

BSSM 2012: Test and analysis of materials in sports engineering

Understanding the traction of tennis surfaces

James Clarke Sports Engineering Research Group The University of Sheffield



Project Overview



Biomechanics Research Team







Background Traction in tennis:



*Dunn *et al.* Assessing tennis player interactions with tennis courts, 29th international conference on biomechanics in sport (2011).



Traction in tennis:





*Dunn *et al.* Assessing tennis player interactions with tennis courts, 29th international conference on biomechanics in sport (2011).



Injury Risk:



Acrylic Hard Court – higher occurrence of injury.



Clay – lower occurrence of injury.



Injury Risk:



Acrylic Hard Court – higher occurrence of injury. COT ~ 0.8 - 1.2 (Nigg, 2003)



Clay – lower occurrence of injury. COT ~ 0.5 - 0.7 (Nigg, 2003)



Injury Risk:





Surfaces which do not allow sliding increase the potential to cause injury.



Project objectives

- Identify parameters that influence traction
- Design and develop a test rig
- Develop predictive models



Methodology

Bespoke UoS1

STM 603 Slip resistance tester







Methodology UoS1 Rig

Horizontal and vertical load cells

Mounted _____ footwear on plate





Hydraulic ram
normal force

 LVDT (displacement)

Pneumatic ram
force
controlled
displacement



Methodology







Strong power relationships were found between Normal Force and COT.





Effect of Roughness





Effect of Roughness





Effect of Stiffness







Effect of Stiffness





Effect of Stiffness





Initial Findings

- Loading conditions change the tribological interaction at the shoe-surface interface
- Testing under inappropriate loading conditions may give misleading results



UoS1 Rig - Limitations

Horizontal and vertical load cells

Mounted – footwear on plate





Hydraulic ram
normal force

 LVDT (displacement)

Pneumatic ram
force
controlled
displacement



Further Testing

STM 603 - Slip resistance tester





Sliding Speed (m/s)

•0.1 ■0.2 ▲0.3 ×0.4 ×0.5





Methodology





















Results (observation)

Surface A





Surface E



Test Rig (UoS2)



Pneumatic cylinders

Load Cells and LVDTs – Force and Displacement



Typical Traces:

Wet Artificial Clay



Dry Acrylic Hard Court





Typical Traces:

Wet Artificial Clay



Dry Acrylic Hard Court 0.3 () 0.25 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.05 0

Time (s)

Traction Force (N)

Horizontal Displacement (m)







Typical Traces:

Region II:

Wet Artificial Clay







Typical Traces:

Region III:

Wet Artificial Clay







Results Example (UoS2)

Comparison of surface: Average Dynamic Traction





Results Example (UoS2)

Influence of Hard Court Roughness: Peak Traction Force





Validate

Future Work

Biomechanical Testing at Exeter

Generate boundary conditions

Develop predictive model



Parametric study

Mechanical Testing





Acknowledgements:











Biomechanics Research Team

Dr Matt Carré Dr Andrea Richardson Zhijun Yang Dr Sharon Dixon Dr Loic Damm