



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

LONGITUDINAL HANDLING CHARACTERISTICS OF A TAILLESS GULL-WING AIRCRAFT

Daniël Sarel Agenbag

July 28, 2008

Longitudinal handling characteristics of a tailless gull-wing aircraft

by

Daniël Sarel Agenbag

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree

Master of Engineering

(Mechanical Engineering)

in the

Faculty of Engineering, Built Environment and Information
Technology

University of Pretoria

July 2008

Synopsis

Longitudinal handling characteristics of a tailless gull-wing aircraft

Author : Daniël Sarel Agenbag
Student number : 9701128-3
Study leader : Prof. N.J. Theron
Co-leader : Mr. R.J. Huyssen
Degree : Master of Engineering (Mechanical)
Department : Department of Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering

A handling quality investigation was performed on the swept gull-wing configuration. The swept gull-wing configuration is tailless and has a wing with a transition in the sweep and dihedral angle. An example of this type of aircraft is the Exulans. This aircraft is currently under development at the University of Pretoria. The handling quality study was focussed on pitch axis dynamics. The Exulans is a research testbed that will be used to investigate the swept gull-wing configuration and its special controls by means of full-scale flight testing. Variable wing sweep, twisting elevons and winglets will be investigated as means of control. These control devices are configured in such a way as to have minimum impact on the performance of the aircraft. The handling qualities of the swept gull-wing configuration have to be acceptable while using these different control strategies.

The study was launched to investigate whether a gull-wing configuration aircraft will have satisfactory handling qualities at CG positions associated with the most favourable aerodynamic performance. There is an aerodynamic performance gain in designing an aircraft so that the CG falls on the so-called 'E-point'. The E-point is the centre of pressure for an elliptical circulation distribution. An ellip-

tical circulation distribution is associated with the highest Oswald efficiency for an aircraft.

Time domain simulation techniques and frequency domain analysis techniques were used to analyse the handling qualities of the gull-wing configuration. The C-star criterion was used to analyse handling qualities with time domain simulation data as input. Comparative time domain simulations were performed between the Exulans and other aircraft to compare handling qualities. Eigenvalue analysis was used together with the thumbprint criterion to investigate inherent gull-wing airframe dynamics. The Shomber-Gertsen and Military Specification 8785 criteria were also used for the same purpose. The Neal-Smith method was used to investigate the effect of control authority on handling qualities and the effect of a pilot. The Mönlich and Dalldorff criterion was used to evaluate gust handling qualities. An analysis chart by Fremaux and Vairo was used to evaluate the tumbling susceptibility of the gull-wing configuration.

The pitch handling quality investigation shows sufficient promise that the swept gull-wing configuration will have acceptable handling qualities with the CG placed at positions associated with optimised aerodynamic performance. Analysis showed that the swept gull-wing configuration is potentially prone to tumbling. With low static margins, the configuration should exhibit improved handling qualities in gusty conditions when compared to existing tailless aircraft.

It is recommended that a lateral handling quality study be performed before full scale flight testing commences on the Exulans. In addition, the possibility of wingtip stall must be investigated for the case of the swept gull-wing configuration.

KEYWORDS: Tailless aircraft; Handling qualities; Gust handling qualities; E-point; O-point; Flight simulation; Swept gull-wing configuration; Mönlich and Dalldorff criterion; C-star criterion; Thumbprint criterion; Shomber-Gertsen analysis; Neal-Smith analysis; Pilot induced oscillation; Pecking; Tumbling; Exulans; Variable static margin; Variable sweep wing; Pilot mathematical model; Oswald efficiency.

Opsomming

Longitudinale hanteringseienskappe van 'n stertlose meeuwlerkvliegtuig

Skrywer : Daniël Sarel Agenbag
Studentenommer : 9701128-3
Studieleier : Prof. N.J. Theron
Mede-studieleier : Mnr. R.J. Huysen
Graadbenaming : Magister in Ingenieurswese (Meganies)
Departement : Departement Meganiese en Lugvaartkundige
Ingenieurswese

'n Onderzoek is geloods aangaande die vlughanteringseienskappe van die meeuwlerkuiteleg. Hierdie uitleg is 'n stertlose ontwerp waarvan die vlerk 'n oorgang in veeg en diëderhoek het. Die Exulans sweeftuig, tans onder ontwikkeling by die Universiteit van Pretoria, is 'n voorbeeld van hierdie uitleg. Die studie het gefokus op heivlak dinamika. Die Exulans is 'n navorsingsplatform wat gebruik sal word om die spesiale vlugbeheerstelsel van die meeuwlerkuiteleg te ondersoek deur volskaalse vlugtoetse. Veranderbare vlerkveeg, asook wringbare hoogterolroere en rigtingroere op entvlerke word gebruik om die Exulans te stuur. Die beheeroppervlaktes is ontwerp om die impak op die werksverrigting van die vliegtuig te minimeer. Die hanteringseienskappe van die meeuwlerkuiteleg moet aanvaarbaar wees met die gebruik van hierdie stuurmeganismes.

Die ondersoek moes bepaal of die meeuwlerkuiteleg gunstige hanteringseienskappe sal vertoon terwyl die vliegtuig se swaartepunt geplaas is op 'n posisie wat assosieer word met die mees gunstige aerodinamiese werksverrigting. Daar is 'n voordeel met betrekking tot aerodinamiese werksverrigting wanneer 'n vliegtuig ontwerp word sodat die swaartepunt ooreenstem met die sogenaamde 'E-punt'.

