

Implementation of a Comprehensive Mathematical Model for Tilt-Rotor Real-Time Flight Simulation

*Original*

Implementation of a Comprehensive Mathematical Model for Tilt-Rotor Real-Time Flight Simulation / Barra, Federico; Guglieri, Giorgio; Capone, Pierluigi; Monstein, Raphael; Godio, Simone. - ELETTRONICO. - (2019). (Intervento presentato al convegno European Rotorcraft Forum).

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2753192 since: 2020-06-18T13:59:58Z

*Publisher:*

European Rotorcraft Forum

*Published*

DOI:

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

default\_conf\_draft [DA NON USARE]

-

(Article begins on next page)

# IMPLEMENTATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE MATHEMATICAL MODEL FOR TILT-ROTOR REAL-TIME FLIGHT SIMULATION

**Federico Barra, Simone Godio, Giorgio Guglieri**

federico.barra@polito.it, simone.godio@studenti.polito.it, giorgio.guglieri@polito.it  
*Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering  
 Politecnico di Torino (Italy)*

**Pierluigi Capone, Raphael Monstein**

pierluigi.capone@zhaw.ch, raphael.monstein@zhaw.ch  
*ZAV\* Centre for Aviation  
 ZHAW† Zurich University of Applied Sciences (Switzerland)*

## Abstract

This paper aims at describing the effort performed by the joint research group of Politecnico di Torino and ZHAW (Zurich University of Applied Sciences) in achieving a novel implementation of a mathematical model for real-time flight simulation of tilt-rotors and tilt-wings aircraft. The focus is on the description of the current stage of the project, the achievements of the first version of the model, on-going improvements and future developments.

The first part of the work describes the initial development of the overall simulation model: relying on several NASA reports on the Generic Tilt Rotor Simulator (GTRS), the mathematical model is revised and the rotor dynamic model is improved in order to enhance computational performance. In particular, the model uses the conventional mathematical formulation for non-dynamic inflow modelling based on Blade Element Momentum Theory. A novel but simple numerical method is used to ensure the convergence of the non-linear equation in every tested condition. The resulting simulation model and its development and implementation in the MATLAB/Simulink® environment is described.

The second part of the work deals with the integration of the model in the ZHAW Research and Didactics Simulator (ReDSim), the replacement of the pilot controls by the introduction of a center stick and the corresponding adjustment of the force-feel system to suitable values for the tilt-rotor model. Subsequently, several pilot tests are carried out and preliminary feedbacks about the overall behaviour of the system are collected. Limits and weaknesses of the first release of the model are investigated and future necessary improvements are assessed, such as the development of a novel generic prop-rotor mathematical model.

The third part introduces the novel multi-purpose rotor mathematical model which was developed to improve the overall tilt-rotor simulation model. The multi-purpose rotor model implements non-approximated flapping dynamics and inflow dynamic based on Pitt-Peters formulation. The validation of the novel rotor model is carried out with available data of both the XV-15 Research Aircraft and the UH-60 Helicopter.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Tilt-rotor is a concept which draws particular interest in the world of Vertical/Short Take Off and Landing vehicles (V/STOL): a tilt-rotor can convert its nacelles within a range of 95 degrees, from the helicopter mode (which allows the vertical take-off) to the airplane mode and therefore providing enhanced vehicle's performance in terms of speed, endurance and fuel consumption. Despite being far from mature, the tilt-rotor does present a high potential among commercial aircraft, military platforms as well as UAV/drone application. Currently, several attempts exist of developing innovative, rotary wing

concepts for the future air taxi market and among them, tilt-rotor as well as tilt-wing platforms are rather recurrent [30, 26, 28]. However, such innovative, unconventional platforms indeed require suitable flight simulation models able to faithfully describe their peculiarities, such as the considerable wing download caused by the flow stream of the rotors in helicopter mode, the tilting mechanism which allows the conversion of the rotors during flight, the behaviour of the wing in backwards flight as well as the coexistence of both conventional aircraft flight controls and rotorcraft ones. Although many publications are available concerning tilt-rotor aircraft

\*ZAV is the official German acronym for Zentrum für Aviatik

†ZHAW is the official German acronym for Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften

(several books have also been published recently on the topic, such as [8]) and mainly related to the NASA-Bell XV-15 project or to the Bell-Boeing V-22 Osprey [9, 7], full descriptions of a comprehensive flight simulation model are limited [15, 11]. What reported by S. W. Ferguson in [11] is the latest reference available on public domain which extensively describes the mathematical model developed for the tilt-rotor flight simulation by NASA and Bell Helicopters but does not provide a full detailed derivation of several non-standard equations, such as those describing the rotor dynamics. Nevertheless, [11] provides an extensive aerodynamic database which is crucial to develop the flight simulation model. Additional references are available of later studies on tilt-rotors flight simulation models conducted by different universities, mainly focused on handling qualities and controls ([19] and [20] seem to have benefited from XV-15 published data, as well). Based on what described in these documents, thought, none of the later studies seems to have aimed for or achieved yet the development of a model suitable for piloted simulations. Although piloted flight simulation is, to some extent, a trade-off between performance and accuracy [14], state-of-the-art computational power and model-based design tools provide room for improvements in the development of more detailed physical models to be implemented in flight simulation platforms. For instance, the direct use of MATLAB/Simulink<sup>®</sup> comes with much potential in terms of flexibility and modularity of models and allows easy modifications and new developments. As a matter of fact, interpreted and non compiled MATLAB/Simulink<sup>®</sup> models are already extensively exploited at the ZAV for airplanes, helicopters and convertiplanes.

## 2. TILT-ROTOR MODEL

As already mentioned, the initial mathematical model of the tilt-rotor was mainly derived from [11], which is referred as the first release of the GTRS, a simulation code which is believed to be still in use in its updated and extensively modified version within several US programs. The implementation of the simulation code, instead, is novel and Matlab/Simulink<sup>®</sup> based. Additional information concerning the novel tilt-rotor simulation model can be found in [1, 2].

### 2.1. First version of the prop-rotor model

What reported in this section is the initial version of the rotors mathematical model as derived from [11], which was meant to improve what presented in [15] by introducing a customised formulation of the rotor hub forces as well as a first order flapping dynamics model as

shown in Eq. (1). In [15] the flapping dynamic was neglected and the steady-state result for the tilt of the rotors' tip path planes were computed. The first order flapping dynamic model is derived from the simplified formulation introduced by Chen in [6] and further developed in [4], but customized terms appear for the particular case of tilt-rotors and the authors cannot trace the derivation of those terms back to any additional reference. However, the flap motion model can be expressed in compact form, for each rotor, as

$$\begin{bmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & C_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{\bar{a}}_1 \\ \dot{\bar{b}}_1 \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \bar{a}_1 \\ \bar{b}_1 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{Bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where  $\bar{a}_1$ ,  $\bar{b}_1$  are the lateral and longitudinal cyclic angles of the ideal tip-path plane of each rotor. According to Eq. (1), the first derivative of each angle can be expressed in explicit form and integrated numerically using simple discrete Euler integrators. Since the flap dynamics was reduced and expressed in terms of disk angles by exploiting the Multi Blade Coordinate Transformation, discrete Euler integrators can be used and are numerically stable already at relatively low sampling frequencies so that the real-time simulation is allowed. The equations describing the flapping dynamics were implemented as reported in [11].

As far as the rotor forces are concerned, the formulation reported in [11] is essentially an integration of the Blade Element Theory along the blade span as proposed in [4], but once again non-standard terms appear to account for highly twisted blades such as those of prop-rotors. The inflow dynamics, instead, is reduced to the uniform, constant formulation (a rather useful insight in the different inflow models generally adopted for flight dynamics and control applications can be found in [5]) and computed resolving numerically the inflow-thrust implicit equation

$$\lambda_{i+1} = \lambda_0 + \frac{C_{T_i} [1 - (1 - G)(K_w)] (1 + X_{SS} + X_{SF})}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + 0.866\lambda_i^2} + \frac{0.6\sqrt{C_{T_i}^3 + |C_{T_i}| - \frac{8}{3}\lambda_i|\lambda_i|}}{(|C_{T_i}| + 8\mu^2)(|C_{T_i}| + 8\lambda_i^2)}} \quad (2)$$

where  $C_T$  is the thrust coefficient of the rotor,  $G$  is the in-ground-effect coefficient,  $K_w$  is the washout coefficient,  $X_{SS}$  and  $X_{SF}$  account for the side-by-side and tandem effects, while  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda_0$  are the inflow terms. Evidently, Eq. (2) recalls the conventional expression of the inflow ratio as also reported by Johnson in [18], but several semi-empirical corrections are introduced to adapt the formulation to experimental data. Eq. (2) was implemented as reported in [11] but the iterative method was modified: instead of using two nested loops to ensure

the convergence of first the inflow (2) and then the thrust equation, a single loop was implemented so that the iteration is performed for both the equations at the same time until the old values of  $\lambda$ ,  $C_T$  and the new converge with a tolerance of  $10^{-6}$ . The algorithm representing the modified loop is shown in Fig. 1, while the original one can be found in [11].




