241272 E 6953

NASA Technical Memorandum 105362 AVSCOM Technical Report 91–C–009

# A Comparison Between Theoretical Prediction and Experimental Measurement of the Dynamic Behaviour of Spur Gears

Brian Rebbechi and B. David Forrester Defence Science and Technology Organisation Aeronautical Research Laboratory Melbourne, Australia

and

Fred B. Oswald and Dennis P. Townsend Lewis Research Center Cleveland, Ohio

Prepared for the Sixth International Power Transmission and Gear Conference sponsored by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Phoenix, Arizona, September 13–16, 1992





# A COMPARISON BETWEEN THEORETICAL PREDICTION AND EXPERIMENTAL

## MEASUREMENT OF THE DYNAMIC BEHAVIOUR OF SPUR GEARS

Brian Rebbechi and B. David Forrester Defence Science and Technology Organisation Aeronautical Research Laboratory Melbourne, Australia

and

Fred B. Oswald and Dennis P. Townsend National Aeronautics and Space Administration Lewis Research Center Cleveland, Ohio 44135

# ABSTRACT

A comparison was made between computer model predictions of gear dynamic behaviour and experimental results. The experimental data were derived from the NASA gear noise rig, which was used to record dynamic tooth loads and vibration. The experimental results were compared with predictions from the Australian Defence Science and Technology Organisation Aeronautical Research Laboratory's gear dynamics code, for a matrix of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic load predictions agree with experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. Tooth separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degrée of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth-contact region.

### INTRODUCTION

The dynamic behaviour of gears is important for a number of reasons—the dynamic load increment, the gear life, the gear noise, and the overall vibratory behaviour of the gear system. In aerospace applications, such as helicopter transmissions, all of these factors are relevant, and weight is also an important factor. A knowledge of dynamic load factors can assist in weight reduction.

The NASA gear noise rig was built to enable fundamental studies of gear dynamic behaviour to be carried out and to provide support to gear noise reduction programs. Oswald et al. (1991) compared dynamic load measurements from the NASA rig with predictions from the computer program DANST (Dynamic Analysis of Spur Gear Transmissions). This report continues that work, and compares the same experimental data with predictions from another model, developed at the Australian Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO) Aeronautical Research Laboratory (ARL), designated ARL\_DYN.

The two models differ significantly. DANST (Lin et al. 1989, 1987) has four torsional degrees of freedom representing the motor, the gears, and the load. The shaft stiffness elements are represented by linear stiffnesses, and the tooth compliance by a variable stiffness. ARL\_DYN (Rebbechi, 1991) models the gear in a way that allows the detailed contact conditions of each of the tooth pairs in contact to be separately represented. The model also includes shaft deflection. Although this has the disadvantage of increasing the complexity of the model, it has the advantage that the model parameters, such as the sliding friction coefficient, can be varied in a way that accords with the physical parameters.

The objectives of this work were (1) to evaluate predictions of dynamic load increment by using the ARL model and compare these with experimental results, and (2) to refine the model as necessary to match the predictions with the measured dynamic load curves.

#### APPARATUS AND PROCEDURES

The NASA Lewis gear noise rig (Fig. 1) was used for these tests. This rig features a single-mesh gearbox powered by a 150-kW (200-hp) variable-speed electric motor. An eddy-current dynamometer loads the output shaft. The gearbox can be operated at speeds up to 6000 rpm. The rig was built to carry out fundamental studies of gear noise and the dynamic behaviour of gear systems. It was designed to allow testing of various configurations of gears, bearings, dampers, and supports. The gearbox is extensively instrumented for strain and vibration measurements.

A poly-V belt drive was used as a speed increaser between the motor and the input shaft. A soft coupling was installed on the input shaft to reduce input torque fluctuations, which were caused by nonuniformity at the belt splice.

The test gears were identical spur gears (at 1:1 ratio) machined to American Gear Manufacturers Association (AGMA) class 13 accuracy. The gear profiles were modified with linear tip relief as shown in Fig. 2. Test gear parameters are shown in Table I.

Tooth root fillet strains were measured on the tensile and compressive sides of two successive teeth, at the 30° tangency location (Cornell, 1980), Fig. 3. Dynamic strains were recorded for the four gages at a matrix of 28 load-speed test conditions: four speeds (800, 2000, 4000, and 6000 rpm) and seven torque levels (16, 31, 47, 63, 79, 94, and 110 percent of the nominal torque of 71.8 N-m (635 lb-in.)). The strain gage signals were transmitted through a slip-ring assembly to constant-current signal conditioners. The dynamic strain data were digitized by a digital data acquisition system, with sample rates of 50 kHz per channel at the 2000-, 4000-, and 6000-rpm speeds and 20 kHz at the 800-rpm speed. A once-per-revolution timing pulse provided an accurate angular position reference for digital resampling by linear interpolation. The resampled data were then synchronously averaged over several successive revolutions to reduce noise effects, such as the torque fluctuation from the drive belt.

