sh. Thomson Mathew and Mrs. Ipsita Biswas for giving me permission to join for PhD program at IIT Delhi. Their seamless encouragement, support and cooperation is deeply acknowledged. I am grateful to Dr. D R Saroha, Sh. Parvendra Kumar and Sh. Yashpal for providing me material required for my research work. I am also thankful to my colleagues Dr. Pradeep Chandel, Dharmanshu, Vikas Bhardwaj, Vikas Mangla, Davinder and Rajinder for their assistance and help in conduct of ballistic impact tests and high strain rate experiments.

I highly appreciate the help extended by Dr. Gopinath from Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory, Hyderabad in conducting high temperature experiments at his facility.

Thanks are also due to Mr. Rishi for his help in conducting tensile tests at strength of materials lab in Applied Mechanics Department, IIT Delhi.

My stay in IIT Delhi was a life changing experience. I met my soulmate Dr. Geeta in IIT and fell in love with her forever. I wish to thank her for giving me support and encouragement during the toughest phases of my life. No words are sufficient to express my feelings for the sacrifices she has made during my doctoral studies. Moreover, since she completed her PhD well ahead of me, her experience in technical writing was of great help. Her contributions in writing my thesis are thankfully acknowledged.

I have made some wonderful friends during my stay at IIT Delhi. I wish to thank Rajnish, Chaman, Ankur, Yaqoob, Nilamber, Amit, Mohit, Danish, Mehnaaz, Anurag for making my stay enriching and enjoyable.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for their sacrifices in financing my education in spite of having great economical constraints. Their unconditional love and blessings have enabled me reach this point in my life.

Abstract

The tremendous increase in demand for light weight armour systems has inspired the development of novel armour designs using optimal combination of high strength metals, polymers, composites and ceramics. Aluminium alloys have emerged as a strong candidate material for defence, aerospace and automobile applications due to their low density, high strength and high corrosion resistance. But their impact behaviour needs to be fully understood in order to utilize their potential for such critical applications

The dynamic behaviour of high strength aluminum alloys during ballistic impact is a complex phenomenon due to the presence of, large deformations, high strain rates, elevated temperatures and propagation of elastic, plastic and shock waves. The failure of target may occur due to a combination of various perforation mechanisms depending upon the material properties, impact velocity, projectile shape and size, target thickness etc. An in-depth understanding of the dynamic behaviour of impacting materials is thus of paramount importance in designing materials and structures for defence applications.

The present study is aimed at investigating the ballistic impact response behaviour of aluminium alloy AA2014-T652, which is one of the strongest available aluminium alloys, against rigid and deformable projectiles. Hardened steel spheres were used as rigid projectiles while soft iron spheres were used as deformable projectiles. An integrated approach encompassing dynamic material characterization, constitutive and failure modeling, ballistic impact tests, analytical analysis and numerical simulations has been employed to gain more insight about the material behaviour.

A comprehensive material characterization program was executed to study the plastic flow and failure of the material. Tensile tests were carried out on target and projectile materials at different stress triaxialities, strain rates and temperatures. Hardened steel projectiles were considered rigid and no material tests were conducted for steel. Low and medium strain rate tests

were conducted on a standard universal testing machine (UTM) while high strain rate tests were conducted using split hopkinson pressure bar (SHPB). High temperature tests were conducted using a special UTM having provision for in-situ heating of the specimen. True stress – true strain curves were generated using the measured force-displacement data from UTM and SHPB. Fracture strain values of the materials were calculated by measuring the reduction in area of fractured specimens.

The experimental information from stress-strain curves were used to calibrate the material parameters of Johnson-Cook constitutive model, which relates the flow stress of the material to effective plastic strain, strain rate and temperature. Fracture strain values were used to calibrate the material parameters of Johnson-Cook failure model, which relates the fracture strain of a material to stress triaxiality, strain rate and temperatures.

Ballistic impact tests were conducted using a smooth bore propellant gun of 30 mm bore diameter. 15 mm thick target plates were impacted by 10 mm diameter steel and iron spheres. Impact velocities were varied by changing the amount of propellant in the cartridge to achieve complete perforation of the target. Impact phenomenon was captured with a high speed video camera to measure the impact velocity and residual velocity of the projectiles. Ballistic limit velocity was calculated by using energy based analytical methods. An analysis of crater dimensions in the targets was carried out in order to identify various perforation mechanisms responsible for target failure.

