

Step-Size Independent Approach for Multidisciplinary Sensitivity Analysis

James C. Newman III*

Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762-9549

David L. Whitfield†

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403-2598

and

W. Kyle Anderson‡

NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia 23681-2199

A multidisciplinary sensitivity analysis technique based on a complex Taylor series expansion method is implemented. This technique is shown to be independent of step-size selection as it pertains to cancellation errors. The primary focus of this research is to validate a new aero-structural analysis and sensitivity analysis procedure. This validation consists of comparing computed and experimental data obtained for an aeroelastic research wing. Because the aero-structural analysis procedure has the complex variable modifications already included into the software, sensitivity derivatives are automatically computed. Other than for design purposes, sensitivity derivatives can be used for predicting the solution at nearby conditions. The use of sensitivity derivatives for predicting the aero-structural characteristics of this configuration is demonstrated and compared with experimental measurements.

Introduction

OVER the last half-century, through relentless experimental and computational studies, resourceful design engineers have produced near optimal aerospace configurations. To further improve these designs, where the margin for improvement is small, designers will require additional information such as sensitivity derivatives. This additional information may also be used to expedite the design of new engineering systems for which there is no vast experimental or computational database. These needs are the impetus for the development of efficient and accurate multidisciplinary analysis and sensitivity analysis procedures. To maximize the benefits of these procedures, they must have the capability of resolving both the physics and the geometric complexities of practical configurations.

In the mid-1970s, researchers began exploring the use of numerical optimization techniques for the design of aircraft components. These early studies primarily focused on airfoil and wing design using low-fidelity fluid models for the analyses and finite difference calculations for gradient information. The inability of these fluid models to predict accurately nonlinear phenomena limited their applicability. By the mid-1980s, computational resources were available that permitted aerodynamic simulations using the higher-fidelity Euler and Navier–Stokes equations about isolated components and moderately complex configurations. Then Sobieszczanski-Sobieski¹ challenged the aerodynamics community to extend these algorithms to include the shape sensitivity analysis for the geometry. This plea ignited studies aimed at developing methods that would allow for the use of nonlinear aerodynamics in shape optimization. A review on the early aerodynamic shape optimization work has been given by Labrujere and Sloof,² and a concise

review on the use of sensitivity analysis in aerodynamic shape optimization has been reported by Taylor et al.³ and by Newman et al.⁴ A recent paper by Jameson,⁵ furthermore, delineates the evolution of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) as a design tool.

For aerodynamic optimization, the state equation is a system of nonlinear partial differential equations (PDE) expressing the conservation of mass, momentum, and energy. Differentiation of this system of PDE, that is, sensitivity analysis, can be performed at one of two levels. In the first method, termed the continuous or variational approach, the PDE are differentiated before discretization, either directly or by introducing Lagrange multipliers, which are defined as a set of continuous linear equations adjoint to the governing PDE. Subsequently, these directly differentiated or adjoint equations are discretized and solved. In the second method, termed the discrete approach, the PDE are differentiated after discretization. The discrete approach may also be cast in either a direct or an adjoint formulation; see Hou et al.⁶ for a comprehensive presentation of both discrete formulations. For more detailed recent discussions of the continuous approaches to aerodynamic design optimization, see, for example, Refs. 7–11 for the adjoint formulations and Ref. 12 for the direct formulation.

The task of constructing exactly or analytically all of the required linearizations and derivatives by hand for either the direct or adjoint approach and then building the software for evaluating these terms can be extremely tedious. This problem is compounded by the inclusion of even the most elementary turbulence model (for viscous flow) or the use of a sophisticated grid-generation package for adapting (or regenerating) the computational mesh to the latest design. One solution to this problem has been found in the use of a technique known as automatic differentiation. Application of this technique to an existing source code that evaluates output functions automatically generates another source code that evaluates both output functions and derivatives of those functions with respect to specified code input or internal parameters. One such precompiler software tool, ADIFOR (Bischof et al.¹³), has been developed and utilized with much success to obtain complicated derivatives from advanced CFD and grid-generation codes, for use within aerodynamic design optimization procedures.^{14–17} The use of ADIFOR produces code that, when executed, evaluates these derivatives of the output functions via a discrete-direct approach, referred to as forward-mode automatic differentiation. More recently, automatic

Received 3 October 2001; revision received 18 November 2002; accepted for publication 25 November 2002. Copyright © 2003 by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. All rights reserved. Copies of this paper may be made for personal or internal use, on condition that the copier pay the \$10.00 per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923; include the code 0021-8669/03 \$10.00 in correspondence with the CCC.

*Associate Professor, Department of Aerospace Engineering. Member AIAA.

†Professor, Computational Engineering. Associate Fellow AIAA.

