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A general purpose squeeze-film damper interactive force element has been developed, coded into a software package (module) and debugged. This software package has been applied to nonlinear dynamic analyses of some simple rotor systems. Results for pressure distributions show that the long-bearing (end-sealed) is a stronger bearing as compared to the short-bearing as expected. Results of the nonlinear dynamic analysis, using a four-degree-of-freedom simulation model, showed that the orbit of the rotating shaft increases nonlinearly to fill the bearing clearance as the unbalanced weight increases.
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NOMENCLATURE

C = radial clearance of damper annulus
D = nominal damper annulus diameter = 2R
e = damper eccentricity
F_x = X-component of damper force
F_y = Y-component of damper force
h = damper annulus film thickness distribution
L = damper length
p = damper film thickness distribution
R = nominal damper annulus radius
t = time
x = Rθ = damper annulus circumferential coordinate
X = X-direction radial motion coordinate
Y = Y-direction radial motion coordinate
z = damper annulus axial coordinate
μ = damper lubricant viscosity
Ω = frequency of vibration excitation

SPECIAL TERMINOLOGY

Infinitely Long Bearing Model - axial flow is neglected \( \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \ll \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \)
Infinitely Short Bearing Model - circumferential flow is neglected \( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \ll \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \)
Driver Code - Any computer code which calls the squeeze-film damper force computation code
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Section 1
SUMMARY

As a result of the first-year effort on this grant, a general purpose squeeze-film damper interactive force element has been developed, coded and debugged. This software package has been applied in nonlinear dynamic analyses of some simple rotor systems.

The work completed under this first-year grant is a significant step in the development of strategies and add-on software packages which will be needed to apply available advanced nonlinear finite-element codes (such as ADINA) to general engine dynamic simulation. Also, a detailed discussion is provided of the direction of effort for the next two years.
Section 2

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

2.1 Engine System Dynamics

Present day jet engine configurations have evolved primarily through a trial-and-error process involving extensive testing. There are many fundamental dynamic phenomena which take place within these engines for which basic description and understanding have yet to be generated. Nonetheless, they work well. Modern aircraft engines are typical of current high-technology products in which the recently acquired computing capabilities of today are being used to better understand and improve what is already designed, built and operating.

A better understanding of the basic dynamic characteristics of existing and new engine configurations is a prerequisite for producing acceptable engine efficiencies on advanced configurations (i.e. smaller rotor/stator running clearances). Also, a better definition of engine dynamic response would more than likely provide valuable information leading to reduced maintenance and overhaul costs on existing configurations. Furthermore, application of advanced engine dynamic simulation methods could potentially provide a considerable cost reduction in the development of new engine configurations by eliminating some of the trial-and-error process done with engine hardware.

The emergence of advanced finite element codes, such as NASTRAN, NONSAP, MARC and ADINA, and related algorithmic advances, have placed comprehensive engine system dynamic analyses within...
reasonable reach. What remains to be done is to develop new component element software to properly model engine rotor/stator interactive components, such as squeeze-film damper, within the algorithmic logic of already proven finite element codes. This is the major mission of this grant.

2.2 The Function of Squeeze-Film Dampers

For good reasons, aircraft engines use rolling element bearings exclusively. This design philosophy has, until recent years, deprived engines of the beneficial damping inherent in many other types of rotating machinery where fluid-film journal bearings are used. The implementation of squeeze-film dampers in recent engine designs has now provided engine designers with an effective means of vibration energy dissipation. The net result is that the newer engines with squeeze-film dampers are less sensitive to residual rotor imbalance and better able to control vibration and transmitted force levels resulting from various excitation sources within the engine.

2.3 Currently Available Analysis Procedures and Limitations

The field of rotor dynamics has evolved to its present state primarily through the solution to problems in types of machinery other than aircraft engines. In most other types of rotating machinery (e.g., steam turbines, centrifugal pumps and compressors, fans, generators, motors, etc.) the rotor can be adequately modelled as an Euler or Timoshenko beam;\[1\] In addition, the support structure holding each bearing can often be adequately modelled as a separate mass-damping-stiffness path to ground
(i.e., to the inertial frame). Also, for most purposes, bearing lubricating film dynamic properties are characterized as stiffness and damping elements, linearized for small vibration amplitudes about some static equilibrium state. It is this level of sophistication that has been utilized for the most part in rotor-dynamic analyses of aircraft engines (e.g., Hibner [2]).

Present day aircraft engines are structurally far more complex than most other types of rotating machinery. The multi-shaft configuration, plus the fact that the shafts are thin rotating shells, not simple beams, creates unique but significant complicating differences between aircraft engines and other machinery. Also, the stator structural support at each rotor bearing represents anything but a separate mass-damper-stiffness path to an inertial frame. In fact, setting the inertial frame for the engine is not a simple matter when the full range of in-service maneuvers is realized. Dynamic paths between different bearings exist not only through the rotor but through several other paths within the non-rotating engine structure, i.e., a "multi-level multi-branch" system. As many as eight significant "levels" have been identified.

The feasibility of nonlinear dynamic analyses of multi-bearing flexible rotors has been recently demonstrated on non-aircraft applications (see Adams [3]). There are highly nonlinear dynamic effects in aircraft engines, particularly under large excitation forces, such as blade or disk failures, hard landings and foreign matter ingestion events.
Clearly, the field of aircraft engine dynamics is presently in a position where there is both a need for substantial advances and feasible means available by which such advances can be accomplished.

2.4 The Need for Time-Transient Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses

In recent years it has become evident that an important class of engine dynamic phenomena can not be studied without accounting for the highly nonlinear forces produced at bearings, labyrinths and other close-running rotor/stator clearances under large amplitude vibrations. In such cases, linear theory typically predicts vibration amplitudes larger than the actual running clearances. Furthermore, important vibratory phenomena, such as subharmonic resonance and motion limit cycles, are "filtered" out of the problem with a linear model, giving grossly erroneous predictions, qualitatively as well as quantitatively.

With few exceptions, nonlinear dynamic problems must be solved numerically as time-transient responses, whether the sought "answer" is a steady state periodic motion or is strictly a transient phenomenon. The problem is mathematically categorized as an initial value problem in which the displacements and velocities of the complete system must all be specified at the beginning of the transient. From that point forward in time, the equations of motion are numerically integrated (known as "marching") as far in time as one wishes to study the system motions and forces. If the system is dynamically stable, the transient motion dies out yielding the steady state response
which in a system with a periodic force excitation will be a periodic motion. In a stable system with no time-varying force excitation, the transient will die out as the system comes to rest at one of its stable static equilibrium positions. If the system is unstable, the transient does not die out but continues to grow in time unless or until some nonlinear mechanism in the system limits the motion to what is frequently called a "limit cycle".

In order to study the general dynamical characteristics of aircraft engines, nonlinear dynamic computational schemes are required. The approach taken in this grant is to develop software packages to model engine components which are not typically found on dynamical structures and therefore are not already built into existing nonlinear finite-element structural dynamics computer codes. This first-year effort has concentrated on developing such a software package for squeeze-film bearing dampers.

2.5 First-Year Effort, Development of Damper Element

The main objective of the first-year effort was to develop a squeeze-film damper element (i.e., software package) suitable for implant into a general purpose nonlinear finite-element computer code. This objective has been met in full. Furthermore, workable strategies have already been developed to implant this damper element. Also, the damper element has been extensively tested on simple rotor/stator configurations under a wide variety of dynamic loading conditions. These results are presented in subsequent sections of this report.
Section 3
BEARING DAMPER ELEMENT

3.1 Introduction

The bearing damper finite element code is essentially an interactive element to represent squeeze film dampers. That is, its purpose is to bridge the "gap" between structural elements which are separated in the actual engine by a squeeze film damper. In its simplest version, it has an input/output setup as shown in Figure 1. As the bearing-damper element is extended to encompass more types of rotor/stator interactive forces (e.g., rubs, impacts, etc.) the input/output list will expand.

