

ISSUES IN DESIGN OF PROTECTIVE GEAR FOR BLAST APPLICATION

KANHAIYA LAL MISHRA



DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

JUNE 2021

ISSUES IN DESIGN OF PROTECTIVE GEAR FOR BLAST APPLICATION

by

KANHAIYA LAL MISHRA

Department of Mechanical Engineering

Submitted

in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

To the



Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
June 2021

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled **Issues in design of protective gear for blast application** being submitted by Mr. Kanhaiya Lal Mishra to the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in Department of Mechanical Engineering is a record of bonafide research work carried out by him. He has worked under my guidance and has fulfilled the requirements for the submission of thesis, which, in my opinion, has reached the requisite standard.

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

(Anoop Chawla)

(Sudipto Mukherjee)

Professor,

Professor,

Department of Mechanical Engineering,

Department of Mechanical Engineering,

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

New Delhi-110 016

New Delhi-11

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my Ph.D. supervisors, Prof. Anoop Chawla and Prof. Sudipto Mukherjee, for their meticulous guidance, constant encouragement and continuous support and patience.

I would also like to sincerely thank the Student Research Committee (SRC) members, Prof. S.P. Singh (SRC Chairman), Prof. Suhail Ahmad, and Prof. Devendra Kumar Dubey, for their valuable comments that helped me to outline and improve the content of the thesis.

I would like to acknowledge the support received from my organization Defense Research and Development Organization (DRDO). I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. R.K. Tiwari of DMSRE (DRDO laboratory) Kanpur, for inspiring me to work on, ceramic honeycomb material application in mine blast environment. I would like to express my sincere thanks to Sri Manpreet Singh and Ms Ipsita Biswas of TBRL (DRDO laboratory) Chandigarh, for material testing.

Thanks, are also due to all the faculty members of Mechanical Engineering Department, I.I.T. Delhi who had supported me, at various stages of my research.

I am also thankful to Mr. Piyush gaur, Mr. Devendra Kumar, Mr. Sanyam Sharma, Mr. Kuldeep singh, Mr. Aman Vikram for helping me in my thesis. In addition,

I am thankful to Mr. Rabindra Kar, Mr. Kamal Rana and all project staff for constant support during my visit to Impact lab.

Thanks, can never express my deep gratitude for my ever-loving parents, Sri R.C. Mishra and Smt Mansa Devi. I am deeply indebted to my big brother Late Ashtha Bhuja Mishra for his support and care. Words cannot express my thanks to my ever-loving wife Dr. Sonal Mishra and my daughter Kavya Mishra, for their endless love and support, the sacrifices they made and the patience they maintained throughout these years without which I could have never been able to reach this stage. At the same time, I acknowledge the love and support; I received from my dear in laws Dr. V.K.D. Tripathi and Smt. Shespati Tripathi who always encouraged me.

Finally, I thank all those people, who knowingly or unknowingly inspired me in many ways throughout these years.

Kanhaiya Lal Mishra

Indian Institute of Delhi

ABSTRACT

Anti-mine boots protect lower limbs of soldier, paramilitary and demining forces from accidental detonation of mine. These Anti-Mine Boots, which have blast reflecting and absorbing layers in the sole and minimize the physical damage to the lower limb. New design of Anti-Mine Boots involves new materials, in different layering pattern. These materials need testing in blast field environment as well as FEM simulation environment. FEM simulations reduced the mine field testing but for this validated material modal and material properties are required at high strain rate. Ceramic honeycomb structure has found importance, for its use in AMB for blast pressure attenuation. This thesis contributes to the development of methodology for finding the material modal and material properties of brittle ceramic honeycomb at high strain rate with validation check in mine blast experimental setup, for optimizing Anti-Mine boot design in thoroughly optimized FEM simulation environment.

Material properties of ceramic honeycomb is obtained through FEM inverse material mapping of SHPB experimental results. Material was modeled as linear brittle modal with failure stress and strain. Mine blast experiments were done to test the material alone and in sandwich structure form in blast environment and measured blast pressure was compared with FEM simulation result to draw the conclusion regarding ceramic honeycomb material use in design of AMB. All the parameters affecting output of FEM simulation were thoroughly investigated for valid simulation environment, with simulation of published mine blast experiments.

