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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>dimensionless distance in half-chord lengths from midchord to rotational axis, positive if the rotational axis is aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>half-chord length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>chord length, (c = 2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C(k))</td>
<td>Theodorsen function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d,e,f,t)</td>
<td>quantities defined in Eq. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>translation displacement of model from equilibrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h_0)</td>
<td>initial amplitude of simple harmonic translatory motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H,J)</td>
<td>quantities defined in Eq. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H'(s))</td>
<td>dimensionless downwash velocity at (3/4) chord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>integral index, (i = 1, 2, 3...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I_c)</td>
<td>mass polar moment of inertia of rotating parts about its center of gravity, per unit span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I_\alpha)</td>
<td>mass polar moment of inertia of rotating parts about the rotational axis, per unit span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I_{\alpha n})</td>
<td>value of (I_\alpha) for the (n)th mass condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta I_{\alpha i})</td>
<td>the (i)th change in (I_{\alpha n}), (\Delta I_{\alpha i} = I_{\alpha 1}^{i+1} - I_{\alpha 1}^{i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>imaginary unit, (J = \sqrt{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>reduced frequency, (k = \omega b / U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K_h)</td>
<td>support stiffness in translation per unit span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_a$</td>
<td>support stiffness in rotation per unit span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_1$</td>
<td>length of $i$th cylindrical weight in second group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{L}$</td>
<td>the Lagrangian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{L}^{-1}$</td>
<td>inverse Laplace transformation operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L, M$</td>
<td>unsteady hydrodynamic lift and moment, per unit span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_h, L_\alpha, M_h, M_\alpha$</td>
<td>dimensionless unsteady hydrodynamic coefficients, complex functions of $k$, tabulated in references 9 and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{h_1}, L_{\alpha_1}, L_{\alpha r}, L_{h r}, M_{h_1}, M_{\alpha_1}, M_{\alpha r}, M_{h r}$</td>
<td>dimensionless unsteady hydrodynamic coefficients, real functions of $k$ and $\alpha$, defined in Eq. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>total oscillating mass per unit span, $m = m_a + m_h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_a$</td>
<td>mass required in weight group 1 to attain desired mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_h$</td>
<td>mass of translating parts per unit span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_n$</td>
<td>total mass of $n$th mass condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_\alpha$</td>
<td>mass of rotating and translating parts, per unit span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_b$</td>
<td>value of $m$ for apparatus with no weights added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta m_1$</td>
<td>the $i$th change in $m_n$, $\Delta m_1 = m_{i+1} - m_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>index giving mass condition, numbered successively starting with the lowest value, $n = 1, 2, 3...$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>complex Laplace transform variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P(p)$</td>
<td>fifth order complex polynomial in $p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_h$</td>
<td>generalized force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_\alpha$</td>
<td>generalized moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q(p)$</td>
<td>sixth order complex polynomial in $p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_\alpha$</td>
<td>dimensionless radius of gyration about rotational axis, $r_\alpha^2 = I_\alpha/m_b^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>radius of cylindrical weights in group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R(p)$</td>
<td>fifth order complex polynomial in $p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>dimensionless time variable, $s = Ut/b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{\alpha_n}$</td>
<td>first moment of mass of rotating parts in the $n$th mass condition, about the rotational axis, per unit span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u, v$</td>
<td>real and imaginary parts of the Laplace transform variable, $p = u + jv$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_1, u_2$</td>
<td>real roots of Eq. 46 given in Table III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U$</td>
<td>free stream velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W(s)$</td>
<td>dimensionless circulatory response function giving unsteady lift and moment for an arbitrary motion, defined in Eq. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}_\alpha$</td>
<td>distance from desired center of gravity location to the center of gravity of $m_\alpha$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}_b$</td>
<td>distance from desired center of gravity location to the center of gravity of $m_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_\alpha$</td>
<td>dimensionless distance in half-chords from the rotational axis to the center of gravity of $m_\alpha$, positive if the c.g. is aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>rotation displacement of model from equilibrium position, positive for leading edge up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_0$</td>
<td>initial amplitude of simple harmonic rotary motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>coupling mass coefficient, $\beta = m_\alpha/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>indicates virtual displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>complex eigenvalue of equations of motion, ( \lambda = -\sigma + j\omega )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>density ratio, ( \mu = m/(\pi \rho b^2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ&lt;sub&gt;n&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>value of ( \mu ) for the ( n )th mass combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δμ&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>the 1th change in ( \mu ), ( \Delta \mu_1 = \mu_1 + 1 - \mu_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ&lt;sub&gt;cr&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>critical density ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>mass density of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>mass density of weights in second group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>real part of (-\lambda), determines decay rate of oscillatory motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>phase angle between ( h ) and ( \alpha ), positive when ( h ) is leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ(( s ))</td>
<td>Wagner function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ</td>
<td>dimensionless ( \lambda ), ( \psi = \lambda b/U )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω</td>
<td>imaginary part of ( \lambda ), circular frequency of oscillatory motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω&lt;sub&gt;n&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>uncoupled natural frequency in translation, ( \omega_n^2 = K_n/m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω&lt;sub&gt;α&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>uncoupled natural frequency in rotation, ( \omega_\alpha^2 = K_\alpha/I_\alpha )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω&lt;sub&gt;n&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>dimensionless natural frequency in translation, ( \Omega_n = \omega_n b/U )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω&lt;sub&gt;α&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>dimensionless natural frequency in rotation, ( \Omega_\alpha = \omega_\alpha b/U )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

. indicates differentiation with respect to \( t \)

. indicates differentiation with respect to \( s \)

. indicates Laplace transformation
ABSTRACT

The theoretical procedures commonly used by aeroelasticians were applied to predict the flutter speed of a rigid hydrofoil that had two degrees of freedom. The results, compared with corresponding experimental measurements, indicated a discrepancy between theoretical and experimental flutter speeds at low density ratios; the predicted asymptotic behavior of flutter speeds occurred, but at a lower density-ratio. In addition, the accuracy of the circulation terms is more doubtful than that of the added mass and linear terms in the theory.
I. INTRODUCTION

Destructively large stresses or undesirable levels of vibration have been induced in airfoils operating near the critical flutter-speed. Theoretical and experimental investigations have shown that for certain elementary elastic configurations, flutter of foils in water is unlikely (references 1, 2, 3, and 4). Figure 1 shows the range of density ratios applicable to these simple hydrofoil-configurations. The magnitude of the dynamic pressure encountered by submerged control surfaces—rudders, stabilizing fins, hydrofoils, bow planes, etc.—is greater than that encountered by airfoils, except for those used on recent, high-speed aircraft. Therefore, one is led to the following question: why have hydrodynamic control surfaces not experienced flutter?

In particular, bending-torsion flutter of cantilever-supported hydrofoils has been investigated (reference 3). In this investigation, a critical density-ratio was predicted below which flutter was not possible. Isolated experiments using simple supports, confirmed these results. In these experiments, no flutter was obtained and none predicted. However, the low, overall damping associated with the unsteady hydrodynamic forces on the rudders of a destroyer, which recently experienced severe and sustained hull vibrations, has provided the impetus for further investigations of hydrodynamic flutter (reference 5). Cursory investigations of this vibration indicate that more realistic support conditions, and other conditions, may reduce the lowest value of density ratio at which hydrofoils will flutter. Therefore, the reliability of theoretical predictions of flutter speed at low values of density ratio must be determined.
In previous hydroelastic work, it was assumed that aerodynamic theories would apply directly to the hydrodynamic problem. Assuming this to be true, these theories should correctly predict the flutter speed of a hydrofoil. This investigation was conducted to experimentally verify the accuracy of aeronautical theories when used to predict flutter speed (throughout the range of parametric values of interest in hydrofoil design).

Some previous work along these lines has been performed. The NACA investigated flutter of light, cantilever-supported wings in an airstream made heavy by the use of Freon and air mixtures (reference 4). The experimental points in Figure 1 are representative of the results obtained by NACA. The range of density ratio in this investigation did not extend into that for a cantilever-supported hydrofoil. However, the range of density ratio in which flutter was obtained experimentally extends, by a small amount below the critical density-ratio, into the range in which flutter is theoretically impossible. It is this discrepancy which was investigated.

In view of the inconclusiveness of previous experimental and theoretical results, a single set of experiments was conducted over a range of density ratio extending from region 1 through regions 2 and 3 and well into region 4 (Figure 1).

In these experiments, speed and density ratio were varied; all other parameters were constant. Another series of experiments is being conducted at several additional values of center-of-gravity location and radius of gyration to investigate further the discrepancy between theory and experiment.
II. TEST SETUP

A. MODEL AND SUPPORTS

The experimental setup was designed so that flutter would be obtained under controlled conditions that closely duplicated the theoretical assumptions; the setup did not typify any hydrofoil application (Figures 2 through 6). The experiments were performed in the High-Speed Facility.

