## **General Disclaimer**

## One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.

Produced by the NASA Center for Aerospace Information (CASI)

## NASA TM X- 72836

## NASA TECHNICAL

r

1963

72836

×

TM

NASA

## MEMORANDUM

(NASA-TM-X-72836) VORTEX MANEUVER LIFT FOR N76-21161 SUPER-CRUISE CONFIGURATIONS (NASA) 26 p HC \$4.00 CSCL 01A

> G3/02 Unclas G3/02 25154

#### VORTEX MANEUVER LIFT FOR SUPER-CRUISE CONFIGURATIONS

By James F. Campbell, Blair B. Gloss, and John E. Lamar NASA Langley Research Center Hampton, VA 23665



February 1976

This informal documentation medium is used to provide accelerated or special release of technical information to selected users. The contents may not meet NASA formal editing and publication standards, may be revised, or may be incorporated in another publication.

> NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER, HAMPTON, VIRGINIA 23665

| 1, Report No.<br>TM X-72836   | 2. Government Access  | on No.   | 3. Rec  | ipient's Catalog No.  |  |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| 4. Title and Subtitle   |   |  | 5. Rep  | ort Date  |  |
| VORTEX MANEUVER LIFT FOR SUPER-CRUISE CONFI   |   | GURATION   | S <u>Febru</u>  | ary 1976  |  |
|   |   |  | 6. Perf   | orming Organization Code  |  |
| 7. Author(s) James F. Campbell,<br>Lamar  | and John  | E. 8. Perf   | orming Organization Report No.  |   |  |
|   |   | <u> </u>   | 10. Wor   | k Unit No.  |  |
| 9. Performing Organization Name and Address   |   |  |   |   |  |
| NASA Langley Research Center<br>Hampton, VA 23665   |   |  | 11. Con   | tract or Grant No.  |  |
|   |   |  | 13. Typ   | e of Report and Period Covered  |  |
| 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address  |   |  | -   | Technical Memorandum  |  |
| National Aeronautics and Sp<br>Washington, DC 20546   | on  | 14. Spo  | nsaring Agency Code   |   |  |
| 15. Supplementary Notes   |   | ····   | l   |   |  |
|   |   |  |   |   |  |
|   | · · · ·   |  |   |   |  |
|   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 16. Abstract  |   |  |   |   |  |
| NASA Langley Research Center<br>capabilities for two classes<br>arrangement and a slender w<br>methods are discussed for e<br>highly swept wings having s | er to investigate<br>s of Super-Cruis<br>ying configurations<br>stimating critic<br>separated leading | the sub<br>design<br>n. In a<br>al struc<br>-edge vo | sonic vortex-<br>s: a close-c<br>ddition, seve<br>tural design<br>rtex flows. | lift producing<br>oupled wing-canard<br>ral analytical<br>loads for thin, |  |
|   | · .   |  |   |   |  |
| ·<br>•  | · · · ·   |  |   |   |  |
|   |   |  |   |   |  |
|   |   |  |   |   |  |
|   | · · · · · ·   |  |   |   |  |
|   | · · · · ·   |  |   |   |  |
|   |   | ·  |   |   |  |
|   | ant e segnet e trach.<br>An e se  |  |   |   |  |
|   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 17. Key Words (Suggested by Author(s))  |   | 18. Distribut  | ion Statement   |   |  |
| Separation-Induced Vortex Flows<br>Critical Structural Design Loads   |   | linclas  | Unclassified - Unlimited  |   |  |
|   |   | 41141944   |   |   |  |
| Close-Coupled Wing-Canard   |   |  |   |   |  |
|   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 19. Security Classif, (of this report) 2  | Security Classif (of this   | nnan)  | 21 Ma of Bases  |   |  |
|   | or occurry classif, for this  | paget  | ZI, NO, OI Fages  | 22. Price"  |  |

•

For sale by the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161

#### INTRODUCTION

Other papers in this conference have discussed some aerodynamic design philosophies used to develop Super Cruise fighter aircraft (references 1 to 3). These studies demonstrate that Super Cruise concepts are characterized by thin wings with high sweepback angles. Wings of this type produce separation-induced vortex flows at angles of attack corresponding to maneuver conditions. The vortex lift forces associated with these flow conditions may be particularly important for the Super Cruise aircraft if it is to have maneuver characteristics similar to those of current subsonic-transonic fighters. Therefore, this paper reviews some theoretical and experimental research conducted at the NASA Langley Research Center for the purpose of investigating the subsonic vortex-lift producing capabilities for two classes of Super Cruise designs: closecoupled wing-canard configurations and a slender wing configuration. (See figure 1) In addition, several analytical methods are discussed for estimating critical structural design loads for thin, highly swept wings having separated leading-edge vortex flows.