Fig. 1 Flow-chart of the Inflow-Thrust solution algorithm

## 2.2. Aerodynamic model

The aerodynamic model accounts for all the forces and moments generated by the fuselage, the wing-pylons and tail surfaces. The model is mainly based on the aerodynamic database of the XV-15 reported in [11]. The novel Simulink<sup>®</sup> model mainly exploits what reported in [11] with no major modification, but the aerodynamic database is modified according to [12] and then interpolated and organized in a series of multidimensional look-up tables (Fig. 2 shows the data used for the aerodynamic lift coefficient of the wing, further data can be found in [2]). The model accounts for the interaction between the wakes of both rotors and the main aerodynamic surfaces in terms of induced downwash/upwash angles as well as the download exerted on the wing. The interaction between the fuselage and the rotor, instead, is neglected based on the assumption that unlike conventional helicopters the rotors of the XV-15 are shifted from the centre-line of the fuselage and mainly affect the behaviour of the wing from both a structural and an aerodynamic point of view.




Fig. 2 XV-15 experimental data of the aerodynamic lift coefficient ( $C_{LW}$ ) of the wing as a function of the mast tilt-angle ( $\beta_M$ ), flap deflection ( $\delta_F$ ) and angle of attack of the aircraft ( $\alpha_F$ )

## 2.3. Rigid Body Equations of Motion

What described in [11] is the typical formulation of the equations of motion of a rigid body with six-degrees-of-freedom, expressed using Euler angles. Moments equations, though, are expressed in the implicit form, which is identical to the one provided by Etkin in [10] and not as convenient as the explicit one for the software implementation (algebraic loops may occur and additional modification shall be made, see [24]). Therefore, within the new simulation model, the explicit formulation was introduced in a form which essentially resembles the one provided by Stevens in [29].

## 2.4. Software architecture

The model was implemented in Matlab/Simulink<sup>®</sup> environment: a Simulink<sup>®</sup> library of the tilt-rotor model was created and can be connected to either the trim model (which is exploited by a proprietary trim algorithm to define the initial condition of the aircraft before the simulation) or the overall simulation model which interacts with the simulation platform (Displays, Visual System, and Control Loading System). What shown in Fig. 3 is the top-level view of the tilt-rotor model, which is structured in subsystems according to what described before in this section (additional information can be found in [1]).

## 2.5. Limits of the rotor model derived from literature

As anticipated, when testing the first release of the mathematical model, weaknesses were highlighted in some specific flight conditions in helicopter mode. Precisely,




V [kts]	T <sub>2</sub> [s]	ℜ(z)	ℑ(z)
5	0.89	0.78	0
7	0.96	0.72	0
10	1.07	0.65	0
12.5	1.19	0.58	0
15	1.31	0.53	0
17.5	1.43	0.48	0
20	1.56	0.44	0
22.5	1.75	0.40	0
25	1.96	0.35	0
27.5	2.14	0.32	0
30	2.51	0.28	0
32.5	3.26	0.21	0
35	12.71	0.05	0

**Table 1** Most unstable pole of the system analysed at several low forward speeds. For each flight speed the table reports time-to-double, real part and imaginary part of the relative pole

On the contrary, when simulating flight at higher speeds the model behaves as intended, so that a simple tasks as a series of speed captures like the one shown in fig. 5 can be performed as expected. Detailed results of the off-line stability analyses for the whole flight envelope of the aircraft are not reported here, but additional data can be found in [1] and referred to [12] for validation). Eventually, the model was also tested in aircraft mode with positive results.

Several attempts have been made to identify the source of the behaviour at low-speed/hover (which is believed to be unrealistic since [12] does not refer to similar conditions during validation). Since the source of instability seems to be located in the rotor models, the authors tend to believe the non-standard rotor model described in [11] has been either wrongly interpreted or contains some documentation mistakes. Unfortunately, the issue with this model is that the whole mathematical derivation of the equations of motion is not fully available.

Consequently, the authors decided to develop a more reliable mathematical model of the prop-rotor aiming at improving the overall simulation model of the generic tilt-rotor aircraft. The choice of developing a new one seem to be in line with previous works such as [19], [20] and [21], in which the aerodynamic database and the overall aircraft model was preserved, while the rotor model was replaced with different standard versions from literature or new developments, too.



