Journal of Terramechanics 79 (2018) 1-21

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Journal of Terramechanics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jterra

### Development and numerical validation of an improved prediction model for wheel-soil interaction under multiple operating conditions



Yonghao Du<sup>a,b</sup>, Jingwei Gao<sup>a,\*</sup>, Lehua Jiang<sup>a</sup>, Yuanchao Zhang<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> College of Aerospace Science and Engineering, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha 410072, China
<sup>b</sup> College of Systems Engineering, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha 410072, China

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 16 May 2017 Revised 4 April 2018 Accepted 21 April 2018

Keywords: Wheel-soil interaction Prediction model Lug effects Multiple operating conditions Discrete element method

#### ABSTRACT

This paper presents the establishment and validation of an improved model predicting tractive parameters of a lugged wheel under multiple operating conditions. During the basic straight driving wheel-soil interaction, the common-used equivalent radius theory and the bulldozing theory are combined to calculate the lug effects referring the traditional theories of soil stress distribution, while the bulldozing effect is reconsidered according to the work conservation. On the basis of the further prediction under multiple conditions including the inclination in three degrees of freedom and the turning driving, the numerical model using the discrete element method under each operating condition is separately established. Under such circumstances, the validation and analysis are conducted differing in sizes and driving parameters of the wheel. It is indicated that the improved model displays the better reasonability and precision in predicting lug effects of a heavy off-road wheel. This model is mostly accurate and sensitive to the variation of parameters under straight and inclining driving conditions, but demands further correction during low slipping of the turning condition. Generally, the improved model in this paper focuses on the prediction of drawbar pull and driving torque, but lacks precision in the tendency of sinkage.

© 2018 ISTVS. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

#### 1. Introduction

As important equipments during resource exploration and transportation, off-road vehicles equipped with different kinds of lugged wheels usually present outstanding tractive performance under various operation conditions, which mainly benefits from the wheel-soil interaction. Concentrating on the different performances produced by various soils and lugged wheels, the early study on wheel-soil interaction conducted by Bekker (1960b) contributed to the foundation of a cross-discipline subject called terramechanics. As the development of terramechanics in recent years, three major analysis means including the laboratory experiment, the theoretical model and the burgeoning numerical simulation separately play important roles.

The earliest means to quantitatively analyze the wheel-soil interaction is soil-bin experiment, which was put forward by Bekker (1960b). On the surface of the sampled soil during an experiment, the scaled wheel model is driven by an engine in the constant driving and rotating velocity, while the tractive parameters including drawbar pull, driving torque and sinkage will be steadily measured, so the soil-bin experiment is widely considered

\* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* mmjingwei@163.com (J. Gao).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jterra.2018.04.005 0022-4898/© 2018 ISTVS. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. as the most convinced method. However, limited to the size and cost of the instrument, the soil-bin is commonly shaped in rectangle and only experimented for the wheel-soil interaction under the straight driving condition (Brooks et al., 2006; Ding et al., 2011; lizuka et al., 2014; Senatore et al., 2013). Hence to include multiple operating conditions like climbing and turning, several different experiments were conducted. Carnegie Mellon University (Shamah et al., 1998) designed a regular polygonal soil-bin for turning driving analysis, but the instrument could not flexibly change the turning radius, also the size and the turning radius of the scaled wheel were smaller than the normal. Raheman and Singh (2004) studied an actual single wheel along a curved turning trajectory, but limited to the size of the soil-bin, the turning angle of the tested wheel was 50° to the max. Besides, to analyze the wheel-soil interaction under inclining driving conditions, Chofu Aerospace Center (Wakabayashi and Matsumoto, 2006) designed a soil-bin instrument which could change the longitudinal inclination angle, while Tohoku University (Inotsume et al., 2012) manufactured an instrument with the transverse inclining control system. Hence it can be seen, the experimental analysis on the wheel-soil interaction under different driving conditions demands multiple functional or large-scale soil-bin instruments along with sufficient sampled soil, so the soil-bin experiment is difficult to be generalized in spite of its accuracy and reliability.





