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Abstract
Experimental data are presented for the parasite drag of various helicopter fuselage components, such as skids, external fuel tanks, and tailplane. The experiments were conducted at the KNRTU-KAI T-1K wind tunnel, investigating four versions of a fuselage similar to the ANSAT helicopter. It was found that for the range of pitch angles $-10^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 10^\circ$, the skids added 80% to the drag of the bare fuselage, while the tailplane increased the drag by 20%. At the same conditions, external fuel tanks were found to add 48% to the clean fuselage drag. A simple rotor hub with a tail support added 74% to the bare fuselage in the range of pitch angles $-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ$. Streamlining the rear fuselage was found to reduce the drag by 16% over the range of pitch angles $-10^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 10^\circ$. Apart from the parasite drag, ideas for drag reduction are also discussed.

Nomenclature
Latin
$C$ = area of the exit cross-section of the nozzle, m\(^2\)
$C_D$ = drag coefficient, $C_D = 2D / \rho V^2 S$
$C_{D,max}$ = maximum value of drag coefficient $C_D$
$C_{D,s}$ = scaled drag coefficient (Equation 3)
$L$ = fuselage length, m
$M$ = Mach number
$N$ = number of samples
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\( S \) = characteristic area of a tested model (it remains constant for dressed and undressed configurations), which was defined as a frontal area of the clean fuselage at \( \alpha = 0^\circ \) and \( \beta = 0^\circ \), m\(^2\)

TEL = twin engine light

\( V \) = wind speed, m/s

\( k_0 \) = constant scaling coefficient, which took the same value for each model

max = maximum

min = minimum

\( \tilde{x} \) = sample mean

**Greek**

\( \alpha \) = pitch angle (degrees)

\( \beta \) = yaw angle (degrees)

\( \nu \) = kinematic viscosity, m\(^2\)/s

\( \sigma \) = standard deviation

\( \varphi_{hs} \) = angle of incidence of the horizontal stabilizer (degrees)

\( \varphi_{vs} \) = angle of incidence of the vertical stabilizer (degrees)

**Acronyms**

CF = clean fuselage

CF1,CF2,CF3,CF4 = clean fuselage of models 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively

FT1 = type 1 fuel tank (rectangular prism shape with rounded edges)

FT2 = type 2 fuel tank (cylindrical shape with rounded ends)

HB = main rotor hub

KNRTU-KAI = Kazan National Research Technical University named after A.N. Tupolev

MTOW = Maximum take-off weight

MH = main rotor hub

RANS = Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes equations

\( Re \) = Reynolds number based on the fuselage length, \( Re = VL/\nu \)

SK = skids

SK1,SK2 = type 1 and type 2 skid configurations

TEL = Twin-Engine Light

TH = tail hub

TP = tailplane

TS = tail support

TsAGI = Central Aero-Hydrodynamics Institute (Russian Federation)

T-1K = wind tunnel at KNRTU-KAI

WT = wind tunnel

**Subscripts**

\( D \) = drag

\( DS \) = scaled drag

\( i \) = the number of the measured sample

\( hs \) = horizontal stabilizer

\( vs \) = vertical stabilizer
1. Introduction

Fuselage drag has always been of primary concern for fixed and rotary-wing aircraft. However, helicopter fuselages are less streamlined, because helicopters have the overall lower flight speed in comparison to fixed-wing aircraft, and the need to accommodate mission-specific equipment added externally to helicopters such as search lights, winches, fuel tanks etc., which significantly increase the overall drag [1]. The cost of helicopter operations and concerns over the impact of all flying machines to the environment fueled a rethink of the helicopter fuselage drag. Because most designs begin from a bare hull, it is beneficial to achieve low drag even for this simplified configuration. Higher drag will not necessarily limit the top speed of the helicopter, which is mainly dictated by the design of the main rotor, but will affect the payload versus range trades of the aircraft with operational and financial consequences.

Therefore, drag reduction is one of the main targets of modern helicopter design. The drag itself is influenced by various parameters, such as shape, roughness, free stream turbulence, boundary layer properties [1]. Its accurate prediction remains one of the most difficult challenges in aerodynamics because of the complex geometries inherent to helicopters, unsteady flowfields [2] and complex fuselage-rotor interactions [3–6].

Parasite drag reduction has become increasingly important during the last decade because of the potentially significant gains it may bring to the aerodynamic performance and the minimization of fuel consumption [7–9]. Parasite drag is the aggregate drag of parts of a helicopter (e.g., tailplane, skids, rotor head etc.), which provide no direct contribution to the main rotor lift [10]. It consists of streamline drag, where the flow closes smoothly behind the body, and the bluff body drag in which case the flow separates behind the body [11]. The total drag of a helicopter, at level cruise flight, comprises parasite drag, profile drag of rotor blades, and induced drag due to lift production [12]. The power breakdown of a typical single-rotor helicopter has shown that at cruise flight of 270 km/h, over 45% of its power is used to overcome its airframe drag [13]. References [14,15] suggest that the total drag of a typical civil utility helicopter is caused by induced drag (about 25%), viscous drag (23%), interference drag (40%, main contributor being the rotor-fuselage interaction), wave drag (10%), and other components (10%). These numbers are only indicative and can vary with the configuration, weight class and flight conditions of the helicopter.

