

Optimum aerodynamic design for dynamic stall risk mitigation

by

Vishal Raul

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Aerospace Engineering

Program of Study Committee:
Leifur Leifsson, Co-major Professor
Thomas Ward, Co-major Professor
Chao Hu
Anupam Sharma
Peng Wei

The student author, whose presentation of the scholarship herein was approved by the program of study committee, is solely responsible for the content of this dissertation. The Graduate College will ensure this dissertation is globally accessible and will not permit alterations after a degree is conferred.

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2021

Copyright © Vishal Raul, 2021. All rights reserved.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents Vinod Raul and Shubhangi Raul, my sister Ashwini Parab, my Aaji Sulochana and my wife Supriya without whose continuous support and encouragement I would not have been able to complete this work.

PREVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xiv
ABSTRACT	xv
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Motivation and Challenges	1
1.2 Research Objectives	5
1.3 Thesis Outline	5
CHAPTER 2. SURROGATE-BASED AERODYNAMIC SHAPE OPTIMIZATION FOR DELAYING AIRFOIL DYNAMIC STALL USING KRIGING REGRESSION AND IN- FILL CRITERIA	11
2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Background	16
2.3 Surrogate-based shape optimization	19
2.3.1 Problem statement	20
2.3.2 Optimum design problem formulation	22
2.3.3 Optimization algorithm	25
2.3.4 Global sensitivity analysis by Sobol' indices	33
2.4 Computational fluid dynamics modeling	36
2.4.1 Governing equations	36
2.4.2 Flow Solver	38
2.4.3 Computational grid	38
2.4.4 Grid and time independence studies	39
2.4.5 CFD model validation	41
2.5 Results	44
2.5.1 Surrogate modeling	44
2.5.2 Optimal design	45
2.5.3 Global sensitivity analysis	55
2.6 Conclusion	57
CHAPTER 3. MULTIFIDELITY AERODYNAMIC SHAPE OPTIMIZATION FOR MIT- IGATING DYNAMIC STALL USING COKRIGING REGRESSION-BASED INFILL . .	66
3.1 Introduction	68

3.2	Background	70
3.3	Surrogate-based shape optimization	73
3.3.1	Optimum design problem formulation	73
3.3.2	Design variables	75
3.3.3	Optimization algorithm	77
3.3.4	Surrogate modeling	80
3.3.5	Infill criteria	86
3.3.6	Surrogate model validation	88
3.3.7	Global sensitivity analysis	89
3.4	Computational fluid dynamics modeling	90
3.4.1	Flow solver	91
3.4.2	Grid generation	92
3.4.3	Grid and time independence studies	92
3.4.4	High-fidelity CFD model validation	94
3.4.5	Low-fidelity modeling	95
3.5	Results	96
3.5.1	Surrogate model construction	98
3.5.2	Optimal design	99
3.5.3	Global sensitivity analysis	109
3.6	Conclusion	113
CHAPTER 4. MULTIFIDELITY MODELING SIMILARITY CONDITIONS FOR AIR- FOIL DYNAMIC STALL PREDICTION WITH MANIFOLD MAPPING		121
4.1	Introduction	124
4.2	Multifidelity modeling	127
4.2.1	Dynamic stall test case	128
4.2.2	Dynamic stall performance metric	129
4.2.3	Manifold mapping	131
4.3	Computational fluid dynamics modeling	135
4.3.1	Governing equations	135
4.3.2	Flow solver	136
4.3.3	Computational grid	137
4.3.4	Grid and time independence studies	137
4.3.5	High-fidelity model validation	141
4.3.6	Low-fidelity modeling	144
4.4	Results	147
4.4.1	Description of test cases	147
4.4.2	Case 1	149
4.4.3	Case 2	151
4.4.4	Case 3	153
4.5	Conclusion	157
CHAPTER 5. MULTIFIDELITY AERODYNAMIC SHAPE OPTIMIZATION FOR DY- NAMIC STALL MITIGATION USING MANIFOLD MAPPING		164
5.1	Introduction	167
5.2	Computational fluid dynamics modeling	171

5.2.1	Test case	172
5.2.2	Flow solver	172
5.2.3	Computational domain and grid	173
5.2.4	Grid and time independence study	174
5.2.5	High-fidelity model validation	174
5.3	Aerodynamic shape optimization with manifold mapping	175
5.3.1	Problem formulation	175
5.3.2	Airfoil parameterization	177
5.3.3	Optimization algorithm	178
5.3.4	Multifidelity modeling with manifold mapping	180
5.3.5	Data-fit low-fidelity modeling with Kriging regression	182
5.3.6	Gradient-free optimizer	186
5.4	Results	189
5.4.1	Low-fidelity surrogate model training	189
5.4.2	Test case-1: Baseline as initial design	189
5.4.3	Test case-2: Low-fidelity optimum as initial design	191
5.4.4	Discussion	195
5.5	Conclusion	200
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION		209