सारांश

माइन प्रतिरोधी जूते सैनिकों और अर्धसैनिकों के निचले अंग की माइन विस्फोट से रक्षा करते हैं। माइन प्रतिरोधी जूते विस्फोट की उर्जा को अवशोषित करके निचले अंग की शारीरिक क्षति को कम करते हैं। नये माइन प्रतिरोधी जूते नये सामाग्री और नये विभिन्न लेयरिंग का उपयोग करते हैं। इन समाग्रियों को विस्फोट क्षेत्र के वातावरण क्षेत्र के साथ-साथ एफ ई एम सिमुलेशन वातावरण में परीक्षण की आवश्यकता है। एफ ई एम सिमुलेशन ने खान क्षेत्र परीक्षण को कम कर दिया है लेकिन इसके लिए उच्च तनाव पर मान्य सामाग्री माडल और भौतिक गुणों की आवश्यकता होती है सिरेमिक हनिकाम्ब संरचना को माइन विरोधी जूते में विस्फोट दबाव क्षीणन के लिए उपयोग में महत्व मिला है। यह क्षीतिस पूरी तरह से अनुकूलित एफ ई एम सिमुलेशन वातावरण में माइन प्रतिरोधी जूते के डिजाइन को अनुकूलित करने के लिए माइन विस्फोट प्रायोगिक सैटअप में सत्यापन जाँच के साथ उच्च तनाव पर भंगूर सिरेमिक हनिकाम्ब के सामाग्री मॉडल और भौतिक गुणों को खोजने के लिए कार्यप्रणाली के विकास में योगदान देता है।

सिरेमिक हनिकाम्ब के भौतिक गुण एस एच पी बी प्रयोगात्मक परिणामों के एफ ई एम प्रतिलोम सामाग्री मानचित्रण के माध्यम से प्राप्त किये जाते हैं। सामाग्री को विफलता तनाव और तनाव के साथ रैखिक भंगुर मॉडल के रूप में तैयार किया गया था। माइन विस्फोट प्रयोग अकेले सामाग्री और सैंडविच सामाग्री संरचनास का परीक्षण करने के लिए किये गये थे। विस्फोट वातावरण में सैंडविच संरचना के रूप में माइन प्रतिरोधी जूते के डिजाइन उपयोग के बारे में नि-वर्क निकालने के लिए एफ ई एम परिणाम के साथ प्रायोगिक माप विस्फोट दबाव की तुलना की गई थी। एफ ई एम सिमुलेशन के परिणाम को प्रभावित करने वाले सभी मापदण्डों की वैध सिमुलेशन वातावरण के लिए पूरी तरह से जाँच की गई थी। जिसमें प्रकाशित माइन विस्फोटों का अनुकरण किया गया था।

Table of Contents

CERTIFICATE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
Table of Contents	v
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xv
NOMENCLATURE	xvii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Organization of thesis	2
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Introduction	5
2.1 5	
2.2 Explosives	6
2.2.1 Detonator	7
2.2.2 Detonation wave theory.....	8
2.2.3 Unconfined and confined Explosion.....	8
2.2.4 Scaled Distance.....	8

2.3	Physics of Explosion.....	9
2.3.1	Blast Pressure calculations and prediction	14
2.4	BLAST MINE.....	18
2.4.1	Types of Anti Personal Mines.....	19
2.4.2	Surrogate mines	20
2.4.3	Explosion mechanism of mines	20
2.5	Wave Propagation through soil	21
2.5.1	Soil- Air interface.....	23
2.6	Wave propagation through solid	23
2.7	Blast mine injuries to Lower and upper body.....	26
2.7.1	Blast effect on lower leg:	27
2.7.2	Blast effect on upper body	28
2.7.3	Injury Risk Evaluation (IRE) and injury criterion.....	28
2.8	Surrogate leg.....	30
2.8.1	Mechanical Legs:	30
2.8.2	Frangible leg.....	32
2.8.3	Human Cadavers	33
2.9	Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and Anti-Mine Boots	33
2.9.1	Combat Boot (CB).....	33
2.9.2	Over boot (OB)	35
2.9.3	Spider Boot.....	35
2.9.4	Anti-mine Boot (AMB)	36
2.10	Experimental Testing of Ant-Mine Boots	37
2.11	Simulation: Testing of AMB Boots	38