#### Nomenclature

| i<br>i <sub>eq</sub>  | slip ratio of wheel<br>equivalent slip ratio            | $egin{array}{c} 	heta_0 \ 	heta_1 \end{array}$ | interaction angle considering dynamic sinkage (°) entrance angle of front region (°) |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| i <sub>c</sub>        | slip ratio at center of lug force                       | $\theta_2$                                     | leaving angle of rear region (°)   |
| r                     | wheel radius (m)  | $\theta_{m}$                                   | location of maximum radial stress (°)  |
| r <sub>eq</sub>       | equivalent wheel radius (m)                             | $\theta_{\mathbf{f}}$                          | variable angle in front region (°)   |
| r <sub>c</sub>        | center of lug bulldozing force (m)                      | $\theta_{\rm r}$                               | variable angle in rear region (°)  |
| R                     | turning radius (m)                                      | $\theta_{lug}^{k}$                             | location angle of lug (°)  |
| b                     | width of wheel (m)                                      | $\sigma$                                       | radial stress of soil (Pa)   |
| $b_{lug}$             | width of lug (m)  | $\sigma_1$                                     | radial stress in front region (Pa)   |
| $h_{lug}$             | height of lug (m)                                       | $\sigma_2$                                     | radial stress in rear region (Pa)  |
| $h_{eq}$              | equivalent height of lug (m)                            | $\sigma_{1}{}'$                                | extra pushing stress of wheel broadside (Pa)   |
| λ                     | equivalent coefficient of lug                           | $\sigma_{2}{}'$                                | extra pushing stress of lug broadside (Pa)   |
| γ                     | angle between adjacent lugs (°)                         | $\sigma_{ m lug}$                              | stress at the bottom of lug (Pa)   |
| $c_1, c_2, c_3$       | fitting coefficients in Wong's model                    | $\sigma'_{ m lug}$                             | stress at the top of lug (Pa)  |
| С                     | Internal cohesion of soil (Pa)                          | τ  | shearing stress (Pa)   |
| $\varphi$             | Internal friction of soil (°)                           | $	au_1$  | shearing stress in front region (Pa)   |
| k <sub>c</sub>        | Bekker's cohesive modulus (N/m <sup>n+1</sup> )         | $	au_2$  | shearing stress in front region (Pa)   |
| $k_{arphi}$           | Bekker's frictional modulus $(N/m^{n+2})$               | $\tau_1'$                                      | extra shearing stress of wheel broadside (Pa)  |
| п                     | Bekker's sinkage exponent of soil                       | $\tau_2'$                                      | extra shearing stress of lug broadside (Pa)  |
| $n_{lug}$             | lug number in the wheel-soil interaction region         | W  | vertical load of lugged wheel (N)  |
| Κ                     | Janosi's shearing modulus of soil (m)                   | Ws   | vertical force of smooth wheel (N)   |
| Kp                    | fluid coefficient of soil                               | $W_{\rm L}$                                    | extra vertical force from lugs (N)   |
| $\rho$                | Natural density of soil (kg/m <sup>3</sup> )            | $U_{\rm L}$                                    | work produced by lug (N·m)   |
| $F_{lug}$             | vertical bulldozing force of lug (N)                    | Μ  | torque of lugged wheel (N·m)   |
| $F_{\rm DP}$          | drawbar pull of lugged wheel (N)                        | Ms   | torque under transverse inclining condition (N·m)                                    |
| $F_{\rm DP}^{\rm s}$  | drawbar pull under transverse inclining condition (N)   | $M_{\rm s0}$                                   | torque under longitudinal inclining condition (N·m)                                  |
| $F_{\rm DP}^{\rm s0}$ | drawbar pull under longitudinal inclining condition (N) | $M_{s3}$                                       | torque under horizontal inclining and turning condition                              |
| $F_{\rm DP}^{\rm s3}$ | drawbar pull under horizontal inclining and turning     |  | $(N \cdot m)$  |
|                       | condition (N)   | $M_{\rm R}$                                    | torque produced by resistance force of soil (N·m)                                    |
| $F_{\rm R}$           | resistance force of soil (N)                            | Ms   | torque of smooth wheel (N·m)   |
| Fs                    | drawbar pull of smooth wheel (N)                        | $M_{\rm L}$                                    | extra torque from lugs (N·m)   |
| $F_{L}$               | extra drawbar pull from lugs (N)                        | $M_{\rm M}$                                    | extra resistance torque (N·m)  |
| $F_{M}$               | extra resistance force (N)                              | $M_{M1}$                                       | extra resistance torque from wheel broadside (N·m)                                   |
| $F_{M1}$              | extra resistance force from wheel broadside (N)         | $M_{M2}$                                       | extra resistance torque from lug broadside (N·m)                                     |
| $F_{M2}$              | extra resistance force from lug broadside (N)           | $M_{\rm F}$                                    | extra adhesion torque (N·m)  |
| $F_{\rm F}$           | extra adhesion force (N)                                | $M_{\rm F1}$                                   | extra adhesion torque from wheel broadside (N·m)                                     |
| $F_{\rm F1}$          | extra adhesion force from wheel broadside (N)           | $M_{\rm F2}$                                   | extra adhesion torque from lug broadside (N·m)                                       |
| $F_{F2}$              | extra adhesion force from lug broadside (N)             | $Z_{s0}$                                       | sinkage under longitudinal inclining condition (m)                                   |
| Ζ                     | total sinkage of wheel (m)                              | $Z_{s1}$                                       | sinkage under terrain transverse inclining condition (m)                             |
| $z_1$                 | static sinkage (m)                                      | $Z_{s2}$                                       | sinkage under wheel transverse inclining condition (m)                               |
| $Z_2$                 | slipping sinkage (m)                                    | $Z_{S3}$                                       | sinkage under horizontal inclining and turning condi-                                |
| $Z_3$                 | lug rutting sinkage (m)                                 |  | tion (m)   |
| $\Delta z$            | equivalent soil sinkage in Rankine's theory (m)         | $\omega_0$                                     | rotating speed of wheel  |
| $\theta$              | variable interaction angle (°)                          |  |  |
|                       |   |  |  |