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1 Dynamic stall motion and flow parameters [Lee and Gerontakos (2004)] . . .	22
Table 2.2 PARSEC design variables	23
Table 2.3 Design variables with their bounds for upper airfoil surface	24
Table 2.4 Time step independence study results.	41
Table 2.5 Comparison of the dynamic stall and moment stall locations for URANS, LES and experiments.	44
Table 2.6 Properties of the baseline and the optimum airfoil design shapes.	46
Table 2.7 Details of dynamic stall cycle	49
Table 3.1 Design variables in PARSEC airfoil parameterization.	76
Table 3.2 Design variable bounds.	77
Table 3.3 Grid convergence study on the baseline design.	93
Table 3.4 Results of the time-step independence study with the baseline airfoil NACA 0012.	94
Table 3.5 Comparison of the dynamic stall and moment stall locations acquired from the HF and LF models.	96
Table 3.6 Grid convergence study of the optimum design at $Re = 135,000$ and $\alpha = 4$ deg.	102
Table 3.7 Results of the time-step independence study with the optimum design. . . .	102
Table 3.8 Airfoil shape characteristics of the baseline and the optimum designs. . . .	104
Table 3.9 Characteristics of the baseline and optimal shapes.	104
Table 3.10 Computational cost of the surrogate modeling.	109

Table 4.1	Dynamic stall motion and flow parameters [Lee and Gerontakos (2004)] . . .	129
Table 4.2	The PARSEC design variables.	131
Table 4.3	Design variable bounds representing airfoil upper surface.	131
Table 4.4	Time step independence study results.	140
Table 4.5	Comparison of mean square error (MSE) between consecutive cycles for lift, drag and pitching moment coefficients with oscillation cycle parameters $\alpha = 10 + 15\sin(\omega t)$, $k = 0.05$	140
Table 4.6	Comparison of dynamic stall and moment stall location for URANS, LES and experimental data.	143
Table 4.7	Low-fidelity (LF) and high-fidelity (HF) model configuration used in current study.	145
Table 4.8	Performance of MM model with designs $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(1t)}$ (Case 1).	149
Table 4.9	Dynamic stall and moment stall angles for Case 1 designs.	149
Table 4.10	Performance of MM model with designs $\mathbf{x}^{(2)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(2t)}$ (Case 2).	151
Table 4.11	Dynamic stall and moment stall angles for Case 2 designs.	153
Table 4.12	Performance of MM model with designs $\mathbf{x}^{(3)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(3t)}$ (Case 3).	154
Table 4.13	Dynamic stall and moment stall angles for Case 3 designs.	156
Table 4.14	Broad-level recommendation for selection of LF model configuration for different trust-region radii.	156
Table 5.1	Grid convergence study on the baseline design.	174
Table 5.2	Results of the timestep independence study with the baseline airfoil NACA 0012.	175
Table 5.3	Design variables and their bounds for the upper airfoil surface.	178
Table 5.4	Comparison of dynamic stall and moment stall location acquired from the HF and LF models.	183
Table 5.5	Test case-1 optimization results.	191
Table 5.6	Test case-2 optimization results.	193

Table 5.7	Airfoil shape characteristics for the baseline and optimum designs.	195
Table 5.8	Dynamic stall characteristics of baseline and optimum shapes.	197
Table 5.9	Computational cost of current optimization study with surrogates models for same problem formulation.	200

PREVIEW

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1 Parameters for describing the airfoil oscillating motion and response: (a) normalized blade angle of attack variation ($\frac{\alpha(TSR, \theta_z)}{\alpha_{max}}$) with varying tip-speed ratios TSR in Darrieus motion, and (b) the force and moment coefficients at the quarter chord of an airfoil in uniform flow	21
Figure 2.2 The PARSEC airfoil geometry parameters.	24
Figure 2.3 A flowchart of the surrogate-based optimal design and global sensitivity analysis (GSA).	26
Figure 2.4 A coarse c-mesh around the NACA 0012 airfoil: (a) the full computational domain and (b) the mesh close to the airfoil.	39
Figure 2.5 Results of the grid independence study of the NACA 0012 airfoil at $Re = 135,000$ showing the variation in (a) the lift coefficient, and (b) the drag coefficient.	40
Figure 2.6 Results of the time step independence study showing (a) the Richardson extrapolation estimate based on the lower order values, and (b) the estimated error from the Richardson extrapolation.	42
Figure 2.7 A comparison of the time dependent aerodynamic coefficients: (a)lift, (b)drag, (c)pitching moment, obtained from the URANS model (current work), LES model [Kim and Xie (2016)] and experiments [Lee and Gerontakos (2004)] with oscillation cycle parameters $\alpha = 10 + 15\sin(\omega t)$, $k_r = 0.05$	43
Figure 2.8 Surrogate model construction of the objective (f) and constraint (g) functions.	45
Figure 2.9 Evolution of the optimal airfoil shapes: (a) the optimum shapes at the initial surrogate model and at every 5 infill points, and (b) change in z-coordinates of the consecutive optimum designs.	46
Figure 2.10 Results of the grid and time independence study of the optimized shape at $Re = 135,000$, $\alpha = 4$ deg showing the variation in (a) the lift coefficient, and (b) the drag coefficient.	47

