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Combustion Processes in Solid Propellant Cracks, by K. K. Kuo, M. Kumar, S. M. Kovacic, J. E. Wills, and Y. Y. Chang, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania; China Lake, California, Naval Weapons Center, June 1981, 98 pp. (NWC TP 6278, Publication UNCLASSIFIED.)

This report presents results of a study of combustion processes in solid propellant cracks. As might be expected, under moderate chamber pressurization rates (<10 atm/s), the theoretical predictions, as well as the experimental observations, indicate that the ignition front propagates from the entrance of the crack to the tip. However, under rapid chamber pressurization rates (>10 atm/s or higher), the tip region of the crack was observed to ignite before the arrival of the convective ignition front. (Ignition is defined here as the onset of emission of luminous light from the propellant surface with some material loss. A theoretical model has been developed to explain the tip ignition phenomena. The model considers: a one-dimensional transient heat conduction equation for the solid phase, and one-dimensional, unsteady mass and energy conservation equations for the gas phase near the crack tip. Both experimental and theoretical results indicate that the ignition delay time decreases as the pressurization rate is increased. Theoretically calculated ignition delay times are in good agreement with the experimental data. Based upon this agreement, ignition near the crack-tip region is considered to be caused by the enhanced turbulent transport of energy in the gas phase, which is driven by strong compression waves.

The Crack Combustion Code (CCC) has been combined with the consolidated Nonlinear Finite-Element Analysis Program (NFAP). Initial runs of the combined program (CCC/NFAP) indicate that the structural deformation and combustion phenomena are interrelated. The combustion phenomena inside the crack may either enhance or retard, depending upon the effect of mechanical deformation on the gap width along the crack. The program has the option of using either the linear elastic or linear viscoelastic material model. As expected, results show that the viscoelastic model is more realistic for the solid propellant.

Test firings were conducted to determine the one-dimensionality of the flame front. It was observed that, except near the entrance region, the one-dimensional assumption for the flame propagation is quite appropriate. Experiments were continued to determine the effect of propellant crack geometry on flame propagation inside a crack.

A complete set of dimensionless parameters which govern the flame-spreading and combustion phenomena inside a solid propellant crack were obtained.
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INTRODUCTION

A very important characteristic of a gas permeable solid propellant is that it undergoes the transition from normal burning to detonation under certain operating conditions. A transition from deflagration-to-detonation (DDT) may not only cause malfunction or failure of a solid propellant motor, but it is also a potential source of hazard. DDT usually involves very high flame propagation rates, high pressures, and large burning surface areas. DDT is therefore more likely to occur in gas permeable propellants, such as granular propellant beds or propellant grains with flaws or cracks which have large burning surface areas.

Cracks inside solid propellant grains, which are likely to be encountered in high-energy propellants with high-solids loading, can allow hot, high pressure gases to penetrate the cavity. The combustion processes inside the crack can produce much higher pressure than the designed maximum operating pressure. If the local pressure rise due to the gasification is sufficiently rapid, it may produce strong compression waves, or even shock waves which can initiate detonation. Furthermore, for DDT in damaged propellant grains with cracks, crack branching/propagation must take place to provide the additional surface area. Some experimental and theoretical studies, based purely on solid mechanics considerations, have been conducted to predict crack propagation in solid propellant grains. However, realistic predictions of accelerative convective burning and crack propagation cannot be made unless a combustion program incorporating a structural analysis program is used.

Convective burning, however, is not the only mechanism responsible for producing the steep pressure gradients that lead to the transition to detonation. There are other mechanisms which may also be important in DDT processes. The presence of numerous ignited spots and ablating surfaces at some distance from the combustion zone in a damaged propellant may enhance the possibility of DDT. For example, ignited spots can be produced by reflection of shock-like compression waves at the propellant surface located in the region ahead of the combustion zone. A similar phenomenon was observed during the course of experimental investigations of ignition and flame-spread ing inside a solid propellant crack. As noted in our last annual report,1 under rapid pressurization

rates (~10^5 atm/s), anomalous ignition was observed near the crack-tip region. High-speed (~15,000 pps) motion picture films used to record the experimental observations of the flame propagation inside the crack show that, at high chamber pressurization rates, the tip region of the crack ignites before the convective ignition front propagates from the crack entrance to the tip. Consequently, under these operating conditions, two flame fronts moving in opposite directions have been observed: one propagates from the crack entrance and the other from the crack tip.

The observed ignition phenomena near the tip region could be one of the very important mechanisms responsible for the generation of ignited spots in a region ahead of the combustion zone. Indeed, these ignited spots can contribute significantly to the DDT process. These studies in convective burning and related topics are essential for a sound physical understanding of the phenomena involved in the DDT process. Moreover, solid knowledge of the ignition phenomena associated with strong convective burning is an important step towards the goal of modeling a more complex DDT phenomenon. The main objectives of the work performed during this reporting period are as follows.

1. To identify the possible mechanism for ignition near the crack tip region, and to develop an analytical model for its prediction.

2. To consolidate the Nonlinear Finite-Element Analysis Program (NFAP) and combine it with the Crack Combustion Code (CCC).

3. To experimentally verify the one-dimensional assumption of the flame front.

4. To determine a complete set of dimensionless parameters that govern the combustion phenomena inside a solid propellant crack, for the combined problem of aerothermochemistry and solid mechanics.

5. To continue experimental firings of single pore propellants with narrow gap-widths, for the purpose of establishing a data base and for further verification of the theoretical model.

BACKGROUND

A considerable amount of work in the area of solid propellant crack combustion has been conducted at the Pennsylvania State University.\(^1\)\(^-\)\(^3\) Substantial progress has been made in both experimental and


theoretical areas towards a better understanding of the convective burning inside a solid propellant crack. Some of the important achievements are as follows:

1. A quasi-one-dimensional theoretical model has been developed to describe the transient combustion processes in a propellant crack. The theoretical model can be used to predict the flame propagation, presurization, and gas dynamic phenomena at various locations along the propellant cavity.

2. A computer program, based upon the above theoretical model, has been developed and successfully implemented. This program can be used to predict the flame propagation and combustion phenomena inside the propellant crack.

3. A laboratory-sized combustion chamber, utilizing current techniques in high-speed photography and pressure recording, has been developed for solid propellant crack combustion experiments and model validation.

4. In order to simulate the conventional pressurization rates during rocket motor ignition transients, a reproducible solid propellant ignition system has been designed and fabricated.

5. Experimental firings with single-pore propellant grain have been conducted to study the effects of crack geometry, chamber presurization rates, propellant type, etc., on flame spreading and pressure variation inside the cavity.

6. The combustion program has been modified to consider different ignition criteria, and to obtain the in-depth temperature profile of the solid propellant, in order that the dynamic burning behavior can be studied.

7. An extensive literature survey on the combustion phenomena inside a solid propellant crack, and its relevance to the process of DDT, has been conducted.

THEORETICAL WORK

MODELING OF THE CRACK TIP IGNITION PHENOMENA

Introduction

As mentioned earlier, under rapid chamber pressurization conditions ignition may be achieved near the crack tip region--far ahead of the convective combustion zone in an isolated crack. It is conceivable that
in the combustion of a prefractured or granulated propellant, numerous ignited regions can be generated in a similar manner by rapid rates of gasification and pressurization in the combustion zone. These ignited regions can propagate further to produce even higher gasification rates in the combustion chamber, or in an actual rocket motor. Flame-front propagation rates can be increased not only by the presence of these ignited regions, but also by the steepening of compression or shock waves near the flame front; eventually, the waves become strong enough to initiate a final transition to detonation. Therefore, a fundamental understanding of the basic mechanisms that contribute to the generation of these ignited regions would be an important step in the convective burning and DDT study.

The observed ignition of the tip region of the crack before the arrival of the convective ignition front may have been caused by one or more of the following mechanisms:

1. Turbulent diffusion of the hot product gases to the crack tip region, and the stagnation heating of the propellant by the hot gases at the crack tip.

2. Compression/shock wave heating of the gas adjacent to the propellant surface and the stagnation heating of the propellant by the hot gases at the crack tip.

3. Local heat release, due to the chemical reaction of the combustible species transported to the crack tip by the initial pressure gradient.

4. Radiative heating of the crack tip.

5. Vaporization of the fuel binder at low temperatures, followed by a gas phase reaction between the fuel and the oxidizer gases in the air near the crack tip region.

Ignition near the tip region can be achieved if some of the combustible species evaporate from the propellant surface near the entrance of the crack and if these species are transported by the initial pressure gradient to the crack-tip region, where they react and ignite. Under these circumstances, it is possible to observe the ignition of the tip region prior to the arrival of the convective ignition front. In order to investigate this possibility, an inert crack was formed with propellant only at the tip. Tests conducted with this type of inert crack also showed ignition at the tip, thus eliminating the third mechanism noted above.

Some preliminary calculations were conducted to evaluate the effect of radiative heating. Calculations showed that radiative heating of the propellant at the tip by the hot gases in the combustion chamber is far
too low to cause ignition. One of the main reasons for such a small amount of radiative heating is that the crack length to hydraulic diameter ratio is on the order of 0.80, resulting in a very small shape factor. Therefore, the fourth mechanism mentioned above was eliminated.

The fifth mechanism, i.e., the gas phase reaction mechanism is quite probable for propellants using fuel with low vaporization temperatures. However, the gas phase reaction may not be very appreciable for propellants with fuel binders having high vaporization temperatures (i.e., of the same order as the vaporization temperature of the oxidizer crystals). Propellant A, for which all tip ignition experiments were conducted, is an example of the latter type; in other words, its fuel-binder and oxidizer have almost identical vaporization temperatures. For the present study, therefore, the gas phase ignition mechanism may not be significant, and, hence, can be neglected. It should be noted, however, that for other types of propellants this mechanism may be important.

This leaves us with only two possible mechanisms that should be considered. The ignition could be caused by a combination of these two mechanisms. An extensive literature survey was conducted for these two heating mechanisms. The heat transfer mechanism near the closed end of a long isolated pore, with a time-varying interface temperature, has not been studied in the past. Some of the published results which are related to the problem being considered are discussed in the following paragraphs.

McAlevy, Cowan and Summerfield\textsuperscript{4-5} studied the mechanism of ignition of composite solid propellants by hot gases in a shock tube. The objectives of their study were to measure the ignition delays of test propellants heated to a shock; to develop a theoretical model based upon the gas phase ignition mechanism in order to calculate the ignition delay; and to study the effect of oxygen concentration on the ignition delay. For the experimental measurements, the specimen was flush-mounted in the end wall of a shock tube. The propellant was heated by high temperature, high pressure, stagnant gas behind the reflected shock wave. Photocells were used to detect ignition. In the theoretical model, it was assumed that at the instant of shock reflection a stagnant column of hot gases comes in contact with the propellant surface. The temperature of this column of gas was obtained from the reflected shock relationships. The interface temperature, which remains constant with time,


was obtained by considering two uniform temperature, semi-infinite bodies brought in contact at the instant of shock reflection. Pyrolyzed fuel vapor generated at the propellant surface propagates upstream at a rate governed by the laws of mass diffusion. This fuel vapor reacts with the gaseous oxygen and ignition takes place as a result.

The general conclusions of McAlevy, Cowan, and Summerfield were that the observed ignition delay is the time required for sufficient fuel to react with the gaseous oxygen, and that the ignition delay time was found to increase with the decrease in oxygen concentration and pressure. Since this was the first study on the gas phase ignition model, the analytic model has several limitations. The assumption of constant propellant surface temperature condition is not very realistic. Calculated ignition delay time based on their model was an order of magnitude higher than the experimentally observed ignition delay. Contrary to their theoretical predictions, they observed a longer (two times) ignition delay for pure fuel than for composite propellant with the same fuel.

Hermance, Shinnar, and Summerfield improved the gas phase ignition model by including oxidizer species equations. Later, they proposed a more realistic model for pure fuel, which included the effect of heat feedback to the propellant surface. Unfortunately, they did not make comparisons with the experimental data and, therefore, no conclusions about the quantitative prediction capabilities can be drawn. Although the effect of oxygen concentration (as observed by McAlevy et al.) supports the concept of gas phase ignition, there remains a large number of uncertainties and unknowns which could strongly influence the quantitative predictions of ignition delay. Some of these are: detailed processes involved in fuel and oxidizer pyrolysis; gasification temperatures of various ingredients in the propellant; the effect of exothermic oxidation at the propellant surface; and the catalytic effect of oxidizer gases on the vaporizing propellant surface. Because of these reasons and the fact that the studies were conducted for shock tube conditions where the effect of pressurization rates cannot be observed, the results of the gas phase ignition model cannot be used for the present study.

