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1. INTRODUCTION

This report is the fourth semi-annual report of a research project concerned with the optimal design of helicopter rotor blades. The goals of the project and the approach adopted have been described in previous reports, and these descriptions will not be repeated here. The present report will be confined primarily to describing several studies comparing the forced responses of an initial (i.e., non-optimized) blade to those of a final (optimized) blade.

At the 39th Annual Forum of the American Helicopter Society last spring, we presented a paper describing our work on optimal rotor blade design. In the ensuing discussion, several questions were raised about the manner in which the optimal design problem had been formulated. One question was whether or not the forced response of the blade can be adequately controlled, as we have assumed, by our approach of "frequency placement", that is, of restricting the natural frequencies of the blade to lie within narrow intervals located away from certain integer multiples of the rotor speed. A second question was whether or not aerodynamic damping substantially reduces the resonant peaks, in which case concern about avoiding resonances through proper selection of frequency windows would be unnecessary. Similar questions had been mentioned in the original proposal for this project, when it was stated that the sensitivity of the optimal design to the choice of frequency window would be studied, and if it was found that frequency placement did not in fact reduce vibrations, then some other objective such as minimizing root shear would be
explored. Because of the timely coincidence of the questions raised at the Forum and the intent expressed in our original proposal, we decided the time had arrived to investigate the appropriateness of "frequency placement".

The investigation of this question was carried out through two, somewhat overlapping, problems. First, the forced responses of an initial (i.e., non-optimized) design were compared to those of a final (optimized) design as the frequency of the forcing function was changed; cases with and without aerodynamic damping were considered. Next, the responses of initial and final designs were evaluated as one natural frequency was varied (the others were held fixed), and a forcing function containing harmonics of the rotor speed was applied. Again, cases with and without aerodynamic damping were considered. The general finding from these studies is that frequency placement is a viable means of reducing vibration, although it is by no means the only method and should be used in conjunction with others.

In the penultimate section of the report, several topics are briefly described in which studies have been initiated during the reporting period, but not yet completed. The final section of the report contains a sketch of plans for future work.

2. RESPONSE OF STARTING AND OPTIMAL DESIGNS FOR VARYING FORCING FREQUENCIES

In this section of the report, the response of both the initial and final (optimal) designs to an external forcing function is studied as the frequency of the forcing function is varied. Blades both with and without aerodynamic damping are
considered. To formulate these problems, consider the forced behavior of a rotor-blade.

The equation of motion for the finite-element representation of a rotor blade subjected to an external excitation may be written in matrix form as

\[
[M] \{\ddot{X}(t)\} + [C] \{\dot{X}(t)\} + [K] \{X(t)\} = \{F(t)\},
\]

where
\[
[M] = \text{mass matrix}, \\
\{X(t)\} = \text{column vector of nodal displacements}, \\
[C] = \text{damping matrix}, \\
[K] = \text{stiffness matrix}, \text{ and} \\
\{F(t)\} = \text{forcing function column vector}.
\]

The forcing function may in turn be expressed as

\[
\{F(t)\} = \{V_0\} e^{i\omega t},
\]

where
\[
\omega = \text{forcing frequency, and} \\
V_0 = \text{forcing amplitude}.
\]

After some calculation, it can be shown that the amplitude of the response -- written as \{X\}, independent of \(t\) -- can be given as

\[
\{X\} = [K + i\omega C - \omega^2 M]^{-1}\{V_0\}
\]

In the present section, the flapping response is considered. The in-plane response is inferred from the results without
damping, since there is little aerodynamic damping in the inplane direction.

Fig. 1 shows a plot of the forcing amplitude $V_0$ [Ref.1] used in the study. Given the forcing amplitude, we can calculate the response of each node of the finite-element representation of the blade as the value of the forcing frequency, $W$, is varied. The tip (finite-element node farthest from the hub) response is of special interest. Before the results obtained from this study are presented, it is useful to examine the frequency placement results which are described in the Third Semi-Annual Report (pp. 21-26). The results for the frequencies (in units of cycles/rev) are, for flapping mode only,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>INITIAL DESIGN</th>
<th>FINAL DESIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blade dimensions are given in Table 8, p. 26, of the Third Semi-Annual Report.