Finite element analyses of all the impact experiments were carried out using a two dimensional axisymmetric model. Ballistic impact velocities were overestimated and all the perforation mechanisms were not captured in numerical results using Johnson-Cook constitutive and failure model. Limitations of Johnson-Cook failure were analyzed and numerical simulations were repeated using hydrostatic tensile stress failure model. A non-linear equation of state was also introduced in the model for more accurate calculations of hydrostatic stress. These modifications resulted in an excellent correlation between experimental and numerical results.

सारांश

हल्के वजन की कवच प्रणाली की मांग में जबरदस्त वृद्धि ने सम्मिश्रित पदार्थ से बने कवच डिजाइन के विकास को प्रेरित किया है। एल्युमीनियम अपने कम घनत्व, उच्च सामर्थ्य तथा उच्च जंग निरोधक क्षमता के कारण रक्षा, एयरोस्पेस और ऑटोमोबाइल अनुप्रयोगों के लिए एक मजबूत उम्मीदवार के रूप में उभरा है। प्राक्षेपीय समाघात के समय उत्पन्न विशाल विकार, उच्च विकृति दर तथा उच्च तापमान के कारण एल्युमीनियम धातु का व्यवहार बहुत जटिल प्रक्रिया हो जाता है। इसलिए रक्षा अनुसन्धान जैसे महत्वपूर्ण अनुप्रयोगों के लिए एल्युमीनियम के संघात व्यवहार को व्यापक तरीके से समझने की जरूरत है।

वर्तमान अध्ययन की जांच का उद्देश्य एल्युमीनियम २०१४-टी ६५२, जोकि सबसे मजबूत एल्युमीनियम मिश्रधातुओं में से एक है, के संघात व्यवहार का अन्वेषण करना है। दो तरह के प्रक्षेप्य इस अध्ययन में प्रयोग किये हैं। स्टील के गोलों को अनम्य प्रक्षेप्य के रूप में तथा शुद्ध लोहे के गोलों को मुलायम गोलों के रूप में प्रयोग किया गया था। वर्तमान अध्ययन में यांत्रिकी परिक्षण, पदार्थ प्रतिरूपण, प्राक्षेपिक परिक्षण, सैद्धांतिक विश्लेषण तथा अभिकलन अनुकरण का समन्वित प्रयोग किया गया है, तांकि पदार्थ के संघात व्यवहार का सम्पूर्ण ज्ञान प्राप्त किया जा सके।

एक विस्तृत यांत्रिकी परिक्षण कार्यक्रम संचालित किया गया था, जिसमें पदार्थों के प्रत्यास्थ, नम्य तथा विघात व्यवहार का निरक्षण किया गया। विभिन्न विकृति दरों, प्रतिबल त्रिअक्षितायों तथा तापमानों पर तन्यता परीक्षण किये गए। प्राक्षेपीय परीक्षणों में स्टील के प्रक्षेप्यों में किसी विकार की अनुपस्थिति के कारन उन्हें अनम्य मान लिया गया तथा इसलिए स्टील पर यांत्रिकी परिक्षण नहीं किये गए। एल्युमीनियम २०१४-टी ६५२ तथा शुद्ध लोहे पर मंद तथा उच्च विकृति दर परिक्षण किये गए जिसके लिए सार्वलौकिक परिक्षण यन्त्र तथा स्प्लिट होप्किंसन बार का प्रयोग किया गया। उच्च तापमान पर परिक्षण करने के लिए विशेष सार्वभौमिक परिक्षण यन्त्र का उपयोग किया गया जिसमें प्रतिरूप को गर्म करने की व्यवस्था थी। तन्यता यांत्रिक परीक्षणों से प्राप्त जानकारी से जॉनसन-कुक पदार्थ प्रतिमान के अचर मापदंडों का परिकलन किया गया। जॉनसन-कुक प्रतिमान पदार्थ के प्रतिबल को विकार, विकृति, विकृति दर तथा तापमान के साथ संबंधित करता है।

प्राक्षेपीय परीक्षणों के लिए ४० मिलीमीटर व्यास वाली गन का प्रयोग किया गया। १५ मिलीमीटर मोटी एल्युमीनियम के लक्ष्य पर १० मिलीमीटर व्यास वाले स्टील और शुभ लोहे के गोले दागे गए। संघात घटना को उच्च गति वाले कैमरे से अभिलेखित किया गया ताकि प्रक्षेप्यों की संघात गति मापी जा सके। लक्ष्यों में हुए छिद्रों का गहराई से अध्ययन किया गया ताकि वेध की विभिन्न क्रियाविधियों की पहचान की जा सके।