Fay and Kemp predicted the heat transfer rates to the end wall of a shock tube.\textsuperscript{8} In their analysis, the end wall of a shock tube was assumed to be suddenly put in contact with the quiescent hot gas. The pressure of the gas behind the reflected shock was determined from shock relationships. Continuity and energy equations in the gas phase were used. The wall was assumed to remain at its initial temperature. By using an integral method, a similarity type of solution was obtained for the heat transfer rate to the end wall. A closed form solution was obtained, which predicted the heat flux as a function of shock velocity and time. For the following reasons, results obtained from the study cannot be used to predict the heat transfer rate in the present study: a shock tube type of study cannot take into account the effect of pressurization rates; the end-wall temperature is assumed to be at its initial constant temperature, and, therefore, is not realistic for ignition studies; and, the rate of heat transfer to the end wall can only decrease with time ($\dot{q} \propto 1/\sqrt{t}$) in the analysis (this is true for the Fay-Kemp study, but is contrary to the physical situation of the present investigation).

Levy and Potter made some transient measurement in a rarefaction wave tube.\textsuperscript{9} Their objectives were to build and calibrate a heat transfer instrument, to perform transient heat flux measurements in a rarefaction wave tube, and to evaluate the significant parameters which influence the instrument performance in the measurement of the transient heat flux. Using a heat transfer measuring instrument, they experimentally measured the heat transfer from the end wall for various pressure ratios. In their theoretical approach, they used energy and continuity equations in a control volume very close to the end wall. Temperature of the end wall was assumed to be constant, and the gas temperature variation was assumed to be a second order polynomial of the distance from the end wall. The expansion process was assumed to be isentropic. From their analysis, they found that $\dot{q} \propto \sqrt{P_{\text{initial}}/P_{\text{atm}}}$ was a function of a dimensionless time $t_{\text{initial}}/L_{\text{tube}}$. This analysis has very limited use for the present study because of the severe simplifying assumptions and the physical process of depressurization.


Chao gave an alternative approach\(^\text{10}\) to the same problem solved by Levy and Potter. Using an analytic solution, Chao solved the energy and continuity equations for an ideal gas. The end wall was assumed to remain at its initial temperature. Gas density was assumed to be independent of the axial location. By using a coordinate transformation, the energy equation for the gas phase was converted into the form of a heat equation. A closed form solution for the dimensionless heat flux was obtained. The predicted heat transfer rate was in close agreement with Levy and Potter's data. Once again, the assumption of constant end wall temperature and the physical process of depressurization makes this analysis of very limited use to the present study.

Theoretical Model

From the above literature survey, it is clear that none of the existing theoretical models can be employed to study the current ignition phenomenon observed. Therefore, a theoretical model was developed to predict the ignition delay and its dependence on the pressurization rate. The theoretical model considers an inert crack—a rectangular shaped inert channel with propellant only at the tip. When the chamber is pressurized, hot ignition gases penetrate the cavity and are reflected from the solid propellant at the closed end. Ignition delay is defined as the time lag between the arrival of the pressure front at the tip and the incipient ignition.

As soon as the hot gases reach the closed end of the crack, heat starts to flow into the propellant surface and, consequently, the surface temperature rises. Ignition is defined as the attainment of a critical temperature at the propellant surface. It is assumed that the solid or gas phase reaction takes place before the onset of ignition. Here, the tacit assumption is made that there is little time between the attainment of a critical surface temperature and the reaction between the fuel and the oxidizer species to cause ignition. For propellant A, the ignition of which is studied here, the surface temperature ignition criteria may be quite suitable since its fuel binders and the oxidizer have an almost identical vaporization temperature. It should be pointed out that if the fuel vaporization temperature is much lower than that of the oxidizer crystals, the gas phase reaction between vaporized fuel and oxidizer in the ambient gas may be important, and that this ignition criteria may not be valid.

In the theoretical model, the propellant is considered to be a one-dimensional, semi-infinite solid which is brought in contact with hot gases at the instant of the arrival of the pressure front at the tip. The hot gases cause heat transfer to the propellant surface. A schematic diagram of the physical model considered is given in Figure 1.

![Schematic Diagram of the Physical Model for the Tip Ignition Study.](image)

The solid phase heat conduction equation is:

$$\frac{\partial T_p}{\partial t} = \alpha_p \frac{\partial^2 T_p}{\partial x^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The initial and boundary conditions are:

$$t = 0: \quad T_p(0,x) = T_{pi}$$

$$x = : \quad T_p(t,\infty) = T_{pi}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

$$x = 0: \quad k \frac{\partial T_p}{\partial x}(t,0^+) = k \frac{\partial T_p}{\partial x}(t,0^-) = -\dot{q}_w(t)$$
where \( \dot{q}(t) \) is the rate of heat transfer from the hot gases to the propellant surface and is unknown. In order to determine the heat flux at the propellant surface, the gas phase equations have to be considered.

Assuming the bulk flow to be predominantly one-dimensional, the transient mass and energy conservation equations are considered for the gas phase. Experimentally obtained pressure-time trace near the crack tip region is used, instead of solving the pressure at the crack tip through the use of momentum equation. The region of interest is that adjacent to the solid propellant surface. The governing equations can be written as follows:

Continuity equation:

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho u}{\partial x} = 0
\]  

Energy equation:

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho h)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho u h)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{2} \rho u^2 \right) = \frac{k}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (k \frac{\partial T}{\partial x}) \right) + \text{dissipation}
\]

P(t, 0-) = P_{\text{measured}}(t)

In order to simplify the analysis, the following basic assumptions are made:

1. \( u \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} \ll \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} \) for the region of interest, i.e., locally uniform pressure near the propellant surface.

2. The viscous dissipation, \( \phi \), is small.

3. The specific heat, \( C_p \), is constant.

4. The hot gases behave as ideal gas.

Using these assumptions and then taking the Favre Average\(^{11}\) of the gas phase conservation Eq. (3) and (4), we get (Appendix A summarizes the basic definitions and operation rules for Favre Averaging):

\[ \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\rho \overline{u}) = 0 \]  
(6)

\[ \rho \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \rho \overline{u} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} - \partial P = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\mu}{\text{Pr}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{3}{\partial x} \left( k \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} - \rho h' \overline{u}' \right) \]  
(7)

Considering \( k \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \) to be negligible in comparison with \( \rho h' \overline{u}' \) and defining

\[ \rho h' \overline{u}' \equiv \frac{\mu}{\text{Pr}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \]  
(8)

The energy equation can be written in the following form:

\[ \rho \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \rho \overline{u} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} - \partial P = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\mu}{\text{Pr}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} + \frac{\mu}{\text{Pr}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \right) \]  
(9)

The initial and boundary conditions are

I.C. \( t = 0 \) \( \overline{h}(0,x) = T_i \)

B.C.1 \( x = -\infty \) \( \overline{h}(t,-\infty) = T_\infty \)

B.C.2 \( x = 0 \) \( \overline{h}(t,0) = T_p(t,0) \)  
(10)

Solution Method

Integrating the continuity equation (Eq. (6)) and using the boundary condition, at

\( x = 0 \) \( \overline{u} = 0 \)

we get

\[ \overline{u} = \int_0^x -(\partial \rho / \partial t) \, dx \]  
(11)

Replacing the \( \rho \overline{u} \) term in the gas phase energy equation (Eq. (9)) by Eq. (11), we get:

\[ \rho \frac{\partial \overline{h}}{\partial t} - \left[ \int_c^x \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} \, dx \right] \frac{\partial \overline{h}}{\partial x} - \partial P = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\mu}{\text{Pr}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} + \frac{\mu}{\text{Pr}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \right) \]  
(12)

Now, in order to obtain the heat flux to the propellant surface and the propellant surface temperature, Eq. (1) and (12), together with the boundary conditions (Eq. (2) and (10)) must be solved simultaneously. An attempt was made to solve these equations analytically to obtain closed form solutions for the propellant surface temperature. The
Partial differential equations can be transformed, in the transformed coordinates, into a diffusion type of equation (see Appendix B). Some difficulties were encountered in obtaining analytical solution, as discussed in Appendix 2. In order to obtain theoretical results to compare with experimental data, this set of equations is solved numerically.

The region near the propellant surface is the most interesting; it is here that large temperature gradients exist. For mathematical tractability, the infinite $x$-region is transformed into a finite region, using transformation given below. The transformed coordinate system also makes possible a finer grid-size near the propellant surface in the real spatial coordinate, while using a uniform grid in the transformed coordinate.

For the gas phase region:

$$-\infty < x < 0$$

$$z = -[1 - 1/(1 - Ax)]$$

which gives

$$x = 0 \quad z = 0$$

$$x = -\infty \quad z = -1$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} = A(1 + z)^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} = A^2(1 + z)^4 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + 2A^2(1 + z)^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$$

After making these substitutions into the gas phase energy equation (Eq. (12)) and the initial boundary conditions (Eq. (10)), and some simplification as well, we get

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \left[ \int_{0}^{z} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} \frac{dz}{(1 + z)^2} \right] \frac{(1 + z)^2}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho} \left( \frac{\mu}{\text{Pr}} + \frac{\mu_t}{\text{Pr}_t} \right) 2A^2(1 + z)^3 \left| \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right|$$

$$+ \left( \frac{\mu}{\text{Pr}} + \frac{\mu_t}{\text{Pr}_t} \right) \frac{1}{\rho} A^2(1 + z)^4 \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} + \frac{1}{\rho \rho_c} \frac{\partial P}{\partial t}$$

\[ (14) \]
The transformation for the solid phase region $0 \leq x < -1$ is given by:

$$Z = \left[1 - \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_1 x}\right]$$

which gives:

$$x = 0 \quad z = 0$$

$$x = -\infty \quad z = 1$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} = \Lambda_1 (1 - z)^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} = \Lambda_1^2 (1 - z)^4 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} - 2 \Lambda_1 (1 - z)^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$$

After making these substitutions into Eq. (1) and (2), and after some simplifications, we get:

$$\frac{\partial T_p}{\partial t} = \left[-2 \Lambda_1^2 (1 - z)^3 \alpha_p\right] \frac{\partial T_p}{\partial z} + \left[\Lambda_1^2 (1 - z)^4 \alpha_p\right] \frac{\partial^2 T_p}{\partial z^2}$$

1.C. $t = 0 \quad T_p(0,z) = T_{p1}$

B.C.1 $z = -1 \quad T_p(t,-1) = T_{p1}$

B.C.2 $z = 0 \quad A_k \frac{\partial T_p}{\partial z} (t,0^-) = \Lambda_1 k_p \frac{\partial T_p}{\partial z} (t,0^+)$

**Numerical Scheme**

The coupled set of partial differential equations (namely, the energy equation for the fluid and the transient heat conduction equation for the propellant), was solved using a finite difference numerical technique. The most important solution parameter was the interfacial temperature as a function of time. The heat flux to the propellant surface was then easily computed from the calculated temperature distribution. The finite difference equation was written for the equations in
transformed coordinates. As mentioned in the previous section, this transformation made possible the use of uniform grid spacing in z-coordinate, thereby bypassing the instability associated with nonuniform grid spacing, which would have been necessary for the x-coordinate. The compression of the axis near the interface was controlled by the parameters A and $A_1$. Larger values of A and $A_1$ result in finer grid spacing near the interface.

The two partial differential equations (Eq. (14) and (17)), to be solved are of the form

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = B(T, z) \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} + C(T, z) \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} + D(T, z)$$

The backward difference method was used to approximate the time derivative and central difference for spatial derivatives. The equations were linearized by evaluating the coefficients B, C, and D at an intermediate time step. When

$$T_i^k = T(k\Delta t, i\Delta x)$$

Eq. (14) is approximated by

$$\frac{T_i^{k+1} - T_i^k}{\Delta t} = B_i^{k+1/2} \left[ \frac{T_i^{k+1} - T_i^{k-1}}{2(\Delta z)} \right]$$

$$+ C_i^{k+1/2} \left[ \frac{T_i^{k+1} - 2T_i^k + T_i^{k-1}}{(\Delta z)^2} \right] + D_i^{k+1/2}$$

The resulting set of simultaneous algebraic equations was solved by using a standard tridiagonal matrix inversion. At each time step, the properties at $k + 1/2$ were evaluated, using linear interpolation between $k$ and $k + 1$ levels. Iteration was performed at every time step, until the solution converged.