The averaged strain data values were converted to normal tooth force (dynamic tooth load) by using calibration data measured under static conditions. The calibration apparatus and data reduction procedures are more fully described in Rebbechi et al. (1991) and Oswald et al. (1991).

## ANALYTICAL MODEL

ARL\_DYN (Rebbechi, 1991), Fig. 4, considers both torsional and lateral displacements of the gears and can accommodate variable numbers of teeth in contact. The equations of motion were derived by considering dynamic equilibrium for moments and forces



Figure 1.—NASA gear noise rig.

acting on the components of the system. Moments are taken about the axes of rotation. The mode of deflection of the gear teeth is taken as rotation about a point in the gear wheel at one tooth height below the base circle (see Rebbechi, 1983). The tooth stiffness, which varies with load position, is calculated according to a deflection equation in Merritt (1971). Forces acting through gear centers are resolved into coordinates  $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2$ . This results in [8+2(t-1)] equations of motion, where t is the number of tooth pairs in contact. The set of equations can be reduced to [7+(t-1)]equations by invoking the kinematic constraint equations for the gears in mesh.

To improve numerical accuracy, the equations involving gear body rotation  $\theta_1, \theta_2$  were transformed to new coordinates  $\Theta_1 = (\theta_1 + n\theta_2)/2$  (average rotation of gear pair) and  $\Theta_2 = (\theta_1 - n\theta_2 + c)/2$ (relative rotation of gear pair), where  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  represent the rotation of the gear wheels, *n* is the gear ratio, and *c* is a constant used to make  $\Theta_2 = 0$  if there are no errors. The new equations relate to (1) the absolute rotation, and (2) the relative rotation of the gear wheels. The gear dynamics code assembles the equations of motion in matrix form as shown in equation (1):

$$[\mathbf{M}]\{X\} + [\mathbf{C}]\{X\} + [\mathbf{K}]\{X\} = \{F\}$$
(1)



# TABLE I.- TEST GEAR PARAMETERS

Construction Characteristic full doubt to the	L
Gear type Standard involute; full-depth toot	n
Number of teeth	8
Module, mm (diametral pitch, in. $^{-1}$ ) 3.175 (8)	3)
Face width, mm (in.) 6.35 (0.25	5)
Pressure angle, deg 2	0
Theoretical contact ratio 1.6	4
Driver modification amount, mm (in.) 0.023 (0.0009	))
Driven modification amount, mm (in.) 0.025 (0.0010	))
Driver modification start, deg 2	4
Driven modification start, deg 2	4
Tooth-root radius, mm (in.) 1.35 (0.053	;)
Gear quality AGMA class 1	3
Nominal (100 percent) torque, N-m (inlb) 71.77 (635.25	i)



(a) Gage installation.



(b) Gage location.

Figure 3.—Strain gage installation and location on test gear.

where M, C, and K are square coefficient matrices representing the mass (inertia), damping, and stiffnesses, and X and F are vectors of displacements and forces (torques), respectively. The order (number of degrees of freedom) of equation (1) is (6+t), where t is the number of tooth pairs in contact. For low-contact-ratio gears, t normally varies between 1 and 2. If tooth separation (tooth bounce) occurs, t may also be zero. Therefore, the degrees of freedom vary



Figure 4.-Gear dynamics model.

between 6, 7, and 8, depending on whether there are zero, one, or two pairs of teeth in contact. The M, C, and K matrices contain a number of nonlinear terms owing to the nonlinear kinematic constraints.

The dynamics code allows prescription of such features as profile errors and modification, shaft deflection (including interaction effects with conditions of tooth contact), tooth deflection (including resulting change of contact position and common normal direction), and tooth sliding friction. The friction coefficient for the gear mesh (the friction force divided by the normal force) was taken to be 0.06. Values up to 0.10 were tried but made little difference in the results. Material damping in the gear tooth was modeled as viscous damping and expressed as the damping ratio (fraction of critical damping). Gear tooth material damping produces a significant effect. A damping ratio of 0.10 gave the best correlation with experimental data. The same damping ratio (0.10) was assumed for lateral bending of the shaft. The torsional shaft damping coefficient was  $2.3 \times 10^{-5}$  N-m/(rad/sec). Changing the shaft damping values had little effect.

