## **REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

Form Approved			
OMB NO. 0704-0188			

UL

Public Reporting burden for this collection of gathering and maintaining the data needed, an of information, including suggestions for redu Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and t	information is estimated to average 1 hour per d completing and reviewing the collection of in cing this burden, to Washington Headquarters o the Office of Management and Budget, Paper	response, including the formation. Send comm Services, Directorate for work Reduction Project	time for reviewing instructio ent regarding this burden esti r information Operations and (0704-0188,) Washington, D	ns, searching existing data sources, imates or any other aspect of this collection Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, DC 20503.
1. AGENCY USE ONLY ( Leave Blank	) 2. REPORT DATE	02/21/2005	3. REPORT TYPE AND FINAL – 6/1/2004 to	D DATES COVERED D 2/28/2005
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Wing Force & Moment Characterization of Flapping Wings for Micro Air Vehicle Application		5. FUNDING NUMBE C: W911NF-04-1-	RS 0110	
6. AUTHOR(S) Zaeem A. Khan and Sunil S	unil K. Agrawal			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION N University of Delaware Newark, DE 19716	AME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		8. PERFORMING ORC REPORT NUMBER	GANIZATION
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AG	ENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSORING / M AGENCY REPOR	ONITORING I NUMBER
U. S. Army Research Office P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, No	• C 27709-2211		46897.1-EG-II	
<ol> <li>SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views, opinions and/or Department of the Army position</li> </ol>	findings contained in this report a n, policy or decision, unless so de	re those of the au signated by other	thor(s) and should no documentation.	ot be construed as an official
12 a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILIT	TY STATEMENT		12 b. DISTRIBUTION	CODE
Approved for public release;	distribution unlimited.			
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)	)			
This paper presents a general For this purpose, a dynamically s pattern. A quasi-steady aerodyn mechanisms. This model additio data. 24 kinematic patterns were focus of the present work is on h future.	method for investigating the unste caled robotic flapper was designe amic model and wing testing meth nally accounts for the wing twistin a tested and the quasi-steady aerc overing flight, however, the metho	ady aerodynamic d and fabricated v lodology was dev g. The experime dynamic model c dology is general	is of flapping wings for which can flap the wi eloped based on uns intal results show a g compares well with th and can be extended	or micro air vehicle application. ngs in a desired kinematic steady aerodynamic ood agreement with published e experimental results. The d to slow forward flight in
14. SUBJECT TERMS				15. NUMBER OF PAGES
				18
			F	16. PRICE CODE
17 SECURITY OF ASSUREMENTAN	10 SECURITY OF A CONTRACTION	10. 0500 15 1917		
OR REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	ON THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	OF ABSTRAC	TASSIFICATION	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

## Wing Force and Moment Characterization of Flapping Wings for Micro Air Vehicle Application

Zaeem A. Khan, Graduate Student, Sunil K. Agrawal. Ph.D., Professor

Department of Mechanical Engineering University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716 agrawal@me.udel.edu

*Abstract*— This paper presents a general method for investigating the unsteady aerodynamics of flapping wings for micro air vehicle application. For this purpose, a dynamically scaled robotic flapper was designed and fabricated which can flap the wings in a desired kinematic pattern. A quasisteady aerodynamic model and wing testing methodology was developed based on unsteady aerodynamic mechanisms. This model additionally accounts for the wing twisting. The experimental results show a good agreement with published data. 24 kinematic patterns were tested and the quasi-steady aerodynamic model compares well with the experimental results. The focus of the present work is on hovering flight, however, the methodology is general and can be extended to slow forward flight in future.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The creation of flapping wing micro air vehicles (FW-MAV) is a challenging problem. Flapping wing flight offers high maneuverablity and the capability to hover as witnessed in insects and hummingbirds. These properties make FWMAVs more suitable for micro air vehicle missions such as reconnaissance and surveillance, specially, in confined areas. The aerodynamics of flapping wings, such as that of insects and hummingbirds, is unsteady. The flow over the wings is a function of time and this makes unsteady aerodynamics extremely complex. Unlike conventional fixed and rotary wing vehicles, the flapping wing aerodynamics is still a largely unexplored area.

As shown in Fig. 1, the aerodynamic module is fundamental to the design process of a FWMAV. The module takes the wing and body kinematics as inputs and gives the aerodynamic forces and torques. These are then used to compute the rigid body dynamics, navigation and control algorithms, and to perform design optimization.

Due to the complexity of solving Navier-Stokes equation [2] for flow around flapping wings and possible inaccuracies in the theoretical modeling, we have selected the experimental method to determine the aerodynamic forces and moments based on blade element analysis. Experimental investigation of flapping wing aerodynamics based on fruit fly (Drosophila) kinematics has been reported [9]. Flow visualization experiments using scaled hawkmoth wings were performed [7, 8]. These experiments led to the discovery of certain unsteady aerodynamic mechanisms that are responsible for high lift in biological flying species.



Fig. 1. The architecture of FW-MAV Design

In our work, we conduct experiments on flapping wings using a robotic flapper. However, our focus is the FWMAV aerodynamics and design. Therefore, we keep the wing kinematics to be very general and use a generic insect-like wing for testing. We have taken into account the effects of wing twist along the span, since wings of large insects and hummingbirds show marked twisting compared to small insects such as Drosophila. The moments and the location of force on the wing are also determined experimentally using a six-axis force torque sensor. We also present a mathematical model of flapping wing aerodynamics which constitutes the aerodynamic module.

The main goal of this paper is to present a method for determining the force coefficients to be used in the aerodynamic model. Using this methodology, the coefficients of a number of wing shapes and geometries can be catalogued analogous to NACA airfoil sections. This information can then be utilized for designing insect-like MAV's or for comparison of aerodynamic characteristics of different wing planforms.

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section II describes the flapping wing kinematics. Section III presents a derivation of the aerodynamic model along with the assumptions. Section IV outlines the experimental setup. In Section V, we present a modification to the aerodynamic model based on the initial experimental data. Section VI

explains the methodology of determining the coefficients in the aerodynamic model. In Section VII, the experimental results are compared with published data and in Section VIII, we compare the quasi-steady aerodynamic model with the experimental results. Finally, conclusions are presented in Section IX.

## **II. KINEMATICS**

#### A. Wing motion analysis

We consider the left wing of a typical insect. For the right wing motion, a similar but different rotation sequence is required and will not be considered here. As shown in Fig. 2, the wing frame  $(x_w, y_w, z_w)$  can be described by three succesive rotations with respect to frame  $(x_s, y_s, z_s)$  attached at the wing base. First, rotation about  $z_s$  axis by an angle  $\phi$ , next a rotation about the current x' axis by an angle  $\theta$  and finally rotation about the current y'' axis by an angle  $\psi$ . Therefore, the wing position is given by the body sequence 3-1-2 rotation and by angles  $(\phi, \theta, \psi)$ . The  $y_w$  axis attached to the wing is the feather axis.



Fig. 2. Figure showing the body sequence 3-1-2 which gives the three rotation angles  $(\phi, \theta, \psi)$ 

Wing angles can be a represented by Fourier series given below [10]:

$$\phi(t) = \phi_o + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Phi_n \sin(n\omega t + \zeta_{\phi_n}), \tag{1}$$

$$\theta(t) = \theta_o + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Theta_n \sin(n\omega t + \zeta_{\theta_n}), \qquad (2)$$

$$\psi(t) = \psi_o + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Psi_n \sin(n\omega t + \zeta_{\psi_n}), \qquad (3)$$

where  $\omega$  is the flapping speed in radians/sec,  $\Phi_n$ ,  $\Theta_n$ ,  $\Psi_n$  are the flapping amplitudes and  $\zeta_{\phi_n}$ ,  $\zeta_{\theta_n}$  and  $\zeta_{\psi_n}$  are the phase differences.

## B. Terminology

#### Stroke plane

The plane defined by  $(x_s, y_s)$  axes represents the stroke plane as shown in Fig. 2. The frame  $(x_s, y_s, z_s)$  is referred to as the *stroke plane frame*. The motion of the feather axis is not necessarily confined to the stroke plane due to  $\theta$ , the elevation or out of stroke plane angle.

## Planar flapping

If the out of stroke plane angle  $\theta$  is zero, the motion is called planar flapping. In this paper, we will consider planar flapping.