A source listing of the bearing damper element code developed during the first-year is given in Appendix A of this report.

3.2 Governing Equations

The rotor/stator interactive force generated in a bearing squeeze film damper is modeled using an adaptation of the classical Reynolds lubrication equation for incompressible laminar isoviscous films.

\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{h^3}{\mu} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x}\right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\left(\frac{h^3}{\mu} \frac{\partial p}{\partial z}\right) = 6 \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(hU) + 12 \frac{dh}{dt}
\end{equation}

where:
- \(z\) = axial coordinate
- \(x\) = circumferential coordinate = \(r\theta\)
- \(h\) = local film thickness
- \(\frac{dh}{dt}\) = instantaneous local rate of change in \(h\)
U = sliding velocity = Rω, typically zero in a damper
C = radial clearance of damper annulus

The relationship between system inertial coordinates and damper parameters comes through the expression for h, ∂h/∂x and dh/dt. Referring to Figure 2, these relationships are summarized as follows:

\[ \ddot{e} = (X_R - X_S)\hat{i} + (Y_R - Y_S)\hat{j} \] (2)

then

\[ h = C - \dot{e} \cdot \hat{n}_\theta = C - (X_R - X_S) \cos \theta - (Y_R - Y_S) \sin \theta \] (4)

\[ \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta} = \frac{1}{R} \left[ (X_R - X_S) \sin \theta - (Y_R - Y_S) \cos \theta \right] \] (5)

and

\[ \frac{dh}{dt} = -(X_R - X_S) \cos \theta - (Y_R - Y_S) \sin \theta \] (6)

3.3 Typical Configurations and Boundary Conditions (see Figures 3, 4, 5)

Some engine manufacturers do not use centering springs in general on either military or commercial application because of fatigue. This can require using a tighter clearance and thus requires a tighter control on dimensional tolerances on annulus diameters. In both cases \( \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} \ll \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} \), i.e., axial pressure drop within annulus is much smaller than circumferential pressure drop. This reduces the governing equation (1) to,

\[ \frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{h^3}{\mu} \frac{dp}{dx} \right) = 12 \frac{dh}{dt} \] (7)

the "infinitely long" bearing equation for zero rotation (U = 0).
Other less frequently used configurations do not employ end seals, in which case the "short bearing" approximation or its equivalent is used. In this case, the local axial end flow is considered to far outweigh the circumferential flow leading the "short bearing" approximation.

\[
\frac{d}{dz} \left( \frac{h^3}{\mu} \frac{dp}{dz} \right) = 12 \frac{dh}{dt} \quad (8)
\]

Actually, an improved adaptation of the short-bearing approach is obtained by implementing the parabolic assumption of O'Donoghue [9]. That is, the following approximation is made,

\[
p(\theta,z) = p(\theta,0)(1 - \frac{4z^2}{L^2}) \quad (9)
\]

which assumes an axially symmetric axial pressure distribution at every circumferential location. This then gives the following pressure field equation.

\[
\frac{1}{\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( h^3 \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} \right) = 12 \frac{dh}{dt} + 8 \frac{p(\theta,0)h^3}{L^2} \quad (10)
\]

This is actually a first-order Fourier approximation using the parabola as the single approximative function.

A convergent approximation to the full two-dimensional Reynolds equation can be obtained, as an extension of the foregoing approach by O'Donoghue [9]. The number of Fourier terms is increased to N, resulting in N simultaneous ordinary differential equations.

\[
p(\theta,z) = p_1(\theta,0) \cos \frac{\pi z}{L} + p_2(\theta,0) \cos \frac{3\pi z}{L} + ... \\
+ p_N(\theta,0) \cos \frac{(2n-1)\pi z}{L} \quad (11)
\]
Substitution into the general 2-D Reynolds equation (1), expansion of the right hand side (RHS) by the same series, followed by LHR:RHS segregation by the arguments under cosine yields N ordinary differential equations, one for each \( p_i(\theta,0) \).

3.4 Method of Solution

Whether the long-bearing formulation (7) or the other two formulations described by (10) and (11) are used, the following solution method is employed. It is described below as implemented for the long-bearing formulation.

Based on 3-point central difference,

\[
\begin{align*}
    h^3 \frac{d^2 p}{dx^2} + 3h^2 \frac{dp}{dx} \frac{dp}{dx} &= 12\mu \frac{dh}{dt} \\
    \frac{d^2 p}{dx^2} &= \frac{p_{i+1} - 2p_i + p_{i-1}}{\Delta x^2} \\
    \frac{dh_i}{dx} (\frac{p_{i+1} - p_{i-1}}{2\Delta x}) &= 12\mu \frac{dh_i}{dt} 
\end{align*}
\]

Rearranging

\[
\begin{align*}
    p_{i+1}[\frac{h^3_i}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{3h^2_i dh_i}{\Delta x^2}] + p_i[-\frac{2h^3_i}{\Delta x^2}] + p_{i-1}[\frac{h^3_i}{\Delta x^2} - \frac{3h^2_i dh_i}{\Delta x^2}] &= 12\mu \frac{dh_i}{dt} \\
    \boxed{D_j} &\quad \boxed{C_j} &\quad \boxed{E_j} &\quad \boxed{R_j}
\end{align*}
\]

Recurrision relationship,

\[
C_j p_j + E_j p_{j-1} + D_j p_{j+1} = R_j, \text{ form of difference equation}
\]
Employ the form,

\[ P_{j-1} = A_j P_j + B_j \]

Then,

\[ C_j P_j + E_j (A_j P_j + B_j) + D_j P_{j+1} = R_j \]

or

\[ P_j (C_j + E_j A_j) + E_j B_j + D_j P_{j+1} = R_j \]

Then,

\[ P_j = \frac{-D_j}{C_j + E_j A_j} P_{j+1} + \frac{R_j - E_j B_j}{C_j + E_j A_j} \]

\[ A_{j+1} = \frac{-D_j}{C_j + E_j A_j} \]

\[ B_{j+1} = \frac{R_j - E_j B_j}{C_j + E_j A_j} \]

From upstream boundary condition the \{A\} and \{B\} vectors are determined by starting with \( A_2 = 0, B_2 = P_1 \) (called forward sweep).

The downstream boundary condition is inserted at the beginning of the backward sweep, i.e.

\[ P_{M-1} = A_M P_M + B_M \]

\[ P_{M-2} = A_{M-1} P_{M-1} + B_{M-1} \]

\[ \vdots \]

\[ P_2 = A_3 P_3 + B_3 \]

Film rupture is handled by the following substitution. If \( P_j < P_{\text{vapor}} \), set \( P_j = P_{\text{vapor}} \) before computing \( p_{j-1} \). This is
equivalent to the condition \( \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = 0 \) at the film-rupture full-film boundary. In the case of the 2-D convergent approach indicated by eqn. (11), this point-by-point test is made on the local summation \( P(\theta_j, z) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} P_k(\theta_j, z) \).

The method of solution although not closed-form, is non-iterative. While it does entail a one-dimensional finite-difference scheme, it requires only a very small amount of CPU time and is therefore ideally suited to time transient rotor dynamics analyses. It has major advantages over the purely closed-form approximations, e.g., [10,11]. These major advantages are immediate account of specified-pressure boundary conditions at feed and drain holes of a damper. Also, the finite difference approach easily permits account of static as well as dynamic deflections which alter the oil film gap geometry from ideal rigid circular shapes.

