Chinese Journal of Aeronautics, (2018), xxx(xx): xxx-xxx



CJA 1034

16 April 2018

Chinese Society of Aeronautics and Astronautics & Beihang University

Chinese Journal of Aeronautics

cja@buaa.edu.cn www.sciencedirect.com

JOURNAL AERONAUTICS

An efficient aerodynamic shape optimization of blended wing body UAV using multi-fidelity models

Parviz MOHAMMAD ZADEH*, Mohsen SAYADI

Faculty of New Sciences and Technologies, University of Tehran, Tehran 1439957131, Iran

Received 25 July 2017; revised 26 October 2017; accepted 26 December 2017

KEYWORDS

(UAV)

12 Adaptive filter sequential 13 quadratic programing 14 (AFSOP): Adaptive robust meta-model; 15 16 Aerodynamic shape opti-17 mization: Blended wing body (BWB); 18 19 Move limit strategy; 20 Unmanned aerial vehicle 21

3

5

6

7

10

Abstract This paper presents a novel optimization technique for an efficient multi-fidelity model building approach to reduce computational costs for handling aerodynamic shape optimization based on high-fidelity simulation models. The wing aerodynamic shape optimization problem is solved by dividing optimization into three steps-modeling 3D (high-fidelity) and 2D (lowfidelity) models, building global meta-models from prominent instead of all variables, and determining robust optimizing shape associated with tuning local meta-models. The adaptive robust design optimization aims to modify the shape optimization process. The sufficient infilling strategyknown as adaptive uniform infilling strategy-determines search space dimensions based on the last optimization results or initial point. Following this, 3D model simulations are used to tune local meta-models. Finally, the global optimization gradient-based method-Adaptive Filter Sequential Quadratic Programing (AFSQP) is utilized to search the neighborhood for a probable optimum point. The effectiveness of the proposed method is investigated by applying it, along with conventional optimization approach-based meta-models, to a Blended Wing Body (BWB) Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV). The drag coefficient is defined as the objective function, which is subjected to minimum lift coefficient bounds and stability constraints. The simulation results indicate improvement in meta-model accuracy and reduction in computational time of the method introduced in this paper.

© 2018 Production and hosting by Elsevier Ltd. on behalf of Chinese Society of Aeronautics and Astronautics. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/ licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

In recent years, in order to reduce fuel consumption and

improve the performance, the optimization of UAV shapes

has been the main focus of the competitive aerospace market.

The development of Blended Wing Body (BWB) design is such

an effort. In addition to the elimination of the tail for this par-

ticular kind of UAV and the significant reduction in equivalent

weight, drag force, and radar cross-section, the available space

for installing equipment inside the wing and the effective range

1. Introduction

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Corresponding author. E-mail address: (P. MOHAMMAD ZADEH).

pmohammadzadeh@ut.ac.ir

Peer review under responsibility of Editorial Committee of CJA.



Production and hosting by Elsevier

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cja.2018.04.004

1000-9361 © 2018 Production and hosting by Elsevier Ltd. on behalf of Chinese Society of Aeronautics and Astronautics.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Please cite this article in press as: MOHAMMAD ZADEH P, SAYADI M An efficient aerodynamic shape optimization of blended wing body UAV using multifidelity models, Chin J Aeronaut (2018), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cja.2018.04.004

CJA 1034

P. MOHAMMAD ZADEH, M. SAYADI

No. of Pages 16

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

32 have also been increased. Despite all these mentioned advan-33 tages, instability is the negative outcome of eliminating the tail. Correcting this flaw requires designing a combination of con-34 trol surfaces and reflexed wing sections and using sophisticated 35 computer control systems. Therefore, the aerodynamic shape 36 design optimization of BWBs, along with the need to meet 37 the design requirements, has inspired several researchers to 38 overcome its challenges. 39

However, BWB and pure flying wing have some differences
in definition; their optimization design approaches and some
principles of aerodynamic design are practical for each other.
The BWB design challenges along with necessity of developing
aircraft efficiency impose more computational effort on the
preliminary design process.

