

Definition and Optimisation of the Structure of a Hypersonic Aircraft Considering Aero-Elastic Deformations

Dries Verstraete, François Thirifay** and Patrick Hendrick****

**School of Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering, The University of Sydney
Sydney, NSW, Australia*

***Cenaero*

Gosselies, Belgium

****Aero-Thermo-Mechanics Department, Université Libre de Bruxelles
Brussels, Belgium*

Abstract

Structural design of hypersonic aircraft is severely impacted by the high temperatures encountered during flight as they can lead to high thermal stresses and a significant reduction in material strength and stiffness. This reduction in rigidity of the structure requires innovative structural concepts and a stronger focus on aeroelastic deformations in the design and optimisation of the aircraft structure. This imposes the need for a closer coupling of the aerodynamic and structural tools than is current practise. The current paper presents how the different sizing, analysis, design, and optimisation tools are coupled in the design of the structure for the A2 vehicle during LAPCAT II and gives results of the optimisation of a hot structure for the wing. The results indicate that skin buckling is the main driver for the wing structural weight regardless of the number of spars and ribs used. A wing structure with 6 spars and 6 ribs with cross-grid stiffeners leads to the lightest solution, weighing in just under 20 tons. Uni-axial stiffened skin concepts are considerably heavier.

1. Introduction

Trends in aeronautics clearly show a continuous increase in air traffic across all ranges, including long distance flights such as from Europe to the Asia-Pacific region. These long-distance flights easily take up to 16 hours or more to connect two major intercontinental cities.¹ Flights on these routes would become more attractive if the travel time could be reduced drastically. With present aircraft and propulsion technology, margins for improvement of the overall vehicle system are getting small as the optimum wing and tube design is approached. Only drastic changes in aircraft configuration, propulsion concepts, and flight velocities can provide a step change. In the "classical" subsonic flight regime new configurations (e.g. blended wing bodies), and new propulsion concepts (e.g. geared turbofans) are explored to improve the aerodynamic and propulsive performance of aircraft. These developments will enable a decrease in fuel consumption of up to 30%¹ but will not lead to reduced travel times. With the notional exception of Concorde, new aircraft development seems to be stalled with respect to flight speed for the last 4 to 5 decades.¹⁻³ To reduce travel times drastically and reach antipodal destinations in 4 hours or less therefore needs a step change in flight Mach number, resulting in hypersonic speeds.

Hypersonic Mach numbers however present several technological challenges that have to be overcome. The LAPCAT (Long-Term Advanced Propulsion Concepts and Technologies) and LAPCAT II programs are set up to design different vehicle concepts and to develop critical technologies and know-how to realise antipodal flights in less than 4 hours.^{1,4} At these high speeds, classical turbo-jet engines need to be replaced by advanced airbreathing propulsion concepts. During the first LAPCAT program, different propulsion cycles and concepts were analysed, comprising both turbine-based and rocket-based combined cycles. Using the developed engine concepts, vehicles were then defined and their aerodynamic performance was optimised for a nominal Brussels to Sydney mission. From the different vehicles studies in LAPCAT I two were selected for further evaluation in LAPCAT II: one for Mach 5 and one for Mach 8 cruise flights.

The current article presents the initial structural design work for the Mach 5 A2 vehicle as part of LAPCAT II. Structural design of hypersonic aircraft is severely impacted by the high temperatures encountered during flight. The high

temperatures not only result in several thermal stresses for the structure. Both the yield stress and the stiffness of most materials are also strongly reduced. Due to this reduced rigidity, particular attention needs to be paid to aero-elastic deformations during the design and optimisation of the structure. This not only demands innovative structural concepts but also imposes the need for a closer coupling of the tools used for both the aerodynamic and the structural calculations. The different tools used in the current design and their coupling and integration are presented in section 3, after an introduction of the A2 vehicle in section 2. The fourth section of the paper gives the results of the various optimisation analysis that were performed. Results for a varying number of spars and ribs, different wing stiffening concepts, and different materials are given. Finally conclusions are drawn and future work is outlined.