Figure 2.11	Results of the time step independence study of optimized design showing (a) the Richardson extrapolation estimate based on the lower order values, and (b) the estimated error from the Richardson extrapolation estimate (C_{dRE}).	48
Figure 2.12	A comparison of the baseline and optimized designs: (a) airfoil shapes, (b) lift coefficient, (c) drag coefficient, (d) pitching moment coefficient.	49
Figure 2.13	Z-vorticity contour plot of (a) the baseline at $\alpha = 16.5$ deg, (b) the optimized shape at $\alpha = 16.5$ deg, (c) the baseline at $\alpha = 19.1$ deg, and (d) the optimized shape at $\alpha = 19.1$ deg.	51
Figure 2.14	Z-vorticity contour plot of (a) the baseline at $\alpha = 21.5$ deg, (b) the optimized shape at $\alpha = 21.5$ deg, (c) the baseline at $\alpha = 22.5$ deg, and (d) the optimized shape at $\alpha = 22.5$ deg.	52
Figure 2.15	Contours of the pressure coefficient ($-c_p$) and the skin friction coefficient (c_f) on the suction side for the baseline and optimized airfoils.	54
Figure 2.16	Convergence of the Sobol' indices of the objective function: (a) the first-order Sobol' indices, and (b) the total-effect Sobol' indices.	55
Figure 2.17	Results of global sensitivity analysis of the objective function	56
Figure 2.18	Results of global sensitivity analysis of the constraint function	57
Figure 3.1	PARSEC airfoil geometry parametrization.	75
Figure 3.2	A flowchart of the algorithm to determine an appropriate LF sampling plan that captures the global trend in the underlying function.	78
Figure 3.3	A flowchart of the algorithm to find the optimal design using Cokriging regression with infill.	79
Figure 3.4	Computational domain with a coarse C-grid around the baseline airfoil (NACA 0012) and a zoomed in view of the airfoil.	93
Figure 3.5	Comparison of the time dependent aerodynamic coefficients acquired from the high and low-fidelity simulation models: (a) lift, (b) drag, (c) pitching moment, results of the NACA 0012 airfoil with oscillation cycle parameters $\alpha = 10 + 15\sin(\omega t)$, $k = 0.05$ (results are shown only for the upstroke part of the cycle).	97
Figure 3.6	Progression of the NRMSE metrics for the error-based infill process of the LF-KR model construction: (a) NRMSE and WMA NRMSE of LF-KR(f), and (b) NRMSE metric of LF-KR(f) and LF-KR(g).	99

Figure 3.7	Progression of metrics for the EI-based infill process of the CKR model construction: (a) maximum EI magnitude, and (b) NRMSE.	100
Figure 3.8	Progression of the optimal designs in the EI-based infill process (a) the optimum shapes after every infill point, and (b) the Euclidean distance between consecutive optimum designs.	101
Figure 3.9	Comparison of the shapes and aerodynamic loads of the baseline and optimum designs acquired from the HF-KR and CKR models: (a) airfoil shapes, (b) lift coefficient, (c) drag coefficient, and (d) pitching moment coefficient. .	103
Figure 3.10	Vorticity contour plot of the baseline and optimum airfoil shapes from the CKR and HF-KR models at (a) $\alpha = 16.27$ deg, (b) $\alpha = 18.91$ deg, (c) $\alpha = 21.66$ deg, and (d) $\alpha = 22.56$ deg.	106
Figure 3.11	Contours of the negative pressure coefficient ($-c_p$) and the skin friction coefficient (c_f) over the upper surface of the airfoils: the baseline (a,b), Optimum-HF-KR (c,d), and, Optimum-CKR (e,f).	107
Figure 3.12	Sobol' indices convergence over the number of samples for the CKR model of the objective function: (a) the first-order Sobol' indices, and (b) the total-effect Sobol' indices.	110
Figure 3.13	Results of the global sensitivity analysis of the objective function with the HF-KR and CKR models: (a) the first-order Sobol' index, and (b) the total-effect Sobol' index.	111
Figure 3.14	Results of the global sensitivity analysis of the constraint function with the HF-KR CKR models: (a) the first-order Sobol' index, and (b) the total-effect Sobol' index.	112
Figure 4.1	Forces and moments acting on airfoil undergoing a sinusoidal pitching motion about the quarter chord point.	128
Figure 4.2	PARSEC airfoil geometry parameters.	130
Figure 4.3	A coarse C-mesh around the NACA 0012 airfoil: (a) the full computational domain, and (b) a view of the mesh close to the airfoil.	138
Figure 4.4	Results of the grid independence study of the NACA 0012 airfoil at $Re = 135,000$ and an angle of attack of 4 deg showing the variation in (a) the lift coefficient, and (b) the drag coefficient.	139
Figure 4.5	Results of the time step independence study showing (a) the Richardson extrapolation estimate based on the lower order values, and (b) the estimated error from Richardson extrapolation.	141