सभी प्रक्षेपिकीय परीक्षणों का सीमित तत्त्व विश्लेषण किया गया, जिसके लिए द्विआकारीय प्रतिमान का उपयोग किया गया। जिन अभिकलित अनुकरणों में जॉनसन-कुक विघात प्रतिमान का प्रयोग किया था, उनमें प्रक्षेपिकीय सीमा वेग परीक्षणों की तुलना में अधिक पाया गया। जॉनसन-कुक विघात प्रतिमान की समस्याओं का अध्ययन करने के पश्चात जलस्थैतिक प्रतिबल प्रतिमान का उपयोग करते हुए दोबारा अभिकलित अनुकरणों की पुनरावृत्ति की गयी। एक गैर रेखीय स्थिति समीकरण को भी सीमित तत्त्व विश्लेषण में सम्मिलित किया गया ताकि जलस्थैतिक प्रतिबल का यथार्थ आंकलन किया जा सके। इन परिवर्तनों से परीक्षणात्मक तथा अभिकलनात्मक परिणामों में अति-उत्कृष्ट समकक्षता पायी गयी

Table of Contents

Certificate	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Figures	ix
List of Tables	xiv
CHAPTER 1. Introduction and Literature Review	1-29
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Literature review	4
1.2.1 Some fundamental definitions in ballistics	4
1.2.2 Target failure mechanisms	6
1.2.3 Scientific studies in terminal ballistics	10
1.3 Existing gaps in knowledge	24
1.4 Motivation and objectives	27
1.5 Organization of the thesis	28
CHAPTER 2. Constitutive and Failure Modeling	30-79
2.1 Method for calibration of J-C constitutive model	30
2.1.1 Determination of parameter A	31
2.1.2 Determination of strain hardening parameters B and n	31
2.1.3 Determination of strain rate sensitivity parameter C	32
2.1.4 Determination of thermal softening parameter m	32
2.2 Method for calibration of J-C failure model	33
2.2.1 Determination of stress triaxiality parameters $D1, D2$	34

and <i>D3</i>	
2.2.2 Determination of strain rate parameter <i>D4</i>	37
2.2.3 Determination of thermal parameters <i>D5</i>	37
2.3 Materials and methods	38
2.3.1 Material details	38
2.3.2 Experimental techniques	39
2.3.2.1 Universal testing machines	39
2.3.2.2 Split Hopkinson Pressure Bar	43
2.3.3 Plan of experiments	45
2.4 Material characterization and calibration of parameters	50
2.4.1 Material characterization and calibration for AA2014-T652	50
2.4.2 Material characterization and calibration of parameters for Iron	68
CHAPTER 3. Ballistic Impact Tests and Analytical Modeling	80-96
3.1 Experimental set-up and test methodology	80
3.2 Ballistic impact tests with rigid projectiles	83
3.3 Ballistic impact tests with deformable projectiles	88
3.4 Analytical analysis of failure mechanisms	92
3.4.1 Ductile hole growth and discing	92
3.4.2 Plugging	93
3.5 Analytical analysis of residual velocities	94
3.5.1 Rigid projectiles	95
3.5.2 Deformable projectiles	96
CHAPTER 4. Finite Element Modeling and Analysis	97-124

4.1 Overview of finite element program	97
4.2 Finite element model	101
4.3 Numerical results using Johnson-Cook models	102
4.3.1 Impact with rigid projectiles	104
4.3.2 Impact with deformable projectiles	106
4.3.3 Limitation with Johnson-Cook failure model	109
4.4 Effect of hydrostatic stress on failure	111
4.4.1 Tensile pressure failure model	111
4.4.2 Equation of state	113
4.5 Numerical results using tensile pressure failure model	114
4.5.1 Impact with rigid projectiles	114
4.5.2 Impact with deformable projectiles	122
CHAPTER 5. Conclusions and Scope for Future Research Work	125-129
5.1 Uniaxial tensile behaviour	125
5.1.1 Aluminum AA2014-T652	125
5.1.2 Soft iron	126
5.2 Ballistic impact tests	127
5.2.1 Hardened steel projectiles	127
5.2.2 Soft iron projectiles	127
5.3 Finite element analyses	128
5.3.1 Johnson-Cook failure model	128
5.3.2 Hydrostatic tensile limit failure model	128
5.4 Future scope of research	129
References	130-140

