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Simulation of the vibration test can be useful

- Heavy structure
- High imposed loads
- Centre of gravity misalignment
- Anti-resonance

Can induce undesirable behaviour (beating, transversal load, over or under testing,...)

Tools allowing to simulate the coupled system (specimen, shaker and controller) help the test engineer to foresee the difficulties and look for solutions.
All the parts play a role in the Virtual Shaker Testing

1. Introduction
2. Virtual Shaker Simulator
   - Shaker functioning
   - EM model
   - System identification
   - Model updating
   - Controller model
   - Specimen coupling
3. Test Cases
   - Simple beam
   - Industrial structure
4. Conclusions
From measurements via modelling to validation

1) Virtual Shaker Simulator
   a. Shaker functioning
   b. Electromechanical model
   c. System identification
   d. Model updating
   e. Controller model
   f. Specimen coupling

2) Validation on test cases
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Shaker similar to a robust loudspeaker

Coupled electromechanical system
- Magnetic circuit + current through the coil = vertical force
- Velocity of the coil within magnetic field = back EMF

Limitations:
- At low frequencies: maximal displacement
- At intermediate frequencies: maximal velocity linked to maximal current
- At high frequencies: maximal forces and voltage
7 +1 degrees of freedom model ...

\[
F = B I n i = K_F i \\
E_{bemf} = B I n \dot{x}_{coil} = K_F \dot{x}_{coil}
\]

\[
x = [z_{Coil} \quad z_{table} \quad z_{body} \quad \theta_{z,table} \quad \theta_{x,table} \quad \theta_{y,table} \quad \theta_{z,Coil}]^T \\
q = [x \quad i]^T
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
M & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} \ddot{q} + \begin{bmatrix}
C_F & 0 \\
0 & L
\end{bmatrix} \dot{q} + \begin{bmatrix}
K & -F \\
0 & R
\end{bmatrix} q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\
V \end{bmatrix}
\]
Shaker can be rotated and coupled to a slip table

Finite element model (Samcef):
- Table: shell element
- Oil effect: spring element
- Bearing: spring/damper element
Measurements taken as basis for the model updating

For both vertical and horizontal configurations:
- Hammer impact testing
- Low level sine sweep [5-2500 Hz]

Data needed for the model updating:
- Modal characteristics: resonance frequencies, modal shapes and damping ratios
  - For vertical configuration:
    - \textit{Coil mode}
    - \textit{Suspension mode}
    - \textit{Rotation modes} of the table (in-plane and torsion)
    - \textit{Isolation mode} (below frequency of interest)
  - For horizontal configuration:
    - \textit{Pumping mode}
- Electromechanical coupling and RL system parameters identification
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Rotation modes identified

- Coil mode not properly detected during impact testing
- In-plane rotation mode
- Torsion mode
- Rotation modes also observed during sine sweep
- Highly sensitive to the suspension mounting
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   Pumping mode identified thanks to modal analysis (shaker at rest) and sine sweep (shaker on)
   - Pumping mode detected at lower frequency with sine sweep

   528 Hz – 1,9 %
   691 Hz – 1,5 %
   886 Hz – 1,0 %
Model updating strategy

- For the vertical configuration, initial values for the masses, the stiffnesses, the resistance and inductance from data sheets
- For the horizontal configuration, measurement of the geometrical dimensions
- Updating performed by manual sensitivity analyses

In order to:
- Represent the modal content: frequencies, mode shapes and damping ratios
- Minimize the differences between measured and simulated frequency response functions

The effort is focused on the features potentially involving undesirable effects (coil mode, pumping mode, torsion mode,...)

Additional works (measurements and updating) have to be done to achieve a model with a better level of correlation
Model updating: vertical configuration
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**Suspension Mode**
- Non-measured
- Tuned based on data sheet data

**In-Plane Rotation**
- Twice (symmetrical)
- High level of damping

**Torsion Mode**
- Low level of damping
- Supposed to be out-of-phase mode

**Coil Mode**
- Detected on sine sweep measurements
- Coherent with data sheet
Model updating: vertical configuration

Electrical parameters and coupling coefficient $F$ updated thanks to table vertical acceleration to drive voltage FRF

Correlation satisfactory to represent the shaker dynamic

Comparison between measured and simulated table vertical acceleration to drive voltage Frequency Response Function

Comparison between measured and simulated table acceleration (rotation around the vertical axis) to table vertical acceleration Frequency Response Function
Model updating: horizontal configuration

- Pumping mode correlated (to modal analysis when shaker at rest)
- Difficulty to achieve satisfactory level of correlation (MAC < 0.7) for the other slip table modes due to the difficult representation of the oil effect
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Controller that mimic the LMS hardware

- Controller model created and validated by Siemens LMS team
- Allowing to simulate sine sweep
- Available control parameters:
Reduced-order model coupled to the system

Assuming that:
- A finite element model of the specimen is available
- Modal characteristics are known (ideally with the specimen fixed on the shaker in test configuration): frequencies, mode shapes and modal ratios
- Updated model is performed

The procedure to integrate the specimen model to the shaker model is:
- Define a master node rigidly linked to the specimen interface
- Compute a Craig-Bampton super-element: retained Dofs of the master node (vertical translation and rotation) and number of modes to have sufficient effective masses in the frequencies range of interest
Reduced-order model coupled to the system

- Link the reduced model of the specimen to the shaker table Dofs by imposing the compatibility and equilibrium conditions

Compatibility

\[ q_{spe_i} = q_{table_i} \text{ with } i = 3, 4, 5 & 6 \]

Equilibrium

\[ F_{\text{react:specimenToShaker}} + F_{\text{react:ShakerToSpecimen}} = 0 \]

with \( F_{\text{react}} = \left\{ M_{FI} \times \left[ \frac{-K_H}{M_H} - \frac{C_H}{M_H} \right] \times \frac{[p]}{[\dot{p}]} \right\} + \left\{ M_{FI} \times \frac{M_{FI}}{M_H} \right\} \times \dot{q}_f \)
Simple beam to validate the procedure

Steel 30x30x4x4 mm beam clamped on the shaker head

Modal characteristics identified:
- 0,9% of damping for the 1B modes
- 0,3% of damping for the 2B modes

Finite element model updated:
- Beam elements

Two control point locations tested:
- At the beam basis
- At the beam centre
Good prediction of the coupled system

1) Control point at the beam basis

Drive Voltage

Vertical acceleration at beam tip

Transverse acceleration at beam tip
Difficulty predicted when control on antiresonance

2) Control point at the beam centre

- During the physical test, control parameters have been modified to be able to pass the antiresonance frequency
Industrial structure can be tested

Luminaire designed and commercialized by Schréder

Finite element updated:
- 650 000 dofs
- Assembly of parts by face gluing and rigid body elements (RBE)
- Modal damping percentage determined

Qualification test according to IEC norm:
- 0,5 g imposed at the luminaire fixation at first resonance frequency
- Sine sweep between 5 and 55 Hz
Industrial structure can be tested

Simulation duration: 580 s to be compared to the 240 s of physical test

Non-linearity observed at around 40 Hz (opening of the fork assembly)
Conclusions

All blocks of the virtual shaker are created and assembled:
- 7 + 1 degrees of freedom model for the electromechanical model of the shaker
- Controller model supplied by Siemens LMS
- Reduced-order model of the specimen allows dealing with industrial structure (modal characteristics needed to update the finite element model)

Additional studies has to be performed to improve the slip table model

Validation on two test cases: the dynamic of coupled system is accurately predicted

Control parameter modification can be tested to deal with detected difficulties

Additional functionalities such as the control on average on several points are planned to be implemented