**Fig. 5** Time history of a piloted simulation. Simulation starts in forward flight at 80 kts and the pilot performs a series of speed capture tasks

### 3. NEW GENERIC PROP-ROTOR MATHEMATICAL MODEL

#### 3.1. Assumptions

What described below is the novel generic prop-rotor mathematical model developed for real-time flight simulation. For this particular reason, a trade-off is needed between the level of detail the model provides and its performance. Thus, according to [14] and previous works such as [4] and [19], the rotor dynamics was limited to the sole flapping degree of freedom, while lead-lag dynamics and torsion dynamics are neglected. The model implements the full, second-order flapping dynamics of each blade with no approximation for the reduced order tip-path-plane dynamics and a full calculation of the air-loads along the blade span as function of the azimuthal position. The resulting model is based on the following assumptions:

- air-loads are expressed by exploiting the Blade Element Theory and integrating along each blade span, so no numerical integration must be performed during the simulation, but mere algebraic calculations must be computed at each time step;
- the blade section's aerodynamics is expressed with no approximation and therefore extended to large inflow angles (which are generally typical for prop-rotors and propellers, [16]).
- the blade section's aerodynamic data are derived from conventional 2-D analysis based on equipoten-

tial methods for the linear part and then expanded for large angles of attack exploiting the semi-empirical formulation proposed by Hoerner in [17]. This method allows to properly tune the airfoil characteristics to better suit the real blade and reproduce stall and post-stall behaviours.

- each blade is considered rigid in bending and torsion, an equivalent spring is placed at the flap hinge and can be properly tuned to reproduce the behaviour of different rotor designs (rigid, fully articulated, hingeless, gimbaled rotors);
- the blade twist distribution is expressed using a third-order polynomial which can be tuned to well suit prop-rotor as well as conventional rotor designs;
- the chord distribution is also introduced using a third-order polynomial so that a wider range of blade designs can be implemented;
- the approximation of small flapping angles  $\beta$  is used only in the mathematical formulation of the flapping dynamics. This assumption is needed to express the flapping dynamic analytically and it is believed to be acceptable based on previous literature [6] and safety limitations of tilt-rotor designs (XV-15 flapping is limited within  $\pm 12$  degrees, as reported in [11]). However, the approximation is not made when expressing the overall air-loads generated on the blades and then transferred to the rotor hub.
- as shown later in this paper, the effect of  $\dot{\beta}$  on the sectional angle of attack is assumed to be small and therefore linearised to preserve the analytical formulation (theoretically it should be instead expressed by  $\arctan\left(\frac{V_p}{V_t}\right)$  but then it would not be possible to isolate the terms in  $\dot{\beta}$  within the flapping equation, see later Eqs. 4 and 5) and therefore simplified as  $\frac{\dot{\beta}r}{\Omega(e+r)}$  by neglecting, for this term only, the effect of the hub components of velocities which might now lead to singularities in the model for blade stations close to the hub at which, in some translational flight regimes, the denominator might become zero. Nevertheless, such a contribution is preserved for all the other terms in the  $\arctan\left(\frac{V_p}{V_t}\right)$ ;
- terms in  $\dot{\beta}$  and the Coriolis contribution due to  $\dot{\beta}$  are also considered small and neglected only when calculating the accelerations acting on the blade, as in [6];
- a dynamic inflow model is implemented based on Pitt-Peters formulation [23];
- an analytical formulation of the tip loss factor is implemented according to what suggested in [25]

### 3.2. Mathematical model

#### 1. Elementary Angle of Attack

According to the Blade Element Theory and referring to Fig. 6, the sectional aerodynamic angle of attack ( $\alpha$ ) is defined as




Fig. 6 Blade Element

$$\alpha = K_1\beta + \theta_0 - a_1 \cos(\psi) - b_1 \sin(\psi) + t_3 r^3 + t_2 r^2 + t_1 r + t_0 + \arctan\left(\frac{V_p}{V_t}\right) - \alpha_0 - \frac{\dot{\beta}r}{\Omega(e+r)} \quad (3)$$

where  $\beta$  is the flapping angle of a single blade,  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  are the lateral and longitudinal cyclic inputs,  $K_1$  is the pitch-flap coupling term,  $t_3, t_2, t_1, t_0$  are the coefficients of the twist distribution law,  $\alpha_0$  is the zero-lift angle and  $\theta_0$  is the collective pitch input referred the blade root, while perpendicular and tangential velocities ( $V_p, V_t$ ) are expressed as

$$V_p = \frac{(q_h(e+r)R - V_{tip}r\lambda_{1c}) \cos(\psi)}{R} + \frac{(p_h(e+r)R - V_{tip}r\lambda_{1s}) \sin(\psi)}{R} + \frac{R(-V_{tip}\lambda_0 + w_h)}{R} + x_{uo}(a_1\Omega \sin(\psi) - b_1\Omega \cos(\psi)) \quad (4)$$

$$V_t = \sin(\psi)u_h + \cos(\psi)v_h + \Omega(e+r) \quad (5)$$

The last term of Eq. (4) is a first-order contribution which introduces an approximated unsteady component which is connected to  $\dot{\theta}$  through the offset  $x_{uo}$ , according to a formulation derived from Theodorsen's theory and reported by Johnson in [18]. Furthermore, the effect of the hub's rotational ( $p_h, q_h, r_h$ ) and translational rates ( $u_h, v_h, w_h$ ) are also taken into account.