**Discussion of Results**

The input variables used in a typical run for the tip ignition program are given in Table 1. The computation is terminated when the propellant surface temperature reaches the specified ignition temperature of 850°F. Since no experimental or theoretical results are available in the literature for turbulent transport properties under highly
transient flow conditions, the initial selection of \( k_{\text{eff}}/k \) was somewhat arbitrary. However, it was selected because of its close agreement with one set of experimental data. In all later computations, the same value of \( k_{\text{eff}}/k \) was used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. Input Variables for the Tip Ignition Computer Program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{M}_w ) = 26.10 g(_f)/g-mole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma ) = 1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho_{\text{pr}} ) = 1.71 g/cm(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{\text{pr}} ) = 0.80 \times 10^{-3} \text{cal/s-cm}^-\text{K}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_{\text{pr}} ) = 0.0018 cm(^2)/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_f ) = 3000(^\circ)K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{\text{ign}} ) = 850(^\circ)K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_i ) = 298(^\circ)K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{\text{pi}} ) = 298(^\circ)K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k ) = 2.085 \times 10^{-4} \text{cal/s-cm}^-\text{K}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{\text{eff}}/k ) = 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_i ) = 1033.23 g(_f)/cm(^2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 shows the ignition delay as a function of the pressurization rate at the crack tip. This figure also shows the comparison of predicted and measured ignition delays. The experimental setup and data reduction procedure are discussed in the section on Experimental Work. It can be seen that the ignition delay time decreases as the pressurization rate is increased. The slope of the curve is larger at the lower pressurization rates. The nature of the curve may help to explain why, at higher pressurization rates, the tip region of a real propellant crack may ignite prior to the arrival of the convective ignition front. At lower pressurization rates, the ignition delay time by this mechanism is much longer (>1 ms); therefore, the convective ignition front will reach the tip before the tip region ignites, due to stagnation point heat transfer associated with the compression waves and turbulent energy transport in the gas phase. However, as the pressurization rate is increased, the ignition delay time drops sharply, and under certain operating conditions, the ignition delay time may be smaller than the time for the ignition front to propagate to the tip. It should be noted that the numerical values of the ignition delay times and pressurization rates reported here should not be arbitrarily used for any crack geometry.
The results for the tip ignition tests are for a given geometry and, more importantly for an inert crack; the numerical values of the result should, therefore, be used with caution. The theoretical predictions are also dependent upon the value of $k_{\text{eff}}/k$. An increase in this ratio will cause the ignition delay time versus pressurization rate curve to shift downward, whereas a smaller value of $k_{\text{eff}}/k$ will cause it to shift upward. The validity of the theoretical model and the proposed physical mechanism is supported by the good agreement between theoretical and experimental results.

Figure 3 presents a plot of propellant surface temperature and heat flux to the propellant as a function of time for a given pressurization rate. The propellant surface temperature increases almost linearly with time, although it shows some curvature at the beginning. A higher pressurization rate would cause the slope of the curve to steepen, since, for a higher pressurization rate, the ignition delay will be shorter. The heat flux to the propellant surface also increases with time: as time increases, the temperature gradient at the propellant-gas interface steepens. The slope of heat flux versus time curve is higher in the beginning and decreases with time. At a higher pressurization rate, the curve will shift upward.
FIGURE 3. Calculated Heat Flux and Propellant Surface Temperature vs. Time.
The calculated temperature distribution at different times for a given pressurization rate is plotted in Figure 4. The temperature is plotted as a function of the transformed dimensionless coordinate, z, so that the detailed variations near the crack tip region can be illustrated. The temperature profile in the solid propellant shows that the gradient \( (\partial T/\partial z)_{z=0^+} \) [which is proportional to \((\partial T/\partial x)_{x=0^+}\)] steepens as time increases. The gradients near the interface appear to be steeper on the propellant side than on the fluid, because the effective (turbulent plus molecular) thermal transport coefficient for the gas is higher than that of the propellant. Although the high temperature region in the gas phase seems to be located at a considerable distance from the solid-gas interface, the actual physical distance to the high temperature region is only about 0.5 cm.

**LINKAGE OF CRACK COMBUSTION CODE AND NONLINEAR FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS PROGRAM**

**introduction**

As mentioned earlier, for DDT in damaged propellant grains with cracks, crack branching/propagation is essential to provide the additional surface area for anomalous burning. A crack combustion program which can also predict stress concentrations at the tip is needed for realistic theoretical predictions of the accelerative burning inside the propellant crack, crack propagation, etc. Since the propellant is deformable, burning inside a solid propellant crack is basically a coupled solid mechanics and combustion phenomenon. The combustion phenomenon inside the crack is strongly influenced by the crack geometry. The geometry, or gap width, can be altered for the following two reasons:

1. **Mass loss due to gasification or ignition of the propellant surface along the crack during the combustion process, leading to a variation in the geometry.**

2. **Mechanical deformation of the propellant due to:** (a) the pressure loading on the interior surface of the crack; (b) the pressure force of the combustion chamber acting on the propellant grain near the crack entrance; and (c) stresses in the propellant, due to pressure and temperature gradients in the grain, can also cause the crack geometry to change significantly.

Both the burning rate and the mechanical deformation are governed by pressure acting on the crack surfaces. On the other hand, a change in gapwidth or geometry will cause the pressure distribution to vary. This pressure distribution along the crack will strongly influence the deformations and stress concentration at the crack tip. It is obvious, therefore, that pressure and crack geometry are strongly interdependent in a burning solid propellant crack.
In order to predict the effect of mechanical deformation on the ignition phenomena inside the crack, and at the same time the prediction of stress concentration at the crack tip due to a realistic pressure distribution along the crack, the crack combustion program was merged with a well-established structural analysis program. Of the numerous finite-element structural analysis programs, the Nonlinear Finite-Element Analysis Program (NFAP) (a modified version of the NONSAP)\textsuperscript{12,13} was considered most suitable for this study. This program is a user-oriented program which can be easily modified according to need. It is also capable of handling geometrical nonlinearities caused by the large deformations which are typical of propellants under high pressure. Another important feature of the program is its restart capability. The NFAP was modified to suit the needs of the current problem. A linear viscoelastic material model was added to the program in order to treat the mechanical properties of the propellants more realistically.


Consolidation NFAP

For computational storage efficiency of the combined program, the original version of NFAP was modified and consolidated. The unnecessary portions of NFAP were deleted. In the input phase of NFAP, the subroutine for bandwidth reduction was deleted. Bandwidth reduction is essential for a structure whose geometry is very intricate and for which it is not manually possible to number the nodes in order to obtain the narrowest bandwidth. For our well-defined crack geometry, it was felt that the bandwidth reduction subroutine was unnecessary. The subroutine for calculating three-dimensional pressure loading was also deleted. Since the propellant geometry being considered is two-dimensional, the subroutines for handling one-dimensional and three-dimensional input element data have also been deleted.

In the assembly phase of NFAP, the subroutines for the assembly of one-dimensional and three-dimensional stiffness matrices have also been removed. The original NFAP had several two-dimensional material models which were considered unnecessary, and, hence, were deleted. Instead, a two-dimensional linear viscoelastic material model was added. This will be discussed in detail in the next section. In the incremental solution phase of NFAP, once again the one-dimensional and three-dimensional equilibrium iteration subroutines have been deleted. The one-dimensional and three-dimensional stress calculation subroutines have also been eliminated. Deletion of these subroutines has resulted in a significant reduction in the size of NFAP, which, in turn, results both in a reduction in the storage space and in computational time and cost.

Viscoelastic Material Model

A linear viscoelastic material model has been implemented to describe the behavior of the propellant. The material behavior of the solid propellant is assumed to be viscoelastic in shear, and elastic in bulk. At present, only the isothermal condition is considered, and the viscoelastic response is assumed to be thermorheologically simple. The stress and strain tensors are defined as follows:

\[ S_{ij} = \text{stress deviators} \]
\[ e_{ij} = \text{strain deviators} \]
\[ \sigma_{ij} = \text{stress components} \]
\[ \varepsilon_{ij} = \text{strain components} \]

where

\[ S_{ij} = \sigma_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \sigma_{kk} \]  \hspace{1cm} (21)
\[ e_{ij} = \varepsilon_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \varepsilon_{kk} \]  \hspace{1cm} (22)

Then, the stress-strain relations with zero initial conditions are written in two parts.
The shear behavior is governed by

\[ S_{ij} = \int_0^T G_i (\xi - \xi') \frac{d}{dt'} e_{ij} (t') dt' \]  

(23)

where \( G_i \) is the relaxation modulus in shear, and \( \xi \) is a "reduced time" due to the temperature above a reference state. For a constant temperature field, \( \xi \) is defined by

\[ \xi = \phi(T)t \]  

(24)

where \( \phi \) is a shift function due to temperature effect on the viscoelastic behavior of the propellant. For most viscoelastic materials, it is usual to consider

\[ G_i = g_o + \sum_{m=1}^{M} g_m e^{-\beta_m t} \]  

(25)

The bulk behavior is governed by

\[ \sigma_{kk} = 3K \varepsilon_{kk} \]  

(26)

where \( K \) is the bulk modulus.

For time-dependent structural analysis, it is necessary to form an incremental stress-strain relationship. When \( (\sigma)(t+\Delta t) \) is a quantity at time \( t+\Delta t \) and \( (\sigma)(t) \) at time \( t \), the incremental stresses, \( \Delta \sigma_{ij} \), and strains, \( \Delta \varepsilon_{ij} \), are defined by

\[ \Delta \sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}^{t+\Delta t} - \sigma_{ij}^t \]

\[ \Delta \varepsilon_{ij} = \varepsilon_{ij}^{t+\Delta t} - \varepsilon_{ij}^t \]  

(27)

Then, from Eq. (21) to (27), we can derive the incremental stress-strain relations in matrix form.

\[ \{ \Delta \sigma \} = [D_{VF}] \{ \Delta \varepsilon \} - \{ \sigma_o \} \]  

(28)

where

\[ \{ \Delta \sigma \} = \{ \Delta \sigma_{22}, \Delta \sigma_{33}, \Delta \varepsilon_{23}, \Delta \sigma_{11} \} \]

\[ \{ \Delta \varepsilon \} = \{ \Delta \varepsilon_{22}, \Delta \varepsilon_{33}, \Delta \varepsilon_{23}, \Delta \varepsilon_{11} \} \]

\[ \{ \sigma_o \} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} B_m \{ c_{22}^t, c_{33}^t, c_{23}^t, c_{11}^t \} \]  

(29)
and

\[
[D_{VE}] = [D_{VE}]^T \begin{bmatrix}
(K+2/3 A) & (K-1/3 A) & 0 & (K-1/3 A) \\
(K+2/3 A) & 0 & (K-1/3 A) & 0 \\
A & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
(K+2/3 A) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Symmetric

where

\[
A = g_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{M} g_m (1 - e^{\beta_m t/\Delta t})/(\beta_m \Delta t)
\]

\[
B_m = 1 - e^{-\beta_m t} 
\]

and the term \( C_{ij} \) has a recursive relationship, i.e.,

\[
C_{ij}^{t} = e^{-\beta_m \Delta t} C_{ij}^{t-\Delta t} + \frac{g_m (1 - e^{-\beta_m t})}{\beta_m \Delta t} e_{ij}'
\]

\[
e_{ij}' = e_{ij}^{t} - e_{ij}^{t-\Delta t}
\]

From the virtual work principle and the relationship of Eq. (28), one can derive the finite-element stiffness equations for a time interval \([t, t+\Delta t]\),

\[
[k] \{\Delta v\} = \{\Delta f\} - \{f_o\}
\]

where \(\Delta v\) represents the increment of nodal displacement vector, and \(\Delta f\) the increment of applied nodal force vector. The element stiffness matrix is given by

\[
k = \int [B]^T [D_{VE}] [B] \, dv
\]

and \(f_o\), a force vector due to the viscoelastic reponse of the material

\[
f_o = \int [B]^T \{\tau_o\} \, dv
\]

where \(B\) is a strain-nodal displacement transformation matrix.

The material model described above has been written in the form of computer subroutines and these subroutines were implemented into NFAP for the purpose of conducting the viscoelastic analysis of solid propel- lant. A total of three new subroutines were prepared:
ELT2D9: Allocate array storages for calculating stresses, strains, and material matrix.

IVEL29: Initialize the arrays relating to the formation of the material matrix.

VSEL29: Calculate incremental stresses and strains and form the viscoelastic material matrix.

For the validation of the viscoelastic material model, the program was tested for some simple cases for which analytical solutions were available. The agreement between the numerical and analytical solutions was excellent.

For actual computations of the combined program, the material properties were obtained from Mr. C. F. Price of NWC, China Lake, California. They are as follows:

\[ K = 700,000 \text{ psi} \]

\[ G_1 = 212 + 654 \exp(-0.095t) \text{ psi} \]  

(38)

Combination of NFAP and CCC

Approach. For the transient burning inside a solid propellant crack, many interrelated physical phenomena should be considered in the theoretical modeling. The combination of convective burning and structural mechanics analyses can be very complex. Some of the interdependent processes are:

1. Pressure inside the crack results in a deformation of the propellant crack geometry.

2. During combustion, there is mass loss due to the gasification of the propellant surface inside the crack, and this changes the geometry of the crack.

