



Photo courtesy of Harris Metals

Predicted Effect of Dynamic Load on Pitting Fatigue Life for Low-Contact-Ratio Spur Gears

David G. Lewicki,
U.S. Army Aviation Research &
Technology Activity – AVSCOM
NASA Lewis Research Center
Cleveland, Ohio

Summary:

How dynamic load affects the pitting fatigue life of external spur gears was predicted by using NASA computer program TELSGE. TELSGE was modified to include an improved gear tooth stiffness model, a stiffness-dynamic load iteration scheme and a pitting-fatigue-life prediction analysis for a gear mesh. The analysis used the NASA gear life model developed by Coy, methods of probability and statistics and gear tooth dynamic loads to predict life. In general, gear life predictions based on dynamic loads differed significantly from those based on static loads, with the predictions being strongly influenced by the maximum dynamic load during contact.

With the modified TELSGE, parametric studies were performed that modeled low-contact-ratio involute spur gears over a range of

gear speeds, numbers of teeth, gear sizes, diametral pitches, pressure angles and gear ratios. Dynamic loads and pitting fatigue lives were calculated. Gear mesh operating speed strongly affected predicted dynamic load and life. Meshes operating at a resonant speed or at one-half the resonant speed had significantly shorter lives. Dynamic life factors for gear surface pitting fatigue were developed on the basis of the parametric studies. The effects of number of teeth, gear size, diametral pitch, pressure angle and gear ratio on predicted life were related to the contact ratio. In general, meshes with higher contact ratios had higher dynamic life factors than meshes with lower contact ratios. A design chart was developed for use in the absence of a computer and program TELSGE. An example illustrates the use of the design chart.

INTRODUCTION

Gears may fail from scoring, tooth fracture due to bending fatigue or surface pitting fatigue. Scoring failure is usually lubrication related and can be prevented by proper lubrication and proper operating temperatures. Tooth fractures are usually caused by poor materials, improper design or overloading and can be prevented by designing for bending stresses below the material's maximum allowable stress. The American Gear Manufacturers Association (AGMA) has a standard practice for predicting gear surface pitting fatigue.⁽¹⁾ The method assumes that infinite life results when the maximum surface contact stresses are less than the material's endurance limit. Surface contact stress calculations may include a dynamic factor to account for gear dynamic loading. The AGMA recommends a dynamic factor of 1 for gear teeth of high accuracy, but states that actual dynamic loads, computed or measured, can be used.⁽¹⁾

Gear research authorities do not completely agree on surface pitting fatigue. Some state that gear materials do not have surface endurance limits,⁽²⁻³⁾ as is true for rolling-element bearings. In 1975, Coy developed an improved model for the surface fatigue life of spur and helical gears, using an approach




Fig. 1 - Tooth intervals of a meshing gear pair.



Technical Education Seminar No. 5

May 2, 1989 - Cincinnati, Ohio

AGMA's Technical Education Seminars have been well received by the participants, who've reported that the information has been useful and very practical. This, the fifth in the series, will cover topics important to understanding gear generation and gear machine tool set-up.

Gear Math at the Shop Level *for the* Gear Shop Foreman

By Don McVittie, President of Gear Engineers, Inc.

Specifically designed for Gear Shop Foremen and Manufacturing Engineers who must perform calculations necessary to set up machines to cut standard and nonstandard gears with available tools on a standard cutting machine.

The topics to be covered include:

- Two Gears in Mesh
- Internal Gears
- Ratio Problems

- The Involute Curve
- Helical Gears
- Interference Problems
- Practical Applications

- Plus -

- Hand Calculator Solutions for Common Calculations
- Some Handy Guides for Keeping it all in Your Head

MATH REQUIRED: High School Algebra or equivalent, plus knowledge of trigonometry functions

Registration \$295 for Members, \$395 Non-Members

For more information contact the American Gear Manufacturers Association Headquarters,
1500 King Street, Suite 201, Alexandria, VA 22314 (703) 684-0211

M&M Precision Systems . . .

the innovators in CNC gear inspection

Smart™ Probe package. LVDT probe and μ processor-based converter deliver high-speed data in μ inches.



Operator Control Panel for part loading and machine set up.



Keyboard with "Mouse" for one-time entry of part print and tolerance data. "Mouse" permits use of CAD techniques.

Color graphics CRT with touch screen makes operation simple and fast.

Graphics printer copies CRT.

Plotter delivers multi-color hard copy of graphics and test data.

CNC status monitor provides status and positional display of mechanical system and CNC control functions.

**See us at Quality
Expo-Booth #1943**

Our Model 3000 QC Gear Analyzer is a third generation CNC gear inspection system incorporating all of the comprehensive analytical tests and evaluation capabilities of previous M & M systems, such as our Model 2000, but with these added capabilities:

- Dramatically improved speed and accuracy through new mechanical system design and advanced CNC control technology.
- Computer hardware and applications software are modular to allow the user to buy only the required capability. This makes the 3000 QC adaptable to laboratory testing or production-line inspection.
- Integrated Statistical Process Control with local data base capability is an optional feature.
- Networking with MAPS compatibility is available.
- Robotic interfacing for totally automatic load/test/unload operation can be incorporated.

For more information or applications assistance, write or call: M & M Precision Systems, 300 Progress Rd., West Carrollton, OH 45449, 513/859-8273, TWX 810/450-2626, FAX 513/859-4452.

**M&M PRECISION
SYSTEMS**

AN ACME-CLEVELAND COMPANY

CIRCLE A-4 ON READER REPLY CARD

Nomenclature

B	material constant ($2.23 \times 10^8 \text{ N/m}^{1.979}$, 35,000 lb/in. ^{1.979} , ref. 21)	r_r	root radius, m (in.)
C_{eq}	equivalent damping per unit face width, N sec/m ² (lb sec/in. ²)	s	displacement, m (in.)
C_v	dynamic life factor	T	torque, N m (lb in.)
c	contact ratio	t	tooth thickness at pitch radius, m (in.)
d	distance of inscribed parabola, m (in.)	X	relative displacement, m (in.)
E	modulus of elasticity, Pa (psi)	x	contact position, m (in.)
e	Weibull exponent	Δx	interval length, m (in.)
f	gear tooth face width, m (in.)	Y	Lewis form factor
h_0	tooth thickness at root radius, m (in.)	Z	contact length, m (in.)
I_0	beam cross-sectional moment of inertia, m ⁴ (in. ⁴)	z_1	contact length from pitch point to start of contact, m (in.)
i	contact position index	z_2	contact length from pitch point to end of contact, m (in.)
J	number of intervals; or polar mass moment of inertia per unit face width ($1/2mr_b^2$ for disk), kg m (lb sec ²)	α	pressure angle at root radius, deg
j	interval index	γ	density, kg/m ³ (lb/in. ³)
K	combined stiffness per unit face width, Pa (psi)	δ	beam deflection, m (in.)
K_{eq}	equivalent stiffness per unit face width, Pa (psi)	ζ	damping ratio
\bar{K}_{eq}	mean equivalent stiffness per unit face width, Pa (psi)	η	life for 90% probability of survival, millions of stress cycles
k	gear tooth stiffness per unit face width, Pa (psi)	θ	angular displacement, rad
L	life for 90% probability of survival, Mrev	Σp	curvature sum, m ⁻¹ (in. ⁻¹)
l	involute length, m (in.)	$\bar{\Sigma p}$	average curvature sum, m ⁻¹ (in. ⁻¹)
M	effective mass per unit face width, J/r_b^2 , kg/m (lb sec ² /in. ²)	φ	pressure angle, deg
M_{eq}	equivalent mass per unit face width, kg/m (lb sec ² /in. ²)	ω	speed, rpm
m	mass per unit face width, kg/m (lb sec ² /in. ²)	ω_n	resonant speed, rpm
m_o	module, mm/tooth		
N	number of teeth	Subscripts:	
P	diametral pitch, teeth/in.	d	dynamic life
P_d	dynamic load per unit face width, N/m (lb/in.)	I	gear tooth stiffness-dynamic load iteration index
P_s	static load per unit face width, N/m (lb/in.)	i	contact position index
p_b	base pitch, $2\pi r_b/N$, m (in.)	j	interval index
Q	normal load, N (lb)	m	mesh
\bar{Q}	average interval load, N (lb)	max	maximum during contact position
Q_t	tangential load, $Q \cos \varphi$, N (lb)	s	static life
R	radius of curvature, m (in.)	t	tooth
r_b	base radius, $r_p \cos \varphi$, m (in.)	1	driver gear
r_o	outside radius, m (in.)	2	driven gear
r_p	pitch radius, $Nm_o/2 = N/2P$, m (in.)	Superscripts:	
		(I)	first pair of teeth in contact
		(II)	second pair of teeth in contact