2.11.1	Mine-Blast Simulation Environment	40
2.12	Equation of states	41
2.12.1	Air	41
2.12.2	Explosives:	41
2.12.3	Soil	41
2.12.4	Solid	43
2.13	Blast attenuation Methods	45
2.14	High Strain Rate Experiments:	46
2.14.1	Split Hopkinson Pressure Bar Test:	47
2.14.2	Flyer Plate Impact and Inverse Flyer Impact tests	50
2.15	Summary:	52
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH PROBLEM, OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY		53
3.1	Introduction	53
3.2	Research Problem	53
3.3	Objectives	53
3.4	Methodology	54
3.1	Summary	56
CHAPTER 4 BLAST ENVIRONMENT SIMULATION AND BLAST PRESSURE SENSITIVITY		57
4.1	Introduction	57
4.2	Validation of simulation environment: soil buried explosive experiment and simulations	57
4.2.1	Deviations in simulation environment:	62
4.3	Validation of simulation environment: air blast and plate deflection	63

4.4	Blast pressure sensitivity	65
4.4.1	Convergence analysis-element size	65
4.4.2	Detonation point effect on peak pressure	68
4.4.3	Depth of Burial effect on peak pressure	69
4.4.4	Obstruction effect on reflected overpressure	69
4.4.5	Obstruction material effect on reflected overpressure	72
4.4.6	Effect of boundary conditions of obstruction on peak pressure	74
4.5	Summary	75

CHAPTER 5 STATIC COMPRESSION AND DYNAMIC SHPB TESTING OF CERAMIC HONEYCOMB 77

5.1	Introduction	77
5.2	Material Description	77
5.3	Compression Test.....	81
5.3.1	Sample preparation	81
5.3.2	Sample Testing.....	81
5.3.3	Result and discussion.....	81
5.3.4	Material Property	84
5.3.5	Ceramic honeycomb properties.....	85
5.4.1	Sample preparation:.....	86
5.4.2	Sample Testing.....	87
5.4.3	SHPB result	89
5.4.4	Material Property	92
5.5	FEM Inverse material mapping	92
5.5.1	Simulation Environment:	93

5.5.2	Initial material property and SHPB simulation.....	94
5.5.3	FEM Inverse material mapping: Elastic region	97
5.5.4	FEM Inverse material mapping: Plastic region.....	99
5.6	Equivalent material property of ceramic honeycomb	100
5.6.1	Ceramic honeycomb properties at higher strain rate(10^3 order) (SHPB Test)	100
5.7	Summary.....	101
CHAPTER 6 MINE BLAST EXPERIMENT WITH CERAMIC HONEY COMB AND ITS SIMULATION		102
6.1	Introduction	102
6.2	Experimental setup.....	102
6.2.1	Sample preparation:.....	104
6.2.2	Experimental result	104
6.2.3	Simulation environment of experimental setup	105
6.3	Experimental and simulation results	110
6.4	Critical analysis of experimental results:	110
6.1.1	Ceramic Sample experimental result: FEM analysis	110
6.1.2	Sandwich sample experimental result: FEM Analysis	111
6.1.3	Other Reason of variations with experimental result	111
6.5	Summary.....	112
CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES		113
7.1	Introduction	113
7.2	Summary.....	113
7.3	Conclusions	115

7.4	Limitations and future scope	116
REFERENCES		118
ANNEXURE		123
Material Name: Air		123

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Pressure-time history of an air blast in free air of modified air-Friedlander equation	11
Figure 2.2: Blast wave propagation-Decreasing amplitude over distance (Karlos & Solomos, 2013)	12
Figure 2.3: Incident, reflected and dynamic pressure time histories (Karlos & Solomos, 2013)..	13
Figure 2.4: Blast Parameters of positive phase of shock wave of TNT charges from free-air burst (Karlos & Solomos, 2013)	15
Figure 2.5: Blast parameters of positive phase of shock hemispherical wave of TNT charges from the surface bursts (Karlos & Solomos, 2013)	16
Figure 2.6: Comparison of peak incident overpressure prediction in free-air bursts (Karlos & Solomos, 2013)	17
Figure 2.7: Anti-Personnel Mine (Blast) component (Wikipedia)	21
Figure 2.8: In soil effects of detonation of Soil buried explosives (Braid & Bergeron, 2001)	22
Figure 2.9: Material pre-requisite for formation of shock wave: pressure-volume relationship under high pressure (NATO, 2004)	25
Figure 2.10: Pressure-Volume (Hugoniot) curve and Rayleigh line (NATO, 2004).....	25
Figure 2.11: The Nether land Mechanical Leg (NATO, 2004)	31
Figure 2.12: DRDC Mechanical leg (NATO, 2004).....	31
Figure 2.13: Frangible Surrogate Leg- Bone Structure (Left) and casted Product (right) (NATO, 2004)	32
Figure 2.14: Mk III Combat boot of Canadian Army (Bergeron et al., 2006).....	34
Figure 2.15: Wellco Over boot (Bergeron et al., 2006).....	34
Figure 2.16: Wellco spider boot (Bergeron, D. et al., 2006)	35
Figure 2.17: Anti Mine Boot (Avantek.in)	36
Figure 2.18: Indian AMB (A) with ceramic inserts (Zee, 2017) and Wellco AMB metallic insert (Bergeron et al., 2006).....	37
Figure 2.19: Graphical representation of Anti-Mine Boot testing rig	38
Figure 2.20: Simulation of APM (Cronin, 2003).....	39
Figure 2.21: Lagrangian, Eulerian and ALE meshes and material movement (Cheng et al., 2013)	