Figure 4.6	Comparison of time dependent aerodynamic coefficients (a) lift, (b) drag, (c) pitching moment, results for URANS, LES [Kim and Xie (2016)] and experiments [Lee and Gerontakos (2004)] with oscillation cycle parameters $\alpha = 10 + 15\sin(\omega t)$, $k = 0.05$	142
Figure 4.7	Comparison of time dependent aerodynamic coefficients: (a) lift, (b) drag, (c) pitching moment, results of NACA 0012 airfoil with HF, LF4 and LF8 fidelities with oscillation cycle parameters $\alpha = 10 + 15\sin(\omega t)$, $k = 0.05$ (result are shown only for the upstroke cycle).	146
Figure 4.8	Comparison of airfoil shapes considered in this study (a) Case 1, (b) Case 2, (c) Case 3.	148
Figure 4.9	A comparison of HF model response for designs $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(1t)}$ on the basis of (a) lift coefficient, (b) drag coefficient, and (c) pitching moment coefficient.	150
Figure 4.10	A comparison of HF model response for designs $\mathbf{x}^{(2)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(2t)}$ on the basis of (a) lift coefficient, (b) drag coefficient, and (c) pitching moment coefficient.	152
Figure 4.11	A comparison of HF model response for designs $\mathbf{x}^{(3)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(3t)}$ on the basis of (a) lift coefficient, (b) drag coefficient, and (c) pitching moment coefficient.	155
Figure 5.1	C-grid topology over the airfoil: (a) full computational domain, and (b) a view of the coarse mesh domain and zoom in view of the NACA 0012 airfoil.	173
Figure 5.2	Airfoil geometry parameters from PARSEC.	177
Figure 5.3	Workflow of the optimization process with manifold mapping.	179
Figure 5.4	Aerodynamic coefficients acquired from the high and low-fidelity CFD model for NACA 0012 airfoil with oscillation cycle $\alpha = 10 + 15\sin(\omega t)$, and $k = 0.05$: (a) lift, (b) drag, and (c) pitching moment coefficients (results are shown only for the upstroke cycle).	184
Figure 5.5	Low-fidelity (LF) Kriging regression model construction flowchart.	185
Figure 5.6	Progression of NRMSE over the error-based infill process for construction the LF-KR models: (a) LF-KR-f model with the corresponding WMA, and (b) the objective (f) and the constraint function (g).	190
Figure 5.7	Test case-1 convergence history and optimum design evolution: (a) penalty function $E(\mathbf{x})$, (b) HF responses $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ of designs, (c) norm of consecutive designs and trust-region radius R_{TR} , (d) total HF and LF evaluations at every iteration, (e) baseline vs optimum shape, and (f) evolution in the airfoil shape.	192

- Figure 5.8 Test case-2 convergence history and optimum design evolution: (a) penalty function $E(\mathbf{x})$, (b) HF responses $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ of designs, (c) norm of consecutive designs and trust-region radius R_{TR} , (d) total HF and LF evaluations at every iteration, (e) baseline vs optimum shape, and (f) evolution in the airfoil shape. 194
- Figure 5.9 Aerodynamic characteristics of optimum and baseline designs: (a) airfoil shapes, (b) lift coefficient, (c) drag coefficient, and (d) pitching moment coefficient. 196
- Figure 5.10 Contours of the negative pressure coefficient ($-c_p$) and the skin friction coefficient (c_f) over the upper surface of airfoils: the baseline (a,b), optimum (Test case-1) (c,d), and, optimum (Test case-2) (e,f). 199

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to those who helped me with various aspects of conducting research and the writing of this thesis. First and foremost, Dr. Leifur Leifsson for his guidance, patience, and support throughout this research and for constantly pushing me into unknown research areas that helped me expand my knowledge. I would also like to express my appreciation to my committee members for their insights and helpful advice during this research: Dr. Thomas Ward, Dr. Anupam Sharma, Dr. Peng Wei, and Dr. Chao Hu.

In addition, I would like to thank all my colleagues, including Andrew Thelen, Anand Amrit, Xiaosong Du, Priyank Pradeep, Pavan Kotriake, Ramsankar Veerakumar, Jethro Nagawkar, Nazareen Sikkandar, and Yen-Chen Liu. I would like to especially thank Marc Brittain and Xuxi Yang for helping me to better understand the field of deep learning.

I would like to acknowledge funding from the National Science Foundation for Trinect (Grant No. DRL-1440446) and Iowa Food-Energy-Water System (Grant no. 1739551) research that supported my work during my graduate program.

