

Parameter-Varying Aerodynamics Models for Aggressive Pitching-Response Prediction

Maziar S. Hemati*

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

and

Scott T. M. Dawson† and Clarence W. Rowley‡

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544

DOI: 10.2514/1.J055193

Current low-dimensional aerodynamic-modeling capabilities are greatly challenged in the face of aggressive flight maneuvers, such as rapid pitching motions that lead to aerodynamic stall. Nonlinearities associated with leading-edge vortex development and flow separation push existing real-time-capable aerodynamics models beyond their predictive limits, which puts reliable real-time flight simulation and control out of reach. In the present development, a push toward realizing real-time-capable models with enhanced predictive performance for flight operations has been made by considering the simpler problem of modeling an aggressively pitching airfoil in a low-dimensional manner. A parameter-varying model, composed of three coupled quasi-linear sub-models, is proposed to approximate the lift, drag, and pitching-moment response of an airfoil to arbitrarily prescribed aggressive ramp–hold pitching kinematics. An output-error-minimization strategy is used to identify the low-dimensional quasi-linear parameter-varying sub-models from input–output data gathered from low-Reynolds-number ($Re = 100$) direct numerical fluid dynamics simulations. The resulting models have noteworthy predictive capabilities for arbitrary ramp–hold pitching maneuvers spanning a broad range of operating points, thus making the models especially useful for aerodynamic optimization and real-time control and simulation.

Nomenclature

(A, B, C, D)	= full parameter-varying state-space system
$(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D})$	= quasi-linear parameter-varying sub-model state-space system
C_d, C_l, C_m	= drag, lift, and quarter-chord pitching-moment coefficients
$C_{d,\alpha=0^\circ}, C_{l,\alpha=0^\circ}, C_{m,\alpha=0^\circ}$	= drag, lift, and quarter-chord pitching-moment coefficients at $\alpha = 0^\circ$
c	= chord length
$G(z)$	= known discrete-time dynamics
$K := \dot{\alpha}c/(2U)$	= reduced frequencies
p	= linear parameter-varying-model parameter/pseudoinput vector
t^*	= convective time, U_1/c
U	= freestream fluid speed
u	= linear parameter-varying-model input vector
x	= total aerodynamic state vector, (\tilde{x}, p)
\tilde{x}	= identified internal model state
y	= output vector (C_l, C_d, C_m) of forces and moments
y^i, y	= sub-model force/moment output, $i \in (C_l, C_d, C_m)$
y^{train}	= training-maneuver simulated force/moment-output data
α	= angle of attack, or pitch angle

$\dot{\alpha}$	= pitch rate
$\ddot{\alpha}$	= pitch angular acceleration
ϵ_{rms}	= rms error with respect to simulated output data
ξ	= optimization parameter for model identification
ρ	= fluid density

I. Introduction

AGILE flight maneuvers are tightly coupled with unsteady aerodynamic effects; body motions lead to vortex shedding, whereas the velocities induced by shed vortices lead to aerodynamic body forcing. Numerous low-dimensional models have been developed to characterize these unsteady aerodynamic processes, most notably motivated by progress in biologically inspired flight systems. The ability to model the force response of a flight vehicle to unsteady motions, in a computationally efficient manner, is essential for real-time flight simulation, control, and optimization. Unfortunately, current approaches to low-dimensional unsteady aerodynamic modeling yield inadequate predictions when faced with aggressive flight maneuvers that move an air vehicle through many operating regimes characterized by appreciably different wake-vortex interactions. This is problematic, for example, in the realm of flight simulation for pilot training, in which realistic models are needed to adequately train pilots to effectively manage compromising flight scenarios (e.g., sharp wind gusts and aerodynamic stall). The accuracy and reliability of low-dimensional models over a broad operating range also play a major role in aerodynamic optimization, because the topology of a given cost function inherently depends on the specific dynamic model used.

Work on unsteady aerodynamic modeling is long-standing and consistently improving. Numerous models, grounded in fundamental aerodynamic principles, have continued to expand aerodynamic predictive capabilities to progressively more ambitious situations. Beginning in the 1920s and 1930s, Wagner [1] and Theodorsen [2] developed elegant models that relied upon a decomposition of the aerodynamic-force response into contributions from circulatory (i.e., vortex induced) and noncirculatory (i.e., added mass) components. To extend this general framework to a broader range of aerodynamic maneuvers, numerous models have been developed

Presented as Paper 2015-1069 at the 53rd Annual AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting, Kissimmee, FL, 5–9 January 2015; received 14 March 2016; revision received 14 July 2016; accepted for publication 26 July 2016; published online 19 October 2016. Copyright © 2016 by Maziar S. Hemati. Published by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc., with permission. All requests for copying and permission to reprint should be submitted to CCC at www.copyright.com; employ the ISSN 0001-1452 (print) or 1533-385X (online) to initiate your request. See also AIAA Rights and Permissions www.aiaa.org/randp.

*Assistant Professor, Department of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics. Member AIAA.

†Graduate Student, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. Student Member AIAA.

‡Professor, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. Associate Fellow AIAA.

since then, based on various vortex representations, such as vortex sheets [3–8], continuous sequences of point vortices [9–12], and finite sets of point vortices with evolving strengths [13–17]. Most vortex models are able to predict forces and moments with remarkable accuracy over a wide range of kinematics, because they account for the most relevant parameters that influence the aerodynamic response (i.e., the evolving distribution of vorticity in the flow). Unfortunately, owing to their large dimensionality, the models that exhibit superb predictive capabilities are too computationally costly to be used in real time. On the other hand, the models that are suitable for real-time implementation currently lack sufficient accuracy to be effective in many applications.