‡Senior Research Scientist, Aerodynamics and Acoustic Methods Branch. Associate Fellow AIAA.

differentiation software has emerged that enables the derivatives to be evaluated with a discrete-adjoint approach.^{18,19} This type of automatic differentiation is known as reverse mode.^{20,21}

The best known method for computing the sensitivity information between coupled systems is via the solution of the global sensitivity equations derived by Sobieszczanski-Sobieski.²² This system of equations, which is obtained by directly differentiating the state vector of each discipline, may sometimes be ill conditioned, and the memory requirements associated with the storage of the coefficient matrix may be prohibitive. The ill conditioned, global sensitivity equations, as well as those associated with higher-order spatially accurate aerodynamic sensitivity analysis, may be reformulated and solved by the incremental iterative technique.^{23,24} The incremental iterative technique allows the linear sensitivity equations to be solved iteratively where the coefficient matrix may be any convenient approximation that will converge the system. This allows a better-conditioned, and reduced memory requirement, coefficient matrix to be used. Examples on the use of this technique for aerodynamic shape sensitivity analysis may be found in Refs. 9, 25, and 26 and for multidisciplinary sensitivity analysis in Ref. 27. Furthermore, Arslan and Carlson²⁷ demonstrated the need for multidisciplinary sensitivity analysis, within the design optimization process, by showing that the sensitivity derivatives produced by an aerodynamic-only calculation had different magnitudes, and in some cases different signs, from that obtained with the coupled aero-structural sensitivity analysis. Similar findings have been reported by Barthelemy and Bergen²⁸ and by Newman et al.²⁹ Examples of current research being conducted in the field of multidisciplinary sensitivity analysis may be found in Refs. 26 and 30–32.

Recently, a new method for performing aerodynamic, structural, and multidisciplinary sensitivity analysis^{33,34} has been developed. This method is based on ideas that were explored over three decades ago by Lyness and Moler³⁵ and Lyness³⁶ and recently revisited by Squire and Trapp.³⁷ The researchers in Refs. 35–37 demonstrate that a complex Taylor series may be used to evaluate the derivatives of real functions that are explicitly dependent on the independent variable, for example, $x^{9/2}$ and $e^x/(\sin^3 x + \cos^3 x)$. In Ref. 33 it was shown for the first time that this approach may be used to evaluate the derivatives of real functions with explicit and implicit dependencies on the independent variable and that require the iterative solution to coupled nonlinear systems of equations. The method was then demonstrated via the computation of aerodynamic (inviscid), structural, and multidisciplinary sensitivity derivatives with respect to design variables appropriate for both aerodynamic and structural design optimizations. Subsequently, the work in Ref. 33 was extended to obtain sensitivity derivatives for turbulent flows.³⁸ Furthermore, in Ref. 38, various features and drawbacks of the complex variable technique are closely examined and discussed. Recently, other research groups^{39–42} have adopted the complex variable technique of Ref. 33 for obtaining sensitivity derivatives, details of which may be found in the cited literature.

In the current work, the aero-structural analysis procedure used in Ref. 33 is validated and multidisciplinary sensitivity derivatives computed. The validation comprises comparing computed pressure and deflection values with experimental data for an aeroelastic research wing (ARW-2). Furthermore, the use of sensitivity derivatives for predicting the aerostructural characteristics of this configuration is demonstrated and compared with experimental measurements.

Sensitivity Derivatives Using Complex Variables

For a central finite difference approximation to the derivative, one may expand the function in a Taylor series about the point x using a forward step and a backward step and then subtract to yield the formula

$$\frac{dF}{dx} = \frac{[F(x+h) - F(x-h)]}{2h} - \frac{h^2}{3!} \frac{d^3 F}{dx^3} - \frac{h^4}{5!} \frac{d^5 F}{dx^5} + \dots \quad (1)$$

This expression for the derivative has a truncation error of $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$. The advantage of the finite difference approximation to obtain sensitivity derivatives is that any existing code may be used without

modification. The disadvantages of this method are the computational time required and the possible inaccuracy of the derivatives. The former results because, for every derivative, Eq. (1) requires two well-converged solutions for the function evaluations. In the case of nonlinear aerodynamics, these solutions may become extremely expensive. The latter is attributed to the sensitivity of the derivatives to the choice of the step size. To minimize the truncation error, one selects a smaller step size, however, an exceedingly small step size may produce significant subtractive cancellation errors. Subtractive cancellation errors, which are produced by the subtraction of nearly equal numbers, is the most significant source of roundoff errors in numerical computations. The optimal choice for the step size is not known a priori and may vary from one function to another and from one design variable to the next.

Alternatively, if a real function is expanded in a Taylor series using a complex step as

$$F(x + \hat{i}h) = F(x) + \hat{i}h \frac{dF}{dx} - \frac{h^2}{2!} \frac{d^2 F}{dx^2} - \frac{\hat{i}h^3}{3!} \frac{d^3 F}{dx^3} + \frac{h^4}{4!} \frac{d^4 F}{dx^4} + \dots \quad (2)$$


where $\hat{i} = \sqrt{-1}$. Solving this equation for the imaginary part of the function yields

$$\frac{dF}{dx} = \frac{\text{Im}[F(x + \hat{i}h)]}{h} + \frac{h^2}{3!} \frac{d^3 F}{dx^3} - \frac{h^4}{5!} \frac{d^5 F}{dx^5} + \dots \quad (3)$$


This expression for the derivative also has a truncation error of $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$. When the function at a complex argument is evaluated, both the function and its derivative are obtained, without subtractive terms, and thus, cancellation errors are avoided. The real part is the function value. This method for obtaining sensitivity derivatives is referred to as the complex Taylor series expansion (CTSE) method. Note that if the approximations for the derivative in Eqs. (1) and (3) are averaged, an expression for the gradient results, which has a truncation error of $\mathcal{O}(h^4)$. This is because the leading term in the truncation error for the central finite difference and the CTSE method have the same magnitude but opposite sign. However, the cost of this accuracy would be prohibitive.