The frequencies in the above table correspond to the symmetric modes of a teetering rotor. Thus, only even harmonics of the rotor speed have been considered as forcing frequencies. As a result, the optimized blade (Final Design) finds the third mode moved away from the critical 6.0/rev (from 5.89 to 5.67). Similarly, the movement of the second mode to 3.09/rev removes it from 2.0 and 4.0/rev. In the comparison study to follow, however, we will apply the entire spectrum of frequencies to this blade (not just even harmonics). Thus, the "Final Design" can no longer
be considered optimum. A comparison of the two blades, however, does indicate the strong effect of resonance because each case has a distinct resonance (6 and 3/rev).

We shall now consider the results of the present study. Fig. 2 shows the tip responses of both the initial design and final (i.e., optimized) design as functions of the forcing frequency. Aerodynamic damping has been neglected (Alternatively, the results can be interpreted as giving the inplane response.). It can be seen that near 1.18 cycles/rev, the responses of the two designs are very similar. However, the responses corresponding to the second and third modes differ significantly. For example, in the second mode the peak of 3.22 cycles/rev (initial design) moves to 3.09 cycles/rev (final design). Similarly, the peak of the third mode moves from 5.89 cycles/rev to 5.67 cycles/rev, which is especially important since it is highly desirable to keep the frequency away from the integer frequency of 6 cycles/rev. We conclude from these results that the frequency placement approach does have a significant effect on the forced tip response when damping is not considered.

Next, the effect of aerodynamic damping is considered, that is, the results to be presented correspond to flapping. Mathematical details of the damping formulation are available in the thesis by Ko [Ref.2]. The effect of aerodynamic damping on reducing the resonant peaks of the tip response of the initial blade is shown in Fig. 3. Fig. 4 shows the damped responses of both the initial and optimized blades so that the effect of frequency placement can be studied. It is interesting to observe
here that when damping is included, no apparent advantage is gained by optimizing the blade, at least in terms of reducing the tip response, except in the range of 3-4/rev, in which a thirty-five percent reduction occurs. However, we must also examine the effect of optimization when the response is measured by the average shear force existing in the blade.

Consequently, the shearing force in the blade is considered next. As a measure of the average shear in the rotor, we consider the sum of the squares of the shear force (abbreviated SSS),

\[
SSS = y_1^2 + y_2^2 + \ldots + y_{10}^2
\]

In this equation, \( y_i \) represents the shear force at node \( i \) in the (ten-element) finite-element model. Note that the root shear is necessarily included as one of the terms on the right-hand side of the equation, so that a large value of root shear will cause SSS to also be large.

Fig. 5 shows the variation of SSS with respect to the forcing frequency for the initial design with and without aerodynamic damping. Fig. 6 shows the same quantities for the final (optimized) design. Fig. 7 compares the quantity SSS corresponding to initial and final designs when aerodynamics is considered. Inspection of these figures shows that, in contrast to behavior of the tip response, the shear response is significantly affected by optimizing the blade, even when aerodynamic damping is included. The 3/rev loads are increased by fifty percent due to the movement of \( w_2 \) from 3.22 to 3.09/rev. Similarly, the 6/rev loads are reduced by seventy percent due to the movement of \( w_3 \).
from 5.89 to 5.67/rev. Thus, even with damping, frequency placement is a powerful driver of loads. It follows that frequency placement can be justifiably considered an important part of blade optimization.

3. BLADE RESPONSE TO HARMONICS OF ROTOR SPEED

In the study just described, the response of the blade to changes in the forcing frequency was considered. Now we consider a different approach. In effect, we examine how the blade responds to a forcing function "during the optimization procedure" -- in the sense that during optimization, the optimization algorithm varies the natural frequency of the blade (to force it to satisfy the frequency constraints). In obtaining the results to be presented next, we simulated the optimization procedure by varying the natural frequency. Thus we can observe what happens to the forced response during frequency placement.