2. The LAPCAT Mach 5 A2 Vehicle

The A2 vehicle was designed by Reaction Engines to fly at Mach 5 using a hydrogen fuelled precooled Mach 5 engine. The proposed configuration is shown on Figure 1. The vehicle consists of a slender fuselage with a low aspect ratio delta wing positioned slightly aft of the mid fuselage section. The vehicle is controlled by all movable foreplanes in pitch, an all movable fin in yaw, and ailerons in roll. The selected configuration leads to good supersonic and subsonic lift to drag ratios and acceptable low speed handling qualities for takeoff and landing. A leading edge sweep angle of 55 degrees was chosen in order to generate a stable separated vortex at high angle of attack.¹ All aerodynamic surfaces utilise a 3% thickness airfoil. The fuselage diameter was chosen as 7.5 m to trade off a small increase in drag for a saving in fuselage mass.¹ The fuselage is nonetheless much longer than existing aircraft at 139 m. The passenger compartment (arranged in two decks) occupies a length of about 32 m and is located over the wings on the vehicle centre of gravity. The liquid hydrogen fuel occupies the remainder of the fuselage volume and is split into two large pressurised tanks either side of the passenger compartment. Storage of the fuel in the fuselage instead of in the wings allows circular cross section tanks, which minimises insulation and pressure vessel mass.




Figure 1: The LAPCAT A2 configuration for a Mach 5 TBCC vehicle based on hydrogen¹

The A2 uses 4 precooled turbojet engines, called Scimitar, for its propulsion.⁵ The Scimitar engines are mounted in separate axisymmetric nacelles on the wing. Two engines are located on the wingtips while the remaining two are installed in inboard nacelles located under and ahead of the wing leading edge. Separating the nacelles reduces the possibility of a mechanical failure in one engine causing damage to the adjacent engine, and also causes less aerodynamic disturbance when an engine is shutdown or unstarts.¹ Carrying the engines on the wing leads to a good matching between the centre of pressure and the centre of gravity and is structurally efficient. Engines of supersonic cruise vehicles are however normally mounted underneath the wing towards the trailing edge to capitalise on shock wave compression. As the wing shock wave at Mach 5 is at an angle of only 8.9 degrees relative to the wing lower surface, the nacelle would have to be moved so far aft that the intake face is behind the wing trailing edge, which is structurally impractical.¹ The nacelles are therefore positioned with the intake face ahead of the wing shock wave in relatively free-stream conditions. The inboard nacelles are mounted underneath the wing to reduce wing skin acoustic fatigue damage. The main disadvantage of the inboard nacelle location is that the nacelle cross section is introduced ahead of the wing maximum thickness which is opposite to normal area ruling practice and will increase transonic wave drag.¹

Table 1 summarises the main features of the A2. The aircraft weighs in at approximately 400 tons at takeoff of which roughly half is empty weight. The wing area is set at 900 m² to ensure subsonic cruise at a reasonable lift coefficient. The Mach 5 phase of the 18700 km design mission takes place between 25 and 28 km.

Table 1: Lapcat A2 vehicle characteristics

Characteristic	Value	Characteristic	Value
Maximum Take-Off Weight	400 tons	Overall vehicle length	139 m
Empty Weight	202 tons	Design Range	18700 km
Wing Area	900 m ²	Passengers	300
Wing Span	41 m	Cruise Height	25-28 km

Table 2 shows 3 of the critical load cases used to size the structure. Besides those 3 flight cases, additional cases will be considered related to the maximum cabin pressure differential, the maximum hydrogen tank pressure and the 9g crash loads on the mounting structure of the tanks. The canard structure will be sized for a maximum upload at take-off rotation whereas the fin will be sized by a twin engine out consideration (at the same side of the fuselage) at Mach 5. The current analysis considers only the Mach 5 load case at 2.5g and -1g.

Table 2: Lapcat A2 load cases

Description	Altitude [km]	Mach No	Weight [tons]	Load Factor
Manoeuvre	1.2	0.67	396.2	2.5
Manoeuvre	25.4	5.00	350.8	2.5
High Weight Gust	5.9	1.11	386.3	2.87

3. Structural Optimisation Tools and Set-up

The aforementioned characteristics of the A2 were determined by Reaction Engines Ltd. during LAPCAT. A verification of both the Scimitar engine performance and component weight estimates for the A2 are performed as part of LAPCAT II together with a detailed sizing of the structure of the A2 vehicle. For this structural design and optimisation study several tools are set up and combined as shown on Figure 2. The green dashed line indicates the preliminary sizing that was performed by Reaction Engines as part of the first LAPCAT project, whereas the red dashed line indicates the current structural analysis, sizing and optimisation. The black arrow represents a possible restart of the design loop with the updated structural weight.




