

Wing Design Using Evolutionary Algorithms

By
Akira Oyama

A dissertation submitted to the Department of Aeronautics and Space Engineering of
Tohoku University in fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Aeronautics and Space Engineering

March 2000

Abstract

Although Evolutionary Algorithms (EAs) have become increasingly popular in aerodynamic design problems, the previous applications of EAs are restricted to more or less simplified problems involving not more than 10-30 design parameters. In contrast to that, in real-world design problems, a large number of design parameters must be handled – for example, a wing shape for a generic transonic aircraft usually parameterized by more than a hundred of design parameters. Since such problem has a highly multidimensional search space and extremely complicated objective function distribution, standard EAs would fail to find a globally optimum. This research develops a new, robust, and efficient numerical design method applicable to such real-world aerodynamic design problems.

One of the most important difficulties in real-world aerodynamic shape design problems is their highly multidimensional design space. To develop a robust and efficient EA applicable to such design problems, the real-coded ARGAs have been developed by incorporating the idea of the binary-coded ARGAs with the use of the floating-point representation. The performance of the proposed EAs was demonstrated by applying to a typical test function minimization problem and an aerodynamic airfoil shape optimization problem. The real-coded ARGAs consistently found better solutions than the conventional real-coded GAs do.

Because the flow field is governed by a system of nonlinear partial differential equations, objective function landscape of an aerodynamic optimization is often multimodal and nonlinear. To improve EAs' capability of finding a global optimum in such a problem, a crossover operator based on the structured coding has been proposed. The coding structure of the design variables is constructed according to the interaction information among design parameters analyzed by the experimental design. Aerodynamic optimizations of a transonic wing demonstrated that the crossover based on the structured coding was more efficient than the traditional one.

To ensure the capability of the present EA in handling large-scale aerodynamic design optimizations, the real-coded ARGAs coupled with the crossover based on the structured coding is applied to an aerodynamic design optimization of a transonic wing shape for generic transport aircraft. Aerodynamic performances of the design candidates are evaluated by using the three-dimensional compressive Navier-Stokes equations to guarantee an accurate model of the flow field. Structural constraint is introduced to avoid an apparent solution of zero thickness wing for low drag in high speeds. To overcome enormous computational time necessary for the optimization, the computation is parallelized on NWT. The designed wing had a good L/D value satisfying the given structural constraint on wing thickness.

Finally, an EA is applied to an aerodynamic wing shape design for a supersonic transport to examine the feasibility of the EA-based optimization in supersonic wing design optimizations. The optimum design obtained from the present approach yielded both the minimum induced drag and the minimum volume wave drag in the given design space. The design also indicated the most important features of supersonic wing design as compared with conventional transonic wing design as follows:

- 1) Warp geometry based on camber line and twist angle distributions plays a more important role than spanwise thickness distribution because the thickness becomes simply as thin as possible.
- 2) Because the wing thickness constraint comes from the wing structure, a practical structural constraint will be required.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank my thesis advisors, Dr. Kazuhiro Nakahashi and Dr. Shigeru Obayashi for their guidance, support, and encouragement over the last six years. You've guided, supported, and continually motivated me since I belonged to Nakahashi Laboratory. I genuinely feel fortunate to have you as mentors. Thanks are also due to Dr. Hisao Hukunaga for advising me on structural modeling of a wing. I thank Dr. Ian Fejtek of deHavilland Inc. for his help and guidance.

I wish to thank everyone at National Aerospace Laboratory in Japan. In particular, I thank the following key persons to my doctoral dissertation: Mr. Takashi Nakamura, who assisted me for Parallelization on the Numerical Wind Tunnel, Dr. Naoki Hirose, who graciously provided FLO-27 code for aerodynamic evaluations in Chap. 3, and Dr. Kenji Yoshida, who shared his expertise and knowledge in connection with the design of supersonic transport.

I thank my father and mother for their love and support. I would especially like to thank my wife Junko for her patience and encouragement. I also thank my many friends and colleagues for their help and friendship.

Finally, I acknowledge that this research is funded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Thesis Objectives	3
1.3	Evolutionary algorithms	4
1.3.1	What's Evolutionary Algorithm?	4
1.3.2	Representation of Individuals	6
1.3.3	Mechanics of Evolutionary Algorithms	7
1.3.3.1	Initialization	7
1.3.3.2	Evaluation	8
1.3.3.3	Selection	8
1.3.3.4	Recombination	11
1.3.3.5	Mutation	15
1.3.3.6	Elitist Strategy	15
1.3.4	Parallelization	15
1.4	Multiobjective Evolutionary Algorithms	16
1.4.1	Introduction	16
1.4.2	Pareto Optimality	18
1.4.3	Pareto-Based MOEAs	18
1.4.3.1	Multiobjective Genetic Algorithm	18
1.4.3.2	Niched Pareto Genetic Algorithm	19
1.4.3.3	Non-Dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm	20
1.4.4	Niching	20
1.5	Documentation Organization	22
2.	Real-Coded Adaptive Range Genetic Algorithm	28
2.1.	Introduction	28
2.2.	Adaptive Range Genetic Algorithms	29
2.2.1	ARGAs for Binary Representation	29
2.2.2	ARGAs for Floating-Point Representation	31
2.3.	Results	33
2.3.1	Test Function Minimization	34
2.3.2	Aerodynamic Airfoil Shape Optimization	35
2.4.	Summary	36