3. Deformation of the propellant crack geometry causes the pressure to change.

4. Pressure wave phenomena is interdependent with the transient variation in the crack geometry.

5. Compression of the propellant may alter its burning characteristics.

6. The temperature gradients involved in the convective burning may cause thermal stresses in the solid, contributing to crack propagation.
7. The structural analysis should account for the mass loss and the effect of surface ablation on the stresses in the solid.

It is obvious that the coupling between the pressure along the crack and the deformation is the most important, and that it could influence the combustion phenomena significantly. Some of the other coupled processes mentioned above are of secondary importance and are ignited in the present analysis. The thermal stresses due to the temperature gradients are considered to be small when compared with the mechanical stresses caused by deformation alone. Variation in the burning rate due to compression of the propellant may not be significant, considering the strong dependence of the burning rate on pressure.

Incorporation of the mass loss of the propellant into the structural analysis may be important, but it is quite involved, requiring extensive program revisions. However, it should be noted that for the region of interest of our analysis, i.e., during the early phase of combustion before substantial burning takes place, ignoring mass loss in the structural analysis may be justified. During this period, the geometry variation due to surface gasification is small when compared to the variation due to mechanical deformation, which, of course, is accounted for in the program.

In the present solution scheme, the pressure and the deformation are not solved simultaneously. They are obtained independently at a finite time interval apart, i.e., pressure at time \( t \) is used as an input to determine the deformation at time \( t + \Delta t \). In other words, a time lag is introduced between the pressure computations obtained from CCC, and the deformation computations obtained from NFAP. The smaller the time lag, the more accurate the solution will be. A schematic diagram of the coupling is shown in Figure 5. It is believed that the time lag between the pressure and deformation computations will result in only negligible errors. In fact, it may even be justified on the grounds that the material would require some finite time lag to respond to an applied pressure load. Also, these time lags are usually smaller than a few hundreds of the total event time, and, therefore, may not have a very significant effect on the overall solution.

**Implementation of the Combined Program.** The initial implementation of the combined program included such considerations as input and output data, an overlay structure to conserve memory core, and organization of COMMON storage areas to transfer necessary data between the two programs. A system of interfacing-subroutines were used to transfer program control between the NFAP routines and the CCC routines. When coupling the two programs, the approach was to keep them as separate as possible, for the following two reasons. First, if modifications to CCC are made, program modification and testing can be made for CCC alone, and NFAP and CCC can be recoupled without further revisions. This
CCC - PRESSURE DEPENDS ON TIME HISTORY AND DEFORMATION OF GAP WIDTH

NFAP - MECHANICAL DEFORMATION IS A FUNCTION OF PRESSURE AND TIME

CCC/NFAP COMBINATION - COUPLED COMBUSTION AND SOLID MECHANICS SOLUTION FOR ANY SPECIFIED INCREMENTAL TIME STEP

FIGURE 5. Schematic Diagram of CCC and NFAP Linkage.

improves the efficiency of any program testing, and allows the greatest flexibility in program verification. Similarly, NFAP can be tested alone, with a coupling to CCC, or with an artificial pressure loading routine, in order to perform solid mechanics studies. A second reason for maintaining the two programs separately is to keep NFAP and CCC as close to their original forms as possible. In this way, others can utilize the programming procedures developed, substituting their own procedure for convective burning or structural analysis, if desired, without formulating a new linkage. These considerations increase the potential usefulness of the combined program by keeping it general and versatile.

The disadvantages of this approach are minimal. The greatest disadvantage of keeping NFAP and CCC as complete as possible is the need for increased program memory size. Both are large programs, with large core storage requirements. This limitation, however, can be relaxed by utilizing a memory overlay structure to conserve memory core for program use. Since the two halves of the combined NFAP/CCC program are executed alternately, only one half needs to be in memory at any given instant during the execution of the program. That is, while the structural analysis is taking place during the execution of the combined program,
the convective burning routine is not immediately needed, so the space in memory is overlaid by the NFAP routines. Similarly, when the convective burning analysis is taking place, the NFAP routines not in execution at that time are replaced in core by the CCC routines. The penalty of increased execution time due to the transfers between memory core and an intermediate input/output device (direct access magnetic disk) is small when compared to overall execution time. The overlay procedure is automatic and independent of the program. The operating system for the IBM Model 370 computer used for all the computations includes an overlay feature which requires only an outline of the overlay structure and some control cards. The use of the overlay feature was not critical for any of the analyses performed on the IBM 370 computer at Pennsylvania State University because of the large memory capacity (1000 k bytes of storage to a single program) available. The core size specification of the operating system allowed maximum available storage and, consequently, the overlay feature was not needed for the computations. At other computer installations, however, core size limitations are usually very critical, and an overlay structure will be necessary.

The theoretical coupling considered between the convective burning and structural analysis is simplified, as previously discussed, to the transfer of pressure loading and crack deformation. Pressure is calculated by the CCC portion of the combined program at each nodal point location on a one-dimensional grid along the length of the crack. The convective burning analysis of the crack combustion incorporates the crack geometry variation caused by both mechanical deformation and mass loss through gasification of the propellant surface. Once the gas phase equations are solved and pressures along the crack are calculated for a particular time \( t \), program control is transferred to the NFAP portion of the combined program. The surface elements in the finite element mesh are then loaded with the pressure calculated in CCC. NFAP updates the stiffness matrix, performs a static analysis at time \( t \), and calculates the propellant deformation. The change in the crack width at each finite-difference node is calculated and added to the existing crack width. Control is transferred back to CCC, the next time iteration \( (t + \Delta t) \) is made, and control is again transferred to NFAP. In this manner, pressure and changes in crack width are coupled. The general layout of the linkage is shown in Figure 6.

Some modifications to the procedure described above are necessary due to considerations of execution time efficiency. The time required for NFAP to complete a static analysis is approximately an order of magnitude higher than the execution time for one CCC time iteration. Although CCC uses an implicit solution method, the time must be small enough to give accurate results. Performing structure analysis for every iteration in CCC is prohibitive in view of the extremely long computer time required. An option of the combined program coupling is to specify the number of time iterations CCC will complete before
SOLVE GAS PHASE EQUATIONS FOR ALL NODES AT TIME, $t$

CALCULATE $\Delta_{\text{burn}}_{i,t}$ FOR EACH NODE, $t$
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$t = t + \Delta t$

FIGURE 6. General Layout of the CCC and LFAP Linkage.
transfer is made to NFAP for an updating of the crack width. When CCC takes more than one time step between crack-width updating, the change in crack width is averaged over the time increments before addition to the existing width. For example, if CCC completes ten iterations before transferring control to NFAP for an updating of crack geometry, one-tenth of the change in deformation returned by NFAP will be added during the next ten iterations in CCC. This averaging approximation is designed to smooth out any step changes in the geometry that would affect the CCC solution convergence. The allowable number of iterations in CCC between transfers to NFAP is, in general, dependent on the time increment, chamber pressurization rate, and crack width.

The general stress-strain equations are solved using a plane-strain analysis. This is compatible with the experimental test configuration, in which the propellant is confined from all sides except the entrance. The transient nature of the pressure loading is considered by using a static analysis at incremental time steps. A static analysis was chosen because of the prohibitive computational times involved and the complex nature of dynamic analysis. However, the options of using the dynamic analysis is available.

Emulation of the Finite Element Mesh. The analysis considers a two-dimensional configuration, which is compatible with the crack geometry considered in the convective burning model in the crack combustion code. Two-dimensional continuum elements were used to model a sample crack. Because of symmetry about the crack centerline, only one half of the solid-propellant crack model needs to be considered. Figure 7 is a diagram of a finite element grid for a sample problem. The element mesh near the crack entrance was slightly modified. The square corner at the entrance of the crack was rounded a bit, and the grid was refined somewhat for better computational accuracy. Each isoparametric, quadrilateral element contains eight nodes, four nodes at the corners and one node at the midpoint of each side. This feature of NFAP makes it possible to reduce the number of elements needed to produce accurate results. Equal accuracy may thus be achieved with less computational effort than is necessary with four-node elements. During the initial testing of the program, a simplified element grid was used, with only one layer of elements instead of the present configuration of four layers in the axial direction of the crack. Multiple layers are used in order to increase the accuracy of the solution.

The finite-difference nodes used in the CCC one-dimensional grid are in a one-to-one correspondence with the finite-element nodes which form the propellant surface in the NFAP two-dimensional mesh. This allows one to transfer the deformations obtained from NFAP directly to CCC. The model grid is stressed by applying pressure loading to the appropriate surfaces, and fixing boundary conditions to the elements. The transient pressure loading for the individual elements along the
crack surface is determined by the crack combustion routine. The loading at the entrance of the crack is determined by the chamber pressure, given as a function of time. The schematic diagram of the pressure loading and boundary conditions of the model grid is shown in Figure 8. All surfaces of the propellant mesh are either pressure loaded or have fixed boundaries. The propellant at the tip of the crack is fixed in one direction only, due to the symmetry of the mesh. Along the surfaces of the propellant in contact with the brass mold, the boundaries are assumed fixed.

Pressure data from the convective burning analysis are available at the finite-difference nodes. Pressure input to NFAP, however, must be in the form of uniform pressure loading on individual element surfaces. Every element surface is defined by three nodes: two nodes at the endpoints of the elements, and one node at the midpoint of the surface. The uniform surface loading of an element is obtained from the spatially-weighted average of the pressures at the three surface nodes. Although there is a one-to-one correspondence between the finite-element and finite-difference nodes along the surface of the crack, the pressure profile considered by NFAP contains discontinuities at each element boundary along the surface, because of the pressure averaging procedure.

Pressure loading of the two-dimensional elements at the entrance and the tip of the crack also involved side loading, i.e., loading in the axial direction of the crack. The side loading of the surface elements at the opening of the crack was determined by the chamber pressure at any given time. Side loading at the tip of the crack was considered the same as pressure loading on the last element along the
Discussion of Results. Some preliminary computations were made with the combined structural analysis and convective burning program. The results obtained from the combined program were compared with those obtained from convective burning analysis alone. From these comparisons, it was possible to draw some general conclusions. A more detailed analysis of the results from the combined program is being performed under the second phase of the contract.

The crack geometry used for the combined NFAP/CCC program is compatible with the dimensions of the propellant test specimen used for experimental test firings. The primary inputs to the program are the chamber pressurization rate and the crack geometry. For preliminary test runs, the initial geometry of the crack has a uniform rectangular-cross-sectional area. The chamber pressurization rates are assumed to be constant, i.e., the chamber pressure is a ramp function of time. For a very low chamber pressurization rate, the effect of the mechanical deformation is relatively insignificant on the combustion process inside the crack.

The chamber pressurization rate is $5 \times 10^5$ atm/s for the result reported here. It should be pointed out that the constant pressurization rate used is quite close to that observed experimentally, especially over the period of interest. In an actual test firing, the chamber pressure rises at a nearly constant rate, remains steady for a long period of time, and then falls. The calculation is continued until the pressure reaches the peak chamber pressure.

FIGURE 8. Boundary Condition for a Test Specimen.
Calculated pressure distributions at various times, from the convective burning analysis alone, are shown in Figure 9. As time progresses, the chamber pressure increases, hot gases enter the crack, and pressure waves travel along the length of the crack. As the hot gases flow over the propellant surface, the surface temperature increases until surface ignition occurs. Propellant mass loss through gasification causes increased pressure, which enhances the burning rate. The combustion gases, driven by the pressure gradient, penetrate deeper into the crack, causing the ignition front to propagate. The locus of the ignition is shown by the dashed line on the same figure. At 232.5 \mu s the ignition front has propagated through 60% of the crack length.

![Calculated pressure distributions](image)

**FIGURE 9.** Calculated Pressure Distributions for Various Times From the Crack Combustion Code.

Using the same initial geometry and pressurization rate, the test case was run again, but with the coupled convective burning and structural analysis program incorporating the linear viscoelastic model. The pressure distributions and the locus of the ignition front calculated from the combined NFAP/CCC program is shown in Figure 10. The general trends of pressure with respect to time are similar to those from the convective burning analysis alone, but when the pressure inside the crack increases above 25 atm, the pressure distributions from the two analyses begin to differ. The pressure obtained from the combined analysis generally increases faster than the pressure calculated by the
convective burning program alone. This can be explained by an examination of the port area variation along the crack. The increased pressure corresponds to a reduction in the area of the flow channel. The physical explanation of the decrease in crack width in the combined analysis is based on the solid mechanics consideration. Because of the pressure loading on the elements at the entrance of the crack and the constraints along the boundaries, the deformation of the propellant was fairly complicated. The elements at the entrance, compressed by the chamber pressure, deform inward, pushing the propellant into the crack. Since the chamber pressure increases faster than the pressure inside the crack during the early stage, the propellant is pushed towards the lower pressure region inside the crack. The mechanical deformation of the propellant causes the narrowing of the crack width.

