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Accurate Predictions of Hovering Rotor Flows Using CFD

A. Jimenez Garcia\textsuperscript{a}, S. Colonia\textsuperscript{b}, G.N. Barakos\textsuperscript{c}

CFD Laboratory, School of Engineering, University of Glasgow, G12 8QQ Glasgow, UK

With work on the S-76 rotor providing encouraging results regarding the prediction of integral loads with CFD in hover, the XV-15 rotor is now analysed. Fully turbulent and transitional results are obtained showing the capability of modern CFD methods. The transition onset and distribution of skin friction are well predicted and were found to have a mild effect on the overall figure of merit. This work also shows the potential of transport-based models for transition prediction in complex 3D flows. Finally, hover simulations for the PSP blade are also shown in terms of surface pressure coefficient and wake visualisation.

Nomenclature

\begin{align*}
R & = \text{flow equation residual vector} \\
W & = \text{flow solution vector} \\
a_{\infty} & = \text{freestream speed of sound, m/s} \\
c & = \text{rotor blade chord} \\
c_{\text{ref}} & = \text{reference blade chord} \\
C_P & = \text{blade section pressure coefficient, } C_P = \frac{P - P_{\infty}}{1/2 \rho_{\infty} (\Omega r)^2} \\
C_P^* & = \text{critical pressure coefficient} \\
C_Q & = \text{rotor torque coefficient, } C_Q = \frac{Q}{\rho_{\infty} (\Omega R)^2 \pi R^3} \\
C_q & = \text{blade section torque coefficient, } C_q = \frac{dC_Q}{dr} \\
C_{Q/\sigma} & = \text{blade torque coefficient, torque coefficient divided by rotor solidity} \\
C_t & = \text{blade section thrust coefficient, } C_t = \frac{dC_T}{dr} \\
C_T & = \text{rotor thrust coefficient, } C_T = \frac{T}{\rho_{\infty} (\Omega R)^2 \pi R^2} \\
C_{T/\sigma} & = \text{blade loading coefficient, thrust coefficient divided by rotor solidity}
\end{align*}
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$C_{DO} =$ overall profile drag coefficient

$k =$ turbulent kinetic energy

$k_i =$ induced power factor

$M_{\text{tip}} =$ blade-tip Mach number, $M_{\text{tip}} = \frac{V_{\text{tip}}}{a_{\infty}}$

$N_b =$ number of blades

$P =$ pressure

$P_{\infty} =$ freestream pressure

$Q =$ rotor torque

$R =$ rotor radius

$r =$ radial coordinate along the blade span

$Re =$ Reynolds number, $Re = \frac{V_{\text{tip}} c_{\text{ref}}}{\nu}$

$Re_{\theta} =$ momentum thickness Reynolds number

$T =$ rotor thrust

$V_{\text{tip}} =$ blade-tip speed, $V_{\text{tip}} = \Omega R$

$\text{FoM} =$ figure of merit, $\text{FoM} = \frac{C_T^{3/2}}{\sqrt{2C_Q}}$

$\gamma =$ intermittency factor

$\nu_{\infty} =$ freestream kinematic viscosity

$\Omega =$ rotor rotational speed

$\rho_{\infty} =$ freestream density

$\sigma =$ rotor solidity, $\sigma = \frac{N_b c_{\text{ref}}}{\pi R}$

$\Theta =$ local blade twist angle

$\theta_{75} =$ blade pitch angle at $r/R = 0.75$

$\text{ALE} =$ arbitrary Lagrangian Eulerian

$\text{ATB} =$ advanced technology blade

$\text{BILU} =$ block incomplete lower upper
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CFD = computational fluid dynamics
CFL = Courant Friedrichs Lewy
DDES = delayed detached eddy simulation
DES = detached eddy simulation
HMB = helicopter multi-block
LES = large eddy simulation
MUSCL = monotone upstream centred schemes for conservation laws
OARF = outdoor aerodynamic research facility
PSP = pressure sensitive paint
RANS = Reynolds averaged Navier-Stokes
SA = Spalart Allmaras
SST = shear stress transport
VTOL = vertical take-off landing
∞ = freestream value
tip = blade-tip value
* = sonic condition
I. Introduction

Tiltrotor is a flying vehicle that combines VTOL (vertical take-off/landing) capability with high speed cruise. Tiltrotors were successfully demonstrated in United States with the Bell XV-3, which first flew in 1955[1]. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the XV-15 tiltrotor was developed, and was followed by modern tiltrotors like the Bell-Boeing V-22 Osprey[2, 3] and the AW609[4, 5] which is currently undergoing certification.

Very little wind tunnel data is available for model and full-scale tiltrotors. At the early stage of the XV-15 program, the NASA 40-by-80-Foot Wind Tunnel was used to measure integrated rotor loads in helicopter[6], aeroplane and transition-corridor modes[7]. However, force and moment measurements did not exclude the contribution from the airframe. The NASA-Ames Outdoor Aeronautical Research Facility (OARF) was also extensively used by Felker et al.[8] with the XV-15 rotor and Bartie et al.[9] with the XV-15 Advanced Technology Blade (ATB). The hover and forward flight tests began in the late 90s with the work of Light[10] in the 80-ft by 120-ft wind tunnel at NASA Ames, but only few conditions were tested. To fill this gap, Betzina[11] in 2002 undertook an extensive campaign of experiments on the full-scale XV-15 rotor, where the experiments were corrected for hub and tares effects.