The model had a chord length \( c \) of 6 inches and a span of 12 inches. The profile was a thin symmetrical shape, (NACA 0012). The offsets for the model were obtained from reference 6. The material used for the model was a plastic whose properties are summarized in Table I.

1. End Plates

   End plates were used to provide two-dimensional flow and were attached to the carriage by struts and aluminum box-beams. The chord plane of the model was arranged vertically and the end plates were above and below the model, each with a maximum clearance of 0.006c. The end plates were 11.29c long by 6.71c wide. The rotational axis of the model was located in the middle and 4.31c aft of the leading edge of the end plates. The end plates were made of 1/8-inch aluminum plates stiffened in both the transverse and longitudinal direction. The transverse stiffening members were covered with aluminum sheets, which provided fairing to reduce drag.

2. Sting Support

   The model was supported by a vertical sting that passed through the upper end-plate and the water surface to a flexure balance that was entirely above water. The sting was a stainless-steel tube (1-inch OD, 0.87-inch ID, BWG No. 16)
protected from the stream velocity in the region between the upper end-plate and the water surface by a faired shield.

To reduce the effect of the hole in the upper end-plate, a small, circular plate made of 1/16-inch stainless steel was attached to the lower end of the sting. The radius of this auxiliary end-plate overlapped the hole in the upper end-plate when the sting was displaced to either side. The auxiliary end-plate was below the main end-plate and had a maximum clearance of 0.006c.

3. Balance

The sting was attached to the fixed support through a flexure balance (Figures 5, 6, and 7). Two modes of motion for the model in the horizontal plane were permitted by this balance; rotation about a vertical, spanwise axis and horizontal translation normal to the direction of motion. Mechanical stops limited these motions to \( \pm 3/4 \)-inch of translation and \( \pm 2 \) degrees of rotation. The axis of the sting was in line with the quarter-chord axis of the model and was located at the apex of a pair of V-frames (Figure 7). These frames, located in parallel horizontal planes one above the other, provided a linear elastic restoring moment in the desired rotational degree of freedom and were effectively rigid in all other degrees of freedom. These frames were I-beams with lightening holes in the webs and were necked down at both ends as shown in Figure 7. Most of the flexibility of these beams was concentrated in the necked-down sections (flexures); the dimensions of the flexures were chosen to give the desired rotational stiffness. The base of the V-frames was connected to the fixed support through four parallel bars, which allowed the whole unit to translate in the desired direction. In a manner similar to the members of the V-frames, the ends of the parallel bars were necked down to provide the desired translation flexibility (Figure 7). The translation bars were aluminum channels and the rotation beams were machined aluminum stock.
A spring-loaded, locking mechanism was installed that held the model in the desired initial position until it was released by a solenoid controlled by a switch at the operators station.

The flexure balance was anchored to the carriage by a supporting structure. To provide greater rigidity against rotation of the apparatus in the vertical transverse plane, an outrigger was attached to an auxiliary wheel that ran along the side of the tank.

The apparatus satisfied all requirements for the support of the model. The rotation spring stiffness came within 8% of the desired value and the translation spring stiffness came within 3%. These errors arose mainly from the estimate of the effect of fillets at both ends of the flexures. A flexure length equal to the actual flexure length, including both fillets, minus one fillet radius, gave values for predicted stiffnesses within 2% of the measured values. The rigidity of support against undesired motions was found to be well within reasonable limits. The frequency of vertical translatory oscillations of the model in air was found to be three times greater than the highest frequency encountered during the tests in water. All other observed frequencies of extraneous motions were five or more times the highest test frequency.

B. INSTRUMENTATION

The motions of the model were measured by recording the unbalance of strain-gage bridges. Strain gages were mounted on the flexure balance and the signal outputs from the strain-gage bridges were recorded. To measure the speed of the apparatus, an electronic counter was used to determine the time required for the apparatus to pass between two locations a known distance apart. In addition, a tachometer generator, attached to the carriage, was activated by a wheel running on the carriage rail to measure the instantaneous speed of the
apparatus. The average speeds obtained by these two methods were in agreement and no appreciable speed fluctuations during the runs were observed.

In general, slide rule accuracy was maintained throughout the experimental analysis. Scatter in the data is a result of actual extraneous effects in the experiments and is not caused by inaccuracies in the instrumentation.

The parametric values obtained in the experiments are shown in Table II. In view of the large amount of weight added externally and rigidly to the foil, the results of the experiments described here should not be viewed as representative of any hydrofoil application. In practice, density ratios greater than 1.0 are seldom encountered, if ever.

The experimental flutter speeds and frequencies are given in Table II and the results are plotted in Figures 10 through 24. The corresponding theoretical results are presented along with these results.

C. WEIGHTS

Two sets of weights were connected rigidly to the sting to obtain the selected center-of-gravity (c.g.) location \((x_a, b)\), radius-of-gyration \((r_a, b)\), uncoupled natural frequency ratio \((\omega_n/\omega_\alpha)\), and to vary the density ratio \((\mu_n)\) while maintaining all other parameters as constants (Table II).

The uncoupled natural frequency in each mode of vibration can be defined as follows:

\[
\omega_n^2 = K_n/m \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_\alpha^2 = K_\alpha/I_\alpha
\]

where

- \(K_n\) = support stiffness in translation per unit span
- \(K_\alpha\) = support stiffness in rotation per unit span
- \(m\) = total oscillating mass per unit span
- \(I_\alpha\) = mass polar moment of inertia of rotating parts about the rotational axis, per unit span.
The dimensionless radius of gyration can be defined as follows:

\[ r_a^2 = \frac{I_a}{mb^2} \quad (2) \]

where \( b \) is the half-chord length of the model. When equations 1 and 2 are combined, the uncoupled natural frequency ratio is

\[ \left( \frac{\omega_h}{\omega_a} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{K_h}{K_a} \right) \left( \frac{r_a}{b} \right)^2 \quad (3) \]

Thus, the stiffness ratio \( \left( \frac{K_h}{K_a} \right) \) is determined by the values of \( \omega_h/\omega_a \), \( r_a \), and \( b \).

Let the subscript \( b \) denote the characteristics of the apparatus without weights and the subscript \( a \) denote the characteristics of the apparatus with the first set of weights. Let the subscript \( n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \) denote the desired values of the properties numbered successively, starting with the smallest mass condition. Therefore, the necessary additional mass \( m_a \) can be determined as follows:

\[ m_a = m_o - m_b = \mu_o \pi \rho b^2 - m_b \quad (4) \]

where \( \mu_o = \) density ratio of initial mass-condition = \( m_o/\pi \rho b^2 \)
\( \rho = \) mass density of water.

To find the required location of the c.g. of \( m_a \), the moment of mass about the selected c.g. location is set equal to zero as follows:

\[ \bar{x}_a m_a + \bar{x}_b m_b = 0 \quad (5) \]

where \( \bar{x} \) is the distance from the selected c.g. location to the c.g. of the mass indicated.

Equations 4 and 5 were used to determine the amount of mass necessary to obtain the initial mass-condition and the location of the c.g. of this mass. The distribution of \( m_a \) was selected to provide the required mass polar moment of inertia \( (I_{ao}) \). Therefore, two weights, each with mass \( m_a/2 \), were symmetrically placed on either side of the c.g. location \( (\bar{x}_a) \). The distance between the masses was adjusted until
In this manner, the desired values of $x_a$, $r_a$, $\omega_h/\omega_a$, in addition to the initial value of density ratio ($\mu_0$), were obtained. The second set of weights were designed to provide the selected values of $\mu_n$ while maintaining $a$, $x_a$, $r_a$, and $\omega_h/\omega_a$ constant.

The position of the rotational axis $(ab)$ and the stiffness ratio $(K_h/K_a)$ were fixed; these properties remained unchanged throughout the experiments. The desired $x_a$ was obtained with the first set of weights. To keep the c.g. location constant, the c.g. of the second set of weights was put at the selected c.g. location and thus did not change $x_a$. Equation 3 shows that $\omega_h/\omega_a$ will remain constant as $m$ increases when $r_a$ is constant. Therefore, the ratio $I_a/m$ was kept constant as the weights were added.