Wind tunnel experiments are usually complemented by theoretical or numerical studies. Experiments are difficult to conduct and very expensive. This means that a considerable effort should be put into computing, which itself is limited by the availability of CFD software and computer hardware [16]. However, WT experiments provide the main validation data for CFD. An accurate interpretation of WT data, such as WT wall interference corrections [17], is of paramount importance. Furthermore, rescaling of experimental scaled conditions to flight conditions should be conducted with care so as to minimize errors [18].
Wagner [12] presented drag breakdown in percentage of total parasite drag for a typical TEL-class utility helicopter (without external fuel tanks), with a MTOW of 2.5 metric tons in level cruise flight [12], which is listed in Table 1. Grawunder et al. [7] carried out WT experiments and numerical computations on a similar type TEL-class helicopter, where the case with rotating rotor head, trimmed for fast level flight was investigated. Drag values for this model were slightly higher because the tailboom was truncated upstream of the stabilizer to fit the balance support. The summary of the drag breakdown is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$\alpha = 0^\circ, \beta = 0^\circ$</td>
<td>$\alpha = 0^\circ, \beta = 0^\circ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuselage</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating rotor head</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skids (with</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interference effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail (with</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interference effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail rotor hub</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating rotor head</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(isolated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skids (isolated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skids - fuselage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor head - fuselage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Parasite drag breakdown in percentage of total parasite drag for a typical TEL-class utility helicopters (with no external fuel tanks) [7]

According to Stroub and Rabbot [19], the total consumed power for a typical TEL helicopter in forward flight consists of the parasite power, induced power, profile power and tail rotor power. The parasite power makes up about 50% of total power requirement.

The parasite power can be estimated as follows [7]:

$$P_p = \frac{1}{2} \rho A C_D V^3$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

Hence, for a TEL class helicopter, the 10% reduction of parasite drag in forward flight will lead to 5% power reduction [7].

The main hub is considered to be the largest contributor to parasite drag [10], which adds up to a third of the total drag for medium and light helicopters [20]. A comprehensive summary of hub drag along with ways to minimize it, were previously presented by Sheehy [21]. Drag
of the rotor head with its components having different geometries was previously investigated by Kneisch et al. [20].

Apart from the hub, the fuselage is one of the biggest parasite drag contributors, especially at high speed flight. Hence, recently there has been growing concern over accurate fuselage drag prediction [22–24].

Costes et al. [25] presented results of pressure distribution and force data obtained in the ONERA F1 wind tunnel (WT) for three simplified fuselage configurations of a helicopter up to real flight Reynolds numbers (from 6 to 60 million) based on fuselage length. The data were then compared against numerical results. Although the pressure distribution obtained by numerical methods compared well to the WT results, none of the computations could predict the total drag. This was because of the Reynolds number effect and fuselage geometry variations of three tested models. Subsequent computations which included strut interference effects improved the predictions [26, 27].

Lehman et al. [28] compared WT experiments of the MRH 90 helicopter fuselage with numerical data and observed poor agreement at low angles of attack and angles of sideslip, where the pressure and viscous drag components were comparable.

One of the largest drag contributors to a helicopter drag is characterized by the aft-body of helicopter fuselage due to flow separation and formation of two vortices [29]. However, quite often the shape of the fuselage aft-body cannot be easily modified due to mission requirements and design constraints. A special drag problem relates to the rear fuselage upsweep with rear loading doors, where the width of the doors should be approximately constant. Seddon [30] used wind tunnel model tests and obtained the variation of drag with upsweep angle at separate pitch angles ($-18^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 9^\circ$).

Zhang et al. [29] investigated the aerodynamic design of the EC135 backdoor area and presented results of numerical computations and wind tunnel experiments. Reshaping of the fuselage aft body lead to 22% drag decrease in comparison to the baseline EC135 helicopter. An additional drag reduction of 4% was achieved as a result of the backdoor geometry optimization.

Another study was carried out by Venturelli et al. [31], where the effect of a rear ramp of a helicopter fuselage on its aerodynamic characteristics was investigated. They presented results of multivariable CFD computations of different rear ramp shapes and fitted the obtained data using multivariate smoothing splines based on thin plates. Van Dam [32] summarized the usage of numerical methods with Euler and RANS equations to estimate the drag of helicopters and its components.

Research in fuselage drag reduction using active flow control has also been gaining momentum in recent years. Le Pape et al. [33] attempted to reduce fuselage drag by alleviating flow separation at the backdoor area of a helicopter (clean fuselage with no additional components and with a pronounced rear loading ramp) with active flow control. An average of 15 to 20% drag reduction was achieved. Schaeffler et al. [34] observed a
maximum drag reduction of 22% for a 1/3 scale powered rotorcraft model, which was equipped with 8 blowing slots in the ramp section. In a similar study, Martin et al. [35] achieved large drag reductions (about 20%) using active flow control in the rear ramp section. They also presented a detailed study of flow topology in the ramp section.

Keeping in mind that a large portion of parasite drag is generated because of the rotor hub and fuselage, recent attention was primarily focused on rotor fuselage interaction and on rotor and hub interaction [9, 36–37]. Reß et al. [38] studied the effect of landing gear and a rotating rotor head in a low-speed wind tunnel, which induce approximately 80% of the total parasite drag. While studying different landing gear modifications, it was found that streamlining the cross sections of the landing gear leads to 45% lower drag compared to the baseline configuration.


Apart from major drag contributors, modern helicopters have small geometric features, such as antennas, door handles etc., which contribute greatly to overall drag because they operate at subcritical Reynolds numbers and hence have high drag coefficients [11].

Keys et al. [13] presented recommendations on parasite drag reduction, which were based primarily on wind tunnel test data. However, there seems to be a shortage of information related to parasite drag reduction of different fuselage components (skids, external fuel tanks, tailplane, etc.).

It is, therefore, important to understand the impact of each fuselage component on the overall drag and to quantify the parasite drag. Equally comparing the drag coefficient of clean and “dressed” fuselage is very important for the overall performance analysis of the helicopter. This is the objective of the present work that uses a baseline fuselage design, similar to the ANSAT helicopter (Figure 1).
This paper addresses helicopter fuselage drag, mostly from an experimental perspective. All wind tunnel (WT) measurements were conducted at the KNRTU-KAI T1K subsonic, closed-return, open-jet tunnel. The paper begins with a survey of similar studies reported in the literature and a table is compiled comparing the various tests. Then, the geometries and configurations of the employed WT models are discussed, along with a matrix presenting the available data and the conditions they were obtained at. Then, the analysis of the parasite drag is presented. Based on the obtained results, suggestions for drag reduction are put forward and assessed. Finally, conclusions are drawn and a summary of the findings is presented with some suggestions for further studies.