List of Figures

Figure 1.1	The Survivability Onion.	2
Figure 1.2	Different criteria for defining ballistic limit	4
Figure 1.3	Different criteria for defining ballistic limit	7
Figure 1.4	Scabbing failure of aluminum alloy AA2014-T6	9
Figure 1.5	Mechanism of discing failure (a) initiation and (b) fracture	9
Figure 1.6	Discing failure in an aluminum alloy (a) 12X and (b) 40X	10
Figure 1.7	Ballistic Pendulum of Benjamin Robins	11
Figure 2.1	Geometry and Stress distribution in the notch	35
Figure 2.2	Zwick Z-250 UTM	40
Figure 2.3	Clip-on extensometers for strain measurement	40
Figure 2.4	Walter-Bai-1200 High Temperature UTM	41
Figure 2.5	High Temperature extensometer	41
Figure 2.6	Experimental set-up for high strain rate tensile tests	45
Figure 2.7	Schematic of tensile specimen set-up	45
Figure 2.8	Tensile test specimen for UTM	47
Figure 2.9	Tensile test specimen for SHPB	47
Figure 2.10	Notched (Notch Radius 1mm) tensile test specimen for UTM	48
Figure 2.11	Notched (Notch Radius 2mm) tensile test specimen for UTM	48
Figure 2.12	Notched (Notch Radius 3mm) tensile test specimen for UTM	49
Figure 2.13	Notched (Notch Radius 4mm) tensile test specimen for UTM	49
Figure 2.14	Notched (Notch Radius 5mm) tensile test specimen for UTM	50
Figure 2.15	Engineering and True stress-strain curve for AA2014	51
Figure 2.16	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at strain rate 10^{-4} s^{-1}	52

Figure 2.17	True stress – True Strain curves at strain rate 10^{-3} s^{-1}	53
Figure 2.18	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at strain rate 10^{-2} s^{-1} .	53
Figure 2.19	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at strain rate 10^{-1} s^{-1}	54
Figure 2.20	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at strain rate 10^3 s^{-1}	54
Figure 2.21	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at different strain rates	55
Figure 2.22	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at 25°C	55
Figure 2.23	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at 50°C	56
Figure 2.24	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at 100°C	56
Figure 2.25	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at 150°C	57
Figure 2.26	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at 200°C	57
Figure 2.27	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at 250°C	58
Figure 2.28	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at 300°C	58
Figure 2.29	True stress – True Strain curves for AA2014 at different temperatures	59
Figure 2.30	Determination of yield strength for AA2014	60
Figure 2.31	Determination of strain hardening parameters for AA2014	61
Figure 2.32	Comparison of experimental and J-C model results for AA2014	61
Figure 2.33	Determination of strain rate sensitivity parameter (C) for AA2014	62
Figure 2.34	Determination of thermal sensitivity parameter (m) for AA2014	63
Figure 2.35	Determination of stress triaxiality parameters for AA2014	64
Figure 2.36	Fractured tensile specimens of AA2014 at various stress triaxialities	65
Figure 2.37	Fractured surface of AA2014 at stress triaxiality = 0.3	65
Figure 2.38	Fractured surface of AA2014 at stress triaxiality = 1.62	65
Figure 2.39	Determination of strain rate parameter (D_4) for AA2014	66

Figure 2.40	Fractured tensile specimens of AA2014 at various strain rates	66
Figure 2.41	Determination of thermal parameter (D_5) for AA2014	67
Figure 2.42	Fractured specimens of AA2014 at various temperatures	68
Figure 2.43	Fractured surface of AA2014 at 50 ⁰ C (Left) and 300 ⁰ C (Right)	68
Figure 2.44	Engineering and True stress-strain curve for soft iron	69
Figure 2.45	True stress – True Strain curves for soft iron at strain rate 10 ⁻⁴ s ⁻¹	70
Figure 2.46	True stress – True Strain curves for soft iron at strain rate 10 ⁻³ s ⁻¹	71
Figure 2.47	True stress – True Strain curves for soft iron at strain rate 10 ⁻² s ⁻¹	71
Figure 2.48	True stress – True Strain curves for soft iron at strain rate 10 ⁻¹ s ⁻¹	72
Figure 2.49	True stress – True Strain curves for soft iron at strain rate 10 ³ s ⁻¹	72
Figure 2.50	True stress – True Strain curves for soft iron at different strain rates	73
Figure 2.51	Determination of yield strength of soft iron	74
Figure 2.52	Determination of strain hardening parameters for soft iron	74
Figure 2.53	Comparison of experimental and J-C model results for soft iron	75
Figure 2.54	Determination of strain rate sensitivity parameter (C) for soft iron	75
Figure 2.55	Determination of stress triaxiality parameters for soft iron	77
Figure 2.56	Fractured specimens of soft iron at various stress triaxialities	77
Figure 2.57	Fractured specimens of soft iron with stress triaxiality = 0.3 (left) and stress triaxiality =1.68(Right)	78
Figure 2.58	Determination of strain rate parameter (D_4) for soft iron	78
Figure 2.59	Fractured specimens of soft iron at various strain rates	79
Figure 3.1	Smooth bore propellant gun	81
Figure 3.2	Two-piece sabot along with projectile.	81
Figure 3.3	Complete assembly of sabot, projectile and cartridge	82