similar to that for rolling-element bearings.⁽²⁻⁶⁾ This work did not, however, include the effect of dynamic load.

Early contributions to gear dynamic loading were made by Buckingham, Tuplin, Richardson and Attia.⁽⁷⁻¹⁰⁾ More recently computer-based analytical programs have been developed to determine gear tooth dynamic loads.⁽¹¹⁻¹⁶⁾ The dynamic loads of these programs depend on such factors as inertia and stiffness of rotating members, tooth spacing and profile errors, size and speed. The loads are determined by solving the equations of motion of a given gear mesh system.

The objective of the present study was to combine the dynamic load calculation procedure of Wang and Cheng⁽¹⁴⁾ with the NASA gear life model of Coy⁽²⁻⁶⁾ to determine how

AUTHOR:

DAVID G. LEWICKI is employed by the United States Army Aviation Research and Technology Activity's Propulsion Directorate at the NASA Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio. He has been doing work at NASA on helicopter and turboprop transmissions and transmission components since 1982, involved in both analytical and experimental research activities. He holds a B.S. degree in Mechanical Engineering at Cleveland State University and a M.S. degree in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Toledo. He is a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and is current chairman of the ASME Publicity Committee for the Design Engineering Division.

dynamic load affects the pitting fatigue life of external spur gears. NASA computer program TELSGE, modified to include Cornell's gear tooth stiffness model,⁽¹⁷⁾ a stiffness-dynamic load iteration scheme and a pitting fatigue life analysis, was used to predict gear dynamic loads and life. Parametric studies using modified TELSGE were performed for low-contact-ratio involute gears with no tooth spacing or profile errors. Gear dynamic loads and tooth stiffness were calculated as a function of contact position and speed. On the basis of the parametric studies dynamic life factors for gear surface pitting fatigue were developed as a function of speed and contact ratio.

ANALYSIS Gear Life Model

Current theory. The life model proposed by Lundberg and

Palmgren⁽¹⁸⁻²⁰⁾ is the commonly accepted theory for predicting the pitting fatigue life of rolling-element bearings. Because the fatigue failure mechanism is similar for both gears and rolling-element bearings made from high-strength steel, the Lundberg-Palmgren model for bearings has been adapted to predict gear life.⁽²⁻⁶⁾ Reference 6 gives the life for a 90% probability of survival η of a single tooth on a driver or driven gear of a mesh as

$$\eta = B^{4.3} f^{3.9} \Sigma \rho^{-5} l^{-0.4} Q^{-4.3} \quad (1)$$

where B is a material constant based on experimental data; f is the tooth face width; $\Sigma \rho$ is the curvature sum at the start of single-tooth contact; l is the involute surface length during single-tooth contact; and Q is the static tooth load, normal to the contact. A complete list of symbols is given in the Nomenclature.

The life of the complete driver gear (all teeth) L_1 in terms of driver gear rotations is

$$L_1 = N_1^{-1/e} \eta \quad (2)$$

where N_1 is the number of teeth on the driver gear and e , the Weibull exponent, is a measure of scatter in fatigue life. Experimental research on AISI 9310 steel spur gears has shown gear fatigue to follow the Weibull failure distribution with $e \approx 2.5$.⁽³⁾

NEW!

* GEARS *

DEBURR & CHAMFER

quickly, accurately, inexpensively
...with the compact, rugged

AIR JUNIOR



Air Junior models are designed for table mount or portable cart operations on gears or parts up to 14" O.D. and 50 pounds. Select from 2 styles to meet your application requirements. Both deliver precise deburring or chamfering with maximum flexibility.

Ask for our brochure, describing the complete line of GMI-MUTSCHLER tools... designed and built to perform year after year. Call or FAX today!



GMI - MUTSCHLER

(312) 986-1858 • FAX (312) 986-0756




Fig. 2—Basic geometry of a pair of external spur gears in mesh.

The life of the complete driven gear L_2 in terms of driver gear rotations is

$$L_2 = \left(\frac{N_2}{N_1} \right) N_2^{-1/\epsilon} \eta \quad (3)$$

where N_2 is the number of teeth on the driven gear. The mesh life (both driver and driven gears) L_m in terms of driver gear rotations is given by

$$L_m = (L_1^{-\epsilon} + L_2^{-\epsilon})^{-1/\epsilon} \quad (4)$$

Expanded theory. To adapt the current gear life model for predictions based on gear tooth dynamic loads, the tooth was divided into intervals (Fig. 1). The use of intervals allowed the current gear life model to account for load and curvature sums varying with contact position. The complete gear tooth life was determined from the interval lives and methods of probability and statistics. The details are as follows.

When a pair of external spur gears is in mesh (Fig. 2), the line tangent to the base circles of both the driver and driven gears is called the line of action. The gears begin contact when the outside radius of the driven gear intersects the line of action. As the gears rotate, the contact point occurs on the line of action. The contact ends when the outside radius of the driver gear intersects the line of action. The point at which the pitch circles of the driver and driven gears intersect is called the pitch point.




Fig. 3—Curvatures of involute teeth in contact.

The distance along the line of action from the pitch point to the start of contact is

$$z_1 = \sqrt{r_{o,2}^2 - r_{b,2}^2} - r_{p,2} \sin \varphi \quad (5)$$

The distance along the line of action from the pitch point to the end of contact is

$$z_2 = \sqrt{r_{o,1}^2 - r_{b,1}^2} - r_{p,1} \sin \varphi \quad (6)$$

The contact length Z is defined as

$$Z = z_1 + z_2 \quad (7)$$

Dividing the contact length into equal-size intervals of length Δx gives

$$\Delta x = \frac{Z}{J} \quad (8)$$

HOBBIING FIXTURE by DREWCO



Drewco Hobbing Fixtures maintain the required close relationship between the locating surface and the face of the gear. The rugged precision construction maintains the close hold to face relationship whether locating on smooth diameters or spline teeth. The expanding arbor will effectively hold a gear blank for finish turning, gear cutting, gear finishing, and gear inspection operations.