2. Fuselage configurations and experimental conditions

This paper presents a summary of wind tunnel experiments carried out in the T-1K wind tunnel. All of the models were manufactured of wood or composite materials for the WT tests and made at 1:7 scale. The shapes of all four models were derived from the baseline twin engine light (TEL) ANSAT fuselage, based on an empirical design with the aim to reduce the drag because of the bluff shape inherent to helicopter fuselages while maintaining the ability to fulfil operational needs set by manufacturers. Efforts were made to collect data from most of the four configurations with or without added components.

For each case, geometric changes made to the previous models were considered. Figure 2 shows the outlines of the various designs considered in this work and table 2 compares these models. Detailed descriptions are given in Sections 2.1 through 2.4. Throughout this work, CF1, CF2, CF3 and CF4 will refer to the clean fuselages 1, 2, 3 and 4, where the numbers indicate the corresponding model.

Two different skids were used in the experiments, referred to as Type 1 (SK1) and Type 2 (SK2) skids, as shown in Figure 3. The length of the skids was 35% of the fuselage length (L). The skids for Models 1 and 4 were manufactured separately to satisfy the scale condition 0.35L. Same skids were used for Models 1 and 2.
Figure 4 shows comparative composite views of the two models which also feature three different fuel tank shapes (FT1, FT2 and FT3).

![Figure 2. Side view comparison of the fuselage models](image)

**SK1: Type 1**  
**SK2: Type 2**

![Figure 3. Two modifications of the skids](image)

Type 1 fuel tank (FT1) had a shape of a circular cylinder with rounded ends. Fuel tank 2 (FT2) had a cylindrical shape with a rounded front and a conical rear. Type 3 fuel tank (FT3) had a shape which is close to a right rectangular prism with rounded corners. Its inner surfaces of FT1 and FT3 were made to match the shape of the fuselage. A tail support was also used for all experiments with Model 3. The tail support was of a circular cross-section with a radius of 0.34% of the CF3 fuselage length. To gain better understanding, the tail support, fuel tanks and the tailplane are shown on Figure 4.
The pitch angles of the tailplane’s horizontal ($\varphi_{hs}$) and vertical ($\varphi_{vs}$) stabilizers relative to the fuselage reference plane for each model are also presented in Table 2. The main rotor hub (MH) was fixed to the fuselage and included the blade-root attachment beanie and main shaft. A detailed view of the MH is shown in Figure 5. It is shown that the MH diameter was approximately 25% of the fuselage length ($L$) of Models 2 and 3.
2.1. Model 1
The model consisted of a clean fuselage (CF1), skids (SK2), and twin-fin tailplane (TP) (refer to Figure 6).

![Figure 6. Schematic of Model 1](image)

2.2. Model 2
Model 2 had the same shape as Model 1 except of the aft part of the fuselage that was extended near the rear ramp, as shown in Figure 2. MH was also added for this case.

![Figure 7. Schematic of Model 2](image)

Model 2 consisted of the clean fuselage (CF2), removable skids (SK1), main rotor hub (MH) with a hub fairing, and a twin-fin tailplane (TP).

2.3. Model 3
Model 3 was obtained as a result of the following modifications made to Model 1. A modified engine cowling was installed (see Figure 2) and a tail support (TS) was also added.

![Figure 8. Schematic of Model 3](image)
A tail gearbox fairing was installed, which resulted in a tail boom extension (see Figure 2). Two modifications of external fuel tanks (FT1 and FT2) were used, which were symmetrically positioned on each side of the fuselage (see Figure 8).

Model 3 consisted of the clean fuselage (CF3), tail support (TS), main hub (MH) removable skids (SK2), twin-fin tailplane (TP) and two types of external fuel tanks (FT1 and FT2).

2.4. Model 4
Compared to Model 3, Model 4 had a modified engine cowling (see Figure 2) with a more streamlined shape, lower bottom surface of the fuselage and shorter length of the tailboom with a modified shape of the tail gearbox fairing.

Model 4 consisted of the clean fuselage (CF4) and removable skids (SK1), twin-fin tailplane (TP) and external fuel tanks (FT3).

![Figure 9. Schematic of Model 4](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Fuselage</th>
<th>Tail support</th>
<th>Tail boom</th>
<th>Tailplane type</th>
<th>Main rotor hub</th>
<th>Skids</th>
<th>Fuel tanks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>CF1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>CF1</td>
<td>twin-fin, (\varphi_{vs} = +7^\circ), (\varphi_{hs} = -0.5^\circ)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>SK1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>CF1 + extended rear ramp</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>CF1</td>
<td>twin-fin, (\varphi_{vs} = +6^\circ), (\varphi_{hs} = -0.5^\circ)</td>
<td>yes (hub fairing, torsion)</td>
<td>SK1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>modified (new engine cowls), yes, added tail support (TS)</td>
<td>Extended due to gearbox fairing</td>
<td>twin-fin, (\varphi_{vs} = +7^\circ), (\varphi_{hs} = -0.5^\circ)</td>
<td>yes (hub fairing, torsion)</td>
<td>SK2</td>
<td>FT1, FT2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>modified (new engine cowls, extended bottom surface)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>CF1 + gearbox fairing</td>
<td>twin-fin, (\varphi_{vs} = +7^\circ), (\varphi_{hs} = -0.5^\circ)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>SK1</td>
<td>FT3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of tested models
3. Wind tunnel characteristics, measurement methods, wind tunnel corrections and processing of the raw data

3.1. Test facility
All results were obtained in a low speed WT at the Kazan National Research Technical University (KNRTU-KAI). This is a single-return, closed-circuit, open-jet WT with a contraction ratio of 4.9. The WT has a free stream turbulence intensity below 0.5% in the jet core, a nozzle exit diameter of 2.25 m, and can reach wind speeds up to 50 m/s. The tests were performed at 28, 36 and 43.5 m/s, respectively.

![Figure 10. Model 4 fuselage in the T-1K WT at KNTRU-KAI](image)

Strain gauge sensors, with the 16-Bit National Instruments PXI 4220 analog-to-digital converter, were used for measurements of forces and moments in a six component Prandtl-type balance [40]. In this work, the integration time for each angle was set to 60 seconds; the recorded data were then time-averaged. The strain gauge sensors were able to measure loads with a precision of 10 grams at each of all six components of the balance. The model was suspended on wires of 0.8 mm diameter, as shown in Figure 10.