Figure 2: The Sizing Process Used for the A2 Structure

As shown on Figure 2 the pressure and temperature loads for the different cases identified in Table 2 are calculated using Argo®, an in-house developed code of Cenaero.^{6,7} Argo is a domain decomposition based parallel three-dimensional Navier-Stokes solver on unstructured tetrahedral meshes with implicit time-integrators based on a Newton-Krylow-Schwarz solver. Figure 3a shows a typical pressure load obtained from RANS calculations with Argo for Mach 5. The temperatures and pressures from the Argo CFD mesh are then translated into the corresponding loads for the FE mesh using MpCCI, a code coupling interface. After all, an FE mesh is typically much coarser than the corresponding CFD

mesh. Figure 3b shows a zoom on the CFD/FE translation for the nose cone and the canard at Mach 5. The Nastran FE mesh is generated in Matlab®. As shown, the skin is meshed in the FE model to allow for aeroelastic coupling with Argo. The mesh consists of predominantly quadrangular elements for the fuselage, wing, canard, and fin. The intersections between the meshes for the individual components are however done with triangular elements as this allows more freedom in the definition of the mesh for each individual components while still ensuring that all nodes that are on the intersection between two components are linked to both components.




Figure 3: CFD results and CFD/FE mesh translation.

Once the loads are translated to the FE mesh, the internal structure of each of the components is sized and optimised using MSC/NASTRAN® and HyperSizer®. HyperSizer® is a sizing and optimisation software that is mathematically coupled with MSC/NASTRAN®. HyperSizer® is able to discretely optimise structures in a manner that guarantees structural integrity of the selected optimum design, using methods to accurately compute margins-of-safety for all potential failure modes (over 100 modes can be analysed for both ultimate and limit load cases).⁸ Failure mode analysis vary from traditional closed form methods to modern instability algorithms (such as those used for asymmetric panel buckling). HyperSizer's unique panel and beam stiffness formulations using equivalent plate generalised stiffness terms achieve accuracy with coarsely meshed finite element models and allow simultaneous optimisation at various levels.⁸

Because the model does not have to be re-meshed for different panel designs, a rapid optimisation of concept, shape, size, and material selection are possible. Tight coupling with MSC/NASTRAN® allows finite element properties and materials (PSHELL, PBAR, MAT1, and MAT2) to be automatically generated in HyperSizer® and included in the FEA to obtain correct and consistent running loads.⁸ Over 40 different panel and beam concepts are provides such as hat and Z stiffened panels, honeycomb sandwiches, and I, Z, T, and C beams. For a hot structure of a hypersonic vehicle, only the spars and ribs of the wing, fin, and canard and the longerons and frames of the fuselage have to be manually changed to analyse different structural concepts. After all they are represented by CBAR elements and can therefor not be smeared out in the skin as is done with stiffeners.

In a final step, the stiffness of the finite element model of the optimised structure is coupled with the Argo CFD code for aeroelastic calculations. A new methodology is currently implemented in Argo to deform the CFD mesh while preserving a good quality of the anisotropic cells of the boundary layer near the aeroelastic interface. This will enable Navier-Stokes aeroelastic calculations with a viscous sub-layer instead of Euler aeroelastic calculations as performed in the past.^{6,7} The structural optimisation loop using HyperSizer® and Nastran® will then be re-initiated based on the aeroelastic calculations.

4. Structural Design for the A2 Wing

The current section presents the sizing results for the wing of the A2. The first section describes the down-selection of the different structural concepts and materials. After this the numbers of spars and ribs are optimised for titanium, followed by an optimisation of the stiffener concept and spacing. Finally the use of beryllium alloys is assessed.

