



9th – 14th of May 2022 Bucaramanga, Colombia 2022.iptnet.info



Problem no.2 - Airbounce IPT 2022

Team Slovenia Presenter: Rok Grgič Meško



University of Ljubljana Faculty of Mathematics and Physics

Official Problem Statement

When a Frisbee is thrown in a certain way it can be made to bounce in mid-air. Study the physics of this phenomenon.



Ideas and Hypotheses

- Normal component of Frisbee velocity will decrease faster because of its shape.
- Frisbee will appear to bounce in mid-air.

- Frisbee in the original video is stable. Angle to the ground is constant.
- Assumptions:
 - Frisbee keeps constant angle to the ground during the whole flight because of gyroscopic stability.
 - Frisbee travels in a straight line. (no Magnus effect...)

Axis graphs:




Figure 1: Ground coordinate system: N

 $\theta=$ angle to the ground




Figure 2:

Coordinate system of Frisbee: D

 $\alpha = {\sf angle} \ {\sf of} \ {\sf attack}$

Lift and drag force

$$L = \frac{1}{2} A \rho C_L v^2 \qquad D = \frac{1}{2} A \rho C_D v^2$$
 (1)

Lift and drag coefficient depending on angle of attack [1]

$$C_L = C_{L0} + C_{L\alpha}\alpha \qquad C_D = C_{D0} + C_{D\alpha}\alpha^2 \tag{2}$$

Cutoff

- C_D cutoff; when $C_D = 1.1$ (drag coefficient of a disc perpendicular to velocity)
- C_L cutoff; at stall angle = 25°




Figure 3: $C_{L0}=0.188, C_{L\alpha}=2.37, C_{D0}=0.15, C_{D\alpha}=1.24$ M. Hubbard, S. A. Hummel. Simulation of Frisbee Flight. (2000). [1] (short flights)

Theoretical Description: Forces




Figure 4: Coordinate system of Frisbee: D

$$K = \frac{A\rho}{2m} \qquad \tan \alpha = \frac{-v_2}{v_1}$$
$$v = \sqrt{v_1^2 + v_2^2}$$

$$L = mKC_L v^2 \begin{pmatrix} \sin \alpha \\ \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix}_D$$

$$L = mKC_L v \begin{pmatrix} -v_2 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}_D$$
(3)

$$D = mKC_D v^2 \begin{pmatrix} -\cos \alpha \\ \sin \alpha \end{pmatrix}_D$$

$$D = mKC_D v \begin{pmatrix} -v_1 \\ -v_2 \end{pmatrix}_D$$
(4)

$$F_{g} = -mg \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta \\ \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}_{D}$$
 (5)

$$ma = L + D + F_g \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{v_1} \\ \dot{v_2} \end{pmatrix}_D = KC_L v \begin{pmatrix} -v_2 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}_D + KC_D v \begin{pmatrix} -v_1 \\ -v_2 \end{pmatrix}_D - g \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta \\ \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}_D$$
 (7)

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{d}_1 \\ \dot{d}_2 \end{pmatrix}_D = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}_D$$
 (8)

Solve for: d_1, d_2, v_1, v_2 and rotate to ground coordinate system N.

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$



Experiment

- Video analysis of a throw.
- Analysed only stable throws.
- Problems:
 - Frisbee is not stable as in the original video.
 - Parallax error. Throw is not perpendicular to the camera.
 - Wind speed was not measured.
 - Rotation of Frisbee not measured, coefficients of lift and drag for rotating Frisbee.

Experiment

m[kg]	$A[\mathrm{m}^2]$	$ ho[{ m kg/m^3}]$	$g[m/s^2]$
0.175	0.0616	1.23	9.8

Table 1: Frisbee parameters and constants.



Figure 5: Example of a throw.

Parallax Error Correction

dx is measured, dx' is correct

$$k = \frac{\text{final frisbee size}}{\text{initial frisbee size}}$$
 $l = \text{lenght of a throw}$ (11)

$$dx = \left(\frac{k-1}{l}x + 1\right)dx'\tag{12}$$

$$x' = \int_0^x \left(\frac{k-1}{l}x + 1\right)^{-1} dx \tag{13}$$

$$x' = \frac{l}{k-1} \left[\ln((k-1)x + l) - \ln l \right]$$
 (14)

Results, example of a throw:




Figure 6: $\theta=19^\circ$, $v_x(t=0)=10.64\frac{\rm m}{\rm s}$, $v_y(t=0)=-1.21\frac{\rm m}{\rm s}$ $C_L,C_D\text{: article [1]}$

Fitting C_L and C_D

Angle to the ground (θ) in not constant, we used effective (average) angle θ_{ef} .

Parameters in finding C_L and C_D :

 θ_{ef} , C_{L0} , $C_{L\alpha}$, C_{D0} , $C_{D\alpha}$

Minimization of s over k experiments:

$$s_k = \sum_i w_i \| (x_i, y_i)_{sim} - (x_i, y_i)_{exp} \|^2$$
 (15)

$$s = \sum_{k} s_k \tag{16}$$

$$w_i = \frac{1}{\Delta x_i^2} \tag{17}$$

scipy.optimize.minimize(method='TNC')



Fitting C_L and C_D

Weights

$$x_i = \int_0^{t_i} \left(\int_0^{t_i} a \, dt \right) \, dt \tag{18}$$

$$\Delta x_i = \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial a} \Delta a + \Delta x_0 \tag{19}$$

$$w_i = \left(\frac{\Delta a}{2} t_i^2 + \Delta x_0\right)^{-2} \tag{20}$$

$$\Delta a \approx 0.1 \frac{\mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{s}^2}$$
 $\Delta x_0 \approx 1 \mathrm{cm}$

Fitting C_L and C_D




Figure 7: $C_{L0}=0.188, C_{L\alpha}=2.37, C_{D0}=0.15, C_{D\alpha}=1.24$ [1] $C_{L0}=0.138, C_{L\alpha}=2.20, C_{D0}=0.171, C_{D\alpha}=1.47$ [minimization]

Trajectories: Weighted Minimization and Experiment




Figure 8: All experiments. 4 D P 4 AP P 4 B P 4 B P B

Minimization: Weighted vs Unweighted




Figure 9: $C_{L0}=0.138, C_{L\alpha}=2.20, C_{D0}=0.171, C_{D\alpha}=1.47$ (weighted) $C_{L0}=0.127, C_{L\alpha}=2.23, C_{D0}=0.258, C_{D\alpha}=0.585$ (unweighted)

Minimization: Weighted vs Unweighted




Figure 10: All experiments.

Conclusion

- Simulation and experiment match.
- Coefficients similar as article: good model
- Experiment improvements:
 - measure wind speed
 - practice more for a stable throw
 - experiment conducted inside
 - measure Frisbee rotation

References

- [1] M. Hubbard, S. A. Hummel. Simulation of Frisbee Flight. (2000). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/253842372_Simulation_of_Frisbee_Flight
- [2] J. Potts, W. J. Crowther. Disc-wing Aerodynamics. (2002). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/ 268559957_FrisbeeTM_Aerodynamics