Similarity parameters for low speed WTs are affected by free and solid boundaries. The jet of the WT is distorted due to the presence of the models inside the test section. Corrections for $S/C$ ratio ($S$ – characteristic area of a tested model, which was defined as a frontal area of the clean fuselage configuration; $C$ – area of the exit cross-section of the nozzle), influence of the balance suspension system and suspension devices [41], flow deformation at different pitch and yaw angles and blocking-effect correction were applied to the results obtained in T-1K WT. The drag coefficient of the mounting system was determined separately (with the model removed) and subtracted from the drag coefficients of the tested model obtained earlier. The pitch angle was corrected for the effect of flow boundaries and slanting angle of the wind velocity, which is 0.2° for T-1K WT. A summary on the data analysis in the T1K wind tunnel can be found in reference [40].
It should be noted that the characteristic area of the tested model $S$ remained constant for dressed and clean configurations, which was equal to the frontal area of the clean fuselage of each model at $\alpha = 0^\circ$ and $\beta = 0^\circ$. However, each model had its own reference area $S$.

Depending on the test, the pitch angles ranged as $-10^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 10^\circ$, and were set relative to the reference plane, which was parallel to the bottom surface of the clean fuselage. The balance was positioned on a turntable which allowed for yaw angle changes in the range $-18^\circ \leq \beta \leq 18^\circ$ of the tested models.

Previously obtained results in the T-1K WT were in good agreement with the T-102, T-103, T-106 and T-5 TsAGI WTs [42]. The T-1K WT results are also in good agreement with CFD computations carried out in KNRTU-KAI. The comparison of the wind tunnel results of a sample helicopter fuselage with CFD computations is shown on Figure 11. Here all drag values were scaled to the maximum $C_D$ value ($C_D/C_{D,\text{max}}$) at $C_L = -0.3$ for the CFD case at $Re = 4.4 \times 10^6$ (based on fuselage length). The 95% confidence interval of the 8-fold experiments is indicated by the error bars. The relatively good agreement with CFD suggests that the measurements have good validity. The effect of the Reynolds numbers can also be seen in the CFD results; it is important to bear this in mind if the experiments are to be scaled to full-size helicopters.

![Figure 11. Comparison of experimental and CFD results of a sample helicopter fuselage [43]](image-url)
3.2. Random errors

Random errors were accounted for by performing eightfold experiments at wind speed of \( V=36 \) m/s, which approximately corresponded to the range \( 3.6 \times 10^6 \leq Re \leq 4 \times 10^6 \). Random errors depend on many factors, the main being measurement system errors, errors due to the model positioning, the unsteady character of aerodynamic loading, etc. The magnitude of random errors depends on the scale and aerodynamic properties of the tested models.

Measured samples were described by a Gaussian distribution function with mean \( \bar{x} \) and standard deviation \( \sigma \). The \( \bar{x} \pm 1.96\sigma \) interval corresponds to a 95% confidence interval [44].

\[
\bar{x} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i 
\]

\[
\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i - \bar{x})^2} 
\]

Here, \( N \) is the number of samples (\( N = 8 \) for eightfold experiments) and \( x_i \) is the \( i^{th} \) measurement.

Due to high operational costs of WTs, the eightfold confidence intervals in this paper were calculated only for cases of Models 1 and 4 (see Figures 12, 17, 18), which was also used as an estimate to assess errors present in the experiments. In terms of \( C_D \), the confidence intervals varied from 0.019 to 0.123.

3.3. Data presentation

3.3.1. Scaled drag coefficient

The obtained drag coefficients \( C_D \) at different pitch (\( \alpha \)) and yaw (\( \beta \)) angles were scaled with a constant coefficient \( k_0 \), resulting in a scaled drag coefficient \( C_{DS} \):

\[
C_{DS} = k_0 C_D 
\]

Here, \( C_D \) is the actual drag coefficient measured during the WT experiments for a given fuselage configuration (\( C_D \) values of the different configurations were calculated based on the reference area \( S \) of the clean fuselage); the coefficient \( k_0 \) has the same value for all plots in the paper but its exact value is not disclosed.

The plot style in this work includes + and – signs, which indicate presence or absence of a fuselage component, respectively. For example, (CF4+; TP−; SK1−; FT3−) configuration indicates that the Model 4 clean fuselage (CF4) was used, and that the tailplane (TP), first configuration of skids (SK1) and the third configuration of fuel tanks (FT3) were removed.

For convenience, if the same configuration is presented on the same figure for two different models, they have same symbols but different colours (black, grey and white). For example, the (CF1+; SK1+; TP+; MH−) and (CF2+; SK1+; TP+; MH−) configurations in Figure 12
represent the same configuration for two different models. Therefore, they are indicated by same square-symbol (but with black and grey colours).

3.3.2. Calculation of the drag increase

The percentage of the drag increase for different configurations was calculated by using two values of \( C_{DS} \) for both configurations at the same angle of attack, and the following relation:

\[
\Delta C_D = \frac{C_{DS_k} - C_{DS_j}}{C_{DS_j}} \cdot 100\% = \left( \frac{k_0 C_{D_k}}{k_0 C_{D_j}} - 1 \right) \cdot 100\% = \left( \frac{C_{D_k}}{C_{D_j}} - 1 \right) \cdot 100\% \tag{4}
\]

here,

\( \Delta C_D \) is the drag increase of the \( k^{th} \) configuration relative to the \( j^{th} \) configuration;

\( C_{DS_j}, C_{DS_k} \) are the scaled drag coefficients at a given pitch angle \( \alpha_0 \) or yaw angle \( \beta_0 \) of the \( j^{th} \) and \( k^{th} \) configurations, respectively;

\( C_{D_j}, C_{D_k} \) are the unscaled drag coefficients at a given pitch angle \( \alpha_0 \) or yaw angle \( \beta_0 \) of the \( j^{th} \) and \( k^{th} \) configurations, respectively;

\( k_0 \) is a constant coefficient, which took the same value throughout this paper;

\( \alpha_0, \beta_0 \) are the arbitrary pitch and yaw angles, respectively.