For input and output boundary conditions, steady external torques were assumed. The code solves the equations of motion with a Newmark-Beta numerical integration technique. The profile modification measured for the test gears (Fig. 2) was specified for the analysis.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Dynamic tooth loads computed from the strain gage readings were compared with the predictions of ARL\_DYN for dynamic tooth force. Initial runs of the computer model, although producing good results at high loads (with an average error in maximum tooth load of 5 percent), did not successfully characterise dynamic behaviour at light loads and high speeds. An example is shown in Fig. 5, where at the roll angle of 21°, the predicted value is about 3.5 times the measured value.





The experimental results were critically examined to evaluate reasons for the disagreement at light loads between analysis and experiment. A segment of these results is shown in Fig. 6. Here the dynamic tension strains at 31-percent torque are plotted for four speeds in the range 800 to 6000 rpm. Each curve has three parts: (1) a region where the strain increases rapidly as the load is taken up by the tooth of interest; (2) a region of slowly declining static strain (with dynamic effect superimposed) where the entire load is carried by a single tooth pair; this region lies approximately between points A and B in Fig. 6; and (3) a region where the load is passed to the following tooth. It can be seen that the load-sharing regions (1 and 3), and thus the effective contact ratio, were virtually unaffected by speed. Speed had little effect on the dynamic load until point A in Fig. 6 was reached. The higher speeds show an "overshoot." As this overshoot changed only in magnitude as the speed increased, and did not change in angular position, it most likely resulted from a predominantly inertial effect, and not from a combined mass/stiffness (resonance) effect, where we would expect a phase shift.

The approximate displacement error for this gear tooth profile when lightly loaded is as described by Munro (1989) and is sketched in Fig. 7. Munro terms this type of profile correction as "long profile relief," where the relief extends from below the high point of single-tooth contact to the tooth tip. It appears that the overshoot in response evident in Fig. 6 arose from the inability of the gear pair to instantaneously adapt to the "separating mode" (where the driven gear leads the driving gear). As the gear speed increased, this effect became more marked. The dominant factors here are probably the gear wheel inertia, which relates to speed through the separating acceleration, and the external torque, which acts to reduce dynamic overshoot.

The effect of overshoot or tooth separation was reproduced in the computer model. Initially, the value used for gear wheel inertia did not include the inertias of the gear hub, shaft, spacers, or couplings. When these parts were accounted for, the inertia value increased by a factor of 4. The tooth forces for the "light" and the "standard" (corrected) gears are compared in Fig. 8. The measured tooth force data are also shown for comparison. This result closely accords with and confirms the hypothesis of Munro (1989), who described the tendency of gears with long relief to separate at light loads.

The influence of shaft deflection was also considered. Owing to the construction of this test gearbox (Fig. 1), where the gears are centrally mounted on relatively long supporting shafts, it was at one stage thought that lateral deflection may be a cause of the tooth bounce observed when light loads are combined with high speeds. Dynamic tooth strains at 4000 rpm are compared for seven torque levels in Fig. 9. The effect of tooth bounce can be seen in the curve for 16-percent torque. Here, the force vanishes around the pitch point, indicating that the teeth have lost contact. It is interesting to note that the tooth bounce shown here is not unique to the NASA gear noise rig but is also seen in the results of other researchers such as Tobe et al. (1977). Figure 10 compares the predicted dynamic tooth force for the normal gears with a case where the shaft stiffness is increased by a factor of 4. There is little difference in the character of these curves.

The shaft deflection in the radial direction (along the line joining the gear centers) for both normal and stiff shafts is plotted in Fig. 11. As expected, the mean deflection was less when the stiffness was increased, but surprisingly the dynamic displacement increased. This increase in dynamic displacement for a stiffer shaft was apparently a resonance effect (note the phase shift of approximately 90° between the curves). This indicates that shaft flexibility is not likely to be a contributing factor to the tooth bounce.

Dynamic load predictions for the model with the normal (heavier) gear wheels are compared with measured values in Fig. 12. Agreement is reasonable except in Fig. 12(c), at 6000 rpm and 31-percent torque. The prediction shows tooth separation at this condition, but tooth separation was actually recorded at the lower speed of 4000 rpm and the lighter torque of 16 percent (see Fig. 9). It is evident from these results that further refinement of the model is necessary to produce consistent results across the whole speed range. It is probable that the introduction of additional torsional degrees of freedom, representing the motor and the dynamometer, would aid in this regard, so that the dynamic load increments at different speeds could be magnified or reduced. The analysis was particularly successful in predicting the response in the load-sharing region (roll angle greater than 23° or less than 19°).

The peak values of the dynamic load from both measured and predicted data are compared at four speeds (800, 2000, 4000, and 6000 rpm) for the highest torque level (110 percent) in Fig. 13. The predicted and measured data show the same trend (i.e., a minimum at about 4000 rpm), and the values agree within an average error of 5 percent. The static load line drawn in Fig. 13 is calculated from the external applied torque of 110 percent. The resulting force of 1894 N (426 lb) is computed from the torque divided by the base circle radius.