To this end, a multitude of aerodynamic-modeling approaches have invoked the data-driven paradigm of dynamic systems theory to identify low-dimensional computationally efficient models for real-time utilization. Data-driven methods are often desirable because they work with empirical aerodynamic input–output response data directly, thus allowing a low-order model to be “trained” on a representation of the dynamics it is intended to reproduce. Recently, the eigensystem realization algorithm (ERA), a data-driven method, was used to construct linear state-space models of an airfoil undergoing pitch, plunge, and surge maneuvers [18,19]. The models realized from the ERA approach proved successful in conjunction with \mathcal{H}_∞ control methods—which are robust to model uncertainty—for tracking commanded lift trajectories. However, the models demonstrated inadequate predictive capabilities, for the purpose of realistic flight simulation and aerodynamic optimization, when subjected to dynamics that moved away from the operating points about which the models were designed.

Gain scheduling between sets of linear models, such as ERA models, has been proposed as a means of resolving the shortcomings of local linear state-space representations. The approach of gain scheduling between linear models has been used successfully in various application areas, including aircraft flight control [20–22]; however, the framework is not without drawbacks. For example, it is often the case that a large collection of linear models and slow variations between operating points is required to satisfy controller performance specifications [23], thus making the framework ill-suited for aggressive aerodynamic maneuvers, in which variations between operating points are, by definition, rapid.

In response to the limitations associated with gain scheduling between linear models, much research has focused on linear parameter-varying (LPV) systems, in which the system matrices are known functions of a measurable set of time-varying parameters. Gain-scheduled controller design within the LPV framework allows for tighter performance bounds and can deal with fast variations of the operating point [24]. The LPV framework has been applied successfully to the modeling and control of various aircraft systems [25–27], but much of this work has focused on variations in Reynolds and Mach numbers; progress on LPV methods for aggressive flight maneuvers remains underdeveloped.

It is important to note that previous system-modeling efforts have focused on predicting lift and pitching moment, without demonstrations of drag modeling. Of course, if such models are intended for use in flight simulation, they must be capable of accurately predicting all of the components in the resultant forces and moments. In the case of an airfoil, for example, a suitable model must accurately predict lift, drag, and pitching moment—or, equivalently, axial force, normal force, and pitching moment.

In the present paper, we study the viability of using parameter-varying models for accurately predicting the full force and moment responses to aggressive aerodynamic maneuvers. Encouraged by observations reported in [28,29]—that the empirical force response data of an unsteady airfoil, with both leading- and trailing-edge vortex shedding, can be accurately reproduced, over a short time window, by a small set of vortex parameters (i.e., the position and strength of two point vortices)—we devise a parameter-varying model that uses the angle of attack α and its associated rate of change $\dot{\alpha}$ as proxies for the pertinent vortex parameters influencing the force and moment response to rapid pitching motions. We propose a model structure in the form of three quasi-LPV (qLPV) subsystems—LPV

systems whose scheduling parameters include a subset of the states [22,26]—and invoke an output-error minimization procedure to identify the sub-models from empirical aerodynamic force and moment response data generated in direct numerical fluids simulations. Motivated by our desire to better understand the principles that govern the aerodynamics of unsteady flight, we restrict our attention to idealized geometries and simple motions. Specifically, we study the response of a flat-plate airfoil to aggressive pitching kinematics. The pitching maneuvers are fully prescribed and flight dynamics effects are neglected. Further, the freestream velocity remains fixed at all times, such that the pitch angle and angle of attack α are equivalent. The resulting qLPV models yield respectable predictive capabilities for lift, drag, and pitching moment over a broad range of operation (i.e., $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$), testifying to the promise of parameter-varying representations in the context of aggressive aerodynamic-response modeling.

We begin, in Sec. II, by discussing the general notion of parameter-varying models in an aerodynamic context. This discussion is followed by a development of the qLPV model structure used to represent the lift, drag, and pitching-moment response to commanded pitch accelerations $\ddot{\alpha}$. Section III introduces and develops the system-identification method used for realizing qLPV models from input–output data, whereas details pertaining to the generation of aerodynamic input–output data for model identification are presented in Sec. IV. In Sec. V, force and moment predictions from the identified qLPV model are compared with results from direct numerical simulations over a variety of operating regimes; the qLPV model is also compared with an ERA lift-response model in an effort to highlight the advantages of parameter-varying models over linear models in the context of unsteady aerodynamic-response modeling.

II. Pitching-Airfoil Parameter-Varying-Model Formulation

The aim of the present study was to use empirical input–output data, measured from either numerical simulations or physical experiments, to identify a low-order model that accurately represents the dynamic lift C_l , drag C_d , and pitching-moment C_m response of an airfoil to arbitrary pitching maneuvers. In an effort to better ascertain a fundamental understanding with regard to modeling, we restrict our attention to a flat-plate airfoil undergoing fully prescribed pitching motions about its quarter-chord point, as depicted in Fig. 1. Additionally, we enforce that the freestream velocity U remains constant throughout a maneuver, such that the angle of attack α and the pitch angle are equivalent. We also take $\ddot{\alpha}$, the angular acceleration about the pitch axis, as the system input, because pitching maneuvers of physical interest can be generated from this choice.