Die E-punt is die sentroïede van die drukverdeling van 'n elliptiese sirkulasiever-spreiding. 'n Elliptiese sirkulasiever-spreiding word assosieer met die mees gunstige Oswald rendement van 'n vliegtuig.

Tyddomein simulasetegnieke en frekwensiedomein analyses is gebruik om die hanteringseienskappe van die meevlerkuiteleg te ondersoek. Die C-ster kriterium is gebruik om hanteringseienskappe te ondersoek met behulp van tyddomein si-mulasie resultate. Tyddomein simulaties was gebruik om die Exulans en ander vliegtuie te vergelyk met betrekking tot hanteringseienskappe. Eiewaarde analise is gebruik tesame met die 'vingerafdruk' kriterium om die inherente lugraamhan-te-ringseienskappe van die meevlerk te ondersoek. Die Shomber-Gertsen en Militêre Standaard 8785 kriteria is ook vir dieselfde doel gebruik. Die Neal-Smith metode is gebruik om die effek van beheerouteiteit op hanteringseienskappe en die invloed van 'n vlieënier te ondersoek. Die Mönnich-Dalldorff kriterium is gebruik om die effek van rukwindtoestande op hanteringseienskappe te ondersoek. 'n Analisekaart deur Fremaux en Vairo is gebruik om die vatbaarheid van die meevlerkuiteleg vir tuimeling te ondersoek.

Die heivlak hanteringseienskapstudie het getoon dat die meevlerkuiteleg ge-noegsame belofte van gunstige hanteringseienskappe toon wanneer die swaartepunt geplaas word op posisies wat assosieer word met hoë aerodinamiese werksverrig-ting. Analise het ook onthul dat die meevlerkuiteleg vatbaar is vir tuimeling. Die studie het verder ook aangetoon dat die uiteleg meer gunstige hanteringseienskap-pe het as bestaande stertlose ontwerpe tydens turbulente omstandighede, mits dit met 'n lae stabiliteitsgrens ontwerp word.

Dit word aanbeveel dat 'n laterale hanteringseienskapstudie van stapel ge-stuur word voor enige volskaalse vlugtoetse met die Exulans onderneem word. Die moontlikheid van staking by die vlerkpunte moet ook ondersoek word vir die meevlerkuiteleg.

SLEUTELWOORDE: Stertlose vliegtuig; Hanteringseienskappe; E-punt; O-punt; Vlugsimulasie; Teruggeveegde meevlerkkonfigurasie; Mönnich en Dalldorff kriterium; C-ster kriterium; Vingerafdruk kriterium; Shomber-Gertsen analise; Neal-Smith analise; Vlieënierinsetossilasies; Knikossilasies; Tuimelvlug; Exulans; Veranderbare stabiliteitsgrens; Veranderbare vlerkveeghoek; Oswald rendement.

Credits

The author of this document would like to thank the following persons who have played a part in the successful completion of this study:

- S. Ackerman
- M. Agenbag
- Mev. Annamarie Bezuidenhout
- A.V. Bergh
- C.P. Crosby
- E. Güther
- M. Heyns
- R.J. Huyssen
- W.E. Misselhorn
- C. Sandrock
- R. Sogno
- J. Sutherland
- N.J. Theron
- C.G. van Deventer

Artificial flight may be defined as that form of aviation in which a man flies at will **in any direction**, by means of an apparatus attached to his body, the use of which requires **dexterity** of the user.

Otto Lilienthal, 1895

Kunstflug bedeutet willkürliches Fliegen eines Menschen mittels eines an seinem Körper befestigten Flugapparates, dessen Gebrauch persönliche geschicklichkeit voraussetzt.

Typeset using L^AT_EX 2_ε

Contents

Synopsis	i
Keywords	ii
Opsomming	iii
Sleutelwoorde	iv
Credits	v
1 Introduction	1
1.1 The Swept Gull-Wing Configuration	2
1.2 The Exulans Project	3
1.3 The Goal	5
1.4 Methodology and Limitations	5
2 A History of Tailless Aircraft	8
3 Handling Quality Criteria	22
3.1 Cooper Harper Flying Qualities Rating Scale	22
3.2 The Zacher Protocol	23
3.3 Thumbprint Criterion Analysis	23
3.4 Military Flying Qualities Specifications	26
3.5 The C-star Flying Qualities Criterion	28
3.6 The Shomber-Gertsen criterion	31
3.7 The Neal-Smith Criterion	33
3.8 A Turbulence Handling Criterion	41
4 Mathematical Model	42
4.1 Definition of Aircraft Axis System	42

4.2	Aircraft Model Characterisation	43
4.3	Stability Derivatives	46
4.4	Equations of Motion	48
4.5	Analytical Approximations for Short Period and Phugoid Modes	49
4.5.1	The Short Period Approximation	49
4.5.2	The Phugoid Approximation	50
4.5.3	Tailed aircraft Sensitivity Analysis	51
4.6	Aircraft Mathematical Models	55
4.7	Gull-Wing Configuration Model	56
4.7.1	Inertial Parameters	57
4.7.2	Aerodynamic Parameters	61
4.7.3	E-point, O-Point and C-point of the Gull-Wing Configuration	70
4.8	Disturbance models	75
4.8.1	Gust Disturbance	75
4.8.2	Elevon Step Input	77
5	Gull-Wing Sensitivity Analysis	78
5.1	Baseline and method	79
5.2	Pitch Axis Inertia	81
5.3	Pitch Damping Coefficient	85
5.4	Elevon Control Authority	88
5.5	Conclusion of Sensitivity Analysis	91
6	Time Domain Analysis	92
6.1	C-star Criterion Analysis	92
6.2	Comparative Simulations	95
7	Frequency Domain Analysis	102
7.1	Thumbprint Criterion Analysis	102
7.2	Military Flying Qualities Specifications	104
7.3	Shomber-Gertsen Analysis	106
7.4	Neal-Smith Handling Qualities Analysis	110
7.5	Frequency Domain Analysis Summary	113

