

² Hitch, H. P. Y., "Modern Methods of Investigating Flutter and Vibration," *Journal of the Royal Aeronautical Society*, Vol. 68, No. 642, June 1964, pp. 357-373.

³ Rauscher, M., "Station Function and Air Density Variations in Flutter Analysis," *Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences*, Vol. 16, No. 6, June 1949, pp. 345-353.

⁴ Schmitt, A. F., "A Least-Squares Matrix Interpolation of Flexibility Influence Coefficients," *Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences*, Vol. 23, No. 10, Oct. 1956, p. 980.

⁵ Rodden, W. P., "Further Remarks on Matrix Interpolation of Flexibility Influence Coefficients," *Journal of the Aerospace Sciences*, Vol. 26, No. 11, Nov. 1959, pp. 760-761.

⁶ Rodden, W. P. and Revell, J. D., "Aerodynamic Influence Coefficients from Unsteady Slender Wing Theory," Rept. NA-57-1437, Sept. 1957, North American Aviation Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

⁷ Rodden, W. P. and Revell, J. D., "Status of Unsteady Aerodynamic Influence Coefficients," Rept. TDR-930(2230-09)TN-2, Nov. 22, 1961, Aerospace Corp., El Segundo, Calif.

⁸ Andrew, L. V., et al., "Unsteady Aerodynamics for Advanced Configurations," FDL-TDR-64-152, Pt. I, II, and IV, May 1965, Air Force Flight Dynamics Lab., Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

⁹ Kordes, E. E., Kruszewski, E. T., and Weidman, D. J., "Experimental Influence Coefficients and Vibration Modes of a Built-Up 45° Delta-Wing Specimen," TN 3999, May 1957, NACA.

¹⁰ Rodden, W. P., "A Method for Deriving Structural Influence Coefficients from Ground Vibration Tests," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 5, May 1967, pp. 991-1000.

¹¹ McGrew, J. A., "Orthogonalization of Measured Modes and Calculation of Influence Coefficients," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 4, April 1969, pp. 774-776.

Reply by Authors to W. P. Rodden, J. A. McGrew, and T. P. Kálmán

ROBERT L. HARDER*

The MacNeal-Schwendler Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.

AND

ROBERT N. DESMARAIS†

NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va.

THE authors welcome the comments, and the evaluation of the surface spline methods. There are two points which were not sufficiently emphasized in the comparison of surface splines and "interpolation-in-the-small." 1) The success of interpolation-in-the-small requires much work by the analyst to determine the choice of structural points and interpolation functions to be used for each interpolated point. The surface spline technique is more easily automated. 2) The example chosen to compare the two methods is incapable of giving an accurate evaluation. The errors associated with modal truncation are much greater than errors resulting from interpolation, thus completely overshadowing the differences.

Received August 21, 1972.

Index category: Structural Static Analysis.

* Staff Scientist. Member AIAA.

† Aerospace Engineer, Loads Division.