To be of any use in effectively modeling aggressive pitch maneuvers, the identified model must be able to approximate the response of the airfoil to strong variations in the relevant flow states. For simplicity, we make a particular choice to use the airfoil kinematic states—angle of attack and its associated rate of change ($\alpha, \dot{\alpha}$)—as proxies for the aerodynamic states that may be more pertinent to the overall dynamics, but are either difficult to measure directly or challenging to represent adequately in a low-dimensional manner (e.g., vorticity distribution, as depicted in Fig. 2). Our choice to parameterize the airfoil response via the state of the airfoil ($\alpha, \dot{\alpha}$) is a reasonable one, because the state of the fluid varies significantly based on the angle of attack and the pitch rate; as highlighted in Fig. 2, there is a significant contrast between the flow state for different angles of attack at a fixed pitch rate and for different pitch rates at a




Fig. 1 Pitching-airfoil study configuration.




Fig. 2 State of fluid varies with state of airfoil (α , $\dot{\alpha}$). Figure adapted from [29].

given angle of attack. Because we know that the airfoil state evolves by means of a double integrator with respect to the input

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{k+1} \\ \dot{\alpha}_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta t \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_k \\ \dot{\alpha}_k \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \Delta t^2/2 \\ \Delta t \end{bmatrix} \ddot{\alpha}_k \quad (1)$$

these parameters are readily available and, therefore, a convenient choice from a modeling standpoint. Here, we have expressed the evolution of the airfoil state from time t_k to time t_{k+1} by means of its discrete-time state-space representation, in which $\Delta t = t_{k+1} - t_k$. Lastly, note that the maneuvers considered here are performed about a base angle of attack $\alpha_o = 0$ and associated rate $\dot{\alpha}_o = 0$; however, the modeling approach is equally valid for non-zero α_o and $\dot{\alpha}_o$ and can be generalized to such instances by working with deviations from these base states instead [i.e., work with $(\alpha_k - \alpha_o)$ and $(\dot{\alpha}_k - \dot{\alpha}_o)$].

In addition to our particular choice to set $(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$ as parameters, we also include a set of internal states $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k$ to model the time evolution of any unaccounted flow physics. Although the internal state could be chosen to correspond to the evolution of a physical quantity (e.g., surface stress distribution [31]), here, we opt to determine $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k$ from a subspace-identification procedure (see Sec. III). Based on these choices, the general dynamic system that maps from angular-acceleration inputs $\ddot{\alpha}_k$ to a column vector of force and moment outputs $\mathbf{y}_k = (C_l, C_d, C_m) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathcal{A}(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \mathbf{x}_k + \mathcal{B}(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \ddot{\alpha}_k \quad (2a)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \mathcal{C}(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \mathbf{x}_k + \mathcal{D}(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \ddot{\alpha}_k \quad (2b)$$

in which the total aerodynamic state $\mathbf{x}_k := (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k, \alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a column vector composed of the airfoil states $(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$ and a set of yet to be identified internal states $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$. By parameterizing the system dynamics by means of the airfoil states, which are also included in the total aerodynamic state vector \mathbf{x}_k , the system evolution takes the form of a qLPV system—an LPV system for which the parameters correspond to a subset of the system states [22,26].

The goal of the identification problem is to approximate $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ from input–output data measured during a training maneuver, such that the model in Eq. (2) robustly captures the dynamic response to arbitrary “untrained” maneuvers. Rather than setting out to identify the full model in Eq. (2) from a single invocation of a system-identification procedure, we decompose the problem into three separate single-input/single-output (SISO) parameter-varying systems to make the identification procedure (discussed in Sec. III) more manageable. Such decomposition allows the individual sub-models to be coupled to one another; thus, the full model is able to maintain important dynamic interplays, between the simplified SISO sub-models, that may be necessary for an accurate prediction. For example, the drag sub-model requires an additional parameterization by the lift coefficient predicted by the lift sub-model to yield reliable predictions (see Sec. V for a full discussion). In principle, rather than decomposing the system into separate sub-models for lift, drag, and




Fig. 3 Decomposition of the parameter-varying aerodynamic model into three qLPV sub-models for system identification.

pitching moment, a single common model could be used instead; however, in practice, nonlinear couplings—such as those needed for reliable drag prediction—would pose a significant challenge from the standpoint of system identification. Here, upon identifying the individual subsystem models, we combine the identified models to construct the full system model (2), a schematic of which is presented in Fig. 3.

In addition to decoupling the full system model into three SISO sub-models, we further simplify the system-identification task by assuming that each of these sub-models has affine parameter dependence [see Eqs. (3c–3f)]. In doing so, we arrive at a set of qLPV subsystems (i.e., LPV systems parameterized by a subset of the system states), for which the state-space representation of subsystem $i \in \{C_l, C_d, C_m\}$ can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1}^i = A^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \mathbf{x}_k^i + B^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \ddot{\alpha}_k \quad (3a)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_k^i = C^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \mathbf{x}_k^i + D^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \ddot{\alpha}_k \quad (3b)$$

in which

$$A^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) = A_0^i + A_\alpha^i \alpha_k + A_{\dot{\alpha}}^i \dot{\alpha}_k \quad (3c)$$

$$B^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) = B_0^i + B_\alpha^i \alpha_k + B_{\dot{\alpha}}^i \dot{\alpha}_k \quad (3d)$$

$$C^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) = C_0^i + C_\alpha^i \alpha_k + C_{\dot{\alpha}}^i \dot{\alpha}_k \quad (3e)$$

$$D^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) = D_0^i + D_\alpha^i \alpha_k + D_{\dot{\alpha}}^i \dot{\alpha}_k \quad (3f)$$