3.5 Force and Force Gradients

Forces Components on Rotor:

\[
F_x = - \int_{A} \rho \cdot \cos \theta \, dA = -LR \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} \rho(\theta) \cos \theta \, d\theta
\]

\[
F_y = - \int_{A} \rho \cdot \sin \theta \, dA = -LR \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} \rho(\theta) \sin \theta \, d\theta
\]

Stator Force Components:

\[
F'_x = -F_y, \quad F'_y = -F_y
\]

Force Gradients:

\[
[C_{ij}]_{2x2} = - \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j}; \quad [K_{ij}]_{2x2} = - \frac{\partial \dot{F}_i}{\partial \dot{x}_j}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\Delta F_i}{\Delta x_j}; \quad \frac{\partial \dot{F}_i}{\partial \dot{x}_j} = \frac{\Delta \dot{F}_i}{\Delta \dot{x}_j}
\]
Numerical differentiation is performed with small $\Delta X_j$ and $\Delta X_j$ increments about instantaneous conditions. This provides continuous updating of $\{F_j\}$, $[C_{ij}]$ and $[K_{ij}]$. See Appendix A for the computer code source listing of the completed squeeze-film element SQUEEZE.

Section 4
APPLICATION OF DAMPER ELEMENT

4.1 Introduction

For purposes of checking out the damper element code and to demonstrate its use, two types of computations were made and the results presented herein. First, a parametric study of damper pressure distributions was made for a variety of specified circular orbits, for both long-bearing and short bearing solutions. Second, a four-degree-of-freedom rotor-damper-stator model was investigated under conditions of small rotor unbalance through large rotor unbalance. These results are reported in the following sections.

4.2 Pressure Distributions for Specified Circular Orbits

For this series of computations the following damper annulus parameters were used.

Diameter, $D = 6$ in.
Length, $L = 1.25$ in.
Radial clearance, $C = 0.010$ in.
Lubricant viscosity, $\mu = 1 \times 10^{-6}$ reyns
Angle between inlet oil port and drain port, $(\theta_i - \theta_o) = 180^\circ$
Inlet oil port pressure, $P_1 = 55$ psia
Drain port pressure, $P_0 = 15$ psia
Lubricant vapor pressure, $P_v = 1.5$ psia
Orbit angular velocity, $\Omega = 3600$ cpm (376.99 rad/sec)

The above damper parameters are typical for modern gas turbine aircraft engines. A parametric study was made postulating the outer ring of the damper fixed and the inner ring having a constant-radius constant-velocity concentric orbit. Eccentricity ratios (i.e., orbit radius/radial clearance) from 0.05 to 0.95 were computed, both for the long-bearing and short-bearing solutions (both are presently incorporated in the damper-element computer code).

Circumferential center-line pressures were plotted as a function of circumferential position and time, for one period of prescribed motion. The results for the long-bearing solution are shown in Figure 6, and Figure 7 for the short-bearing solution. The difference between long-bearing and short-bearing solutions is quite large, particularly as motion amplitudes get smaller. The long-bearing solution provides a considerably stronger damper, thus the common preference of designers to use end-sealed dampers.

4.3 Nonlinear Dynamic Response of Simple Rotor Systems

A simple "driver" code was written (see Appendix B for listing) which uses the damper-element code in the same manner as a general application with large finite-element codes. The "driver" code is based on a four (4) degree-of-freedom system
i.e., planar motion of the inner and outer damper elements. This then simulates a single-mass rotor connected to a single-mass stator via the damper element. The system analyzed is shown in Figure 8. The model is coded to simulate arbitrary rotating and/or static radial loads. Aside from demonstration purposes, this four (4) degree-of-freedom model has been devised to check against the same type of system when executed with the damper element implanted into the general purpose nonlinear finite-element code ADINA, which the University of Akron has purchased as its contribution to this grant.

Note from Figure 8 that the high pressure port (i.e., feed port) is located on the bottom of the damper so as to assist "lift-off". Since centering springs are not typically used, they have been excluded in this example. Lift-off therefore requires some amount of vibration to overcome the dead weight load. Rotating unbalance loads of 100, 200, 300, 500 and 1000 lbs were run with \( \Omega = 150 \) rad/sec. Orbital plots were made showing rotor and stator total motion on one plot and rotor-relative-to-stator motion on a second plot. The plotted results are shown in Figure 9 through 13.

For a 100 lb rotating load (Figure 9) the motions shown are for a 20 cycle transient from time \( = 0 \). The rotor and stator each show close to the same motion, and their relative motion is small, with the rotor barely "lifting off". The relative orbit is essentially oscillatory. However, when the rotating load is increased to 200 lbs, (Figure 10), the relative orbital
motion shows the beginnings of orbital motion, i.e., a "crescent moon" shape as measured by numerous investigators. Further increase in magnitude of the rotating load to 300 lbs (Figure 11) shows a well defined steady-state total motion as well as relative motion. Note that with a 300 lbs rotating load, the relative (rotor-to-stator) orbit is still small in comparison to the radial damper clearance and confined to the region of the bottom of the damper. However, an increase of rotating load magnitude to 500 lbs causes a considerable change to the relative orbit (Figure 12). Notice now that the relative motion of the rotor with respect to the stator fills a major portion of the clearance circle. Further increase of rotating load magnitude to 1000 lbs (Figure 13) simply causes the steady-state relative orbit to expand and fill even more of the damper clearance circle.

Section 5

FINITE ELEMENT IMPLANT STRATEGY

The previous sections gave a thorough discussion of the development of the interactive squeeze film bearing element. This section will outline ongoing efforts aimed at incorporating these elements into the finite element procedure. In this context, the discussion will be organized into several main parts, namely:

i) Choice of FE code used for initial implantation;
ii) Overall solution strategy; and,
iii) Solution algorithms employed.
5.1 Choice of FE Code Used for Initial Implantation

Before discussing the choice of FE code adopted, it is worthwhile to briefly overview various of the salient features associated with rotor-bearing-stator modelling. To organize our thoughts, we consider them in two main phases, namely:

i) Normal operating conditions; and,
ii) Abnormal operating conditions.

For normal situations, since the clearance between the blade and shroud and the various engine seals are quite small, the overall kinematic description can be characterized by small strains superposed on an initially small field [4]. Because of this, except for local zones, the overall structural material characterization can be considered essentially Hookean in nature. In this context, the structural modelling of the engine can be considered essentially linear in nature. Regardless of this though, as has been seen from the discussion in the previous sections, even small unbalance loads can initiate highly nonlinear interactive forces in the squeeze film bearings. Because of such nonlinearity, under normal operating conditions the rotor-bearing-stator system can be modelled as a partitioned system wherein the structural components are linear while the bearings are nonlinear.

For abnormal operating conditions, the rotor excursions are on the order of the various blade and seal clearances. In this context, due to the relative smallness of such clearances, the deformation process can be characterized by at most small
strain moderate rotations superposed on small initial fields [12]. Since such kinematic excursions are still deemed small, except for local events *, the global structural material behavior can still be considered Hookean. Because of this, the structural modelling of the engine can be assumed kinematically nonlinear. Obviously, during a fatal event both kinematic and massive material nonlinearity are evidenced during structural collapse.

In the context of the foregoing, it is of utmost importance that the FE test code chosen have adequate nonlinear element substructural capabilities to allow for the proper partitioning into linear and nonlinear element groups. This obviously enables more efficient running characteristics. Together with the partitioning capabilities, the code should also have an efficient updating architecture. As this feature is typically the heart of any nonlinear solution strategy, it is an absolutely essential characteristic. In addition to the foregoing features, the code chosen to test the bearing element should have [5]:

i) Accessible program architecture;
ii) Efficient running characteristics; and,
iii) Flexible algorithmic options.

* blade impacts, creep/fracture of blades
Since many general purpose codes such as NASTRAN, STRUDL, FESAP, etc. are essentially linear with grafted nonlinear capabilities, they tend to have a less efficient/flexible program architecture. Because of this, our attention must turn to codes such as ADINA, ANSYS, MARC, etc. Since ANSYS and MARC have somewhat inaccessible program architecture, the ADINA program was chosen to check out the "bearing element implant". This follows since ADINA has the requisite combinations of capabilities, namely [6].

i) Nonlinear element partitioning feature;
ii) Efficient updating architecture;
iii) Flexible algorithmic options;
iv) Accessible program architecture; and,
v) Efficient running characteristics.