4.1 Selection of structural concepts and materials

One of the biggest structural challenges of any hypersonic design is the management of the heat load to the structure. At Mach 5, the stagnation temperature is around 750 K. For the A2 design mission the leading edge of the wing, canard, and fin, and the nose of the fuselage will be exposed to those temperatures for up to 4 hours. Managing the resulting high heat loads for those long exposure times is critical. Three primary solutions have traditionally been explored for structures of hypersonic vehicles. In a *hot structure*, the external surface acts as a load-bearing structure and absorbs all the heat. This type of structure is simple and easy to maintain but leads to high thermal stresses and requires adequate materials to be used.⁹ In the so-called *cold structures* the load bearing and heat absorbing structures are on the other hand decoupled. An external "shield" absorbs the heat, with the internal structure suspended inside it. Insulation is used to protect the load bearing structure from the heat.⁹ Cold structures can potentially be lighter than hot structures but it is difficult to access and inspect the load bearing structure and differences in thermal expansion between the different components can result in integrity issues.⁹ Finally, in actively cooled structures, the heat sink potential of the cryogenic liquid hydrogen is exploited to remove the heat by passing the liquid through pipes near the hot areas. Even though this allows the actual load bearing structure to be much lighter,⁹ this type of structure is not considered for this particular application. The redundancy needed to ensure reliability of the cooling system in case of blockages of the cooling pipes and the additional complexity and manufacturing cost namely make it an unattractive option for airline operation. Only hot and cold structures are therefor considered for the A2. The current article presents the initial hot structure solutions.

For a hot structure material options are limited by the high operating temperatures. The choice of aluminium for the Concorde limited its maximum operational Mach number to 2.2.¹⁰ Aluminium is therefor not an option as a structural material for the A2. After all, with the anticipated long exposure times, the complete structure will end up at elevated temperatures. Titanium alloys are considered the primary candidate material at this stage as it can be used effectively for temperatures up to 800K and, relative to most other metals, titanium alloys have a significantly higher specific strength.⁹ From a structural perspective beryllium is an interesting alternative candidate. Beryllium has a low density, low elasticity and a high thermal conductivity, which aids in reducing thermal stresses. It also retains both its specific stiffness and specific strength up to elevated temperature, which makes it particularly interesting for the current design. Further to this beryllium is able to be machined and worked with relative ease.⁹ The toxicity of beryllium oxide however limits its use in practice.⁹ It will nonetheless be considered here to allow a comparison with titanium. The major alternatives to titanium and beryllium alloys are carbon-carbon composites and metal matrix composites. They will be considered in a later stage but are not presented in the current article.

4.2 Optimisation of the rib and spar configuration

Finding the lightest combination of ribs and spars in the wing is pivotal to creating the lightest possible design. For subsonic transport aircraft a two spar configuration is standard. For supersonic aircraft typically a higher number of spars is used due to the low aspect ratio of the wing. In a first series of analysis the numbers of spars and ribs is therefor varied to find the combination that leads to the lightest solution. Whereas the rib spacing, and to a some extent also the spar spacing, will normally not be uniform, a uniform spacing is maintained for the current analysis to enable a rapid generation of the different concepts. The number of ribs and spars is varied from 3 to 8. Figure 4 shows the resulting wing weights for a varying number of ribs and spars for the 2.5g load case at Mach 5. All analysis were performed with a crossgrid stiffened skin with titanium 6242. The results presented here represent a sample of the full matrix of analysis that was executed.

Figure 4a shows the weights for 3 to 7 spars with 6 equally spaced ribs. The figure shows that the lightest weight solution is obtained for 6 spars. The weight of the beams (spars and ribs) remains fairly constant but the weight of the panels (skin) varies considerably. Figure 4b shows a similar analysis for a varying number of ribs with 6 equally spaced spars. The overall wing weight varies only with around 10% but for an increasing number of ribs, the fraction of the weight from the beams increases considerably. The lightest of all analysed solutions is the 6 spars and 6 ribs combination that weighs in at just under 20 tons. When considering both the 2.5 and -1g loads, the trends remains the same but the weight of the lightest solution increased to about 24.5 tons. Figure 5 shows the deflection of the resulting structure for the 2.5g and -1g load case at Mach 5. The figure clearly indicates that for both load cases the rear spars are loaded to higher stress levels due to the torsion of the wing.