As time progresses, the pressure distribution becomes wavy in shape, causing the propellant surface also to become wavy. The localized pressure rises correspond to the deformation of the propellant along the crack. The pressure and port area display a very strong inverse relation. Propagation of the localized pressure phenomena along the crack toward the tip can be seen in Figure 10. At 232.5 μs, the
localized pressure phenomena, evident around nodes 12 and 20, are increasing in magnitude. The locus of ignition front exhibits a slightly faster rate of propagation into the crack, as compared to that shown in Figure 9. It is interesting to note that the result obtained from the coupled program does not necessarily give lower pressure inside the crack or a lower flame propagation rate.

DETERMINATION OF COMPLETE SET OF DIMENSIONLESS PARAMETERS

The nondimensionalized governing equations for the gas-dynamic and heat-transfer equations were reported in the last annual report, and will not be repeated here. The nondimensional equations for the solid mechanics portion, and the resulting dimensionless parameters will be given here. The equation for stresses in the solid under equilibrium conditions is:

\[ \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (39)

the constitutive law for linear viscoelastic materials is:

\[ \sigma_{ij}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} G_1(t - \tau) \frac{d}{d\tau} \epsilon_{ij}(\tau) d\tau \]

\[ - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^{t} G_1(t - \tau) \frac{d\epsilon_{\alpha\alpha}}{d\tau} d\tau + \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \kappa \epsilon_{\alpha\alpha} \]  \hspace{1cm} (40)

where the relaxation modulus in shear, \( G_1 \), can be expressed as

\[ G_1(t) = G_\infty + (G_0 - G_\infty)e^{-\beta t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (41)

Defining the dimensionless parameters as follows

\[ \tilde{t} = \frac{t}{t^*} \]  \hspace{1cm} (42)

\[ \tilde{\sigma}_{ij} = \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{\sigma^*} \]  \hspace{1cm} (43)

\[ \tilde{R}_j = \frac{R_j}{\lambda} \]

\[ \tilde{\omega} = \frac{G_0}{p\lambda}, \tilde{\omega}_\infty = \frac{G_\infty}{p\lambda} \]  \hspace{1cm} (44)
The reference quantities selected are given below (see Ref. 1 for details)

\[ t^* = \frac{\lambda_{pr}}{\rho_{pr} h c^2} \left( \frac{T_{ign} - T_1}{T_f - T_1} \right)^2 \]  

\[ \sigma^* = \frac{K_I c}{\sqrt{L}} \]  

\[ \tilde{\xi} = \xi_{web} \text{ for the transverse coordinate} \]  

\[ P^* = \left[ \frac{a}{\Gamma(y)} \left( \frac{A_b}{A_p} \right) \rho_{pr} \sqrt{\frac{RT_f g}{g}} \right]^{1/(1-n)} \]  

where

\[ \Gamma(y) = \sqrt{\gamma + 1 \gamma - 1} \]  

After nondimensionalization, the equilibrium equation for stresses in solid propellant becomes:

\[ \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_{ij}}{\partial \tilde{x}_j} = 0 \]  

The constitutive law for linear viscoelastic material becomes

\[ \tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(\tilde{t}) = \left( \frac{P^* L}{K_I c} \right) \int_{-\infty}^{\tilde{t}} \tilde{C}_1(\tilde{\tau} - \tilde{t}) \frac{d}{d\tilde{\tau}} \tilde{\epsilon}_{ij}(\tilde{\tau}) d\tilde{\tau} \]

\[ - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^{\tilde{t}} \tilde{C}_1(\tilde{\tau} - \tilde{t}) \frac{d\tilde{\epsilon}_{kk}}{d\tilde{\tau}} d\tilde{\tau} \]

\[ + \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \tilde{K} \tilde{\epsilon}_{kk} \]

and

\[ \tilde{C}_1(\tilde{t}) = \tilde{C}_\infty + (\tilde{C}_0 - \tilde{C}_\infty) e^{-(\tilde{\sigma}^*)} \tilde{t} \]
Finally, the complete set of dimensionless parameters can be put into the following form

\[
\frac{u_{fp}}{u^*} = \frac{u_{fp}}{u^*} \left( \frac{\alpha_{pr}}{r_b} \frac{dP_c}{dt} \right)_{\text{tip}}, \quad \frac{\delta_{fs}}{\delta_{\text{gap}}}, \quad \frac{b_1^*}{b_{1a}}, \quad \frac{\rho_{bi}}{\rho_{wi}}, \\
\frac{L}{D_{H_i}}, \quad M^*, \quad St^*, \quad \frac{T_{\text{Ign}} - T_i}{T_f - T_i}, \quad \frac{L}{\delta_{\text{web}}}, \quad \frac{\varepsilon}{D_{H_i}}, \quad \text{Re}^*, \quad \text{Re}^*_{D_{H_i}}.
\]

\[
\frac{r_{c_{\text{tip}}}}{L}, \quad \frac{G_0}{P^*}, \quad \frac{G_\infty}{P^*}, \quad \frac{K_1}{P^*}, \quad \frac{K_c}{P^*}, \quad \text{and } \alpha^t* \quad \quad \text{(54)}
\]

**EXPERIMENTAL WORK**

**CRACK TIP IGNITION STUDY**

In the last annual report,\(^1\) it was noted that a bright spot near the tip region of the propellant crack was observed before the convective ignition front reached the tip. The existence of this spot can be attributed to one of the following conditions.

1. Ignition of combustible species evaporated from the propellant surface near the crack entrance region and transported to the propellant tip by the initial pressure gradient.

2. Ignition or combustion of the unreacted species from the igniter system carried to the crack tip by the initial pressure gradient.

3. Ignition of the propellant tip region by a mechanism other than items 1 or 2 mentioned above.

In order to experimentally investigate the phenomena of crack tip ignition, an inert crack was formed, as shown in Figure 11. It was designed to have inert surfaces along the crack, with a propellant sample only at the tip. Some modifications were made in the combustion chamber to accommodate the desired geometry. The crack was formed between a thick plexiglass window and the bottom surface of the crack combustion chamber. To examine any material loss of the propellant at the tip, some go/no-go tests were conducted for such a configuration. In all these tests the propellant sample burned and mass loss were observed. Since the tests were done for the inert crack, there was no possibility of any combustible species evaporating from the crack entrance.
FIGURE 11. Schematic Diagram of the Test Rig for the Study of Propellant Ignition at the Closed End of an Inert Crack.
and then reacting at the tip. Therefore, it was possible to rule out the first mechanism mentioned (item 1). The tests were also conducted with inert material, e.g., silicon rubber or clay, instead of propellant at the tip of the inert crack. High speed motion pictures of these tests revealed no bright spot near the tip region, thereby eliminating the possibility of the reaction of some of the combustible species from the igniter system.

These observations confirm the fact that the previously observed and reported bright spot in a propellant crack is not caused by further reaction of fuel and oxidizer species resulting from the incomplete combustion of the propellant near the entrance region of the crack or from the igniter system. The bright spot represents the actual ignition of the propellant at the crack tip. As explained in the section entitled Theoretical Work, the mechanism of tip ignition appears to be caused by the enhanced transport of energy in the gas phase which is driven by strong compression waves.

Numerous experimental test firings were conducted to obtain the effect of pressurization rates on the ignition delay time. Propellant A was used as the test propellant in all tip-ignition tests. A schematic diagram of the combustion chamber is shown in Figure 11. The rectangular cross-sectional channel simulating the crack was placed normal to the flow direction in the chamber. A pair of brass strips was placed between the bottom surface of the combustion chamber and the innermost plexiglass window to form the crack. The gap width of the crack could be varied by using brass strips of different thicknesses. For all results reported here, the same pair of brass legs were used. The gap width of the crack thus formed was 0.051 in. (1.3 mm). The length of the crack was about 7.48 in. (190 mm) and the width was 0.37 in. (9.4 mm). Use of the plexiglass window as one of the surfaces of the channel facilitated an unobstructed view of the ignition phenomena. The chamber was completely sealed, except for the interchangeable exit nozzle through which the product gases were discharged to the atmosphere. The chamber was designed for a maximum static pressure of 800 atm. In this study, however, the maximum pressure was only about 200 atm.

A solid propellant igniter system was used as a source for hot gas generation. Percussion primers were used as the initiators for ignition of a propellant strand. A solenoid-activated firing pin was used to trigger the primer. When the primer is triggered, the hot gases flow over the propellant strand and ignite it. The product gases flow through a multi-perforated converging nozzle into the main chamber. The pressurization rate of the chamber can be varied by altering the dimensions of the propellant strip in the igniter, by changing the dimensions of the multi-perforated nozzle, or by changing the exit nozzle of the chamber. In the present study, pressurization rates up to \(8 \times 10^4\) atm/s were obtained at the crack tip.
A block diagram of the remotely controlled ignition and high-speed photography system is shown in Figure 12. The solenoid which triggers the percussion primer is activated by an event-switch built into the high-speed camera. After the camera is switched on, a few milliseconds are required to reach the desired framing rate. This delay time can be related to the footage of the film that passes through the camera before the attainment of the prescribed framing rate. The event switch of the camera is controlled by a footage indicator. During the operation, the footage indicator is set to a preselected value corresponding to the desired framing rate. After a certain length of film (preset on the footage indicator) runs through the camera, the event switch closes, thereby activating the relay. The relay, in turn, activates two other switches; one triggers the solenoid to initiate the ignition event, and the other closes the common-time switch on a light emitting diode (LED) driver unit. At the instant when the common-time switch closes, the LED driver unit generates a 2 ms pulse. The pulse is recorded on a magnetic tape and is simultaneously marked on the film. These common-time marks are used for the time correlation of the data recorded on the tape and the film.

The data acquisition system consisted of two major parts: (1) the pressure recording system, and (2) the ignition event recording system. A block diagram of the data acquisition system is shown in Figure 13. Pressure measurements were taken at four locations along the crack, including one at the crack entrance and another at the tip. Piezoelectric quartz transducers (Kistler model 601 B) were used to measure the pressure. These transducers have a rise time of 1.5 μs, natural frequency of 300 kHz, and can accurately record pressures up to 18,000 psi (1225 atm). The transducers were mounted in a water-cooled adapter (Kistler model 628C) which prevented drifting or damage caused by excessive heat. The signals from the pressure transducers were carried through an insulated, high-impedance, coaxial cable [Model 121 M(x)] with a capacitance of 30 pF/foot, to a charge amplifier (Kistler model 504E). The amplified signals were recorded on FM channels of a 14-channel AM/FM tape recorder (Hewlett-Packard model 3924B).

Two separate systems were used to simultaneously record the ignition event. A high-speed, 16-mm, motion picture camera (Hycam Model K20S4E-115) was used to observe the complete ignition event in the chamber. The camera was capable of filming at a maximum of 16,000 pictures per second and was equipped with a dual LED timing system which recorded the common-time and timing marks on the film. The LED driver unit, a common-time pulse and high frequency (up to 10 kHz) timing generator, was used to operate the LED timing system. A photodiode system was also used to observe ignition at the tip. A camera lens (Schneider-Kreuznauch, 150 mm) was used to focus the tip region onto a photodiode (E.G. and G. model SGD040A). When the tip region is ignited the photodiode gives out a signal which is amplified and recorded on the magnetic tape.
FIGURE 12. Block Diagram of Remotely-Controlled Ignition and Photography System.
FIGURE 13. Block Diagram of Data Acquisition System.
The data recorded on tape were digitized using a 4-channel Biomation Model 1015 waveform digitizer with a 1024-word memory per channel, and a capability of maximum real-time resolution of 10 µs. Output from the digitizer can be displayed on an oscilloscope (Tektronix type 535 A), or plotted on an x-y plotter (Hewlett-Packard model 7044A) for a hard copy.

Correlated experimental data are shown in Figures 14 to 18. Even though pressures were measured at four axial locations, only the traces at the entrance and the tip are shown in the figures. The first discernible pressure rise for each pressure gauge occurred consecutively from the crack entrance to the crack tip. The pressurization rates recorded at various gauge locations along the crack indicate that the pressurization rates decrease consecutively downstream of the crack entrance. This attenuation can be attributed to the inert nature of the crack. A typical pressure-time trace at the tip can be divided into three regions: (1) the pressurization region where the pressure continuously increases; (2) the constant pressure region; and (3) the depressurization region. The uprising portion of the pressure-time trace at the crack tip location is quite linear. In most of the tests, the ignition occurred during the uprising portion of the pressure-time curve at the crack tip location.

Ignition is defined in this report as the onset of emission of luminous light from the propellant surface. This luminous light can be detected by either the high-speed motion picture camera or the photodiode. The high-speed camera was used for all the tests; the photodiode system was used only during the later tests. It was noted that the photodiode system alone cannot give a very reliable signal (see Figure 18). This is due to the fact that the photodiode picks up light reflected from the walls of the stainless steel combustion chamber even before the onset of ignition at the propellant tip. With a high-speed motion picture it was possible to record a more complete ignition event, thereby reducing the chance of error.