Fig. 3. Motion terminology: (A) Rotational Motion of a wing section about the feather axis given by  $\psi$ . (B) Translational motion of the section about the flapping axis given by  $\phi$ . The difference between flapping translation and linear translation is shown in (C) and (D).

## Translational motion

Linear translation [11] is the wing motion where the entire wing moves forward perpendicular to the feather axis in such a way that the velocity of the base and the tip of the wing are the same as shown in Fig. 3(D). Therefore, every section of the wing moves along a straight line path with the same velocity. A conventional aircraft wing undergoes linear translation. In flapping translation [11], the wing tip rotates around the flapping axis fixed at the base as shown in Fig. 3(C). Therefore, the velocity along the wing increases linearly from the root to the tip such that a section of the wing translates along a circular path as shown in Fig. 3(B). Insect wings undergo flapping translation. A section of helicopter rotor blade undergoes flapping translation since the section follows a circular path. However, unlike insect flapping motion, it can trace a complete circle. For a wing section located at a distance r from the flapping axis, the translational speed  $|\bar{u}_T(r,t)|$  is given by  $\dot{\phi}r$  as shown in Fig 4(C) and the translational acceleration along the circular path is  $\ddot{\phi}r$ .

#### Flap amplitude

For a single frequency motion, the flap amplitude is an important parameter of the wing kinematics, denoted by  $\Phi$  as shown in Fig. 3(B). The total stroke amplitude is labeled as  $\overline{\Phi}$ , which is twice the flap amplitude  $\Phi$ .  $\Phi_0$  is the mean stroke amplitude. The *mid* – *stroke* is that position of the wing where  $\phi = \Phi_0$  as shown in Fig. 3(B). When  $\Phi_0 \neq 0$ , the motion is called *asymetric flapping*. When  $\Phi_0 = 0$ , the motion is referred to as *symmetric flapping*.

#### Rotational motion

Wing rotation refers to the rotation of the wing about the feather axis through an angle  $\psi$  as shown in Fig. 3(A) and given by Eq. (3). Flapping wing typically rotates at the extremes of the stroke. When the wing goes from upstroke to downstroke, the rotation is called *pronation*. Similarly, rotation between downstroke and upstroke is called *supination*. The rotational speed and rotational acceleration are  $\dot{\psi}$  and  $\ddot{\psi}$ , respectively.

#### Rotational amplitude

The rotational amplitude is denoted by  $\Psi$ . As shown in Fig 3(A),  $\Psi_0$  is the mean rotational amplitude. For symmetric rotation,  $\Psi_0 = 0$ , otherwise the motion is referred to as asymetric rotation.

## Angle of attack

The angle of attack is the angle between the chord at a location r from the wing base and the relative flow velocity  $\bar{u}_T(r, t)$ . Mathematically,  $\alpha$  is given by

$$\alpha = \pm tan(\frac{u_n}{u_t}) \quad , \quad -\pi/2 < \alpha < \pi/2, \tag{4}$$

where  $u_t$  and  $u_n$  are the components of  $\bar{u}_T(r, t)$  along the normal  $\hat{n}$  and axial  $\hat{t}$  axes fixed to the airfoil section shown in Fig. 4(B). The  $\pm$  in Eq. (4) takes the sign of  $u_t$ .

## *Mean angle of attack* $(\bar{\alpha})$

We define the mean angle of attack  $\bar{\alpha}$  as the angle of attack of a section located at a distance  $\hat{r}_2 R$  along the span and having the chord length equal to the mean chord  $\bar{c}$  [3].  $\hat{r}_2$  is the radius of gyration of the wing area nondimensionalized by the wing length R [3]. Therefore,  $\bar{\alpha}$  is given by Eq. (4)

$$\bar{\alpha} = \pm \arctan\left(\frac{u_n(\hat{r}_2 R, t)}{u_t(\hat{r}_2 R, t)}\right) \ , \ -\pi/2 < \bar{\alpha} < \pi/2$$
 (5)



Fig. 4. (A) Wing geometry of a typical insect. (B) shows the definition of angle of attack at a wing section. (C) The angle of attack remains constant during the translational motion of a section. If translational speed  $|\bar{u}_T(r,t)| = \phi r$  is also held constant, then the flow over the section is steady-state.

#### III. AERODYNAMIC MODEL

## A. Quasi-steady state analysis

If the flow velocity at a location on the wing does not change with respect to time, it is referred to as steady state flow. In order to maintain steady state flow over an airfoil section, it is required that the section be placed in a flow of constant velocity  $U_{\infty}$  and at a fixed orientation, i.e, the angle of attack  $\alpha$  with respect to time be fixed in an inertial frame. The steady-state aerodynamic force is given by

$$F = C_F(\alpha) 1/2 \ \rho \ U_\infty^2 A. \tag{6}$$

where F is the aerodynamic force such as lift or drag,  $U_{\infty}$  is the relative flow velocity, A is the wing area and  $\rho$  is the air density.  $C_F(\alpha)$  is the coefficient of the aerodynamic force. It is a function of the angle of attack  $\alpha$  of the wing.

The steady state force equation for flapping wing can be derived using the blade element method (BEM). The force on a strip of wing at a distance r from the flapping axis is given by

$$dF = C_F(\alpha) 1/2 \ \rho \ |\bar{u}_T(r,t)|^2 c(r) dr, \tag{7}$$

where  $C_F(\alpha)$  is the force coefficient of an element of the wing which is a function of the local angle of attack  $\alpha$  and c(r)dr is the area of the section as shown in Fig. 4(A). Eq. (7) can be integrated for the entire wing as follows

$$F = 1/2 \ \rho \ \int_0^R C_F(\alpha) \ |\bar{u}_T(r,t)|^2 c(r) dr, \tag{8}$$

The force coefficient can also be defined for the entire wing based on the mean angle of attack  $\bar{\alpha}$ . Therefore, Eq. (8) can be written as

$$F = C_F(\bar{\alpha}) 1/2 \ \rho \ \int_0^R \ |\bar{u}_T(r,t)|^2 c(r) dr.$$
(9)

In the hope of finding approximate analytical solutions to the flapping wing aerodynamics, simplified models based on quasi-steady state assumption have been developed [15]. According to quasi-steady state assumption, the motion kinematics during flapping cycle is replaced by a series of static positions having instantaneous velocity and angle of attack [3]. The force is determined using Eq. (7) or (8) which is not a function of wing rotation and acceleration. It is only a function of the translational velocity  $\bar{u}_T(r,t)$ of the wing. Therefore, we refer to quasi-steady state force as the translational force. In this method, any time dependence of the aerodynamic force arises from the time dependence of the kinematics but not that of the fluid flow itself. Ellington [3] used quasi-steady analysis to investigate insect flight and determined that the analysis underestimated the lift required to support an insect during hovering and concluded that a substantial revision of the quasi-steady method is necessary. He further proposed that the quasi-steady state model must include wing rotation in addition to flapping translation.

#### B. Quasi-unsteady state analysis

Since Ellington's investigation [3], several researchers have provided more data to support the insufficiency of the quasi-steady model (Ennos, 1989a; Zanker and Gotz, 1990; Dudley, 1991). These developments have spurred the search for specific unsteady mechanisms and mathematical models to explain the aerodynamic forces on insect wings. Dickinson [9],[12] used experimental investigation to determine the aerodynamics of hovering fruitfly. According to Dickinson [12], the total instantaneous aerodynamic force on the wing can be represented as a sum of four force components given below;

$$F_{inst} = F_a + F_{trans} + F_{rot} + F_{wc}, \tag{10}$$

where  $F_{inst}$  is the instantaneous aerodynamic force,  $F_a$  is the force due to virtual mass effect and  $F_{trans}$  is the instantaneous translational force,  $F_{rot}$  is the rotational force and  $F_{wc}$  is the force due to wake capture. Dickinson did not provide a mathematical form for wake capture effect. However, wake capture effect was identified from the experimental data. Delaurier [1] presented a theoretical model of flapping wings based on circulation theory of lift. In Delaurier's model, the wake capture effect is also modeled in addition to rotational and virtual mass forces. Walker [13] also presented a semi-empirical model of flapping with an alternate mathematical form for the rotational force. Walker applied this model to the fruitfly wing and found good comparison with both the experimental results of fruitfly experiment by Dickinson et

al and the CFD-modeled forces on the virtual fruitfly wing (Sun and Tang, 2002 [16]).