## 2. Inflow Dynamics

In Eqs. (4) and (5) the periodic and constant terms of inflow ( $\lambda_{1c}$ ,  $\lambda_{1s}$ ,  $\lambda_0$ ) are also introduced according to Pitt-Peters classical inflow model as shown in Eq. (6),

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \dot{v}_0 \\ \dot{v}_{1s} \\ \dot{v}_{1c} \end{Bmatrix} = -[M]^{-1}[L]^{-1} \begin{Bmatrix} v_0 \\ v_{1s} \\ v_{1c} \end{Bmatrix} + [M]^{-1} \begin{Bmatrix} C_t \\ C_{la} \\ C_{ma} \end{Bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Matrices  $[M]$  and  $[L]$  are respectively the apparent mass matrix and the static gain matrix, as introduced in [23] and reported below in eqs. (7) and (8), in which  $\chi$  is the wake skew angle, while  $v_m$  and  $v_t$  are the mass flow parameters, functions of the advance ratio and static inflow coefficient.  $C_t$ ,  $C_l$  and  $C_m$  are, respectively, the coefficients of thrust, rolling moment and pitching moment of the equivalent rotor disk generated by the rotation of the blades.

$$[M] = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{128}{75\pi} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{16}{45\pi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{16}{45\pi} \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

$$[L] = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2v_t} & 0 & \frac{15}{64v_m} \tan \frac{\chi}{2} \\ 0 & -\frac{4}{v_m(1+\cos\chi)} & 0 \\ \frac{15}{64v_m} \tan \frac{\chi}{2} & 0 & -\frac{4 \cos \chi}{v_m(1+\cos\chi)} \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

## 3. Elementary Airloads

According to Eq. (3), the elementary aerodynamic moment acting on the blade with respect to the blade root can be expressed as

$$dm = \frac{1}{2} \rho V^2 c(r) (C_d \sin(\phi) + C_{l\alpha} \alpha \cos(\phi)) r dr \quad (9)$$

in which  $C(r)$  is the chord distribution,  $C_d$  is the airfoil drag coefficient,  $r$  is the blade elementary station,  $\rho$  is the air density and  $V$  the overall speed acting on the blade element. What referred as  $C_{l\alpha}$  is not to be mistaken for the conventional lift-curve slope, but it is actually a curve expressing the derivative of the lift curve with respect to the zero-lift angle of the airfoil. This coefficient is not constant and allows to account for stall and post-stall conditions. By using such a formulation for the elementary aerodynamic angle of attack as showed in Eq. (3), numerical integration method like trapezoid (which is in some sort linear, too) can be performed symbolically without losing the linearity of the terms in  $\beta$  and  $\dot{\beta}$ , terms which can be grouped firstly in  $dm_1$ ,  $dm_2$ ,  $dm_3$ , yielding to  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$ ,  $M_3$  after the integration:

$$dm = dm_1 \dot{\beta} + dm_2 \beta + dm_3 \quad (10)$$

$$M = M_1 \dot{\beta} + M_2 \beta + M_3 \quad (11)$$

As already mentioned, the blade elementary forces and moments are integrated along each blade using a simple trapezoidal numerical method and considering 20 blade elements which can be evenly or progressively distributed between root and tip. The same structure of Eq. (11) applies to all the aerodynamic forces and moments.

## 4. Flapping Dynamics

The flapping motion, is derived according to Eq. (11), yielding to

$$m \ddot{\beta} + c \dot{\beta} + k \beta = F \quad (12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m &= I_\beta \\ c &= -M_1 \\ k &= K_\beta - M_2 a_{z_1} m_b r_{cg} \\ F &= M_3 - m_b a_{z_2} r_{cg} - m_b g_{hz} r_{cg} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$


Referring to Eq. (13),  $I_\beta$  is the blade's flapping inertia,  $K_\beta$  the equivalent flapping spring,  $r_{cg}$  the distance of the flapping hinge from the centre of gravity of the aircraft,  $m_b$  is the blade mass and  $g_{zh}$  the gravity contribution. The acceleration  $a_{z_{blade}}$  along  $z_{blade}$ , instead, is collected in the form:

$$a_{z_{blade}} = a_{z_1} \beta + a_{z_2} \quad (14)$$


For the sake of brevity further details about the mathematical model are omitted in this paper but will be the subject of a forthcoming paper which is currently being prepared.