The common-time signal is not shown in any of the results presented in Figures 14 to 18. This is because there is a 4 to 5 ms time lag between the common-time signal and the first discernible pressure rise at the pressure gauge located at the crack entrance. Since the region of interest is the uprising portion of the pressure traces, that region has been expanded, and, therefore, the common-time signal cannot be included in the same figure. The time-correlated pressure and ignition data indicated that the time of first discernible pressure rise coincides with the appearance of hot igniter gases at the crack entrance. The time delay between the appearance of the hot igniter gases at the crack entrance and the ignition at the tip was obtained from the motion picture recording. The time lag between the first discernible pressure rises at the crack entrance and crack tip was obtained from the pressure-time trace. The difference between these two time lags is the
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FIGURE 14. Measured Pressure-Time Traces for Crack Tip Ignition Experiment (DNC Test No. 30).
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FIGURE 17. Measured Pressure-Time Traces for Crack Tip Ignition Experiment (DNC Test No. 41).
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FIGURE 18. Measured Pressure-Time Traces for Crack Tip Ignition Experiment (DNC Test No. 42).
ignition delay time for the propellant at the tip. This is identical to the definition given in the section on Theoretical Work, i.e., the ignition delay time is the time lag between the arrival of the pressure wave at the tip and the incipient ignition. The plot of ignition delay time and pressurization rate is given in Figure 2 (Theoretical Work). Ignition delay times are plotted against the pressurization rate at the tip (Gage 5); no effort was made to relate them to pressurization rates at the crack entrance (Gage 2).

INVESTIGATION OF THE ONE-DIMENSIONALITY OF THE FLAME FRONT

Experimental firings were conducted to determine the one-dimensionality of the flame front. The crack was formed between a propellant slab which was slightly regressed below the brass leg assembly and the inner surface of the plexiglass sacrificial window which was mounted on top of the leg assembly, i.e., one side of the crack was an inert, transparent, plexiglass window and the other side was the propellant slab. With this type of configuration, it was possible to observe the flame propagation process by looking directly at the burning propellant surface. A schematic diagram of the test sample used for this type of test is shown in Figure 19. The gap width of the crack was varied between 0.018 and 0.060 in. (0.46 and 1.52 mm). The length of the sample was about 7.2 in. (183 mm), and the width was about 0.7 in. (17.7 mm).

Two pressure traces were obtained for this configuration: one at the crack entrance and the other at the crack tip. The pressure traces for DNC Test No. 24 are shown in Figure 20. The two pressure traces are quite similar. The flame spreading event for DNC Test No. 24 is depicted in Figure 21. The filming rate approximately about 12,000 pictures per second. A detailed discussion of the flame spreading event is given in Table 2. Some of the general observations that can be made from these tests are: (1) the hot gases precede the ignition front along the crack and reach the tip much earlier than the convective ignition front; (2) the hot gases are luminous for a short time, with the luminosity disappearing later; this can be attributed to the quenching of the hot gases; (3) the flame front is nonuniform near the crack entrance, but becomes quite uniform along the crack and near the tip. It can be concluded that, except near the entrance region of the crack, the one-dimensional assumption for the flame propagation is quite appropriate. The nonuniformity of the flame front near the entrance region can be attributed to the nonuniform flow at the entrance of the rectangular-cross-sectional crack channel. These experiments support the one-dimensional assumption used in the theoretical model.
FIGURE 19. Geometric Configuration of the Propellant Sample Used in DNC Test No. 24. (All Dimensions are in mm)
EFFECT OF PROPELLANT CRACK GEOMETRY

Tests were continued for the purpose of studying the effect of propellant crack geometry on the ignition and flame-spreading phenomena. Since tests are still in progress, the detailed results and discussion will be included in the next report. A millmount (an attachment to the index table) has been designed and fabricated to manufacture tapered cracks in the laboratory. Using the millmount, a maximum taper angle of about 6 degrees can be manufactured. At very high chamber pressurization rates, the present high-speed motion picture recording system gives only a few useful pictures of the flame-spreading event. A quarter frame head camera, capable of recording up to 44,000 pictures per second, has been acquired through the Pennsylvania State University in order to increase the number of pictures and to achieve better time resolution. Even at this high speed, there is still the possibility that some events, such as partial or transient ignition, etc., may not be filmed because of the discrete nature of the framing process. At the suggestion of Dr. R. L. Derr, a streak attachment to the Hycam camera was obtained to alleviate this problem.
FIGURE 21. Motion Pictures of the Flame Spreading Phenomenon for DNC Test No. 24.
FIGURE 21. (Continued.)
TABLE 2. Interpretation of the Motion Pictures in Figure 21 (DNC Test No. 24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture No.</th>
<th>Time, ms</th>
<th>Observations and interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Hot igniter gas enters the rectangular duct at the bottom of the main chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>The crack entrance is ignited. Hot gases penetrate into the crack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>The ignition front is still near the entrance. The hot gases penetrate 30% of the crack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>The hot gases penetrate more than 30% of the crack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>2.50-2.72</td>
<td>Hot gases gradually penetrate the whole length of the crack. The ignition front still near the entrance region of the crack and appears nonuniform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>The luminosity of the hot gases starts to decrease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>The hot gas front recedes to about 70% of the crack. The ignition front moves up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>Hot gas front disappears. The ignition front penetrates about 50% of the crack length. Ignition front appears quite uniform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,60</td>
<td>5.67,6.69</td>
<td>The ignition front gradually moves up to about 66% of the crack. It appears quite uniform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,92</td>
<td>9.0,10.32</td>
<td>The ignition front eventually engulfs the whole crack length.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AND CONCLUSIONS

The progress made during the past 12 months in the study of combustion processes inside solid propellant cracks can be summarized as follows:

1. A theoretical model has been developed to explain the tip-ignition phenomena. It considers one-dimensional, unsteady mass and energy conservation equations for the gas-phase near the crack tip.
Experimentally observed pressure-time trace near the crack-tip region has been used instead of a gas-phase momentum equation. A transient, one-dimensional heat conduction equation is considered for the solid phase.

2. A computer program has been implemented, based upon the above theoretical model. It uses a stable, implicit scheme for the solution of the finite-difference equations. The program can predict ignition delay time, rate of heat flux to the propellant surface, temperature distribution, etc., as functions of pressurization rates.

3. Experiments were conducted in an inert crack to eliminate some of the possible mechanisms for the ignition at the tip. Test firings were conducted in the inert crack to obtain the effect of pressurization rate at the crack-tip on the ignition delay time of the test propellant placed at the crack tip.

4. Both the theoretical and experimental results of the tip ignition tests indicate that the ignition delay time decreases as the pressurization rate is increased. Theoretically calculated ignition delay times are in good agreement with experimental data. Based upon this agreement, the ignition at the crack tip is considered to be caused by the enhanced turbulent energy transport in the gas phase, which is driven by strong compression waves.

5. The crack combustion code (CCC) has been merged with a structural analysis program (NFAP). Initial computer runs of the combined code showed that the solid mechanics and combustion phenomena are interdependent.

6. The crack geometry changes, not only because of burning, but also because of mechanical deformation. The combustion phenomena could either enhance or retard, depending upon the variation in geometry along the crack. More realistic computation of the combustion phenomena inside the crack should be based upon the combined program (CCC/NFAP).

7. The complete set of governing equations for describing the transient combustion phenomena inside a solid propellant crack which undergoes geometry change due to both combustion and mechanical deformation, has been nondimensionalized. A set of governing dimensionless parameters has been obtained to aid future data correlation and analysis.

8. Experiments were conducted to investigate the one-dimensionality of the ignition front. Results indicate that, except near the entrance region of the solid propellant crack, the one-dimensional assumption of the flame front propagation is quite appropriate.
9. Experiments were continued to investigate the effect of propellant crack geometry on the ignition and flame-spreading phenomena. A millmount has been designed and fabricated to manufacture tapered cracks. A quarter frame head camera and a streak attachment to the high-speed camera have been obtained to facilitate more accurate visual recording of the flame-spreading and ignition events.
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Appendix A

BASIC DEFINITIONS AND OPERATION RULE FOR FAVRE AVERAGING

Definitions

\[ \rho = \overline{\rho} + \rho' \]

\[ P = \overline{P} + P' \]

\[ u = \overline{u} + u'' \]

\[ T = \overline{T} + T'' \]

\[ h = \overline{h} + h'' \]

Operation Rules

For any quantity, \( \alpha \),

\[ \overline{\alpha} = \frac{\overline{\alpha \rho}}{\overline{\rho}} \]

\[ \overline{\alpha' \overline{\rho}''} = 0 \]

\[ \overline{\alpha''} = -\frac{\overline{\alpha' \rho''}}{\overline{\rho}} \]

\[ \overline{\alpha} - \overline{\alpha'} = \overline{\alpha''} \]

\[ \overline{\alpha' \rho''} = \overline{\rho' \alpha''} \]

\[ \overline{\alpha''} = -\frac{\overline{\rho' \alpha'}}{\overline{\rho}} \]
DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN OBTAINING ANALYTICAL SOLUTIONS

The final equation for the gas phase (Eq. 12) as derived in section 3 is:

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - x \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \Delta \ln \left(\frac{P}{P_1}\right) \left(1 + c t \gamma \right)^{\gamma - 1} = T \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(1 + c t \gamma \right)^{\gamma - 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(1 + c t \gamma \right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial x}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2-1)

If we make the following additional assumptions:

1. \( P = P_1 (1 + c t \gamma) \)
2. \( \rho = \rho_\infty \)
3. Outside the thermal boundary layer near the propellant surface the compression process is isentropic: i.e., \( \frac{P}{P_1} = \left(\frac{T}{T_1}\right)^{\gamma - 1} = \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_\infty}\right)\gamma \)
4. \( k = \frac{1}{2} \left[ k_1 + k_\infty \right] \)
5. \( k_\infty = k_1 \left[ \frac{T_\infty}{T_1} \right]^\omega \)

Then Eq. (2-1) becomes:

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - x \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \Delta \ln \left(\frac{P}{P_1}\right) \left(1 + c t \gamma \right)^{\gamma - 1} = T \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(1 + c t \gamma \right)^{\gamma - 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(1 + c t \gamma \right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + \frac{\alpha^4}{4} \left[ \frac{1 + (1 + c t \gamma)^{\gamma - 1}}{(1 + c t \gamma)^{\gamma - 1}} \right] \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2-2)

Introducing

\[
\theta = \frac{T}{T_1} \left(1 + c t \gamma \right)^{\gamma - 1} \quad (2-3)
\]

i.e., \( T = T_1 \left[ \theta + (1 + c t \gamma) \right] \)

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = T_1 \left[ \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + \frac{d}{dt} \left(1 + c t \gamma \right) \right] \left(1 + c t \gamma \right)^{\gamma - 1}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial x} = T_1 \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} = T_1 \frac{\partial^2 \theta}{\partial x^2}
\]
Substituting these into (2-2), we get:

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} - x \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \frac{1}{\ln(1 + ct^n)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}} = \frac{\alpha_0}{2} \frac{[1 + (1 + ct^n)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}]}{(1 + ct^n)^{1/\gamma}} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2-4)

This equation can be transformed into the form of a diffusion equation by the following transformation:

\[
\tau \equiv \frac{\xi^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}}{2} \int_0^t \left[ 1 + (1 + ct^n)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \right] \frac{1}{(1 + ct^n)^{1/\gamma}} \, dt
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2-5)

\[
X \equiv x c^{2n} \alpha_0^2 (1 + ct^n)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2-6)

which results in:

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} = \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2-7)

I.c. \hspace{0.1cm} t = 0 \rightarrow \tau = 0; \hspace{0.1cm} \phi = 0

B.c.1 \hspace{0.1cm} x = 0 \rightarrow X = 0; \hspace{0.1cm} \phi = \phi_0 \hspace{1cm} (t)

B.c.2 \hspace{0.1cm} x \rightarrow -\infty; \hspace{0.1cm} X \rightarrow -\infty; \hspace{0.1cm} \phi \rightarrow 0

For the propellant, if we define

\[
T_p \equiv T_p - T_i
\]

Equation (1) of Section 3 becomes:

\[
\frac{\partial^2 T_p}{\partial x^2} = \frac{1}{\frac{\rho}{\lambda_p}} \frac{\partial T_p}{\partial \tau}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2-9)

I.c. \hspace{0.1cm} t = 0 \hspace{0.1cm} T_p = 0

B.c.1 \hspace{0.1cm} x = 0 \hspace{0.1cm} \frac{k_p}{\frac{\partial T_p}{\partial x}} = k_{eff} \frac{1}{T_i} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} \left[ x = 0 \right]

B.c.2 \hspace{0.1cm} x \rightarrow \infty \hspace{0.1cm} \phi = 0

For the propellant, if we define

\[
T_p \equiv T_p - T_i
\]