As an example, at \( \alpha = 10^\circ \), \( C_{DS1} = 0.0707 \) for (CF2+; SK1+; TP+; MH−) and \( C_{DS2} = 0.1139 \) for the (CF2+; SK1+; TP+; MH+) configuration of Figure 12. This means that the presence of MH results in 61% drag increase at that angle.

Drag coefficients were calculated with the reference area \( S \) at \( \alpha = 0^\circ \) and \( \beta = 0^\circ \).

Equation (4) implies that the scaled drag coefficients for two different configurations of a given model can be used to show the drag increase (or decrease) and are independent of the coefficient \( k_0 \). This feature is used in Tables 3 to 8 to show true drag variations for different configurations of the four models.

3.3.2. Calculation of the drag breakdown

The drag breakdown was calculated as:

\[
\Delta C_{D0} = \frac{C_{DS_k}}{C_{DS_{j0}}} \cdot 100\% = \frac{k_0 C_{D_k}}{k_0 C_{D_j}} \cdot 100\% = \frac{C_{D_k}}{C_{D_j}} \cdot 100\% \tag{5}
\]

Here,

\( \Delta C_{D0} \) is the drag ratio (in terms of percentage) of the \( k^{th} \) configuration relative to the \( j^{th} \) configuration;

\( C_{DS_{j0}} \) is the scaled drag coefficient at a given pitch angle \( \alpha_0 \) or yaw angle \( \beta_0 \) for a configuration, which has highest drag;

The drag breakdown of each model was carried out with the configuration, which had the highest drag \( C_{DS_{j0}} \) for that model.
4. Results and Discussion

In this section each configuration is prefixed with the model’s number. For example, configuration 1-5 indicates a configuration 5 of the Model 1.

4.1. Models 1 and 2

In this section, comparison of two models with different configurations is considered. Model 2 has the same fuselage shape as Model 1, except of its extended rear ramp.

Figure 12 shows how the drag of the configurations differ with the pitch angle $\alpha$. The addition of skids (SK1) from configuration 1-3 (CF1+;SK1+;TP+;MH−) to configuration 1-5 (CF1+;SK1−;TP+;MH−) resulted in a gradual increase of the drag coefficient $\Delta C_D$ from 23% at $\alpha = -10^\circ$ to 78% at $\alpha = 10^\circ$. Then, removal of the TP from configuration 1-3 resulted in a slight drag decrease (see configuration 1-4). Configurations 1-3 and 2-2 are similar but the latter has an extended rear ramp, and their comparison indicates that drag reduction due to extended rear ramp is highest at negative angles of attack ($-21\%$ at $\alpha = -10^\circ$) and becomes less evident at higher pitch angles ($-7\%$ at $\alpha = 10^\circ$). This was expected since during the experiment separation zones near the rear ramp and below the tail boom were observed using a tuft wand. The extended rear ramp had delayed flow separation.

Comparison of configurations 1-3 and 1-4 indicates that installation of the TP leads to an average drag increase of 4%.

Model 2, which had an extended rear ramp, was also used to estimate drag increase because of its installed main rotor hub and hub fairing. Comparison of configurations 2-1 and 2-2 reveals that addition of MH resulted in the drag increase from 48% at $\alpha = -10^\circ$ to 62% for $0^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 10^\circ$. This indicates that the drag of the main hub is higher at positive pitch angles than at negative. The average drag increase due to addition of main hub was 59% (Table 3).

Figure 13 shows the effect of drag increase of different configurations at different yaw angles $\beta$. The addition of skids from configuration 1-5 (CF1+;SK1−;TP+;MH−) to configuration 1-3 (CF1+;SK1+;TP+;MH−) resulted in a drag increase from 36% at $\beta = -18^\circ$ to its maximum value of 66% at $\beta = -6^\circ$, and then a gradual decrease to 30% at $\beta = -12^\circ$. Comparison of configurations 2-2 and 1-3 shows drag reduction due to the extended rear ramp, which is almost negligible at $\beta = -18^\circ$, and which then gradually decreases to $-16\%$ at $\beta = 3^\circ$, and then gradually increases to $-11\%$ at $\beta = 12^\circ$. The difference between Model 1 and Model 2 in terms of drag reduction becomes more evident near zero yaw because of the lower form drag due to the delayed flow separation behind the extended rear ramp.

The drag increment due to the main hub of model 2 (see configurations 2-1 and 2-2) reaches its peak at near-zero yaw angles (52%) and decreases with higher (30% at $\beta = 12^\circ$) or lower (25% at $\beta = -18^\circ$) yaw angles.

A summary of the drag increments of the various configurations of Models 1 and 2 is presented in tables 3 and 4.
The dependence of reduced drag coefficients at different pitch angles at three different Reynolds numbers is shown in Figures 14. As can be seen, Reynolds numbers in the range $2.58 \cdot 10^6 \leq Re \leq 4.01 \cdot 10^6$ have little effect on drag, and lower drag values correspond to higher Reynolds numbers, which was expected [45].