Center Mandrels • Adjustable Holders • Checking Fixtures
Centering Chucks • Boring Bar Chucks • Spindle Chucks

DREWCO CORPORATION

Precision Workholding and Tool Holding Devices
3745 Nicholson Road • P.O. Box 127
Franksville, WI 53126

Telephone (414) 886-5050
Fax Number (414) 886-5872

CIRCLE A-6 ON READER REPLY CARD

where J is the total number of intervals on a tooth, and

$$x_i = -z_1 + (i - 1)\Delta x \quad \text{for } i = 1 \text{ to } J + 1 \quad (9)$$

where x is the contact position along the line of action. The value of x is negative when contact is before the pitch point, zero when at the pitch point, and positive when after the pitch point.

The life of each interval for a 90% probability of survival is given from Equation 1 by

$$\eta_j = B^{4.3} f^{3.9} \bar{\Sigma\rho}_j^{-5} \ell_j^{-0.4} \bar{Q}_j^{-4.3} \quad \text{for } j = 1 \text{ to } J \quad (10)$$

where B and f do not change from interval to interval. Both curvature sum and involute length, however, change with contact position.

At the i^{th} contact position the radii of curvature of the driver

and driven gears (Fig. 3) are

$$R_{1,i} = r_{p,1} \sin \varphi + x_i \quad (11)$$

$$R_{2,i} = r_{p,2} \sin \varphi - x_i \quad (12)$$

The curvature sum at the i^{th} contact position is

$$\Sigma\rho_i = \frac{1}{R_{1,i}} + \frac{1}{R_{2,i}} \quad (13)$$

For the j^{th} interval the average curvature sum used in the life model is

$$\bar{\Sigma\rho}_j = \frac{\Sigma\rho_j + \Sigma\rho_{j+1}}{2} \quad \text{for } i = j \quad (14)$$

The curvature sum varied slightly with contact position for the example gear mesh data from Table I for 100 intervals on each tooth (Fig. 4a). (The contact position was made dimensionless by dividing by the base pitch p_b .) The plot shows the curvature sum to be symmetric about the pitch point ($x=0$). This was true only because the driver and driven gears of the example were the same size.

The involute surface lengths of the driver and driven gears for the j^{th} interval (for small Δx) are

$$\ell_{1,j} = \left(\frac{\Delta x}{r_{b,1}}\right)x_i + \Delta x \tan \varphi \quad \text{for } i = j \quad (15)$$

$$\ell_{2,j} = -\left(\frac{\Delta x}{r_{b,2}}\right)x_i + \Delta x \tan \varphi \quad \text{for } i = j \quad (16)$$

The involute length is a linear function of contact position (Fig. 4b). Equations 15 and 16 imply that rotating a gear mesh through equal angles produces unequal involute lengths and, thus, different-size tooth intervals (as shown in Fig. 1).

By using intervals the life model considers load that can vary with contact position. For the j^{th} interval the average load used in the life model is

$$\bar{Q}_j = \frac{Q_i + Q_{i+1}}{2} \quad \text{for } i = j \quad (17)$$

The static load variation with contact position depends on the number of teeth in contact (Fig. 4c). As a pair of teeth begin contact, the preceding pair of mating teeth are also in contact. This

Table I. Baseline Data For Both Driver And Driven Gear

Number of teeth	36
Diametral pitch	8
Outside radius, cm (in.)	6.033 (2.375)
Base pitch, cm (in.)	0.937 (0.369)
Face width, cm (in.)	0.635 (0.250)
Pressure angle, deg	20
Root radius, cm (in.)	5.318 (2.094)
Fillet radius, cm (in.)	0.102 (0.040)
Chordal tooth thickness, cm (in.)	0.485 (0.191)
Normal load, N (lb)	1718 (386)
Speed, rpm	4000
Material	Steel

GEAR DEBURRING



- ★ Compact Design: Ideal for cell environments.
- ★ Durable: Designed to meet production demands.
- ★ Fast set up and operation: Most set ups made in less than 1 minute with typical cycle times of 1 minute or less.
- ★ Portable: With optional cart it can be moved from work station to work station.
- ★ Fast chucking: Quickly chucks most parts without costly and time consuming special tooling.
- ★ Vernier Scales: Vernier scales on the adjustment axes allow quick and consistent repeat setups.
- ★ Modular Design: Options install and remove in seconds.
- ★ Versatile System: With the optional equipment practically any type of gear and edge finish can readily be achieved.

JAMES ENGINEERING

11707 McBean Drive
El Monte, California 91732
(818) 442-2898
FAX (818) 442-0374

CIRCLE A-7 ON READER REPLY CARD

double-tooth-pair contact occurs for Intervals 1 to 41, and it is assumed that half the applied load is transferred per contact. Near the pitch point single-tooth-pair contact occurs (Intervals 42-59), and all the load is transferred by it. Toward the end of contact, double-tooth-pair contact again occurs (Intervals 60-100) as the following pair of mating teeth begin contact. As before, it is assumed that half the load is transferred per contact.

The life of a complete gear tooth η_t is determined from the interval lives and methods of probability and statistics where

$$\eta_t = \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \eta_j^{-e} \right)^{-1/e} \quad (18)$$

The complete tooth life was always shorter than the lives of the shortest-lived intervals (Fig. 4d). Also, intervals with larger applied loads had much more influence on gear tooth life than intervals with smaller loads.

The tooth lives for a driver and driven gear in mesh are determined by the expanded life theory and Equation 18. They are equal if the driver and driven gears are the same size. They are slightly different if the driver and driven gears are different sizes because of curvature sums and involute lengths. The complete gear lives and mesh life are determined, as before, by using Equations 2 to 4 and substituting η_t for η .

The total number of tooth intervals was varied from 30 to over 400 to check convergence on life. Static loads were used. All cases predicted the same tooth life. Gear size, diametral pitch, pressure angle and gear ratio were also varied to compare mesh lives predicted by the current and expanded theories. Static loads were used. The expanded theory predicted mesh lives a little longer than, but within 10% of, those predicted by the current theory for meshes with equal-size gears. This difference was caused by the expanded theory's curvature sum variation with contact position. Thus for meshes with equal-size gears, the curvature sum variation has a small effect on life. For meshes with unequal-size gears, however, there were greater differences in the mesh lives predicted by the two theories.

Gear Tooth Dynamic Loads

Gear tooth dynamic load model. The contact load of meshing gear teeth varies as the contact point moves along the line of action. This is known as dynamic load. It is mainly caused by single- and double-tooth-pair contact transitions, tooth stiffness variation along the contact, and tooth profile deviations from true involutes (tooth profile errors). NASA computer program TELSGE⁽¹⁴⁻¹⁶⁾ was used to determine gear tooth dynamic loads. The program models meshing gears as a pair of rigid disks connected by a spring (Fig. 5). The spring stiffness corresponds to gear teeth stiffnesses.

