

Application of Adjoint Methodology in Various Aspects of Sonic Boom Design

Sriram K. Rallabhandi, National Institute of Aerospace

In support of NASA High Speed Project

- AIAA Aviation 2014
- Sonic Boom Activities III
- June 17, 2014

Outline



- Current status of adjoint shape optimization applied to sonic boom mitigation
- Goals
- Extension to boom adjoint theory
- Verification of adjoint sensitivities
- Results
- Discussion
- Summary

Current Status: Adjoint-Based Shape Optimization for Sonic Boom Mitigation



Current Status: Adjoint-Based Shape Optimization for Sonic Boom Mitigation





Current Status: Adjoint-Based Shape Optimization for Sonic Boom Mitigation

Goals

Extend sonic boom propagation utility (sBOOM^{1,2}) to:

- Generate target equivalent areas using adjoint sensitivities
 - Targets at multiple azimuths in the neighborhood of the baseline design
 - Efficient compared to non-gradient based optimization approaches
- > Obtain sensitivity of sonic boom metrics to:
 - Flight conditions
 - Propagation parameters
 - Atmospheric quantities

¹Rallabhandi, S. K., "Advanced Sonic-Boom Prediction Using the Augmented Burgers Equation", Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 48, pp: 1245-1253, 2011 ²Rallabhandi, S. K., Nielsen, E. J., Diskin, B., "Sonic-Boom Mitigation Through Aircraft Design and Adjoint Methodology", Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 51, pp: 502-510, 2014

Discrete Boom Adjoint Formulation

Derivative of the Lagrangian

k_n – Blokhintzev scaling term
$A^n, B^n - N_2$ Relaxation matrices
$A_2^n, B_2^n - O_2$ Relaxation matrices
A_3^n, B_3^n – Absorption matrices
$f(t_n)$ – Nonlinear terms

Boom Adjoint Equations: Existing Theory

- Sonic boom discrete-adjoint equations: $A^{n}q_{n} = k_{n}B^{n}p_{n-1}$ $A^{n}_{2}r_{n} = B^{n}_{2}q_{n}$ $A^{n}_{3}t_{n} = B^{n}_{3}r_{n}$ $p_{n} = f(t_{n})$ Mog $A^{n}_{n}A^{n}_{3} = \lambda^{T}_{n}\frac{\partial f_{n}}{\partial t_{n}}$ $\gamma^{T}_{1,n}A^{n}_{2} = \beta^{T}_{n}B^{n}_{3}$ $\gamma^{T}_{0,n}A^{n} = \gamma^{T}_{1,n}B^{n}_{2}$
 - Cost functions:

$$J = (dBA - dBA_t)^2$$
$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial p_0} = 2(dBA - dBA_t)\frac{\partial (dBA)}{\partial p_0}$$

$$J = \frac{1}{2} (\overline{A_e} - \overline{A_{e,t}}) (\overline{A_e} - \overline{A_{e,t}})^T$$
$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial p_o} = \left[\overline{A_e} - \overline{A_{e,t}}\right] \frac{\partial A_e}{\partial p_o}$$

• Gradient of the objective: $\frac{dL}{dD} = -\gamma_{0,1}^T k_1 B^1$

Boom Adjoints: Extension to Existing Theory

• Change of independent variable vector from p_0 to A_e

50

x¹⁰⁰

150

Gradient optimization leads to numerically better, but practically worse targets

Boom Adjoints: Extension to Existing Theory

• Change of independent variable vector from p_0 to A_e

- Smoothing is needed
 - > Cubic spline based A_e targets based on control points
 - Algorithm not only returns spline interpolation, but also the Jacobian matrices: $\frac{\partial A_e}{\partial X_{CP}}$, $\frac{\partial A_e}{\partial A_{e,CP}}$ [N > C, CP = Control Points]
 - Gradient computation extended by chain rule

$$\frac{dL}{dD} = \begin{cases} \frac{dL}{dA_e} \frac{dA_e}{dX_{CP}} & \text{if } D = X_{CP} \\ \frac{dL}{dA_e} \frac{dA_e}{dA_{e,CP}} & \text{if } D = A_{e,CP} \\ 1 \times N & N \times C \end{cases}$$

Sensitivities wrt flight conditions and propagation parameters

- Independent variable vector $D: [\Delta \sigma, S, \Gamma, \theta_{v,1}, C_{v,1}, \theta_{v,2}, C_{v,2}, h, M]$
- Updated derivative of the Lagrangian