Based on a study of quasi-unsteady aerodynamic models presented by Dickinson [12], Delaurier [1] and Walker [13], we modify the quasi-steady model given by Eq. (8) as follows

$$F_T = F_{steady}(\dot{\phi}) + F_{unsteady}(\dot{\phi}, \dot{\psi}, \ddot{\phi}, \ddot{\psi}), \qquad (11)$$

where  $F_T$  is the total instantaneous force on the wing,  $F_{steady}$  is the steady state or translational force given by Eq. (9) and  $F_{unsteady}$  is the unsteady force which is a function of wing rotation and acceleration. In this paper, we will refer to this method as quasi-unsteady since the total force  $F_T$  is implicitly dependent on time. The current focus is to determine the mathematical form of  $F_{unsteady}$ .

## C. Unsteady effects

## Leading edge vortex (LEV) Force

When a thin wing translates at a high angle of attack close to the stall, the flow breaks up at the leading edge and rolls into a leading edge vortex (LEV). The presence of this vortex increases the circulation and, thereby, the lift force significantly. In conventional airplane wings, this effect occurs momentarily before stall. However, in insects such as hawkmoths, the flapping translation motion stabilizes the vortex and it remains attached to the wing during the entire stroke [2], [7]. LEV was shown to remains attached even in rotating wings at high angles of attack [5], [6]. Therefore, based on this study, we conclude that LEV force is not a function of wing rotation and acceleration and it can be modeled by steady-state Eq. (9) which can be written as

$$F_{lev} = C_1(\bar{\alpha}) 1/2\rho \int_0^R |\bar{u}_T(r,t)|^2 c(r) dr = C_1 F_1.$$
(12)

Equation (12) can be thought of as a product of a function  $F_1 = 1/2 \rho \int_0^R |\bar{u}_T(r,t)|^2 c(r) dr$  which captures the physics of  $F_{steady} = F_{lev}$  and a coefficient  $C_1 = C_1(\bar{\alpha})$  that adjusts the magnitude. Since  $F_{lev}$  is generated during the translational phase of wing motion, it can be referred to as translational force.

#### Rotational Force

If the wing rotates about the feather axis with an angular rate  $\dot{\psi}$ , a rotational circulation force is generated [12]. In this paper, we use the mathematical form of rotational force given by Walker [13]. It says that rotational force can be modeled by selecting the flow velocity  $|\bar{u}_T(r,t)|$ in Eq. (12) at a location 'i' along the chord as shown in the Fig. 5(A). The total flow velocity  $\bar{u}(r,t)$  can be written as a vector sum of translational velocity  $\bar{u}_T(r,t)$ and rotational velocity  $\bar{u}_R(r,t)$ . The magnitude of  $\bar{u}_R(r,t)$ is dependent on  $d_o$  and  $d_i$  which are percentage distances along the chord c(r). The parameter  $d_i$  is an unknown constant while  $d_o$  is known from wing geometry and can vary along the span. Therefore  $d_o = d_o(r)$ . The coefficient of rotational force  $C_2$  appears as the non-dimensional parameter  $d_i - d_o(r)$  in the expression for  $|\bar{u}(r, t)|$  which can be adjusted to scale the rotational force. Therefore,

$$C_2(r) = d_i - d_o(r).$$
(13)

Note that if the rotational axis lies ahead of the leading edge then  $d_o(r)$  should be taken as negative. Therefore  $C_2$  can vary along the span depending upon the wing geometry unless  $d_o(r) = 0$ . The combined LEV and rotational force is given as

$$F_{lev+rot} = C_1 1/2 \ \rho \ \int_0^R \ |\bar{u}(r,t)|^2 c(r) dr, \tag{14}$$

where the coefficient  $C_2$  appears in the expression for  $|\bar{u}(r,t)|$ . If the wing has only translation, i.e,  $\dot{\psi}$  is zero, then Eq. (14) simplifies to Eq. (12) and we get the translational force only. In Fig. 5(A), note that the angle of attack  $\alpha$  due to combined rotational and translational velocity is greater than  $\alpha_T$  due to translational velocity alone.



Fig. 5. (A) The combined rotational and translational/LEV effect on a wing section located at a distance 'r' from the flapping axis.  $\bar{u}_T(r,t)$  is the translational velocity,  $\bar{u}_R(r,t)$  is the rotational velocity and  $\bar{u}_(r,t)$  is the vector sum of translational and rotational velocities. (B) Virtual mass force acting at a section located at a distance 'r' from the flapping axis. Here,  $\dot{u}_n(r,t)$  is the component of acceleration normal to the wing surface in the wing frame and 'dm' is the mass of air assumed to be contained in a cylinder of diameter c(r) and height dr.

#### Virtual Mass force

As the wing accelerates, it moves along with it a mass of air, assumed to be contained in a cylinder with diameter equal to the chord [1], [3]. The acceleration of this mass of air shows up as a virtual mass force (see Fig. 5(B)) and can be written as

$$dF_{virtual\ mass} = dm\ \dot{u}_n(r,t),\tag{15}$$

where  $\dot{u}_n(r,t)$  is the rate of change of normal velocity component at the mid-chord location in the wing frame and dm is the mass of air enclosed in a thin cylinder of width dr and a diameter equal to the chord c at a distance r from the flappping axis. The mass of air is  $\rho \pi c^2/4$ . Therefore, Eq. (15) can be written as

$$dF_{virtual\ mass} = \frac{\rho\pi}{4} \dot{u}_n(r,t)c(r)^2 dr.$$
 (16)

On integrating Eq. (16) from root to the tip of the wing, we get the total force given by

$$F_{virtual\ mass} = C_3 \frac{\rho \pi}{4} \int_0^R \dot{u}_n(r,t) c(r)^2 dr = C_3 F_3 \quad (17)$$

The coefficient of virtual mass  $C_3$  is included in order to adjust the magnitude while the function  $F_3$  captures the physics of virtual mass effect.

## D. Total Force

The total aerodynamic force including translational (LEV effect), rotational and virtual mass effects can be written as

$$F_T \cong C_1 \frac{\rho}{2} \int_0^R |\bar{u}(r,t)|^2 c(r) dr + C_3 \frac{\rho \pi}{4} \int_0^R \dot{u}_n(r,t) c(r)^2 dr.$$
(18)

Here, the LEV and rotational forces are combined as the first term in the above equation.  $C_1$  and  $C_3$  are the coefficients of LEV and virtual mass force respectively. The coefficient of rotational force,  $C_2$ , appears implicitly in  $\bar{u}(r, t)$ .

- E. Assumptions in the model
  - Superposition of steady and unsteady aerodynamic effects holds.
  - LEV force can be modeled by the steady-state aerodynamic equation.
  - Chordwise-force due to skin friction is ignored. This is based on the results of revolving wing experiments [5],[6].
  - The total force  $F_T$  acts normal to the chord throughout the flapping cycle, i.e, we assume that  $C_1F_1$ ,  $F_2(C_1C_2)$  and  $C_3F_3$  act normal to the chord at every section of the wing.
  - The total force  $F_T$  acts at the mid-chord location at every section of the wing.

#### **IV. EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION**

#### A. Flow similarity

In order to determine the coefficients  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$  and  $C_3$ in Eq. (18), we conducted experimental investigation. The basis of experimental investigation is flow similarity which ensures that the coefficients are similar for the actual and the experimental wing. In order to achieve flow similarity, the reduced frequency parameter K along with Reynolds number Re and wing geometry should match for the actual and experimental wing. The wing size, flapping speed and fluid medium can be different. Therefore,

$$C_1 = C_2 = f(Re, K, geometry) \tag{19}$$

It is shown in [17] that the virtual mass force depends on Reynolds number and wing geometry

$$C_3 = f(Re, geometry) \tag{20}$$

The flow Reynolds number Re and reduced frequency K for the case of hovering flapping flight are given by [4, 10]

$$Re = \frac{8\Phi R^2 f}{\nu \Lambda}$$
,  $K = \frac{\pi}{2\Phi\Lambda}$ . (21)

where  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity of the fluid medium, R is the wing length,  $\Phi$  is the flapping amplitude, f is the flapping frequency in cycles/sec and  $\Lambda$  is the wing aspect ratio. Reduced frequency K is a measure of unsteadiness of the flow.