At each mass condition ($n$), the moment of inertia ($I_{an}$) and the mass ($m_n$) may be divided into the sum of the respective values for the lowest mass condition plus the increment due to each weight added $(1 = 1, 2, ..., n - 1)$.

\[
I_{an} = I_{a0} + \sum_{1}^{n} \Delta I_{an} \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots
\]

\[
m_n = m_0 + \sum_{1}^{n} \Delta m_1
\]

By substituting these quantities into the definition of the radius of gyration, equation 2 yields

\[
I_{a0} + \sum_{1}^{n} \Delta I_{an} = (r_a b)^2 [m_0 + \sum_{1}^{n} \Delta m_1],
\]

and subtracting equation 6 from equation 8 leaves

\[
\sum_{1}^{n} \Delta I_{an} = (r_a b)^2 \sum_{1}^{n} \Delta m_1,
\]

which must hold for all $n$. Therefore,

\[
\Delta I_{an} = (r_a b)^2 \Delta m_1.
\]
A cylindrical shape was chosen for the weights with radius \( R_1 \) and length \( l_1 \) and with axis at the desired c.g. location. The mass polar moment of inertia of the \( i \)th weight per unit span about the rotational axis is given by

\[
\Delta I_{a_1} = \frac{\Delta m_i}{2} R_1^2 + \Delta m_i (x_a b)^2. \quad (11)
\]

Equation 11 combined with equation 10 shows that:

\[
R_1 = b [2 (r_a^2 - x_a^2)]^{1/2}. \quad (12)
\]

But the right-hand side is independent of \( i \). Therefore, the subscript may be dropped from \( R \). The length of the \( i \)th weight is governed by the required change in mass, as follows.

\[
l_1 = \frac{\Delta m_1}{\pi \rho_2 r_a^2} \quad (13)
\]

where \( \rho_2 \) is the mass density of the second set of weights.
III. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

A. GENERAL

In hydrofoil applications, an adequate definition of flutter properties can be obtained from a study of the stability of very small motions. Small motions should be stable; otherwise, they lead to fatigue conditions if not to larger destructive motions. In practice, the large motions usually are stable if the small motions are stable. Therefore, time dependence can be assumed to be proportional to $e^{\lambda t}$, where $\lambda$ is a complex number; all other motions can be built up by superposition. (The procedure for superposing the lift response for more complicated motions is given in Appendix A.)

During flutter, the critical flutter-speed is associated with a frequency of sustained vibratory motion. The determination of the critical flutter-speed becomes a simpler problem when simple harmonic motion is assumed; it is easier to describe mathematically the hydrodynamic loads for simple harmonic motion than it is to describe these loads for more general motions. Therefore, to simplify the problem, the speed and frequency required for sustained simple harmonic motion should be determined, rather than the response of the foil system as a function of speed. In this investigation, all time dependent terms for simple harmonic motion were assumed proportional to $e^{j\omega t}$ ($\omega$ real), rather than $e^{\lambda t}$. Figure 8 shows the coordinates and nomenclature used in this investigation.

B. EQUATIONS OF MOTION

The equations of motion for the experimental model were derived from Lagrange's equations. A lumped-parameter
system, with negligible damping due to friction or structural
deformations, was assumed representative of the model.
Figure 9 shows the dynamic system and the following defini-
tions were used:

\[ m_h = \text{mass of translating parts per unit span}; \]
\[ m_\alpha = \text{mass of rotating parts per unit span}; \]
\[ I_c = \text{mass polar moment of inertia of rotating parts} \]
\[ \text{about its center of gravity per unit span.} \]

The Lagrangian for the translation and rotation displacements \( h(t) \) and \( \alpha(t) \) is

\[ L = \frac{1}{2}m_h \dot{h}^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_\alpha (\dot{h} + x_\alpha \dot{\alpha})^2 + \frac{1}{2}I_c \dot{\alpha}^2 - \frac{1}{2}K_h h^2 - \frac{1}{2}K_\alpha \alpha^2. \quad (14) \]

By substituting \( L \) into Lagrange's equation, the equations of
motion for the system are

\[ m \ddot{h} + m_\alpha x_\alpha \dot{\alpha} \ddot{\alpha} + K_h h = Q_h, \quad (15) \]

and

\[ I_\alpha \ddot{\alpha} + m_\alpha x_\alpha \dot{h} \dot{\alpha} + K_\alpha \alpha = Q_\alpha, \quad (16) \]

where the dots indicate differentiation with respect to \( t \) and
the following definitions have been used:

\[ m = m_h + m_\alpha = \text{total oscillating mass per unit span}, \]
\[ I_\alpha = I_c + (x_\alpha)^2 m_\alpha = \text{mass polar moment of inertia of} \]
\[ \text{rotating parts about the rotational} \]
\[ \text{axis per unit span.} \]

\( Q_h \) and \( Q_\alpha \) are the generalized force and moment, respectively,
acting on the system. By considering the work done by external
forces during a virtual displacement \( \delta h \) and \( \delta \alpha \), \( Q_h \) and \( Q_\alpha \)
became the hydrodynamic lift and moment per unit span at the
rotational axis.

The equations of motion can be put in non-dimensional
form by dividing equation 15 by \( \pi \rho b U^2 \) and equation 16 by
\( \pi \rho b^2 U^2 \) and by using the following non-dimensional parameters:
\[ \mu = \frac{m}{\pi \rho b^2} = \text{density ratio}, \]
\[ \beta = \frac{m_{\alpha}}{m} = \text{coupling mass ratio}, \]
\[ \Omega_h^2 = \frac{K_h b^2}{\mu U^2} = \text{dimensionless uncoupled natural frequency in translation}, \]
\[ \Omega_\alpha^2 = \frac{K_\alpha b^2}{I_\alpha U^2} = \text{dimensionless uncoupled natural frequency in rotation}, \]
\[ r_\alpha^2 = \frac{I_\alpha}{mb^2} = \text{dimensionless radius of gyration about rotational axis}, \]
\[ s = \frac{Ut}{b} = \text{dimensionless time variable}, \]
\[ h(s), \alpha(s) = \text{dimensionless translation and rotation displacements} \]

so that
\[ h(s) = \frac{1}{b} h(t) \text{ and } \alpha(s) = \alpha(t). \] (17)

By introducing these quantities and by nondimensionalizing, the equations of motion become
\[ \mu h'' + \beta \mu x_\alpha h'' + \mu \Omega_h^2 h = L/\rho b U^2 \] (18)

and
\[ \mu r_\alpha^2 \alpha'' + \beta \mu r_\alpha^2 \alpha'' + \mu \beta \Omega_\alpha^2 \alpha = M/\rho b^2 U^2 \] (19)

where the primes indicate differentiation with respect to \( s \).

1. **Flutter Analysis**

The description of the mode shape associated with the flutter of a hydrofoil connected to a hull involves the superposition of the normal vibration modes of the complete structure. When this precise mode shape is used in flutter analyses it results in a lengthy computation because there are an infinite number of normal vibration modes.

Aeroelastic computations have shown that flutter speed and frequency can be predicted accurately by the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure. With this procedure, the mode shape is approximated by the superposition of a finite number of pre-assigned or assumed modes. The choice of modes is governed by the structure involved and by the results desired. Reference 7 discusses the choices available and the criterion.
for their use. An accurate and simple procedure is to use two or three primitive mode shapes that are compatible with the boundary conditions. The assumed modes method of flutter analysis has been compared with a more exact treatment (reference 3). The two methods reasonably agreed in the range of parameters used in hydrofoil design.

In this investigation, the assumed modes method exactly described the flutter mode of vibration; the two degrees of freedom of translation and rotation in the plane of flow are the only appreciable displacements of the model. A linear combination of these displacements exactly described the flutter mode-shape. Thus, no approximation was used in the application of the assumed modes method.

In this case, it was more convenient to divide the equation of motion by $\pi \rho b^3 \omega^2$ and $\pi \rho b^4 \omega^2$ rather than use equations 18 and 19. Introducing the assumption of simple harmonic motion in the form

$$h = h_o e^{j\omega t} \quad \text{and} \quad a = a_o e^{j\omega t}$$

and using the quantities $\mu$, $x_\alpha$, and $r_\alpha$, the equations of motion were

$$\mu [1 - (\frac{\omega}{\omega_a})^2] h_o e^{j\omega t} + \mu^2 x_\alpha a_o e^{j\omega t} = L/\pi \rho b^3 \omega^2$$

and

$$\mu^2 x_\alpha h_o e^{j\omega t} + \mu r_\alpha^2 [1 - (\frac{\omega}{\omega_a})^2] a_o e^{j\omega t} = M/\pi \rho b^4 \omega^2$$

At this point, an explicit representation of the hydrodynamic loads was introduced. The Theodorsen results cited in reference 8 were used in this analysis. In the design of the experimental apparatus, every effort was made to model the assumptions involved in the theory—that is, large end-plates were provided with small clearances to preserve two-dimensional flow; the foil supports were designed so that
the desired, "rigid-body motions were achieved at every point along the span of the foil; no free surface, cavitation, ventilation or sidewall effects were permitted. In addition, the foil motions were assumed to be sinusoidal; however, the recorded motions were checked only visually.