The disadvantage of the complex variable approximation is the increased run time required by the evaluating routines when run with complex arguments. With current compiler options, this run time is on the order of three times the cost of the original solver. However, automatic differentiated versions of analysis software, using, for example, ADIFOR, incur about the same time penalties. A detailed comparison of sensitivity derivative calculations from automatic differentiated software and using the CTSE technique may be found in Ref. 38. See Ref. 38 for a more complete discussion on the competing methods. Note, however, that more recent research has indicated that via judicious use of the CTSE method, considerable reductions in CPU run times are possible.

The advantages of the complex variable approximation for obtaining the derivatives are numerous. First, like the finite difference approximation to the derivatives, very little modification to the original software is required. All of the original features and capabilities of the software are retained. Thus, user experience with the current software is not lost, and ongoing advancements and enhancements can be readily introduced into subsequent versions without extensive modifications or redifferentiation. This is in direct contrast to hand- or automatically differentiated codes, where any modification to the original software will require redifferentiation. This advantage is extremely useful in the problem formulation stages of the design process when new objective functions and constraints are being explored. Second, this method is equivalent to a discrete-direct approach, either from automatic differentiation or hand-differentiated codes solved in incremental iterative form, in the way that the state vector and its derivatives are being solved for simultaneously. When the state equation is solved, the state vector resides in the real part and the derivatives in the imaginary part. Hence, fully converged flow solutions are not required to obtain derivatives of sufficient accuracy for design. Finally, the complex variable approximation to the derivative is not sensitive to the step-size selection as it pertains



Unstructured aerodynamic mesh




Structural mesh; only ribs and spars shown


Fig. 1 ONERA M6 wing discretizations.

to cancellation errors and only requires step size that avoids excessive truncation error. The truncation error is minimized by choosing the step size to be at most the square root of machine precision, and thus, the second-order leading term is multiplied by the machine epsilon. Therefore, because a compromise between cancellation and truncation errors is avoided and the step size required to minimize the truncation error is known a priori, the selection of the optimal step size is considered independent. Additionally, the CTSE technique can be used to compute second derivative information using available data³⁸; however, these computations are subject to cancellation errors.


To demonstrate and verify the accuracy of the CTSE approach for obtaining multidisciplinary sensitivity derivatives, a low aspect ratio ONERA M6 wing is considered. The aero-structural analysis is performed by loosely coupling an inviscid, unstructured grid flow solver with a structural analysis code. Additional information concerning this software and the methods used to couple the flow solver and structural analysis code are presented in subsequent sections. The current aero-structural example is used simply to validate the accuracy of the multidisciplinary sensitivity derivatives and not the underlying aero-structural analysis procedure. The ONERA M6 aerodynamic mesh and the spars and ribs of the structure are shown in Fig. 1. Note that the spars of this wing are not straight because the structure was created from a subset of the aerodynamic nodes. This was done for simplicity and expediency and is not meant to represent an actual wing structure. The accuracy of CTSE approach, as compared with central finite differences, is illustrated in Fig. 2. In Fig. 2, the sensitivity derivatives of lift, drag, and wing-tip deflection with respect to free-stream Mach number are shown for various step sizes. Furthermore, the log of the difference between the finite difference and the complex variable approach is plotted; values have been normalized by derivatives obtained using the complex variable approximation at the smallest step size. Note the accuracy of the finite difference formulation depends on the step size and suf-



Sensitivity of lift coefficient to Mach number



Sensitivity of drag coefficient to Mach number



Sensitivity of wing tip deflection to Mach Number

Fig. 2 Sensitivity of aeroelastic outputs for the ONERA M6 with respect to Mach number.

fers from subtractive cancellation errors as the step size is reduced. The CTSE approach demonstrates true second-order accuracy; each time the step size is reduced by one order of magnitude, the accuracy is increased by two digits.

Aero-Structural Analysis

Briefly described are the aerodynamic and structural analysis codes used in the current work. In addition, previous sensitivity analysis research performed with these codes is discussed. Finally,

some issues concerning the interdisciplinary transfer of information across boundary interfaces are presented.

Aerodynamic Analysis

The aerodynamic analysis is conducted using the three-dimensional unstructured Euler/Navier–Stokes code described in Refs. 43–45 and known as FUN3D. This is an implicit, upwind, finite volume code in which the dependent variables are stored at the vertices of the mesh. Both compressible and incompressible versions of this code exist and have been previously hand differentiated using an adjoint approach for inviscid, laminar, and turbulent flows.^{7,44,46}

In the current work, the required discrete-direct sensitivity of the aerodynamic analysis is obtained via the CTSE approach. However, note that, in an adjoint approach, the sensitivity derivatives are evaluated by performing a product of the costate variables with the derivatives of the residual with respect to the design variables. Because the complex variable technique can be easily applied to obtain the derivatives of the residuals with respect to each of the design variables, the current methodology can be applied as part of an adjoint method for obtaining sensitivity derivatives.