.....	40
Figure 2.22: Soil Pressure and density Relation (Laine & Larsen, 2012)	42
Figure 2.23: Schematic of compressive SHPB experiment	47
Figure 2.24: (a) Plate Impact test experimental setup (b) VISAR measurement (Rosenberg et al., 1985)	51
Figure 3.1: Block diagram of proposed research methodology	56
Figure 4.1: DRES, Canada mine blast experimental setup with transducers positions	59
Figure 4.2: Simulation environment of DRES C4 blast experiments	60
Figure 4.3: Laterally offset, in soil pressure sensors mounted on U-shaped frame (Bergeron et al., 1988)	60
Figure 4.4: Schematic of experimental setup, showing (a) cross section view of explosive configuration, and (b) 3-D view of the clamped v- plate test (Yuen et al., 2012)	64
Figure 4.5: 2-D axis symmetric AUTODYN simulation environment for circular flat plate under air blast	65
Figure 4.6: Near field burst and simulation output with varying mesh element size (0.3 mm to 0.03 mm) (Cheng et al., 2013)	66
Figure 4.7: Explosive-air interaction Simulation for convergence analysis	67
Figure 4.8: Explosive-sand-air interaction Simulation for convergence analysis	68
Figure 4.9: AUTODYN-Surface air blast simulations for detonation point effect	68
Figure 4.10: Simulation: Peak pressure results with varying location of detonation point	69
Figure 4.11: Influence of angle of incidence on reflected overpressure coefficient (Karlos & Solomos, 2013)	70
Figure 4.12: Air Blast Pressure- Mine blast 40 gm C4 (Depth of burial 20 mm)	71
Figure 4.13: Reflected Air Blast Pressure: Mine blast 40 gm C4 (Depth of burial 20 mm) 20 mm thick steel at 250 mm (B.C.: side fixed)	72
Figure 4.14: Sand buried mine blast simulation (2D) with obstruction	73
Figure 4.15: Simulation environment for B.C. and weight effect on transmitted pressure	75
Figure 5.1: Ceramic Honeycomb sample (Sourced from: ARCI Hyderabad)	79
Figure 5.2: Effect of orientation and rubber encapsulation on compression behavior of ceramic	