The dynamic load model uses the equations of motion governing the angular displacements of the driver and driven gears. By converting the angular movements of the disks to linear displacements along the line of action, and by algebraic manipulation, the equations of motion are represented by a single differential equation, where

$$M_{eq}\ddot{X} + C_{eq}\dot{X} + K_{eq}X = P_s \quad (19)$$

The dependent variable X , called the relative displacement, is the

compression of the spring along the line of action,

$$X = s_1 - s_2 \quad (20)$$

where

$$s_1 = r_{b,1}\theta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad s_2 = r_{b,2}\theta_2 \quad (21)$$

The equivalent mass per unit face width is

$$M_{eq} = \frac{M_1 M_2}{M_1 + M_2} \quad (22)$$




Fig. 4—Effect of contact position on gear life parameters for gear data from Table I.




Fig. 5 - Dynamic model of meshing gears.




Fig. 6 - Gear tooth stiffness models.




Fig. 7 - Flowchart of gear tooth combined stiffness-dynamic load interaction scheme in computer program TELSGE.

The equivalent damping coefficient per unit face width C_{eq} includes the effect of viscous damping,

$$C_{eq} = 2\zeta\sqrt{K_{eq}M_{eq}} \quad (23)$$

where ζ is the damping ratio, K_{eq} is the equivalent stiffness per unit face width (discussed in the section *Equivalent gear tooth stiffness*), and P_s is the static load per unit face width.

The relative displacement is determined as a function of contact position by using a Runge-Kutta numerical method and solving Equation 19. The dynamic load on a gear tooth is determined as a function of contact position by

$$P_d = KX \quad (24)$$

where P_d is the dynamic load per unit face width and K is the combined stiffness per unit face width (discussed in the section *Equivalent gear tooth stiffness*). Note that when X is negative, the teeth separate and the dynamic load is zero. Although tooth profile errors can be accounted for in Equations 19 and 24, they were beyond the scope of this study.

Gear tooth stiffness. Computer program TELSGE was modified to incorporate the gear tooth stiffness model of Cornell,⁽¹⁷⁾ regarded as the present state of the art. The stiffness model consists of tooth bending as a cantilever beam, fillet and foundation flexibilities and local Hertzian compression, all as functions of contact position. In Cornell's model the deflections due to bending and fillet and foundation flexibilities are expressed as linear functions of load, but the deflections due to Hertzian effects are not linear with load. This makes the stiffness of a gear tooth dependent on dynamic load, and Equation 19 nonlinear.

Equivalent gear tooth stiffness. The stiffnesses of the driver and driven teeth of a mesh, k_1 and k_2 respectively, are found by




Fig. 8—Effect of gear tooth combined stiffness-dynamic load iteration scheme on dynamic load for gear data from Table I.

the methods of Cornell.⁽¹⁷⁾ The combined stiffness K for a pair of teeth in contact is

$$K = \frac{k_1 k_2}{k_1 + k_2} \quad (25)$$

For single pair of teeth in contact (Fig. 6a) the equivalent stiffness is

$$K_{eq} = K \quad (26)$$

For two pairs of teeth in contact (Fig. 6b) the equivalent stiffness is

$$K_{eq} = K^{(I)} + K^{(II)} \quad (27)$$

where

$$K^{(I)} = \frac{k_1^{(I)} k_2^{(I)}}{k_1^{(I)} + k_2^{(I)}} \quad (28)$$

$$K^{(II)} = \frac{k_1^{(II)} k_2^{(II)}}{k_1^{(II)} + k_2^{(II)}} \quad (29)$$

The superscript (I) refers to the first pair of teeth in contact and (II) refers to the second pair of teeth in contact. The equivalent stiffness of Equation 19 varies from double-tooth-pair contact at the start of mesh to single-tooth-pair contact and back to double.

Iteration of gear tooth stiffness and dynamic load. Because of the Hertzian compression, gear tooth stiffness is not independent of dynamic load. TELSGE was therefore modified to iterate for dynamic load (Fig. 7). First the static load is defined. As in the example (Fig. 4c) all the load is transferred per contact during single-tooth-pair contact, and half the load is transferred per contact during double-tooth-pair contact. Next the combined stiffness is determined along the contact position by using the static load in the Hertzian deflection computation. Then the dynamic load is determined along the contact position. Next combined stiffness is recalculated by using the calculated dynamic load in the Hertzian deflection computation. Then dynamic load is




Fig. 9—Effect of contact position on gear tooth combined stiffness for gear data from Table I.

recalculated by using the latest stiffness values. The stiffness and load calculations continue until the change in dynamic load with each iteration becomes smaller than a preset amount.

With modified TELSGE and the example data (Table I) the dynamic load required only four iterations to converge to within 0.1% (Fig. 8). So few iterations were required since the Hertzian deflection was usually only 10 to 20% of the total gear tooth deflection. The variation in equivalent stiffness due to double- and single-tooth-pair contact transitions is a major excitation in the dynamic load model (Fig. 9). The dynamic load varied appreciably from the static when the operating conditions of the example were used (Fig. 10). The maximum dynamic load dur-



NIAGARA GEAR CORP.
955 MILITARY RD.
BUFFALO, NY 14217

GEAR GRINDING SPECIALISTS

Reishauer RZ 300E Electronically controlled gear grinders

Commercial & Precision Gear Manufacturing to AGMA Class 15 Including:

- Spur
- Helical
- Internal
- Pump Gears
- Splines and Pulleys
- Serrations
- Sprockets and Ratchet Type Gears
- Hobbing up to 24" in Diameter
- O. D. and I. D. Grinding, Gear Honing w/Crowning, Broaching, Keyseating, Turning and Milling, Tooth Chamfering and Rounding

- Supplied complete to print
- Finishing operations on your blanks
- Grind teeth only



FAX (716) 874-9003 • PHONE (716) 874-3131

CIRCLE A-8 ON READER REPLY CARD

ing contact was about 30% greater than the static load.

Gear life using dynamic loads. The expanded gear life model, which accounts for variations of load and curvature sums with respect to contact position, was incorporated in modified TELSGE. The dynamic loads were used in the life model, where

$$Q_i = P_{d,i} f \quad \text{for } i = 1 \text{ to } 101 \quad (30)$$




Fig. 10 — Effect of contact position on gear tooth dynamic load for gear data from Table I.

(TELSGE divides the contact length into 100 intervals.) For the data from Table I the mesh life based on dynamic loads was then 50% shorter than that based on static loads. The cause was the increase in maximum load during contact when dynamic loads were considered (Fig. 10).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

NASA computer program TELSGE, modified to include an improved gear tooth stiffness model, a tooth stiffness-dynamic load iteration scheme, and a pitting fatigue life prediction method was used to perform parametric studies. Dynamic loads and gear mesh life predictions were performed over a range of gear speeds, numbers of teeth, gear sizes, diametral pitches, pressure angles and gear ratios.

Effect of Speed on Dynamic Load and Life

Modified TELSGE was run using the mesh data in Table I for speeds ranging from 600 to 12000 rpm. At very low speeds the dynamic load as a function of contact position (Fig. 11) resembled the static load. However, spikes occurred at double-to single-tooth-pair contact transitions, and at single to double. As the speed increased, the dynamic load as a function of contact position differed appreciably from the static.