Additionally, for complex flow physics, such as chemically reacting or time-dependent flows, the complex variable approach may be utilized and may provide the best approach for determining sensitivity information for these complicated codes. The current methodology may also be employed for a wide range of applications within the aerodynamic analysis such as obtaining numerical flux Jacobians for complex flux functions or for Newton–Krylov schemes (see Ref. 47).

Structural Analysis

The finite element structural analysis program used in the present work has been documented in Ref. 48. Because the stiffness matrix for linear static structural analysis is symmetric and positive definite, a Choleski factorization is used to solve the system of equations. Further details of the solution algorithm may be found in Ref. 49. The solution to this system of equations produces the vector of nodal displacements. From this deformation field, element stresses can be computed. Furthermore, the available element types consist of truss members, beam elements, constant strain triangles with the ability to model multilayer composites, and triangular and quadrilateral plate/shell elements.

This finite element structural analysis code has been previously differentiated using the automatic differentiation software tool ADIFOR. Details on the usage and development of the supplementary code are documented in Ref. 50. The new software is capable of computing the displacement derivatives with respect to shape design variables. These displacement derivatives may then be used to compute element stress derivatives.

In the current work, the structural derivatives are obtained using the complex variable approximation. In addition to shape and sizing derivatives, derivatives with respect to material properties can be evaluated without code modification. This is not the case for ADIFOR versions of this software, which would require redifferentiation. An interesting example that would use material properties as design variables is the aeroelastic tailoring of composite wings. The design variables could be the fiber orientation in the composite layers.


Interdisciplinary Data Transfer

To resolve the nonlinear fluid flow around an arbitrary object, both the surface and the volume exterior to that surface must be discretized. For the structural analysis, the discretization encompasses the surface of the object and the volume interior to the surface. In practice, the nonlinear aerodynamic analysis requires a higher degree of resolution than linear structural analysis. Therefore, the interdisciplinary transfer of data between the fluid and the structure becomes an important concern in the aeroelastic analysis of a flexible wing. This aero–structures interaction has been an active area of research.^{51–56}


When the aeroelastic analysis is performed to determine the static equilibrium position of a wing, structural properties can be lumped into sectional quantities, and a reduced resolution model, for example, classical beam theory, can be used. When element stresses are required for constraints or when structural optimization is performed, a more detailed model is necessary. Because multidisciplinary analysis and optimization is the focus of this work, a detailed model is used even though only the static equilibrium position is sought here.

Once deformations have been determined from the structural analysis, these deflections must be represented on the aerodynamic surface. Similarly, aerodynamic loads must also be transferred to the structural nodes. The simplest approach uses bilinear interpolation to transfer the disciplinary information across the interface boundary. This approach, commonly referred to as load lumping, has been successfully used by numerous researchers.^{52,53} An alternative to this procedure was developed by Guruswamy and Byun,⁵² who introduce a virtual surface between the aerodynamic surface and the structural finite element mesh. This virtual surface is then used to transfer the structural deformations to the aerodynamic mesh, and the principle of virtual work is employed to obtain the loads at the structural nodes from the aerodynamic analysis. In a similar fashion, Tzong et al.⁵⁴ introduce a virtual surface based on finite element technology to transfer the deflections and virtual work (reciprocal theorem) to obtain the structural loads. Samareh⁵⁵ has demonstrated the ability to transfer interdisciplinary information across interface boundaries using nonuniform rational B splines. The emphasis of that work was to demonstrate that parameterization techniques, consistent with the CAD definition of the geometry, can be used to perform the coupling between the aerodynamic and structures disciplines.

In the current work, the interaction between the fluid and the structure is accomplished by lumping the aerodynamic forces at the surface structural nodes. After the static structural equilibrium equations have been solved, using the aforementioned loads, the corresponding aerodynamic surface mesh must be updated to the computed deformations. Because the structural deformations at each



a) Aerodynamic grid









b) Structural mesh

Fig. 3 Aerodynamic and structural grids for the ARW-2 test configuration.

node are three dimensional, changes in sectional properties are possible. Herein, it is assumed that the in-plane deformations of the sections are limited to rigid-body translation and rotation. Furthermore, for this wing these section deformations are modeled approximately with an equivalent vertical translation and a twist angle, that is, deformations consistent with beam theory. This approximation is justified by the experimental findings in Ref. 57, which revealed sufficient chordwise rigidity for the ARW-2 wing.

Once the surface deformations have been determined, either from the structural analysis or when the design process requires modifications to the surface geometry, the interior volume of the aerodynamic mesh must be adapted to reflect these changes. For the inviscid computations in the current work, the spring analogy method described in Ref. 46 is used. For discrete approaches to shape design optimization, the sensitivity of the mesh to the geometric design variables is required. In the design studies of Refs. 7, 38, 44, and 46, these



0.0-deg angle of attack

3.0-deg angle of attack

Fig. 4 Computed and measured⁵⁷ front and rear spar deflections, $M = 0.8$, and $q = 102.5$ psf.




Fig. 5 Computed and experimental⁶¹ pressure coefficient data for $M = 0.8$, $q = 102.5$ psf, and 0.0 -deg angle of attack.

terms were achieved by directly differentiating the mesh movement algorithm. In Ref. 58, these terms were obtained via automatic differentiation of the mesh movement algorithm. In the current work, the grid sensitivity derivatives are computed with the CTSE method.