8	Turbulence and Tumbling Criteria	115
8.1	Turbulence Handling Criterion	115
8.2	Tumbling	119
9	Handling Qualities and Performance	122
10	Conclusion	128
11	Recommendations	131
	Bibliography	134
	Index	141
A	The Cooper-Harper Scale	144
B	Eigenvalue Analysis	146
C	Aircraft Planforms in this Study	149
D	Time Step Size	151
E	C_{M_q} Benchmark Investigation	155
E.1	Planforms under Investigation	156
E.2	Results and Conclusions	157
F	$C_{M_{\delta_e}}$ Benchmark Investigation	161
F.1	Planforms under Investigation	161
F.2	Wind tunnel Data	163
F.3	The Sensitivity of $C_{M_{\delta_e}}$ with respect to Panel Size in VLM 's.	168
F.4	Results and Conclusions	171
G	Neutral Point Benchmark Study	174
G.1	Wind tunnel results	174
G.2	Neutral Point Using VLM	176
G.3	Wind tunnel and VLM Comparison	177
G.4	Conclusions	179

H Aircraft Configurations	181
I Time Domain Simulations	189
I.1 Pitch Control Input Analysis	189
I.2 Pitch Control Input Simulations	196
I.2.1 Configurations 45, 54, 63, 72	196
I.2.2 Configurations 117, 126, 135, 144	199
I.2.3 Configurations 93, 96, 99	202
I.2.4 Configurations 57, 60, 63	205
I.2.5 Configurations 97, 98, 99	208
I.3 Gust Response Analysis	211
I.4 Gust Response Simulations	216
I.4.1 Configurations 15, 18, 21, 24	216
I.4.2 Configurations 39, 42, 45, 48	219
I.4.3 Configurations 31, 32, 33	222
I.5 C-star Analysis Results	225
J Frequency Domain Analysis Results	228
J.1 Thumbprint Criterion Analysis	228
J.2 Military Flying Qualities Analysis	230
J.3 Shomber-Gertsen Analysis	232
K Neal-Smith Example	237
L Longitudinal Transfer Functions	245

List of Figures

1.1	The Göppingen Gö 3 or ‘Minimoa’ (Anonymous, 2006).	2
1.2	A computer generated image of the Exulans II.	3
1.3	The variable outboard wing sweep as implemented on the Exulans.	3
1.4	Exulans I hanging from balloon prior to launch	4
2.1	The tailless sailplane ‘Weltensegler’ (Nickel & Wohlfahrt, 1994:12).	8
2.2	Photo of the sailplanes Horten H II, H III, H IV. (Nickel & Wohlfahrt, 1994)	9
2.3	Different Horten wing planforms (Nickel & Wohlfahrt, 1994).	10
2.4	The Messerschmitt Me-163 Komet (Nickel & Wohlfahrt, 1994).	11
2.5	Two Northrop tailless aircraft designs. (Anonymous, n.d. g)	12
2.6	The Fauvel AV-36. (Anonymous, n.d. b)	13
2.7	Polish tailless aircraft designs of the 50’s.	14
2.8	The G.A.L./56 tailless aircraft. (Nickel & Wohlfahrt, 1994:217- 222)	15
2.9	A Jim Marske design. (Anonymous, n.d. d)	15
2.10	Modern low taper ratio sailplanes.	17
2.11	The SWIFT foot launched glider. (Kroo et al., 1991)	18
2.12	The Blended Wing Body Concept from Cambridge University (Anonymous, 2005:12).	19
2.13	Tailless experimental aircraft. (Wilson, 2003:23-24)	20
2.14	The Boeing ScanEagle <i>UAV</i> (Holly, 2005:37).	21
3.1	Typical pilot opinion contours for the short period mode (O’Hara, 1967).	24

3.2	Category A control anticipation parameter and ζ_{sp} requirements (Chun & Chang, 2001).	26
3.3	The C-star time history envelopes from Tobie et al. (1966).	29
3.4	The longitudinal short-period criterion of Shomber & Gertsen (1967) for $n_\alpha \leq 15$ g/rad.	32
3.5	The longitudinal short-period criterion of Shomber & Gertsen (1967) for $n_\alpha \geq 15$ g/rad.	33
3.6	The Neal-Smith criterion for fighter manoeuvring dynamics.	34
3.7	Mathematical model of pitch attitude tracking.	36
3.8	Tracking performance standards used in the Neal-Smith analysis (Neal & Smith, 1970:44).	37
3.9	Nichols chart with performance standards.	39
3.10	Amplitude-phase curves for ‘Optimum’ pilot compensation. (Neal & Smith, 1970:54)	40
4.1	Aircraft axes system used in this document.	43
4.2	Three views of the Exulans glider showing assumed CG locations of different aircraft components. (Outboard wing sweep angle (γ) at 31°).	60
4.3	Four different CG locations and the neutral point as a function of sweep.	61
4.4	Aircraft static margin as a function of sweep angle for four different CG locations.	62
4.5	Pitch inertia (I_{yy}) as function of sweep angle for four different static margin configurations.	63
4.6	C_{L_α} and C_{M_α} for different outboard wing sweep angles.	65
4.7	$C_{L_{\delta_e}}$ and $C_{M_{\delta_e}}$ for different outboard wing sweep angles.	68
4.8	Pitch damping coefficient (C_{M_q}) for different outboard sweep angles.	69
4.9	Calculation of O-Point by means of graphical method for a wing with an outboard sweep angle of 30°	72
4.10	Calculation of C-Point by means of graphical method for a wing with an outboard sweep angle of 30°	73