Fig. 11 — Effect of contact position and speed on gear tooth dynamic load for gear data from Table I.

The dynamic load reached a maximum at a resonant speed ω_n of about 8500 rpm. At speeds below resonance the excitation frequency from the change in equivalent stiffness was lower than the resonant frequency, and the dynamic load was basically an oscillatory load superimposed on the static load. This produced peak dynamic loads greater than the static load. At speeds above resonance the dynamic load had a smoother response, with peaks lower than the static. This was caused by the greater inertia forces at higher speeds. The resonant speed can be approximated by

$$\omega_n = \frac{\sqrt{K_{eq}/M_{eq}} \cos \varphi}{N} \left(\frac{60}{2\pi} \right) \quad (31)$$

Here, although the mean equivalent stiffness K_{eq} varies with load and speed due to Hertzian effects, its influence on ω_n is not significant.

For the data in Fig. 11 the maximum dynamic load during contact was greatest at the resonant speed (Fig. 12). It was also greater than the static load at speeds below resonance, with a secondary peak at about $\omega/\omega_n = 0.5$. At speeds above resonance the maximum dynamic load during contact decreased and was less than the static load above $\omega/\omega_n \approx 1.2$.

The gear mesh life as a function of speed for mesh data in Table I is shown in Fig. 13. The dynamic life factor is defined as

$$C_v = \frac{L_d}{L_s} \quad (32)$$

where L_d is the gear mesh life based on the expanded life theory and dynamic loads, and L_s is the gear mesh life based on the expanded life theory and static loads (as illustrated in Fig. 4). Comparing Figs. 12 and 13 shows that the gear mesh life decreased when the maximum dynamic load during contact increased. This was true even though the analysis considered the load along the complete contact length. The mesh life as a function of speed was lowest at resonance.

Effect of Mass, Stiffness and Damping on Gear Life

The mass, stiffness and damping of a gear mesh system significantly affected dynamic load and life. Modified TELSGE was run using the mesh data in Table I while varying the




Fig. 12 – Effect of speed on maximum gear tooth dynamic load during contact for gear data from Table I.




Fig. 13 – Effect of speed on gear mesh life for gear data from Table I.



The ONLY source for O.E.M.
CLEVELAND RIGIDHOBBER
Genuine Parts & Documentation

- NEW CR-200, CR-300 HOBBER
- O.E.M. REBUILD/RETROFIT
- NEW HI-TECH HOBHEADS
- O.E.M. RIGIDHOBBER PARTS

TEL: 1 203 272 3271
FAX: 1 203 271 0487

CLEVELAND HOBGING
WATERBURY FARREL

P.O. BOX 400

CHESHIRE, CT

06410

CIRCLE A-9 ON READER REPLY CARD




Fig. 14 – Effect of damping ratio on gear mesh life for gear data from Table I.

equivalent mass M_{eq} and keeping all other parameters the same. The life-speed results were identical when plotted on dimensionless coordinates (as in Fig. 13). Modified TELSGE was also run while varying the equivalent stiffness K_{eq} and keeping all other parameters the same. Again, the life-speed results were identical when plotted on dimensionless coordinates (as in Fig. 13). Thus, the value of the equivalent mass or the equivalent stiffness had no effect on the life-speed results when plotted on dimensionless coordinates. However, as expected from Equation

31, different values of the equivalent mass or the equivalent stiffness produced different values for the resonant speed. The equivalent mass and equivalent stiffness must accurately portray the gear mesh being modeled for the calculated resonant speed to be accurate.

The damping force in the dynamic load model depends on the gear system's viscous friction and is usually an unknown. Damping ratios ζ between 0.1 (in Equation 23) and 0.2 were used in Reference 11 to correlate analytical and experimental dynamic load gear tests. Here damping ratios of 0.10, 0.17 and 0.25 were used (Fig. 14). Decreasing the damping ratio increased the dynamic load and, thus, shortened the mesh life at speeds near the resonant speed and one-half the resonant speed ($\omega/\omega_n = 1.0$ and 0.5, respectively). A damping ratio of 0.17 was used in the original version of TELSGE and was used in this study for all other figures.

Effect of Speed and Contact Ratio on Gear Life

Modified TELSGE was used to predict how speed and contact ratio affect dynamic load and gear life. Number of teeth, gear size, diametral pitch, pressure angle and gear ratio were varied. The driver gear data for the different runs are shown in Table II. The different sets had basically the same shape while displaced upward or downward when plotted on dimensionless life-speed coordinates (Fig. 15). In most sets the mesh life was shortest at the resonant speed or one-half the resonant speed and was significantly shorter than the life based on static loads at those speeds. For all sets meshes operating above resonance had



AGMA Gear Manufacturing Symposium

April 9 – 11, 1989 Terrace Hilton Hotel
Cincinnati, Ohio

AGMA's Gear Manufacturing Symposium is a comprehensive program providing information to help you be more competitive in the marketplace. This year, the symposium offers a variety of topics on manufacturing and inspection, as well as highlights on the future of the gearing industry.

Featured Topics:

- Basic Gearing
- Solutions to Gear Manufacturing Problems
- The Evolution of Bevel Gear Manufacturing
- The Theory of Modern Bevel Gear Manufacturing
- Grinding Spiral Bevel Gears
- CNC Analytical Gear Inspection
- CNC Inspection and Evaluation of Gear Cutting Tools
- An Introduction to Statistical Process Control
- Statistical Process Control as Applied to Gear Shaving Machines
- A Guide to Successful Qualification of Gear Hobbing Machines
- Manufacturing of Forged and Extruded Gears
- CBN Finishing – Near Net Forged Gears
- Design, Manufacture and Inspection of Plastic Gears

Special Presentations:

- ☞ *Review of the Use of AGMA 2000–A88, Gear Classification & Inspection Handbook*
- ☞ *"Challenge to American Gear Manufacturers," a review of where the industry is going*

Registration \$375 for Members, \$495 Non-Members

For more information contact AGMA Headquarters:

1500 King Street, Suite 201, Alexandria, VA 22314 (703) 684-0211

CIRCLE A-10 ON READER REPLY CARD




Fig. 15—Effect of speed on gear mesh life for parametric study data from Table II.

Table II. Driver Gear Data

(Set 1 used for baseline; shaded area indicates parameter varied from baseline.)

Set	Number of teeth	Pitch radius, cm	Diametral pitch	Pressure angle, deg	Gear ratio	Contact ratio
1	36	5.715	8	20	1	1.69
2	20	3.175	↓	↓	↓	1.56
3	28	4.445	↓	↓	↓	1.64
4	44	6.985	↓	↓	↓	1.73
5	52	8.255	↓	↓	↓	1.76
6	60	9.525	↓	↓	↓	1.78
7	66	6.985	12	↓	↓	1.80
8	99	6.985	18	14.5	↓	1.85
9	28	4.445	8	25	↓	1.92
10	20	3.175	↓	25	↓	1.41
11	28	4.445	↓	25	↓	1.46
12	36	5.715	↓	25	2	1.50
13	36	5.715	↓	20	2	1.75
14	36	5.715	↓	20	3	1.78




Fig. 16—Effect of contact ratio on gear mesh life for parametric study data from Table II.

significantly longer life when compared with the static load calculations.