ARW-2

The ARW-2 was the second of a series of aeroelastic research wings developed at NASA Langley Research Center to study experimentally transonic steady and unsteady phenomenon in the Transonic Dynamics Tunnel. This research wing has an aspect ratio of 10.3, a leading-edge sweep of 28.85 deg, and supercritical airfoil sections. The test configuration consisted of the ARW-2 and a rigid half-body fuselage. Further details about this configuration may be found in Ref. 59.

For the aerodynamic analysis, the field around the test configuration contains 769,798 tetrahedrons (146,397 nodes). The fuselage and wing surface has 52,784 triangular faces (26,565 surface nodes) and is shown in Fig. 3a with the plane of symmetry. This unstructured aerodynamic grid for the ARW-2 test configuration was generated using SolidMesh.⁸ The structural model used for the ARW-2 wing is shown in Fig. 3b. Figure 3 only shows the spars and ribs; for clarity

the wing skin and stringers are not shown. The model contains 2042 degrees of freedom.

The ARW-2 test model was constructed with fiberglass skins. To avoid the need to simulate this composite skin, an isotropic wing model was developed that possessed nearly the same bending and torsional properties, which was also the approach taken by Bhardwaj et al.⁶⁰ to model the ARW-2 composite wing. In the current work, this was accomplished via an inverse design optimization whereby the difference in the computed and experimentally measured⁶¹ bending and torsional rigidities was minimized. The design variables were the properties of the isotropic spars, ribs, stringers, and skin, and the sensitivity derivatives were computed using the complex variable technique.

Results

The aero-structural analysis of the ARW-2 configuration discussed in the preceding section is examined. The experimental study, presented in Refs. 57 and 61, consisted of an enormous number of test conditions. These test conditions studied variations in freestream Mach number, angle of attack, dynamic pressure, and control surface deflections. Furthermore, tests were conducted in both a heavy gas and an air medium. The results presented herein correspond to a freestream Mach number of 0.8, a dynamic pressure 102.5 psf, an air medium, and angle-of-attack variations from -2.0 to 3.0 deg. Control surface deflections were not considered.

⁸Data available online at <http://www.ERC.MsState.edu/simcenter/docs/solidmesh>.




Fig. 6 Computed, experimental,⁵⁷ and predicted wing tip twist.

The computed (inviscid) aero-structural and experimentally measured⁵⁷ deflections of the front and rear spars for various freestream angles of attack are shown in Fig. 4. In addition, the wind-off-positions (WOP) are also included in Fig. 4 to help quantify the static deflections taking place. The WOP are the measured coordinates of the wing when the tunnel is not in operation. As shown, reasonable accuracy is obtained for each of the angles of attack considered. The greatest deviations occur at an angle of attack of 3.0 deg, which corresponds to the highest wing loading. This discrepancy is attributed to the inability to model precisely the bending and torsional properties of the composite wing and possibly to increased viscous effects at this higher angle of attack.

Experimentally measured,⁶¹ computed rigid-wing and computed aeroelastic-wing pressure coefficient data are shown in Fig. 5 for various spanwise stations at 0.0-deg angle of attack. The twist angle and bending deflections, as seen in Fig. 4, are relatively small for the inboard stations of the wing; hence, only minor differences can be seen between rigid-wing and aeroelastic-wing calculations. However, at the outboard stations of the wing, it can be seen that the aeroelastic-wing calculations compare better with the experimental data. This is especially true for the station nearest the tip, where the largest twist angle and bending deflections occur. Note that in Fig. 5a the lower surface pressure distribution compares well with the experimental data. This may indicate that the aerodynamic interference between the high mounted wing and the fuselage is being captured. The discrepancy seen on the upper surface may indicate that viscous effects are significant. Moreover, an overprediction of the pressure on the suction side is typical of inviscid solutions.

Sensitivity derivatives, other than for design purposes, may be used to predict or estimate a solution at a nearby condition. This is because, given a baseline solution and the gradient of that solution with respect to an independent variable, one may use a Taylor series to obtain a first-order estimate of the solution at a neighboring value of this variable. To illustrate this point, the aforementioned complex variable technique was used to compute the sensitivity derivative of wing tip twist with respect to freestream angle of attack. The angle of attack about which the derivative was taken is 0.0 deg. The comparison of the experimentally measured,⁵⁷ computed, and predicted wing-tip twist vs angle of attack is shown in Fig. 6. As expected, the wing-tip twist is estimated via the sensitivity derivative reasonably well around the baseline solution, but deviates significantly at higher angles of attack. Note that Fig. 6 represents a validation of computed sensitivity derivatives with experimental measurements. The slope of the experimental wing-tip twist vs freestream angle of attack at 0 deg compares well with the sensitivity derivative.