which is simply a weighted sum of several linear models with $(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$ serving as weights. Here, the script formatting for the system matrices is dropped to highlight the fact that a particular choice has been made on the functional form of each subsystem model. This qLPV form is convenient because existing algorithms from the LPV system-identification theory can be invoked (with little modification) to determine the system matrices $A^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$, $B^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$, $C^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$, and $D^i(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$, as will be shown in Sec. III. For a given set of parameters, this model reduces to a locally linear state-space model, which is typical of LPV and qLPV systems [32]. Although the qLPV model in Eq. (3) is similar to a gain-scheduled model (i.e., one that interpolates between a collection of linear models), it is not restricted to slow variations in the scheduling parameters [22–24]; thus, the system model in Eq. (3) is well suited for predicting the response to aggressive pitching maneuvers characterized by rapid variations in $(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$. For notational convenience, in the remainder, we will drop the superscript i corresponding to each sub-model, keeping in mind

that future developments are based on the definitions of inputs, parameters, outputs, and states that vary between sub-models.

Special considerations must be made for modeling the drag response; we acknowledge that the absence of a nonlinear coupling term in the drag model leaves much of the relevant dynamic behavior unmodeled. Numerical experiments indicate that including C_l as a parameter in the drag sub-model substantially improves drag-response predictions (see Sec. V for further discussion). As such, we include a nonlinear coupling term by including the output of the lift sub-model C_{l_k} as a model parameter in the qLPV drag sub-model, as shown in Fig. 3. Thus, the qLPV drag sub-model has dynamics expressed by

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = A(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k, C_{l_k})\mathbf{x}_k + B(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k, C_{l_k})\ddot{\alpha}_k \quad (4a)$$

$$y_k = C(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k, C_{l_k})\mathbf{x}_k + D(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k, C_{l_k})\ddot{\alpha}_k \quad (4b)$$

in which

$$A(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k, C_{l_k}) = A_0 + A_\alpha \alpha_k + A_{\dot{\alpha}} \dot{\alpha}_k + A_{C_l} C_{l_k} \quad (4c)$$

$$B(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k, C_{l_k}) = B_0 + B_\alpha \alpha_k + B_{\dot{\alpha}} \dot{\alpha}_k + B_{C_l} C_{l_k} \quad (4d)$$

$$C(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k, C_{l_k}) = C_0 + C_\alpha \alpha_k + C_{\dot{\alpha}} \dot{\alpha}_k + C_{C_l} C_{l_k} \quad (4e)$$

$$D(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k, C_{l_k}) = D_0 + D_\alpha \alpha_k + D_{\dot{\alpha}} \dot{\alpha}_k + D_{C_l} C_{l_k} \quad (4f)$$

Modeling the nonlinear coupling in this manner does not hinder our ability to invoke existing algorithms for identifying systems with affine parameter dependence, because we have chosen to decompose the full aerodynamic-response model into three SISO subsystems. That is, we can perform the identification procedure on the drag model independent of the lift model; C_l now serves a measurable parameter in the drag sub-model, thus keeping the modeled drag response in the qLPV form required for the system-identification methods presented in Sec. III.

III. qLPV Model Identification

Our ultimate goal is to determine an approximate dynamic representation for the aerodynamic pitching response of an airfoil from available input–output data, such that the resulting model adequately reproduces the true system dynamics. As discussed in Sec. II, we anticipate that $(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$ will serve as suitable proxies for the state of the surrounding fluid during airfoil pitching motions. Furthermore, we expect that $(\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k)$, together with a set of appropriately identified internal states that model the dynamic evolution of any remaining flow physics, will provide an adequate template for computing aerodynamic-response models from input–output data.

Because the evolution equations corresponding to the airfoil states are already known [i.e., Eq. (1)], it makes sense to recast the full qLPV model into a set of known dynamics and a set of unknown dynamics (see Fig. 4); then, by relaxing the definitions of inputs and states for the purpose of system identification, the quasi-linear




Fig. 4 Each sub-model can be decomposed into known dynamics $G(z)$ and unknown qLPV dynamics.

terms—that is, the quadratic and bilinear terms arising from the fact that $(\alpha, \dot{\alpha})$ are included both as model states and model parameters—can be treated as known inputs to the system. Such a rearrangement is beneficial because it allows a straightforward application of existing techniques for LPV system identification to be applied for qLPV system identification. Figure 4 graphically depicts this decomposition of each sub-block into known dynamics—represented by the discrete-time transfer function $G(z)$ associated with a double integrator, as in Eq. (1) and unknown dynamics, which are assumed to evolve according to a qLPV system structure $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D})$, as in Eqs. (3) and (4).

Once a particular realization for the unknown qLPV model is identified, the original (desired) qLPV form can be obtained through a reversal of the rearrangement procedure, which amounts to a simple exercise in accounting. We emphasize that such rearrangements are permitted because the evolution of the system parameters is known ahead of time; hence, we can compute a sequence of pseudoinputs $\mathbf{p}_k := (\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, or in the case of the drag sub-model $\mathbf{p}_k := (\alpha_k, \dot{\alpha}_k, C_{l_k}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, to be used during the identification step. We then move \mathbf{p}_k from the total state vector \mathbf{x}_k to the augmented input vector $\mathbf{u}_k := (\ddot{\alpha}_k, \mathbf{p}_k)$, leaving only the identified internal state $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k$ to serve as a state vector during model identification. In other words, we focus on finding a realization for the unknown qLPV representation:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} = \tilde{A}(\mathbf{p}_k)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k + \tilde{B}(\mathbf{p}_k)\mathbf{u}_k \quad (5a)$$

$$y_k = \tilde{C}(\mathbf{p}_k)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k + \tilde{D}(\mathbf{p}_k)\mathbf{u}_k \quad (5b)$$

in which the qLPV system matrices $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D})$ relate back to the original qLPV system matrices (A, B, C, D) through a rearrangement of columns corresponding to the elements of \mathbf{p}_k between the two representations. In this form, the quadratic and bilinear terms associated with the airfoil states (i.e., the quasi-linear terms) are treated as inputs, which are fully known; the representation can be identified by means of output-error minimization techniques; next, we describe a particular technique for performing this identification, although a variety of alternative techniques can be employed instead.