The contact ratio c , defined as the average number of teeth pairs in contact, is given by

$$c = \frac{Z}{p_b} \quad (33)$$

For a mesh with a contact ratio of 1.6, two pairs of teeth are in contact 60% of the time, and one pair is in contact 40% of the time. Low-contact-ratio gears have contact ratios between 1 and 2. In the parametric studies the contact ratio ranged from 1.41 to 1.92.

For the data in Fig. 15 the dynamic life factor was plotted as a function of contact ratio in Fig. 16 for speeds ω/ω_n of 0.7 and

1.0. A sixth-order polynomial curve-fit was used to generate the curves. At a constant normalized speed the dynamic life factors were about the same for meshes with contact ratios between 1.4 and 1.6, but were significantly higher for meshes with higher contact ratios.

With higher contact ratios the equivalent stiffness (Fig. 9) had a smaller duration of single-tooth-pair contact and, thus, a smoother transition of double- to single- to double-tooth-pair contact. This resulted in lower dynamic load factors and higher dynamic life factors. For the sets studied, the resonant speed varied with equivalent mass, mean equivalent stiffness, pressure angle and number of teeth.

A general design chart for the dynamic life factor of a gear mesh was developed from the parametric studies (Fig. 17). The objective was to determine the dynamic life factor as a single simple function of speed and contact ratio to be used when a computer and program TELSGE are not available. The heavy solid line represents the best fit of the results of the parametric studies. For $\omega/\omega_n \leq 0.5$ the dynamic life factor can be read directly from the plot by using the scale on the left. For $\omega/\omega_n > 0.5$ the dynamic life factor is the product of the value of the curve (using the scale on the right) and the contact ratio to the sixth power. The light dotted lines represent the actual results of the parametric studies and indicate the possible error when using the chart. An example problem given in Appendix A demonstrates the use of the design chart. A simplified hand calculation of gear tooth stiffness is also given in Appendix A.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

How dynamic load affects the pitting fatigue life of external spur gears was predicted by using a modified version of the NASA computer program TELSGE to perform parametric studies. TELSGE was modified to include a surface pitting fatigue life analysis. The parametric studies modeled low-contact-ratio involute gears with no tooth spacing or profile errors. The following results were obtained:

1. Gear life predictions based on dynamic loads generally differed significantly from those based on static loads and were strongly influenced by the maximum dynamic load during contact.

2. Gear mesh operating speeds strongly affected predicted dynamic loads and, thus, gear life. In most cases studied, meshes operating at a resonant speed or one-half the resonant speed had significantly shorter lives than the life based on static loads. Meshes operating above resonance had significantly longer lives.

3. In general, meshes with higher contact ratios had higher predicted dynamic life factors than meshes with lower contact ratios.

4. Damping significantly affected predicted gear mesh life for meshes operating at or near a resonant speed or one-half the resonant speed.

5. A solution for dynamic load converged with only a few iterations of gear tooth stiffness and dynamic load because the Hertzian deflection was relatively small in comparison with the total gear tooth deflection.

TRUE DIMENSION GEAR INSPECTION



Provides actual over ball/pin measurement of any helical or spur gear or spline without the need of costly setting masters.

Provides vital S.P.C. information.

Gage Division

United Tool Supply

851 OHIO PIKE • CINCINNATI, OHIO 45245 • (513) 752-6000

CAPACITY:

9" O.D.
8" I.D.

CIRCLE A-11 ON READER REPLY CARD

Consistent Quality — Unbeatable Value

That is why Overton Gear & Tool
grinds with Okamoto Gear Grinders

"The Okamoto gear grinder has stood the test with Overton Gear. The machine has proven to be dependable and accurate. Service is outstanding. No question, we made the right choice. We have one more on order — a new CNC HTG-24 High Tech Form Gear Grinder."

Kevin Walsh, Dept. Foreman, Carl Overton, Chairman, and Tony Waitekus, President.



Overton

Gear and Tool
Corporation

*Designed, Built and Sold by the Group
That Can Solve Your Gear Grinding Problems*

PEREZ MACHINE TOOL CO.

11 GINGER CT. • E. AMHERST, NEW YORK 14051 • TELEPHONE 716-688-6982



Exclusive U.S.A. &
Canadian Distributor of
Okamoto Gear Grinders
GTP-200 & GTR Series
Gear Tooth Chamfering
Machines



CIRCLE A-12 ON READER REPLY CARD




Fig. 17—Dynamic life factor.

APPENDIX A Example Problem

Example problem. Determine the dynamic life factor of the mesh from the data given in Table III when the driver gear is rotating at 5000 rpm.

Solution. The pitch radii are

$$r_{p,1} = \frac{1}{2} N_1 m_o = \frac{1}{2} (32 \text{ teeth}) \left(4.233 \text{ mm/tooth} \times \frac{1 \text{ cm}}{10 \text{ mm}} \right) = 6.773 \text{ cm} (2.667 \text{ in.})$$

$$r_{p,2} = \frac{1}{2} (100 \text{ teeth}) \left(4.233 \text{ mm/tooth} \times \frac{1 \text{ cm}}{10 \text{ mm}} \right) = 21.165 \text{ cm} (8.333 \text{ in.})$$

Table III. Gear Mesh Data Used In Dynamic Life Factor Example Problem

Parameter	Driver gear	Driven gear
Number of teeth	32	100
Outside radius, cm (in.)	7.196 (2.833)	21.590 (8.500)
Root radius, cm (in.)	6.246 (2.459)	20.638 (8.125)
Lewis form factor	0.433	0.521
Module, mm/tooth (Pitch, teeth/in.)	4.233 (6)	
Face width, cm (in.)	6.350 (2.500)	
Pressure angle, deg (rad)	25 (0.436)	
Tooth thickness at pitch radius, cm (in.)	0.665 (0.262)	
Modulus of elasticity, Pa (psi)	2.068×10^{11} (30×10^6)	
Density, kg/m ³ (lb/in. ³)	7833 (0.283)	

The base radii are

$$r_{b,1} = r_{p,1} \cos \varphi = (6.773 \text{ cm}) \cos 25^\circ = 6.138 \text{ cm} (2.417 \text{ in.})$$

$$r_{b,2} = (21.165 \text{ cm}) \cos 25^\circ = 19.182 \text{ cm} (7.552 \text{ in.})$$

From Equations 5 and 6 the contact lengths from the pitch point to the start and end of contact are

$$z_1 = \sqrt{(21.590 \text{ cm})^2 - (19.182 \text{ cm})^2} - (21.165 \text{ cm}) \sin 25^\circ = 0.964 \text{ cm} (0.379 \text{ in.})$$

$$z_2 = \sqrt{(7.196 \text{ cm})^2 - (6.138 \text{ cm})^2} - (6.773 \text{ cm}) \sin 25^\circ = 0.894 \text{ cm} (0.351 \text{ in.})$$

From Equation 7 the contact length is

$$Z = (0.964 \text{ cm}) + (0.894 \text{ cm}) = 1.858 \text{ cm} (0.730 \text{ in.})$$

The base pitch is

$$p_b = \frac{2\pi r_{b,1}}{N_1} = \frac{2\pi(6.138 \text{ cm})}{32 \text{ teeth}} = 1.205 \text{ cm} (0.475 \text{ in.})$$