Conclusions

In the current work, the aero-structural analysis and sensitivity analysis procedure, previously used to establish the accuracy of the complex variable method for obtaining multidisciplinary sen-

sitivity derivatives in Ref. 33, were validated. This validation took the form of comparing computed deflection and pressure data with experimentally measured values for an ARW-2. Because the aero-structural analysis procedure has the complex variable modifications already included into the software, multidisciplinary sensitivity derivatives are computed automatically. To demonstrate the use of these sensitivity derivatives, the gradient of wing-tip twist with respect to free stream angle of attack was computed and used to estimate the tip twist at neighboring angles, which also represents an experimental validation of computed sensitivity derivatives.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Grant NCC-1-286 from the Aerodynamic and Acoustic Methods Branch at NASA Langley Research Center. The authors would like to express their gratitude to Adam Gaither for generating the aeroelastic research wing 2 (ARW-2) aerodynamic grid and to Charles V. Spain for providing documentation and discussions concerning the ARW-2 geometric configuration.

References

- Sobieszcanski-Sobieski, J., "The Case for Aerodynamic Sensitivity Analysis in Engineering," NASA/Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State University Symposium on Sensitivity Analysis in Engineering, NASA CP-2457, Sept. 1986.
- Labrujere, T. E., and Sloof, J. W., "Computational Methods for the Aerodynamic Design of Aircraft Components," *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 25, 1993, pp. 183-214.
- Taylor, A. C., III, Newman, P. A., Hou, G. J.-W., and Jones, H. E., "Recent Advances in Steady Compressible Aerodynamic Sensitivity Analysis," *Flow Control: Volumes in Mathematics and Applications*, Vol. 68, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, pp. 341-346.
- Newman, J. C., III, Taylor, A. C., III, Barnwell, R. W., Newman, P. A., and Hou, G. J.-W., "Overview of Sensitivity Analysis and Shape Optimization for Complex Aerodynamic Configurations," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 36, No. 1, 1999, pp. 87-96.
- Jameson, A., "Essential Elements of Computational Algorithms for Aerodynamic Analysis and Design," ICASE Rept. 97-68, Dec. 1997.
- Hou, G. J.-W., Taylor, A. C., III, and Korivi, V. M., "Discrete Shape Sensitivity Equations for Aerodynamic Problems," *International Journal of Numerical Methods in Engineering*, Vol. 37, No. 13, 1994, pp. 2251-2266.
- Anderson, W. K., and Venkatakrisnan, V., "Aerodynamic Design Optimization on Unstructured Grids with a Continuous Adjoint Formulation," *Computers and Fluids*, Vol. 28, Nos. 4-5, 1999, pp. 443-480.
- Beux, F., and Dervieux, A., "Exact-Gradient Shape Optimization of a 2D Euler Flow," *Finite Elements in Analysis and Design*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1992, pp. 281-302.
- Iollo, A., Salas, M., and Ta'asan, S., "Shape Optimization Governed by the Euler Equations Using an Adjoint Method," ICASE Rept. 93-78, Nov. 1993.
- Jameson, A., "Aerodynamic Design via Control Theory," *Journal of Scientific Computing*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1988, pp. 233-260.
- Reuther, J., Jameson, A., Farmer, J., Martinelli, L., and Saunders, D., "Aerodynamic Shape Optimization of Complex Aircraft Configurations Via an Adjoint Formulation," *Proceedings of the 34th Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit*, Reno, NV, Jan. 1996.
- Borggaard, J. T., Burns, J., Cliff, E. M., and Gunzburger, M. D., "Sensitivity Calculations for a 2-D Inviscid Supersonic Forebody Problem," *Identification and Control Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations*, SIAM Publications, Philadelphia, 1993, pp. 14-24.
- Bischof, C., Carle, A., Corliss, G., Griewank, A., and Hovland, P., "ADIFOR: Generating Derivative Codes from Fortran Programs," *Scientific Programming*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1992, pp. 11-29.
- Green, L. L., Bischof, C., Griewank, A., Haigler, K., and Newman, P. A., "Automatic Differentiation of Advanced CFD Codes With Respect to Wing Geometry Parameters for MDO," 2nd U.S. National Congress on Computational Mechanics, Aug. 1993.
- Green, L. L., Newman, P. A., and Haigler, K. J., "Sensitivity Derivatives for Advanced CFD Algorithms and Viscous Modeling Parameters Via Automatic Differentiation," *Journal of Computational Physics*, Vol. 125, No. 2, 1996, pp. 313-324.
- Taylor, A. C., III, "Automatic Differentiation of Advanced Flow-Analysis Codes in Incremental Iterative Form for Multidisciplinary Applications," NASA Final Rept. Master Contract NAS1-19858 (Task No. 77), Nov. 1995.