Less depending on experimental instruments, the theoretical model has advantages in rapidity, consumption and the visualized analysis on major factors. The theoretical model of wheel-soil interaction deserves to be founded on the basic stress-strain relationship of soil under the wheel's pressure. Nowadays, the most widely accepted and applied soil stress-strain relationship is the Bekker's normal stress-sinkage model (Bekker, 1960b) and the shearing stress-strain model simplified by Janosi and Eiler (1968), as Bekker's original shearing model is quite complex in measuring and calculating the parameters. On that basis, Bekker established the primary wheel-soil interaction model in a mechanical way (Bekker, 1960a), which was widely referred by following researches. Meanwhile the original model also had some disadvantages. First of all, Wong JY and Reece AR pointed that only radial stress before the peak well satisfies the Bekker's sinkage model according to their experiential results, so they provided the comprehensive stress distribution along the wheel-soil interaction surface (Wong and Reece, 1967). Then, the sinkage calculated by

Bekker's model of lugged wheel is usually proved smaller than the experiential results (Ishigami et al., 2007), hence several researches proposed the dynamic correction by theoretical analysis (Jiang et al., 2013; Lyasko, 2010; Ding et al., 2010) or mathematical fitting in linear (Ding et al., 2014), exponential (Jin et al., 2013) and polynomial functions (Huang et al., 2015). Moreover, the lug effects derived from Bekker's model, which are based on Rankine's passive soil pressure theory, also exceed the normal level especially under a heavy load, hence the equivalent radius method is put forward and substituted for explaining the extra performance of lugged wheels (Ding et al., 2009). Last but not least, the existing theories on wheel-soil interaction mostly establish a planar model which ignores the additional adhesion or resistance along the wheel broadside and other inclining or turning driving conditions in a three-dimensional environment.

To validate the accuracy of theoretical models, numerical simulation is usually conducted if without the conditions of soil-bin experiment. The discrete element method (DEM), which was put Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/7178408

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/7178408

Daneshyari.com