The representation of the hydrodynamic loads was taken from reference 9, where the expressions for the hydrodynamic lift and moment are given as

$$L = \pi \rho b^4 \omega^2 \left\{ L_h \alpha_o + \left[ L_\alpha - \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) L_h \right] \alpha_o \right\} e^{j\omega t} \tag{23}$$

and

$$M = \pi \rho b^4 \omega^2 \left\{ \left[ M_h - \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) L_h \right] \alpha_o + \left[ M_\alpha - \left( L_\alpha + M_h \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) \right] \alpha_o \right\} e^{j\omega t}. \tag{24}$$

In these relations, $ab$ is the distance from midchord to the rotational axis and is positive if the rotational axis is aft. The coefficients $L_h$, $L_\alpha$, $M_h$, and $M_\alpha$ are complex functions of the reduced frequency $(k)$, which is

$$k = \frac{ab}{U}. \tag{25}$$

A tabulation of these coefficients may be found in references 9 and 10.

These results were introduced into the equations of motion with the following notation:

$$L_{hr} = L_{hr}$$
$$L_{h\theta} = L_{h\theta}$$
$$L_{\alpha r} = L_{hr} - (\frac{1}{2} + a)L_{hr}$$
$$L_{\alpha \theta} = L_{h\theta} - (\frac{1}{2} + a)L_{h\theta}$$
$$M_{hr} = M_{hr} - (\frac{1}{2} + a)L_{hr}$$
$$M_{h\theta} = M_{h\theta} - (\frac{1}{2} + a)L_{h\theta}$$
\[ M_{ar}' = M_{ar} - \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) (L_{ar} + M_{hr}) + \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right)^2 L_{hr} \]
\[ M_{aj}' = M_{aj} - \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) (L_{aj} + M_{hj}) + \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right)^2 L_{hj} \]
\[ d = L_{hr}' M_{aj}' + L_{hj}' M_{ar}' - L_{ar}' M_{hj}' - M_{aj}' M_{hr}' \]
\[ e = L_{hr}' M_{ar}' - L_{hj}' M_{aj}' - L_{ar}' M_{hr}' + L_{aj}' M_{hj}' \]
\[ f = L_{aj}' + M_{hj}' \]
\[ t = L_{ar}' + M_{hr}' \]  

Equation (26)

The subscripts \( r \) and \( j \) denote the real and imaginary parts of the corresponding complex numbers. Equations 23, 24, and 26 were introduced into equations 21 and 22 and \( e^{j\omega t} \) which is common to all terms was cancelled, yielding:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\left\{ \mu \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_a} \right)^2 \right]^2 + L_{hr} + jL_{hj} \right\} h_o + \left\{ \mu \beta x_a + L_{ar} + jL_{aj} \right\} a_o &= 0 \\
\left\{ \mu \beta x_a + M_{hr} + jM_{hj} \right\} h_o + \left\{ \mu \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_a} \right)^2 \right]^2 + M_{ar} + jM_{aj} \right\} a_o &= 0.
\end{aligned}
\]

Equations (27) and (28)

These are the equations of motion that the unknowns \( h_o, a_o, \omega, U, \) and \( \omega \) must satisfy.

Equations 27 and 28 are complex, homogeneous, simultaneous linear algebraic equations in the unknown amplitudes \( h_o \) and \( a_o \). A nontrivial solution for these unknowns exists, if and only if the determinant of their coefficients vanishes. In this case, the determinant is complex and results in two simultaneous equations by setting the real and imaginary parts of the expanded determinant equal to zero separately. The solution is thus reduced to finding the eigenvalues for \( U \) and \( \omega \) which satisfy two algebraic equations.

However, \( U \) appears in equations 27 and 28 only implicitly in the argument \( (k) \) of the hydrodynamic coefficients.
Because these coefficients are most easily handled in tabular form rather than functional, the argument usually is considered as an independent parametric variable. The unknown frequency and one other parameter are then considered the dependent unknowns and solutions to the expanded determinant are found at chosen values of \( k \). The second unknown is usually chosen so that one of the equations resulting from the expansion of the determinant is linear in both dependent unknowns. One method of solution of the flutter determinant is the density variation method. Alternate means of solution are described in reference 7.

2. Density Variation Method

The density variation method was particularly appropriate here, because the density ratio was varied while other parameters were kept constant. Thus, the density ratio and the square of the unknown frequency ratio were taken as the dependent unknowns in solving the flutter determinant, which is:

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
\mu l - \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_0} \right)^2 + I_{hr} + Jl_{hj} & \mu \beta x_a + I_{ar} + Jl_{aj} \\
\mu \beta x_a + M_{hr} + Jm_{hj} & \mu r_a^2 \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_0} \right)^2 \right] + M_{ar} + Jm_{aj}
\end{vmatrix} = 0
\]

By expanding and setting the imaginary part of the resulting equation equal to zero, the following linear relation exists between the chosen dependent unknowns:

\[
\frac{1}{\mu} = \frac{1}{d} \left[ \frac{\omega}{\omega_0} \right]^2 M_{aj} + r^2 L_{hj} \left[ \frac{\omega}{\omega_0} \right]^2 - \frac{1}{d} [M_{aj} + r^2 L_{hj} - \beta x_a f]; \quad (30)
\]

d and \( f \) are defined in equation 26. By setting the real part of the expanded determinant equal to zero, and eliminating \( 1/\mu \) by introducing equation 30,
\[
\left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_a} \right)^4 \left\{ r_a^2 \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_a} \right)^2 - H \left[ \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_a} \right)^2 M_{ar}' + r_a^2 L_{hr}' \right] + eH^2 \right\} \\
- \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_a} \right)^4 \left\{ r_a^2 \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_a} \right)^2 \right] + J \left[ \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_a} \right)^2 M_{ar}' + r_a^2 L_{hr}' \right] \\
- 2HJ \right\} \\
+ r_a^2 \left( \frac{\beta x_a}{a} \right)^2 + J \left[ M_{ar}' + r_a^2 L_{hr}' - \beta x_a \right] + eJ^2 = 0,
\]
which contains only one unknown \((\omega/\omega_a)^2\), in quadratic form. The expressions for \(H\) and \(J\) are defined by equation 30 so that
\[
\frac{1}{\mu} = H \left( \frac{\omega_a}{\omega} \right)^2 + J
\]
At chosen values of \(k\), equation 31 is solved for values of \((\omega/\omega_a)^2\), which are substituted into equation 30 to determine \(\mu\). Finally, the corresponding values of the reduced speed are found from the following relationship:
\[
\frac{U}{bw_0} = \frac{1/k}{(\omega/\omega_a)}
\]
This method of flutter analysis, including appropriate elastic and dynamic assumptions, is believed to be most useful in hydrofoil design procedures. The results of this analysis applied to the experimental conditions are shown in Figure 10.

The Theodorsen representation of the hydrodynamic forces limited this analysis strictly to simple harmonic motions in two degrees of freedom. If other motions are involved, which are either not simple harmonic or other degrees of freedom, this analysis is not applicable. Subject to these restrictions, the curve of reduced flutter speed versus density ratio obtained by the density variation method defines the condition—that is, speed \((U)\) and frequency \((\omega)\)—that must prevail at flutter for a particular hydrofoil section. At speeds above critical flutter-speed, the motion of the
foil will be oscillatory divergent and at lower speeds the motion will be convergent. The curve plotted in Figure 10 is the boundary between unstable motion at higher speeds and stable motion at lower speeds.

3. Stability Analysis

In the stability analysis, the time dependence of the motions again was assumed to be $e^{\lambda t}$. Therefore, from the equations of motion, a characteristic equation was derived, which was a polynomial in $\lambda$. The characteristic values (the roots of the polynomial) were found and a quantitative measure of stability was obtained from considering the magnitude and sign of the real parts of all roots. In this sense, the assumed modes method of flutter analysis is not a stability analysis because of the simplifying assumption of sinusoidal motion.

In this analysis, the equations of motion in non-dimensional form were used:

$$
\mu h'''' + \mu \beta x_a a'''' + \mu \alpha^2 h - L/\pi \rho b U^2 = 0 \tag{18}
$$

and

$$
\rho a'''' + \mu \beta x_a a'''' + \mu \alpha^2 a'''' - M/\pi \rho b^2 U^2 = 0. \tag{19}
$$

The hydrodynamic terms are introduced by the Duhamel superposition integral and the Wagner function $\phi(s)$, which gives the time dependence of the circulatory lift response to a unit step change in angle of attack. The development of these expressions and the following results are described in Appendix A of this report and in references 7 and 10. The Theodorsen representation of the lift and moment is not applicable to this analysis (Appendix B).