Figure 6.—Tension gage strain at 31-percent torque and four speeds.







Figure 8.—Effect of gear wheel inertia on predicted dynamic tooth force at 4000 rpm and 31-percent torque.



Figure 10.—Predicted dynamic tooth force at 4000 rpm and 31 percent torque. Comparison of results for two shaft stiffnesses.



Figure 12.—Comparison between predicted and measured dynamic tooth loads for normal gear wheels.





#### CONCLUSIONS

Experimental data for gear tooth dynamic load were compared with predictions from the Australian Defence Science and Technology Organisation Aeronautical Research Laboratory's gear dynamics code. The effects of lateral shaft stiffness and gear body inertia were examined by using the computer model to improve predictions of gear tooth bounce as observed at light loads and high speeds. The following results were obtained:

(1) Peak dynamic load predictions agreed with measured data within an average error of 5 percent for 110-percent torque and speeds ranging between 800 and 6000 rpm.

(2) Tooth separation (or bounce) was observed in the experimental data for light-load, high-speed operation. The computer model predicted tooth separation under slightly different conditions. The model shows that this phenomenon is primarily dependent on the operating conditions of speed and load and the physical parameters of tooth profile and gear body inertia. An increase in gear wheel inertia increases the likelihood of tooth separation.

(3) The analytical model was successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth-contact region.

#### REFERENCES

Cornell, R.W., 1980, "Compliance and Stress Sensitivity of Spur Gear Teeth," ASME PAPER 80-C2/DET-24.

Lin, H.H., Townsend, D.P., and Oswald, F.B., 1989, "Profile Modification to Minimize Spur Gear Dynamic Loading," <u>Inter-</u> national Power Transmission and Gearing Conference, 5th: <u>New</u> <u>Technologies for Power Transmissions for the 90's</u>, ASME, New York, Vol. 1, pp. 455–465. (Also, NASA TM-89901, 1987.) Lin, H.H., Huston, R.L., and Coy, J.J., 1987, "On Dynamic Loads in Parallel Shaft Transmissions, 1: Modelling and Analysis," NASA TM-100180.

Merritt, H.E., 1971, <u>Gear Engineering</u>, Pitman Publishing, London, pp. 221-222.

Munro, R.G., 1989, "The D.C. Component of Gear Transmission Error," International Power Transmission and Gearing Conference, 5th: New Technologies for Power Transmissions for the 90's, ASME, New York, Vol. 1, pp. 467-470.

Rebbechi, B., Oswald, F.B., and Townsend, D.P., 1991, "Dynamic Measurements of Gear Tooth Friction and Load," AGMA report 91-FTM-10. (Also NASA TM-103281.)

Rebbechi, B., 1991, "A Dynamic Model of Spur Gear Behaviour," ARL Report PROP-R-188, Aeronautical Research Laboratory, Melbourne, Australia.

Rebbechi, B., and Crisp, J.D.C, 1983, "Kinetics of the Contact Point and Oscillatory Mechanisms in Resilient Spur Gears," <u>Proceedings of the Six World Congress on the Theory of Machines</u> and Mechanisms, Halsted Press, New York, Vol. 1, pp. 802–808.

Oswald, F.B., Rebbechi, B., Zakrajsek, J.J., and Townsend, D.P., 1991, "Comparison of Analysis and Experiment for Dynamics of Low Contact Ratio Spur Gears," <u>Proceedings of 13th Biennial</u> <u>Conference on Mechanical Vibration and Noise</u>, ASME, 1991. (Also NASA TM-103232.)

Tobe, T., Sato, K., and Takatsu, N., 1977, "Statistical Analysis of Dynamic Loads on Spur Gear Teeth," JSME Bulletin, Vol. 20, No. 148, pp. 1315–1320.