The formulation of the approach is as follows. Through appropriate transformations (described in the Appendix), the system mass matrix can be written as

\[
[M] = [U]^{-T} [U]^{-1}
\]

and the system stiffness matrix as

\[
[K] = [M][U] \text{ diag}(w_i^2) [U]^{T} [M]
\]

in which \(w_i\) are the natural frequencies of the system, \([U]\) is a matrix whose columns are eigenvectors and the notation "diag" indicates a diagonal matrix (all off-diagonal terms vanish). From
examination of these expressions, it can be seen that the
stiffness and mass matrices can be considered functions of the
natural frequencies. Thus it becomes possible to fix all
frequencies but one, and then study the response of the system as
that one frequency is varied. In particular, the response to the
following forcing function will be studied:

\[ \{F(t)\} = \{v_1\}e^{iWt} + \{v_2\}e^{i2Wt} + \ldots + \{v_n\}e^{inWt} \]

where

\[ W = \text{the rotor speed, and} \]

\[ \{v_n\} = (1/n)\{v_0\}, \]

and \( \{v_0\} \) was defined previously in Fig. 1. Since the arguments of
the exponentials are integer multiples of \( W \), resonance will occur
at harmonics of the rotor speed. The particular forcing function
given above is known from empirical observation to provide an
approximate, but physically realistic representation of the
radial and harmonic variations of the amplitude of the load on a
real blade. As in Section 2, the blade response will be defined
through the tip displacement and the sum of the squares of the
shears, except that, here, the \( n = 1 \) term has been omitted from
the expressions for calculating tip displacement and shears
because this term represents a tip-path plane tilt that is
controlled by the pilot for trimming purposes. It is not part of
the true vibratory loads we are considering.

Results for the problem just formulated are shown in Fig. 8,
where the sum of the squares of the shears is plotted as a
function of \( w_2 \), the second natural frequency, with the other
natural frequencies being fixed. This figure corresponds to the initial blade design (Blade dimensions are given in Table 8, p. 26, of the Third Semi-Annual Report.) Fig. 9 shows the same quantity for the case where the third natural frequency is varied. It is interesting to note that the response curve for the damped case in Fig. 9 lacks resonant peaks -- apparently the damped response is so completely dominated by the resonance of the second natural frequency, which is fixed near 3/rev, that the (damped) resonant peaks for the third frequency are negligible by comparison. It is worth mentioning, in passing, that the value of the damped response corresponding to $w_1 = 1.18$, $w_2 = 3.22$, and $w_3 = 5.89$ can be read from Fig. 8 as well as Fig. 9 and can be seen to be the same (approximately 6.0 lbs). This observation provides a re-assuring check that the figures represent actual behavior and not a programming error.

For the final (optimal) design, the analogous quantities are plotted in Figs. 10 and 11. Again, no resonant peaks are present in the damped response when the third natural frequency is varied. Comparison of magnitudes of ordinates in Figs. 8 and 10 (no damping) shows that the overall shear measure is reduced in the final design in the regions away from resonance. Also, the choice of scale on the vertical axis in Fig. 10 highlights the effect of frequency placement. Note that by inspecting Figs. 8-11, a designer may select the design frequency which minimizes the average shear as measured by the SSS.

One of the most interesting results of Fig. 10 is information about the width of valleys and peaks, since
this gives design information. First, let us examine the no-
damping curve (inplane response). Here, the minimum points are
nearly at the centers of the regions (2.55/rev) and (3.55/rev).
The frequency windows to maintain no more than thirty percent
increase in loads are 2.40 - 2.70/rev and 3.40 - 3.70/rev (plus
or minus 0.15/rev) -- a fairly narrow window. For the damped
curves (flapping response), minima are also near the one-half
points, but the window for thirty-percent increases are much
wider -- 2.20 - 2.90/rev and 3.20 to 3.80/rev (plus or minus
0.30/rev). Stated another way, inplane frequencies should be no
closer than a 0.4/rev from integers, but flapping frequencies may
be as close as 0.2 from an integer. It should be emphasized that
these observations apply to this particular example and may not
be generalized for other frequency constraints. In future work,
we will apply similar reasoning to optimized articulated rotors
for which the frequency spectrum is more meaningful.

Another conclusion to be drawn from the above results is
that the undamped response curve has very flat-bottomed "valleys"
when one of the fixed frequencies is near an integer value (cf.
Figs. 10 and 11).

4. OTHER STUDIES CONDUCTED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

As an extension of work reported previously, data were
obtained for six rotor-blades produced by several different
helicopter companies, and considerable effort was expended in
attempting to choose box-beam dimensions and other stiffness and
mass parameters in our finite-element model in order to match the
natural frequencies of these given blades. The motivation for
this work is, once a given blade can be properly represented by
the finite-element model, to improve it through the application
of optimization techniques. The task of matching frequencies
necessarily proceeds by a certain amount of trial-and-error and
is, as a result, time-consuming and tedious. The results of this
frequency-matching effort will be described in the final report.