4.11	The O-point, C-point, E-point and the neutral point of the gull-wing configuration for a range of outboard wing sweep angles.	74
4.12	Wing velocity distribution due to pitching. (Etkin, 1972:270) .	76
4.13	The 1 – cos vertical gust disturbance. (Mönnich & Dalldorff, 1993)	77
5.1	Gust response of aircraft angle of attack (α) at different pitch axis inertias.	83
5.2	Magnified gust response of aircraft angle of attack (α) at different pitch axis inertias.	83
5.3	Gust response of aircraft attitude (θ) at different pitch axis inertias.	84
5.4	Short period gust response of aircraft attitude (θ) at different pitch axis inertias.	84
5.5	Gust response of aircraft angle of attack (α) at different damping coefficient values.	87
5.6	Gust response of aircraft attitude (θ) at different damping coefficient values.	87
5.7	Control input step response of aircraft angle of attack (α) at different control authority aircraft configurations.	89
5.8	Control input step response of aircraft attitude (θ) at different control authority aircraft configurations.	90
6.1	The C-star analysis for all control authority variations at 24° sweep with the baseline aerodynamic damping at a 10.7% (at 30°) static margin configuration. (Configurations 57, 60, 63) .	95
6.2	The response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a 1 – cos gust, for the ASW-19, the SB-13, the 24° (15% static margin) and the 36° (5% static margin) sweep Exulans.	97
6.3	Aircraft attitude (θ) to a 1 – cos gust, during the period of the introduction of the gust, for the ASW-19, the SB-13 and Exulans.	98

6.4	The superimposed response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a $1 - \cos$ gust, for the ASW-19, the SB-13, the 24° (15% static margin) and the 36° (5% static margin) sweep Exulans.	99
6.5	The response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a $1 - \cos$ gust, for the ASW-19, the SB-13 and the 30° (2% static margin) sweep Exulans.	99
6.6	Zoomed aircraft attitude (θ) to a $1 - \cos$ gust, for the ASW-19, the SB-13 and Exulans.	100
6.7	The superimposed response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a $1 - \cos$ gust, for the ASW-19, the SB-13 and the 30° (2% static margin) sweep Exulans.	101
6.8	The response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a $1 - \cos$ gust, for the Piper Cherokee (gliding flight).	101
7.1	Thumbprint analysis for 24° outboard wing sweep, at various static margin cases, with the baseline aerodynamic damping. (Configuration nr. 18 is 24° 5% d, Configuration nr. 21 is 24° 10.7% d, Configuration nr. 24 is 24° 15% d, as per Table H.2)	104
7.2	<i>CAP</i> for 24° outboard wing sweep, at various static margin cases, with the baseline aerodynamic damping. (Configuration nr. 18 is 24° 5% d, Configuration nr. 21 is 24° 10.7% d, Configuration nr. 24 is 24° 15% d, as per Table H.2)	105
7.3	Group one analysis results for $n_\alpha < 15$ g/rad.	108
7.4	Group one analysis results for $n_\alpha \geq 15$ g/rad.	109
7.5	Results of the Neal-Smith study performed on various gull-wing configurations.	112
8.1	Generic flying wing models used for tumbling research. (Fremaux & Vairo, 1995)	120
8.2	Static margin for tumbling as a function of aspect ratio for models with ‘wing-heavy’ (ie. $I_{xx} > I_{yy}$) loadings. (Fremaux & Vairo, 1995)	121

9.1	Region of best Oswald efficiency for the Exulans. The y-axis represents the distance behind the wing leading edge (at plane of symmetry).	123
9.2	Region of acceptable handling qualities (PR is 3.5 or better) for the Exulans for different sweep angles and CG positions. The y-axis represents the distance behind the wing leading edge (at plane of symmetry).	124
9.3	Superposition of regions of acceptable handling qualities and best Oswald efficiency for the Exulans. The y-axis represents the distance behind the wing leading edge (at plane of symmetry).	126
9.4	Region with both acceptable handling qualities and best Oswald efficiency for the Exulans. The y-axis represents the distance behind the wing leading edge (at plane of symmetry).	127
C.1	Planforms that formed part of the handling quality investigation.	150
D.1	The effect of step size on angle of attack (α) response for four step sizes.	152
D.2	The effect of step size on attitude (θ) response for four step sizes.	152
D.3	The effect of step size on the short period attitude (θ) response for four step sizes (Zoomed-in portion of Figure D.2).	153
D.4	The effect of step size on the pitch rate response for four step sizes.	153
D.5	The effect of step size on the normal acceleration response for four step sizes.	154
D.6	The effect of step size on the true airspeed response for four step sizes.	154
E.1	The four wing planform types used in the vortex lattice method benchmark study. (Toll & Queijo, 1948:47)	156
E.2	Convergence of C_{M_q} values as calculated with the Tornado vortex lattice method.	157