Figure 12. Models 1 and 2 (Re=$3.67 \times 10^6$, M=0.1, $\beta=0^\circ$)

Figure 13. Models 1 and 2 (Re=$3.67 \times 10^6$, M=0.1, $\alpha=0^\circ$)
Figure 14. Model 1 (CF1+; SK1+; TP+; MH−) at different Reynolds numbers (β=0°)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>$C_{DS_j}$</th>
<th>$C_{DS_k}$</th>
<th>$\Delta C_D = \frac{C_{DS_k} - C_{DS_j}}{C_{DS_j}} \cdot 100%$</th>
<th>Range of pitch angles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>min</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5. CF1+;SK1−;TP+;MH−</td>
<td>j = 5</td>
<td>k = 3</td>
<td>+23%</td>
<td>+60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3. CF1+;SK1+;TP+;MH−</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3. CF1+;SK1+;TP+;MH−</td>
<td>j = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2. CF2+;SK1+;TP+;MH−</td>
<td>j = 2</td>
<td>k = 1</td>
<td>+48%</td>
<td>+59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Table 3. Summary of the Models 1 and 2 drag increase for different configurations. Mean values are calculated over the range of pitch ($\alpha$) angles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>$C_{DS_j}$</th>
<th>$C_{DS_k}$</th>
<th>$\Delta C_D = \frac{C_{DS_k} - C_{DS_j}}{C_{DS_j}} \cdot 100%$</th>
<th>Range of yaw angles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>min</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5. CF1+;SK1−;TP+;MH−</td>
<td>j = 5</td>
<td>k = 3</td>
<td>+30%</td>
<td>+50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3. CF1+;SK1+;TP+;MH−</td>
<td>j = 3</td>
<td>k = 2</td>
<td>−16%</td>
<td>−9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2. CF2+;SK1+;TP+;MH−</td>
<td>j = 2</td>
<td>k = 1</td>
<td>+25%</td>
<td>+41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Table 4. Summary of the Models 1 and 2 drag increase for different configurations. Mean values are calculated over the range of yaw ($\beta$) angles.
4.2. Model 3
The tail support (TS) and main hub (MH) were installed on the clean fuselage of Model 3 for almost all tested configurations.

Figure 15 shows the effect of the pitch angle $\alpha$ on the drag. As can be seen, the addition of the tailplane (TP) to the configuration 3-7 (CF3+; TS+; MH+; SK2−; FT2−; TP−) results in a small drag increase, as an average value near 5% (configuration 3-6). The installation of the skids (SK2) to configuration 3-6, results in a gradual drag increase from 22% at $\alpha = -8^\circ$ to 56% at $\alpha = 6^\circ$ (configuration 3-4). If then external fuel tanks (FT2) are added on top of TP and SK2 to configuration 3-4 (which then becomes configuration 3-3), the drag further increases from 20% to 29% depending on the angle. However, if only skids (SK2) are added to configuration 3-7 (which is configuration 3-5), then the drag gradually increases from 20% at $\alpha = -8^\circ$ to 55% at $\alpha = 8^\circ$.

Comparison of configurations 3-3 and 3-4 indicates that the addition of rectangular fuel tanks (FT2) leads to 20% average drag increase over the entire range of pitch and yaw angles. In turn, addition of skids (SK2) to configuration 3-7 has an effect of about 40% drag increase and does not change over the range of yaw angles. However, the situation varies as the pitch angle changes, and the drag rises steadily from $\alpha = -8^\circ$ to $\alpha = 8^\circ$.

Comparison of configurations 3-1 and 3-3 indicates that FT1 is slightly better than FT2 at nonzero pitch angles. This additional drag could be due to the circular attachment rods of the FT2, which are exposed to the flow, even though FT2 is more streamlined than FT1.

Figure 16 shows the drag variation as a function of the yaw angle $\beta$. The addition of TP to the clean fuselage (i.e., to configuration 3-7), results in an insignificant drag increase; the difference can be distinguished only in the range $-6^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ$, where the drag increase is about 5 to 7%. On the other hand, if skids are added to configuration 3-7 (the result is configuration 3-5), the drag increases by about 41% (refer to Table 6).

The comparisons of configurations 3-6 with 3-7, 3-4 with 3-5 and 3-1 with 3-2 demonstrate that the addition of the tailplane (TP) has a very low contribution to the overall drag. Comparison of the clean fuselage configurations 3-8 and 3-7 (with installed MH and TS) indicate that MH and TS adds up 74% on average over the pitch angles and 50% over the yaw angles.

A summary of drag increments for the various configurations of Model 3 is presented in Tables 5 and 6.
Figure 15. Model 3 (Re=3.85x10^6, M=0.1, β=0°)

Figure 16. Model 3 (Re=3.85x10^6, M=0.1, α=0°)
### Table 5. Summary of the Model 3 drag increase for different configurations. Mean values are calculated over the range of pitch (\(\alpha\)) angles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>(C_{DS_j}/C_{DS_k})</th>
<th>(\Delta C_D = \frac{C_{DS_k} - C_{DS_j}}{C_{DS_j}} \cdot 100%)</th>
<th>Range of pitch angles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-1, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT1+;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 1</td>
<td>+31% +54% +71%</td>
<td>(-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-2, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT1+;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 2</td>
<td>+28% +54% +71%</td>
<td>(-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-3, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 3</td>
<td>+51% +63% +80%</td>
<td>(-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-4, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 4</td>
<td>+27% +41% +61%</td>
<td>(-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-5, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 5</td>
<td>+20% +38% +55%</td>
<td>(-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-6, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 6</td>
<td>+1% +5% +9%</td>
<td>(-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 8, k = 7</td>
<td>+54% +74% +95%</td>
<td>(-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. Summary of the Model 3 drag increase for different configurations. Mean values are calculated over the range of yaw (\(\beta\)) angles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>(C_{DS_j}/C_{DS_k})</th>
<th>(\Delta C_D = \frac{C_{DS_k} - C_{DS_j}}{C_{DS_j}} \cdot 100%)</th>
<th>Range of pitch angles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-1, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT1+;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 1</td>
<td>+62% +66% +75%</td>
<td>(-12^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-2, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT1+;TP+</td>
<td>j = 1, k = 2</td>
<td>+57% +62% +69%</td>
<td>(-12^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-3, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 3</td>
<td>+59% +64% +69%</td>
<td>(-12^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-4, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 4</td>
<td>+39% +42% +46%</td>
<td>(-12^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-5, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 5</td>
<td>+37% +41% +46%</td>
<td>(-12^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-6, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 7, k = 6</td>
<td>+0% +5% +7%</td>
<td>(-12^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-7, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2--;FT1--;TP-- to 3-8, CF3+;TS+; MH+;SK2+;FT2--;TP+</td>
<td>j = 8, k = 7</td>
<td>+31% +50% +66%</td>
<td>(-12^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Model 4

In this section, comparison of different configurations of Model 4 is considered. Model 2 has the same fuselage shape as Model 1, except of its extended rear ramp. Model 4 included a tailplane (TP), type 1 skids (SK1) and type 3 fuel tanks (FT3).