#### B. Robotic Flapper

In order to conduct experimental investigation, a robotic flapper was designed and fabricated at the University of Delaware. It is shown in Fig. 6. The flapper is driven by three independent servo motors designed to give three degrees-of-freedom flapping motion, i.e,  $\phi$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\psi$ .

## Flapper Kinematics

In our experiments, we keep the out of plane motion  $\theta = 0$ . This simplifies the kinematics but still retains the features of wing motion. The flapper coordinate system is shown in Fig. 7(A). For the case of hovering flight, the body of FWMAV is assumed to be stationary with respect to the earth. The body frame  $f_o(\hat{x}_0, \hat{y}_0, \hat{z}_0)$  is also the inertial frame. The rotation matrices between the body frame and frame  $f_1(\hat{x}_1, \hat{y}_1, \hat{z}_1)$  and between  $f_1$  and wing frame  $f_3(\hat{x}_3, \hat{y}_3, \hat{z}_3)$  are given by:

$$R_0^1 = \begin{pmatrix} C_{\phi} & 0 & S_{\phi} \\ S_{\phi} & 0 & -C_{\phi} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \ R_1^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ C_{\psi} & -S_{\psi} & 0 \\ S_{\psi} & C_{\psi} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
(22)

The frame  $f_4(\hat{x}_4, \hat{y}_4, \hat{z}_4)$  is the force/torque sensor frame. The  $F_x, F_y, F_z$  are the sensor read forces along



Fig. 6. Figure shows the robotic flapper designed and fabricated at University of Delaware. It is driven by three independent servo motors and can give 3-DOF flapping wing motion. A six-axis force torque sensor (Nano 17) from ATI industrial automation is mounted at the base of the wing. The aerodynamic forces and torques along with wing position can be seen real time with the help of this apparatus.

the directions  $(\hat{x}_4, \hat{y}_4, \hat{z}_4)$  respectively. The rotation matrix between the wing frame  $f_3$  and sensor frame  $f_4$  is given by

$$R_3^4 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & -1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$
 (23)

and

$$R_{0}^{4} = R_{0}^{1} R_{1}^{3} R_{3}^{4} = \begin{pmatrix} -S_{\phi} S_{\psi} & -S_{\phi} C_{\psi} & C_{\phi} \\ C_{\phi} S_{\psi} & C_{\phi} C_{\psi} & S_{\phi} \\ -C_{\psi} & S_{\psi} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (24)

The lift, drag force is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0\\Lift\\Drag \end{pmatrix} = R_1^4 \begin{pmatrix} F_x\\F_y\\F_z \end{pmatrix},$$
(25)

where Lift and Drag are along  $\hat{y}_1$  and  $\hat{z}_1$  direction respectively. Similarly, the vertical and horizontal force is given by.

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0\\F_h\\F_v \end{pmatrix} = R_0^4 \begin{pmatrix} F_x\\F_y\\F_z \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (26)

where  $F_h$  is the horizontal force and  $F_v$  is the vertical force along the directions  $\hat{y}_o$  and  $\hat{z}_o$  respectively. Due to symmetry, we expect the force along the  $\hat{x}_0$  direction to



Fig. 7. (A) Figure shows the sensor co-ordinate frame  $f_4$  and the postive direction of force and moment components  $(F_x, F_y, F_z, M_x, M_y, M_z)$ . The direction of lift, drag, vertical and horizontal force are also identified. (B) Wing Planform used in the experiment.

cancel by the two opposite wings. The angular velocity of wing with respect to the earth frame is given by

$$\omega_{3/0} = \dot{\phi}\hat{z_o} + \dot{\psi}\hat{z_3}.$$
 (27)

Therefore, velocity of air at the point 'i' on the wing in frame  $f_4$  is given by

$$\bar{u}(r,t) = -\dot{\phi}r\sin\psi\hat{x}_{4} - (\dot{\phi}r\cos\psi + C_{2}c(r)\dot{\psi})\hat{y}_{4} + C_{2}c(r)\dot{\phi}\sin\psi\hat{z}_{4}.$$
 (28)

For the estimation of total aerodynamic force given by Eq. (18), the velocity and normal acceleration components are required. For the robotic flapper, these are given by

$$|\bar{u}(r,t)|^{2} = (\dot{\phi}r\sin\psi)^{2} + (\dot{\phi}r\cos\psi + C_{2}c(r)\dot{\psi})^{2}, \quad (29)$$

$$\dot{u}_n(r,t) = -(\ddot{\phi}r\cos\psi - \dot{\psi}\dot{\phi}\sin\psi + 0.5c(r)\ \ddot{\psi}), \quad (30)$$

where the velocity of air in the  $\hat{z}_4$  direction is ignored because it is in the spanwise direction and does not contribute to the force. For estimation of  $\bar{\alpha}$ , given by Eq. (5), the normal and tangential velocity components in the  $\hat{y}_4$  and  $\hat{x}_4$  directions respectively are given by

$$u_n(\hat{r}_2 R, t) = -(\dot{\phi}\hat{r}_2 R\cos\psi + C_2 \bar{c}\dot{\psi}), \qquad (31)$$

$$u_t(\hat{r}_2 R, t) = -\dot{\phi}\hat{r}_2 R\sin\psi. \tag{32}$$

If we substitute  $|\bar{u}(r,t)|^2$  and  $\dot{u}_n(r,t)$  given by Eqs. (29) and (30) into Eq. (18), we get the total force as

$$F_T = C_1 F_1 + F_2(C_1, C_2) + C_3 F_3, \tag{33}$$

where

$$F_{1} = \frac{\rho}{2} \dot{\phi}^{2} \int_{0}^{R} r^{2} c(r) dr$$
 (34)

$$F_{2} = \frac{\rho}{2} [2C_{1}C_{2}\dot{\psi}\dot{\phi}\cos\psi\int_{0}^{R}rc(r)^{2}dr + C_{2}^{2}\dot{\psi}^{2}\int_{0}^{R}c(r)^{3}dr]$$
(35)

$$F_{3} = \frac{\rho \pi}{4} \left[ -\ddot{\phi} \cos \psi \int_{0}^{R} rc(r)^{2} dr + \dot{\psi} \dot{\phi} \sin \psi \int_{0}^{R} c(r)^{2} dr - 0.5 \ddot{\psi} \int_{0}^{R} c(r)^{3} dr \right]$$
(36)

where  $C_1F_1$  is the steady-state or LEV force,  $C_3F_3$  is the virtual mass force. The function  $F_2$  captures the rotational force and it is an implicit function of the coefficients  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . The integrals are a function of wing geometry.

#### C. Wing Design

Size and shape: The size of the wing can be determined from Eq. (21) based on Reynolds number. Reynolds number of hummingbird (*Lampornis clemenciae*) is 14,300 with a wing length of 85 mm, aspect ratio of 8.2, total stroke amplitude of 151 deg and a flapping frequency of 23.3 cycles/sec. A flapping wing MAV capable of hovering flight will be similar to a hummingbird in size and therefore the anticipated *Re* range for FWMAV design is between 12,000-25,000. Based on this *Re* range, we selected a generic insect-like wing shape for experiment shown in Fig. 7(B). It has the following scaled dimensions:

- Wing length R = 0.58m,
- Aspect ratio  $\Lambda = 5.7677$ ,
- $\hat{r}_2 = 0.5628$  (dimensionless).
- Scaled flapping frequency = 0.5 cycles/sec

The wing geometry is given in Table I. Each element has constant width, i.e dr = 0.05 meters.

#### Wing fabrication

The wing structure is made of carbon rods representing the veins in a typical insect wing or feathers in hummingbird's wing. Carbon rods radiate from the triangular wing base made of balsa block. A cellophane membrane was attached to the structure using cellophane tape. The entire wing assembly weighs just 18 grams.

TABLE I WING GEOMETRY USED IN THE EXPERIMENT

section	spanwise location 'r'(m),	chord c(r)(m),	$d_o(r)\%$
1	0.105	0.270	0
2	0.155	0.287	0
3	0.205	0.284	0
4	0.255	0.271	0
5	0.305	0.261	0
6	0.355	0.254	0
7	0.405	0.236	0
8	0.455	0.212	0
9	0.505	0.180	-0.12
10	0.555	0.115	-0.27

#### D. Measurement of Force and Moment

We used ATI Industrial Automation multi-axis forcetorque sensor which can measure three forces  $F_x$ ,  $F_y$ ,  $F_z$ and three moment components  $M_x$ ,  $M_y$ ,  $M_z$ . The sensor can measure a maximum of  $\pm 12$  N in the  $F_x$  and  $F_y$ directions and  $\pm 17$  N in the  $F_z$  direction. The maximum moment range in all directions is  $\pm 120$  N-mm. The resolution for all three force components is 1/1280 N and for all three moment components it is 1/256 N-mm.