E.3	C_{M_q} values for different angles of attack from experimental data (Toll & Queijo, 1948:58) compared with calculated values from vortex lattice methods.	159
F.1	Planforms of the horizontal tail models of aspect ratio 6 used in the benchmark investigation. (Dods, 1948:13)	162
F.2	Aerodynamic moment reference axis as used in Dods (1948:.) .	163
F.3	Lift coefficients of an unswept tail. Aspect ratio, 6; R_e , 3.0×10^6 . (Dods, 1948:19)	164
F.4	Pitching moment coefficients of an unswept tail. Aspect ratio, 6; R_e , 3.0×10^6 . The moments are measured around a lateral axis through a point that is 25% chordwise aft of the leading edge on the mean aerodynamic chord. (Dods, 1948:21)	165
F.5	Lift coefficients of a 35° swept-back tail. Aspect ratio, 6; R_e , 3.0×10^6 . (Dods, 1948:29)	166
F.6	Pitching moment coefficients of a 35° swept-back tail. Aspect ratio, 6; R_e , 3.0×10^6 . The moments are measured around a lateral axis through a point that is 25% chordwise aft of the leading edge on the mean aerodynamic chord. (Dods, 1948:31)	167
F.7	Sensitivity study with respect to the number of panel elements on the wing for the C_{L_α} , C_{M_α} , $C_{L_{\delta_e}}$ and $C_{M_{\delta_e}}$ parameters. . . .	170
F.8	Comparison of calculated values of $C_{L_{\delta_e}}$ and $C_{M_{\delta_e}}$ with wind tunnel data.	172
G.1	Convergence of static margin with respect to number of <i>VLM</i> elements.	178
I.1	Response in aircraft angle of attack (α) to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	193

I.2	Response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a unit step elevon control input to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	194
I.3	Response in aircraft pitch rate to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	194
I.4	Response in aircraft normal acceleration to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	195
I.5	Response in aircraft airspeed to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	195
I.6	Response in aircraft angle of attack (α) to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	196
I.7	Response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	197
I.8	Response in aircraft pitch rate to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	197
I.9	Response in aircraft normal acceleration to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	198
I.10	Response in aircraft airspeed to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	198

I.11	Response in aircraft angle of attack (α) to a unit step elevon control input for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	199
I.12	Response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a unit step elevon control input for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	200
I.13	Response in aircraft pitch rate to a unit step elevon control input for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	200
I.14	Response in aircraft normal acceleration to a unit step elevon control input for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	201
I.15	Response in aircraft airspeed to a unit step elevon control input for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	201
I.16	Response in aircraft angle of attack (α) to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	202
I.17	Response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	203
I.18	Response in aircraft pitch rate to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	203
I.19	Response in aircraft normal acceleration to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	204

I.20	Response in aircraft airspeed to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	204
I.21	Response in aircraft angle of attack (α) to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	205
I.22	Response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	206
I.23	Response in aircraft pitch rate to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	206
I.24	Response in aircraft normal acceleration to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	207
I.25	Response in aircraft airspeed to a unit step elevon control input for 24° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline aerodynamic damping with variations in control authority.	207
I.26	Response in aircraft angle of attack (α) to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline control authority with variations in aerodynamic damping.	208
I.27	Response in aircraft attitude (θ) to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline control authority with variations in aerodynamic damping.	209

I.28	Response in aircraft pitch rate to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline control authority with variations in aerodynamic damping.	209
I.29	Response in aircraft normal acceleration to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline control authority with variations in aerodynamic damping.	210
I.30	Response in aircraft airspeed to a unit step elevon control input for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30°) with the baseline control authority with variations in aerodynamic damping.	210
I.31	Gust response for aircraft angle of attack (α) for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	213
I.32	Gust response for aircraft attitude (θ) for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	213
I.33	Gust response for aircraft pitch rate for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	214
I.34	Gust response for aircraft normal acceleration for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	214
I.35	Gust response for aircraft airspeed for 30° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	215
I.36	Gust response for aircraft angle of attack (α) for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	216
I.37	Gust response for aircraft attitude (θ) for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	217

I.38	Gust response for aircraft pitch rate for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	217
I.39	Gust response for aircraft normal acceleration for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	218
I.40	Gust response for aircraft airspeed for 24° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	218
I.41	Gust response for aircraft angle of attack (α) for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	219
I.42	Gust response for aircraft attitude (θ) for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	220
I.43	Gust response for aircraft pitch rate for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	220
I.44	Gust response for aircraft normal acceleration for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	221
I.45	Gust response for aircraft airspeed for 36° outboard wing sweep at different static margins with the baseline control authority and aerodynamic damping.	221
I.46	Gust response for aircraft angle of attack (α) for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30° sweep) with different configurations for aerodynamic damping.	222
I.47	Gust response for aircraft attitude (θ) for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30° sweep) with different configurations for aerodynamic damping.	223
I.48	Gust response for aircraft pitch rate for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30° sweep) with different configurations for aerodynamic damping.	223