#### SEPARATION-INDUCED VORTEX FLOWS

Prior to the data presentations for the Super Cruise configurations, it is desirable to comment on separation-induced vortex flows and vortexlift technology. Figure 2 presents turn rate, a measure of maneuverability, as a function of Mach number and illustrates typical maneuver boundaries for a fighter aircraft. The limit denoted by C<sub>Lmax</sub> is an aerodynamic boundary at subsonic and transonic speeds and reflects the maximum usable lift for the fighter. This includes buffet onset as well as stability limitations on maneuver performance. There are many aerodynamic concepts which can help improve the maneuver capability, among them is the utilization of the important leading-edge vortex flows. Wings which utilize leading-edge vortex flows to achieve high maneuver lifts can have low structural weights and design simplicity compared with other high-lift approaches; while some drag penalty can be encountered for flat wings with vortex flows, this drag penalty can be essentially eliminated by combining wing camber with the leading-edge vortex.

Figure 3 shows a photograph of an F-16 to illustrate one type of vortex system which exists in a current aircraft design. The photograph shows that the flow separates from the wing's leading-edge extensions, or strakes, and forms a discrete pair of vortices which pass over the wing. This vortex system produces sizeable increments of vortex lift at maneuver attitudes. A similar situation can exist with thin, highly swept wings, as shown in figure 4. This figure shows the effect of Mach number on the lift coefficient obtained for a 74° delta wing at  $\alpha = 16^\circ$ . The estimated vortex lift contribution is seen to be relatively constant through the

Mach number range. This apparent insensitivity to Mach number is important because the experimental data on the Super Cruise configurations were obtained at low Mach numbers of 0.2 and 0.3. Based on this information, the vortex-lift trends obtained for the Super Cruise configurations at low Mach numbers should be essentially the same at high subsonic and transonic speeds. These studies will be extended to transonic speeds in future wind-tunnel tests.

The theory used to calculate the vortex lift for the simple delta wing (in figure 4) is referred to as the Leading Edge Suction Analogy (ref. 4). As seen in figure 5, the theory has been extended to account for leadingedge and side-edge vortex flows for a variety of configurations and Mach numbers. These efforts are providing improved aerodynamic design and analysis theories (ref. 5) which account for separation-induced vortex flows associated with high performance aircraft. This theory is used throughout the remainder of the paper to compare, where it is possible, with the Super Cruise experimental results.

#### CLOSE-COUPLED WING-CANARD CONFIGURATION

The first Super-Cruise configuration to be examined utilizes the close-coupled wing-canard arrangement presented in reference 6. Lift coefficient is shown in figure 6 as a function of  $\alpha$  and illustrates the synergetic effect which occurs for this configuration. The square symbols represent the data for the basic wing body, and the circle symbols represent the total configuration, i.e., the canard, wing, and body. It is obvious that adding the canard results in large lift gains. A better understanding of how these lift benefits are achieved can be obtained by examining the data represented by the diamond symbol. These data were obtained by adding the lift loads on the canard and forebody, not in the presence of the wing, to the loads on the wing and aft body, not in the presence of the canard. It was possible to do this because the data were obtained using two strain gage balances, one located in the model's aft section to measure total configuration loads and the other located in the model's forward section to measure only canard loads. Comparing the circle and diamond data at high angles-of-attack shows that the lifts on the complete configuration are much higher than those obtained by adding the two parts. This synergetic effect is due to the beneficial interference which results when the wing and canard are in close proximity. In particular, the canard's presence helps control the leading edge vortex that forms on the wing, thus promoting vortex lift. The vortex flow theoretical predictions shown on figure 6 assume that the wing develops full vortex lift. This assumption is borne out by the good agreement with the data.

