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# Introduction

Civil aviation is an industry that has made the world a more accessible place for everyone. People can now travel to locations that would have been impossible only a few generations ago. Climate change is caused by greenhouse gas emissions. The aviation industry is responsible for a significant proportion of global emissions. The EU commissioned report Flight Path 2050 [1] has set a series of targets for the industry to achieve by the year 2050.  
The targets set for industry are to reduce emission levels, relative to emission levels from the year 2000, by the following amounts:

* A 75% reduction in emissions per passenger kilometre
* A 65% reduction in noise emissions
* A 90% reduction of emissions relative to

It is not desirable to cut the levels of flights as this limits the opportunities for global travel to only a few people. This means major advancements in aviation technology must be achieved and implemented quickly. The aircraft industry is relentlessly pursuing more advanced designs to improve efficiency as much as possible. Aircraft optimisation is going to be key in reaching these objectives. Optimisation techniques have reached maturity in the aviation industry over the last decade and have been applied to wide range of application in aircraft design. Strategies aimed at improving the aerodynamic efficiency of an aircraft at transonic speeds have been pursued vigorously in both academia and industry. The studies conducted in [2] and [3] show the first integration of optimisations into the design process for commercial aircraft.

Optimising specific disciplines on their own has already improved aircraft efficiency. Many different authors have demonstrated various aerodynamic optimisation techniques to improve aircraft efficiency [4]–[11]. However, ignoring the strong coupling between all the disciplines that affect aircraft efficiency, will inevitably miss out on further efficiency savings that can be gained. As a wing deforms in flight due to its aerodynamic loading, the flow around it will change and therefore modify the pressure distribution, potentially drastically [12].

A clear way to reduce fuel consumption is to fly lighter aircraft. A very significant percentage of an aircraft’s weight is in its wings so minimising the weight of the wings is clearly desirable. Doing this brings complications with it, a lighter wing will typically be accompanied with lower structural stiffness. This will result in more aero-elastic deformation of the wing, leading to greater differences in the wing’s shape throughout the flight envelope. Two challenges must therefore be confronted when faced with this. First, how to determine the jig shape that will result in an optimised flight shape and second, how to ensure that off-design performance is not considerably poor.

The first challenge can be met in 2 ways. A purely aerodynamic optimisation can be performed at the design point to produce an optimum flight shape. The jig shape that will produce the desired flight shape can be determined for a given flight condition and this will produce an optimised wing shape for the design point. There are two drawbacks from this approach, one there is no guarantee that the required jig shape is feasible and second, a multi-point approach can’t be implemented \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* CITATION NEEDED\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*. A shape which is optimised only for one point will be very poor away from the design point [13]. This poor off-design performance can be somewhat mitigated by a multi-point approach. The second approach is to perform a coupled aero-elastic optimisation. The shape of the aircraft is still the design parameter but the aero-elastic effect on the jig shape is considered during the optimisation. This means the jig shape can be optimised for directly, which in turn allows the use of a multi-point approach thus going some way to alleviate poor off-design performance.

More still needs to be done to salvage performance further away from the design condition for the following reason. A drawback of a multi-point approach is that it takes away from the drag saving potential at the design point. A low-stiffness wing is going to have such different shapes across the flight envelope that this must be mitigated for through some other means. The approach of this research project to address this is to use the exciting technology known as a variable camber wing. A variable camber wing is able to change its shape in a desirable way across the flight envelope.

The challenge of making a low-stiffness wing maintain reasonable performance all the way through its flight can now be addressed successfully. The optimal variable camber configuration can be determined for a range of design flight conditions, and at each flight condition the wing would deflect its control surfaces to form the shape that would aero-elastically deform into the optimal shape for that condition. To determine how to deflect the control surfaces in the necessary way at each flight condition would require an aero-elastic optimisation with the control surface deflections being the design parameters. This optimisation would be used late on in the design process and therefore, unlike conceptual design optimisations, the highest fidelity software must be used.
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |
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# Adjoint Approach for Aero-Elastic Optimisation

The focus of this research was to perform high-fidelity optimisations in an efficient way. The only feasible way of performing a fast optimisation for a multi-physics high-fidelity problem is to use gradient-based optimisation, especially when there are a large number of design variables. In aerodynamic applications, often 100s of design variables are required to produce a large enough design space capable of producing a significant improvement in performance [14]. This section focuses on how to obtain the gradient after a completing an aero-elastic simulation. There are two major ways of obtaining a gradient of an objective function with respect to an aircraft’s shape. These are the finite differences (FD) approach and the adjoint method. Finite differences is of course a very old method that is very easy to implement while the adjoint method has been used in aerodynamic optimisation literature since 1988 [15]. This use of the adjoint method for aerodynamic optimisation has matured over the last few decades and it is now widely used within the commercial aviation industry [16].  
The adjoint method has the major advantage of only requiring one evaluation of the objective function. This is essential for any practical high-fidelity gradient-based optimisation. The adjoint method therefore has a negligible dependence on the number of design variables employed, allowing the optimiser to explore a large design space without adding significant computational overhead. Finite differences still have their place in aerodynamic optimisation although mostly for validation purposes.