I.49	Gust response for aircraft normal acceleration for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30° sweep) with different configurations for aerodynamic damping.	224
I.50	Gust response for aircraft airspeed for 30° outboard wing sweep at a 10.7% static margin (at 30° sweep) with different configurations for aerodynamic damping.	224
I.51	The C-star analysis for all static margin variations at 30° sweep having the baseline aerodynamic damping and control authority. (Configurations 81, 90, 99, 108).	225
I.52	The C-star analysis for all static margin variations at 24° sweep having the baseline aerodynamic damping and control authority. (Configurations 63, 72).	226
I.53	The C-star analysis for all static margin variations at 36° sweep having the baseline aerodynamic damping and control authority. (Configurations 117, 126, 135, 144)	226
I.54	The C-star analysis for all control authority variations at 30° sweep with the baseline aerodynamic damping at a 10.7% (at 30°) static margin configuration. (Configurations 93, 96, 99)	227
I.55	The C-star analysis for all damping variations at 30° sweep with the baseline control authority at a 10.7% (at 30°) static margin configuration. (Configurations 97, 98, 99)	227
J.1	Thumbprint analysis for 20° outboard wing sweep, at various static margin cases, with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	228
J.2	Thumbprint analysis for 30° outboard wing sweep, at various static margin cases, with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	229
J.3	Thumbprint analysis for 36° outboard wing sweep, at various static margin cases, with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	229
J.4	<i>CAP</i> for 20° outboard wing sweep, at various static margin cases, with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	230
J.5	<i>CAP</i> for 30° outboard wing sweep, at various static margin cases, with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	231

J.6	<i>CAP</i> for 36° outboard wing sweep, at various static margin cases, with the baseline aerodynamic damping.	231
J.7	Group two analysis results for $n_\alpha < 15$ g/rad.	232
J.8	Group three analysis results for $n_\alpha < 15$ g/rad.	233
J.9	Group three analysis results for $n_\alpha \geq 15$ g/rad.	233
J.10	Group four analysis results for $n_\alpha < 15$ g/rad.	234
J.11	Group four analysis results for $n_\alpha \geq 15$ g/rad.	234
J.12	Group five analysis results for $n_\alpha < 15$ g/rad.	235
J.13	Group five analysis results for $n_\alpha \geq 15$ g/rad.	235
J.14	Group six analysis results for $n_\alpha < 15$ g/rad.	236
J.15	Group six analysis results for $n_\alpha \geq 15$ g/rad.	236
K.1	Nichols chart for aircraft configuration 99 with only gain adjustment in order to achieve the performance standards. . . .	238
K.2	Nichols chart illustrating the difference between a system that requires lead and lag compensation.	239
K.3	Nichols chart for aircraft configuration 99 with lead, lag and gain adjustment in order to achieve the performance standards.	241
K.4	Bode plot of the pilot compensation network. The phase angle at 3.5 rad/s is indicated by an arrow.	242
K.5	Bode plots for aircraft configuration 99 showing the Bode characteristics of the airframe only, the open loop as well as the closed loop pilot compensated aircraft transfer function. .	243
K.6	Step response for the closed loop pilot compensated aircraft configuration 99.	244

List of Tables

3.1	Level 1 requirements for MIL-F-8785C	28
4.1	Longitudinal dimensional and dimensionless derivatives (Stevens & Lewis, 1992:105).	47
4.2	Results of the sensitivity analysis of the short period mode. (The absolute values of the changes in magnitude of the properties are shown)	53
4.3	Results of the sensitivity analysis of the phugoid mode. (The absolute values of the changes in magnitude of the properties are shown)	54
4.4	The aircraft mathematical model parameters used in this study.	56
4.5	Longitudinal mass and balance data of the Exulans (30° sweep, 10.7% @ 30° static margin layout).	59
4.6	Lift curve information from Crosby (2000)	66
4.7	Comparison of aerodynamic data from Crosby (2000) to JK-VLM results	66
5.1	Baseline parameter values used for the sensitivity study (30° sweep gull-wing configuration with a 10.7% static margin at 30° sweep).	80
5.2	Comparison of modal characteristics estimated by numerical methods and analytical approximations (30° sweep gull-wing configuration with a 10.7% static margin at 30° sweep).	81
5.3	Sensitivity of circular natural frequency with respect to pitch inertia.	82
5.4	Sensitivity of damping ratio with respect to pitch inertia.	82

5.5	Sensitivity of natural frequency with respect to pitch damping coefficient.	86
5.6	Sensitivity of damping ratio with respect to pitch damping coefficient.	86
5.7	Sensitivity of pitch attitude (θ) amplitude with respect to $C_{M_{\delta_e}}$	89
8.1	Trim conditions used for the Mönnich-Dalldorff analysis of the gull-wing configuration.	117
8.2	The evaluation of the Mönnich-Dalldorff criterion for different outboard wing sweep angles of the gull-wing configuration aircraft for a 2% static margin at 30° sweep case.	117
8.3	The evaluation of the Mönnich-Dalldorff criterion for different outboard wing sweep angles of the gull-wing configuration aircraft for a 5% static margin at 30° sweep case.	118
8.4	The evaluation of the Mönnich-Dalldorff criterion for different outboard wing sweep angles of the gull-wing configuration aircraft for a 10.7% static margin at 30° sweep case.	118
8.5	The evaluation of the Mönnich-Dalldorff criterion for different outboard wing sweep angles of the gull-wing configuration aircraft for a 15% static margin at 30° sweep case.	119
A.1	Pilot opinion rating and flying qualities level. (The Cooper Harper scale)	145
E.1	Comparison of values of C_{M_q} calculated by different methods	158
F.1	<i>VLM</i> model sizes used for the $C_{M_{\delta_e}}$ sensitivity analysis.	168
F.2	Comparison of the JKVLM elevator deflection coefficients with Tornado results. All coefficients have the units [1/rad]	169
F.3	Comparison of the calculated elevator deflection coefficients with wind tunnel results for the same coefficients. All coefficients have the units [1/rad]	171
G.1	Wind tunnel results for the neutral point. The neutral point position is given in percentage of mean aerodynamic chord.	175