5.2 Overall Solution Strategy

The initial approach taken has been to implant the bearing element directly into the ADINA architecture so that direct numerical time integration algorithms can be employed to generate the transient rotor stator solution. To simplify the discussion, the presentation will be organized into several main areas, namely:

i) Element architecture;
ii) Overall FE code architecture; and,
iii) Solution methodology
The overall architecture of the bearing element is being structured to have several main options, namely:

i) Initial I/O;
ii) Interactive I/O;
iii) Generalized stiffness and damping connectivity; and,
iv) Generalized element library.

The initial I/O options involve a one-time input of various pre-selected parameters including such categories as:

i) Geometric configuration;
ii) Material properties;
iii) Element selection; and,
iv) Required element connectivities.

Each of these categories are in turn broken down into several different items, for instance:

1. Geometric Configuration
   i) Inner and outer damper radii
   ii) Bearing length
   iii) Orientation of oil feed grooves
   iv) Structural clearances
   v) Placement of roller bearings

2. Material Properties
   i) Oil properties
   ii) Temperature dependence
   iii) Roller bearing force deflection characteristics
3. Element Selection
   i) Short bearing
   ii) Infinite bearing
   iii) Roller bearing characterization
   iv) Rub/impact

4. Required Element Connectivities

Several of the foregoing parameters are being coded to be interactively redefined depending on the nature and level of excitation for example, temperature and structural clearances fall into this category. Additionally, such field variables as film forces as well as the instantaneous tangent stiffness and damping matrices are being coded so as to be interactively re-defined. Such parameters are updated depending on the nature of the interactively calculated position and velocity histories.

In this context, the various interactive field quantities now being coded into the bearing implant associated with the ADINA code consist of:

1. Velocity differential developed across the squeeze film;
2. Positional differential developed across the squeeze film;
3. Interactive force field developed;
4. Tangent stiffness matrix developed by squeeze film;
5. Tangent damping matrix developed by squeeze film; and,
6. Tangent stiffness of roller bearing.

To generalize the capability of the "bearing implant", the initial and interactive I/O modes of data transfer are being developed so as to admit fairly extensive structural con-
Figurations. This includes the possibility of accessing the entire array of structural elements inherent to ADINA together with the various constitutive models including

1. Hookean
2. Plasticity
3. Temperature dependent properties
4. Mooney Rivilin [3], etc.

The overall architecture of the bearing implant is defined in Figures 14 and 15. As can be seen in Figure 14, the bearing implant is being imbedded in a buffer routine which will serve primarily as a link between the various data transfer modes of ADINA, namely:

i) Common blocking (dynamic form);
ii) Subroutine parameter lists;
iii) Disk I/O.

The buffer routine will also serve to convert the interactive information into the appropriate partitioned form for assembly into the mainstream of data flow inherent to ADINA. Namely, the tangent stiffness and damping matrices together with the interactive forces will be assembled into the proper locations in their global counterparts. This is currently being programmed into both the in core and out of core storage mode options inherent to ADINA.

Additionally, the buffer routine will be programmed to contain a degree of adaptive updating which will enable a more accurate calculation of the tangent stiffness and damping matrices.
Specifically, since the stiffness and damping matrices are calculated by admitting a perturbation in the position and velocity fields of a given state, care must be taken to insure that the perturbation is neither too small nor too large. In the case that the perturbation is too large then the stiffness calculated will act more like a secant stiffness and hence be inaccurate. If too small, then roundoff error may be introduced into the calculations. To circumvent this difficulty, the current and past fields are compared. If the percentage changes are deemed too large/small, then the levels of perturbation introduced can be either contracted or expanded to insure proper evaluation of the tangent matrices.

While the structure of the buffer will be somewhat dependent on the ADINA architecture [7] the main core of the beam implant will be more or less code independent. The actual flow of data into the core of the implant is achieved by subroutine argument lists. Figure 15 defines the overall flow of control within the core program of the bearing implant. The architecture of the core program is being made flexible enough to admit new options as they become available.

Based on the foregoing bearing element implant, the architecture of the overall FE code is defined in Figure 16. As can be seen, the overall flow of control is broken into several major steps, namely:

1. Initial I/O, including:
   i) Structural information
   ii) Bearing information
iii) Boundary conditions
iv) Applied load
v) Element connectivities

2. Structural element generation, including:
i) Linear elements
ii) Partitioned assembly of linear elements
iii) Nonlinear stiffness update loop with partitioned assembly of nonlinear structural elements

3. Bearing element generation, including:
i) Tangent stiffness and damping matrix generation
ii) Development of right-hand side loads
iii) Partitioned assembly

4. External load generation

5. Integration algorithm, including:
i) "Stiffness" inversion
ii) Implicit integration
   a) Newmark
   b) Wilson
iii) Explicit integration
   a) Central difference

6. Convergence checks
   i) Norm test of out of balance loads and nodal displacements
   ii) Higher order checks

7. Clearance checks
8. Adaptive Strategies, including [7]:
   i) Structural stiffness updating
   ii) Bearing stiffness updating
   iii) Choice of perturbation size
   iv) Choice of integration algorithm
   v) Choice of time step size
   vi) Preferential partitioned updating, etc.

A simplified view of the actual flow of control is given in Figure 17. This figure includes both the linear and nonlinear structural loops. Currently such modifications are being inserted into the ADINA architecture.

5.3 Solution Algorithms

As noted earlier, having developed the "bearing element", the current thrust is to implant the element into ADINA wherein direct numerical integration will be employed to generate the transient solution. In this context, several types of integration operators are being incorporated into the coding. In particular various versions of the following operators are being considered:

1. Newmark [9]
2. Wilson [10]
5. Hughes [12]
6. Felippa, Park, etc. [13]
Section 6
DISCUSSION - DIRECTIONS OF FUTURE WORK

In view of the modelling deficiencies noted earlier, a more direct way of handling the structural aspects of the rotor-bearing-support (RBS) system is necessary if a proper transient/steady state model is to be developed for jet engines. In this direction, it appears that the finite element (FE) method is the requisite modelling approach for such problems. This follows from the fact that its inherent capabilities include the following features:

i) The FE procedure has the capability to handle multi-branch/level structure in a more direct and efficient manner than flexibility approaches;

ii) The approach is well suited to handle nonlinearities due to:
   a) kinematic and kinetics associated with the structure [14];
   b) various types of boundary and constraint conditions [14], and;
   c) material characterization [14,15].

iii) A body of established and proven algorithms which can handle various types of nonlinearities has evolved; this includes both the capability to handle static [14,15] as well as transient situations [14,16];

iv) Modelling of overall RBS systems more direct as extensive element libraries are currently available; this includes beam, plate, shell, 2-D, as well as 3-D elements [15].
v) Algorithmic adaptability.

Currently available general purpose codes such as NASTRAN, MARC, ANSYS, ARGUS, ADINA, ASKAII, NEPSAP, FESAP, SAPVI all have most of the foregoing items implemented as user features [17]. Although these codes possess the required degree of generality to model the structural aspects of jet engine rotor-stator structure, what is currently lacking are interactive "bearing type elements" and the overall algorithmic strategies to handle conservative/nonconservative interactive type forces. In turbine engine, such fields are generated in the squeeze film dampers and labyrinth seals and during rub-impact events.

In addition to the foregoing modelling difficulties, there is also a need to better quantify the effects of such factors as:

i) Rotor/stator static de-centering forces generated via:
   a) manufacturing tolerances
   b) thermal warps
   c) high "g" forces
   d) in service damage and wear,

ii) Degree of structural nonlinearity encountered,

iii) In service dynamic phenomena (rubs, impacts, etc.).

6.1 Compatibility With Proven Finite Element Codes

As noted earlier, while currently available FE codes possess the requisite generality to handle the structural aspects of RBS system modelling, no provisions are currently available to model the conservative/nonconservative effects of squeeze film damp-
ers, seals, rubs, impacts, etc. In view of this, future efforts will be given to developing a variety of special purpose "bearing elements" which can model such rotor/stator interactive force fields. These "elements" will be developed so as to be both algorithmically as well as architecturally compatible with proven FE codes. In this direction, it appears that codes such as ADINA would be the most likely software candidates about which such a development should be configured. This follows from the twofold fact that such codes have the following:

i) Extensive and well proven dynamic/element capacity,

ii) An architecture developed to allow the user to modify the overall algorithmic flow of a given solution loop.