The hydrodynamic force and moment are

$$
-L/\pi \rho b U^2 = h'''' + a'''' - 2\phi(s) \tag{34}
$$

and

$$
-M/\pi \rho b^2 U^2 = ah'''' + \left(\frac{1}{2} + a\right) a'''' + \left(\frac{1}{8} + a^2\right) a'''' - 2\left(\frac{1}{2} + a\right) \phi(s) \tag{35}
$$
In these equations, the quantity $W(s)$ is defined as

$$W(s) = H'(0)\phi(s) + \int_0^s \phi(s - \sigma)H''(\sigma)\,d\sigma,$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

where

$$H'(s) = h' + \alpha + (\frac{1}{2} - a)\alpha'$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

and where $H'(0)$ is the value of $H'(s)$ at $s = 0$. Equation 37 is identical to the expression for the vertical downwash velocity at the $3/4$ chord point of the foil.

An approximate form of the Wagner function was used in this analysis. The following are two approximations commonly used in aeronautical literature (reference 7).

$$\phi(s) \approx 1 - 0.165e^{-0.0455s} - 0.335e^{-0.3s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)

or

$$\phi(s) \approx \frac{s + 2}{s + 4}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (39)

The former was used because of its adaptability to the Laplace transform method of solution. Introducing these results into the equations of motion, taking the Laplace transform, and using the initial conditions (Figure 8),

$$h'(0) = a'(0) = 0, \ h(0) = h_o \ and \ a(0) = a_o,$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

results in the following pair of simultaneous, linear, algebraic, nonhomogeneous equations in the transforms of the motion $h(p)$ and $\alpha(p)$ in which $p$ is the complex Laplace transform variable:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}
h\left\{p^2(\mu + 1 + 2\bar{\phi}) + \mu h_o^2\right\} + \bar{\alpha}\left\{p^2\mu p^2 x_a - a + 2(\frac{1}{2} - a)\bar{\phi}\right\} + \\
p(1 + 2\bar{\phi})\left\{h_o p(\mu + 1 + 2\bar{\phi}) + \alpha_o\left\{1 + \mu p^2 x_a - a + 2(\frac{1}{2} - a)\bar{\phi}\right\}\right\}
\end{array}\right.$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)

and
where the bar indicates Laplace transformation. The transform of equation 38 yields

\[
\ddot{\bar{h}}(p) = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{0.165}{p + 0.0455} - \frac{0.335}{p + 0.3} \tag{43}
\]

Finally, by solving equations 41 and 42 for the transformed responses \(\bar{h}(p)\) and \(\bar{a}(p)\), then clearing the fraction yields

\[
\bar{h}(p) = \frac{F(p)}{Q(p)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{a}(p) = \frac{R(p)}{Q(p)} \tag{44}
\]

where \(F\), \(Q\) and \(R\) are polynomials in \(p\). \(Q\) and \(R\) are of order five and \(Q\) is of order six, which permitted the following inverse transformation to be used:

\[
\mathcal{L}^{-1} \left( \frac{F(p)}{Q(p)} \right) = \sum_{n=1}^{6} \frac{P(p_n)}{Q'(p_n)} p_n^s \tag{45}
\]

where \(p_n\) are of the roots of the characteristic equation

\[
Q(p) = 0 \tag{46}
\]

and where \(Q'(p_n)\) is the derivative of \(Q(p)\) with respect to \(p\) evaluated at \(p = p_n\). These results may be confirmed in any textbook on operational methods (reference 11). An iterative process based on Newton's method was used to find the quadratic factors of equation 16 and is described in reference 12. The interest here lies in the complex roots of equation 46 and in particular the root in which the real part becomes positive above some critical speed. The results were obtained in the form of the overall damping ratio \((\sigma/\omega_n)\), which is the ratio of the real part of \(\sigma\) to the uncoupled rotational frequency. If the complex root of equation 46 is

\[
p = u + iv \tag{47}
\]
then the overall damping ratio is found from the real part of \( p \) and the frequency ratio \( (\omega/\omega_\alpha) \) from the imaginary part as follows

\[
\frac{\sigma}{\omega_\alpha} = -\frac{u}{\Omega_\alpha}; \quad \frac{\omega}{\omega_\alpha} = \frac{v}{\Omega_\alpha} \tag{48}
\]

The overall damping ratio as predicted by this method for the experimental conditions is plotted in Figures 11 through 17 with the corresponding experimental results and the frequencies are presented in Figures 18 through 25.

C. CRITICAL DENSITY RATIO

An examination of the theoretical results, particularly those shown in Figure 10) will show that the reduced flutter speed becomes infinite at some value of density ratio. This value can be predicted by using the following information: \( U/b_\alpha \to \infty \), when \( k \to 0 \) for finite values of \( \omega/\omega_\alpha \). An extension of the assumed modes analysis leads to an explicit equation for \( U/b_\alpha \) when these limits are introduced. This result is developed in reference 3, where the equation is shown to be a ratio of two polynomials. Setting the denominator of this result equal to zero yields the relation between the parameters that must be satisfied at the asymptote where \( U/b_\alpha \to \infty \) and \( \mu = \mu_{CR} \), the critical density ratio. It is found that \( \mu_{CR} \) decreases with \( \omega_\alpha/\omega_\alpha \) and a very simple relation is found for the limiting case \( \omega_\alpha/\omega_\alpha = 0 \),

\[
\mu_{CR} = \frac{1}{2(x_\alpha + a) + 1} \tag{49}
\]

where \( x_\alpha + a \) is the c.g. location measured in half-chord lengths from midchord, positive if the c.g. is aft. This result is plotted in Figure 25.

By this procedure, an asymptotic behavior is predicted for the flutter speed as \( \mu \) approaches \( \mu_{CR} \). However, this asymptote is approached from the low \( \mu \) side in many cases so that \( \mu_{CR} \) is not always the minimum density ratio at which flutter is predicted.
IV. DISCUSSION

A. GENERAL

In these experiments, flutter was induced under controlled and somewhat artificial conditions to validate the application of airfoil theory to hydrofoil phenomena. Consequently, these theoretical studies were carried out in accordance with aeronautical practices.

B. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

At each mass condition ($\mu_0$, where $n = 0, 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11$) two bits of experimental information were obtained; the overall damping ratio ($\sigma/\omega_a$), and the frequency ratio ($\omega/\omega_a$). The model was locked in position and when the apparatus attained the desired speed, the model was released and the resulting motion was recorded. The speed of each successive test was increased until the motion of the model was divergent, in which case the apparatus was quickly brought to rest to avoid destructive or violent motions. Flutter was obtained in each test series except series 0 ($\mu = 0.758$).

A time signal was recorded simultaneously with the motions to measure frequency ($\omega$). Because the model had two degrees of freedom, two values of $\omega$ were obtainable. The coupled zero-speed, rotation mode-shape led to flutter. The damping in the translation mode increased rapidly with speed, conveniently aiding its elimination from the records. By properly choosing initial conditions, appreciable response in the translation mode was eliminated.

The second piece of information, the overall damping ratio ($\sigma/\omega_a$), was obtained using
\[
\frac{c}{\omega_a} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} (\omega_a)^2 \left[ \frac{\ln \left( \frac{\omega_0}{\omega_a} + 1 \right)}{\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_a} - 1} \right],
\]

where \( I \) is the number of cycles analyzed. The quantity in square brackets is proportional to the slope of a straight line faired through the successive amplitudes of oscillation plotted on semi-log graph paper.

The tests were performed in two groups (series 4, 7, 11 and series 0, 1, 2, 9, respectively), separated by two weeks, during which time, some of the data were analyzed. During this time it was realized that the rotation mode of vibration was leading to flutter; subsequently, the model was held at an initial angle of attack rather than with an initial translation displacement, as in the first group of tests. During the second group of tests, an investigation of the effect of initial conditions on the experimental measurements showed that the results of the first group could still be used, because of the large amount of damping in the translation mode of vibration; by repeated runs at a particular speed, the results were found to be reproducible. (See points at \( U/\omega_a = 1.11 \) in Figure 14 or at \( U/\omega_a = 1.21 \) in Figure 17.)

C. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The maximum speed obtainable was considerably lower than anticipated. The apparatus was designed on the basis of a maximum speed of 30 feet per second. Actually, this speed was 15 feet per second (\( U/\omega_a = 1.67 \), for series 0, \( \mu = 0.758 \), where the limitation was most severe and the only mass condition in which the maximum speed was obtained). The experimental results for the present investigation are somewhat inconclusive in this regard: it is not certain that flutter could not be induced at a higher speed for series 0 (Figure 11). However, a sharp upward turn in reduced flutter speed does occur as \( \mu \) decreases, (Figure 10), which at least partially substantiates the existence of an asymptote as predicted.
D. THEORETICAL RESULTS

The analysis by the two theoretical methods that can be used to predict speed and frequency at flutter has shown that (1) the assumed modes method of flutter analysis leads to a prediction of $\mu_{CR}$ at which the flutter speed increases asymptotically and (2) the superposition method of stability analysis provides information for speeds other than the flutter speed; these results were obtained in addition to the prediction of critical flutter-speed and frequency.