Figure 17 presents the results of the experiments as function of the pitch angle ($\alpha$). If TP is added to configuration 4-8 (see configuration 4-7), the drag increase remains between 11 and 15% for $-10^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 2^\circ$, then it gradually increases from 26–40% at higher angles. If then the rectangular fuel tanks (FT3) are added to configuration 4-7 (see configuration 4-5), the drag further increases on 30% at $\alpha = -8^\circ$, and then gradually rises (at higher positive angles) up to 78% at $\alpha = 10^\circ$. If skids (SK1) are added to configuration 4-5 (which then becomes configuration 4-1), the drag further rises by 30% at $\alpha = -10^\circ$ and then gradually increases by 79% at $\alpha = 10^\circ$.

On the other hand, if rectangular fuel tanks (FT3) are added to the clean fuselage (i.e., from configuration 4-8 to 4-6), the drag increases from 28% at $\alpha = -10^\circ$ up to 91% at $\alpha = 10^\circ$. If only skids (SK1, configuration 4-4) are added to the CF (configuration 4-8), then the drag rises from 27% at $\alpha = -10^\circ$ to 148% at $\alpha = 10^\circ$.

The addition of the TP to configuration 4-4 results in (configuration 4-3) 18% drag increase (at $\alpha = -10^\circ$) and 3% (at $\alpha = -2^\circ$), which then remains relatively constant at the 3% level till $\alpha = 10^\circ$. On the other hand, the addition of the FT3 (configuration 4-2) to configuration 4-4 results in the drag increase of 21% for the $0^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 8^\circ$ range and a relatively constant drag increase of 30 to 32% for the remaining range.

The results of the yaw angle tests are presented in Figure 18. The addition of the TP to configuration 4-8 results in a gradual drag increase from 4% at $\beta = -15^\circ$ to 22% at $\beta = -18^\circ$ (see configuration 4-6). Adding the rectangular fuel tanks (FT3) (configuration 4-5) to configuration 4-6 results in additional drag rise, from 20% (at $\beta = -18^\circ$) to 36% (at $\beta = -6^\circ$) and back to 16% (at $\beta = 18^\circ$). Further addition of skids to configuration 4-5 (which is configuration 4-1) increases drag between 58 and 71%.

If, on the other hand, FT3 is added to configuration 4-8 (which is configuration 4-6), the drag increases gradually from 13% (at $\beta = -18^\circ$) to 42% (at $\beta = -3^\circ$), and then decreases gradually to 24% (at $\beta = 18^\circ$). If skids (SK1) are added to configuration 4-6 (the result is configuration 4-2), then an additional increase of about 60% is observed.

Additional installation of the TP (configuration 4-3) results in the gradual drag increase from 0% (at $\beta = -18^\circ$) to 16% (at $\beta = 18^\circ$).

Comparisons of configurations 4-1 and 4-2, 4-3 and 4-4, 4-5 and 4-6, 4-7 and 4-8 show that, in general, the TP brings an almost constant drag increase over the range of pitch and yaw angles. The drag slope configurations of skids (SK1) and fuel tanks (FT3) configurations in Figure 17 reveal that it is minimal at negative pitch angles ($\alpha$), and is highest at positive pitch angles ($\alpha$).
A summary of drag increments due to different configurations of Model 4 is presented in Tables 7 and 8.

The dependence of reduced drag coefficients at different pitch and yaw angles at three different Reynolds numbers is shown in Figures 19 and 20 for clean fuselage configuration. As can be seen, Reynolds numbers in this range have little effect on drag.
Figure 19. Model 4 at different Reynolds numbers (β=0°)

Figure 20. Model 4 at two different Reynolds numbers (α=0°)
Table 7. Summary of the Model 4 drag increase for different configurations. Mean values are calculated over the range of pitch ($\alpha$) angles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>$C_{DS_j}$</th>
<th>$C_{DS_k}$</th>
<th>$\Delta C_D = \frac{C_{DS_k} - C_{DS_j}}{C_{DS_j}} \cdot 100%$</th>
<th>Range of pitch angles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-8. CF4+; TP--; SK1--; FT3--</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 1</td>
<td>+73%</td>
<td>+117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-1. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 2</td>
<td>+58%</td>
<td>+109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-8. CF4+; TP--; SK1--; FT3--</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 3</td>
<td>+44%</td>
<td>+87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-4. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 4</td>
<td>+27%</td>
<td>+80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-5. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 5</td>
<td>+38%</td>
<td>+62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-6. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 6</td>
<td>+28%</td>
<td>+48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-7. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 7</td>
<td>+11%</td>
<td>+20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Summary of the Model 4 drag increase for different configurations. Mean values are calculated over the range of yaw ($\beta$) angles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>$C_{DS_j}$</th>
<th>$C_{DS_k}$</th>
<th>$\Delta C_D = \frac{C_{DS_k} - C_{DS_j}}{C_{DS_j}} \cdot 100%$</th>
<th>Range of yaw angles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-8. CF4+; TP--; SK1--; FT3--</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 1</td>
<td>+77%</td>
<td>+98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-1. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 2</td>
<td>+79%</td>
<td>+86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-8. CF4+; TP--; SK1--; FT3--</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 3</td>
<td>+58%</td>
<td>+65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-4. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 4</td>
<td>+47%</td>
<td>+57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-5. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 5</td>
<td>+28%</td>
<td>+36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-6. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 6</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From to 4-7. CF4+; TP++; SK1++; FT3+</td>
<td>j = 8</td>
<td>k = 7</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5. Parasite drag breakdown
In this section, the results are summarized in terms of parasite drag breakdown (with interference effects) for each model. Models 1 and 2 are considered together, because the only difference between them is the extended rear ramp of the latter. Two cases are shown for Model 3: the drag breakdown for FT1 and FT2. Model 4 is presented last.