In order to reduce noise from the data, we used a simple low pass digital filter [14]. It is given by the following difference equation

$$y(n) = a \ y(n-1) + (1-a) \ x(n), \tag{37}$$

where x(n) represents the discrete-time observed signal with n = 0, 1, 2..N at the sample points. y(n) is the smoothed output and y(-1) = 0. The parameter a is a weighting factor (0 < a < 1) selected between 0.7 and 0.8, depending on the noise in the data.

#### V. INITIAL OBSERVATIONS

The original force and torque data along with filtered data, in the sensor coordinate frame  $f_4$ , for one particular kinematic pattern is shown in Fig. 8. This data includes the forces and moments due to gravity as well as inertia. In order to filter out the aerodynamic force, we used an identical wing but without the membrane (wing B). The wing with the membrane is referred to as wing A. The inertia and gravity loads from wing B were subtracted from wing A to get the aerodynamic force data.

Fig. 9 shows the aerodynamic and inertia loads from wing A, the inertia loads from wing B and the aerodynamic force in the sensor  $F_x$ ,  $F_y$  and  $F_z$  directions for one stroke. A ten degree polynomial fit was done on the aerodynamic data to further smooth out the noise.

We know from revolving wing experiments [5], [6] that at high angles of attack ( $10^{\circ}$  and up), the aerodynamic force is roughly normal to the wing surface and this was the assumption made in our aerodynamic model. This implies that the sensor should only detect the  $F_y$  component of force. However, initial results revealed the presence of  $F_x$ 



Fig. 8. Force Data in sensor frame  $f_4$  of wing A and wing B (before and after filtering). The unit of force is 'N' (Newtons) and the unit of moment is 'N-mm'

and  $F_z$  components of the force besides the  $F_y$  component as shown in Fig. 8. From observations of the wing during the experiment, we concluded that the wing deforms due to the aerodynamic loads. Both spanwise bending and twist were present which are discussed separately below.

## Spanwise Bending

Initially, the  $F_z$  data appeared simply as noise as shown in Fig. 8. However, after processing the data for one complete cycle, we observed that there was a definite aerodynamic force in the  $F_z$  direction. Fig. 9 shows the aerodynamic force  $F_z$  along the sensor  $\hat{z}_4$  direction which is along the leading edge or feather axis of the wing (see Fig. 7(A)). If we examine the inertia loads from wing B, we see that there is a positive  $F_z$  force. This is most likely due to the centrifugal force trying to pull the wing out from the sensor. The results from wing A show a slight negative  $F_z$  force. We conclude that the possible explaination for the aerodynamic force in the negative  $F_z$  direction is wing bending as shown in Fig. 10(A). The aerodynamic force acts normal to every element of the wing and it is greatest close to the wing tip. The resultant aerodynamic force  $F_T$  bends the wing and creates a negative  $F_z$  component which seems to overcome the centrifugal force in this particular case. This can be further validated by the fact that the  $F_z$  component of aerodynamic force was found to be symmetric between the upstroke and downstroke.

#### Spanwise twist

Fig. 9 shows the aerodynamic force in the negative  $F_x$  direction. This was found during both the upstroke and the downstroke. The negative  $F_x$  force is most likely due to a twist along the wing length with the tip chord at an angle of roughly 10 to 20 degrees with respect to the root chord. As



Fig. 9. Aerodynamic + inertia force of wing A, inertia force for wing B and filtered aerodynamic force for wing A during the upstroke. The unit of force is Newtons. A ten-degree polynomial fit is done on the aerodynamic data.

shown in Fig. 10(B), the  $i^{th}$  element of the wing undergoes twisting by an angle  $\delta \psi_i$ . The aerodynamic force  $dF_T^i$  still remains normal to the  $i^{th}$  element but it contributes a force in the negative  $F_x$  direction with respect to the sensor frame.

#### A. Modifications to the aerodynamic model

In order to better match the experimental results, the aerodynamic model should involve structural deflections to match with the physical wing. As a first approximation, we ignore the  $F_z$  component by assuming infinite rigidity in bending. We model twist by assuming a linear variation of twist from root to the tip of the wing. The twist  $\delta \psi_i$  at the  $i^{th}$  section is given by

$$\delta\psi_i = \beta \frac{r_i - 0.08}{R - 0.08},$$
(38)

where the unit of  $r_i$  and R is meters and 0.08 is the distance in meters between the root chord and the flapping axis and  $\beta$  is the magnitude of twist proportional to the aerodynamic moment about the feather axis. The inertial moment is ignored due to low flapping frequency of 0.5 Hz. The aerodynamic moment is assumed to be proportional to the normal velocity which is computed at a point located at a distance of  $r = \hat{r}_2 R$  along the span from the flapping



Fig. 10. (A) Shows how the spanwise bending creates a  $-F_z$  component of the aerodynamic force which acts in  $-\hat{z}_4$  direction in the sensor frame. The centrifugal force acts in the sensor  $+\hat{z}_4$  direction. (B) shows how the spanwise twist  $\delta\psi_i$  at the  $i^{th}$  element contributes to the  $-F_x$  component of aerodynamic force in the sensor frame.

axis and at a distance of  $C_2 \bar{c}$  along the chord from the feather axis. Therefore,

$$\beta = \pm K_{\beta} \left[ u_n(\hat{r}_2 R, t) \right]^2. \tag{39}$$

The normal velocity is squared to give the same effect as aerodynamic force. Here,  $K_{\beta}$  is a coefficient to adjust the magnitude of  $\beta$  variation in a cycle due to normal velocity. In the current experiment the magnitude of the twist is visually matched with the experiment by varying the value of  $K_{\beta}$ . The  $\pm$  takes the sign of  $u_n(\hat{r}_2R, t)$  to give the correct direction of twist. The wing is considered rigid for computation of  $u_n(\hat{r}_2R, t)$ .

Having an approximation of the aerodynamic twist, the total aerodynamic force is integrated vectorially from the root to the tip of the wing. Considering the  $i^{th}$  element of the wing located at a distance  $r_i$  from the flapping axis, the total force can be written as follows:

$$dF_T^i \cong C_1 \frac{\rho}{2} |\bar{u}(r_i, t)|^2 c(r_i) dr_i + C_3 \frac{\rho \pi}{4} \dot{u}_n(r_i, t) c(r_i)^2 dr_i.$$
(40)

Based on the assumption that the total force remains normal to the chord of any  $i^{th}$  element, we can transform this force

into the sensor frame as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} dF_x^i \\ dF_y^i \\ dF_z^i \end{pmatrix}_{sensor} = R_s^i \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ dF_T^i \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_{i^{th}element}, \quad (41)$$

where  $R_s^i$  is the rotation matrix between each blade element and the sensor frame given as

$$R_{s}^{i} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{\delta\psi_{i}} & -S_{\delta\psi_{i}} & 0\\ S_{\delta\psi_{i}} & C_{\delta\psi_{i}} & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (42)

Here,  $\delta \psi_i$  is the angle of twist of the  $i^{th}$  element with respect to the root chord. The moments in the sensor frame can be computed as follows:

$$dM_x^i = -r_i dF_y^i \quad , \quad dM_y^i = r_i dF_x^i, \tag{43}$$

$$dM_{z}^{i} = [a - d_{o}(r_{i})]c(r_{i})dF_{T}^{i},$$
(44)

where  $d_o(r_i)$  is the non-dimensional distance between the rotation axis and the wing leading edge as shown in Fig. 5(A). The non-dimensional distance a = 0.5 gives the mid-chord location of  $dF_T^i$  at every section based on our assumption (see Section III. E).