## Finite Difference

The finite differences approach is the simplest method to obtain the gradient, it is also the simplest method to implement. Finite differences are typically implemented in one of 3 ways, two of the approaches are accurate to a 1st order approximation and these are the forward and backward difference methods. A 2nd order accurate approximation can be obtained by the central difference method. These are derived from the Taylor series and will evaluate the gradient of a one-dimensional function about a point .

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |
|  |  | (.) |
|  |  | (.) |

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* Figure showing improved accuracy of Central difference \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

An obvious issue with finite differences is selecting the step size . Mathematically, the true gradient is the value of the above expressions as the step size tends to zero. If the step size is too big then, the error of the approximation will be large. However, if they step size is too small, then subtractive cancellation errors will be large [17]. Cancellation errors occur in computing due to the limited memory numerical data types have available to them. In a CFD simulation, if the values of pressure at each node on the mesh are stored in float data types, they will have 6 digits of precision available to them. If a finite difference approximation was attempted with a step size that caused too small a perturbation in the pressure for it to be accounted for with 6 digits of precision, then the recorded approximation would be garbage information.

For complex applications, such as drag sensitivity to a shape change, a range of step sizes must be investigated to ensure a suitable step size is chosen. This will increase the computational cost of finite differences even further.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* Range of Step sizes graphs \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

A suitable step size for a finite difference approximation is found when a range of step sizes are found to produce the same value. Due to the increased accuracy of central differences over the first order methods, it provides a larger range of useable step-sizes as can be seen from the graphs above. To obtain the gradient of an aerodynamic cost function with respect to design parameters through central differences will take flow solutions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |

An aerodynamic cost function calculated through a RANS simulation is explicitly sensitive to the state variables and nodal coordinates at the surface nodes. The state variables are dependent on the design variables but this relationship cannot be defined explicitly \*\*\*\*citation\*\*\*\*\* hence why RANS is used in the first place. The absence of an explicit relationship is what makes impossible to determine without finite differences.

It is clear the computational cost of finite differences is prohibitive for optimisation purposes, therefore for this research project, its use has been consigned to validation purposes.

## Flow Adjoint

To make multi-disciplinary and even aerodynamic optimisation feasible for an aircraft with more than a few design parameters, the adjoint method must be used. Two simple concepts are employed by the adjoint method to eliminate the dependency on the number of design variables. First, if you add a constant to a function, the gradient at all points will remain unchanged. Second, multiplying anything by zero will result in a product equal to zero.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

In equation (4.4), the cost function has been set to the value of the drag coefficient. In order to find the sensitivity of the cost-function to the design parameters efficiently, the equation will be modified by adding a constant to the right-hand-side (RHS) of (4.4) that is also a function of the design parameters.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |
|  | *for all* | (.) |

This innocuous looking modification to the equation is actually very powerful. is the residual of the CFD simulation, for a sufficiently converged solution it can be considered to be a vector of zeros for all of the design space. At this point, the value of the adjoint vector is arbitrary as the term will be equal to zero for all of the design space due to being a vector of zeros. This is why the residual must be strongly converged for the adjoint method to work, the derivation depends on it. This allows the adjoint vector to be defined in a very favourable way.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

Both and are equal to zero so it can be seen how the sensitivity of the Lagrangian is equal to the sensitivity of the cost function. The term [[1]](#footnote-1) is equal to zero and cannot be manipulated for any gain so it is dropped from the equation. The adjoint vector will not be constant for all of the design space, instead it will meet the criteria that allows for the elimination of the state variables’ sensitivity to the design parameters . With this term eliminated, the need for multiple simulations to be run is eliminated too as every other term can be calculated from the results of one converged solution.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |
|  |  | (.) |
|  |  | (.) |

The partial derivatives , , and can all be provided by the CFD solver TAU. The partial differentiation of an aerodynamic cost function or flow residual is a challenging task, for the TAU solver this was addressed by Dwight in [18]. Due to the complexities involved in the derivation of these terms they will not be discussed here; it is sufficient to know that they are available. The remaining unknowns are , and . As seen in the derivation, the adjoint vector is arbitrary and thanks to this, the troublesome term can be eliminated while retaining the ability to calculate the gradient.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

Equation (4.13) is known as the adjoint equation. The adjoint vector that satisfies (\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*4.13\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*) can be plugged into (4.12) and the gradient equation no longer requires the calculation of .

