Introduction

The Luhar lab focuses on the interactions of fluids and structures. This summer, I focused on how porous structures affect the lift and the drag of an airfoil. Reducing drag and increasing lift produces more efficient wings, which in turn decreases the amount of fuel needed to fly.

Objectives & Parameter Design

To reduce drag and increase lift in order to produce more efficient wings, we varied two parameters: the inter-hole spacing and the angle of the holes. For spacing, we modified the gap s, between holes as a function of the length of the airfoil:

\[ s = 10\%, \ 15\%, \ \text{and} \ 20\% \]

For the angles, we drilled holes that would appear horizontal when the airfoil was at the following angles of attack:

\[ \text{AoA} = 3^\circ, \ 6^\circ, \ 9^\circ, \ \text{and} \ 12^\circ \]

We tested on a NACA 0012 airfoil that was 10 cm long. To apply our findings to realistic airfoils, and to be consistent with previous work, we experimented at Reynolds’s Number, \( Re = 5 \times 10^5 \). The Reynolds’ Number is a nondimensional quantity that characterizes a system in a way that allows its properties to be compared at various scales. The (nondimensional) lift and drag of an airfoil are given by:

\[
C_d = \frac{D}{0.5 \rho U^2 c}
\]

\[
C_l = \frac{L}{0.5 \rho U^2 c}
\]

Our airfoil is symmetric and must be positioned at a nonzero AoA to generate lift. By adding holes through the airfoil, air is able to move from below to above the airfoil, reducing the so-called ‘separation bubbles’ by preserving laminar flow – a flow where the layers of the fluid move smoothly past each other without mixing.

Methods and Results

We ran our simulations with Ansys, which runs in the order above. First, we imported the geometry of the airfoil that we generated in MATLAB. We used a 2D model instead of 3D so we could get higher resolution results with less processing power and processing time. The software tests certain data points across the field. In order to get the fine resolution that we want near the airfoil and in its channels, we have to specify the grid lines, called the mesh. We also named different parts of the model “inlet”, “outlet”, “wall”, or “channel” so that we could tell the software where the fluid was entering and exiting from, and what parts of the model were solid walls. Then, in setup, we set the simulation to a time dependent model (time step = 0.005 secs; 500 timesteps). Additionally, we varied the angle of attack, by specifying the velocity of the fluid using x and y components, which depend on the sine and cosine of the angle of attack.

Results:

\[ \text{Figure 1. Mesh for } s = 10\% \]

\[ \text{Figure 2. Graphs of } C_d \text{ vs. } \text{AoA} \text{ at spacing = 15\%, 20\%} \]

\[ \text{Figure 3. Graphs of } C_l \text{ vs. } \text{AoA} \text{ at spacing = 15\%, 20\%} \]

\[ \text{Figure 4. Velocity Magnitude Contour for } s = 10\%, \text{ AoA} = 6^\circ \]

\[ \text{Figure 5. Airfoil fixture within water channel} \]

\[ \text{Figure 6. Porous Airfoil 3D CAD Model in SolidWorks} \]

\[ \text{Figure 7. Horizontal velocity profile at trailing edge in y direction} \]

Experiments

For our experiment, we 3D printed airfoils with different parameters. First, we used SolidWorks, a CAD program, to design two models - one with a set spacing (s = 15%) and one with a set angle of 0°. This way, we could make copies of each and vary each parameter separately. Due to the limitations of the 3D printer, we kept the size of the holes to 1 mm in diameter, to avoid clogging the holes with the resin. The printer also had a size limitation, so we printed the airfoils in two parts, and added a 9 mm hole through the airfoil so that the parts could be assembled with a rod. After printing, we sanded the airfoils down and glued the parts together.

Results:

\[ \text{Figure 8. Velocity magnitude contour at } s = 10\%, \text{ positive AoA} \]

Conclusion

Our simulations showed the following:

1) For small inter-hole separation, the lift coefficient first increases with angle of attack and then decreases.
2) For larger inter-hole separation, the lift coefficient levels off at an angle of attack of 3°.
3) For even larger inter-hole separation, the data are too unreliable to draw a firm conclusion.

Experiments in the water channel were limited to a single inter-hole spacing. We experimented with AoA = 0°, and both small and large positive/negative AoAs. Interpreting the results is ongoing.

SHINE has been a great experience this summer and has furthered my interest in Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering as well as research in general. I hope to continue learning about these subjects throughout my junior and senior years of high school, as well as in college.
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