The forces and moments can be summed in the sensor frame in order to get the total force and moment components

$$F_x = \sum_{i=1}^N dF_x^i, \quad F_y = \sum_{i=1}^N dF_y^i, \quad F_z = \sum_{i=1}^N dF_z^i = 0 \quad (45)$$

$$M_x = \sum_{i=1}^{N} dM_x^i, \quad M_y = \sum_{i=1}^{N} dM_y^i, \quad M_z = \sum_{i=1}^{N} dM_z^i$$
(46)

Since the  $F_z$  component of sensor force is ignored, the resultant force  $F_T$  in the sensor frame can be written as

$$F_T = \sqrt{F_x^2 + F_y^2}.$$
 (47)

The inclusion of moderate spanwise twist will have insignificant effect on the magnitude of  $C_1$  [5]. We further assume that it has no effect on coefficients  $C_2$  and  $C_3$ . Therefore, based on this assumption, the sensor output,  $F_T$ could still be used to find the coefficients using Eq. (33) for rigid wing by ignoring the twist and Eq. (40) and Eq. (45) can then be used to determine the force components by taking into account the twist. In the computation of kinematics and angle of attack, the twist  $\delta \psi_i$  is ignored.

#### VI. DETERMINATION OF COEFFICIENTS

The sensor measures the total aerodynamic force  $F_T$  given by Eq. (47). The functions  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  in Eq. (33) capture the physics of the particular unsteady effect and the coefficients simply adjust the magnitude. Once the magnitudes of  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  are adjusted at any point during the flapping cycle, these functions are expected to be robust enough to match the experimental data throughout cycle. We determined the coefficients as follows.

#### A. Determination of $C_1$

In order to determine  $C_1$ , we select the flapping kinematics such that the functions  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  become zero at some point in the flapping cycle but  $F_1$  remains non-zero. This means  $\dot{\phi} \neq 0$ , while  $\dot{\psi} = \ddot{\phi} = \ddot{\psi} = 0$ . The following simple kinematic pattern was selected using Eqs. (1)-(3).

$$\phi(t) = \Phi \sin(\omega t) , \quad \phi_o = \zeta_{\phi_n} = 0, \quad n = 1$$
 (48)

$$\theta(t) = 0$$
 ,  $\theta_o = \Theta_n = 0$  (49)

$$\psi(t) = -\Psi\cos(\omega t)$$
,  $\psi_o = 0$ ,  $\zeta_{\psi_n} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ ,  $n = 1$  (50)

This pattern gives maximum values of  $\dot{\phi}$  and  $\ddot{\psi}$  at the mid-stroke position where  $\dot{\psi} = 0$ . The term involving  $\ddot{\psi}$  in  $F_3$  gives the rotational virtual mass effect which is small in comparison to the translational virtual mass effect and therefore we ignore it in subsequent analysis. In other words,  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  both become close to zero and only the translational force,  $F_{lev} = C_1 F_1$  is non-zero at the mid-stroke. Therefore, the sensor measures  $F_T = F_{lev}$  and

$$C_1 = \frac{F_T}{F_1} = \frac{F_{lev}}{1/2\rho \ \dot{\phi}^2 \int_0^R r^2 c(r) dr}, \quad at \ \phi = 0, \quad (51)$$

where  $F_T$  is determined from force sensor components  $F_x$ and  $F_y$ . The integral  $\int_0^R r^2 c(r) dr$  turns out to be simply one half of the second moment of area  $S_2$  [3]. This gives a simple form for the determination of  $C_1$ , i.e,

$$C_1 = \frac{F_{lev}}{1/4 \ \rho \ \dot{\phi}^2 S_2}.$$
 (52)

Procedure

For the safe operation of robotic flapper, the flapping frequency was limited to 0.5 Hz. This together with the wing geometric parameters, gives the Reynolds number Re and reduced frequency K as a function of flap amplitude

$$Re = \frac{15450\pi}{180} \times \Phi$$
,  $K = \frac{0.2725 \times 180}{\pi} \frac{1}{\Phi}$ . (53)

TABLE II Testing scheme

Flap Amplitude $\Phi$ (deg).	Re	K
46	12,404	0.332
63	17,000	0.2477
74.5	20,000	0.2095

TABLE III Angle of Attack at mid-stroke, (  $\phi=0^0$  )

s.no.	Rotational Amplitude $\Psi$ (deg).	$\bar{\alpha}$ (deg)
*	90.0	0.0
1	75.0	15.0
2	64.0	26.0
3	52.4	37.6
4	41.2	48.8
5	30.0	60.0
6	19.0	71.0
7	8.0	82.0
8	0.0	90.0

Three different values of flap amplitude  $\Phi$  were chosen (46, 63, and 74.5 degrees) as shown in Table II. Each flap amplitude gives a different value of Reynolds number Re and reduced frequency K. This conforms with different flap amplitudes of flapping used by biological species.

For each flap amplitude, the rotational amplitude  $\Psi$  and eight correponding  $\bar{\alpha}$  from 0 to 90 degrees were chosen at the mid-stroke position, as shown in Table III. In fact,  $\bar{\alpha}$ varies between -90 and 90 degrees during the cycle, giving two values of force at the same  $\bar{\alpha}$ , differing only in sign. We averaged the two forces and determined an average  $C_1$  corresponding to  $\bar{\alpha}$  at the mid-stroke position. We did not conduct the experiment at  $\bar{\alpha} = 0$  deg and assumed  $C_1(0) = 0$ . This is because normal force is zero on a symmetric flat plate at zero angle of attack. The chordwise friction force is ignored in our model. In all, 24 kinematic patterns were tested.



Fig. 11. Coefficient of LEV/translational force  $C_1$  Vs  $\bar{\alpha}$ 

The plot of  $C_1$  against  $\bar{\alpha}$  is shown in Fig. 11 for the three different stroke amplitudes. This shows that the coefficient of translational force varies linearly with  $\bar{\alpha}$ . Furthermore, the flap amplitude and consequently Re has little effect on the slope  $(dC_1/d\alpha)$ . From Fig 11, we can approximate  $C_1$ as linearly varing with  $\bar{\alpha}$  given by

$$C_1(\bar{\alpha}) = \frac{7}{\pi}\bar{\alpha},\tag{54}$$

where  $\bar{\alpha}$  is in radians.

## B. Determination of $C_2$

 $C_1$  and  $C_2$  occur implicitly in  $F_2$ . Therefore, the best way to determine  $C_2$  is to adjust it untill the model matches with the experimental results. Furthermore,  $C_2 = d_i - d_o(r)$ varies along the span.  $d_o(r)$  is known from the wing geometry and given in Table I. The value of  $C_2$  is based on  $d_i$ . We found that  $d_i = 0.75$  gives best results. In computing  $F_2$ , the coefficient  $C_1$  is considered a known parameter. Therefore,  $C_1$  is determined before  $C_2$ .

## C. Determination of $C_3$

If we modify the kinematic pattern given by Eqs. (48)-(50) by taking  $\Psi = 0^0$  in Eq. (50), then  $F_2$  becomes zero for the entire cycle while  $F_1$  becomes zero at the ends of the stroke, i.e, at  $\phi = \phi_{max}$  and  $\dot{\phi} = 0$ . However,  $F_3$  is maximum there since  $\ddot{\phi}$  is maximum. Therefore, the total force,  $F_T$ , measured by the sensor at the ends of the stroke is due to virtual mass effect.

$$C_3 = \frac{F_T}{F_3} = \frac{F_{virtual\ mass}}{F_3} \quad , \quad at\ \phi = \phi_{max}. \tag{55}$$

The value of  $C_3$  was found to vary between 0.5 and 1.0 for all 24 kinematic patterns.

## VII. COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Most of the published data on flapping wings is for flapping translational motion of the wing, i.e; without rotation. The only way to compare it with our experimental data is to compare it at the mid-stroke of flapping cycle where wing rotation becomes zero instantaneously, for all the kinematic patterns given by Eq. (48-50). Secondly, the published data is in the form of either coefficients of lift and drag or coefficients of vertical and horizontal force. Therefore, in order to compare our experimental data, we determined the coefficients of lift and drag at the mid-stroke position using the lift and drag forces.

## A. Lift, drag, vertical and horizontal force

The aerodynamic force components  $(F_x, F_y, F_z)$  which correspond to  $(\hat{x}_4, \hat{y}_4, \hat{z}_4)$  directions in the sensor frame  $f_4$ , were transformed into lift, drag, vertical and horizontal components for the entire cycle using Eqs. (25) and (26).