I am thankful to my lifelong friends Anit & Rashmi Nayak, Bhavik & Amruta Shah, Manish Mishra, Gaurang Ghanekar, Sandesh Shetty, Alam Khan, Sandeep & Pooja Sharma, and Aashwiji Pai for their support encouragement, and to whom I can always reach out to and count on.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my wife, Supriya, for proudly supporting me on my PhD journey, my parents Vinod and Shubhangi Raul, my sister Ashwini Parab, brother-in-law Abhay Parab, nephew Advait and parents-in-law Suresh & Kalpana Pase for everything they do for me from the bottom of my heart. I would like to dedicate this dissertation to them.

ABSTRACT

Mitigating the adverse effects of dynamic stall is critical for many aerodynamic systems as they can be the primary reason for limiting the system performance, fatal structural loads, and reduced fatigue life. Aerodynamic shape optimization (ASO) is a practical approach for mitigating the adverse dynamic stall characteristics without adding any auxiliary systems. The key challenges in ASO for dynamic stall mitigation are (1) computationally intensive and time-consuming computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulations, (2) multiple and repetitive design evaluations required by conventional optimization algorithms, and (3) high-dimensional parameter space associated with the shape of the aerodynamic surface. The objective of this research is to create efficient ASO algorithms and gain a fundamental understanding of aerodynamic design for dynamic stall risk mitigation.

In this work, an optimization problem formulation is created to mitigate the adverse effects of dynamic stall through ASO. Two global optimal design algorithms are created and implemented using high-fidelity Kriging Regression (HF-KR) and multifidelity Cokriging regression (CKR) surrogate modeling methods. These surrogate models are constructed efficiently using error-based and expected improvement infill criteria. The developed models are utilized for optimization and global sensitivity analysis (GSA). GSA quantifies the sensitivities and the importance of the shape parameters to dynamic stall mitigation. Further, manifold mapping (MM), a multifidelity modeling method, is proposed to determine the local optimal design. Initially, the multifidelity modeling similarity condition is investigated to guide the selection of a low-fidelity (LF) model and a trust-region radius, which are vital for the successful implementation of MM. Later, the MM method is efficiently implemented for ASO-based dynamic stall mitigation using KR to create a fast LF model (LF-KR).

The proposed methods are demonstrated on an airfoil in sinusoidal oscillating motion in uniform flow undergoing deep dynamic stall. The HF-KR and CKR implementation provide optimal designs that delay and mitigate adverse dynamic stall characteristics. Both the acquired optimal designs show similar shape features. However, the CKR model produces a better optimal design than the HF-KR implementation while saving computational cost by almost 41%. The GSA investigation with HF-KR and CKR revealed that the upper airfoil surface thickness, location of thickness, leading-edge radius, and the curvature of the upper surface have a significant effect on the dynamic stall characteristics, whereas the trailing-edge angles has a minimal effect. Further, multifidelity modeling similarity condition investigation with the MM model provided a general approach for LF model selection. The results indicated that the LF model developed from coarser spatial and time discretization can be efficiently used within a small trust-region radius. Lastly, the MM model is implemented with a trust-region-based optimization algorithm and showed significant cost savings in locating an optimal design compared to HF-KR and CKR. Specifically, the MM model demonstrated the capability to determine optimal designs using a LF-KR model with computational cost savings of approximately 84% and 74% compared to the aforementioned HF-KR and CKR implementations.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivation and Challenges

An aerodynamic surface experiencing unsteady motion often shows a complex series of events that involves a dynamic delay of stall beyond static stall limits, followed by formation, convection, and shedding of an energetic leading-edge vortex, typically described as dynamic stall [Carr (1988)]. These characteristics of dynamic stall distort the chord-wise pressure distribution and produce transient forces and moments much larger than their static counterpart [McCroskey et al. (1976)].

The dynamic stall phenomenon was first observed on retreating blades of helicopter rotor [Harris and Pruyne (1968)]. The dynamic stall occurrence on the retreating blades gives rise to large aerodynamic loads and excessive stresses that restrict the helicopter flight envelope [Beddoes and Leishman (1986)]. The dynamic stall adversely affects aeroelastics of the rotor blades, rotor hub loads, and fatigue life [Mani et al. (2012); Carr (1988); Lee and Gerontakos (2004)].

Horizontal and vertical axis wind turbines are also prone to dynamic stall [Butterfield (1988); Butterfield et al. (1991); Butterfield (1989)]. Horizontal axis wind turbines are subjected to dynamic loading from multiple sources such as wind shear, turbulence, yaw angles, upwind turbine wake, and tower shadow that causes unsteady inflow to turbine rotor, which results in dynamic loading and dynamic stall. In vertical axis wind turbines, dynamic stall arises from rapid changes in the angle of attack perceived by each blade in every rotational cycle [Buchner et al. (2015); Wang et al. (2010)]. The dynamic loading on wind turbines increases structural stress on the blade, hub, and tower, which will reduce the turbine life. There are research efforts by the wind turbine industry to model dynamic stall and dynamic loading to improve turbine life [Larsen et al. (2007); Björck (2000)].