6.2 Preliminary Engine Dynamics Analyses

The computational schemes ultimately implemented to track engine dynamic response will have to function properly over a wide spectrum of motion frequency and a wide range of nonlinearities. The development of computationally reliable interactive elements, such as the bearing/damper element, will therefore require a simplified engine dynamics analysis, using available rotor-dynamics computer codes, to realistically assess potential computational difficulties. For example, specifying the outer envelope or limits of the bearing/damper element must be predicated on a correct understanding of relative rigidities and dynamic participation of individual components in and around the bearing. These analyses include the following: (i) linear unbalance forced response, (ii) linear nonsynchronous forced
response, (iii) linear self-excited instability analysis, and (iv) simplified time-transient nonlinear analysis.

6.3 Interactive Elements for Labyrinth Seals

The typical jet engine configuration contains several labyrinth seals. The flow field within these seals results from the combined effects of rotation and pressure-gradient induced axial through flow. Depending upon the design parameters of a labyrinth seal, either a centering or decentering static radial force can be produced on the rotor. Likewise, the mechanical impedance (stiffness, damping and virtual mass) between rotor and stator at the labyrinth seal is a strong function of design details. Carefully conducted experiments by Wright [18] have recently shown that the labyrinth aerodynamic forces can be either stabilizing (positive damping) or destabilizing (negative damping) depending upon the direction of entering flow pre-swirl and the direction of rotor whirl.

The full importance of labyrinth seals to total engine dynamic analyses is therefore not confined only to the potential for rotor/stator rubs and impacts under high vibration levels. A realistic simulation of engine dynamic phenomena, linear as well as nonlinear, must therefore include a comprehensive mathematical model for the labyrinth seals which are located throughout the engine. The development and implementation of a labyrinth-seal interactive element is therefore important future work.
6.4 Rotor-Stator Rub/Impact Elements

While significant efforts have been given to developing codes which can handle the impact behavior of compressor blades, no work is currently available on modelling rotor-stator rub-impact events. Due to the structural flexibility and close tolerances inherent to gas turbine engines, such phenomena must undoubtably play an important role in defining the transient/steady state behavior during moderate and large excursion situations. Because of this, in addition to developing "bearing elements" some attention must be given to FE modelling the rotor-stator rub-impact events occurring in the labyrinth seals, and blade-case zone. Such "rub-impact elements" will have to be capable of:

i) Tracking the appropriate rotor-stator clearances
ii) Model impact-detachment mechanisms
iii) Model traction and kinematic constraints generated during rubbing
iv) Properly model energy losses occurring during such events

6.5 Rotor/Stator Static Radial Offsets Loads

The stiffness and damping characteristics of fluid film bearings are highly dependent upon their static centering or de-centering loads. Clearly, the squeeze-film dynamic forces will change considerably as static radial load is applied at the bearing since a shift of equilibrium eccentricity position will occur. Prominent sources of static radial offset loads result from each of the following:
i) Manufacturing and assembly tolerances
ii) Thermal distortions
iii) High g-force
iv) In-service damage and wear
v) Aerodynamic forces

An evaluation of these static radial offset loads is in itself a major effort. However, a realistic computer-simulation of various engine dynamic phenomena can not be accomplished without a successful effort to determine the static interactive forces between rotors and stator.

6.6 Structural Nonlinearities

In addition to modelling nonlinearities induced by the rotor/stator interactive force fields, purely structural effects may also be encountered. Such structural nonlinearities fall into two main categories:

i) Kinematic and kinetic (geometric) [14]
ii) Material characterization; plasticity, viscoplasticity

The kinematic-kinetic characterization itself falls into three main categories, namely small deflections, small strains-large rotations and moderate/large strains. Apart from highly localized events such as impact-rub zones, the most prevalent geometric modes will most probably be typified by small deflection or at most small strain-moderate rotation characterizations.

For localized rotor/stator rub-impact zones, in addition to interactive traction fields and surface machining, potential
plastic flow and moderate straining may occur. Beyond inducing outright failure, such localized fields may have a significant enough effect on the geometric configuration as to cause engine imbalance.

Because of the foregoing, the potential existence of kinematic-kinetic and constitutive nonlinearity must be accommodated in the overall model. Since the effects of such nonlinearity are fairly well localized, a partitioned linear/nonlinear approach should be employed for the finite element model.

6.7 Dynamic Loads

Emergency modes of operation, such as occur with blade failure, hard landings and foreign matter ingestion events, will require a comprehensive investigation to identify and model the resulting dynamic input loads to the engine system. Some worthwhile information could be obtained from a comprehensive engine dynamics simulation, even with postulated high amplitude dynamic input loads, such as the relative endurance of two different engine configurations. However, real-event simulation will require an accurate prior appraisal of dynamic load inputs to the engine system which result from identifiable emergency operating modes. The effort required to determine reliable estimates of dynamic input force time or frequency signature could be substantial.

As noted earlier, the engine structure must survive a rather severe operating environment. In addition to extreme thermal and aerodynamic loads, the RBS system may be subject to:
i) Transient and steady state inbalance loads

ii) Rotor-stator rub-impacts

iii) Rotor-stator decentering forces

Such events are generally caused by a combination of the following broad categories of factors:

i) Blade erosion

ii) Blade-disk-seal failure

iii) Thermal warps of rotor-stator structure due to ratcheting and creep

iv) Misalignments due to manufacturing tolerances

v) High "g" loads due to maneuvering

In view of the foregoing, future analytical modelling of RBS systems inherent to engines must employ proven computational schemes which possess the capability to handle as wide a cross-section of the loading environment as possible. As the time history of such loading events covers a wide range of time scale, the overall approach must also possess a high degree of algorithmic adaptability so as to accommodate both explicit and implicit integration schemes [16]. This is of potential importance since such schemes have been found to have varying degrees of success over various time scales [16].

6.8 Simulation of In-Service Dynamic Phenomena

The direction of future work outlined here will represent a major advancement in the state-of-the-art of engine system dynamic analysis. Proper account of structural complexities, various rotor/stator interactive forces (static and dynamic),
important nonlinearities, aerodynamic forces and well defined
dynamic load inputs will provide a greatly expanded scope in
the types of engine dynamics phenomena that could be studied.
Engine configuration improvement studies which are impractical
to accomplish through testing can then be pursued through
systematic dynamic simulation studies.

Also, a better understanding of the dynamic behavior of
existing engine configurations can provide valuable information
leading to major reduction in engine maintenance and overhaul
costs. Engine dynamic behavior is becoming progressively more
important as efficiency improvement considerations push rotor/
stator running clearances progressively smaller. A realistic
evaluation of potential engine reliability degradation result­
ing from smaller rotor/stator running clearances demands the
high level of dynamic system simulation described here.

Section 7
CONCLUSIONS

General engine dynamic analyses which properly account for
rotor-to-stator and rotor-to-rotor interactive forces can be
approached through the use of available general purpose nonlinear
finite-element computer codes. Interactive forces originating
at bearing squeeze-film dampers and rub-impact events are, how­
ever, not available with general purpose codes at this time. The
work described herein shows the viability of using general purpose
finite-element codes for engine dynamic analysis. Also, the four-
degree-of-freedom example model demonstrates the use of the
squeeze-film damper code developed in this work. Results with this demonstration model are consistent with the results of other investigators of nonlinear squeeze-film damper dynamics.
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APPENDIX A

Damper Element Fortran Listing
NONLINEAR TIME-TRANSIENT SQUEEZE-FILM DAMPER INTERACTIVE ELEMENT

THIS CODE Computes INSTANTANEOUS FORCE VECTOR AND ITS
SPATIAL GRADIENTS, I.E., THE TANGENT STIFFNESS AND DAMPING
MATRICES.