The objective of the system-identification procedure adopted here is to determine, for each sub-model, a set of system matrices $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D})$ that minimizes the output error with respect to the training output data y_k^{train} , given the training input data \mathbf{u}_k (cf., Sec. IV). We express this as a constrained minimization problem that uses the elements of the LPV system matrices, $\boldsymbol{\xi} := (\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D})$, as optimization parameters:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} J(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := \sum_{k=1}^N \|y_k^{\text{train}} - y_k(\boldsymbol{\xi})\|_2^2 \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{such that } \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \tilde{A}(\mathbf{p}_k)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + \tilde{B}(\mathbf{p}_k)\mathbf{u}_k \quad (6b)$$

$$y_k(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \tilde{C}(\mathbf{p}_k)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + \tilde{D}(\mathbf{p}_k)\mathbf{u}_k \quad (6c)$$

in which $y_k(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ is the model-predicted output, which is determined from the model associated with $\boldsymbol{\xi}$.

Although we can compute a minimizing solution to this constrained nonlinear and nonconvex optimization problem via gradient-descent methods (e.g., Levenberg–Marquardt [33] in the present study), two additional challenges must be addressed beforehand; owing to the structure of the qLPV system in Eq. (5) in conjunction with the fact that the quasi-linear terms in the model are already known, both of the issues described next can be addressed by appealing to techniques originally developed for LPV systems. First, the nonuniqueness of a state-space realization introduces further complexity when determining the descent directions in the optimization algorithm; care must be taken to exclude descent directions for which the cost function does not change, because these solutions will yield the same input–output behavior [34,35].




Fig. 5 Pseudorandom ramp-hold pitching maneuver with $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$ used for model identification.

In the present work, we invoke the method proposed by Lee and Poolla [34] and extended to the LPV output-error minimization problem by Verdult and Verhaegen [35] to exclude such descent directions during the gradient-descent iterations. Second, the optimization problem is further complicated by the presence of multiple local minima, many of which are associated with models that yield unsatisfactory predictive performance for maneuvers that deviate from the training maneuver. Numerical solutions of the optimization problem can be sensitive to the initial model iterate. As such, we follow the subspace method of Verdult and Verhaegen [35], which relies on approximate dynamic relations between various terms in the LPV system, to determine an initial model iterate for the gradient search algorithm; this general approach has been shown to lead to initial model guesses suitable for the output-error minimization problem in a variety of contexts [24]. Here, a kernel formulation is implemented to yield solutions to the subspace-identification problem in a computationally tractable manner [36]. We note that subspace methods can also be used to give an indication of the appropriate dimension to impose on the identified internal state $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, thus guiding our choice in the selection of dimensions for the system matrices. In the present study, the LPV system-identification computations discussed previously are performed using the BILLPV Toolbox, v2.2.[†]

IV. Aerodynamic Input–Output Training Data

Now that we have proposed a parameter-varying representation for the aerodynamic response of a pitching airfoil, and determined a means of identifying the specific qLPV sub-models that comprise it,

we are left with the final step of providing suitable input–output data for model identification. In an effort to provide a “sufficiently rich” training maneuver, we generate input–output response data associated with a flat plate undergoing fully prescribed sequences of pseudorandom ramp–hold pitching kinematics, that is, no effort is made to include flight dynamics effects in the system. The pseudorandom ramp–hold maneuver in α arises by twice integrating a sequence of pulse inputs—pseudorandom in magnitude, pulse width, and frequency—in $\ddot{\alpha}$, as in Eq. (1). Moreover, the imposed maneuvers are simulated such that the freestream velocity U remains fixed at all times, and the pitch angle and the angle of attack α are equivalent throughout a maneuver. These maneuvers have been considered previously in the context of ERA-based pitching-airfoil models by Brunton et al. [18,19]. Additionally, in the present development, we compute the aerodynamic response of a flat-plate airfoil, pitching about its quarter-chord (see Fig. 1), by means of an immersed boundary projection method (IBPM) [37,38] at $Re = 100$; this was also the technique used by Brunton et al. [18,19], thus providing a reasonable baseline for comparing identified qLPV models with identified ERA models [18,19]. The specific training maneuver used for model identification in this study is shown in Fig. 5. The aerodynamic forces and moments are nondimensionalized by $\rho U^2 c/2$ and $\rho U^2 c^2/2$, respectively, in which ρ is the fluid density and c is the length of the chord.

Finally, we note that the force/moment training data must be preprocessed, such that the steady-state $\alpha = 0^\circ$ baseline value is removed from each signal prior to performing system identification. In other words, the identification is performed on $(C_l - C_{l,\alpha=0^\circ})$, $(C_d - C_{d,\alpha=0^\circ})$, and $(C_m - C_{m,\alpha=0^\circ})$, with the steady-state $\alpha = 0^\circ$ contribution reintroduced as a constant term in the output equation. In the present work, we only need to account for this contribution in the drag equations, because the steady-state lift and pitching moment are zero for a flat plate at $\alpha = 0^\circ$.