As shown in Fig. 12, the lift and vertical components are positive for both the upstroke and downstroke while



Fig. 12. Lift, Drag, horizontal and vertical force components for  $\Phi = 46^{\circ}$  and  $\Psi = 52.4^{\circ}$  in the sensor frame  $f_4$ 

the drag and vertical force components cancel out during the cycle. This is expected since the kinematic pattern given by Eq. (48-50) is symmetric between the upstroke and downstroke. Therefore, a net vertical force is generated corresponding to a hovering flight. A net horizontal and drag component is produced if the kinematic pattern is not symmetric.

#### B. Coefficients of lift and drag force

The coefficient of lift and drag are computed from the lift and drag force plots at the mid-stroke position using Eq. (52).

$$C_L = \frac{Lift}{1/4 \ \rho \ \dot{\phi}^2 S_2} \qquad , \qquad C_D = \frac{Drag}{1/4 \ \rho \ \dot{\phi}^2 S_2} \tag{56}$$

Eq. (52) is applicable since  $C_L$  and  $C_D$  are the decomposition of  $C_1$ . The polar plot of  $C_L$  and  $C_D$  for the three flap amplitudes ( $\Phi = 46, 63, 74.5$  deg) is shown in Fig. 13. The polar plot shows high values of  $C_L$  and  $C_D$  compared to linearly translating wings [5] and compares well with the published data Sane [11], Usherwood and Ellington [5], [6]. The only major difference can be seen at the maximum value of  $C_D$  in Fig. 13 where the plot does not go to zero. This is because we tested a wing which could also twist under the aerodynamic loads. Therefore, at the maximum angle of attack, i.e,  $90^{\circ}$  when the coefficient of drag is maximum (close to 3.5), we get added lift due to spanwise twist. The polar plot also show that the coefficients do not vary with flapping amplitudes. However, for a given flapping frequency, large stroke amplitudes generate greater lift due to the fact that the wings sweep a larger area with higher translational velocity. Therefore, we conclude that large stroke amplitude is vital for generating higher vertical force during hovering flight.



Fig. 13. Lift and drag polar plot for three stroke amplitudes, i.e,  $\Phi = 46^{\circ}, 63^{\circ}, 74.5^{\circ}$ . These coefficients are computed at the mid-stroke position during the flapping cycle similar to the determination of  $C_1$ 

## VIII. COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS WITH AERODYNAMIC MODEL

The coefficients  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  will now be used in the aerodynamic model and comparison will be made with the experimental data. Note that  $C_1$  and  $C_3$  were computed from the experimental data but  $C_2$  was tuned to fit the experimental results. In order to compare the aerodynamic model with the experiment, we will compare two kinematic patterns. From Table III, we select two patterns having rotational amplitude of  $\Psi = 75^{\circ}$  and  $\Psi = 0^{\circ}$  (entries 1 and 8 in Table III). In both cases, the flap amplitude is  $\Phi = 46^{\circ}$ . These represent the extreme cases. The experiment was not conducted at  $\Psi = 90^{\circ}$ . If the model compares well with the experimental data for these two extreme cases, we will have more confidence that the comparison will be good for the patterns in between. The kinematic patterns for these two cases are shown in Fig. 14, where arrows indicate instantaneous direction of motion.

#### A. Comparison of kinematics

In Fig. 15, we compare the flap angle  $\phi$  and rotational angle  $\psi$  with the experimental data from the encoder. The kinematic pattern is given by Eq. (48)-(50). The complete cycle takes 2 seconds at flapping frequency of 0.5 cycles/sec. Note that the maximum value of  $\psi = \Psi$ occurs at the mid-stroke (at time = 50 and 150 millisecs) with a corresponding minimum angle of attack during the entire cycle. The comparison of  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  is good throughout the cycle.

### B. Comparison of twist $\delta \psi$

Fig. 15 also shows the variation of twist  $\delta \psi$  at the tip section during the cycle modeled by Eqs. (38) and (39).



Fig. 14. (A) This kinematic pattern has flapping and rotational amplitudes of  $\Phi = 46^{\circ}$  and  $\Psi = 74.9^{\circ}$  respectively. The arrows indicates instantaneous direction of motion of a wing section. At mid-stroke,  $\dot{\psi} = 0$ , the section is undergoing flapping translation. (B) This kinematic pattern has flapping and rotational amplitudes of  $\Phi = 46^{\circ}$  and  $\Psi = 0^{\circ}$  respectively. Section is undergoing translational motion only. Figure also shows roughly the location of maximum twist  $\delta\psi_{max}$  as observed during the experiment.

The model predicts maximum twist  $\delta \psi_{max}$  at the midstroke position (time = 50, 150 millisecs) for pattern (B). This location is also shown in Fig. 14(B). For pattern (A),  $\delta \psi_{max}$  occurs when the wing passes through the mid-stroke position and roughly close to the end of the stroke as shown in Fig 15. This location is roughly shown in Fig 14(A). This is because  $\delta \psi$  is directly proportional to the normal velocity according to Eq. (38) and (39) which turns out to be the greatest when the wing undergoes both rotational and translational motion near the end of the stroke. Note that Eq. (38) and (39) give an approximate representation of the actual wing twist. The amplitude of twist was matched visually with the physical wing through trial and error by varying  $K_{\beta}$ . During the actual experiment, we did notice the pattern of  $\delta \psi$  at the wing tip similar to Fig. 15 with the maximum twist occuring near the end of the stroke for pattern (A) and at the mid-stroke position for pattern (B).



Fig. 15. Comparison of kinematic patterns, (E)=Experiment, (M)= Model. Pattern (A)  $\Phi = 46^{\circ}$ ,  $\Psi = 74.9^{\circ}$  and Pattern (B)  $\Phi = 46^{\circ}$ ,  $\Psi = 0^{\circ}$  show a good match with the model. Plot also shows the twist  $\delta\psi$  at the tip section computed using Eqs. (38) and (39)

## C. Comparison of $F_y$ component of aerodynamic force

Fig. 16 shows the  $F_y$  component of aerodynamic force in the sensor frame for the two kinematic patterns. Plots (A) and (B) show the force data for the patterns having flapping and rotational amplitudes of  $\Phi = 46^{\circ}$  and  $\Psi = 74.9^{\circ}$  while (C) and (D) represent the pattern having amplitudes of  $\Phi =$  $46^{\circ}$  and  $\Psi = 0^{\circ}$ . The  $F_y$  component was computed using Eq. (45). Figs 16(A) and (C) are the plots of individual aerodynamic mechanisms ( $C_1F_1$ ,  $F_2$ ,  $C_3F_3$ ) which are components of the total force transformed in the sensor  $F_y$ direction for half cycle. Figs 16(B) and (D) shows how the individual aerodynamic mechanisms contribute to the total force and match very well with the experimental results.



Fig. 16. Comparison of  $F_y$  component of total aerodynamic force  $F_T = C_1F_1 + F_2(C_1, C_2) + C_3F_3$ . (A) and (B) shows the comparison for the pattern having amplitudes  $\Phi = 46^\circ$ ,  $\Psi = 74.9^\circ$ , (C) and (D) shows the comparison for the pattern having amplitudes  $\Phi = 46^\circ$ ,  $\Psi = 0^\circ$ .

For the patterns in Figs 16(A) and (B), the rotational force  $F_2$  dominates as far as magnitude is concerned. This shows that the quasi-steady aerodynamic force given by  $C_1F_1$ , is inadequate for modeling flapping wing aerodynamics when the rotation is present. Furthermore rotational and virtual mass force  $F_2$  and  $C_3F_3$  respectively are seen to be zero at the mid-stroke position while the translational force  $C_1F_1$  is zero at the ends. This is because the functions  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  are zero while  $F_1$  is not zero at the mid-stroke  $(\phi = 0^o)$ .

For the pattern shown in (C) and (D), the rotational force is zero throughout the cycle since  $\psi = 0$  and the wing undergoes flapping translation only. Therefore, we see that the translational force  $C_1F_1$  dominates throughout the cycle except at the ends of the stroke where it is zero. The virtual mass force  $C_3F_3$  is maximum at the ends of the stroke and adjusts the total force at the ends as shown in Fig. 16(D). This kinematic pattern was specially selected to study the virtual mass effect since this is the only effect present at the ends of the stroke.