Path engine hashes for the detection of vibramition is thereage 1 to 2 per resource, including the balance of the detection of the detec	REPORT	Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Lawre Junni)       2. REPORT DATE       3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED         1992       Technical Memorandum         4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE       3. FUNDING NUMBERS         A. Comparison Between Theoretical Prediction and Experimental Measurement of the Dynamic Behaviour of Spur Gars       5. FUNDING NUMBERS         Measurement of the Dynamic Behaviour of Spur Gars       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(ES)       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(ES)         NASA Levis Research Center       Cevelad, 004 4115-3191       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Advensaries and Space Administration       Wuestower Theoret Transmission and Gars Centercee spassored by the American Society of Michanical Engineers, Program Guide Statistration       8. SPONSORINGMONTORING AGENCY NAMES(5) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Advensaries and Space Administration       Waster Administration       NASA TM-105362         Nus, Samy Aviation System Command       Secondary Report Transmission and Gars Centercee spassored by the American Society of Michanical Engineers, Program Guide Statistration Waster, Methore, Austration From Roundard Research Laboratory Nethores, Center Administration       NASA TM-105362         NUS, Samy Aviation System Command       Secondary Report Transmission and Gars Centercee spassored by the American Society of Michanical Engineers, Program Guide Research Laboratory Nethores, Science and Technology Organization, American Research Laboratory Secondary Report Trauministin and Gars Centercee spassored by the American Society of	Public reporting burden for this collection of gathering and maintaining the data needed, collection of information, including suggestio Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA	information is estimated to average and completing and reviewing the is for reducing this burden, to Wa 2202-4302, and to the Office of N	ge 1 hour per re collection of in ashington Head Management an	esponse, including the time for re- formation. Send comments rega quarters Services, Directorate for d Budget, Paperwork Reduction	viewing instructions, searching existing data sources, arding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.	
1992         Technical Memorandum           4. TTLE AND SUBTILE         A Comparison Between Theoretical Prediction and Experimental Measurement of the Dynamic Behaviour of Spur Gears         F. PINDING NUMBERS           6. AUTHOR(S)         Brian Rebbechi, B. David Forrester, Fred B. Oswald, and Dennis P. Townsend         Perrommuno onganization           7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) NASA Lowis Research Center Cleveland, Obio 4413-3101 and Proguisko Dictoriat U.S. Amy Acation Systems Command Casamy Acation Systems Command Sci. Lowin, Mc. 6128-1798         10. SPONSORING,MONTORING AGENCY NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Acenancies and Space Administration Washingon, DC. 2864-0001 and U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command Sci. Lowin, Mc. 6128-1798         10. SPONSORING,MONTORING AGENCY NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Acenancies and Space Administration Washingon, DC. 2864-0001 and U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command Sci. Lowin, Mc. 6128-1798         10. SPONSORING,MONTORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NASSA Lewis Research Center. Reponsible person, Fred B. Cowadi, 2019 633-997           128. JUPPLIEMENTARY NOTES Proparal for the Sixth International Power Transmission and Gear Conference sponsored by the American Society of Mcchanical Engineers, Pronens, Arcina Spatient 91-16, 1992. Train Rebbechi and D. David Forester, Detenes Science and Technologo Organization, Atomanical Research Laboratory, McHoarne, Awardia: frei B. Oward and Dennis P. Towneed, NASA Lewis Research Center. Responsible person, Fred B. Coward and Casamy Scietere of Loward and an Organization (to bunce), which was observed	1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)         2. REPORT DATE         3. REPORT TYPE A				D DATES COVERED	
4. THE AND SUBTILE       5. FUNDING NUMBERS         A. Comparison Detween Theoretical Prediction and Experimental Measurement of the Dynamic Behaviour of Spur Gears       5. PUNDING NUMBERS         6. AUTHOR(S)       Brian Rebbechi, B. David Forrester, Fred B. Oswald, and Dennis P. Townsend       6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         NASA Levis Research Center       Cleveland, 00: 44135-3191       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aromatics and Space Command       Cleveland, 00: 44135-3191       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aromatics and Space Command       Cleveland, 00: 44135-3191       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aromatics and Space Command       St. Lous, No. 4133-3191       8. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aromatics and Space Command       St. Lous, No. 4133-1917       NASA Levis Research Center. Report NUMBER         11. SUPPLEMENTARY WOTES       Therperiod for the Sinh International Power Transmission and Grad Conference sponsored by the American Society of Mechaneral Engineers, Phoens, Arizan, September 17-16, 1992. Thim Robbechi and D. David Forrester, Defence Science and Technology Organisator, Anomatical Research Laboratory, Melbourn, Auralia, Friel B. Cowald and Densis P. Townsend, NASA Levis Research Center. Responsible person, Friel B. Owald (210) 433-3937.       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         11. SUPPLEMENTARY WOTES       The reperiod for the NASA gear noise rig, which was used to record dynamic itol holads and vib		1992	2	Te	echnical Memorandum	