From Equation 33 the contact ratio is

$$c = \frac{1.858 \text{ cm}}{1.205 \text{ cm}} = 1.54$$

The masses per unit face width of the driver and driven gears can be approximated by

$$m_1 = \gamma \pi r_{p,1}^2 = (7833 \text{ kg/m}^3) \pi \left(6.773 \text{ cm} \times \frac{1 \text{ m}}{100 \text{ cm}} \right)^2$$

$$= 112.886 \text{ kg/m} \quad (1.637 \times 10^{-2} \text{ lb sec}^2/\text{in.}^2)$$

$$m_2 = (7833 \text{ kg/m}^3) \pi \left(21.165 \text{ cm} \times \frac{1 \text{ m}}{100 \text{ cm}} \right)^2$$

$$= 1102.337 \text{ kg/m} \quad (1.598 \times 10^{-1} \text{ lb sec}^2/\text{in.}^2)$$

The effective masses per unit face width are

$$M_1 = \frac{J_1}{r_{b,1}^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} m_1 r_{b,1}^2}{r_{b,1}^2} = \frac{1}{2} m_1 = \frac{1}{2} (112.886 \text{ kg/m})$$

$$= 56.443 \text{ kg/m} \quad (8.185 \times 10^{-3} \text{ lb sec}^2/\text{in.}^2)$$

$$M_2 = \frac{1}{2} (1102.337 \text{ kg/m}) = 551.169 \text{ kg/m}$$

$$(7.990 \times 10^{-2} \text{ lb sec}^2/\text{in.}^2)$$

From Equation 22 the equivalent mass per unit face width is

$$M_{eq} = \frac{(56.443 \text{ kg/m})(551.169 \text{ kg/m})}{(56.443 \text{ kg/m}) + (551.169 \text{ kg/m})}$$

$$= 51.200 \text{ kg/m} \quad (7.424 \times 10^{-3} \text{ lb sec}^2/\text{in.}^2)$$

Determining teeth stiffnesses by the methods of Cornell⁽¹⁷⁾ requires the use of a computer. For this example the stiffness






Fig. 18 - Gear tooth model for simplified stiffness calculations.


calculations will be simplified by modeling the gear teeth as cantilever beams of uniform strength (beams in which the section modulus varies along the beam in the same proportion as the bending moment). The pressure angles at the root radii of the driver and driven gears (Fig. 18) are

$$\alpha_1 = \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{r_{b,1}}{r_{r,1}} \right) = \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{6.138 \text{ cm}}{6.246 \text{ cm}} \right)$$





A Complete Line of



Standard Involute
Special Forms
Spline & Serration
Multiple Thread
Shank Type

GEAR GENERATING TOOLS
12 Pitch & Finer **HOBS** ALL BORE SIZES

TRU-VOLUTE PVD GOLD
Titanium-Nitride Coated Hobs & Cutters
(A selected range available from stock)

Catalog available upon request

Shaper Cutters
Disc Type · Shank Type
Rack Milling Cutters
Thread
Milling Cutters

RUSSELL, HOLBROOK & HENDERSON, INC.

2 NORTH STREET, WALDWICK, NEW JERSEY 07463

TEL.: (201) 670-4220 FAX.: (201) 670-4266

FINE MACHINE TOOLS SINCE 1915

CIRCLE A-13 ON READER REPLY CARD

$$= 10.670^\circ = 0.186 \text{ rad}$$

$$\alpha_2 = \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{19.182 \text{ cm}}{20.638 \text{ cm}} \right) = 21.651^\circ = 0.378 \text{ rad}$$

From Reference 22 the tooth thickness at the pitch radius is related to the tooth thickness at the root radius by

$$t = 2r_p \left[\frac{h_0}{2r_r} + (\tan \alpha - \alpha) - (\tan \varphi - \varphi) \right]$$

Therefore the teeth thickness at the root radii are

$$h_{0,1} = 2r_{r,1} \left[\frac{t}{2r_{p,1}} - (\tan \alpha_1 - \alpha_1) + (\tan \varphi - \varphi) \right]$$

$$= 2(6.246 \text{ cm}) \left[\frac{0.665 \text{ cm}}{2(6.773 \text{ cm})} - (\tan 0.186 - 0.186) + (\tan 0.436 - 0.436) \right]$$

$$= 0.960 \text{ cm (0.378 in.)}$$

$$h_{0,2} = 2(20.638 \text{ cm}) \left[\frac{0.665 \text{ cm}}{2(21.165 \text{ cm})} - (\tan 0.378 - 0.378) + (\tan 0.436 - 0.436) \right]$$

$$= 1.095 \text{ cm (0.431 in.)}$$

From Reference 23 and Fig. 18 the distance of the inscribed parabola is

$$d = \frac{h_0^2}{6m_o Y}$$

where Y is the Lewis form factor. Thus the distances of the inscribed parabolas are

$$d_1 = \frac{h_{0,1}^2}{6m_o Y_1} = \frac{(0.960 \text{ cm})^2}{6 \left(4.233 \text{ mm/tooth} \times \frac{1 \text{ cm}}{10 \text{ mm}} \right) (0.433)}$$

$$= 0.838 \text{ cm (0.330 in.)}$$

$$d_2 = \frac{(1.095 \text{ cm})^2}{6 \left(4.233 \text{ mm/tooth} \times \frac{1 \text{ cm}}{10 \text{ mm}} \right) (0.521)}$$

$$= 0.906 \text{ cm (0.357 in.)}$$

The inscribed parabola in Fig. 18 is a cantilever beam of uniform strength. From Reference 24 the deflection for the beam is

$$\delta = \frac{2Q_t d^3}{3EI_0} \quad \text{where } I_0 = \frac{1}{12} f h_0^3$$

The gear tooth stiffness per unit face width is

$$k = \frac{Q_t}{\delta f} = \frac{3EI_0}{2d^3 f} = \frac{Eh_0^3}{8d^3}$$

For the driver and driven gears, respectively,

$$k_1 = \frac{Eh_{0,1}^3}{8d_1^3} = \frac{(2.068 \times 10^{11} \text{ Pa}) \left(0.960 \text{ cm} \times \frac{1 \text{ m}}{100 \text{ cm}} \right)^3}{8 \left(0.838 \text{ cm} \times \frac{1 \text{ m}}{100 \text{ cm}} \right)^3}$$

$$= 3.886 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa (5.636} \times 10^6 \text{ psi)}$$

$$k_2 = \frac{(2.068 \times 10^{11} \text{ Pa}) \left(1.095 \text{ cm} \times \frac{1 \text{ m}}{100 \text{ cm}} \right)^3}{8 \left(0.916 \text{ cm} \times \frac{1 \text{ m}}{100 \text{ cm}} \right)^3}$$

$$= 4.564 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa (6.599} \times 10^6 \text{ psi)}$$

From Equation 25 the combined stiffness per unit face width is

$$K = \frac{(3.886 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa})(4.564 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa})}{(3.886 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa}) + (4.564 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa})}$$

$$= 2.099 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa (3.040} \times 10^6 \text{ psi)}$$

For this example it is assumed that the combined stiffness is constant with respect to contact position. During single-tooth-pair contact the equivalent stiffness is K . During double-tooth-pair contact the equivalent stiffness is $2K$. The mean equivalent stiffness per unit face width (Fig. 19) is given as

$$\bar{K}_{eq} = \frac{1}{Z} \int_0^Z K_{eq} dx$$

$$= \frac{1}{Z} \left(\int_0^{Z-p_b} K_{eq} dx + \int_{Z-p_b}^{p_b} K_{eq} dx + \int_{p_b}^Z K_{eq} dx \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{Z} \left\{ 2K[(Z-p_b) - 0] + K[p_b - (Z-p_b)] + 2K[Z-p_b] \right\}$$

$$= K \left[3 - 2 \left(\frac{p_b}{Z} \right) \right] = K \left(3 - \frac{2}{c} \right)$$

$$= (2.099 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa}) \left(3 - \frac{2}{1.54} \right)$$

$$= 3.571 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa (5.172} \times 10^6 \text{ psi)}$$




Fig. 19—Equivalent gear tooth stiffness as a function of contact position.

