

Vol. 8, No. 3, 1992, pp. 720, 721.

<sup>2</sup>Glick, R. L., Caveny, L. H., and Thurman, J. L., "Internal Ballistics of Slotted-Tube Solid Propellant Rocket Motors," *Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1967, pp. 525-530.

<sup>3</sup>Johnston, W. A., personal communication, Los Angeles, CA, June 18, 1992.

<sup>4</sup>Boyer, W., "SRMU Test Firing Proves Successful," *Space News*, June 15-21, 1992, p. 3, 21.

## Reply by the Author to R. L. Glick and L. H. Caveny

W. A. Johnston\*

*The Aerospace Corporation,  
Los Angeles, California 90009*

THE author wishes to thank Glick and Caveny for their interest in his Note,<sup>1</sup> and to comment briefly on the issues which they raise. In their Comment, Glick and Caveny make two points. First, and most important, they emphasize that an internal ballistic analysis of a solid rocket motor (SRM) ought to be coupled to a grain structural analysis to properly analyze SRM performance, since grain deformation can significantly alter the internal geometry. Second, they suggest that it may be possible to create more efficient segmented SRM designs than the simple modification proposed in Ref. 1, where alternate segments are installed in the motor upside down (relative to the usual orientation of segments in SRMs). Their prime candidate appears to be a design in which all of the segments are installed upside down (see Fig. 1c of Glick and Caveny's Comment), and the individual segments are tailored so that the resulting port flow area increase across slots is filled by the flow which emerges from the slots.

In regard to the second point, I would agree with Glick and Caveny that the design change proposed in Ref. 1 will not necessarily optimize an SRM from the standpoint of reducing the initial stagnation pressure loss or reducing the danger of catastrophic grain collapse. The idea in the original Note was that a simple rearrangement of the segments would improve the motor in both of these respects, and that this could be achieved with the propellant segment shapes currently in use.

Concerning their first point, that a coupled flow/structural analysis is required to properly analyze SRM performance, I would also agree with Glick and Caveny on this matter. The fixed grain geometry calculations, for which results were presented in Ref. 1, are only valid if the propellant deformation is small, due either to a stiff (high modulus) propellant or to the nature of the design. And the standard SRM design (Ref. 1, Fig. 1a), which has forward propellant segment corners that jut out into the bore flow and experience large aerodynamic loading, is a design which by its very nature is prone to deformation. In cases where the grain deformation is not small, such fixed geometry calculations can only provide a preliminary assessment of SRM performance. A coupled flow-structural interactive calculation is needed in the final analysis. It should be added however, that my modified design (Ref. 1, Fig. 1b), and Glick and Caveny's alternate design (their Fig. 1c), are both less prone to deformation under the expected aerodynamic loading, as are chamfered (i.e., Ritchey radius) designs.

Finally, I would mention that, in addition to the pioneering work done by Glick and Caveny in this area,<sup>2</sup> a coupled flow/structural numerical procedure for SRMs has recently been developed which addresses these concerns.<sup>3</sup> This computer code simultaneously models the developing flowfield and the associated propellant grain deformation during the ignition transient period of SRM operation.

## References

<sup>1</sup>Johnston, W. A., "A Method for Reducing Stagnation Pressure Losses in Segmented Solid Rocket Motors," *Journal of Propulsion and Power*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1992, pp. 720, 721.

<sup>2</sup>Glick, R. L., Caveny, L. H., and Thurman, J. L., "Internal Ballistics of Slotted-Tube Solid Propellant Rocket Motors," *Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1967, pp. 525-530.

<sup>3</sup>Johnston, W. A., and Murdock, J. W., "Flow-Structural Interaction Inside a Solid Rocket During Ignition Transient," The Aerospace Corp., ATM-92(2530-03)-12, Los Angeles, CA, Jan. 1992.

Received Sept. 3, 1992; accepted for publication Jan. 15, 1993. This paper is declared a work of the U.S. Government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States.

\*Member of the Technical Staff, P.O. Box 92957, Member AIAA.