Dynamic stall characteristics are studied to understand insect flight and its applications to micro-air vehicles (MAV) [Ellington (1999); Hu et al. (2018)]. Researchers found that most insects rely on strong leading-edge vortex generated by dynamic stall for lift production during flapping motion [Ellington (1999); Ellington et al. (1996); Van Den Berg and Ellington (1997); Andro and Jacquin (2009)]. Recent research in cycloidal rotors shows the effects of dynamic stall and dynamic stall vortex interaction with the blade during its operation [Hu et al. (2018)]. Consideration of dynamic stall effects in the design of MAVs could be crucial for their performance and longevity.

In summary, dynamic stall and its effects have been observed on helicopter rotors, wind turbines, maneuvering aircraft, insect flight, and MAVs. Evidently, accurate understanding and consideration of dynamic stall is a major priority in the design process of such complex systems to improve their performance, structural strength, and fatigue life.

Considerable research has been done experimentally and computationally to quantify the dynamic stall effects and its behaviour [Carr (1988); Carr et al. (1977); McCroskey et al. (1981); McAlister et al. (1982); McCroskey et al. (1982); Sharma and Visbal (2019); Visbal and Garmann (2017); Benton and Visbal (2019)]. Furthermore, significant research has been conducted to mitigate or control dynamic stall via active control techniques involving variable droop leading-edge [Zhao and Zhao (2015)], trailing-edge flap [Lee and Gerontakos (2006)], vortex generators, elevated wire, and cavity [Choudhry et al. (2016)], adaptive blowing [Müller-Vahl et al. (2016)], and plasma actuators [Post and Corke (2006)]. The application of these approaches can increase the system mass and may require an auxiliary control system, which could increase the complexity and cost of the aerodynamic system. Therefore, these approaches may not always be economically viable.

Aerodynamic shape optimization (ASO) [Jameson (2003); Lyu and Martins (2015)] is a passive technique where aerodynamic surface is controlled to improve its performance and fulfill any constraints. The use of ASO for dynamic stall mitigation could provide a cost-effective

approach for dynamic stall mitigation. However, the application of ASO in a dynamic stall setting could get computationally intensive, or even impractical, due to the following reasons:

1. Time-consuming physics-based unsteady flow simulations using computational fluid dynamics (CFD),
2. Multiple and repetitive design evaluations required by the optimization process, and
3. High-dimensional parameter space associated with the shape of the aerodynamic surface.

With rising computational capabilities, CFD can be used directly in ASO. Currently, large eddy simulation (LES), hybrid RANS-LES, and unsteady Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (URANS) methods are available for dynamic stall simulations (ordered in decreasing computational accuracy and time requirement). In the past, a majority of dynamic stall studies were done with the URANS equations and turbulence models [Wang et al. (2010, 2012); Buchner et al. (2015); Yu et al. (2010)] due to manageable computational expenses. The URANS investigations of dynamic stall have shown mixed success in capturing complex viscous, turbulent, and temporal effects of dynamic stall accurately due to deficiencies associated with turbulence models [Mani et al. (2012)]. More recently, sophisticated methods, such as LES and hybrid RANS-LES, have been used to investigate dynamic stall and have shown success in capturing detailed flow physics of the transitional dynamic stall vortex evolution and the onset of the dynamic stall vortex [Sharma and Visbal (2019); Visbal and Garmann (2017); Benton and Visbal (2019); Kim and Xie (2016); Guillaud et al. (2018); Wang et al. (2012)]. Although, LES or hybrid LES-RANS provide an accurate representation of the dynamic stall phenomenon, the computational cost associated with a single evaluation is substantially higher than URANS, rendering these methods currently impractical for optimization studies. As computational capabilities continue to grow, the drive towards including high-fidelity analysis for design and optimization will lead to increased computational expense making it prohibitively expensive for many systems of interest [Robinson et al. (2008)]. Thus, the selection of an appropriate

optimization approach is critical to the cost-effective implementation of ASO for dynamic stall mitigation.