honeycomb (A) and on critical stress of ceramic honeycomb and foam (B) (Jain et al., 2003)....	80
Figure 5.3: Compression test (A) Ceramic Honeycomb block, (B) Cylindrical samples, (C) Circular Composite strips, (D) Composite-ceramic-composite sandwiched samples, (E) Ceramic sample on UTM before failure and (F) after failure	83
Figure 5.4: Stress-strain response at varying compression rate (0.3mm/ minute to 300 mm/ minute)	84
Figure 5.5: Ceramic honeycomb samples of different diameters and composite ceramic sandwich sample.	85
Figure 5.6: Poisson's ratio vs engineering strain curve for aluminum foam (Nasser et al., 2007)	86
Figure 5.7: Schematic of compressive SHPB experiment.....	88
Figure 5.8: SHPB sample and SHPB set up for test	88
Figure 5.9: SHPB experimental result of incident (Blue) and transmitted (Pink) pulse at oscilloscope and monitor (sample L: 10 mm, D: 5 mm, maraging steel bars)	90
Figure 5.10: SHPB strain rate (A) and stress-strain (B) results (sample L: 10 mm, D: 5 mm, maraging steel bars)	90
Figure 5.11: SHPB (steel bar) experimental response (A) and corresponding stress-strain prediction with copper pulse shaper	91
Figure 5.12: Stress- strain response of ceramic from SHPB test (L/D = 0.5).....	91
Figure 5.13: Schematic of compressive SHPB simulation	94
Figure 5.14: Trial input material properties of sample in simulations (linear elastic).....	95
Figure 5.15: Effect of sample material's Young's modulus on output bar response.....	96
Figure 5.16: Effect of material's failure strain on output bar response	96
Figure 5.17: Simulation Input bar response (incident and reflected pulse)	98
Figure 5.18: Simulation output bar response (Transmitted pulse) with varying material model ..	98
Figure 5.19: Simulation Input bar response (incident and reflected pulse)	99
Figure 5.20: Simulation output bar response (Transmitted Pulse: axial micro deformation vs millisecond time)	100
Figure 5.21: Dynamic and quassi-static stress-strain curve of Indiana limestone (Chen & Song, 2010)	101

Figure 6.1: Mine blast experimental setup.....	104
Figure 6.2: Ceramic samples for mine blast experiment	105
Figure 6.3: 1 mm thick glass- epoxy composite use in mine blast experiment	105
Figure 6.4: simulation environment representing experimental setup of Figure 6.1	107
Figure 6.5: (B) represents testing environment of ceramic honeycomb sample and (B1) represents simulation environment for testing environment of B	108
Figure 6.6: Graphical (C) representation for composite-ceramic-composite sandwich testing and simulation environment (C1) for the same	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: TNT equivalent for Different explosives (Energy based) (Larcher, 2018)	7
Table 2.2: TNT equivalent of some explosives based on Peak pressure and impulse methods	7
Table 2.3: JWL Parameters for TNT (Larcher, 2018)	10
Table 2.4: Kingery and Bulmash general polynomial form (UNODA, 2016)	14
Table 2.5: 12 Most affected Nations: Estimated Number of Land Mines (United States Department of State, 1998 (Braid & Bergeron, 2001)	18
Table 2.6: Abbreviated Injury Score (AIS) (NATO, 2004)	29
Table 2.7: Mine Trauma Score for the Lower Extremity (NATO, 2004)	29
Table 4.1: DRES experimental and Simulation result: Air TOA and peak pressure	61
Table 4.2 : DRES Experimental and simulation result: In-soil TOA and peak pressure	62
Table 4.3: Experimental and simulation result of plate deflection (Yuen et al., 2012)	64
Table 4.4: Element size effect on peak pressure in air-explosive environment	66
Table 4.5: Element size effect on peak pressure in explosive-sand-air environment	67
Table 4.6: Pressure amplification by steel at different standoff distance from soil	72
Table 4.7 : Peak Pressure: Interacting Material Effect in sand buried mine blast	74
Table 5.1: Properties of Ceramic honeycomb and foam (Jain et al., 2003)	78
Table 5.2: Description of honeycomb and foam samples for mechanical property (Jain et al., 2003)	80
Table 5.3: Failure stress of bare ceramic honeycomb ceramic with channel orientation and composite sandwich ceramic honeycomb	84
Table 5.4: SHPB Sample geometrical Description	87
Table 5.5: SHPB experiments: stress and strain result	92
Table 5.6: SHPB _Simulation Component description	93
Table 6.1: Mine blast experimental and simulation result	110
Table 6.2: Obstruction material effect on Reflected overpressure at standoff distance of 250 mm	111

NOMENCLATURE

SYMBOLS

P_{so}	Peak overpressure
t_A	Time of arrival
t_o^+	Positive phase duration
t_o^-	Negative phase duration
P_r	Reflected overpressure
P_0	Ambient pressure
ε_p	Effective plastic strain
$\dot{\varepsilon}_p$	Effective plastic strain rate

ABBREVIATIONS

PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
APM	Anti-Personal Mine
SSL	Simplified Lower Leg

CLL	Complex Lower Leg
FSL	Frangible Lower Leg
FE	Finite Element
FEM	Finite Element Method
DOB	Depth of Burial
TSS	Trauma Scoring System
AIS	Abbreviated Injury Scale
MTS	Mine Trauma Score
MES	Mangled Extremity Score