Fig. 17. Comparison of  $F_x$  component of total aerodynamic force  $F_T$ . (A) shows the comparison for the pattern having amplitudes  $\Phi = 46^\circ$ ,  $\Psi = 74.9^\circ$ , (B) shows the comparison for the pattern having amplitudes  $\Phi = 46^\circ$ ,  $\Psi = 0^\circ$ 

## D. Comparison of $F_x$ component of aerodynamic force

The  $F_x$  component of aerodynamic force is computed using Eq. (45) and compared with the experimental data as shown in Fig. 17 for the two kinematic patterns. The match with the experimental data is less accurate in the case of  $F_x$  component. This is probably due to the approximate match of twist  $\delta\psi$  with the actual wing in terms of both the spanwise distribution as well as variation during the cycle. The model assumes linear twist from the root to the tip of the wing. The actual twist distribution could be different. It should be noted that the approximation of twist does not affect the  $F_y$  component because its magnitude is more than three times that of the  $F_x$  component and the error is not visible in the  $F_y$  plot. We found this typical behavior in all the 24 kinematic patterns.

#### E. Comparison of aerodynamic moments

The sensor measures the aerodynamic moments as well as the aerodynamic force. Therefore, we can compare the experimentally obtained moments with the moments computed from the aerodynamic model. In Fig. 18, the three plots in column (A) and (B) show the three components of moments  $(M_x, M_y, M_z)$  belonging to the two selected kinematic patterns.

The moments are computed using Eq. (46). The  $M_x$  and  $M_z$  components show a good match with the experimental data. The accuracy of  $M_x$  component indicates that the model accurately distributes the  $F_y$  component along the



Fig. 18. Comparison of moments  $(M_x, M_y, M_z)$ . These are computed based on the assumption that the aerodynamic force at each section  $dF_T$  acts at the mid-chord location. (A) shows the results for the kinematic pattern having amplitudes  $\Phi =$  $46^\circ$ ,  $\Psi = 74.9^\circ$ , and (B) shows the results for the kinematic pattern having amplitudes  $\Phi = 46^\circ$ ,  $\Psi = 0^\circ$ .

span. The magnitude of  $F_y$  has already been verified from comparison of the force plots. Similarly, the accuracy of  $M_z$  component idicates that our assumption of midchord location of force  $dF_T$  at every section given by the parameter 'a = 0.5' in Eq. (44) is valid. The comparison of  $M_y$  component is approximate due to the fact that it is dependent on  $F_x$  component of force which compared approximately with the experiment as discussed earlier. This behavior of moments was found to be consistent in all 24 kinematic patterns.

# F. Comparison of the location of resultant aerodynamic force

The location of the resultant aerodynamic force on the wing for one stroke is also compared with the experiment and shown in Fig. 19. The distance  $\bar{a}$  (chord-wise direction) and the distance  $\bar{b}$  (spanwise direction) give the location of the resultant aerodynamic force. This is another way to test our assumption that the total force  $dF_T$  at every section acts at the mid-chord location, i.e, a = 0.5.  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}$  were calculated using the values of force and moment at the location of force/torque sensor for both the model and experiment using the following equations.

$$\bar{a} = \frac{M_z}{F_y} \quad , \quad \bar{b} = \frac{-M_x}{F_y}. \tag{57}$$

Fig. 19 shows good comparison of aerodynamic and experimental values of force location ( $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}$ ) for one kinematic pattern. Fig. 19 also indicates that the location of force does not vary during the stroke except near the very ends.



Fig. 19. Location of resultant aerodynamic force on the wing given by the distance  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}$  for the kinematic pattern ( $\Phi = 46^{0}$  and  $\Psi = 64^{0}$ ). Note 'Exp' stands for experimental and 'Mdl' stands for aerodynamic model.)

#### IX. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a methodology for the experimental determination of unsteady aerodynamic force coefficients based on the principle of dynamic similarity. These coefficients are used in the quasi-unsteady aerodynamic model which additionally takes into account the wing twist due to aerodynamic loads. The key conclusions drawn from this work are given below

- 1) We found a good match of  $F_y$ ,  $F_z$ ,  $M_x$  and  $M_z$  components and an approximate match of  $F_x$  and  $M_y$  components of resultant force and moment at the base of the wing for all the 24 kinematic patterns.
- 2) The coefficient of translational force  $C_1$  is determined as a function of angle of attack at one point during the flap cycle. Similarly, the coefficient  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  are determined as constants for the entire flapping cycle. However, the model matches the experimental data for the entire cycle and for all kinematic patterns. This idicates that the functions  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  are robust and capture the trend or physics of the unsteady effects.
- 3) The variation of stroke amplitude  $\Phi$  at constant flapping frequency does not alter the translational force coefficient  $C_1$ . However, an increase in stroke amplitude results in higher lift and drag forces during the cycle. This means that high stroke amplitude is essential for hovering flight.
- 4) The model assumes that for high angles of attack, typically encountered in hovering flapping flight, the total aerodynamic force remains normal to the chord and the chordwise component is zero for the entire cycle. The good match of model and experimental results indicates that the total force remains roughly normal to the chord for the entire cycle as assumed. In making this conclusion, we have taken into account the approximate spanwise twist in the model.

- 5) We also found that the effects of virtual mass force are small compared to translational and rotational effects at the Re range of 12,000 to 20,000. In our model, we have assumed that  $C_3F_3$  is virtual mass effect. However, it might be wake capture effect because both act in a similar manner. This needs to be verified using PIV measurements.
- 6) Moderate spanwise twist has very little effect on the magnitude of  $C_1$  and total force  $F_T$ , however, it changes the force components in the sensor frame significantly. This implies significant change in the direction of resultant force vector. For wings with large spanwise twist, the procedure should be modified by decomposing  $C_1$  into horizontal  $C_h$  and Vertical  $C_v$  coefficient of force. However, we have not pursued this method.

#### REFERENCES

- DELaurier, J. D., "An Aerodynamic Model for Flapping-Wing Flight". Aeronautical Journal, Vol. 97, No. 964 April 1993, pp.125-130.
- [2] Hao Liu, Ellington, C. P. Kawachi Keiji, Van Den Berg and Willmott A.P," A Computational Fluid Dynamic Study of Hawkmoth Hovering". *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 201, 461-477 (1998).
- [3] Ellington, C. P. (1984a)." The aerodynamics of hovering insect flight. I-V". Phil. Trans. Royal Society of London B 305, 115.
- [4] Ellington, C. P. (1999)." The novel aerodynamics of insect flight: applications to micro-air vehicles." J. Exp. Biol. 202, 34393448.
- [5] Usherwood, J. R. and Ellington, C. P. (2002)." The aerodynamics of revolving wings. I". J. Exp. Biol. 205, 15471564.
- [6] Usherwood, J. R. and Ellington, C. P. (2002)." The aerodynamics of revolving wings. II". J. Exp. Biol. 205, 15471564.
- [7] Willmott A. P., Ellington, C. P. and Adrian L.R. Thomas (1997)." Flow visualization and unsteady aerodynamics in the fight of the hawkmoth, Manduca sexta." *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* (1997) 352, 303-316.
- [8] Van Den Berg, and Ellington, C. P. (1997)." The three dimensional leading-edge vortex of a hovering model hawkmoth." *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* 352, 329340.
- [9] Dickinson, M.H, Lehmann, F.O., Sane, S.P (1997). "Wing Rotation and the Aerodynamic Basis of Insect Flight."
- [10] Azuma. A, Okamoto. M and Yasuda. K "Aerodynamic Characteristics of Wings at low Reynolds number".
- [11] Sane, S.P (2003)."The aerodynamics of insect flight". Journal of Experimental Biology, 206, 4191-4208 (2003)
- [12] Sane, S.P, and Dickinson, M.H (2001)."The aerodynamic effects of wing rotation and a revised quasi-steady model of flapping flight" *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 205, 1087-1096 (2002)
- [13] Walker, J. A., (2002). "Rotational lift: something different or more of the same?". Journal of Experimental Biology, 205, 3783-3792 (2002).
- [14] Advanced Engineering Mathematics 2nd ed by Harman, Dabney and Richert.
- [15] Robert Dudley."The biomechanics of insect flight, form, function and evolution."
- [16] Sun, M. and Tang, J. (2002). Unsteady aerodynamic force generation by model fruit fly wing in flapping motion. J. Exp. Biol. 205, 55-70.
- [17] Sanjay P.Sane and Michael H. Dickinson (2001)."The control of flight force by a Flapping Wing: Lift and Drag Production" accepted 18th May 2001