Surrogate-based optimization (SBO) [(Leifsson and Koziel, 2016; Koziel and Yang, 2011; Giselle Fernández-Godino et al., 2019)] has been suggested to alleviate the computational cost of ASO by shifting the computational burden from the time-consuming physics-based simulations to a fast surrogate model. The surrogate model is typically utilized for optimization using either gradient-based or gradient-free methods. In general, surrogate methods are categorized as data-fit modeling and multifidelity modeling. Data-fit surrogate models are approximations involving interpolation or regression of sampled data from a single-fidelity model (generally, a high-fidelity model) generated through design of experiments. Kriging [Simpson et al. (2001)], polynomial regression [(Zhou et al., 2005)], radial basis functions [Forrester et al. (2008)], neural networks [Papila et al. (2001)], and support vector regression [Forrester et al. (2008)] are examples of data-fit surrogate modeling methods. Multifidelity surrogate models [Peherstorfer et al. (2018)] are developed by utilizing information from multiple fidelities of physics-based models with varying degrees of evaluation speed and accuracy. Cokriging [Forrester et al. (2007)], space mapping [Koziel et al. (2008)], manifold mapping [Echeverría et al. (2007)] and shape-preserving response prediction are examples of multifidelity modeling techniques. Typically, multifidelity surrogate models are more efficient than data-fit surrogate models as they reduce the amount of high-fidelity information needed by encoding knowledge of the system physics within the multifidelity model using a hierarchy of low- and high-fidelity models [Du and Leifsson (2019)]. SBO has been utilized in various research areas, including ASO investigations; however, it has not been used for ASO-based dynamic stall risk mitigation where the cost of optimization is a major obstacle.

1.2 Research Objectives

The objective of this research work is to gain a fundamental understanding of how an aerodynamic surface can be designed for dynamic stall risk mitigation efficiently. The current study will achieve this goal by accomplishing the following research objectives:

1. Model the dynamic stall physics in an accurate and practical way in the context of design,
2. Develop a problem formulation to effectively mitigate dynamic stall,
3. Create efficient local and global optimal design algorithms for dynamic stall risk mitigation, and
4. Understand and quantify the effects of aerodynamic shape features on the dynamic stall flow physics and its mitigation.

1.3 Thesis Outline

Chapter 2 introduces the application of surrogate-based optimization for delaying airfoil dynamic stall through aerodynamic shape optimization [Raul and Leifsson (2021b)]. In this chapter, single-fidelity Kriging regression, along with an infill strategy, is used for determining global optimum design of an airfoil in unsteady subsonic flow. Additionally, a global sensitivity analysis is conducted to provide the effects of the aerodynamic shape features on the dynamic stall mitigation. Chapter 3 presents the application of Cokriging regression to the problem of dynamic stall risk mitigation of an airfoil. In this chapter, Cokriging regression is constructed efficiently using Latin hypercube sampling and infill strategies (expected improvement and error-based infill) to determine the global optimum design. Results of global sensitivity analysis are also presented in this chapter. Chapter 4 investigates the similarity requirements for the application of manifold mapping, a local multifidelity modeling technique for the prediction of airfoil dynamic stall using CFD simulations [Raul and Leifsson (2021a)]. Chapter 5 presents the

application of manifold mapping for dynamic stall mitigation through ASO. In this chapter, manifold mapping is implemented efficiently with a low-fidelity Kriging regression model to iteratively locate the local optimum design that mitigates dynamic stall adverse effects. Chapter 6 summarizes the contribution of this thesis and provides suggestions for future work.

References

- Andro, J.-Y. and Jacquin, L. (2009). Frequency effects on the aerodynamic mechanisms of a heaving airfoil in a forward flight configuration. *Aerospace Science and Technology*, 13(1):71–80.
- Beddoes, T. and Leishman, J. (2-4 June, 1986). A generalised model for airfoil unsteady aerodynamics using the indicial method. In *42nd Annual Forum of the American Helicopter Society*, Washington DC, USA.
- Benton, S. and Visbal, M. (2019). The onset of dynamic stall at a high, transitional reynolds number. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 861:860–885.
- Björck, A. (2000). Dynstall: Subroutine package with a dynamic stall model. *Aeronautical Research Inst. of Sweden, TR-FFAP, Bromma, Sweden*, 110.
- Buchner, A., Lohry, M., Martinelli, L., Soria, J., and Smits, A. (2015). Dynamic stall in vertical axis wind turbines: comparing experiments and computations. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, 146:163–171.
- Butterfield, C., Simms, D., Scott, G., and Hansen, A. (1991). Dynamic stall on wind turbine blades. Technical report, National Renewable Energy Lab., Golden, CO (United States).
- Butterfield, C. P. (1988). Aerodynamic pressure and flow-visualization measurement from a rotating wind turbine blade. Technical report, Solar Energy Research Inst., Golden, CO (USA).
- Butterfield, C. P. (1989). *Three-dimensional airfoil performance measurements on a rotating wing*. Solar Energy Research Institute, Golden, Colorado (USA).
- Carr, L. W. (1988). Progress in analysis and prediction of dynamic stall. *Journal of Aircraft*, 25(1):6–17.
- Carr, L. W., McAlister, K. W., and McCroskey, W. J. (1977). Analysis of the development of dynamic stall based on oscillating airfoil experiments. *NASA Technical Note NASA TN D-8382*.
- Choudhry, A., Arjomandi, M., and Kelso, R. (2016). Methods to control dynamic stall for wind turbine applications. *Renewable Energy*, 86:26–37.