The drag polars for the three configurations of figure 6 are presented in figure 7. The synergistic effect is also noted here, where the favorable interference produces improvements in the drag polar. These trends are predicted reasonably well by the attached flow theory (no leading-edge suction) and the vortex flow theory. A third analytical curve is presented to indicate the theoretical minimum drag achievable for attached flow and full leading-edge suction. This was not possible for the current data because the wing and canard had sharp leading edges and no twist or camber.

9

Figures 8 and 9 show the effect on  $C_L$  and on drag- due-to-lift of adding wing twist and camber to this wing-canard design. It should be noted that the data represented by the triangle and diamond symbols are for a wing design  $C_L$  of 0 and are the same data that are presented in figure 7. It is seen in figure 8 that the increase in lift obtained at  $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$  by increasing the wing design  $C_L$  is generally maintained throughout the angle-of-attack range. In addition, the stall angle of attack remained approximately the same for the three configurations with the canard on. These data, therefore, suggest that vortex lift exists on all three wing-canard configurations. It is noted that wing design  $C_L$ refers to the design condition of the isolated wing, i.e., not in the presence of the canard.

The data in figure 9 show the effect of adding the canard, which, as has already been shown, results in reductions in induced drag and significant gains in lift. Further reductions in induced drag are obtained by increasing the wing design  $C_L$  to 0.35 and 0.70. In fact, this change in design  $C_L$  leads to induced drag levels which approach the theoretical minimum represented by  $1/\pi A$ . Reasonably low drag values are maintained well above the design lift coefficient suggesting some leading-edge thrust recovery as the leading-edge vortex reduces the pressure on the cambered leading edge.

#### SLENDER WING CONFIGURATION

This portion of the paper presents some unpublished data recently obtained by Washburn (ref. 7) for a slender wing Super-Cruise configuration. A sketch of the configuration is shown in figure 10. The configuration is similar to one of the Rockwell Super-Cruise designs reviewed by Shrout, et.al, (ref. 1) and Goebel, et.al., (ref. 3). The major differences between the NASA and Rockwell configurations occur on the wings outer panel. The planform geometry for the NASA model was defined using the theoretical leadingedge suction distribution shown on the right side of the figure. The design goal was to maintain a constant suction coefficient as far outboard as possible; a constant  $C_s$  distribution tends to two-dimensionalize the flow over the wing and provide full benefits of the sweep effect for cruise efficiency. This criterion resulted in a minimum angle (48°) on the outer wing panel which is lower than that on the Rockwell version. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effect of wing tip dihedral on the off-design aerodynamic performance at high angles-ofattack. In order to evaluate the vortex lift effects, the wing had no camber or twist and had symmetrically beveled leading edges. This provides aerodynamic characteristics at high angles-of-attack which are dominated by the forces associated with the separation-induced vortex flows.

The lift characteristics of the configuration with various wing tip geometries are shown in figure 11. The anhedral wing tips result in slightly higher lifts than the flat tips, which, in turn, have higher lifts than the dihedral wing tips. Comparing the data with the two theories that are shown, attached flow representing no vortex lift and vortex flow representing full vortex lift, it is seen that this slender wing configuration does develop some vortex lift. In fact, at  $\alpha = 28^{\circ}$  the anhedral configuration achieves about 67 percent of the vortex lift theoretically available, while the dihedral configuration achieves about 46 percent. The loss of lift from the estimated full vortex-lift level is due partially to the trailing-edge notch effect (ref. 5), to early vortex breakdown on the outer panel (ref. 7), and to differences between the vortex system's behavior and the behavior assumed by the theory.