[†]Private Communication with V. Verdult and M. Verhaegen, “BILLPV Toolbox, v2.2,” 2010, <http://www.dscs.tudelft.nl/datadriven/billpv/> [retrieved June 2014].

V. qLPV Pitching Model Results and Discussion

In the present section, we set out to identify a qLPV realization for airfoil pitching dynamics using the output-minimization approach described in Sec. III. To do so, we begin with the simulated force and moment response of the airfoil to the prescribed pseudorandom ramp–hold pitching maneuver shown in Fig. 5. The identified sub-models capture the dynamic response to lift, drag, and pitching moment over 60 convective time units to within an rms error $\epsilon_{\text{rms}} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ or better. To demonstrate the validity of the model, we use the qLPV realization identified from the maneuver in Fig. 5 to predict the dynamic response to several “untrained” maneuvers over 50 convective time units and with differing $|\alpha|$ bounds.

Predictions from the identified lift sub-model are favorable across all of the untrained pitching maneuvers with $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$ that were considered, as presented in Fig. 6. In fact, the identified parameter-varying model yields predictions with consistent levels of error across all regimes: $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{LPV}} = 3.7 \times 10^{-3}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 5^\circ$ (Fig. 6a), $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{LPV}} = 2.1 \times 10^{-2}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 15^\circ$ (Fig. 6b), and $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{LPV}} = 6.5 \times 10^{-2}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$ (Fig. 6c). An ERA model, identified as in Brunton et al. [19] from impulse-response simulations beginning from $\alpha = 0^\circ$, exhibits diminishing predictive accuracy with increased pitch amplitude: $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{ERA}} = 1.5 \times 10^{-2}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 5^\circ$ (Fig. 6a), $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{ERA}} = 2.8 \times 10^{-2}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 15^\circ$ (Fig. 6b), and $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{ERA}} = 1.4 \times 10^{-1}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$ (Fig. 6c). This comparison demonstrates the superiority of a parameter-varying model over a single linear model in predicting the unsteady aerodynamic response to maneuvers performed at both small and large angles of attack. On the other hand, if the additional precision gained from the parameter-varying framework is not essential, then the linear time-invariant nature of an ERA model may prove more convenient from a controller-design standpoint.

The drag model performs similarly (cf., Fig. 7), with $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{LPV}} = 4.3 \times 10^{-3}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 5^\circ$ (Fig. 7a), $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{LPV}} = 4.9 \times 10^{-3}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 15^\circ$ (Fig. 7b), and $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{LPV}} = 1.6 \times 10^{-2}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$ (Fig. 7c). However, we note that this is only the case when C_l is included as a parameter in the drag sub-model, as parameterization by $(\alpha, \dot{\alpha})$ alone is not sufficient for reliable drag predictions. A crude explanation for this relates back to the steady-state drag curve, which is a nonlinear function of the angle of attack. Because, in the case of a flat plate, the drag for $\pm\alpha$ are indistinguishable from one another, a linear model based on α alone

will be a poor approximation. Although we can improve the approximation by introducing $|\alpha|$, $\sin\alpha$, and other nonlinear parameterizations, numerical experiments indicate that the preceding explanation is incomplete. We find that introducing C_l as a parameter leads to orders-of-magnitude improvement in the model’s predictive performance, which may be attributed to the close relationship between C_l and the bound circulation of the airfoil, that is, C_l may improve the predictions because it serves as a proxy for circulatory contributions to the drag.

Finally, the pitching-moment sub-model also demonstrates consistent performance across all three maneuvers (cf., Fig. 8): $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{LPV}} = 8.5 \times 10^{-4}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 5^\circ$ (Fig. 8a), $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{LPV}} = 2.8 \times 10^{-3}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 15^\circ$ (Fig. 8b), and $\epsilon_{\text{rms}}^{\text{LPV}} = 4.3 \times 10^{-3}$ at $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$ (Fig. 8c).

Despite the promising predictive performance demonstrated by the identified parameter-varying model for ramp–hold pitch maneuvers with $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$, the framework based on $(\alpha, \dot{\alpha})$ quickly deteriorates for $|\alpha|$ beyond approximately 30° . This observation indicates that, for larger angles of attack, $(\alpha, \dot{\alpha})$ alone is not an adequately rich set of proxy parameters for the relevant fluid-flow physics. In fact, the degradation in predictive performance is likely associated with the natural vortex shedding that ensues for $|\alpha| \geq 27^\circ$, which cannot be adequately captured by the airfoil kinematic states.

To reliably predict and model the unsteady aerodynamic response at larger angles of attack, a parameter-varying approach will necessarily require additional parameters to either augment or replace the set $(\alpha, \dot{\alpha})$. Viable candidates are expected to relate back to pertinent flow qualities, such as the evolving vorticity distribution, to serve as a rich set of proxies for the fluid-flow state. As such, one possible choice would be to use point-vortex states (i.e., position and strength) computed by a low-order point-vortex model (e.g., the impulse matching model presented in Wang and Eldredge [17]) as parameters in a parameter-varying model. In this way, even if the vortex model is only qualitatively accurate, which is the case for most low-dimensional vortex models [29], the parameters will serve as indicators of the underlying flow physics. Assuming an appropriate selection of parameters, the system-identification framework trains the parameter-varying aerodynamic-response model with representative input–output data. That is, the model is “tuned” to the given set of parameters in a manner that enables reliable input–output response predictions; hence, qualitative descriptions of the flowfield




Fig. 6 Identified qLPV lift model exhibits robust predictive accuracy across a range of motions.