From Equation 31 the resonant speed in terms of driver gear rotations is

$$\omega_n = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{K_{eq}}{M_{eq}} \cos \varphi}}{N_1} \left(\frac{60}{2\pi} \right)$$

$$= \frac{\sqrt{\frac{3.571 \times 10^{10} \text{ Pa}}{51.200 \text{ kg/m}} \cos 25^\circ}}{32 \text{ teeth}} \left(\frac{60}{2\pi} \right) = 7143 \text{ rpm}$$

At a driver operating speed of 5000 rpm

$$\frac{\omega}{\omega_n} = \frac{5000 \text{ rpm}}{7143 \text{ rpm}} = 0.70$$

From Fig. 17 for $\omega/\omega_n = 0.70$

$$\frac{C_v}{c^6} = 0.04$$

and the dynamic life factor is

$$C_v = 0.04 c^6 = 0.04 (1.54)^6 = 0.53$$

Thus about a 50% decrease in life compared with that using static loads is predicted for this example. Note that the simplified stiffness model used in the example may produce erroneous values for the resonant speed. The mean value of the equivalent stiffness per unit face width for this example was computed by using Cornell's method⁽¹⁷⁾ and TELSAGE, as 2.741×10^{10} Pa (3.975×10^6 psi). This produced a resonant speed of 6260 rpm and a dynamic life factor of 0.56.

References:

- Surface Durability (Pitting) of Spur Gear Teeth. The American Gear Manufacturers Association (AGMA) Standard 210.02, Jan. 1965.
- COY, J.J. TOWNSEND, D.P. and ZARETSKY, E.V. "Analysis of Dynamic Capacity of Low-Contact-Ratio Spur Gears Using Lundberg-Palmgren Theory." NASA TN D-8029, 1975.
- TOWNSEND, D.P. COY, J.J. and ZARETSKY, E.V. "Experimental and Analytical Load-Life Relation for AISI 9310 Steel Spur Gears." *J. Mech. Des.*, Vol. 100, No. 1, Jan. 1978, pp. 54-60.
- COY, J.J. and ZARETSKY, E.V. "Life Analysis of Helical Gear Sets Using Lundberg-Palmgren Theory." NASA TN D-8045, 1975.
- COY, J.J. TOWNSEND, D.P. and ZARETSKY, E.V. "Dynamic Capacity and Surface Fatigue Life for Spur and Helical Gears." *J. Lubr. Technol.*, Vol. 98, No. 2, Apr. 1976, pp. 267-276.
- COY, J.J. TOWNSEND, D.P. and ZARETSKY, E.V. "An Update on the Life Analysis of Spur Gears." *Advanced Power Transmission Technology*, NASA CP-2210, G.K. Fischer, ed., 1983, pp. 421-434.
- BUCKINGHAM, E. *Analytical Mechanics of Gears*. McGraw-Hill, 1949.
- TUPLIN, W.A. "Dynamic Loads on Gear Teeth." *Proceedings, International Conference on Gearing*, Institution of Mechanical Engineers, London, 1958, pp. 24-30.
- RICHARDSON, HERBERT HEATH. *Static and Dynamic Load, Stresses and Deflection Cycles in Spur Gear Systems*. Ph.D. Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1958.
- ATTIA, A.Y. "Dynamic Loading on Spur Gear Teeth." *J. Eng. Ind.*, Vol. 81, No. 1, Feb. 1959, pp. 1-9.
- ICHIMARU, K. and HIRANO, F. "Dynamic Behavior of Heavy-Loaded Spur Gears." *J. Eng. Ind.*, Vol. 96, No. 2, May 1974, pp. 373-381.
- CORNELL, R.W. and WESTERVELT, W.W. "Dynamic Tooth Loads and Stressing for High Contact Ratio Spur Gears." *J. Mech. Des.*, Vol. 100, No. 1, Jan 1978, pp. 69-76.
- KASUBA, R. and EVANS, J.W. "An Extended Model for Determining Dynamic Loads in Spur Gears." *J. Mech. Des.*, Vol. 103, No. 2 Apr. 1981, pp. 398-409.
- WANG, K.L. and CHENG, H.S. "Thermal Elastohydrodynamic Lubrication of Spur Gears." NASA CR-3241, 1980.
- WANG, K.L. and CHENG, H.S. "A Numerical Solution to the Dynamic Load, Film Thickness, and Surface Temperatures in Spur Gears Part I, Analysis." *J. Mech. Des.*, Vol. 103, No. 1, Jan. 1981, pp. 177-187.
- WANG, K.L. and CHENG, H.S. "A Numerical Solution to the Dynamic Load, Film Thickness, and Surface Temperatures in Spur Gears. Part II, Results." *J. Mech. Des.*, Vol. 103, No. 1, Jan. 1981, pp. 188-194.
- CORNELL, R.W. "Compliance and Stress Sensitivity of Spur Gear Teeth." *J. Mech. Des.*, Vol. 103, No. 2, Apr. 1981, pp. 447-459.
- LUNDBERG, G. and PALMGREN, A. "Dynamic Capacity of Rolling Bearings." *Acta Polytechnica, Mechanical Engineering Series*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1947.
- LUNDBERG, G. and PALMGREN, A. "Dynamic Capacity of Rolling Bearings." *J. Appl. Mech.*, Vol. 16, No. 2, June 1949, pp. 165-172.
- LUNDBERG, G. and PALMGREN, A. "Dynamic Capacity of Roller Bearings." *Acta Polytechnica, Mechanical Engineering Series*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 1952.
- LEWICKI, D.G., et al. "Fatigue Life Analysis of a Turborprop Reduction Gearbox." *Journal of Mechanisms, Transmissions, and Automation in Design*. Vol. 108, No. 2, June 1986, pp. 255-262.
- KHIRALLA, T.W. "On the Geometry of External Involute Spur Gears." GEARS, North Hollywood, 1976.
- DEUTSCHMAN, A.D. MICHELS, W.J. and WILSON, C.E. *Machine Design - Theory and Practice*. Macmillan, 1975.
- TIMOSHENKO, S. *Strength of Materials*. 3rd ed., Van Nostrand, 1955.

Acknowledgement: Originally appeared as NASA Technical Paper 2610, AVSCOM Technical Report 86-C-21, June, 1986.