Oil flows patterns were obtained on the upper surface of the wing and are shown in figure 12 to illustrate the type of vortex system developed by this planform. These photographs were obtained for the configuration with dihedral wing tips and are shown for angles of attack of  $8^{\circ}$ ,  $16^{\circ}$ , and 24°. A well-defined flow pattern can be seen on the inner portion of the planform which is indicative of a pair of strong vortices formed from the highly-swept portion of the model. At the lower angles-of-attack, in additional vortex system is evident on the lower-swept outer panel. Increasing the angle of attack results in breakdown of the outer panel vortex, which causes a subsequent loss of lift. This is, at least partly, a consequence of the planform being designed for constant leading-edge suction distribution for cruise considerations. Recalling the lift data, it would appear that the anhedral wing tips (tips do n) provide a favorable pressure gradient on the upper surface which promotes the stability of the outer panel vortex. However, the dihedral tips (tips up) provide an adverse gradient which results in premature vortex breakdown. Wentz (ref. 8) measured the vortex breakdown characteristics on a 48° delta wing and showed that vortex breakdown at the trailing edge occurred at  $\alpha = 10^{\circ}$ .

Figure 13 shows the effect of wing tip geometry on induced drag and, as noted, the anhedral wing tips result in a lower induced drag in comparison to the other wing tip geometries. It is recalled that for sharp leadingedged wings, induced drag is equal to  $C_1 \tan \alpha$ . With this in mind, the drag results are consistent with the lift results presented in figure 11.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY The attached flow theory will full leading-edge suction is presented for reference. The effects of wing tip geometry on the pitching moment are shown in figure 14. The center of gravity location is similar to that used by Rockwell in their design studies and results in an unstable vehicle with about a 7 percent static margin for the test Mach number of 0.2. The data show that at the higher lift coefficient, the wing with the dihed al tips has the largest  $C_m$ , and with the anhedral tips has the lowest  $C_m$ . In addition, pitchup occurs at a  $C_L$  of about 0.3 for the configuration with flat or dihedral wing tips, while the use of anhedral tends to delay pitchup to a  $C_L$  of about 0.5. The disagreement between these measured data and the theories is because the theories estimate more loading on the aft portion of the configuration than is actually present.

#### CRITICAL STRUCTURAL DESIGN LOADS

In the design of advanced aircraft, the effects of separation-induced vortex flows are becoming of increased importance, and adequate theoretical methods of accounting for these flows are urgently needed. While this capability is desired even for cruise point design (ref. 10), there are at least three other design areas where the separation-induced vortex flows play a predominant roll: critical wing structural design loads, vortex lift for takeoff and landing, and vortex lift for high-speed maneuverability.

Since Super Cruise configurations have thin highly-swept wings, the wing flow field at the critical structural design load conditions is usually characterized by leading-edge vortex flows. The importance of these flows is illustrated in figure 15 which shows chordwise pressure distributions on the upper and lower wing surfaces at the 80 percent semispan location. The results are tor  $C_{L} \approx .2$  and M = .85. Theoretical estimates were made

using the Flexstab computer program and Boeing's TEA-230 program. As noted, neither theory adequately estimates the pressures. This is because the theories assume attached flow conditions, but the upper surface pressure distribution indicates that a leading edge vortex flow has formed at this location on the wing.

Recently, Boeing has developed, under contract with Langley Research Center, a Free Vortex-Sheet Method for calculating the pressure field on wings having leading edge vortex flows (ref. 9). The theory is applied to a highly swept delta wing at  $\alpha = 14^{\circ}$  in figure 16. The solid line represents the theoretical estimates using the Boeing method and are in good agreement with the data. Two other theories are shown at the most rearward location on the wing to indicate how the suction pressures have been overpredicted previously.

> ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

FUTURE STUDIES

Figure 17 shows some of the future studies that are planned for close-coupled wing-canard and slender-wing configurations. The current studies will be extended to high subsonic speeds using the Langley 7 x 10-foot wind tunnel. In particular, it is desirable to verify that the vortex lift trends established for low subsonic Mach numbers are similar at transonic maneuver conditions. In addition, more sophisticated wind tunnel models will be used to determine the optimum combinations of attached and vortex flow conditions. One concept that will be tested consists of a rounded leading edge for low drag cruise performance with a device that provides an "effectively" sharp leading edge for generating vortex maneuver lifts. The dynamic stability characteristics of these configurations will be studied at high angles-of-attack, and parametric pressure tests will be conducted to help verify the Free Vortex-Sheet Method for estimating pressures on wings having separation-induced vortex flows.