G.2	<i>VLM</i> results for the neutral point. The neutral point position is given in percentage of mean aerodynamic chord.	177
G.3	Comparison of the wind tunnel and <i>VLM</i> results for the neutral point and static margin.	179
H.1	The aircraft configurations investigated in the pitch control effectiveness analysis.	183
H.2	The aircraft configurations investigated in the gust response and eigenvalue analysis.	187

Nomenclature

Mathematical Symbols

- A Linearised state space matrix (see Equation B.6)
- A Wing area (Only Figure E.1) [m^2]
- a_0 Section lift curve slope for a section normal to the quarter-chord line when placed in the direction of the free stream [$^\circ/\text{rad}$]
- b Wing span of aircraft [m]
- \bar{c} Mean aerodynamic chord [m]
- c Damping term matrix of a multi-degree-of-freedom system
- C^* C-star response []
- C_D Aircraft drag coefficient
- C_L Aircraft lift coefficient
- C_M Aircraft moment coefficient
- C_{D_0} Parasitic drag coefficient
- C_{D_α} Drag coefficient derivative w.r.t. angle of attack
- C_{D_e} Equilibrium drag coefficient
- C_{D_i} Coefficient of induced drag
- C_{D_V} Drag coefficient derivative w.r.t. true airspeed

$C_{D_{\delta_e}}$	Drag coefficient derivative w.r.t. angle of elevator (or elevon) deflection
C_{L_0}	y-intercept of lift coefficient curve
C_{L_q}	Lift coefficient due to the pitch rate of the aircraft
C_{L_V}	Lift coefficient derivative w.r.t. true airspeed
C_{L_α}	Lift coefficient curve slope [1/rad]
$C_{L_{\delta_e}}$	Lift coefficient due to the elevator (or elevon) deflection
$C_{L_{\dot{\alpha}}}$	Lift coefficient derivative w.r.t. the rate of change of angle of attack
C_{M_0}	y-intercept of moment curve
C_{M_q}	Pitch moment coefficient of aircraft due to pitch rate, or pitch damping [1/rad]
C_{M_V}	Moment coefficient derivative w.r.t. true airspeed
C_{M_α}	Moment coefficient curve slope of the aircraft [1/rad]
$C_{M_{\dot{\alpha}}}$	Pitch moment coefficient of aircraft due to rate of change of angle of attack. This coefficient relates to aerodynamic damping due to the interaction between the forward lifting surface and aft lifting surface (the horizontal stabiliser for most aircraft). [1/rad]
$C_{M_{\delta_e}}$	Change of moment coefficient w.r.t. elevon deflection angle [1/rad]
d	Time delay
e	Oswald's span efficiency factor
\bar{F}	Excitation force vector of a multi-degree-of-freedom system
F_s	Elevator (or elevon) stick force, positive for pull [N]
g	Gravitational acceleration [m/s ²]

I	Identity matrix
i	The complex part of a complex number
I_{xx}	X-X moment of inertia (aircraft body axis system) [kg·m ²]
I_{yy}	Y-Y moment of inertia (aircraft body axis system) [kg·m ²]
I_{zz}	Z-Z moment of inertia (aircraft body axis system) [kg·m ²]
k	Stiffness matrix of a multi-degree-of-freedom system
K_1	Normal acceleration scaling constant of the C* analysis [].
K_2	Pitch rate scaling constant of the C* analysis [seconds].
K_3	Pitch acceleration scaling constant of the C* analysis [seconds ²].
K_θ	The ‘airframe only’ gain
K_p	Steady state pilot gain
K_q	Steady state gain, elevator to pitch rate transfer function
l	Distance from aircraft centre of gravity to the head of the pilot. [m]
L_α	$\frac{\rho V_T^2 S C_{L_\alpha}}{2mV_T}$, the dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic lift in the wind axis system w.r.t. angle of attack. In the case of an aircraft with negligible control surface lift this parameter is an approximation of the inverse of τ_{θ_2} . [1/second]
L_{δ_e}	$\frac{\rho V_T^2 S C_{L_{\delta_e}}}{2mV_T}$, the dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic lift in the wind axis system w.r.t. elevon deflection [1/second]
m	Aircraft mass [kg]
m	Mass (inertia) matrix of a multi-degree-of-freedom system
M_α	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic pitch moment in the wind axis system w.r.t. angle of attack

M_q	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic pitch moment in the wind axis system w.r.t. pitch rate of the aircraft
M_V	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic pitch moment in the wind axis system w.r.t. true airspeed
M_{δ_e}	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic pitch moment in the wind axis system w.r.t. elevator (or elevon) deflection
$M_{\dot{\alpha}}$	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic pitch moment in the wind axis system w.r.t. the rate of change of the angle of attack
M_{F_s}	$M_{\delta_e} \left(\frac{\delta_e}{F_s} \right)_{SS}$, the derivative of aerodynamic moment around the pitch axis with respect to elevator (or elevon) stick force at steady state conditions.
n	Aircraft load factor $\frac{L}{mg}$, or the normal acceleration of aircraft [g's]
n_α	Load factor gradient [g/rad]
\bar{q}	Dynamic pressure or $\frac{1}{2}\rho V_T^2$ [N/m ²]
q	Pitch rate of aircraft [rad/s]
q_g	Pitch rate due to gust velocity [rad/s]
q_{rel}	Pitch rate of aircraft relative to surrounding air [rad/s]
S	Wing area [m ²]
s	Laplace operator [1/rad]
s	Quarter chord sweep angle [°]
s_r	Eigenvalue with index r , of a generic multi degree of freedom system
s_r^*	The complex conjugate of s_r
T_{2p}	Time to double, the time for the dynamic mode to double in amplitude [seconds]