The flutter speeds as predicted by the assumed modes analysis, which involved an exact modal description in this case, are shown in Figure 10 and the corresponding frequencies for each test condition are shown in Table II. The critical-density ratio as predicted by this analysis at $\omega_n/\omega_0 = 0$ is plotted in Figure 25. The difference between series 0, 1, 2, 9 and series 4, 7, 11 (Figure 10) is caused by the change in $x_a$ between these two groups, thus causing a slight shift in $\mu_{CR}$.

Figures 11 through 17 show the overall damping ratio obtained from the superposition analysis, which reduces to the well-known critical damping ratio for a one-degree of freedom system vibrating freely in air, plotted against the reduced speed for each mass condition. The predicted flutter speed is found where $\sigma/\omega_0$ goes to zero. A comparison of these speeds with the theoretical results from the assumed modes analysis in Figure 10 for corresponding $\mu$'s shows the anticipated identical agreement between the two methods. The use of the approximation in equation 38, thus agrees well with more exact theory. No flutter is predicted for series 0 or 1. Figures 18 through 24 show the frequency ratio versus reduced speed, as predicted by the superposition method.

Other results of the superposition analysis are tabulated in Table III for series 9 ($\mu = 3.03$).
The theoretical results described here were obtained on an electronic digital computer. The program for both the assumed modes and the superposition analysis have been retained for future use.
V. THEORY COMPARED WITH EXPERIMENT

The results of series 7, 9, and 11 show relatively good agreement between theory and experiment for the predicted flutter conditions (Table II). As cited in reference 4 and as indicated in Figure 10, the theory gave a conservative estimate of flutter speed for these conditions. No apparent reason could be found to doubt the results of series 7 ($\mu = 2.06$) in Figure 10; however, there is nothing to cause these results to be out of line with the other series. A lower experimental value for the reduced flutter speed at this mass condition would be in agreement with the anticipated experimental results.

Between series 7 and 11, the inadequacy of the theory to predict the flutter speed with accuracy becomes more apparent and the resulting error becomes more dangerous. Although the good agreement in frequency ratio is retained at the lower density ratios, the overall damping ratio is considerably overestimated by the theory; in fact, at series 1 the theory predicts freedom from flutter where flutter was obtained during the experiments. In the case of series 0, flutter, though it did not occur, was imminent; the theory predicts no flutter at all speeds. Even in this circumstance the frequency ratio is well predicted (Figure 18) and is within 9 percent.

The results of reference 4, indicated a discrepancy between theory and experiment for the prediction of flutter speed at low density ratios. However, they were not able to extend their investigations to a sufficiently low value of density ratio to check the existence of an asymptote as predicted by equation 49. These results are summarized in Figure 1. At high values of density ratio ($\mu = 3.0$) the
theoretical and experimental results were essentially in agreement, or the theory was conservative.

The present results shown in Figure 10 substantiate the results of reference 4. In addition, the experimental results at series 0 (\( \mu = 0.758 \)) strongly indicate the existence of an asymptote in flutter speed. There is definitely a sharp upward trend shown as \( \mu \) decreases. The position of this asymptote is not correctly predicted by theory. The theoretical and experimental value of \( \mu_{CR} \) are plotted in Figure 25. The comparison is somewhat worse than is shown there since the theoretical curve is derived for the case \( \omega_n / \omega_a = 0 \) and in reference 3, it is shown that \( \mu_{CR} \) increases with \( \omega_n / \omega_a \).

Some more definite information about the discrepancy can be gotten from the results of the stability analysis. The experimental and theoretical overall damping ratios are compared in Figures 11 through 17. There, it is seen that \( \alpha / \omega_a \) is overestimated by the theory up to series 7 (\( \mu = 2.08 \)) and from that point on the predicted overall damping ratio is less than that obtained in the experiments. The frequency ratio is very well predicted throughout as shown in Figures 18 through 24. We have found that the frequency ratio depends mainly on terms proportional to \( h(t) \) and \( a(t) \) or their second derivatives; however, the damping ratio depends mostly on terms proportional to the first derivatives. The latter contain the circulatory responses— that is, the Theodorsen or Wagner functions; the former are not as sensitive to these functions. Since the frequency ratio is fairly well predicted and the damping is not, it may be surmised that the effective mass and inertia terms in the theory are more accurate than the circulatory terms. Other investigators have used this hypothesis as mentioned in reference 3.
VI. CONCLUSIONS

1. A conservative prediction of flutter speed may be expected at high-density ratios.

2. The theory does not correctly predict the flutter speed near $\mu_{CR}$.

3. The theory does not correctly predict the location of $\mu_{CR}$.

4. The frequency is very well predicted at flutter and at lower speeds at all density ratios.

5. The overall damping ratio does not agree with experimental results.

6. The circulatory terms in the theory are more liable to doubt than the effective mass or spring terms.
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Further investigations are in order to describe more fully the discrepancy that has been shown to exist. Several different values of c.g. location and radius of gyration should be used in further investigations. In addition to the results presented here, an experimental determination of amplitude ratio and phase angle should be attempted. Single degree of freedom studies in water should be carried out, to provide separate comparisons between theory and experiment for each component of the lift and moment expressions. Also, zero-speed responses must be analyzed to check the prediction of added mass, added inertia, and added mass coupling terms.
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TABLE I

PROPERTIES OF MODEL TENTE II, FORMULA 233, FLOW MS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow Temperature</td>
<td>284°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Gravity</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulus of Elasticity</td>
<td>1.30 x 10^5 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deformation under Load (Cold Flow)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Absorption (24 Hrs. Immersion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weight Gained</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soluble Matter Lost</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Aging Weight Lost</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II

PARAMETERS AND FLUTTER CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series No.</th>
<th>µ</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>ω²</th>
<th>exp.</th>
<th>the.</th>
<th>U_p/bω</th>
<th>exp.</th>
<th>the.</th>
<th>m x 10³</th>
<th>ω²</th>
<th>rad sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b = 3 inches, a = -0.5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( u/b\omega_a )</th>
<th>( \lambda_1, \lambda_2 )</th>
<th>( \lambda_3, \lambda_4 )</th>
<th>( \lambda_5 )</th>
<th>( \lambda_6 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma/\omega_a )</td>
<td>( \omega/\omega_a )</td>
<td>( h/\alpha )</td>
<td>( \phi )</td>
<td>( u_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.00044</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>179.6°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.01129</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>170.8°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.0208</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>161.1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>.0270</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>149.6°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.0258</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>134.8°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.00874</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>116.8°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-.0325</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>103.0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>-.0869</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>98.6°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>-.1399</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>1.505</td>
<td>99.5°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-.1884</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>101.6°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>104.1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>106.7°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>109.3°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGION 1
a) NO FLUTTER
b) NO FLUTTER THEORETICALLY, NO EXPERIMENTAL INFORMATION

REGION 2
FLUTTER FOUND EXPERIMENTALLY, BUT NONE PREDICTED

REGION 3
THEORY PREDICTS FLUTTER AT HIGHER SPEED THAN THAT FOUND IN EXPERIMENTS

REGION 4
THEORY GIVES CONSERVATIVE PREDICTION OF FLUTTER SPEED

FIGURE 1. PREVIOUS EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS
FIGURE 3. APPARATUS, STARBOARD SIDE

FIGURE 4. APPARATUS, PORT SIDE
FIGURE 5. BALANCE, STARBOARD SIDE

FIGURE 6. BALANCE, PORT SIDE
FIGURE 7. FLEXURE BALANCE
FIGURE 8. REPRESENTATIVE HYDROFOIL ORIENTATION FOR THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

\[ h(0) = h_0, \ a(0) = a_0 \]
\[ \dot{h}(0) = \dot{a}(0) = 0 \]
FIGURE 9. SCHEMATIC DIAGRAM OF SYSTEM USED FOR DYNAMIC ANALYSIS
FIGURE 10. REDUCED FLUTTER-SPEED VERSUS DENSITY RATIO
FIGURE 21. FREQUENCY RATIO VERSUS REDUCED SPEED (STABILITY ANALYSIS, SERIES 4, $\mu = 1.285$)
FIGURE 22. FREQUENCY RATIO VERSUS REDUCED SPEED (STABILITY ANALYSIS, SERIES 7, $\mu = 2.08$)
FIGURE 24. FREQUENCY RATIO VERSUS REDUCED SPEED (STABILITY ANALYSIS, SERIES II, $\mu = 4.07$)
APPENDIX A: STABILITY ANALYSIS BY SUPERPOSITION

I. INTRODUCTION

To predict the stability of small elastic-deformations of a hydrofoil section, three types of forces must be related to the motions of the foil: inertial reactions, elastic restraints, and hydrodynamic loads. The inertial forces can be described by either Lagrange's or Newton's equations; to describe the elastic forces, strain-displacement and stress-strain relationships must be established. (Hooke's law can be used to relate the stresses to the strains.) Hydrodynamic loads due to sinusoidal motions have been described mathematically by Theodorsen (reference 8).