Fig. 7 Identified qLPV drag model exhibits robust predictive accuracy across a range of motions.




Fig. 8 Identified qLPV pitching-moment model exhibits robust predictive accuracy across a range of motions.

should be adequate in the context of parameter-varying aerodynamic-response modeling, making vortex parameters a feasible candidate for future studies.

VI. Conclusions

In this study, a parameter-varying description for the unsteady aerodynamic response of a pitching airfoil was formulated based on physical insights gathered from the simulated flowfield from a series

of canonical pitch-up maneuvers. An output-error minimization approach was leveraged to identify a qLPV model realization from input-output data, using the airfoil states $(\alpha, \dot{\alpha})$ as model parameters. Numerical experiments indicated that including an additional parameterization by a model-predicted C_l improved predictive performance in the drag response. Based on this observation, the full qLPV system was decomposed into three SISO qLPV sub-models in an effort to make model identification tractable, while allowing for coupling between sub-models. The identified model successfully

predicted the lift, drag, and pitching-moment response in a series of untrained ramp–hold pitching maneuvers for $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$. Comparisons with a linear ERA model highlighted the relevance of nonlinear terms in modeling the aerodynamic lift response in larger-amplitude pitch maneuvers. Despite the success in the regime of $|\alpha| \leq 25^\circ$, additional work remains to be conducted to enable reliable predictions at larger angles of attack. One potential means of extending the parameter-varying framework to accommodate such maneuvers may be to incorporate parameters computed in a low-order vortex model, in an effort to better characterize the qualitative evolution of pertinent flow states in the identified model.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend their thanks to Pieter Gebraad, Vincent Verdult, and Michel Verhaegen for providing access to the BILLPV Toolbox, v.2.2. This work was supported by the U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research under awards FA9550-14-0289 and FA9550-12-1-0075. Maziar S. Hemati acknowledges support from the Department of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics at the University of Minnesota. A previous version of this work was presented at the 53rd AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting (AIAA Paper 2015-1069).