Equation (1) of Section 3 becomes:

\[
\frac{\partial^2 T_p}{\partial x^2} = \frac{1}{\frac{\rho}{\lambda_p}} \frac{\partial T_p}{\partial \tau}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2-9)

I.c. \hspace{0.1cm} t = 0 \hspace{0.1cm} T_p = 0

B.c.1 \hspace{0.1cm} x = 0 \hspace{0.1cm} \frac{k_p}{\frac{\partial T_p}{\partial x}} = k_{eff} \frac{1}{T_i} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} \left[ x = 0 \right]

B.c.2 \hspace{0.1cm} x \rightarrow \infty \hspace{0.1cm} \phi = 0

62
In order to find a solution Eqs. (2-7) and (2-9) must be solved simultaneously. A solution for Eq. (2-7) or (2-8) can be obtained using Duhamel's integral theorem. However, when the heat flux is matched at the boundary (B.c.1 of Eq. 2-10), one obtains an integral relationship, which does not seem to be analytically solvable.
Structural Analysis Input Format

I. HEADING
Card 1 (18A4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 72</td>
<td>HED(18)</td>
<td>Master heading information for use in labeling output</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. MASTER CONTROL CARD
Card 1 (I5, 6I1, I4, 13I5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>NUMNP</td>
<td>Total number of nodal points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6       | IDOF(1)  | Master X-translation code  
          |          | EQ.0: admissable  
          |          | EQ.1: deleted    |
| 7       | IDOF(2)  | Master Y-translation code  |
| 8       | IDOF(3)  | Master Z-translation code  |
| 9       | IDOF(4)  | Master X-rotation code     |
| 10      | IDOF(5)  | Master Y-rotation code     |
| 11      | IDOF(6)  | Master Z-rotation code     |
| 12 - 15 | NEGL     | Number of linear element groups  
          |          | EQ.0: all elements are nonlinear |
| 16 - 20 | NEGNL    | Number of nonlinear element groups  
          |          | EQ.0: all elements are linear |
### Card 1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>MODEX</td>
<td>Flag indicating solution mode  &lt;br&gt; EQ.0: data check and plot initial geometry  &lt;br&gt; EQ.1: execution  &lt;br&gt; EQ.2: restart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>NSTEP</td>
<td>Number of solution time steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>IPRI</td>
<td>Output printing interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>ISAVE</td>
<td>Restart-save time step interval  &lt;br&gt; EQ.0: no saving for restart  &lt;br&gt; GE.1: interval of saving step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>ISTAPE</td>
<td>Flag indicating saving solution on the tape  &lt;br&gt; EQ.0: no  &lt;br&gt; EQ.1: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td>IEQB</td>
<td>Specified block size  &lt;br&gt; EQ.0: calculated automatically during the program run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 55</td>
<td>NRENUM</td>
<td>Flag indicating node renumbering to minimize bandwidth  &lt;br&gt; EQ.0: no node renumbering  &lt;br&gt; EQ.1: node renumbering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 60</td>
<td>NPLLOT</td>
<td>Flag indicating plotting option  &lt;br&gt; EQ.0: no plot  &lt;br&gt; EQ.1: plot initial mesh  &lt;br&gt; EQ.2: Plot geometry at selected time steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 65</td>
<td>NTIE</td>
<td>Tying degrees of freedom option  &lt;br&gt; EQ.0: not active  &lt;br&gt; EQ.1: active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 80</td>
<td>ISTAT</td>
<td>Flag indicating static or dynamic analysis  &lt;br&gt; EQ.0: static analysis  &lt;br&gt; EQ.1: dynamic analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Card 2 (4I5, E10.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>ISREF</td>
<td>Number of time steps between reforming effective stiffness matrix. EQ.0: default set to 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>NUMREF</td>
<td>Number of allowable stiffness reformations in each time step.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>IEQUIT</td>
<td>Number of time steps between equilibrium iterations. EQ.0: default set to 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>ITEMAX</td>
<td>Maximum number of equilibrium iterations. EQ.0: default set to 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>RTOL</td>
<td>Relative tolerance used to measure equilibrium convergence. EQ.0: default set to $10^{-3}$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 3 (2F10.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>TSTART</td>
<td>Time of solution start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Time step increment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 4 (3I5, 2F10.2, 20X, 3F5.0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>KPLOT</td>
<td>Plotting option code to pick axis orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>MAXND</td>
<td>Maximum number of nodes in any element to be plotted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>MAXNM</td>
<td>Maximum number of elements in any group to be plotted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 25</td>
<td>VLEN</td>
<td>Length of the horizontal axis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Card 4 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>WLEN</td>
<td>Length of the vertical axis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 65</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Scale factor to magnify displacements of deformed geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 - 70</td>
<td>CMAG(1)</td>
<td>Scale factor to magnify X coordinates (including displacements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 75</td>
<td>CMAG(2)</td>
<td>Scale factor to magnify Y coordinates (including displacements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 80</td>
<td>CMAG(3)</td>
<td>Scale factor to magnify Z coordinates (including displacements)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 5 (1515)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>NPT(1)</td>
<td>First selected solution step to be plotted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>NPT(2)</td>
<td>Second selected solution step to be plotted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 80</td>
<td>NPT(15)</td>
<td>15th selected solution step to be plotted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 6 (Blank)

control card to suppress NFAP displacement printing routines
### III. NODAL POINT DATA

Card 1: \((A1, I4, A1, I4, 515, 3F10.0, I5)\)

*input as many cards as required for all nodes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | CT       | Coordinate system code  
|         |          | EQ.(blank): cartesian \((X,Y,Z)\)  
|         |          | EQ.-X: \(X\)-cylindrical  |
| 2 - 5   | N        | Node (joint) number  
|         |          | GE.\(1\) and LE. NUMNP  |
| 6       | PSF      | Print suppression flag  
|         |          | (ignored unless N.EQ.1)  
|         |          | EQ.(blank): no suppression  
|         |          | EQ-A: suppress list of nodal coord.  
|         |          | EQ-B: suppress list of eqtn. numbers  
|         |          | EQ-C: both A and B above  |
| 7 - 10  | ID(1,N)  | \(X\)-translation boundary code  
|         |          | EQ.0: free  
|         |          | EQ.1: fixed  |
| 11 - 15 | ID(2,N)  | \(Y\)-translation boundary code  |
| 16 - 20 | ID(3,N)  | \(Z\)-translation boundary code  |
| 21 - 25 | ID(4,N)  | \(X\)-rotation boundary code  |
| 26 - 30 | ID(5,N)  | \(Y\)-rotation boundary code  |
| 31 - 35 | ID(6,N)  | \(Z\)-rotation boundary code  |
| 36 - 45 | X(N)     | \(X\) coordinate  |
| 46 - 55 | Y(N)     | \(Y\) coordinate  |
| 56 - 65 | Z(N)     | \(Z\) coordinate  |
| 66 - 70 | KN       | Node number increment for nodal data generation  
|         |          | EQ.0: no generation  |
### IV. LOAD CONTROL CARDS

#### Card 1 (815)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column(s)</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>NLOAD</td>
<td>Number of cards used to prescribe nodal forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>NLCUR</td>
<td>Total number of load curves (time functions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>NPTM</td>
<td>Maximum number of points used to describe one of the load curves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GE. NLCUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>Impact loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.0: no impact loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.1: include impact loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>NPRES</td>
<td>Maximum number of elements in any element group subjected to pressure (no. of pressure subgroups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>NLCP</td>
<td>Number of load curves used for pressure load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ. NLCUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>NDLS</td>
<td>Number of pressure load tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>IPGD</td>
<td>Pressure load with geometry dependent flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.0: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.1: yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. INITIAL CONDITIONS

#### Card 1 (Blank)

Insert blank to specify zero initial conditions
VI. TWO-DIMENSIONAL CONTINUUM ELEMENTS

Card 1 ( 3X, A1, 2I4, 4X, I4, 4X, I4, 8X, I4, 8X, I4, 4X, 4I4 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NPAR(1)</td>
<td>Enter &quot;2&quot; for 2-D elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>NPAR(2)</td>
<td>Number of 2-D elements in this group GE. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>NPAR(3)</td>
<td>Type of nonlinear analysis EQ.0 or 1: material nonlinear analysis only EQ.2: total Lagrangian EQ.3: updated Lagrangian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 20</td>
<td>NPAR(5)</td>
<td>Element type code EQ.0: axisymmetric EQ.1: plane strain EQ.2: plane stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 28</td>
<td>NPAR(7)</td>
<td>Maximum number of nodes to describe one element EQ.0: default set to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - 40</td>
<td>NPAR(10)</td>
<td>Numerical integration order to be used in Gauss quadrature formulae EQ.0: default set to 2 GE. 2 and LE. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 - 52</td>
<td>NPAR(13)</td>
<td>Number of stress output location tables EQ.0: print stresses at integration points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 - 60</td>
<td>NPAR(15)</td>
<td>Material model numbers EQ.1: linear isotropic EQ.9: linear viscoelastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 64</td>
<td>NPAR(16)</td>
<td>Number of different sets of material properties GE. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 68</td>
<td>NPAR(17)</td>
<td>Number of constants per property set EQ.7: if NPAR(15) .EQ. 1 EQ.4: if(NPAR(15) .eq. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 - 72</td>
<td>NPAR(18)</td>
<td>Dimension of storage array required for element history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Card 2  ( I5  )

Columns  Variable  Entry
1 - 5     N         Material property set number

Card 3A  ( 2F10.0 )
Use if linear isotropic material

Columns  Variable  Entry
1 - 10    PROP(1,N) Young's modulus
11 - 20   PROP(2,N) Poisson's ratio

Card 3B  ( 4F10.0 )
Use if linear viscoelastic material

Columns  Variable  Entry
1 - 10    PROP(1,N) Bulk modulus
11 - 20   PROP(2,N) $G_\infty$ (first term in the relaxation modulus expression)
21 - 30   PROP(3,N) $(C - G_\infty)$, factor in the second term of the relaxation modulus expression
31 - 40   PROP(4,N) Beta, exponential time constant in the relaxation modulus expression

Card 4A  ( 5I5 )
Card 4A and 4B needed for each element

Columns  Variable  Entry
1 - 5     M         Element number
                GE. 1 and LE. NPAR(2)
6 - 10    IEL       Number of nodes used to describe this element
                EQ.0: default set to NPAR(7)
Card 4A Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>Number of the stress table to be used in stress calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.0: no stress output for the element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>MTYP</td>
<td>Material property set number assigned to this element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GE. 1 and LE. NPAR(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>KG</td>
<td>Node generation parameter used to compute node numbers for missing elements (given on the first card of the sequence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.0: default set to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 4B (815)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>NOD(1)</td>
<td>Global node number of element node point 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>NOD(2)</td>
<td>Global node number of element node point 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>NOD(8)</td>
<td>Global node number of element node point 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. APPLIED LOADS

Card 1 (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>IPCCC</td>
<td>Code for pressure input source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.0: read pressure load from input deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.1: Pressure load will be determined through linkage to the CCC program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Skip card set 2 if IPCCC .EQ. 1, otherwise supply NLCUR sets with 2 or more cards per set

### Card 2A (215)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>NTF</td>
<td>Time function number GE. 1 and LE. NLCUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>NPTS</td>
<td>Number of points used to describe this time function GE. 2 and LE. NPTM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Card 2B (8F10.0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>TIMV(1)</td>
<td>Time at point 1, (t_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>RV(1)</td>
<td>Function at point 1, (t_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>TIMV(2)</td>
<td>Time at point 2, (t_2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>RV(2)</td>
<td>Function at point 2, (t_2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 80</td>
<td>RV(4)</td>
<td>Function at point 4, (t_4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(next card if required)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>TIMV(5)</td>
<td>Time at point 5, (t_5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>RV(5)</td>
<td>Function at point 5, (t_5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Card 3A ( 315 )

Repeat card set 3 NDLS times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pressure table ID number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>NFACE</td>
<td>Element face on which the pressure is acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>LTC</td>
<td>Load type code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.0: Default set to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.1: normal pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.2: hydrostatic pressure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 3B ( F10.0 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>P(1)</td>
<td>Fraction of pressure at nodes along pressure loaded surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 4 ( 2I5 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Element group number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>NPRSG</td>
<td>Number of subgroups of elements in this element group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repeat this card set for as many as NPRSG cards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>NELPI</td>
<td>First element number for this subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>NELPF</td>
<td>Last element number for this subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>NELINC</td>
<td>Element number increment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>ITABLE</td>
<td>Pressure table ID number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>NCURP</td>
<td>Load curve ID number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 6 (Blank)

Place two blank cards at end of data to signal end of file
### Convective Burning Analysis Input Format