Another study conducted during the reporting period has been
concerned with the application of an alternative optimization
technique -- the optimality-criteria method. This method, a
generalization of the traditional stress-ratio approach to
improving a structural design, has received considerable
attention among structural optimizers in the last five to ten
years [Refs.3-5], and thus it appears appropriate to make at
least a preliminary investigation of its applicability to rotor-
blade design. At this writing, however, our efforts to implement
the optimality-criteria method have not been successful; since
there exist a number of different ways of implementing the
method, one should not conclude that it cannot be made to work
for rotor-blade design. Only the particular implementation we
have chosen appears in doubt. At present, we have no plans for
continuing work on this method, since it threatens to divert
effort from more promising topics.

Yet another topic of study during the reporting period was
the effect on natural frequency calculations when secondary
structural items such as shear deformation, restraint of warping
during twist, and filler stiffness are ignored. A simplified
elliptic blade profile, approximating a true helicopter blade,
was studied to obtain rough estimates of modelling errors caused by neglect of the secondary items. It was concluded that the mathematical model we have been using should be quite accurate (perhaps only a one percent change at most due to the consideration of secondary items.). However, it is imperative that accurate filler properties, dimensions, and locations be known in order to represent the mass distribution with a reasonable degree of precision.

A final topic of study during the reporting period has been the implementation of a faster subroutine for eigenvalue calculation. Computer code for the subspace iteration algorithm has been obtained and integrated into our blade analysis program. Difficulties involving missing eigenvalues have surfaced, however, and further development is required.

5. FUTURE WORK

In addition to continuing work in the area described above (matching data for some actual rotor blades to finite-element models, and then optimizing the blades), we also plan to work in another area: that of investigating the validity of the dimensional constraints we have chosen. In previous reporting periods, we have described many examples in which constraints on the thicknesses of the walls of the box beam have been present. It can be concluded that such constraints can be handled in an optimization procedure with little difficulty. Another, less clearly defined, type of dimensional constraint is that of constructibility; for example, if an actual blade is to be constructed, abrupt thickness changes from one finite element to
the next present manufacturing difficulties. In the remaining year of the research project, one area of investigation will be to formulate, through consultation with helicopter manufacturers, realistic constraints for constructibility.
6. APPENDIX - Derivation of Mass and Stiffness Matrices
as Functions of Natural Frequencies

Define

\[ [K^*] = [M]^{-1/2}[K][N]^{-1/2}, \]

and construct a square matrix \([U^*]\) by using the eigenvectors of
\([K^*]\) as columns. If the eigenvectors are normalized to the
identity matrix, that is, if

\[ [U^*]^T[U^*] = [I], \]

it then follows that

\[ [U^*]^T[K^*][U^*] = \text{diag} \{ (w_i^2) \}, \]

where \(w_i^2\) are the eigenvalues of \([K^*]\).

Next, let

\[ [U] = [M]^{-1/2}[U^*], \]

from which it follows that

\[ [U]^T = [U^*]^T[M]^{-1/2}, \]

\[ [U]^{-1} = [U^*]^T[M]^{1/2}, \]

\[ [U]^T[K][U] = \text{diag} \{ (w_i^2) \}, \]

and

\[ [U]^T[M][U] = [I]. \]

Finally, then, the stiffness and mass matrices can be
written as functions of the eigenvalues, \(w_i^2\):
\[ [M] = [U]^{-T}[U]^{-1} \]
\[ = [M]^{1/2}[M]^{1/2}, \]
and
\[ [K] = [U]^{-T}\text{diag}(w_i^2)[U]^{-1} \]
\[ = [M]^{1/2}[U^*]\text{diag}(w_i^2)[U^*]^{T}[M]^{1/2} \]
\[ = [M][U]\text{diag}(w_i^2)[U]^{T}[M]. \]

Note that the eigenvectors, \([U]\), and eigenvalues, \(w_i^2\), appearing on the right-hand side were originally calculated from the stiffness and mass matrices, \([K]\) and \([M]\). If we consider only relatively small changes in the frequencies, \(w_i\), then the eigenvectors should relatively unchanged. Thus the last two equations for \([M]\) and \([K]\) with \([U]\) held fixed can be considered as expressing the mass and stiffness matrices as explicit functions of the natural frequencies.
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