Figure 4: Wing weight for varying numbers of ribs and spars.




Figure 5: Wing deflection at 2.5g and -1g at Mach 5, coloured by stress level.

4.3 Optimisation stiffener concept and spacing

As the first analysis indicated that the primary failure mode for the skin was buckling for all considered combinations of spars and ribs, an in-depth analysis of skin stiffening was conducted. As indicated previously, the HyperSizer approach to define equivalent plate generalised stiffness terms allows to analyse several stiffening concepts of the skin. Several stiffening options are available in HyperSizer. The skin can either be un-stiffened, stiffened using uniaxial stiffeners, or using a cross-grid of stiffeners. With the cross-grid stiffeners up to 4 directions of stiffeners can be selected. For each of the stiffened concepts, Z, I and T shaped stiffeners were analysed. For each analysis the spacing of the stiffeners was optimised initially. The results for the different stiffener concepts at optimum spacing are given in Table 3. Three different rib/spar combinations were analysed to check consistency across the range of possible combinations.

Table 3: Weight variation for different stiffening concepts [tons]

	Cross-grid	Uni-axial	Un-stiffened
3 spars & 3 ribs	24.5	106.5	80.3
3 spars & 8 ribs	35.8	137.3	69.3
6 spars & 6 ribs	19.9	92.7	62.4

The results clearly show a significant weight reduction is obtained for a cross-grid stiffeners. The un-stiffened and uni-axial stiffened are 100 to 400% heavier than the un-stiffened concept. Across the range of stiffening concepts the combination with 6 spars and 6 ribs The uni-axial stiffener skin is heavier than the un-stiffened skin as the stiffeners run parallel to the fuselage centreline. HyperSizer increases the stiffener dimensions to the maximum value to try to reduce the impact of the buckling constraints which results in a heavier design than the un-stiffened skin where the spars and ribs are beefed up to take care of the extra load.

In a second step, cost considerations were added to the stiffener concepts. First the cross-grid stiffening concept was

restricted to only orthogonal stiffeners parallel and perpendicular to the fuselage centreline (instead of 4 different directions for the spacers for the full orthogonal grid). Then a minimum spacing of 150 mm was imposed to limit the total number of stiffeners. Table 4 shows the outcome of this analysis. The table clearly indicate that the sensitivity to the current analysis is an order of magnitude smaller than for the stiffening concept. For the 6 spars and 6 ribs combination weight increases only by 2.6%.

Table 4: Weight variation for different stiffening concepts [tons]

	Optimised	Orthogonal		Spacing of 150 mm	
3 spars & 3 ribs	24.5	27.0	+10.0%	29.3	+19.0%
6 spars & 6 ribs	19.9	20.4	+2.6%	20.4	+2.6%

As the previous analysis confirms the importance of buckling on the skin sizing and design, the buckling margin of safety was deactivated for limit load analysis. Allowing the wing skin to buckle lead to a significant reduction of the wing weight. For the 6 spars and 6 ribs combination with cross-grid stiffeners the wing weight was reduced by 37%. Whereas the overall wing weight reduces the weight of the spars and ribs actually increases as the spars and ribs take up loads that are otherwise taken by the stiffeners. The weight reductions for the un-stiffened skin and uni-axial skin are bigger than for the cross-grid stiffened skin but the latter still remains the lightest concept.

4.4 Material selection

As indicated previously, several materials could potentially be used for the A2 hot structure. The primary considered candidates were identified as titanium alloys and beryllium alloys. The latter is selected as it keeps its high specific stiffness and strength up to high temperatures. Table 5 shows the resulting weights for both materials for two structural designs: a 3 ribs and 3 spars configuration and a 6 ribs and 6 spars configuration. The table shows that the beryllium alloy results in a considerably lighter structure regardless of the structural configuration. For the baseline 6 spars and 6 ribs configuration a reduction of 38.9% is obtained whereas for the 3 ribs and 3 spars configuration, the structure is 26.4% lighter.