V_e	True airspeed at trim condition [m/s] or [km/h]
V_T	True airspeed [m/s]
\dot{w}_g	Partial derivative of vertical component of gust velocity with respect to time [m/s ²]
W_g	Maximum value of the vertical gust [m/s]
w_g	Vertical component of gust velocity as function of time [m/s]
$\ddot{\bar{x}}$	Acceleration vector of a multi-degree-of-freedom system
$\dot{\bar{x}}$	Velocity vector of a multi-degree-of-freedom system
$\dot{\mathbf{x}}$	State vector in state space representation
\bar{X}	Longitudinal distance rearward from the aircraft <i>CG</i> to the wing aerodynamic centre
\bar{x}	Displacement vector of a multi-degree-of-freedom system
X_α	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic force in the X-direction of the wind axis system w.r.t. angle of attack
X_V	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic force in the X-direction of the wind axis system w.r.t. true airspeed
X_{δ_e}	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic force in the X-direction of the wind axis system w.r.t. elevator (or elevon) deflection
x_{cg}	Distance between the leading edge of the wing on the symmetry axis of the aircraft and the <i>CG</i> [m]
$\dot{\bar{y}}$	Acceleration vector of a multi-degree-of-freedom system (State space substitution)
\bar{y}	Velocity vector of a multi-degree-of-freedom system (State space substitution)

\dot{z}	State space substitution variable
z	Derivative of state space substitution variable
Z_α	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic force in the Z-direction of the wind axis system w.r.t. angle of attack
Z_q	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic force in the Z-direction of the wind axis system w.r.t. pitch rate of the aircraft
Z_V	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic force in the Z-direction of the wind axis system w.r.t. true airspeed
Z_{δ_e}	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic force in the Z-direction of the wind axis system w.r.t. elevator (or elevon) deflection
$Z_{\dot{\alpha}}$	Dimensional derivative of the aerodynamic force in the Z-direction of the wind axis system w.r.t. the rate of change of the angle of attack
α	Angle of attack [rad or degrees]
$\dot{\alpha}$	Rate of change of angle of attack [rad/s]
γ	Outboard wing sweep angle (See Figure 4.2). [rad or degrees]
δ_e	Elevator (or elevon) deflection angle [rad]
ζ	Damping ratio []
ζ_p	Phugoid mode damping ratio []
ζ_r	The damping ratio of the r^{th} mode of a generic multi degree of freedom system []
ζ_{sp}	Short period mode damping ratio []
$\ddot{\theta}$	Pitch acceleration of the aircraft. [rad/s ²]
$\dot{\theta}$	Pitch rate [rad/s]
θ	Pitch angle [rad or degrees]

θ_e	Error between the commanded pitch attitude and the aircraft pitch attitude [rad]
Λ	Angle of sweep of wing quarter-chord line [degrees]
λ	Wavelength of the vertical gust disturbance [m]
ρ	Density of air [kg/m ³]
τ_{θ_2}	Numerator time constant (airframe lead time constant) of pitch rate to elevator deflection transfer function [seconds]
τ_{p_1}	Time constant of control system lead element [seconds]
τ_{p_2}	Time constant of control system lag element [seconds]
χ	Aspect ratio, $\frac{b^2}{S}$ []
ω	Circular frequency [rad/s]
ω_d	Damped natural frequency [rad/s]
ω_r	The natural frequency of the r^{th} mode of a generic multi degree of freedom system [rad/s]
ω_{n_p}	Phugoid mode natural frequency [rad/s]
$\omega_{n_{sp}}$	Short period mode natural frequency [rad/s]
\angle	Signifies Bode phase angle of a transfer function
$\left(\frac{\theta}{\theta_e}\right)^*$	$\frac{\theta}{\theta_e}$ transfer function with uncompensated pilot. This transfer function is considered as uncompensated when only a gain was used to achieve the Neal-Smith performance standards.
$\left(\frac{\delta_e}{F_s}\right)_{SS}$	Steady state gearing between elevator (or elevon) deflection and elevator stick force [rad/N]
$\frac{\theta}{\theta_c}$	The closed-loop transfer function of the aircraft plus control system plus pilot

$\frac{\theta}{\theta_e}$ The open-loop transfer function of the aircraft plus control system plus pilot

$\frac{\theta}{F_s}$ The open-loop transfer function of the aircraft plus control system

Abbreviations

AR Aspect ratio of wing

BW Bandwidth [rad/s]

BW_{MIN} Minimum bandwidth frequency

BWB Blended Wing Body

CAP Control anticipation parameter

CFD Computational Fluid Dynamics

CG Centre of Gravity

dB Decibel units for Bode amplitude, where amplitude in $dB = 20 \log_{10}$ [amplitude]

GPS Global Positioning System

IP Initial point (for a bombing run)

J – UCAS Joint Unmanned Combat Air System

PIO Pilot induced oscillation

PR Pilot rating (of aircraft handling qualities)

UAV Unmanned Air Vehicle

VLM Vortex Lattice Method

Subscripts

e Elevon, as used in δ_e

e Equivalent, as used with V_e

- g* Gust
- r* Index number, typically of an eigenvalue, circular natural frequency or damping ratio
- rel* Relative
- SS* Steady state