A. HYDRODYNAMIC LOADS DUE TO SINUSOIDAL MOTIONS

The sinusoidal motions are expressed as

\[ h(s) = h_0 e^{jks} \]
\[ \alpha(s) = \alpha_0 e^{jks} \]  

(A-1)

where, \( h_0 \) and \( \alpha_0 \) are small dimensionless amplitudes of heave and pitch, and may be complex; \( k \) is reduced frequency; and \( s \) is dimensionless time. The two-dimensional lift \( (L) \) and moment \( (M) \) per unit span for a sinusoidal motion are expressed as

\[ \frac{L}{\pi \rho b U^2} = - [h'' + \alpha' - \alpha a''] - 2C(k) [h' + \alpha + \left( \frac{1}{2} - a \right) \alpha'] \]
\[ \frac{M}{\pi \rho b^2 U^2} = \left[ - ah'' - \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) \alpha' - \left( \frac{1}{2} + a^2 \right) \alpha'' \right] + 2 \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) C(k) \left[ h' + \alpha + \left( \frac{1}{2} - a \right) \alpha' \right] \]  

(A-2)
\[ \omega_n = \frac{2\pi}{T} n; \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \quad (A-5) \]

Let \( S = T U/b \) be the dimensionless period of the motion. Thus, the Fourier coefficients are

\[
\begin{align*}
    h_o &= \frac{1}{S} \int_0^S h(s) ds, \\
    \alpha_o &= \frac{1}{S} \int_0^S \alpha(s) ds,
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
    h_n &= \frac{2}{S} \int_0^S h(s) e^{-j k_n s} ds, \\
    \alpha_n &= \frac{2}{S} \int_0^S \alpha(s) e^{-j k_n s} ds. \quad (A-6)
\end{align*}
\]

To find the lift response to this motion, the response for a single Fourier component must be obtained, which is expressed as

\[
\begin{align*}
    L_n/\pi \rho b U^2 &= -\epsilon^{j k_n s} \left\{ -k_n^2 h_n + \left[ j k_n + a k_n^2 \right] \alpha_n + 2C(k_n) [ j k_n h_n + \left\{ 1 + (\frac{1}{2} - a) j k_n \right\} \alpha_n ] \right\} \quad (A-7)
\end{align*}
\]

and the moment response is expressed as

\[
\begin{align*}
    M_n/\pi \rho b U^2 &= -\epsilon^{j k_n s} \left\{ a k_n^2 h_n + \left[ (\frac{1}{2} + a) j k_n - \left( \frac{1}{8} + a^2 \right) k_n^2 \right] \alpha_n - 2(\frac{1}{2} + a) C(k_n) [ j k_n h_n + \left\{ 1 + (\frac{1}{2} - a) j k_n \right\} \alpha_n ] \right\} \quad (A-8)
\end{align*}
\]

The lift and moment response to \( h_o \) are zero; however, there is a steady response to the mean angle of attack \( (\alpha_o) \):

\[
\begin{align*}
    L_o/\pi \rho b U^2 &= -2\epsilon_o = L_o', \\
    M_o/\pi \rho b U^2 &= +2(\frac{1}{2} + a) \epsilon_o = M_o'. \quad (A-9)
\end{align*}
\]

The sum of the responses to the components of the motion (equation A-4) results in the total lift and moment:
and moment acting on the foil. Thus, the case of a foil operating in oblique seas may be analyzed. These results were derived assuming a rigid chord-section. Elastic deformations in camber could be included using the results of Spielberg*. The affects of aspect ratios as low as 2 can be included by using the table of aerodynamic coefficients by Reissner and Stevens**.

D. ARBITRARY MOTIONS

The Theodorsen results can be extended to arbitrary motions***. For this motion, the noncirculatory terms in equation A-10 are not changed and only terms containing $C(k_n)$ are considered. Also, the circulatory lift and moment terms depend on the motion in exactly the same way—that is, through the vertical velocity of the 3/4-chord point, which is

$$H'(s) = h'(s) + a(s) + (\frac{1}{2} - a)a'(s).$$  \hspace{1cm}  (A-14)

Using this observation, the circulatory lift response to a single Fourier component of reduced frequency $k$ is, for a unit amplitude of $H'(s)$,

$$\frac{\Delta L_c}{\pi \rho U^2 b} = -2C(k)e^{jk_s}$$  \hspace{1cm}  (A-15)

The Fourier integral representation of an arbitrary motion $H'(s)$ becomes


Consider, a step change in $H'(s)$:

$$H'(s) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } s < 0; \\ h'(0) + a(0) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - a\right)a'(0), & \text{for } s > 0 \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-21)

The Fourier integral for such a motion is

$$H'(s) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[ h'(0) + a(0) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - a\right)a'(0) \right] \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{jks} \frac{dk}{j}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-22)

Comparing equation A-22 and equation A-16 shows that

$$\eta(k) = \left[ h'(0) + a(0) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - a\right)a'(0) \right] \frac{1}{j(k)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-23)

for this motion. The circulatory lift response to this step change is found by substituting equation A-23 into equation A-18:

$$L_c/\rho U^2 b = - \left[ h'(0) + a(0) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - a\right)a'(0) \right] \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{C(k)}{j(k)} e^{jks} \frac{dk}{j}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-24)

The Wagner function $[\varnothing(s)]$ is defined as the time dependence of the circulator lift response to a unit step change in $H'(s)$ at $s = 0$ or

$$\varnothing(s) = \frac{1}{2\pi j} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{C(k)}{j(k)} e^{jks} \frac{dk}{j}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-25)

which when substituted into equation A-24 yields

$$L_c/\rho U^2 b = - 2\pi h'(0) + a(0) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - a\right)a'(0) \varnothing(s)$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-26)

Dividing the Theodorsen function into its real and imaginary parts [$P(k)$ and $G(k)$], respectively, results in two simpler relations for the Wagner function:
\[ M = \pi \rho b^2 U^2 \left[ ah'' + \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) a' + \left( \frac{1}{6} + a^2 \right) a'' \right] + \]
\[ 2\pi \rho b^2 U^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} + a \right) \left\{ H'(0) \phi(s) + \int_0^s \phi(s - \gamma) \frac{d}{d\gamma} H'(\gamma) d\gamma \right\} \quad (A-31) \]

where

\[ \phi(s) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{F(k)}{k} \sin ks \, dk, \quad (A-32) \]

\[ H'(s) = \begin{cases} 
0, & s < 0; \\
H'(0) + Ua(0) + b \left( \frac{3}{2} - a \right) a'(0) = H'(0), & s = 0; \\
h'(s) + Ua(s) + b \left( \frac{3}{2} - a \right) a'(s), & s > 0. \quad (A-33) 
\end{cases} \]

II. ANALYSIS OF SYSTEMS WITH TWO DEGREES-OF-FREEDOM

The lift and moment equations were used in the stability analysis to determine the overall damping and frequency ratio associated with the experimental conditions. To do this, equations A-30 through A-33 are substituted into the equations of motion, equations 18 and 19. The equations can be written as

\[ (\mu + 1)h'' + \mu x_a h - a h'' + (\mu x_a - a) a'' + a' + 2 H'(0) \phi(s) + \int_0^s \phi(s - \gamma) H''(\gamma) d\gamma = 0 \]

\[ \quad (A-34) \]

and

\[ (\mu x_a - a) h'' + (\mu_\alpha^2 a + \frac{1}{6} + a^2) a'' + (\frac{1}{2} - a) a' + \mu_\alpha^2 \alpha_\alpha + \]
\[ 2 H'(0) \phi(s) + \int_0^s \phi(s - \gamma) H''(\gamma) d\gamma = 0. \quad (A-35) \]
\[ Q_h = \mu \alpha_{\alpha}^2 a_{\alpha}^2 - (\frac{1}{4} - a^2) \mu \Omega_{h}^2 \]

\[ Q_{\perp} = - (\frac{1}{2} + a) \mu \Omega_{h}^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-36 cont'd)

\[ P_a = h_o Q_a \]

\[ P_b = h_o Q_b \]

\[ P_c = h_o (\mu + 1) \mu \alpha_{\alpha}^2 a_{\alpha}^2 + a_o (\mu \beta x_{\alpha} - a) \mu \alpha_{\alpha}^2 \]

\[ P_d = a_o \mu \alpha_{\alpha}^2 a_{\alpha}^2 \]

\[ P_e = 0 \]

\[ P_f = h_o Q_f \]

\[ P_g = h_o \left[ 1 - (\mu + 1)(\frac{1}{2} + a) - (\mu \beta x_{\alpha} - a) \right] - a_o \left[ (\frac{1}{2} + a)(\mu \beta x_{\alpha} - a) + \mu r_{\alpha}^2 + \frac{1}{8} + a^2 \right] \]