A Comparison Between Theoretical Prediction and Experimental Measurement of the Dynamic Behaviour of Spur Gears       WU-505-63-36         6. AUTHOR(5) Brian Rebbechi, B. David Forrester, Fred B. Oswald, and Dennis P. Townsend       WU-505-63-36         7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(ES) MASS Lovis Research Conter Creveland, 064 4135-3101 and Depulsion Directome U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command Creveland, 064 4413-3101 and Depulsion Directome U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command Creveland, 064 4413-3101       Image: Beneric Annotation Research Labertory Molecular Automatics and Space Administration Washington, D.C. 20546-0001 and U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 61320-1798       Image: Beneric Administration Washington, D.C. 20546-0001 and U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 61320-1798       Image: Beneric Administration Washington, D.C. 20546-0001 and U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 61320-1798       Image: Beneric Administration Washington, D.C. 20546-0001 and U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 61320-1798       Image: Beneric Administration Washington, D.C. 20546-0001 and U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 61320-1798       Image: Beneric Administration Washington, D.C. 20546-0001 and U.S. Distribution Administration Washington Administr	4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE				5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(6)       Brian Rebbechi, B. David Forrester, Fred B. Oswald, and Dennis P. Townsend         7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)       ASA Levis Research Celeter         Creveland, 004 4135-3191       Brian Rebbechi, 3433-3191         and       Propulsion Directorate         U.S. Army, Aviation Systems Command       E-6953         September 2016, 44135-3191       Beneficient Celeter         U.S. Army, Aviation Systems Command       Beneficient Celeter         S. Loos, Mo. 43126-3190       Beneficient Celeter         Value Army, Aviation Systems Command       Beneficient Celeter         St. Louis, Mo. 61320-1798       In. SPONSORING, MONITORING AGENCY NAMES(6) AND ADDRESS(E5)         National Accessitient, Molitorine, Asstratia, Fred B. Oswald and Demis P. Townsend, NASA Levis Research Center, Responsible penon, Provide Morester, Defende Science and Technology Organisation, Astratial, Red B. Oswald and Demis P. Townsend, NASA Levis Research Center, Responsible penon, Provide Morester, Defende Science and Technology Organisation, Astratial Research Laboratory, Melhoume, Asstratial, Fred B. Oswald and Demis P. Townsend, NASA Levis Research Center, Responsible penon, Provide Molitor, Comparison was made between computer model predictions of gear dynamic behaviour and experimental results. The experimental data traits of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic toold loads and vibration. The experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the speed range: 800 to 6000 rpm. Toold separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was asinul	A Comparison Between T Measurement of the Dyna	heoretical Prediction an mic Behaviour of Spur	id Experim Gears	ental	WU-505-63-36	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(6) AND ADDRESS(ES) NASA Lewis Research Center Cleveland, 006 44135-3191 and Propulsion Directorate U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command Cleveland, 016 44135-3191       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER E-6953         9. SPONSORING/MONTORING AGENCY NAMES(5) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Actionality and Systems Command U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 63120-1798       10. SPONSORING/MONTORING AGENCY NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Actional Actional Systems Command U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 63120-1798       10. SPONSORING/MONTORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NASA Lewis Research Lebentory, Michouras, Astrafila, Fred B. Owald and Demis P. Townsend, NASA Lewis Research Center. Responsible person, Fred B. Owald (216) 433-3957.         12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category 37       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       12b. DISTRIBUTION AddLaBILITY STATEMENT Laboratory's gear dynamics code for a matrix of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic load predictions agree with experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. Tooth separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth contact region.       15. NUMBER OF PA	6. AUTHOR(S) Brian Rebbechi, B. David	Forrester, Fred B. Oswa	ald, and Do	ennis P. Townsend		
U.S. Army Avaidon Systems Command Cicveland, 006: 4415-3101       I.       SPONSORING,MONITORING AGENCY NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Aeronautics and Space Administration washington, D.C. 2034-0001 and U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mc. 63120-1798       II.       SPONSORING,MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NASA TM-105362 AVSCOM TR 91-C-009         11.       SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for the Stath International Power Transmission and Gear Conference sponsored by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. Pheenix, Arizona, September 13-16, 1992. Brian Rebbechi and B. David Forrester, Defence Science and Technology Organisation, Aeronautical Research Laboratory, Mchourne, Australia, Fred B. Oswald and Demis P. Townsend, NASA Lewis Research Center. Reponsible person, Fred B. Oswald, (210) 433-3937.         12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVALLABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category 37       Izb. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       A comparison was made between computer model predictions of gear dynamic behaviour and experimental results. The experimental are sults were compared with predictions from the DSTO Aeronautical Research Laboratory's gear dynamics code for a matrix of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic load predictions agree with experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the Speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. Tooth separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth contact region.       15. NUMBER OF PAGES 10         14. SUBJECT TERMS Spur gears; Gear dynamics; Gear load; Dynamic load; Strain gage testing; Dynami	7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NASA Lewis Research Center Cleveland, Ohio 44135–3191 and Propulsion Directorate	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER E-6953				