- ¹⁷Taylor, A. C., III, Oloso, A., and Newman, J. C., III, "CFL3D.ADII (Version 2.0): An Efficient, Accurate, General-Purpose Code for Flow Shape-Sensitivity Analysis," *Proceedings of the 15th AIAA Applied Aerodynamics Conference*, Atlanta, GA, June 1997.
- ¹⁸Carle, A., Fagan, M., and Green, L. L., "Preliminary Results from the Application of Automated Adjoint Code Generation to CFL3D," *Proceedings of the 7th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, St. Louis, MO, Sept. 1998.
- ¹⁹Male, J. M., Mohammadi, B., Rostaing-Schmidt, N., "Direct and Reverse Modes of Automatic Differentiation of Programs for Inverse Problems: Application to Optimum Shape Design," *Computational Differentiation: Techniques, Applications, and Tools*, edited by M. Berz, C. Bischof, G. Corliss, and A. Griewank, SIAM Philadelphia, 1996, pp. 231–250.
- ²⁰Mohammadi, B., "Optimal Shape Design, Reverse Mode of Automatic Differentiation and Turbulence," *Proceedings of the 35th Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit*, Reno, NV, Jan. 1997.
- ²¹Taylor, A. C., III, Green, L. L., Newman, P. A., and Putko, M. M., "Some Advanced Concepts in Discrete Aerodynamic Sensitivity Analysis," *Proceedings of the 19th AIAA Applied Aerodynamics Conference*, Denver, CO, June 2001.
- ²²Sobieszcanski-Sobieski, J., "Sensitivity of Complex, Internally Coupled Systems," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1994, pp. 153–160.
- ²³Korivi, V. M., Taylor, A. C., III, Newman, P. A., Hou, G. J.-W., and Jones, H. E., "An Approximate Factored Incremental Strategy for Calculating Consistent Discrete CFD Sensitivity Derivatives," *Journal of Computational Physics*, Vol. 113, No. 2, 1994, pp. 336–346.
- ²⁴Newman, P. A., Hou, G. J.-W., and Taylor, A. C., III, "Observations Regarding Use of Advanced CFD Analysis, Sensitivity Analysis, and Design Codes in MDO," *Multidisciplinary Design Optimization: State of the Art*, edited by N. Alexandrov and Y. Hussaini, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1997, pp. 263–279.
- ²⁵Hou, G. J.-W., Maroju, V., Taylor, A. C., III, Korivi, V. M., and Newman, P. A., "Transonic Turbulent Airfoil Design Optimization Using Automatic Differentiation in Incremental Iterative Form," *Proceedings of the 12th AIAA Computational Fluid Dynamics Conference*, San Diego, CA, June 1995.
- ²⁶Sobieszcanski-Sobieski, J., "Sensitivity Analysis and Multidisciplinary Optimization for Aircraft Design: Recent Advances and Results," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 27, No. 12, 1990, pp. 993–1001.
- ²⁷Arslan, A. E., and Carlson, L. A., "Integrated Determination of Sensitivity Derivatives for an Aeroelastic Transonic Wing," *Proceedings of the 5th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, Panama Beach, FL, Sept. 1994.
- ²⁸Barthelemy, J.-F. M., and Bergen, F. D., "Shape Sensitivity Analysis of Wing Static Aeroelastic Characteristics," NASA TP-2808, May 1988.
- ²⁹Newman, J. C., III, Newman, P. A., Taylor, A. C., III, and Hou, G. J.-W., "Nonlinear Aerodynamic Design Optimization of a Flexible Wing," *Proceedings of the 6th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, Bellevue, WA, Sept. 1996.
- ³⁰Reuther, J. J., Alonso, J. J., Martins, J. R. R. A., and Smith, S. C., "A Coupled Aero-Structural Optimization Method for Complete Aircraft Configurations," *Proceedings of the 37th Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit*, Reno, NV, Jan. 1999.
- ³¹Giunta, A. A., and Sobieszcanski-Sobieski, J., "Progress Toward Using Sensitivity Derivatives in a High-Fidelity Aeroelastic Analysis of a Supersonic Transport," *Proceedings of the 7th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, St. Louis, MO, Sept. 1998.
- ³²Ghattas, O., and Li, X., "Domain Decomposition Methods for Sensitivity Analysis of a Nonlinear Aeroelasticity Problem," *International Journal of Computational Fluid Dynamics*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1998, pp. 113–130.
- ³³Newman, J. C., III, Anderson, W. K., and Whitfield, D. L., "Multidisciplinary Sensitivity Derivatives Using Complex Variables," Mississippi State Univ., Rept. MSSU-EIRS-ERC-98-08, Mississippi State, MS, July 1998.
- ³⁴Newman, J. C., III, Whitfield, D. L., and Anderson, W. K., "A Step-Size Independent Approach for Multidisciplinary Sensitivity Derivatives," *Proceedings of the 17th AIAA Applied Aerodynamics Conference*, Norfolk, VA, June 1999.
- ³⁵Lyness, J. N., and Moler, C. B., "Numerical Differentiation of Analytic Functions," *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1967, pp. 202–210.
- ³⁶Lyness, J. N., "Numerical Algorithms Based on the Theory of Complex Variables," *Proceedings of the ACM 22nd National Conference*, Thomas, Washington, DC, 1967, pp. 124–134.
- ³⁷Squire, W., and Trapp, G., "Using Complex Variables to Estimate Derivatives of Real Functions," *SIAM Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1998, pp. 110–112.