#### REFERENCES

- Shrout, Barrett L.; et. al.: Review of NASA Super Cruise Configuration Studies, Presented at the Super Cruise Military Aircraft Design Conference, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado, February 17-20, 1976.
- Dollyhigh, Samuel M.; et.al.: Designing for Super Cruise and Maneuver, Presented at the Super Cruise Military Aircraft Design Conference. U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado, February 17-20, 1976.
- Goebel, Thomas P.; et.al.: Preliminary Design of a Supersonic Penetration/Maneuvering Fighter, Presented at the Super Cruise Military Aircraft Design Conference, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado, February 17-20, 1976.
- Polhamus, Edward C.: "Predictions of Vortex-Lift Characteristics by a Leading-Edge Suction Analogy" Journal of Aircraft, Vol.8, 1971.
- 5. Lamar, John E.: "Some Recent Applications of the Suction Analogy to Vortex-Lift Estimates." Presented at the Aerodynamic Analysis Requiring Advanced Computers Conference Langley Research Center, March 4-6, 1975. NASA SP-347.
- Gloss, Blair B.: Effect of Wing Planform and Canard Location and Geometry on the Longitudinal Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Close-Coupled Canard Wing Model at Subsonic Speeds. NASA TN D-7910, June 1975.
- 7. Washburn, Karen E.; and Gloss, Blair B.: Effect of Wing-Tip Dihedral on the Longitudinal and Lateral Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Supersonic Cruise Configuration at Subsonic Speeds. Proposed NASA TMX.
- Wentz, W. H.; and Kohlman, D. L.: "Wind Tunnel Investigations of Vortex Breakdown on Slender Sharp-Edged Wings." NASA CR-98737, 1969.
- Brune, Guenter W.; et.al.: A Three-Dimensional Solution of Flows Over Wings With Leading-Edge Vortex Separation. NASA CR-132709, September 1975.
- 10. Smith, J. H. B.: A Review of Separation In Steady, Three-Dimensional Flow. AGARD-CP-168, May 1975.

7

## OBJECTIVES

Experimental and Theoretical Studies of Vortex Lift at Subsonic Maneuver Conditions for:

Close - Coupled Wing - Canard Configurations



Slender Wing Configuration



Analytical Methods for Estimating Critical Design Loads



MANEUVER BOUNDARIES OF TYPICAL FIGHTER AIRCRAFT





EFFECT OF MACH NUMBER ON VORTEX LIFT FOR A 740 DELTA WING



Figure 4

# 3-D SEPARATED FLOW THEORIES

VORTEX FLOW MANEUVER LIFTCRITICAL WING DESIGN LOADS



O

CLOSE - COUPLED WING-CANARD . . .

AN EXAMPLE OF AERODYNAMIC SYNERGISM



Figure 6

CLOSE - COUPLED WING-CANARD . . . AN EXAMPLE OF AERODYNAMIC SYNERGISM

High Canard M = 0.3





A second s





# SUPER - CRUISE CONFIGURATION STUDY

- Slender Wing -





OF POOR QUALITY

# SURFACE FLOW PATTERNS FOR CONFIGURATION WITH DIHEDRAL

 $\alpha = 8^{\circ}$ 



 $a = 24^{\circ}$ 



.

MANEUVER AERODYNAMICS M = 0.2



Figure 13

я

# $\begin{array}{r} \text{MANEUVER AERODYNAMICS} \\ \text{M} = 0.2 \end{array}$





WING PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION FOR CRITICAL DESIGN LOADS

 $a = 8^{0}$ , M=0.85, C<sub>1</sub>  $\approx 0.2$ 



DELTA WING SURFACE LOADING



CLOSE-COUPLED WING-CANARD AND SLENDER-WING RESEARCH

---- FUTURE STUDIES -----

• EXTEND CURRENT STUDIES TO HIGH SUBSONIC SPEEDS

N 14 TW

DETERMINE OPTIMUM COMBINATIONS OF ATTACHED AND VORTEX FLOW CONDITIONS

STUDY DYNAMIC STABILITY CHARACTERISTICS AT HIGH ANGLES-OF-ATTACK

CONDUCT PARAMETRIC PRESSURE TESTS TO VERIFY FREE VORTEX-SHEET METHOD

~ •

Figure 17