\[ P_h = h_o \mu \alpha_{\alpha}^2 a_{\alpha}^2 + a_o \left[ (\frac{1}{2} - a) \mu r_{\alpha}^2 a_{\alpha}^2 - 1 \right] \]

\[ P_{\perp} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-37)

\[ R_a = a_o Q_a \]

\[ R_b = a_o Q_b \]

\[ R_c = a_o (\mu \alpha_{\alpha}^2 + \frac{1}{8} + a^2) \mu \Omega_{h}^2 + h_o (\mu x_{\alpha} - a) \mu \Omega_{h}^2 \]

\[ R_d = a_o Q_d \]

\[ R_e = 0 \]

\[ R_f = a_o Q_f \]

\[ R_g = a_o \]

\[ R_h = [h_o + (\frac{1}{2} - a)a_o] Q_{\perp} \]

\[ R_{\perp} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-38)
The polynomials in equation 44 are now defined so that the inverse Laplace transform is introduced to determine \( h(s) \) and \( a(s) \). Referring to any text on Laplace transformation the following theorem applies*. If \( Q(p) \) is a polynomial of degree \( i \), with \( i \) distinct zeros \( p = p_1, p_2, ..., p_i \), and \( P(p) \) is a polynomial of degree \( i - 1 \) or less, then

\[
\frac{P(p)}{Q(p)} = \sum_{n=1}^{i} \frac{P(p_n)}{Q'(p_n)} \cdot \frac{1}{(p - p_n)} \tag{A-43}
\]

To each term of equation A-43 the following inverse transform applies

\[
\mathcal{L}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{p - p_n} \right\} = e^{p_n t} \tag{A-44}
\]

Summing this result for each of the six zeros of \( Q(p) \) yields

\[
\mathcal{L}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{P(p)}{Q(p)} \right\} = \sum_{n=1}^{6} \frac{P(p_n)}{Q'(p_n)} e^{p_n s} \tag{A-45}
\]

The six roots of the denominator \( Q(p) \) must be determined. A process based on Newton's iterative method was used.** In this process, the quadratic factors of equation 46 are determined first, then the pairs of roots for each quadratic factor are found. The polynomial to be factored is of sixth order so that three quadratic factors and six roots must be determined.

Each root is complex:

\[
p_n = u_n + jv_n \tag{A-46}
\]

---


APPENDIX B: GENERALIZATION OF THEODORSEN'S FUNCTION
FOR CONVERGENT (STABLE) OSCILLATIONS

by Paul Ritger

The Theodorsen function (reference B-1) was developed for the case of a real argument. When this function was extended to include complex arguments, two different and incompatible conclusions were made. (references B-2 and B-3) To resolve this discrepancy, the following rigorous analysis was developed.

Theodorsen (reference B-1) showed that the circulatory part of lift forces caused by translational motions with unit-magnitude velocities—that is, \( h(s) = e^{\frac{j}{s}} \) is

\[
L(s) = 2\rho m u b C(\zeta) h'(s)
\]

where the Theodorsen function \( C(\zeta) \) is

\[
C(\zeta) = \frac{\int_{1}^{\infty} \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2 - 1}} e^{-j\zeta x} dx}{\int_{1}^{\infty} \frac{x + 1}{x - 1} e^{-j\zeta x} dx}
\]

The function \( C(\zeta) \) is properly defined by equation B-2, if and only if the complex number \( \zeta \) is restricted so that

\[
\text{Im}(\zeta) < 0
\]

This inequality is satisfied in the case of divergent oscillations. If \( \text{Im}(\zeta) = 0 \), the integrands in equation B-2 behave like sin \( \xi x \) at \( \infty \); hence, the integrals would be oscillatory divergent. If \( \text{Im}(\zeta) > 0 \), which is true for convergent oscillations, then both integrals in equation B-2 become infinite. Hence, the Theodorsen function, as defined by equation B-2, is meaningless for \( \text{Im}(\zeta) \geq 0 \).
points then it is essential to specify which branch of the function is to be used. In the present case, the physically correct branch is partly determined by equation B-2. That is, we must be sure to choose a branch of $C_1(\zeta)$ that coincides with $C(\zeta)$ for $\text{Im}(\zeta) < 0$, i.e., $-\pi < \arg \zeta < 0$. If the so-called "principal branch" of $K_n(j\zeta)$ is chosen, this condition is satisfied and, hence, this seems to be the most natural choice. Luke and Dengler have used another branch as will be shown below.

The "principal branch" of $K_n(j\zeta)$ is usually defined (see Watson, reference B-5, p. 77) in terms of the function $I_n$. That is, in general, we have the following definition of the many-valued function $K_n(z)$

$$K_n(z) = \frac{\pi}{2} \lim_{\nu \to -n} \frac{I_{\nu}(z) - I_{\nu}(z)}{\sin \nu \pi}, \quad (z \neq 0). \quad (B-6)$$

Now, $I_{\nu}(z)$ is in turn defined in terms of $J_{\nu}(z)$ and the principal branch of $I_{\nu}(z)$ is given by

$$I_{\nu}(z) = \begin{cases} 
  e^{-\nu \pi j/2} J_{\nu}(z e^{\pi j/2}), & -\pi < \arg z \leq \pi/2, \\
  e^{3\nu \pi j/2} J_{\nu}(z e^{-3\pi j/2}), & \pi/2 < \arg z \leq \pi.
\end{cases} \quad (B-7)$$

In equation B-7, to be precise, the principal branch of $J_{\nu}$ is to be taken, which is the reason for a split definition of $I_{\nu}(z)$. If $z$ in equation B-7, lies in the second quadrant, i.e., $\pi/2 < \arg z \leq \pi$, then $ze^{\pi j/2}$ (i.e. $jz$) would be such that $\pi < \arg (ze^{\pi j/2}) \leq 3\pi/2$ but this would then give a value of $J_{\nu}$ which is not on the principal branch. The principal branch of $J_{\nu}(\zeta)$ (see Watson p. 444) is obtained by restricting $\arg \zeta$ to $-\pi < \arg \zeta \leq \pi$.

To carry this all the way, $J_{\nu}$ is defined by

$$J_{\nu}(\zeta) = (\zeta^\nu \sum_{K=0}^{\infty} a_K(\zeta^K)$$

B-3
This definition of $K_n(z)$ is often written

$$K_n(z) = \frac{n}{2} e^{n\pi i/2} H_n^{(1)}(jz) \quad (B-12)$$

which is correct for the multi-valued function $K_n(z)$, but if one wishes to restrict oneself to the principal branch, then equation B-11 must be used.

The results of Luke and Dengler are obtained by using equation B-12 instead of equation B-11 and hence must be interpreted with this fact in mind. In particular, they are concerned with the values of $G(\xi)$ in the vicinity of arg $\xi = 0$. Hence, by equation B-5 they use $K_n(j\xi)$ near where arg $\xi = 0$, i.e. where arg $j\xi = \pi/2$. So, if arg $\xi$ is slightly greater than zero, they are using values which are no longer on the principal branch. The many valued function $K_n(j\xi)$ is continuous for arg $\xi = 0$, but the single-valued principal branch is not. Jones used the principal branch and hence his values show this discontinuity along arg $\xi = 0$. Incidentally, he uses rectangular coordinates which hide the significance of the restriction on arg $\xi$.

Since aerodynamicists seem to be most interested in the region around arg $\xi = 0$, there is something to be said for the Luke and Dengler approach. That is, their extension of the definition of $G(k)$ is the only one which agrees with equation B-1 for $\text{Im}(k) < 0$ and at the same time is the analytic continuation of equation B-1 across the half-line arg $k = 0$. It should be emphasized, however, that this approach still leaves one with a discontinuity along the negative real axis, i.e. for arg $\xi = \pm \pi$ (if one desires a single-valued function). Since Luke and Dengler do not discuss the branches of functions involved, there is some ambiguity in their definitions.

Moreover, the physical meaning of equation B-5 for $\text{Im}(\xi) \geq 0$ is not at all clear.
Hence, the circulational part of the lift force caused by a unit step change in translational velocity is given in general by

\[ L(s) = 2\rho \pi Ub \left[ \phi(s) + j \int_0^s \phi(x) e^{j\zeta(s - x)} \, dx \right] \quad (B-16) \]

This result agrees with Bisplinghoff, etc. (reference B-7) for a lift force.
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The theoretical procedures commonly used by aerodynamicists were applied to predict the flutter speed of a rigid hydrofoil that had two degrees of freedom. The results, compared with corresponding experimental measurements, indicated a discrepancy between theoretical and experimental flutter speed at low-density ratios; the predicted asymptotic behavior of flutter speeds occurred, but at a lower density ratio. In addition, the accuracy of the circulation terms is more doubtful than that of the added mass and linear terms in the theory.