Experimental Identification of Concentrated Nonlinearity in Aeroelastic System
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Abstract. Identification of concentrated nonlinearity in the torsional spring of an aeroelastic system is performed. This system consists of a rigid airfoil that is supported by a linear spring in the plunge motion and a nonlinear spring in the pitch motion. Quadratic and cubic nonlinearities in the pitch moment are introduced to model the concentrated nonlinearity. The representation of the aerodynamic loads by the Duhamel formulation yielded accurate values for the flutter speed and frequency. The results show that the use of the Duhamel formulation to represent the aerodynamic loads yields excellent agreement between the experimental data and the numerical predictions.

1 Introduction

Nonlinearities in aeroelastic systems can affect the response of aerospace vehicles and lead to complex phenomena such as flutter, limit-cycle oscillations (LCOs), chaos and bifurcations [1–3]. Such phenomena are associated with nonlinear aerodynamic or structural conditions that characterize aeroelastic systems. Regarding structural nonlinearities, they can arise from large structural deflections and/or partial loss of structural integrity. Furthermore, the effects of aging, loose attachments, and material features could lead to undesirable and dangerous responses [4]. The combination of the structural and aerodynamic nonlinearities can lead to changes in the basic response of the system such as changing it from supercritical to subcritical responses and then catastrophic behavior can occur. As such, assessing the evolution of these inevitable behaviors through modeling and analysis of these nonlinearities is important to avoid or control these dangerous responses.

In this work, we perform a nonlinear analysis to identify the concentrated nonlinearity in the torsional spring of an airfoil section. The objective is to show how the use of a cubic nonlinearity to model the concentrated nonlinearity and the Duhamel formulation to represent the aerodynamic loads can yield relevant characterization of the aeroelastic system.

2 Experimental setup of the aeroelastic system

The aeroelastic tests were carried out using an open-circuit wind tunnel with 520 mm × 515 mm of test section and its maximum air velocity of approximately 30 m/s. The experimental apparatus has been designed to characterize the aeroelastic response of an airfoil section. Based on the experimental setup, the airfoil is assumed to be two-dimensional and all parameters are defined per unit span and are assumed to be uniformly distributed. The airfoil is composed of an aluminum rigid wing that is mounted vertically at the 1/4 of the chord from leading edge by using an aluminum shaft. At the edges, the shaft is connected through bearings to the support of the plunge mechanism that includes a bi-cantilever beam made of two steel leaf-springs. Pictures of the experimental setup and of the pitch spring mechanism are presented in Figs 1 and 2, respectively.

Fig. 1. Experimental setup.

Fig. 2. Pitch spring mechanism.
Signals of the rotational motion of the elastic axis were collected using an encoder. An accelerometer was used to collect the plunge motion. To induce motions of the wing, an initial displacement in the plunge was applied. This process was repeated starting with low speeds of about 8 m/s. It was observed that all disturbances with the same set of initial displacement would damp at speeds less than 10.9 m/s. Above this speed, limit cycle oscillations (LCO) were observed.

3 Modeling of the aeroelastic system

We model the rigid airfoil as an aeroelastic system that is allowed to move with two degrees of freedom namely the, plunge (b) and pitch (α) motions as shown in Fig. 3. The equations of motion governing this system are given by [5, 6], and are written in the following form

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{h} + U \dot{\alpha} - ba \dot{\alpha} + 2 \pi \rho \Omega C(k) Q \dot{\alpha} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} C(k) f(\omega) e^{i \omega t} d\omega \tag{7}
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
M_a &= \pi b^2 \left[ b \dot{h} - U \dot{b} \left( \frac{1}{2} - a \right) \dot{\alpha} - b^2 \left( \frac{1}{8} + a^2 \right) \dot{\alpha} \right] + 2 \pi \rho b^2 U (\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \dot{Q}) \tag{8}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[Q = U\alpha + \dot{h} + ab \left( \frac{1}{2} - a \right)\]

and \(k = \frac{\pi}{T}\) is the reduced frequency of the harmonic oscillations. Clearly, the aerodynamic loads are dependent on Theodorsen’s function \(C(k)\). The exact expression of \(C(k)\) is given by [5]

\[C(k) = F(k) + iG(k)\]

where \(F\) and \(G\) are functions of the Hankel and modified Bessel functions.

4.1 Duhamel formulation

Considering a simple harmonic assumption in the system’s variables [8], the aerodynamic loads can be determined for arbitrary time dependent motion as [8]:

\[
L = -\pi \rho b^2 \left[ \dot{h} + U \dot{\alpha} - ba \dot{\alpha} \right] - 2 \pi \rho U b Q C(k) \tag{9}
\]

Using the Wagner function as an initial admittance and Duhamel’s superposition integral, the circulatory term can be written as [8]:

\[
L_a = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} C(k) f(\omega) e^{i \omega t} d\omega = Q(0) \phi(\tau) + \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\partial Q(\sigma)}{\partial \sigma} \phi(\tau - \sigma) d\sigma \tag{10}
\]

where

\[Q(t) = U\alpha + \dot{h} + b \left( \frac{1}{2} - a \right) \dot{\alpha} \]

and \(\phi(\tau)\) is Wagner function. The Sears approximation to \(\phi(\tau)\) is given by [8]
\[
\phi(t) \approx c_0 - c_1 e^{-c_2 t} - c_3 e^{-c_4 t} \tag{12}
\]

where \( c_0 = 1, \ c_1 = 0.165, \ c_2 = 0.0455, \) and \( c_4 = 0.3. \)