----------
NCMENCLATURE
----------

INPUT

BD=NCMINAL DAMPER ANNULUS DIAMETER(IN)
BL=NCMINAL DAMPER ANNULUS LENGTH(IN)
BC=DAMPER ANNULUS RADIAL CLEARANCE(IN)
VISC=DAMPER LUBRICANT VISCOSITY(REYN)
PVAP=FILM RUPTURE PRESSURE(PSIA)
THT(1)=POSITION ANGLE OF LUBRICANT PORT-1(DEG)
THT(2)=POSITION ANGLE OF LUBRICANT PORT-2(DEG)
PB(1)=SPECIFIED BOUNDARY PRESSURE AT PORT-1(PSIA)
PB(2)=SPECIFIED BOUNDARY PRESSURE AT PORT-2(PSIA)
NGRID=NUMBER OF FINITE-DIFFERENCE GRID POINTS PER DAMPER ARC(ODD)
NSOLN=1, LONG-BEARING SOLUTION USED
      =2, SHORT-BEARING(PARABOLIC) SOLUTION USED
      =3, FOURIER-SERIES 2D CONVERGENT SOLUTION USED
NPORT=NUMBER OF LUBRICANT PORTS(0, 1 OR 2)
       IF NPORT=0, JOINED-BOUNDARY CONDITION IS USE
NFILM=NUMBER OF IDENTICAL ANNULI FOR THE DAMPER
KUFK=0, STIFFNESS MATRIX NOT COMPUTED
LIST UTILITY

KUFK=1, STIFFNESS MATRIX COMPUTED
KDFC=0, DAMPING MATRIX NOT COMPUTED
KDFC=1, DAMPING MATRIX COMPUTED
X=X-INERTIAL COORDINATE OF DAMPER INSIDE SURFACE CENTER-LINE (IN)
Y=Y-INERTIAL COORDINATE OF DAMPER INSIDE SURFACE CENTER-LINE (IN)
XDT=X-INERTIAL VELOCITY OF INSIDE SURFACE CENTER-LINE (IN/SEC)
YDT=Y-INERTIAL VELOCITY OF INSIDE SURFACE CENTER-LINE (IN/SEC)
XB=X-INERTIAL COORDINATE OF DAMPER OUTSIDE SURFACE CENTER-LINE (IN)
YB=Y-INERTIAL COORDINATE OF DAMPER OUTSIDE SURFACE CENTER-LINE (IN)
XB=T=X-INERTIAL VELOCITY OF DAMPER OUTSIDE SURFACE CENTER-LINE (IN)
YBT=Y-INERTIAL VELOCITY OF DAMPER OUTSIDE SURFACE CENTER-LINE (IN)

OUTPLT

F1=X-FORCE COMPONENT ON INSIDE DAMPER SURFACE (LBS)
F2=Y-FORCE COMPONENT ON INSIDE DAMPER SURFACE (LBS)

FORCE COMPONENTS ON OUTSIDE DAMPER SURFACE ARE EQUAL BUT OPPOSITE
F1 AND F2 BECAUSE FLUID INERTIA EFFECTS ARE NEGLECTED

SYMMETRIC PORTION OF STIFFNESS MATRIX:
AK11=KXX (LBS/IN)
AK12=KXY (LBS/IN)=KYX
AK22=KYY (LBS/IN)

DIAGONAL PORTION OF DAMPING MATRIX
AC11=CXX (LB*SEC/IN)
AC22=CYY (LB*SEC/IN)

IMPLICIT REAL*3 (A-H,O-Z)
COMMON/INPUT1/BD,BL,BG,VI,CTH(2),PB(2),PVAP
COMMON/INPUT2/NGR1D,NSOLN,NFCRT,NFILM
COMMON/COORD/X,Y,XDT,YDT,XB,YB,XBT,YBT
COMMON/FILM/TH(101),P(101),DHDX(101),DHDT(101),STH(101),CTH(101),
LIST UTILITY

C
1DXD(2), ALFA(2)
C
COMMON/WORK/FNGDM1, KB, KOUNT
C
COMMON/INC/HMIN, VEL, DELS, DELST
C
DIMENSION A(101), B(101), C(101), E(101), RH(101), P(101), ARG1(101),
1 ARG2(101), D(101)
C
ALLOCATE INPUT NAMES
C
BD = AD
BL = AL
BC = AC
VISC = AISC
THT(1) = ATH1
THT(2) = ATH2
PB(1) = AB1
PB(2) = PB2
PVAP = PVAA
X = U
Y = V
XDT = UDT
YDT = VDT
XE = UD
YE = VD
XET = UBT
YET = VBT
NGRID = NGRIA
NSOLN = NSOLA
NFORT = NFORDA
KOFK = KAFK
KOFK = KAFK
NFILM = NFILA
PI = 3.141592654
C
WRITE (5, 2500) X, Y, XE, Y3, XDT, YDT, XBT, YBT
3 3X, 'FOTOR XDT',
1 3X, 'FOTOR YDT', 4X, 'STATOR XDT', 5X, 'STATOR YDT', //,
2 5X, 8(2X, D13.6))
C
WRITE (6, 1999)
1999 FORMAT (7X, 'BEARING ELEMENT INFORMATION', //, 4X,
C
1 1, 'ED' BL BC VISC '
C
2 2, 'PVAP' TH1 TH2 PB1 PB2 NG
C
3 NS NP NF KK KC')
C
WRITE(6, 10) BD, BL, BC, VISC, PVAP, THT(1), THT(2), PB(1), PB(2),
C
1 NGRID, NSOLN, NFORT, NFILM, KOFK, KOFK
10 FORMAT (9D11.4, 4D15, 2I4)
C
SET UP
C
KOUNT = 1
LIST UTILTY

MTEST = NGRID + 1
NTEST = MTEST/2
KTEST = 2*NTEST

IF(KTEST. NE. MTEST) NGRID=NGRID-1

FNGDM1 = FLOAT(NGRID-1)
THT(1) = THT(1)*PI/180.

IF(NPORT.LT.2) GO TO 20

THT(2) = THT(2)*PI/180.

IF(THT(2).LT.THT(1)) THT(2)=THT(2)+2.*PI

ALFA(1) = THT(2)-THT(1)
ALFA(2) = 2.*PI-ALFA(1)
DXD(1) = 0.5*B*D*ALFA(1)/FNGDM1
DXD(2) = 0.5*B*D*ALFA(2)/FNGDM1

GO TO 40

20 DXD(1) = ED*PI/FNGDM1
ALFA(1) = 2.*PI

40 CONTINUE

WRITE(6,10)DXD(1),DXD(2)
AKXX = 0.0
AKXY = 0.0
AKYY = 0.0
ACKX = 0.0
ACKY = 0.0
ACXX = 0.0
ACXY = 0.0
ACYY = 0.0
FX = 0.0
FY = 0.0

ERANCH ACCORDING TO SOLUTION DESIGNATED

60 CONTINUE
CALL INCRT
GO TO (100,100,300),ASOLN

100 CONTINUE

SOLVE FOR SQUEEZE FILM PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION

DO 190 KB=1,NPORT
P(1)=PB(KB)
IF(KB.EQ.1) P(NGRID)=PB(2)
IF(KB.EQ.2) P(NGRID)=PB(1)
DX=DXD(KB)
CALL DFILM
A(2)=0.0
B(2) = P(1)
DC 110 K=2,NGRID
COEF1 = H(K)**3/DX**2

190 CONTINUE
LIST UTILITY

COEF2 = (1.5*H(K)**2)*DHDX(K)/DX
C(K) =-2.*COEF1
E(K) = COEF1-COEFF2
RH(K) = 12.*VISC*DHDT(K)
IF(NSOLN.EQ.1) GO TO 110
C(K) = C(K)+(8.*H(K)**3)/BL**2
110 CONTINUE