- ³⁸Anderson, W. K., Newman, J. C., III, Whitfield, D. L., and Nielsen, E. J., "Sensitivity Analysis for the Navier–Stokes Equations on Unstructured Meshes Using Complex Variables," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 1, 2000, pp. 56–63; also AIAA Paper 99-3294, June 1999.
- ³⁹Martins, J. R. R. A., Sturdza, P., and Alonso, J. J., "The Connection Between the Complex-Step Derivative Approximation and Algorithmic Differentiation," *Proceedings of the 39th Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit*, Reno, NV, Jan. 2001.
- ⁴⁰Giles, M. B., Duta, M. C., and Muller, J. D., "Adjoint Code Developments Using the Exact Discrete Approach," *Proceedings of the 15th AIAA Computational Fluid Dynamics Conference*, Anaheim, CA, June 2001.
- ⁴¹Nadarajah, S., and Jameson, A., "Studies of the Continuous and Discrete Adjoint Approaches to Viscous Automatic Aerodynamic Shape Optimization," *Proceedings of the 15th AIAA Computational Fluid Dynamics Conference*, Anaheim, CA, June 2001.
- ⁴²Butuk, N. K., and Pemba, J.-P., "Computing CHEMKIN Sensitivities Using Complex Variables," American Society of Mechanical Engineers, ASME Paper ETCE2001-17013, Feb. 2001.
- ⁴³Anderson, W. K., and Bonhaus, D. L., "An Implicit Upwind Algorithm for Computing Turbulent Flows on Unstructured Grids," *Computers and Fluids*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 1994, pp. 1–21.
- ⁴⁴Anderson, W. K., and Bonhaus, D. L., "Aerodynamic Design on Unstructured Grids for Turbulent Flows," NASA TM-112867, June 1997.
- ⁴⁵Anderson, W. K., Rausch, R. D., and Bonhaus, D. L., "Implicit/Multigrid Algorithms for Incompressible Turbulent Flows on Unstructured Grids," *Journal of Computational Physics*, Vol. 128, No. 2, 1996, pp. 391–408.
- ⁴⁶Nielsen, E. J., and Anderson, W. K., "Aerodynamic Design Optimization on Unstructured Meshes Using the Navier–Stokes Equations," *Proceedings of the 7th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, St. Louis, MO, Sept. 1998.
- ⁴⁷Whitfield, D. L., and Taylor, L. K., "Variants of a Two-Level Method for the Approximate Numerical Solution of Field Simulation Equations," Mississippi State Univ., Rept. MSSU COE-ERC 98-09, Mississippi State, MS, July 1998.
- ⁴⁸Nguyen, D. T., "Finite Element Software for Multidisciplinary Design Optimization," NASA Final Rept. Master Contract NAS1-19858, Nov. 1995.
- ⁴⁹Storaasli, O. O., Nguyen, D. T., and Agarwal, T. K., "A Parallel-Vector Algorithm for Rapid Structural Analysis on High-Performance Computers," NASA TM-102614, 1990.
- ⁵⁰Hou, G. J.-W., Satyanarayana, A., and Tiwari, S. N., "Finite Element-Based Sensitivity Analysis Code for Structural Applications," NASA Final Rept. Master Contract NAS1-19858, Oct. 1996.
- ⁵¹Giunta, A. A., and Sobieszcanski-Sobieski, J., "Progress Toward Using Sensitivity Derivatives in a High-Fidelity Aeroelastic Analysis of a Supersonic Transport," *Proceedings of the 7th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, St. Louis, MO, Sept. 1998.
- ⁵²Guruswamy, G. P., and Byun, C., "Fluid-Structural Interactions Using the Navier–Stokes Flow Equations Coupled with Shell Finite Element Structures," *Proceedings of the 24th AIAA Fluid Dynamics Conference*, Orlando, FL, 1993.
- ⁵³Newman, J. C., III, Newman, P. A., Taylor, A. C., III, and Hou, G. J.-W., "Efficient Nonlinear Static Aeroelastic Wing Analysis," *Computers and Fluids*, Vol. 28, Nos. 4–5, 1999, pp. 615–628.
- ⁵⁴Tzong, G., Chen, H. H., Chang, K. C., Wu, T., and Cebeci, T., "A General Method for Calculating Aero-Structure Interaction on Aircraft Components," *Proceedings of the 6th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, Bellevue, WA, Sept. 1996.
- ⁵⁵Samareh, J., "Use of CAD Geometry in MDO," *Proceedings of the 6th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, Bellevue, WA, Sept. 1996.
- ⁵⁶Hou, G. J.-W., and Satyanarayana, A., "Analytic Sensitivity Analysis of a Static Aeroelastic Wing," *Proceedings of the 8th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, Long Beach, CA, Sept. 2000.
- ⁵⁷Byrdson, T. A., Adams, R. R., and Sandford, M. C., "Close-Range Photogrammetric Measurements of Static Deflections for an Aeroelastic Supercritical Wing," NASA TM-4194, Dec. 1990.
- ⁵⁸Newman, J. C., III, Taylor, A. C., III, and Barnwell, R. W., "Aerodynamic Shape Sensitivity Analysis and Design Optimization of Complex Configurations Using Unstructured Grids," *Proceedings of the 15th AIAA Applied Aerodynamics Conference*, Atlanta, GA, June 1997.
- ⁵⁹Sandford, M. C., Seidel, D. A., Eckstrom, C. V., and Spain, C. V., "Geometric and Structural Properties of an Aeroelastic Research Wing (ARW-2)," NASA TM-4110, April 1989.
- ⁶⁰Bhardwaj, M. K., Kapania, R. K., Reichenbach, E., and Guruswamy, G. P., "CFD/CSD Interaction Methodology for Aircraft Wings," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 12, 1998, pp. 2179–2186.
- ⁶¹Sandford, M. C., Seidel, D. A., and Eckstrom, C. V., "Steady Pressure Measurements on an Aeroelastic Research Wing (ARW-2)," NASA TM-109046, Feb. 1994.