#### I. HEADING

Card 1 (20A4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 80</td>
<td>TITLE(20)</td>
<td>Master heading information for use in labeling output</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. COMPUTATIONAL CONSTANTS

Card 1 (5E10.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>XIP</td>
<td>Location of the inlet of the gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Distance downstream at which propellant begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>XG</td>
<td>Position at end of propellant in the crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>XE</td>
<td>Position at the end of the crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>BX</td>
<td>Body force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 2 (6E10.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Average molecular weight of all combustion gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>GAMA</td>
<td>Ratio of specific heats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>ROPR</td>
<td>Density of solid propellant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>FKPR</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity of solid propellant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>ALPHAP</td>
<td>Thermal diffusivity of solid propellant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>ROUGH</td>
<td>Equivalent relative roughness of the port wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card 3 ( 7E10.4 )</td>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Adiabatic flame temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>TPSCRI</td>
<td>Temperature at which surface ablation occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pre-exponential factor in the non-erosive burning rate law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>BREXP</td>
<td>Pressure exponent in the non-erosive burning rate law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>EBC</td>
<td>Pre-exponential constant in the Lenoir-Robillard erosive burning relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>EBEX</td>
<td>Factor in exponent of the Lenoir-Robillard erosive burning relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 70</td>
<td>TPSIGN</td>
<td>Temperature at which ignition of the solid propellant occurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card 4 ( 4E10.4 )</th>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>TGI</td>
<td>Initial gas temperature in the crack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>Initial pressure in crack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>UGI</td>
<td>Initial gas velocity in the crack (to facilitate the start of a numerical solution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>TPI</td>
<td>Initial propellant temperature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Card 5 (7I10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>NITER</td>
<td>Number of iterative predictor calculation&lt;br&gt;EQ.1: the solution is obtained from quasilinearized inhomogeneous terms&lt;br&gt;EQ.2: Predict twice before corrector calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>NPRINT</td>
<td>Printing interval, number of time step calculations after which output is printed out&lt;br&gt;GE. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>NPUN</td>
<td>Output punching interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>NSPAVE</td>
<td>Number of time step calculations before space-averaging takes place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>Number of time step calculations after each of which balance of the conservation and governing equation is performed and printed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>NINERT</td>
<td>Flag to indicate whether there is an inert wall or not&lt;br&gt;EQ.0: no inert wall&lt;br&gt;GT.0: inert wall present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 70</td>
<td>NSLAB</td>
<td>Number of propellant slabs forming the crack&lt;br&gt;EQ.1: there is one slab and one inert wall&lt;br&gt;EQ.2: there are 2 propellant slabs forming the crack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Card 6 (37I10, 2E10.4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>NTPPDE</td>
<td>Flag to choose method of solution to find solid propellant temperature&lt;br&gt;EQ.1: P.D.E. solution will be used to solve heat conduction equation&lt;br&gt;NE.1: Goodman's integral solution will be used to solve surface temperature variation equation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Card 6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11 - 20 | ISTART  | Restart option code  
|         |          | EQ.0: no restart  
|         |          | NE.0: program restart  
| 21 - 30 | KXRITE  | Node number at which the in-depth propellant temperature profile will be printed  
|         |          | if NTPDE EQ. 1.  
|         |          | Print out occurs after every NBL time steps  
| 31 - 40 | FAC     | Variable used to generate unequally spaced in-depth grid  
|         |          | EQ.0: produces uniform grid  
|         |          | EQ. 0.3 typically  
| 41 - 50 | YTPDIP  | In-depth location where the dipstick ignition criterion applies  

### Card 7 (7E10.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 - 10  | DELTAX   | Spacewise step for the numerical calculations  
| 11 - 20 | DELTAT   | Time step for the numerical calculations  
| 21 - 30 | TI       | Time of solution start  
| 31 - 40 | TMAX     | Maximum time of a computer run or a restart run  
| 41 - 50 | EPSLON   | Small value to bypass the singularity in the propellant surface temperature  
| 51 - 60 | DDRG     | Friction coefficient multiplication factor  
| 61 - 70 | DDHC     | Heat transfer coefficient multiplication factor  
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### Card 8 (4E10.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>TSAV1</td>
<td>Time before which the space-averaging weight SAVMIN is used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>TSAV2</td>
<td>Time after which the space-averaging weight SAVMAX is used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>SAVMIN</td>
<td>Space-average percentage weight of the values at the neighboring mesh points specified for the time before TSAV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>SAVMAX</td>
<td>Space-average percentage weight of the values at the neighboring mesh points specified after TSAV2. Between TSAV1 and RSAV2 there is a linear increase in the space-average weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Card 9 (4E10.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>TTT1</td>
<td>Time before which the Crank-Nicolson parameter has the value THETAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>TTT2</td>
<td>Time after which the Crank-Nicolson parameter has the value THETAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>THETAN</td>
<td>Value of the Crank-Nicolson parameter for time before TTT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>THETAX</td>
<td>Value of the Crank-Nicolson parameter for time after TTT2. Between TTT1 and TTT2, a linear increase is specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. GEOMETRY OF CRACK SAMPLE

Card 1 ( I5 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>NAPDVX</td>
<td>Number of points in the input table of crack geometry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 2 ( 3F15.6 )
Supply NAPDVX sets of card 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>XAP</td>
<td>Distance from the entrance of the crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 30</td>
<td>BPD</td>
<td>Burning perimeter of the propellant crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45</td>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Port area of the crack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 3 ( 3F15.6 )
Supply NAPDVX sets of card 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>XAP</td>
<td>Distance from the entrance of the crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 30</td>
<td>WPD</td>
<td>Total wetted perimeter of the propellant crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45</td>
<td>THETAG</td>
<td>Angle between propellant wall and the longitudinal axis of the crack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IV. TEST CONDITIONS

### Card 1 (15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>NTSTP</td>
<td>Number of points used to specify the chamber pressure and temperature of rocket with respect to time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Card 2 (3E12.4)

Supply NTSTP sets of card 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 12</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Chamber pressure of rocket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 24</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Chamber temperature of rocket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 36</td>
<td>TSTP</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

SAMPLE DATA FOR NFAP/CCC COMBINED PROGRAM
### NFAP INPUT DATA (INPUT UNIT 24)

**CARD**

1. 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80

1. **SAMPLE PROBLEM**: 2/D ANALYSIS OF PROPELLANT CRACK (92 ELEMENTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>1. . . . . 10. . . . . 20. . . . . 30. . . . . 40. . . . . 50. . . . . 60. . . . . 70. . . . . 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>244 0 0 15.26540 0.150 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>296 0 0 16.53540 0.150 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>232 0 0 14.94790 0.050 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>310 0 0 16.85290 0.050 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>245 0 0 15.26540 0.050 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>297 0 0 16.53540 0.050 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>316 1 1 17.17040 0.750 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>317 1 1 17.17040 0.650 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>318 1 1 17.17040 0.550 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>319 1 1 17.17040 0.450 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>320 1 1 17.17040 0.350 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>321 1 1 17.17040 0.250 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>322 1 1 17.17040 0.150 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>323 1 1 17.17040 0.050 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>220 0 0 14.63040 0.04375 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>298 0 0 16.53540 0.04375 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>221 0 0 14.63040 0.03750 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>299 0 0 16.53540 0.03750 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>233 0 0 14.94790 0.03750 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>311 0 0 16.85290 0.03750 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>222 0 0 14.63040 0.03125 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>300 0 0 16.53540 0.03125 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>223 0 0 14.63040 0.02500 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>301 0 0 16.53540 0.02500 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>234 0 0 14.94790 0.02500 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>312 0 0 16.85290 0.02500 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>224 0 0 14.63040 0.01875 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>302 0 0 16.53540 0.01875 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>225 0 0 14.63040 0.01250 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>303 0 0 16.53540 0.01250 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>235 0 0</td>
<td>14.94790 0.01250 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>313 0 0</td>
<td>16.85290 0.01250 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>226 0 0</td>
<td>16.63040 0.00625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>304 0 0</td>
<td>16.53540 0.00625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>227 0 1</td>
<td>14.94790 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>236 0 1</td>
<td>15.26540 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>253 0 1</td>
<td>15.58290 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>262 0 1</td>
<td>15.90040 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>279 0 1</td>
<td>16.21790 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>288 0 1</td>
<td>16.53540 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>305 0 1</td>
<td>16.85290 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>314 0 1</td>
<td>17.17040 0.04375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>324 1 1</td>
<td>17.17040 0.03750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>325 1 1</td>
<td>17.17040 0.03125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>326 1 1</td>
<td>17.17040 0.02500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>327 1 1</td>
<td>17.17040 0.01875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>328 1 1</td>
<td>17.17040 0.01250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>329 1 1</td>
<td>17.17040 0.00625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>330 1 1</td>
<td>17.17040 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>331 1 1</td>
<td>17.17040 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>0 16 16 0 23 16 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>2 92 3 1 8 0 0 9 1 4 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>49201429. 14901. 45969. 0.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1 8 0 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>3 17 15 1 i1 16 10 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>15 8 0 i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>199 213 211 197 207 212 706 198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>16 8 0 i 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>16 8 0 i 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GCC INPUT DATA (INPUT UNIT 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>FDNC NO. 21 INITIAL INPUT AT TIME ZERO (NEW)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0000E+00 0.0000E+00 0.0000E+00 0.0000E+00 0.0000E+00 0.0000E+00 0.0000E+00 0.0000E+00 0.0000E+00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6100E+01 2.6100E+01 2.6100E+01 2.6100E+01 2.6100E+01 2.6100E+01 2.6100E+01 2.6100E+01 2.6100E+01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0000E+00 3.0000E+00 3.0000E+00 3.0000E+00 3.0000E+00 3.0000E+00 3.0000E+00 3.0000E+00 3.0000E+00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9850E+01 2.9850E+01 2.9850E+01 2.9850E+01 2.9850E+01 2.9850E+01 2.9850E+01 2.9850E+01 2.9850E+01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 015 4000 1 4000 1 4000 1 4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 0 20.2000D-00 0 0 20.2000D-00 0 0 20.2000D-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00 1.000E+00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0 5.0 0.762000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.48767 5.0 0.508000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.97534 5.0 0.254000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.63 5.0 0.254000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0000 5.6800 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.48767 5.6800 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.97534 5.2800 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.63 5.2800 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.3350E+02 0.0000E+00 0.0000E+00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.6646E+02 0.0000E+00 0.002000E-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.9969E+02 0.0000E+00 0.004000E-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.3292E+02 0.0000E+00 0.006000E-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.5087E+02 0.0000E+00 0.000000E-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOMENCLATURE

A
Axial transformation constant for the gaseous region, cm

Al
Axial transformation constant for the solid region, cm

AP
Cross-sectional area of the crack, cm

Cp
Specific heat at constant pressure, cal/g-K

e
Strain deviator

g
Acceleration of gravity, conversion factor, g-cm/gf-s

Gl
Relaxation Modulus, gf/cm

h
Enthalpy of gas, cal/g

hc
Local convective heat transfer coefficient, cal/cm²-s-K

L
Length of the crack, cm

k
Thermal conductivity, cal/cm-s-K

keff
k + kt

K
Bulk modulus, gf/cm²

Mw
Molecular weight, gf/g-mole

P
Pressure, gf/cm²

Pr
Prandtl number

p
Pressure, gf/cm²

pb
Burning perimeter, cm

pw
Wetted perimeter of the port, cm

R
Specific gas constant for the combustion gases, gf-cm/g-K

Re
Reynolds number

T
Temperature (without subscript, gas temperature), K

Tf
Adiabatic flame temperature of the solid propellant, K

Tp
Initial propellant temperature, K

Tps
Propellant surface temperature, K

t
Time, s

u
Gas velocity, cm/s

x
Axial coordinate, measured from propellant surface, m

z
Transformed nondimensional axial coordinate

α
Thermal diffusivity, cm²/s

β
Time constant, s⁻¹

γ
Ratio of specific heats

δ
Gap width of the crack, cm

c
Strain tensor

λ
Thermal conductivity, cal/cm-s-K

u
Gas viscosity, g/cm-s
\( \rho \) Density (without subscript, gas density), g/cm\(^3\)
\( \sigma \) Stress tensor
\( \phi \) Dissipation, cal/cm\(^3\)-s

Subscripts
- \( c \) Rocket chamber
- \( cri \) Critical condition for surface ablation
- \( fp \) Flame propagation
- \( i \) Initial value
- \( ign \) Ignition condition
- \( p, pr \) Propellant
- \( t \) Turbulent

Superscripts
- \( \cdot \) Dimensionless parameters or Favre averaged quantity
- \( * \) Reference parameters
- \( - \) Reynold's or time averaged quantity
- \( ' \) Fluctuating quantities in Reynold's average method
- \( '' \) Fluctuating quantities in Favre's average method
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