NGR = NGRID-1
DG 120 K=2,NGR
FOCTR = C(K)+E(K)*A(K)
A(K+1) = C(K)/FOCTR
120 B(K+1) = (RH(K)*E(K)*E(K))/FOCTR
NGR = NGRID-2
DC 130 K=1,NGR
P(J) = NGRID-K
IF(P(J).LT.PVAP) P(J) = PVAP
130 CONTINUE

WRITE(6,135) (P(J),J=1,NGRID)
135 FORMAT(2x,14E9.2)

C INTEGRATE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION TO GET X AND Y FORCE COMPONENTS

DD 140 K=1,NGRID
ARG1(K) = P(K)*CTH(K)
140 ARG2(K) = P(K)*STH(K)
A1 = ARG1(1)+ARG1(NGRID)
A2 = ARG2(1)+ARG2(NGRID)
B1 = 0.0
B2 = 0.0
DD 150 K=2,NGRD,2
B1 = B1+ARG1(K)
C1 = C1+ARG1(K)
C2 = 0.0
DD 160 K=3,NGR,2
C1 = C1+ARG1(K)
C2 = C2+ARG2(K)
160 DTET=ET+2.*DX/SD
FACTR=FLOCAT(NFLM)*DTHET/3.
XQ=FACTR*(A1+4.*B1+C1)
YQ=FACTR*(A2+4.*B2+C2)
IF(NSOLN.EQ.1) FACTR=-BD*BL/2.
IF(NSOLN.EQ.2) FACTR=-BD*BL/3.
XC=XQ*FACTR
YC=YQ*FACTR
FX=FX+XQ
FY=FY+YQ

190 CONTINUE
GO TO (500,520,540,560,580),KOUNT

500 F1=FX
F2=FY
IF(KDEF.EQ.0) AND,((KCFK.EQ.0)) RETURN
IF(KCFK.EQ.0) KOUNT=4
IF(KCFK.EQ.0) GO TO 60
GO TO 50
520 AXY=(FX-F1)/DELS
LIST UTILITY

AKXY=(FY-F2)/DELS
GC TO 590

540 AKXY=(FX=F1)/DELS
AKYY=(FY=F2)/DELS
C
WRITE (6,657) AKXX,AKXY,AKYY

657 FORMAT (5X,'BEARING STIFF.(SQUEEZ):',3(5X,D13.6))
AK11=-AKXX
AK22=-AKYY
AK12=-0.5*(AKXY+AKYX)
C
WRITE (6,657) AK11,AK12,AK22
C
WRITE (6,658) F1,F2

653 FORMAT (5X,'FORCES ON THE ROTOR/,'//,8(2X,D13.5))
IF(KQFC.EC.0) RETURN
GO TO 590

560 ACXX=(FX=F1)/DELS
ACY=(FY=F2)/DELS
GO TO 590

580 ACXY=(FX=F1)/DELS
ACY=(FY=F2)/DELS
GC TO 60C

590 KOUNT=KOUNT+1
GC TO 60

600 CONTINUE
AC11=ACXX
AC22=ACY
RETURN

300 WRITE(6,700)
RETURN

700 FORMAT(1H1/5X,'FOURIER-SERIES 2-D OPTION NOT READY FOR USE'//)
END
//??
//??

322 RECORDS PRINTED. END OF LIST UTILITY
LIST UTILITY

//NASA JOB 04130, '764ACAMS', 'MSGLEVEL=(2.0):
//JOB3PARM TIME=9
//EXEC FORTRAN

C
C FOUR DOF ROTOR/BEARING/STATOR SYSTEM
C
DIMENSION XS(1002),YS(1002),XBS(1002),YBS(1002),XREL(1002),
YREL(1002),NPTS(2),INC(2)
DIMENSION LINTYP(2),INTEQ(2)
CALL PLOTS
CALL PLOT(1.0,1.5,-3)
IN=5
INC=6
5 CONTINUE
KUNT=0
READ(IN,10)BD,BL,BC,VISC,TH1,TH2,P81,P82,E,CPM1,PHII,PVAP
10 FORMAT(5E15.7)
READ(IN,15)NGRID,NSCLN,NPORT,NCYC,NPTC,KOFK,KOFC,NFILM
15 FORMAT(16I5)
PI=3.141592654
WRITE(IO,20)
20 FORMAT(1H1///)
WRITE(IO,25)ED,BL,BC,VISC,TH1,TH2,P81,P82,E,CPM1,PHII,PVAP
25 FORMAT(2X12E10.3///)
WRITE(IO,30)NGRID,NSCLN,NPORT,NCYC,NPTC,KOFK,KOFC,NFILM
30 FORMAT(2X101I10)
READ(IN,10)RMASS,SMASS,RFORCE,SKX,SKY
READ(IN,10)X,Y,XDT,YDT,XB,YB,YBT,WX,XY
READ(IN,15)NPRINT,KPLCT,LINTF,NSKIP,KLUE
RMASS=RMASS/386.
SMASS=SMASS/386.
PHII=PHII*PI/180.
TAU1=60./CPM1
DT=TAU1/FLCAT(NPTC)
NTS=NCYC*NPTC+1
DM=PI*CPM1/30.
WRITE(IO,35)
35 FORMAT(1H1///,X*NT',EX,'TIME',11X,'X',11X,'Y',10X,'XB',10X,'YB',
1 10X,'FX',10X,'FY',10X,'SX',10X,'SY'///)
DO 50 NT=1,NTS
NTM1=NT-1
IF(NT.GE.NPRINT)WRITE(IO,45)NTM1,T,X,Y,XB,YB,XDT,YDT,XBT,YBT
IF(KPLOT.EQ.0) GO TO 43
MAB=NSKIP*MAB
MAC=NT-1
IF((NT.EQ.1).OR.(MAB.EQ.MAC)) GO TO 40
GO TO 43
40 KUNT=KUNT+1
XS(KUNT)=X
YS(KUNT)=Y
XBS(KUNT)=XB
YBS(KUNT)=YB
43 CONTINUE
45 FORMAT(2X,15,9E12.3)
LIST UTILITY

OMIT=OMIT*T
ARG=CMIT+PHI1
SARG=SIN(ARG)
CARG=COS(ARG)
CALL SQUEEZE(BD,BL,BC,VISC,TH1,TH2,P81,PB2,X,Y,XDT,YDT,XB,YB,
1 XBT,YBT,AK11,AK12,AK22,AC11,AC22,F1,F2,NGRID,NSOLN,NPORT,KOFK,
2 KOFK,FILM,PRYAP)
RFX=RFORCE*XARG+F1+X
RFY=RFORCE*YARG+F2+Y
RFZ=RFORCE*ZARG+F3+Z
FX=RFX/SMASS
FY=RFY/SMASS
FZ=RFZ/SMASS
XDT=XT+RXA*DT
YDT=YT+RYA*DT
ZDT=ZT+RZA*DT
X=X+XDT*DT
Y=Y+YDT*DT
Z=Z+ZDT*DT

50 CONTINUE
IF(KPLOT.EQ.0) GO TO 100
INTEG(1)=85
INTEG(2)=85
LINTYP(1)=LINTP
LINTYP(2)=LINTP
NPTS(1)=KUNT
NPTS(2)=KUNT
INC(1)=1
INC(2)=1
DO 80 K=1,KUNT
XT(K)=XS(K)
YT(K)=YS(K)
X(K)=XS(K)+XBS(K)
Y(K)=YS(K)+YBS(K)
X(K)=XS(K)+XBS(K)
Y(K)=YS(K)+YBS(K)

80 YREL(1)=YS(K)+YBS(K)
CALL PLOT(12,0,0,0)
CALL GRAPH1(XS,YS,XES,YES,XT,YT,NPTS,INC,LINTYP,INTEQ,KUNT)
CALL PLOT(12,0,0,0)
NPTS=KUNT
INC=1
INTEG=89
CALL GRAPH2(YREL,XREL,YREL,NPST,INK,LINTP,INTQ,KUNT,BC)