Table 5: Weight variation for different stiffening concepts [tons]

	Titanium	Beryllium	Difference
3 spars & 3 ribs	24.5	18.1	-26.4%
6 spars & 6 ribs	19.9	12.2	-38.9%

5. Conclusions and Future Work

Hypersonic transport aircraft can potentially reduce flight times of long distance flight significantly provided several technological challenges can be overcome. Structural design of hypersonic aircraft is severely impacted by the high temperatures encountered during flight as they can lead to high thermal stresses and a significant reduction in material strength and stiffness. This reduction in rigidity of the structure requires innovative structural concepts and a stronger focus on aeroelastic deformations in the design and optimisation of the aircraft structure. This imposes the need for a closer coupling of the aerodynamic and structural tools than is current practise. The current paper presents how the different sizing, analysis, design, and optimisation tools are coupled in the design of the structure for the A2 vehicle during LAPCAT II and gives results of the optimisation of a hot structure for the wing. The results indicate that skin buckling is the main driver for the wing structural weight regardless of the number of spars and ribs used. A wing structure with 6 spars and 6 ribs with cross-grid stiffeners leads to the lightest solution, weighing in just under 20 tons for the 2.5 g manoeuvre load at Mach 5. Uni-axially stiffened and un-stiffened skin concepts are considerably heavier. Allowing buckling could lead to considerable weight savings, and so does the use of beryllium alloys instead of titanium alloys. In a next step a non uniform spacing of the ribs and spars will be analysed and extra materials will be considered for all of the identified critical load cases. The full aeroelastic cycle will be closed by coupling the CFD and FE codes through a travelling boundary layer CFD mesh.

Acknowledgments

Several students contributed to the work presented in the current article through their thesis, projects or internships. The authors would like to thank Antoine Bourguignon, Alexander Kobler and François Lesperance for their contributions.

References

- [1] J. Steelant, LAPCAT: High-Speed Propulsion Technology, In: *Advances on Propulsion Technology for High Speed Aircraft*, pp. 12.1-12.38, Educational Notes RTO-EN-AVT-150. Paper 123, Neuilly-Sur-Seine, France: RTO.
- [2] J.E. Green, et. al. , *Air Travel - Greener by Design: The Technology Challenge*, Report of the Technology Sub Group of the Greener by Design Work Group, 2005
- [3] , J.H. McMasters and R.M. Cummings, From Farther, Faster, Higher to Leaner, Meaner, Greener - Future Directions in Airplane Design in the New Century, In *Proceedings of the 41th Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit*, Reno, Nevada, USA, January 2003, AIAA-2003-553.
- [4] J. Steelant and M. van Duijn, Structural Analysis of the LAPCAT-MR2 Waverider Based Vehicle, In: *Proceedings of the 17th AIAA International Space Planes and Hypersonic Systems and Technologies Conference*, San Francisco, California, April, 2011, AIAA-2011-2336.
- [5] F. Jivray, R. Varvill, A. Bond and G. Paniagua, The Scimitar Precooled Mach 5 engine, In: *Proceedings of the 2nd European Conference for AeroSpace Sciences*, Brussels, Belgium, July, 2007.
- [6] F. Thirifay, K. Hillewaert, S. Bogaerts, and P. Geuzaine. Application of efficient loosely-coupled algorithms for nonlinear transient aeroelastic problems. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Methods for Coupled Problems in Science and Engineering*, Santorini Island, Greece, May 2005.
- [7] L. Fitschy, F. Thirifay, E. Wyart, S. Pierret, and P. Geuzaine. Structural optimisation of a small aircraft from aeroelastic responses. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Methods for Coupled Problems in Science and Engineering*, Ibiza, Spain, May 2007.
- [8] C. Collier, P. Yarrington, and M. Pickenheim, Design Optimization Using HyperSizer®. In *Proceedings of the 1998 MSC Americas Users' Conference*, Universal City, CA, USA, October 1998.
- [9] H. McComb, N.M. Harold, and M.F. Card, *Structures and Materials Technology for Hypersonic Aerospacecraft*, NASA Technical Memorandum, NASA-TM-1-2583, 1990.
- [10] T.E. Blackall, *Concorde: The Story, the Facts and the Figures*, G.T. Foulis and Co, Ltd., Great Britain, 1969.