



International conference 6–9 JUNE 2023 Espace Prouvé, Nancy, France Comparison of anti-vibration gloves performe in the laboratory and in the field. Similarities and difference

> Raoul Di Giovanni Angelo Tirabasso <sup>1</sup>, Pietro Nataletti<sup>1</sup> and Enrico Marchetti <sup>1,\*</sup>



### Laboratory certification for the anti-vibration gloves

Certification of anti-vibration gloves is nowadays performed following UNI EN ISO 10819:2013.

This certification is a laboratory standardized protocol that prescribes a series of conditions to perform tests on anti-vibration gloves

Laboratory measurements are a physical model of real field events. In such a role they constitute a rough simplification of the real process. It is well known that field measurements differs from laboratory in many points:



### variability of engine speed



Posture



Force



X

ANCI

### Posture in the field vs posture in the laboratory

It is almost impossibile have a static posture in field. For ergonomic and safety factor the operator have to move constantly



ŢĮ

In the laboratory the principal aim is to find a static and standardized posture



### UNI EN ISO 10819:2013

The calculation of the transmissibility value was performed using the UNI EN ISO 10819:2013 model, i.e., 3 measurements for each of the 6 subjects, with and without gloves. Two methods have been used to calculate the transmissibility which we will call the direct method and the corrected transmissibility:

- 1. Direct method: Acceleration inside the glove / acceleration on the handle; TR<sub>sg</sub> = (a<sub>wsPg</sub> / a<sub>wsRg</sub>)
- 2. corrected transmissibility : (Gloved hand transmissibility / Handle acceleration) / (Bare hand transmissibility / handle acceleration) TR<sub>sg</sub> (a<sub>wsPg</sub> / a<sub>wsRg</sub>) / TR<sub>sb</sub> (a<sub>wsPb</sub> / a<sub>wsRb</sub>) TR<sub>sg</sub> / TR<sub>sg</sub> / TR<sub>sb</sub>



### MEDIUM AND HIGH FREQUENCY

In order to have the prescribed transmissibilities in medium and high frequency the signal was split in these two frequency

### 20-250 Hz (Tm) 200-1250 Hz (Th).

Certification values (Tm) < 0.90 (Th) < 0.60

### Result

Actual results are depicted in Table 1, referred to the handle of the chainsaw; in which are reported, for comparison, certification data declared by manufacturer. In Table 2 are reported transmissibility referred to the bare hand. Those latter are measured in two different cutting session: one for

the bare hand and one for the gloved hand.

4AV 619

# Table 1 Transmissibility calculated with the direct method for each subject.

Subject		Anti-vibrating glove							
	GLO	GLOVE 1		GLOVE 2		VE 3			
	$T_m$	$T_h$	Tm	Th	$T_m$	$T_h$			
1	0.88	0.81	0.88	0.55	0.88	0.81			
2	0.74	0.74	0.70	0.68	0.74	0.74			
3	0.74	0.68	0.46	0.52	0.85	0.82			
4	0.61	0.52	0.50	0.52	0.61	0.57			
5 6	0.55	0.43	0.46	0.36	0.66	0.57			
6	0.81	0.44	0.77	0.40	0.34	0.34			
$Mean \pm SD^1$	0.72±0.12	$0.60 \pm 0.16$	0.63±0.18	$0.50\pm0.12$	0.68±0.20	0.64±0.18			
Declared	0,90	0,52	0,80	0,57	N.a.	N.a.			
Difference	0,18	-0,08	0,17	0,7	N.a.	N.a.			

J.A.

## Table 2 Transmissibility calculated with the corrected transmissibility for each subject.

JA

nissibility for ea	ch subjeo	ct.				NC	
Subject	Anti-vibrating glove						
	GLOVE 1		GLOVE 2		GLOVE 3		
	T <sub>m</sub>	Th	Tm	Th	Tm	T <sub>h</sub>	
1	0.79	0.79	0.59	0.66	0.82	0.98	
2	0.82	0.80	0.80	0.83	0.84	0.89	
3	1.02	0.98	0.64	0.44	1.16	1.17	
4	0.85	0.62	0.62	0.51	0.77	0.68	
5 6 9	0.73	0.61	0.62	0.51	0.88	0.81	
6	0.80	0.45	0.76	0.40	0.34	0.35	
Mean±SD <sup>1</sup>	0.84±0.10	0.71±0.18	$0.67 \pm 0.09$	$0.56 \pm 0.16$	0.80±0.27	0.81±0.28	
Declared	0,90	0,52	0,80	0,57	N.a. <sup>2</sup>	N.a.	
Difference	0,6	-0,19	0,13	0,01	N.a.	N.a.	



### Discussion

The difference between the transmissibility measured in the field, using the direct transmissibility as a reference, and the values declared by the manufacturers is very small, with some exceptions, and the standard deviation of the values measured in the field stands at good values. In the case of experimental transmissibility, however, two out of three gloves would not pass the certification because, for some subjects, they amplify rather than reduce vibrations.

### Next Step and opportunities

The current data seem to confirm the effectiveness of the certification protocol by comparing the measured data with those declared. It seems reasonable to assume, given the high standard deviation, that in the field it would be right to measure a greater number of subjects to account for the high variability. The next step to conclude the work will be to carry out laboratory measurements by reproducing the average signal obtained in the field on the chainsaw and adopting the indications of the UNI EN ISO 10819:2013 certification standard.

# THANK YOU OF FRANCE FOR YOUR KIND ATTENTION FOR YOUR KIND ATTENTION