100 CONTINUE
IF(KLUE.EQ.0) GO TO 150
GO TO 5

150 CALL PLOT(10,0,0,0)
STOP
END

SUBROUTINE GRAPH1(XS,YS,XBS,YBS,XT,YT,NPTS,INC,LINTYP,INTEQ,KUNT)
DIMENSION XS(1002),YS(1002),XBS(1002),YBS(1002),XREL(1002),
YREL(1002),NPTS(2),INC(2)
DIMENSION LINTYP(2),INTEQ(2)
DIMENSION X(1002),Y(1002)

END

SUBROUTINE GRAPH2(XREL,YREL,NPST,INK,LINTP,INTQ,KUNT,BC)
DIMENSION XREL(1002),YREL(1002)

END
LIST UTILITY

\[
\begin{align*}
K_2\text{UNT} &= 2 \times K_1\text{UNT} \\
K_2\text{UNT} &= K_1\text{UNT} + 1 \\
K_2\text{UNT} &= 2 \times K_1\text{UNT} + 1 \\
K_1\text{UNT} &= K_1\text{UNT} + 1 \\
\text{CALL SCALE} (X, 7.5, K_2\text{UNT}, \text{INC}(1)) \\
\text{CALL SCALE} (Y, 7.5, K_2\text{UNT}, \text{INC}(1)) \\
X_\text{S}(K_1\text{UNT}) &= X(T(K_2\text{UNT}1)) \\
Y_\text{S}(K_1\text{UNT}) &= Y(T(K_2\text{UNT}1)) \\
X_\text{S}(K_1\text{UNT}) &= X(T(K_2\text{UNT}2)) \\
Y_\text{S}(K_1\text{UNT}) &= Y(T(K_2\text{UNT}2)) \\
\text{IF} (X_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) \geq Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2)) \text{ Go to 10} \\
X_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) &= Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) \\
Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) &= Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) \\
X_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) &= Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) \\
\text{GO TO 20} \\
\text{10} \\
Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) &= X_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) \\
X_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) &= X_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) \\
Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) &= Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}2) \\
\text{20} \\
X_\text{S}(K_1\text{UNT}) &= X_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}) \\
Y_\text{S}(K_1\text{UNT}) &= Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT}) \\
\text{CONTINUE} \\
\text{CALL AXIS} (0.0, 0.0, 0.0, \text{\textsc{displ}}, 6.7.5, 0.0, X_\text{S}(K_1\text{UNT}), X_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT})) \\
\text{CALL AXIS} (0.0, 0.0, 0.0, \text{\textsc{displ}}, 6.7.5, 90.0, Y_\text{S}(K_1\text{UNT}), Y_\text{S}(K_2\text{UNT})) \\
\text{CALL LINE} (X_\text{S}, Y_\text{S}, \text{NPTS}(1), \text{INC}(1), \text{LINTYP}(1), \text{INTEQ}(1)) \\
\text{CALL LINE} (X_\text{S}, Y_\text{S}, \text{NPTS}(2), \text{INC}(2), \text{LINTYP}(2), \text{INTEQ}(2)) \\
\text{CALL SYMBOL} (0.5, 7.75, 0.14, \text{\textsc{rotor and stator orbits}}, 0.0, 23) \\
\text{RETURN} \\
\text{SUBROUTINE GRAPH2} (X\textsc{rel}, Y\textsc{rel}, \text{NPTS}, \text{INTP}, \text{INTO}, K_1\text{UNT}, BC) \\
\text{DIMENSION XREL}(1002), YREL(1002), XC(402), YC(402) \\
K_1\text{UNT} &= K_1\text{UNT} + 1 \\
K_2\text{UNT} &= K_2\text{UNT} + 1 \\
DC &= 762 \quad K = 1,400 \\
Z &= K/60. \\
X_\text{C}(K) &= EC*COS(Z) \\
Y_\text{C}(K) &= EC*SIN(Z) \\
\text{CONTINUE} \\
\text{CALL SCALE} (X, 7.5, 400, 1) \\
Y_\text{C}(401) &= X_\text{C}(401) \\
Y_\text{C}(402) &= X_\text{C}(402) \\
\text{CALL AXIS}(0.0, 0.0, 0.0, \text{\textsc{displ}}, 11.7.5, 0.0, X_\text{C}(401), X_\text{C}(402)) \\
\text{CALL AXIS}(0.0, 0.0, 0.0, \text{\textsc{displ}}, 11.7.5, 90.0, Y_\text{C}(401), Y_\text{C}(402)) \\
\text{CALL LINE}(X_\text{C}, Y_\text{C}, 400, 1, 0.0) \\
XREL(K_1\text{UNT}) &= X_\text{C}(401) \\
YREL(K_1\text{UNT}) &= X_\text{C}(401) \\
XREL(K_2\text{UNT}) &= X_\text{C}(402) \\
YREL(K_2\text{UNT}) &= Y_\text{C}(402) \\
\text{CALL LINE}(X\textsc{rel}, Y\textsc{rel}, \text{NPTS}, \text{INTP}, \text{INTO}) \\
\text{CALL SYMBOL}(0.5, 7.75, 0.14, \text{\textsc{rotor orbit relative to stator}}, 0.0, 30) \\
\text{RETURN} \\
\text{END}
Fig. 1 Input/Output of Damper Pilot Code
Fig. 2 Inertial coordinates
Fig. 3 A typical aircraft engine damper configuration
Fig. 4(a) Configuration frequently used in military applications
Fig. 4(b) Configuration frequently used in commercial applications
Fig. 5 Unwrapped squeeze-film pressure solution domains for configurations shown in Figure 4.
Figure 6 Pressure distribution in circumferential direction and time of one cycle of circular orbit (long-bearing solution).
Figure 6  Pressure distribution in circumferential direction and time (Cont'd) of one cycle of circular orbit (long-bearing solution).
Figure 7 Pressure distribution in circumferential direction and time of one cycle of circular orbit (short-bearing solution).

(a) $e/c = 0.05$

(b) $e/c = 0.20$
Figure 7 Pressure distribution in circumferential direction and time (Cont'd) of one cycle of circular orbit (short-bearing solution).
Figure 8  Simple 2-mass, 4-degree of freedom. Test case
(Same damper parameters as on page 23)
Fig. 9 Nonlinear dynamic transient of simple 4 DOE system (See Fig. 8)
\(|F| = 100 \text{ lbs, } \dot{\omega} = 150 \text{ rad/sec, } M_1 = M_2 = 500 \text{ lbs, } K_x = K_y = 116000 \text{ lbs/in.}\)
Fig. 10 Nonlinear dynamic transient of simple 4 DOE system (See Fig. 8)

$|F| = 200$ lbs, $\omega = 150$ rad/sec, $M_1 = M_2 = 500$ lbs, $K_x = K_y = 116000$ lbs/in.
Fig. 11 Nonlinear dynamic transient of simple 4 DOE system (See Fig. 8)
$|F|=300 \text{ lbs}, \omega=150 \text{ rad/sec}, M_1=M_2=500 \text{ lbs}, K_x=K_y=116000 \text{ lbs/in.}$
Fig. 12 Nonlinear dynamic transient of simple 4 DOF system (See Fig. 8) |F| = 500 lbs, ω = 150 rad/sec, M1 = M2 = 500 lbs, Kx = Ky = 116000 lbs/in.
Fig. 13 Nonlinear dynamic transient of simple 4 DOF system (See Fig. 8) 

\[ |F| = 1000 \text{ lbs}, \omega = 150 \text{ rad/sec}, M_1 = M_2 = 500 \text{ lbs}, K_x = K_y = 116000 \text{ lbs/in.} \]
FIG. 14 (OVERALL ARCHITECTURE OF BEARING IMPLANT CODE)
Fig. 15 ARCHITECTURE OF CORE PROGRAM OF "BEARING ELEMENT" IMPLANT
Fig. 16 (Overall FE code architecture)
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