### 3.3. Software architecture

The new mathematical model is implemented in a Simulink® library which is then linked to the overall tilt-rotor model and replaces the previous version of the rotor model as described above in this paper (see the block called Rotors, in Fig. 3). Within the so called Rotors-block, both rotors are implemented separately, then the overall forces and induced velocities on the wing and tail are computed in two separate sub-blocks as shown in the simplified flow chart in Fig. 7.



**Fig. 7 Simplified flowchart of the new Rotors-Block of the Simulink® Model**




**Fig. 8 Simplified flowchart of the new Rotors-Block of the Simulink® Model**

The single Rotor-Block is structured as shown in Fig. 8: at each time step pilot controls and the aircraft motion are taken as inputs so the flapping dynamics can be evaluated. Thus, the inflow dynamics is computed and

inflow parameters can be used to calculate all the airloads generated by each blade and the overall forces and moments at each rotor hub. Actually, each of the blocks shown in Fig. 8 requires the values of the states computed in the other blocks, so each signal is fed back to previous block paying attention not to generate unwanted algebraic loops.


### 3.4. Discrete Time integration

The model is implemented in Simulink® in discrete time domain. Unlike the previous model, which used a simplified formulation of the rotor dynamics and required a much lower computational effort, the implementation of the second order flapping dynamics in discrete domain poses some issues related to the representation of fast dynamics with relatively low damping ratio. Precisely, if Euler-discrete integrators were used as in the previous model, a sampling frequency of 10 KHz would be needed to properly reproduce the expected dynamics. Clearly, a sampling frequency of 10 KHz compromises the code computing performance preventing real-time applications.



**Fig. 9 Comparison between different sampling frequencies for Euler Integrators and the reference Tustin integrator (1 of 3)**

To represent this dynamics correctly, Eq. (12) was modeled in Simulink® by using an ad hoc developed second order system based on Tustin integration method. This integration scheme allows quite accurate results with relatively low sampling rate. Thus, the discrete Tustin integrators were modelled according to [13] and introduced within the model with positive results: as shown in Fig. 9 and 10, what obtained by using discrete Euler integrators with a sampling frequency of 10 KHz can be reproduced with Tustin integrators running at 500 Hz and even a sampling frequency of 200 Hz can be considered acceptable.



**Fig. 10 Comparison between different sampling frequencies for Euler Integrators and the reference Tustin integrator (2 of 2)**


**4. VALIDATION OF THE GENERIC PROP-ROTOR MATHEMATICAL MODEL**

A first validation of the generic prop-rotor mathematical model was carried out and results are considered satisfactory. Given the fact that the novel mathematical model is meant to be generic and therefore suitable for a wide range of rotor designs, two substantially different rotor layouts were considered. First, to account for tilt-rotor designs, the XV-15 prop-rotor was considered; second, the Sikorsky UH-60 was used as a reference for a conventional heavy utility class of helicopter design. A comparison between the results of the novel rotor mathematical model. The results of the preliminary validation seem to demonstrate the correctness of the novel model for the two deeply different configurations.


**4.1. XV-15 Case Validation**

In this case, the reference data set is derived from a series of experimental tests conducted at the NASA Langley Research Center on several prop-rotor designs, as reported by Harris in [16]. Precisely, the original layout of the XV-15 is considered, also in accordance with the reference data found in [11] and used for the develop-

ment of the overall tilt-rotor simulation model. From the data provided in [16]), all reference conditions were set at equal Mach Number at the Blades' tip ( $M_{tip}$ ), in environmental conditions referred to sea level on a standard day. As shown below, both coefficients of thrust and power predicted by the model match the reference data for the hover condition with quite a good degree of fidelity.



**Fig. 11 XV-15  $C_p - C_t$  trend in Hover**



**Fig. 12 XV-15  $C_t - \theta$  trend in Hover**




Fig. 13 XV-15  $FM - C_t$  trend in Hover




Fig. 15 UH-60  $C_T - \theta$  trend in Hover

### 4.2. UH-60 Case Validation

For the UH-60 case, the reference data set was derived once again from experimental tests conducted at NASA Langley Research Centre and reported in [31], all data was selected with equal  $M_{tip}$ . What reported in [31] refers to tests conducted on a scaled rotor model (due to the reduced width of the wind tunnel) so all geometric and environmental factors were adapted to ensure the Reynolds numbers similarity and the validity of the comparison performed. As shown in Figs. 14, 15 and 16 the novel mathematical model seems to well predict the rotor's general performance. Instead (Fig. 17), at higher advance ratios the model seems to overestimate the power coefficient. This will be the subject of further investigation in the near future.