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

There only unknown left to calculate in order to obtain the gradient is the mesh sensitivity to the design parameters .

## Mesh Adjoint

The mesh sensitivity can of course be calculated by finite differences. This isn’t a ridiculous prospect as calculating mesh deformations is significantly less time consuming that a full RANS simulation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |
|  |  |  |

Obtaining the mesh sensitivity this way through (\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*4.15\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*) gets the final unknown term and the gradient can be calculated. However, as mesh sizes get larger, the mesh deformation will still take a significant time to compute. To further improve the efficiency of the gradient calculation, a mesh adjoint can be applied using the same principles as described in the previous flow adjoint section. The mesh adjoint was first used in [19], the addition of a mesh residual provides another mesh sensitivity term which can then be used to remove the mesh sensitivity from the gradient equation. This requires the mesh adjoint vector to meet a criterion that will be derived below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |
|  |  | (.) |

The mesh residual is defined by the mesh deformation process, I.E the relationship between the surface mesh and the volume mesh.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | (.) |

The relationship is obviously determined by the choice of mesh deformation strategy. An explicit mesh deformation strategy, one where the volume mesh points can be determined by a simple matrix vector product such as Delaunay Graph Mapping, will have the residual defined in (\*\*\*\*\*\*4.18\*\*\*\*\*). An implicit mesh deformation strategy, one which requires the solution of a large linear system such as linear elasticity, will have the residual defined in (\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*4.19\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | (.) |
|  |  |  |

It can be seen that the addition of a mesh adjoint had no effect on the flow adjoint equation so that can be carried out in exactly the same way as before to obtain the flow adjoint vector . This leaves the gradient equation in the following form:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

Now the mesh adjoint vector can be chosen so that the mesh sensitivity is multiplied with a vector of zeros, thus eliminating it from the gradient equation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

Equation (\*\*\*\*\*4.23\*\*\*\*\*) highlights an advantage of an explicit mesh deformation scheme over and implicit one. For an explicit scheme, the jacobian is the identity matrix making the calculation of the mesh adjoint vector an addition problem. An implicit scheme would require solving a large linear system that will naturally take a significant time to do.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

The jacobian is the identity matrix multiplied by minus 1. It does have to be calculated for explicit schemes, however. In this work, the mesh deformation scheme employed is an explicit version of RBF mesh deformation. The mesh adjoint terms for the RBF mesh deformation scheme are derived in section 4.3.1.

The only unknown left in the gradient equation is the surface mesh sensitivity to the design variables. This is much simpler than the volume mesh sensitivity and it often has an analytic relationship. An analytic relationship means there is no need for any finite differences and can be computed very quickly. The relationship between the time taken to calculate the gradient and the number of design variables is now completely negligible.

### Mesh Adjoint for RBF Mesh Deformation

As seen in section 3.5, the mesh deformation scheme employed in this project is an explicit RBF mesh deformation. As this is an explicit scheme, it enables the gradient to be calculated faster. In this implementation, the CFD surface is approximated by a surrogate CAD model that is defined by the design parameters. This means the term is already known as an analytic relationship has already been derived. The sensitivity of the volume mesh to the surrogate CAD surface however, must be derived.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (4.26) |

The volume points and base points used in the RBF function are the undeformed points defined by the first set of design parameters . When the design parameters are updated, the displacements required to move the undeformed base points to their new position is calculated, this value is . This vector is used to determine the interpolation coefficients for the mesh deformation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (4.27) |

The distance from the surface is obviously 0 for all base points, hence It can be seen from (\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*4.26\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*) that the value of will be 1 for all of the base points. To aid in the derivation of the mesh adjoint, (\*\*\*\*\*\*\*4.27\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*) is put in a matrix format.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | (.) |

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*NEED TO DIFFERENTIATE UNDEFORMED FROM FIRST NODAL COORDINATE \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

The reason for this is it makes the implementation of mesh adjoint much easier. If the RBF function itself were dependent on the design variables, then a matrix of the size would need to be calculated during each gradient equation. The enormous term can be omitted with only a very small loss of mesh quality by making constant during the optimisation. This means the only terms in (\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*4.25\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*) dependent on the design parameters are and . These are implicitly dependent on the design parameters through the known deformation of the surrogate base points .
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