Using integration by parts, the Duhamel formulation is rewritten as follows:

\[
L_c = \int_0^t Q(\tau) \phi(\tau) \, d\tau + \left. \frac{\partial \phi(\tau)}{\partial \tau} \right|_{\tau=\tau} \right|_{0}^{t} \tag{13}
\]

Using the Padé approximation to transform the integral form into a second order ordinary differential equation [9], we write

\[
L_c = (c_0 - c_1 - c_3)(\dot{c}_1 + c_2 c_4(c_1 + c_5) \frac{U^2}{b}) \ddot{x} + (c_1 c_2 + c_3 c_4) U \ddot{x} \tag{14}
\]

where \( \ddot{x} \) and \( \ddot{x} \) are two augmented variables in the state space used to model the wake effects. The lift and moment expressions are then rewritten as:

\[
L = -\pi p b^2 \left[ \dot{h} + U \ddot{x} - ba \ddot{a} \right] - 2\pi p U b (c_0 - c_1 - c_3) Q \tag{15}
\]

and

\[
M_c = \pi p b^2 \left[ b \ddot{h} + U b \left( \frac{1}{2} - a \right) \ddot{a} - b \left( \frac{1}{8} + a \right) \right] \ddot{a} + 2\pi p b^2 U \tag{16}
\]

On the other hand, to consider the effects of the wake dynamics of the airfoil, the augmented state variables are related to the other system parameters through the following differential equation [9]

\[
\ddot{x} = -c_2 c_4 \frac{U^2}{b^2} \ddot{x} - (c_2 + c_4) \frac{U}{b} \ddot{x} + U \ddot{x} + (1 - a) \ddot{a} + \frac{\dot{h}}{b} \tag{17}
\]

Substituting the expressions of the lift and moment in equation 1, the general form of the equations of motion is then written as:

\[
M \dddot{p} + C_1 \dddot{p} + K_1 \dddot{p} + Q_1(p, p) + N_1(p, p, p) = 0 \tag{18}
\]

where

\[
p = \begin{bmatrix} h \\ a \end{bmatrix} \tag{19}
\]

\[
Q_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ k_{c1} a^2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{20}
\]

and

\[
N_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ k_{c2} a^3 \end{bmatrix} \tag{21}
\]

Multiplying equation (18) from the left with the inverse \( M_1^{-1} \) of \( M_1 \), we obtain

\[
\dddot{p} = C_1 \dddot{p} + K_1 \dddot{p} - M_1^{-1} Q_1(p, p) - M_1^{-1} N_1(p, p, p) \tag{22}
\]

where \( C_1 = -M_1^{-1} C_1 \) and \( K_1 = -M_1^{-1} K_1 \).

In state space form, we define

\[
Z = \begin{bmatrix} Z_1 \\ Z_2 \\ Z_3 \\ Z_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} h \\ \dot{h} \\ \alpha \\ \ddot{\alpha} \end{bmatrix} \tag{23}
\]

Using these variables, equation (22) is rewritten as:

\[
\dot{Z} = B_1(U) Z + N_{1q}(Z, Z, Z) + N_{1v}(Z, Z, Z) \tag{24}
\]

Combining these equations, we obtain the following form

\[
\dot{Z} = B_1(U) Z + N_{1q}(Z, Z, Z) + N_{1v}(Z, Z, Z) \tag{26}
\]

where \( N_{1q}(Z, Z) \) and \( N_{1v}(Z, Z, Z) \) are the quadratic and cubic vector functions of the state variables which describe the structural nonlinearity.
5 Linear analysis: Validation of the aerodynamic model

The variation of the damping term as a function of the freestream velocity when using the Duhamel formulation are presented in Fig. 4. This plot was obtained using the parameters values in Table 1. The results show analytical value of 10.90 m/s for the flutter speed. Clearly, the predicted flutter speed based on the Duhamel formulation is very close to the measured values between 10.89 m/s and 10.92 m/s. Values of the flutter frequency as predicted from the linear analysis is shown in the second column of Table 2. The corresponding experimental values are presented in the third column of Table 2. The results show that the predicted flutter frequency when considering the Duhamel formulation have a very good agreement with the experimental results.

Table 2. Comparison between theoretical and experimental results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flutter Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>Duhamel formulation</th>
<th>Experimental results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$U_f$ (m/s)</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>$10.89 &lt; U_f &lt; 10.92$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Variation of the damping term as function of the freestream velocity.

6 Nonlinear analysis: Validation of the aerodynamic model and identified coefficients

The plotted curves in Figs. 5 and 6 show comparison between the experimental results and numerical integrations of the governing equations for $U = 13.68$ m/s. Clearly, time histories of both the plunge and pitch motions are satisfactorily predicted by the identified parameters which are determined numerically ($k_{a_1} = 3.95$ N.m and $k_{a_2} = 107$ N.m).

Figs. 7 and 8 show the bifurcation diagrams for both the plunge and pitch RMS values. In these figures, a comparison is presented between numerical predictions based on Runge-Kutta method and experimental data. We note that there is a very good agreement between the experimental results and the numerical integrations. Finally, we note that the system has a supercritical behavior which is observed in the experiment.

7 Conclusions

In this work, we have performed a nonlinear analysis to identify the concentrated nonlinearity in the torsional spring of a two-dimensional typical section. The concentrated nonlinearity is modeled by adding quadratic and cubic non-linear terms in the pitch moment. We use the Duhamel formulation to model the aerodynamic loads. The results
show that using the Duhamel representation, which takes into consideration the wake effects, yield to an excellent agreement with the experimental values in both linear and nonlinear analyses.
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