Fig. 16 UH-60  $FM - C_T$  trend in Hover




Fig. 14 UH-60  $C_p - C_t$  trend in Hover





Fig. 17 UH-60  $C_Q - \mu$  trend in forward flight


### 5. THE FLIGHT SIMULATION PLATFORM

The ZHAW started the development of ReDSim (Research and Didactics Simulator) in 2010 and its functionality has since then been continuously expanded (Fig. 18 shows the current state of the ReDSim). ReDSim was originally designed as a flexible and universal platform for fixed-wing aircraft. It has a 170-degree out-of-the-window-view projection system and a three-channel control loading system (CLS) to simulate the forces on the pilot controls (yoke/centre stick and pedals). The ReDSim is also equipped with a professional throttle quadrant. The tilt-rotor model presented in this paper was the first non-fixed-wing model to be simulated in ReDSim. To this end, an additional collective lever was installed in the cockpit to control the thrust.



**Fig. 18 ReDSim. Courtesy of ZHAW.**

The mathematical models of the aircraft to be simulated in ReDSim are implemented in MATLAB/Simulink<sup>®</sup> 2019a on a Windows 10 computer. To provide the best flexibility, the Simulink<sup>®</sup> models are not compiled and can be run directly from MATLAB. This allows the user to quickly modify and test the model in the simulator. To allow pilot-in-the-loop simulations, the Simulink<sup>®</sup> model must be able to maintain real-time. This is done with a proprietary C++ S-Function that, for each iteration step, compares the time of the simulation with the time of the computer. If the time of the simulation has caught up with the computer's time, the simulation is blocked and waits for the computer time to pass before the next iteration step is started. This simple approach does not guarantee real-time in the strict sense that, as reported in [27], "computer applications or processes [...] can respond with low bounded latency to user requests", but assures that the simulation time does not run faster than the computer's time. Warnings are generated in case the real-time cannot be respected. The difference of the simulation time and the computer time is shown in Fig. 19.



**Fig. 19 Time History and histogram of the difference between simulation and computer time.**

For this particular test, the function was called at a 400Hz (every 2.5 ms). The histogram of time difference in Fig. 19 shows that about 97.5% of the samples have less than 2.5 ms of time difference. The mean value of the distribution will also depend on the resolution of the function used to suspend the execution of the current thread until the time-out elapses. This is deemed to be acceptable for pilot-in-the-loop simulation, where the main requirement is represented by the time delay between the pilot input and aircraft response (as per "Allowable airplane response delay" in MIL-F-8785C). The time history in Fig. 19 shows a periodic increase in the time difference with a peak value of approximately 37 ms. These spikes are assumed to be caused by other services that are running on the Windows computer and will be investigated in the future. Several mitigations are possible such as: removal of windows services, stop antivirus at run time, increase task priority, etc. Anyhow, it is obvious from Fig. 19 that the execution of one it-

eration of the model can be achieved in less than 2.5 ms, since the simulation is always able to recover from a delay caused by the operating system.

## 6. CLOSING REMARKS

The development of a realistic and efficient simulation model of a tilt-rotor / tilt-wing aircraft to be used for design, development and real-time tests is a challenging task. This led to the development of a novel multi-purpose rotor simulation model able to guarantee the required level of fidelity together with acceptable computational loads. The novel model preliminary validation seems to confirm its suitability for the envisaged tasks. An extensive validation of the model will follow in the near future and is expected to be the subject of further publications. Forthcoming activities involve further validation tests, improvements of the reconfigurable flight simulator, pilot-in-the-loop simulations with the aim to use the generic model for flight control system design and development as well as for handling qualities assessments.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This activity is part of a doctoral research program (Ph.D. in Aerospace Engineering at Politecnico di Torino) supported by Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Centre for Aviation.

## Copyright Statement

*The authors confirm that they, and/or their company or organization, hold copyright on all of the original material included in this paper. The authors also confirm that they have obtained permission, from the copyright holder of any third party material included in this paper, to publish it as part of their paper. The authors confirm that they give permission, or have obtained permission from the copyright holder of this paper, for the publication and distribution of this paper as part of the ERF proceedings or as individual offprints from the proceedings and for inclusion in a freely accessible web-based repository.*