The reference value of each model is taken as the one, having the highest average drag over the range of considered angles. The calculations are performed using Equation (5).

Figures 21-22 show the drag breakdown of Models 1 and 2. Fully dressed configuration 2-1 was taken as a reference drag value $C_{D\text{S}_{\text{jo}}}$.

The drag breakdown of the Model 3 was performed with respect to two different fuel tanks FT1 and FT2. Figures 23-24 show the results for the fuselage with FT1. The drag breakdown with respect to FT2 is presented in Figures 25-26.

The drag breakdown of the Model 4 is shown in Figures 27-28.

Finally, the summary of obtained drag values, averaged over the range of pitch ($\alpha$) and yaw ($\beta$) angles, is presented in Table 9.
Figure 21. Parasite drag breakdown of Models 1 and 2 with respect to configuration 2-1
\((\text{Re}=3.67\times10^6, \text{M}=0.1, \beta=0^\circ)\)

Figure 22. Parasite drag breakdown of Models 1 and 2 with respect to configuration 2-1
\((\text{Re}=3.67\times10^6, \text{M}=0.1, \alpha=0^\circ)\)
Figure 23. Parasite drag breakdown of Model 3 with respect to configuration 3-1 with FT1
(Re=3.85x10^6, M=0.1, β =0°)

Figure 24. Parasite drag breakdown of Model 3 with respect to configuration 3-1 with FT1
(Re=3.85x10^6, M=0.1, α =0°)
Figure 25. Parasite drag breakdown of Model 3 with respect to configuration 3-3 with FT2
\((Re=3.85\times10^6, M=0.1, \beta =0^\circ)\)

Figure 26. Parasite drag breakdown of Model 3 with respect to configuration 3-3 with FT2
\((Re=3.85\times10^6, M=0.1, \alpha =0^\circ)\)
Figure 27. Parasite drag breakdown of Model 4 with respect to configuration 4-1 (Re=3.96x10^6, M=0.1, β =0°)

Figure 28. Parasite drag breakdown of Model 4 with respect to configuration 4-1 (Re=3.96x10^6, M=0.1, α =0°)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models 1, 2</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>$-10^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 10^\circ$</th>
<th>$-18^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4. CF1+: SK1++; TP--; MH--</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3. CF1+: SK1++; TP++; MH--</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2. CF2++; SK1++; TP++; MH--</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5. CF1++; SK1--; TP++; MH--</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3 (FT1)</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>$-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ$</th>
<th>$-12^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2+; FT1+; TP+</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2+; FT1--; TP+</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2+; FT1--; TP+</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2+; FT1--; TP+</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2+; FT1--; TP+</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2--; FT1--; TP+</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8. CF3+: TS--; MH--; SK2--; FT1--; TP+</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3 (FT2)</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>$-8^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 6^\circ$</th>
<th>$-12^\circ \leq \beta \leq 12^\circ$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-3. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2--; FT2+; TP+</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2--; FT2+; TP+</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2--; FT2--; TP+</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2--; FT2--; TP+</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7. CF3+: TS+; MH+; SK2--; FT2--; TP+</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8. CF3+: TS--; MH--; SK2--; FT2--; TP+</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>$-10^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 10^\circ$</th>
<th>$-18^\circ \leq \beta \leq 18^\circ$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1. CF4++; TP--; SK1+; FT3+</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2. CF4++; TP--; SK1+; FT3+</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3. CF4++; TP--; SK1+; FT3+</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4. CF4++; TP--; SK1+; FT3+</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5. CF4++; TP--; SK1+; FT3+</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6. CF4++; TP--; SK1+; FT3+</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7. CF4++; TP--; SK1+; FT3+</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8. CF4++; TP--; SK1+; FT3+</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Parasite drag breakdown in terms of total parasite drag for each tested model. The values are averaged for the range of pith ($\alpha$) and yaw ($\beta$) angles. MH was static.
5. Conclusions and Future Work
The results of wind tunnel experiments on four helicopter fuselage models has been presented. The drag increase because of the presence of skids, fuel tanks, tailplane, rotor hub, and tail support was presented.

The following conclusions were drawn:

1. Comparison of Models 1 and 2 revealed that the average drag reduction due to extended rear ramp was about 16% for pitch angles \((-10° \leq \alpha \leq 10°\) and 9% for yaw angles \((-18° \leq \beta \leq 12°\).

2. The extended rear ramp yields major benefits in terms of drag reduction at near zero yaw angles \((\beta)\) and at negative pitch angles \((\alpha)\), where the drag decrease is mainly associated with lower values of form drag because of delayed flow separation behind the rear ramp, which was observed with the tuft wand.

3. The average value of the drag increase due to addition of the main hub to the Model 2 was 59% for \(-10° \leq \alpha \leq 10°\) and 41% for \(-18° \leq \beta \leq 12°\). Higher values of drag increase were observed at positive pitch angles and at close-to-zero yaw angles.

4. The addition of the twin-fin tailplane below the tail boom had low contribution to the overall drag. The addition of the tailplane was associated with almost constant drag increase over the range of pitch \((\alpha)\) and yaw \((\beta)\) angles.

5. Almost all tests for Model 3 were carried out with the tail support and main hub. It was found that they added about 74% and 50% to the clean fuselage configuration over the range of pitch and yaw angles, respectively.

6. Two types of skids were tested with different models. Addition of the second type of skids (SK2) to the bare fuselage of Model 3 (with the tail support and with main hub) indicated at 38% drag increase over the range of pitch angles \((-8° \leq \alpha \leq 6°)\). Addition of the first type of skids (SK1) to the bare fuselage of Model 4 showed an average value 80% drag increase over the range of pitch angles \((-10° \leq \alpha \leq 10°)\).

7. First type of fuel tanks (FT1) were slightly better in terms of lower drag at nonzero pitch angles \((\alpha)\) than the second fuel tanks (FT2), which had circular attachment rods exposed to the flow.

Future studies aimed at predicting the parasite drag due to different fuselage configurations (skids, tailplane, fuel tanks, etc.), which will be based on additional experimental results, are planned in the near future.
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