Figure 3.4	Target holding fixture and projectile recovery stand	82
Figure 3.5	High Speed video camera system	83
Figure 3.6	Schematic of the perforation channel in the target	84
Figure 3.7	Impact with hard steel projectile at velocity 803m/s	85
Figure 3.8	Impact with hard steel projectile at velocity 834m/s	86
Figure 3.9	Impact with hard steel projectile at velocity 869m/s	86
Figure 3.10	Impact with hard steel projectile at velocity 995m/s	86
Figure 3.11	Impact with hard steel projectile at velocity 1166m/s	86
Figure 3.12	Impact with hard steel projectile at velocity 1247m/s	87
Figure 3.13	Fragmentation of target at impact velocity 1247m/s	87
Figure 3.14	Soft iron projectile before and after impact	89
Figure 3.15	Impact with soft iron projectile at velocity 761 m/s.	89
Figure 3.16	Impact with soft iron at velocity 879 m/s	90
Figure 3.17	Impact with soft iron at velocity 937m/s	90
Figure 3.18	Impact with soft iron at velocity 1052m/s	90
Figure 3.19	Impact with soft iron at velocity 1135m/s	90
Figure 3.20	Impact with soft iron at velocity 1264m/s	91
Figure 3.21	Woodward's model for discing	93
Figure 3.22	Impact versus residual velocity curves for hard steel projectiles	95
Figure 3.23	Impact versus residual velocity curves for hard steel projectiles	96
Figure 4.1	Schematic of Lagrange computational cycle	100
Figure 4.2	Finite element model, (a) three dimensional and (b) axisymmetric	101
Figure 4.3	Mesh convergence study	102
Figure 4.4	Numerical results for steel projectiles with J-C model	105
Figure 4.5	Numerical results for iron projectiles with J-C model	108

Figure 4.6	Fracture energy based damage softening	112
Figure 4.7	Pressure profile along the thickness of target plate	117
Figure 4.8	Hydrodynamic flow and spalling at front surface of target plate	118
Figure 4.9	Radial cracks formation below ballistic limit	119
Figure 4.10	Stress-time history plots at rear surface of the target	119
Figure 4.11	Stress-time history plots at rear surface of the target	120
Figure 4.12	Stress-time history plots at rear surface of the target	120
Figure 4.13	Stress-time history plots at rear surface of the target	121
Figure 4.14	Scabbing at the rear surface of the target at ballistic limit	121
Figure 4.15	Numerical results for impact at (a) 937 m/s and (b) 1052 m/s	124

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Classification of impact response of materials	5
Table 1.2	Johnson-Cook fracture model parameters for various aluminum alloys	25
Table 1.3	Johnson-Cook constitutive model parameters for various aluminum alloys	26
Table 2.1	Notch dimensions and stress triaxialities	36
Table 2.2	Chemical Composition (weight %) of AA 2014 T652	38
Table 2.3	Chemical Composition (weight %) of pure iron	38
Table 2.4	Series-I Tests for determination of parameters A , B , C , n and D_4	46
Table 2.5	Series-II Tests for determination of D_1 , D_2 and D_3	46
Table 2.6	Series-III Tests for determination of m and D_5	46
Table 2.7	Johnson-Cook constitutive model parameters for AA2014	63
Table 2.8	Johnson-Cook failure model parameters for AA2014	67
Table 2.9	Johnson-Cook constitutive model parameters for soft iron	76
Table 2.10	Johnson-Cook failure model parameters for soft iron	79
Table 3.1	Summary of ballistic tests with rigid projectiles	84
Table 3.2	Summary of ballistic tests with soft iron projectiles	88
Table 4.1	Material properties of target and projectiles	103
Table 4.2	Numerical results for rigid projectiles with J-C model	104
Table 4.3	Numerical results for soft projectiles with J-C model	107
Table 4.4	Numerical studies on impact resistance of aluminum alloys	110
Table 4.5	Revised material properties of AA2014	114

Table 4.6	Comparison of experimental and numerical results for steel projectiles with tensile pressure failure model	116
Table 4.7	Summary of experimental and numerical results	123