## References

- [1] F. Barra. "Development of a tilt-rotor model for real-time flight simulation". MA thesis. Politecnico di Torino, 2018.
- [2] F. Barra. "Development of a tilt-rotor model for real-time flight simulation". In: 15th PEGASUS Student Conference (Glasgow, The U.K.). 2019.
- [3] P. Capone. "Linearization of Aircraft Models: A Flight Control System and Flying Qualities Perspective". In: RTO Systems Concepts and Integration Panel (SCI) Symposium (Berlin, Germany). 2002.
- [4] R. T. N. Chen, ed. *A Simplified Rotor System Mathematical Model for Piloted Flight Dynamics Simulation*. NASA TM-78575. 1979.
- [5] R. T. N. Chen, ed. *A Survey of Nonuniform Inflow Models for Rotorcraft Flight Dynamics and Control Applications*. NASA TM-102219. 1989.
- [6] R. T. N. Chen, ed. *Effects of Primary Rotor Parameters on Flapping Dynamics*. NASA TP-1431. 1980.
- [7] G. B. Churchill and D. C. Dugan, eds. *Simulation of the XV-15 Tilt Rotor Research Aircraft*. NASA TM-8422. 1982.
- [8] M. E. Dreier. *Introduction to Helicopter and Tiltrotor Flight Simulation. 2nd Edition*. AIAA Education Series. American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 2018.
- [9] D. C. Dugan, R. G. Erhart, and L. G. Schroer, eds. *The XV-15 Tilt Rotor Research Aircraft*. NASA TM-81244. 1980.
- [10] B. Etkin. *Dynamics of Flight*. John Wiley and Sons, 1959.
- [11] S. W. Ferguson. "A Mathematical Model For Real Time Flight Simulation of a Tilt Rotor Aircraft". In: NASA CR-166536. 2017.
- [12] S. W. Ferguson. "Development and Validation of a Simulation for a Generic Tilt-Rotor aircraft". In: NASA CR-166537. 1988.
- [13] G. F. Franklin, J. D. Powell, and M. L. Workman. *Digital Control of Dynamic Systems. 3rd Edition*. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc., 1997.
- [14] R. K Haffle and M. A. Mnich, eds. *Minimum-Complexity Simulation Math model*. NASA CR-177476. 1988.
- [15] P.B. Harendral, M.J Johlekar, and R. L. Gaffey T. M. Marr, eds. *A Mathematical Model for Real Time Flight Simulation fo the Bell 301 Tilt Rotor Research Aircraft*. NASA CR-114614. 1973.
- [16] F. D. Harris. "Hover Performance of Isolated Proprotors and Propellers—Experimental Data". In: NASA CR-219486. 1988.
- [17] S.F. Hoerner. *Fluid Dynamic Lift*. Hoerner Fluid Dynamics, 1975.
- [18] W. Johnson. *Helicopter Theory*. Dover Publications, Inc, 1980.
- [19] K. M. Kleinhesselink. "Stability and Control Modeling of Tiltrotor Aircraft". MA thesis. University of Maryland, 2007.

- [20] J. S. G. McVicar. "A Generic Tilt-Rotor Simulation Model with Parallel Implementation". PhD thesis. University of Glasgow, 1993.
- [21] M. Miller and J. Narkiewicz. "Tiltrotor Modelling For Simulation in Various Flight Conditions". In: *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics* (2006).
- [22] G. D. Padfield. *Helicopter Flight Dynamics. 2nd Edition*. Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- [23] D. M Pitt and D. A. Peters. "Theoretical prediction of dynamic-inflow derivatives". In: Sixth European rotorcraft and powered lift aircraft forum. 1980.
- [24] *RTO-TR-029. Flight Control Design - Best Practices*. Tech. rep. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 2000.
- [25] S. Schmitz and D. C. Maniaci. "Analytical Method to Determine a Tip Loss Factor for Highly-Loaded Wind Turbines". In: AIAA Aeronautical Sciences Meeting (San Diego, CA). 2016.
- [26] Jim Sherman. "eVTOL Captures the Attention of CES". In: *Vertiflite* March/April (2019), pp. 40–44.
- [27] S. Siewert and J. Pratt. *Real-Time Embedded Components and Systems with Linux and RTOS*. Mercury Learning and Information, 2016.
- [28] Vertical Flight Society Staff. "Electric VTOL News. The Latest in eVTOL Developments". In: *Vertiflite* July/August (2018), pp. 36–38.
- [29] B. L. Stevens. *Aircraft Control and Simulation*. Wiley-Interscience, 2003.
- [30] Kenneth I. Swartz. "The eVTOL Industry in Transition". In: *Vertiflite* March/April (2019), pp. 34–39.
- [31] T. W. Yeager, R. M. Wayne, and L. W. Wilbur. "Wind-Tunnel evaluation of an advance main-rotor blade design for a utility-class helicopter". In: NASA TM-89129. 1987.