Updated gradient calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dL}{dD} &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} \gamma_{0,n}^{T} \left[q_{n}^{T} \frac{\partial A^{n}}{\partial D} - k_{n} p_{n-1}^{T} \frac{\partial B^{n}}{\partial D} - B^{n} p_{n-1} \frac{\partial k_{n}}{\partial D} \right] \\ &+ \sum_{n=1}^{N} \gamma_{1,n}^{T} \left[r_{n}^{T} \frac{\partial A_{2}^{n}}{\partial D} - q_{n}^{T} \frac{\partial B_{2}^{n}}{\partial D} \right] + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \beta_{n}^{T} \left[t_{n}^{T} \frac{\partial A_{3}^{n}}{\partial D} - r_{n}^{T} \frac{\partial B_{3}^{n}}{\partial D} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Significant increase in memory requirement (~12 GB more than previous formulation for a typical case)

Verification of Adjoint Sensitivities

- Adjoint sensitivities verified against complex step gradients
 - ➢ Imaginary step size of 10⁻⁵⁰ used in evaluating complex gradients
 - > Good match up to 8 digits of numerical accuracy for target A_{e}

Grid Point	Adjoint Gradient	Complex Gradient
0	4.99555122854739	$4.99555122\underline{485994}$
200	0.22333517023795	$0.223335170\underline{026696}$
500	-1.83336776546880	$-1.83336776\underline{671720}$

• Sensitivities wrt flight conditions, and propagation parameters

Variable	Adjoint Gradient	Complex Gradient
S	-0.121609572658E-002	-0.121609 <u>679831</u> E-002
$\Delta \sigma$	-0.101433622238E + 004	-0.10143 <u>4351727</u> E+004
Г	$-0.242603369041\mathrm{E}{+005}$	$-0.24260 \underline{7576473} E + 005$
C_{ν_1}	$0.850297505015\mathrm{E}{+}002$	$0.85029\underline{3279821}E{+}002$
C_{ν_2}	$0.114275582996\mathrm{E}{+}003$	$0.11427\underline{9749352}E{+}003$
$\theta_{ u_1}$	-0.270434382922E + 004	$-0.27043\underline{8763849}\mathrm{E}{+004}$
$\theta_{ u_2}$	$-0.226512310051\mathrm{E}{+}005$	$-0.2265\underline{34988755}\mathrm{E}{+005}$
M	$0.103286198407\mathrm{E}{+}002$	$0.10328 \underline{1674303} E + 002$
h	0.373155218390E-004	0.3731552 <u>85384</u> E-004

Results: Target A_e Generation

- 15 spline control points
- SQP optimization with Aweighted loudness (dBA) to be minimized
- 64-bit Xeon CPU with 16GB memory
- Total wall time ~ 30 minutes
- Under- and off-track target generated simultaneously
- Targets generated in the neighborhood of the baseline

Results: Target A_e generation

- Typically convergence achieved in 50-60 function evaluations
- A-weighted loudness (dBA) minimized, but perceived loudness tracked
 - Good correlation between dBA and PLdB

Results: Atmospheric Sensitivity

- Loudness sensitivity to Mach number decreases with Mach number
- Loudness sensitivity to cruise altitude approaches zero in tropopause

- Loudness sensitivity to number of points used during propagation asymptotically approaches zero
- Loudness is very sensitive to step size at extremely low step sizes
 - Quickly approaches zero for higher numbers

Discussion

- Adjoint-based design optimization used to generate targets
 - Targets generated in literature were based on either non-gradient approaches or linearized boom minimization theory
 - New approach provides an efficient way to generate targets
- Adjoint-based atmospheric sensitivity analysis
 - Some sources of epistemic uncertainties considered
 - Possible extension to include aleatory uncertainties such as temperature, winds, and relative humidity profiles
 - Quantify uncertainty during sonic boom propagation
 - Robust design point where error and sensitivity are simultaneously minimized
 - Use information to understand and improve design

Summary

- sBOOM framework extended to generate boom sensitivities with respect to equivalent areas, flight conditions, and propagation parameters
- Target equivalent areas generated using gradient-based optimization at multiple azimuthal angles
- Sensitivity of boom metrics to flight conditions and propagation parameters obtained, plotted and observations made

QUESTIONS?

Acknowledgments:

- NASA High Speed project
- Jim Fenbert for setting up the ModelCenter model for gradient-based optimization to generate target equivalent areas
- Karl Geiselhart (ModelCenter)
- Irian Ordaz (off-track analysis)
- Mathias Wintzer for manuscript review and general discussions
- Lori Ozoroski for manuscript review and support