9. SPONSORING,MONTORING AGENCY NAMES(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Actionatics and Space Administration Washington, D.C. 20346-0001 and U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 63120-1798       10. SPONSORING,MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NASA TM-105362 AVSCOM TR 91-C-009         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for the Sixth International Power Transmission and Gear Conference sponsord by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. Phoenix, Arizona, September 13-16, 1992. Brian Rehbechi and B. David Forrester, Defence Science and Technology Organisation, Acronautical Research Laboratory. Mboume, Australia, Fred B. Oswald and Dennis P. Townsend, NASA Lewis Research Center. Responsible person, Fred B. Oswald, (210) 433-3957.         12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category 37       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) A comparison was made between computer model predictions of gear dynamic behaviour and experimental results. The experimental data were derived from the NASA gear noise rig, which was used to record dynamic tooth loads and vibration. The experimental results were compared with predictions from the DSTO Aeronautical Research Laboratory's gear dynamics code for a matrix of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic load predictions agree with experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the speed round predictions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth contact region.         14. SUBJECT TERMS Spur gears; Gear dynamics; Gear load; Dynamic load; Strain gage testing; Dynamic analysis; Profile modifications <b>10</b> . PRICE CODE A02       15. NUMBER OF PAGES 10         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	U.S. Army Aviation Systems Co Cleveland, Ohio, 44135–3191	mmand				
National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, D.C. 20546-0001 and U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 63120-1798       NASA TM-105362 AVSCOM TR 91-C-009         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for the Stath International Power Transmission and Gear Conference sponsored by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Phoenix, Arizona, Segnethem 13-16, 1992. Brian Rebbechi and B. David Forrester, Defence Science and Technology Organisation, Aeronautical Research Laboratory, Melbourne, Australia: Fred B. Oswald and Dennis P. Townsend, NASA Lewis Research Center. Responsible person, Fred B. Oswald, (216) 433-9357.         12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category 37       Izb. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) A comparison was made between computer model predictions of gear dynamic behaviour and experimental results. The experimental data were derived from the NASA gear noise rig, which was used to record dynamic tooth loads and vibration. The experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the Speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. Tooth separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth contact region.         14. SUBJECT TERMS Spur gears; Gear dynamics; Gear load; Dynamic load; Strain gage testing; Dynamic analysis; Profile modifications       15. NUMBER OF PAGES 10         16. PRICE CODE AQ2       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT       20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AG	ENCY NAMES(S) AND ADD	DRESS(ES)		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING	
Washington, D.C. 20546-0001 and U.S. Army Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 63120-1798       NASA TM-105362 AVSCOM TR 91-C-009         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for the Sixth International Power Transmission and Gear Conference sponsored by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Phoenix, Arizona, September 13-16, 1992. Brian Rebbechi and B. David Fortester, Defence Science and Technology Organisation, Aeronautical Research Laboratory, Melonum, Australia, Fred B. Oswald and Demis P. Townsend, NASA Lewis Research Center. Responsible preson, Fred B. Oswald, (216) 433-3957.         12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category 37       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       A comparison was made between computer model predictions of gear dynamic behaviour and experimental results. The experimental results were compared with predictions from the DSTO Aeronautical Research Laboratory's gear dynamics code for a matrix of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic load predictions agree with experimental results with an average error of 5 precent in the speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. Tooth separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth contact region.         14. SUBJECT TERMS Spur gears; Gear dynamics; Gear load; Dynamic load; Strain gage testing; Dynamic analysis; Profile modifications       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT       20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT MO2 <td>National Aeronautics and Space</td> <th>Administration</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td>AGENCY REPORT NUMBER</td>	National Aeronautics and Space	Administration			AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
and U.S. Amy Aviation Systems Command St. Louis, Mo. 63120–1798       AVSCOM TR 91–C-009         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for the Sixth International Power Transmission and Gear Conference sponsored by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Phoenix, Arizona, September 13–16, 1992. Brian Rebbechi and B. David Forrester, Defence Science and Technology Organisation, Aeronautical Research Laboratory, Methome, Australia; Fred B. Oswald and Dennis P. Townsend, NASA Lewis Research Center. Responsible person, Fred B. Oswald, (216) 433–3957.         12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category 37       12. DISTRIBUTION coDE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       A comparison was made between computer model predictions of gear dynamic behaviour and experimental results. The experimental data were derived from the NASA gear noise rig, which was used to record dynamic tooth loads and vibration. The experimental results were compared with predictions from the DSTO Aeronautical Research Laboratory's gear dynamics code for a matrix of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic load predictions agree with experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. Tooth separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth contact region.       15. NUMBER OF PAGES 10 16. PRICE CODE A02         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT       20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	Washington, D.C. 20546-0001	NASA TM-105362				