- Du, X. and Leifsson, L. (2019). Optimum aerodynamic shape design under uncertainty by utility theory and metamodeling. *Aerospace Science and Technology*, 95:105464.
- Echeverría, D. et al. (2007). Multi-level optimization. space mapping and manifold mapping. *Ph.D. dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*.
- Ellington, C. P. (1999). The novel aerodynamics of insect flight: applications to micro-air vehicles. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 202(23):3439–3448.
- Ellington, C. P., Van Den Berg, C., Willmott, A. P., and Thomas, A. L. (1996). Leading-edge vortices in insect flight. *Nature*, 384(6610):626.
- Forrester, A., Sobester, A., and Keane, A. (2008). *Engineering design via surrogate modelling: a practical guide*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, United Kingdom.
- Forrester, A. I., Sobester, A., and Keane, A. J. (2007). Multi-fidelity optimization via surrogate modelling. *Proceedings of the royal society a: mathematical, physical and engineering sciences*, 463(2088):3251–3269.
- Giselle Fernández-Godino, M., Park, C., Kim, N. H., and Haftka, R. T. (2019). Issues in deciding whether to use multifidelity surrogates. *AIAA Journal*, 57(5):2039–2054.
- Guillaud, N., Balarac, G., and Goncalves, E. (2018). Large eddy simulations on a pitching airfoil: Analysis of the reduced frequency influence. *Computers & Fluids*, 161:1–13.
- Harris, F. D. and Pruyn, R. R. (1968). Blade stall half fact, half fiction. *Journal of the American Helicopter Society*, 13(2):27–48.
- Hu, Y., Zhang, H., and Wang, G. (2018). The effects of dynamic-stall and parallel bvi on cycloidal rotor. *Aircraft Engineering and Aerospace Technology*, 90(1):87–95.
- Jameson, A. (2003). Aerodynamic shape optimization using the adjoint method. *Lectures at the Von Karman Institute, Brussels, Belgium*.
- Kim, Y. and Xie, Z.-T. (2016). Modelling the effect of freestream turbulence on dynamic stall of wind turbine blades. *Computers & Fluids*, 129:53–66.
- Koziel, S., Bandler, J. W., and Madsen, K. (2008). Quality assessment of coarse models and surrogates for space mapping optimization. *Optimization and Engineering*, 9(4):375–391.
- Koziel, S. and Yang, X.-S. (2011). *Computational optimization, methods and algorithms*, volume 356. Springer.

- Larsen, J. W., Nielsen, S. R., and Krenk, S. (2007). Dynamic stall model for wind turbine airfoils. *Journal of Fluids and Structures*, 23(7):959–982.
- Lee, T. and Gerontakos, P. (2004). Investigation of flow over an oscillating airfoil. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 512:313–341.
- Lee, T. and Gerontakos, P. (2006). Dynamic stall flow control via a trailing-edge flap. *AIAA Journal*, 44(3):469–480.
- Leifsson, L. and Koziel, S. (2016). Surrogate modelling and optimization using shape-preserving response prediction: A review. *Engineering Optimization*, 48(3):476–496.
- Lyu, Z. and Martins, J. R. (2015). Aerodynamic shape optimization of an adaptive morphing trailing-edge wing. *Journal of Aircraft*, 52(6):1951–1970.
- Mani, K., Lockwood, B. A., and Mavriplis, D. J. (1-3 May 2012). Adjoint-based unsteady airfoil design optimization with application to dynamic stall. In *American Helicopter Society 68th annual forum proceedings*, volume 68, Washington DC, USA. American Helicopter Society.
- McAlister, K., Pucci, S., McCroskey, W., and Carr, L. (1982). An experimental study of dynamic stall on advanced airfoil section. volume 2: Pressure and force data. *NASA Technical Memorandum 84245*.
- McCroskey, W. J., Carr, L. W., and McAlister, K. W. (1976). Dynamic stall experiments on oscillating airfoils. *AIAA Journal*, 14(1):57–63.
- McCroskey, W. J., McAlister, K., Carr, L., Pucci, S., Lambert, O., and Indergrand, R. (1981). Dynamic stall on advanced airfoil sections. *Journal of the American Helicopter Society*, 26(3):40–50.
- McCroskey, W. J., McAlister, K. W., Carr, L. W., and Pucci, S. (1982). An experimental study of dynamic stall on advanced airfoil sections. volume 1. summary of the experiment. Technical report, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Moffett Field, CA, Ames Research.
- Müller-Vahl, H. F., Nayeri, C. N., Paschereit, C. O., and Greenblatt, D. (2016). Dynamic stall control via adaptive blowing. *Renewable Energy*, 97:47–64.
- Papila, N., Shyy, W., Griffin, L., and Dorney, D. (8-11 January, 2001). Shape optimization of supersonic turbines using response surface and neural network methods. In *39th Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit*, page 1065, Reno, NV, USA.
- Peherstorfer, B., Willcox, K., and Gunzburger, M. (2018). Survey of multifidelity methods in uncertainty propagation, inference, and optimization. *SIAM Review*, 60(3):550–591.