Various objectives and different constraints in the design of 46 47 BWB make them a proper candidate for the application of multi-objective and multi-disciplinary design optimization 48 techniques.^{1,2} The characteristics of their shape makes their 49 geometry parameterization easier. A study on improving the 50 Concurrent Subspace Optimization (CSSO) structure on the 51 basis of response surface and Monte Carlo analysis for the 52 robust, single-objective optimization of the flying wing was 53 conducted in this field.³ Multidisciplinary Design Optimization 54 (MDO) architecture of aerodynamic shape optimization was 55 developed for battery-powered composite BWB with Delta 56 57 wing.⁴ The results of implementing this architecture and con-58 ventional optimization process were compared to demonstrate the presented formulation. Pan et al.⁵ presented a systematic 59 technique in aerodynamic and stealthy MDO issue for 60 double-sweep flying wing. They utilized the hybrid structure 61 of global optimization and gradient algorithm as an optimiza-62 tion strategy in conceptual design. Morris et al.⁶ devoted atten-63 tion to multi-disciplinary multi-level optimization for the 64 simultaneous optimization of aerodynamic shape and 65 structure. 66

67 The mere design of the aerodynamic shape was the main objective of optimization in certain studies, while only the air-68 foil cross-section was the focus in some others.^{7,8} The defini-69 tion of geometry and surface meshing was investigated by 70 Truong et al.9 to enhance the quality of the mesh modified dur-71 72 ing optimization. The robust design of airfoil shape optimization is investigated to reduce the sensitivity of small random 73 geometry perturbations and uncertain operational condi-74 tions.¹⁰ The construction of meta-models based on Kriging 75 and gradient-enhanced Kriging is based on a relatively small 76 number of CFD evaluations. Since the optimization of the 77 78 fixed geometry aircraft demands satisfying conflicted constraints in various flight conditions, aerodynamic shape opti-79 mization of morphing wing is the subject of the study by 80 Hunsaker et al.¹¹ This method increases allowable wingspan 81 with induced drag reduction for a given structural weight. 82

In addition to putting forward an optimal Lifting-Fuselage 83 84 Configuration (LFC) shape for BWB in the research by Reist and Zingg,¹² the aerodynamic shape was optimized for the best 85 cruise altitude and reduced fuel consumption. In another 86 study, the hybrid design of the aerodynamic shape and struc-87 ture of the flying wing was optimized by combining the 88 multi-bump method with automatic optimization and flow 89 control to increase the lift-to-drag ratio and improve longitu-90 dinal static stability.¹³ The presented approaches differ mainly 91 92 in the definition of the geometry of the problem, objective functions, optimization constraints,¹⁴ and finally, the accuracy of the adopted models.¹⁵

In complicated engineering design problems such as BWB, Surrogate-Assisted Optimization (SAO) methods have been developed to enhance the accuracy and reliability of optimization process.¹⁶ In particular, due to the high computational cost of solving the CFD models, the researchers use the meta-model in aerodynamic optimizations.^{14,17,18} However, constructing accurate meta-model would still be timeconsuming and is often associated with insufficient accuracy in order to ensure a great degree of change in variables and the presence of local extrema for the objective and constraint functions.

The concept of sequential approximation method is introduced to overcome the mentioned limitations of the metamodels imposed by large-scale and complex design space.¹⁹ The simulation outcomes show that building appropriate low-fidelity model reduces the computation costs and improves model accuracy. Using the response correction techniques for aerodynamic shape optimization introduced by Koziela et al.⁷, the precision of the alternative models derived from lowaccuracy models is improved. An automated selection of low-fidelity model for aerodynamic shape optimization is proposed in another study.²⁰ This approach utilizes low- and highfidelity model misalignment.

In the variable-fidelity shape optimization, the hierarchical kriging technique is utilized for modifying low-fidelity kriging model.²¹ Since the low-fidelity model is constructed based on a single design point, some weighted aerodynamic data correct the meta-model as high-fidelity data. Other studies consider the effects of boundary layer transition for optimizing the shape of a lifting body with adjustment of the meta-models.²² The sample selection method for correcting the model plays a key role in such architectures.²³ Maximizing the Expected Improvement function (EI),²⁴ Probability of Improvement function (PI), and the Mean Squared Error (MSE)²⁵ and minimizing the Lower Confidence Bound (LCB)²⁶ are some examples of these methods—known as infilling strategies.

K-means algorithm classifies the solutions for selecting points and modifying the database of the meta-model, whereas genetic algorithm is tasked with optimization of the aerodynamic shape.²⁷ The application of the parallel processing capabilities to the optimization of aerodynamic problems is facilitated by combining these techniques in order to mitigate the defects of each.^{23,28}

The other method for reclaiming local adaptive meta-model building is the move-limit strategy. The main merit key of these approaches is the suppression off design space in the current optimum point neighborhood and refining of the model in this space. The vital importance of selecting the move limit strategy is controlling optimization performance. These strategies— both fixed²⁹ and adaptive³⁰—differ from one another by different bound-adjustment methods.³¹ Among them, the global convergence can be achieved by utilizing the trust-region method.³²

On the other hand, the selection of design variables in shape optimization has an important effect on the appropriate covering design space and reduction of computational cost. Poole et al.³³ proposed a novel method for the proper orthogonal decomposing set of training airfoils, which increase the numDownload English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/7153576

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/7153576

Daneshyari.com