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       Prepared for the Sixth International Power Transmission and Gear Conference sponsored by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Phoenix, Arizona, September 13–16, 1992. Brian Rebbechi and B. David Forrester, Defence Science and Technology Organisation, Aeronautical Research Laboratory, Melbourne, Australia; Fred B. Oswald and Dennis P. Townsend, NASA Lewis Research Center. Responsible person, Fred B. Oswald, (216) 433–3957.         12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         Unclassified - Unlimited       12b. DISTRIBUTION code         Subject Category 37       12b. DISTRIBUTION code         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       14 comparison was made between computer model predictions of gear dynamic behaviour and experimental results. The experimental dra were derived from the NASA gear noise rig, which was used to record dynamic tooth loads and vibration. The experimental results were compared with predictions from the DSTO Aeronautical Research Laboratory's gear dynamics code for a matrix of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic load predictions agree with experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. Tooth separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth contact region.       15. NUMBER OF PAGES         10       16. PRICE CODE       10         11. SUBJECT TERMS       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT         12. DINTER PA	and U.S. Army Aviation Systems Co St. Louis, Mo. 63120–1798	nmand			AVSCOM TR 91-C-009	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         A comparison was made between computer model predictions of gear dynamic behaviour and experimental results. The experimental data were derived from the NASA gear noise rig, which was used to record dynamic tooth loads and vibration. The experimental results were compared with predictions from the DSTO Aeronautical Research Laboratory's gear dynamics code for a matrix of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic load predictions agree with experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. Tooth separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth contact region.         14. SUBJECT TERMS <ul> <li>Spur gears; Gear dynamics; Gear load; Dynamic load; Strain gage testing; Dynamic analysis; Profile modifications</li> <li>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT</li> <li>Unclassified</li> <li>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified</li> <li>19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified</li> <li>20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</li> </ul> <ul> <li>Partice code</li> <li>A02</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Unclassified - Unlimited</li> <li>Subject Category 37</li> </ul>	STATEMENT			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
The experimental data were derived from the NASA gear noise rig, which was used to record dynamic tooth loads and vibration. The experimental results were compared with predictions from the DSTO Aeronautical Research Laboratory's gear dynamics code for a matrix of 28 load-speed points. At high torque the peak dynamic load predictions agree with experimental results with an average error of 5 percent in the speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. Tooth separation (or bounce), which was observed in the experimental data for light-torque, high-speed conditions, was simulated by the computer model. The model was also successful in simulating the degree of load sharing between gear teeth in the multiple-tooth contact region.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       Spur gears; Gear dynamics; Gear load; Dynamic load; Strain gage testing; Dynamic analysis; Profile modifications       15. NUMBER OF PAGES 10         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified       20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	<ol> <li>ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 wor A comparison was made b</li> </ol>	<i>is)</i> etween computer model	l prediction	ns of gear dynamic beh	aviour and experimental results.	
14. SUBJECT TERMS       Spur gears; Gear dynamics; Gear load; Dynamic load; Strain gage testing; Dynamic       15. NUMBER OF PAGES         Spur gears; Gear dynamics; Gear load; Dynamic load; Strain gage testing; Dynamic       10         analysis; Profile modifications       16. PRICE CODE         A02       A02         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT       20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT         Unclassified       Unclassified       Unclassified       10	The experimental data wer and vibration. The experin Laboratory's gear dynamic predictions agree with exp Tooth separation (or bound was simulated by the comp between gear teeth in the r	e derived from the NAS nental results were com s code for a matrix of 2 erimental results with an e), which was observed uter model. The model nultiple-tooth contact re	SA gear no pared with 8 load-spe n average o l in the exp l was also gion.	ise rig, which was used predictions from the I ed points. At high tord error of 5 percent in the perimental data for ligh successful in simulatin	I to record dynamic tooth loads OSTO Aeronautical Research que the peak dynamic load e speed range 800 to 6000 rpm. t-torque, high-speed conditions, g the degree of load sharing	
Spur gears; Gear dynamics; Gear load; Dynamic load; Strain gage testing; Dynamic       10         analysis; Profile modifications       16. PRICE CODE         A02         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION         OF REPORT       OF THIS PAGE         Unclassified       Unclassified	14. SUBJECT TERMS				15. NUMBER OF PAGES	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT     18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE     19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT     20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT       Unclassified     Unclassified     Unclassified     19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	Spur gears; Gear dynamics analysis; Profile modificat	10 16. PRICE CODE A02				
Unclassified Unclassified Unclassified	17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFIC OF THIS PAGE	CATION	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICA OF ABSTRACT	TION 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	
	Unclassified	Unclassified		Unclassified		

Prescribed	by	ANSI	Std.	Z39-18	
298-102					

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Lewis Research Center Cleveland, Ohio 44135

Official Business Penalty for Private Use \$300 FOURTH CLASS MAIL

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED



Postage and Fees Paid National Aeronautics and Space Administration NASA 451