References

- Wagner, H., "Über die Entstehung des dynamischen Auftriebes von Tragflügeln," *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1925, pp. 17–35. doi:10.1002/(ISSN)1521-4001
- Theodorsen, T., "General Theory of Aerodynamic Instability and the Mechanism of Flutter," NACA TR 496, 1935.
- Garrick, I. E., "Propulsion of a Flapping and Oscillating Airfoil," NACA TR 567, 1937.
- von Kármán, T., and Sears, W., "Airfoil Theory for Non-Uniform Motion," *Journal of Aeronautical Sciences*, Vol. 5, No. 10, 1938, pp. 379–390. doi:10.2514/8.674
- Krasny, R., "Vortex Sheet Computations: Roll-Up, Wakes, Separation," *Lectures in Applied Mathematics*, edited by Anderson, C. R., Vol. 28, Applied Mathematical Soc., Seattle, Washington, D.C., 1991, pp. 385–402.
- Pullin, D., and Wang, Z., "Unsteady Forces on an Accelerating Plate and Application to Hovering Insect Flight," *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 509, June 2004, pp. 1–21. doi:10.1017/S0022112004008821
- Jones, M., "The Separated Flow of an Inviscid Fluid Around a Moving Flat Plate," *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 496, Dec. 2003, pp. 405–441. doi:10.1017/S0022112003006645
- Shukla, R., and Eldredge, J. D., "An Inviscid Model for Vortex Shedding from a Deforming Body," *Theoretical and Computational Fluid Dynamics*, Vol. 21, No. 5, 2007, pp. 343–368. doi:10.1007/s00162-007-0053-2
- Katz, J., and Weihs, D., "Behavior of Vortex Wakes from Oscillating Airfoils," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 12, 1978, pp. 861–863.
- Jones, K. D., Duggan, S. J., and Platzer, M. F., "Flapping-Wing Propulsion for a Micro Air Vehicle," *39th Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit*, AIAA Paper 2001-0126, Jan. 2001.
- Ansari, S., Zbikowski, R., and Knowles, K., "Non-Linear Unsteady Aerodynamic Model for Insect-Like Flapping Wings in the Hover. Part 1: Methodology and Analysis," *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part G: Journal of Aerospace Engineering*, Vol. 220, No. 1, 2006, pp. 61–72. doi:10.1243/095440605X32075
- Ramesh, K., Gopalarathnam, A., Edwards, J. R., Ol, M. V., and Granlund, K., "An Unsteady Airfoil Theory Applied to Pitching Motions Validated Against Experiment and Computation," *Theoretical and Computational Fluid Dynamics*, Vol. 27, No. 6, Nov. 2013, pp. 843–864.
- Brown, C., and Michael, W., "Effect of Leading Edge Separation on the Lift of a Delta Wing," *Journal of Aeronautical Sciences*, Vol. 21, No. 10, 1954, pp. 690–694. doi:10.2514/8.3180
- Graham, J., "The Forces on Sharp-Edged Cylinders in Oscillatory Flow at Low Keulegan–Carpenter Numbers," *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 97, No. 2, 1980, pp. 331–346. doi:10.1017/S0022112080002595
- Cortelezzi, L., and Leonard, A., "Point Vortex Model of the Unsteady Separated Flow Past a Semi-Infinite Plate with Transverse Motion," *Fluid Dynamics Research*, Vol. 11, No. 6, 1993, pp. 263–295. doi:10.1016/0169-5983(93)90013-Z
- Michelin, S., and Llewelyn Smith, S., "An Unsteady Point Vortex Method for Coupled Fluid–Solid Problems," *Theoretical and Computational Fluid Dynamics*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 2009, pp. 127–153. doi:10.1007/s00162-009-0096-7
- Wang, C., and Eldredge, J. D., "Low-Order Phenomenological Modeling of Leading-Edge Vortex Formation," *Theoretical and Computational Fluid Dynamics*, Vol. 27, No. 5, Aug. 2013, pp. 577–598. doi:10.1007/s00162-012-0279-5
- Brunton, S. L., Rowley, C. W., and Williams, D. R., "Reduced-Order Unsteady Aerodynamic Models at Low Reynolds Numbers," *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 724, June 2013, pp. 203–233. doi:10.1017/jfm.2013.163
- Brunton, S. L., Dawson, S. T., and Rowley, C. W., "State-Space Model Identification and Feedback Control of Unsteady Aerodynamic Forces," *Journal of Fluids and Structures*, Vol. 50, Oct. 2014, pp. 253–270. doi:10.1016/j.jfluidstructs.2014.06.026
- Hyde, R. A., and Glover, K., "The Application of Scheduled H_∞ Controllers to VSTOL Aircraft," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 38, No. 7, 1993, pp. 1021–1039. doi:10.1109/9.231458
- Nichols, R., Reichert, R., and Rugh, W., "Gain-Scheduling for H_∞ Controllers: A Flight Control Example," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1993, pp. 69–79. doi:10.1109/87.238400
- Rugh, W. J., and Shamma, J. S., "Research on Gain Scheduling," *Automatica*, Vol. 36, No. 10, 2000, pp. 1401–1425. doi:10.1016/S0005-1098(00)00058-3
- Shamma, J. S., and Athans, M., "Gain Scheduling: Potential Hazards and Possible Remedies," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1992, pp. 101–107. doi:10.1109/37.165527
- Verdult, V., "Nonlinear System Identification: A State-Space Approach," Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands, 2002.
- Balas, G. J., Fiahlo, I., Packard, A., Renfrow, J., and Mullaney, C., "On the Design of the LPV Controllers for the F-14 Aircraft Lateral–Directional Axis During Powered Approach," *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, Vol. 1, American Automatic Control Council, Evanston, IL, 1997, pp. 123–127.
- Marcos, A., and Balas, G. J., "Development of Linear-Parameter-Varying Models for Aircraft," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, Vol. 27, No. 2, March–April 2004, pp. 218–228. doi:10.2514/1.9165
- Bhattacharya, R., Balas, G. J., Kaya, M. A., and Packard, A., "Nonlinear Receding Horizon Control of an F-16 Aircraft," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, Vol. 25, No. 5, Sept.–Oct. 2002, pp. 924–931. doi:10.2514/2.4965
- Hemati, M. S., "Vortex-Based Aero- and Hydrodynamic Estimation," Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of California, Los Angeles, CA, 2013.
- Hemati, M. S., Eldredge, J. D., and Speyer, J. L., "Improving Vortex Models via Optimal Control Theory," *Journal of Fluids and Structures*, Vol. 49, Aug. 2014, pp. 91–111. doi:10.1016/j.jfluidstructs.2014.04.004
- Eldredge, J. D., "Numerical Simulation of the Fluid Dynamics of 2D Rigid Body Motion with the Vortex Particle Method," *Journal of Computational Physics*, Vol. 221, No. 2, 2007, pp. 626–648. doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2006.06.038
- Dawson, S. T. M., Schiavone, N. K., Rowley, C. W., and Williams, D. R., "A Data-Driven Modeling Framework for Predicting Forces and Pressures on a Rapidly Pitching Airfoil," *45th AIAA Fluid Dynamics Conference*, AIAA Paper 2015-2767, June 2015.
- Johansen, T., and Murray-Smith, R., "The Operating Regime Approach to Nonlinear Modelling and Control," *Multiple Model Approaches to Modelling and Control*, edited by Murray-Smith, R., and Johansen, T. A., Taylor and Francis, Bristol, PA, 1997, Chap. 1.
- Nocedal, J., and Wright, S. J., *Numerical Optimization*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 2006.
- Lee, L. H., and Poolla, K., "Identifiability Issues for Parameter-Varying and Multidimensional Linear Systems," *Proceedings of the ASME Design Engineering Technical Conference*, Sept. 1997, citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.50.5242&rep1&type=pdf.
- Verdult, V., and Verhaegen, M., "Identification of Multivariable LPV State Space Systems by Local Gradient Search," *Proceedings of the European Control Conference*, Sept. 2001, <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7076505?arnumber=7076505&tag=1>.

- [36] Verdult, V., and Verhaegen, M., "Kernel Methods for Subspace Identification of Multivariable LPV and Bilinear Systems," *Automatica*, Vol. 41, No. 9, 2005, pp. 1557–1565.
doi:10.1016/j.automatica.2005.03.027
- [37] Taira, K., and Colonius, T., "The Immersed Boundary Method: A Projection Approach," *Journal of Computational Physics*, Vol. 225, No. 2, 2007, pp. 2118–2137.
doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2007.03.005
- [38] Colonius, T., and Taira, K., "A Fast Immersed Boundary Method Using a Nullspace Approach and Multi-Domain Far-Field Boundary Conditions," *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, Vol. 197, Nos. 25–28, 2008, pp. 2131–2146.
doi:10.1016/j.cma.2007.08.014

F. N. Coton
Associate Editor