3.	Evolutionary Algorithms Based on Structured Coding	
	for Aerodynamic Wing Optimizations	38
3.1.	Introduction	38
3.2	Comparative Study of Airfoil Shape Parameterization Techniques	40
3.2.1	Airfoil Shape Parameterization Techniques	41
3.2.1.1	Extended Joukowski Transformation	41
3.2.1.2	Inverse Theodorsen Transformation	41
3.2.1.3	B-Spline Curves	42
3.2.1.4	Orthogonal Shape Functions	43
3.2.1.5	PARSEC Airfoils	43
3.2.2	Reproduction of a NASA Supercritical Airfoil	44
3.2.3	Aerodynamic Shape Optimization	46
3.3	Wing Design Using EAs Based on Structured Coding	50
3.3.1	Formulation of Optimization Problem	50
3.3.2	Optimization Using MOEA	51
3.3.3	Wing Design Using Extended Joukowski Transformation	51
3.3.3.1	Construction of Structured Coding	51
3.3.3.2	Design Results	53
3.3.4	Wing Design Using PARSEC Airfoils	54
3.3.4.1	Construction of Structured Coding	54
3.3.4.2	Design Results	56
3.4	Summary	57
4.	Transonic Wing Design Optimization Based on Evolutionary Algorithm	59
4.1	Introduction	59
4.2	Aerodynamic Wing Design Goals	59
4.3	Formulation of Optimization Problem	60
4.4	CFD Analysis for Aerodynamic Design	62
4.4.1	Symbols	62
4.4.2	Governing Equations	63
4.4.3	Numerical Algorithm	65
4.4.3.1	LU-SGS Method	66
4.4.3.2	HLLEW Scheme	67
4.4.3.3	Modified Differentiable Limiter	68
4.4.3.4	Turbulence Model	69
4.4.3.5	Time Stepping Technique	70
4.4.3.6	Multigrid Method	71
4.5	Estimation of Required Thickness	74

4.6	Optimization Using EA	75
4.7	Results	76
4.8	Summary	79
5.	Supersonic Wing Design Optimization Based on Evolutionary Algorithm	83
5.1	Introduction	83
5.2	Formulation of Optimization Problem	83
5.3	Optimization Using EA	85
5.4	Results	85
5.5	Summary	88
6.	Summary and Further Work	90
6.1	Summary	90
6.1.1	Real-Coded Adaptive Range Genetic Algorithms	90
6.1.2	Evolutionary Algorithms Based on Structured Coding for Aerodynamic Wing Optimizations	90
6.1.3	Transonic Wing Design Optimization Based on EA	91
6.1.4	Supersonic Wing Design Optimization Based on EA	91
6.2	Further Work	92

List of Figures

Figure

1.1	An example of binary and floating-point representations	7
1.2	Main flowchart of EAs	8
1.3	Roulette-wheel selection	10
1.4	Stochastic universal sampling	10
1.5	BLX- α	12
1.6	One-point crossover for floating-point representation	14
1.7	Illustration of evolutionary direction operator	15
1.8	The concept of Pareto optimality	19
1.9	Fonseca's ranking method for a minimization problem	19
1.10	Goldberg's ranking method for a minimization problem	20
2.1	Decoding for binary-coded ARGAs	31
2.2	Decoding for real-coded ARGAs	32
2.3	Flowchart of the present ARGAs	33
2.4	Optimization histories for the test function optimization problem	34
2.5	Optimization histories for the aerodynamic airfoil shape optimization	35
2.6	Designed airfoil shape and the corresponding pressure distribution	36
3.1	Sequentially coded design candidates	38
3.2	Design candidates coded with structure	39
3.3	Example of the extended Joukowski transformation	42
3.4	B-Spline curves for mean camber line and thickness distribution and the resultant airfoil shape	43
3.5	Design parameters for the PARSEC	44
3.6	Area to be minimized	45
3.7	Comparison of the reproduced airfoils	45
3.8	Residual of the SC(2)-0414 airfoil reproduction	46
3.9	NACA 2412 and the airfoil shape obtained by orthogonal shape functions	46
3.10	Optimization histories	47
3.11	Designed airfoil shape and the corresponding pressure distribution using PARSEC airfoils	48
3.12	Reproduction of the airfoil design obtained by PARSEC airfoils	49
3.13	Wing planform	50

3.14	Effectiveness of factors and their interactions for the extended Joukowski transformation	52
3.15	Structured coding for the extended Joukowski transformation	53
3.16	Sequential coding for the extended Joukowski transformation	53
3.17	Comparison of Pareto fronts for sequential and structured coding techniques	54
3.18	Effectiveness of factors and their interactions for the PARSEC	55
3.19	Effective interactions of the original PARSEC	55
3.20	Effective interactions of the modified PARSEC	56
3.21	Comparison of Pareto fronts for sequential and structured coding techniques	56
4.1	Wing planform	61
4.2	Spline interpolation	61
4.3	Grid sequence	71
4.4	V-cycle	72
4.5	Wing planform geometry and cross section of the wing	74
4.6	Optimization history of L/D	76
4.7	Spanwise thickness distribution	77
4.8	Spanwise lift distribution	78
4.9	Comparison of thickness distributions between the present design and the minimum induced-drag design	78
4.10	Spanwise twist angle distribution	79
4.11	Designed airfoil sections and the corresponding pressure distributions at the 0, 33, and 66% spanwise locations	80
5.1	Wing planform	84
5.2	Optimization history	86
5.3	Spanwise load distribution of the designed wing	86
5.4	Optimized airfoil sections and the corresponding pressure distributions	87
5.5	Spanwise twist angle distribution and its control points	87
5.6	Pressure contours on the upper surface of the wing	88

List of Tables

Table

1.1	Aerodynamic design problems solved by EAs and CFD _____	3
3.1	Results of aerodynamic optimizations _____	47
4.1	Parameter ranges of the design space _____	61
4.2	Aerodynamic performances of the design _____	77
5.1	Parameter ranges of the design space _____	84