For all set of experiments cited, neither surface pressure nor skin friction coefficients were measured. In this regard, Wadcook et al.[12] measured skin friction coefficients on a hovering full-scale XV-15 tiltrotor in the 80-ft by 120-ft wind tunnel at NASA Ames. At low thrust, an extension region of laminar flow was encountered over a significant fraction of the blade chord, while at high disc loading conditions, the laminar to turbulent transition region on the upper blade surface moved towards the blade leading edge, with fully turbulent boundary layer encountered at outboard section. This set of experiments could be employed to validate and improve transitional models for tiltrotors.

Concerning numerical simulations of tiltrotor blades, Kaul et al.[13, 14] studied the effect of inflow boundary conditions and turbulent models on the hovering XV-15 rotor blade, using the OVERFLOW2 CFD solver. Results with the Spalart-Allmaras model [15] with the Detached Eddy Simulation formulation, revealed a lack of agreement with the experiments of Wadcook et al.[12] in the laminar-turbulent transitional region. Likewise, Yoon et al.[16] investigated the effect of the employed turbulence model on the hovering performance and skin friction coefficients of the XV-15 rotor blade at a collective of $10^\circ$. It was found that the $k – \omega$ SST-DDES turbulence model predicted the figure of merit closer to experiment that the SA-DDES one-equation model. However, minimal differences between these fully-turbulent models were observed in the predictions of skin friction coefficient, which did not reproduce well the flowfield encountered in the experiment[12]. Sheng et al.[17] used the U3NCLE and Helios CFD solvers to assess the effect of transition models in predicting the hover figure of merit on the XV-15 blade. Despite the use of a grid size of 294 million cells for the whole rotor, results at $10^\circ$ collective showed an over-predicted FoM with a discrepancy of 3.17%. It was shown that the transitional flow modelling did not have a significant impact on the predicted FoM mainly due to the small laminar-turbulent transition region encountered on the XV-15 blades. A detailed performance analysis of the hover and propeller modes of the XV-15 blades were performed by Gates[18]
using the HMB CFD solver. Good agreement with published experimental data was reported, even though a medium grid size (9.6 million cells per blade) was employed for computations. Furthermore, the effect of the hub spinner on the propeller performance at moderate advance ratios was highlighted.

Further studies have also been published for the V-22 tiltrotor using numerical simulations. The drag polar of the V-22 aircraft has been measured in the 20x20ft Boeing wind tunnel[19] and the results were compared against CFD predictions of the FUN3D and OVERFLOW CFD codes. Neither CFD nor experiments considered the effect of the rotors. The experiments considered a model of the V-22 of 0.15 scale and provided integrated lift, drag and moment data. In general, the authors stated that good agreement between the CFD and experiments was obtained even if further studies were recommended to ensure that mesh independent results can be obtained.

In this work, we present an aerodynamic study of the XV-15 tiltrotor blades with high-fidelity computational fluid dynamics. The aim is to assess the level of accuracy of the present CFD method in predicting the figure of merit for a hover case. This is addressed by comparing with experimental data available in the literature[8, 10, 11]. To reduce the computational cost, we solved the hover flow by casting the equations as a steady-state problem in a noninertial reference frame. Results are presented for a range of design points, which includes medium and high thrust hover conditions. The second objective is to investigate the impact of a fully-turbulent $k-\omega$ SST and transitional $k-\omega$ SST-\(\gamma\) models on the predicted figure of merit at collective angles of $3^\circ$ and $10^\circ$. Moreover, the ability of those models in predicting the experimental skin friction distribution[12] on the blade surface is also discussed.

Due to the lack of surface pressure data for the XV-15 blade, the Pressure Sensitive Paint (PSP) blade is also considered. This blade has so far been used for experiments that compared PSP data with measurements using Kulite pressure transducers [20], and is to be re-used for further tests in hover as part of a future campaign that will be conducted in the USA.

II. CFD Method

A. HMB Solver

The Helicopter Multi-Block (HMB)[21–23] code is used as the CFD solver for the present work. It solves the Unsteady Reynolds Averaged Navier-Stokes (URANS) equations in integral form using the Arbitrary Lagrangian Eulerian (ALE) formulation for time-dependent domains, which may include moving boundaries. The Navier-Stokes equations are discretised using a cell-centred finite volume approach on a multi-block grid. The spatial discretisation of these equations leads to a set of ordinary differential equations in time,

$$\frac{d}{dt}(W_{i,j,k} V_{i,j,k}) = -R_{i,j,k}(W) \tag{1}$$

where \(i, j, k\) represent the cell index, \(W\) and \(R\) are the vector of conservative flow variables and flux residual respectively, and \(V_{i,j,k}\) is the volume of the cell \(i, j, k\). To evaluate the convective fluxes, Osher[24] and Roe[25] approximate Riemann solvers are used in HMB, while the viscous terms are discretised using a
second order central differencing spatial discretisation. The Monotone Upstream-centred Schemes for Conservation Laws, which is referred to in the literature as the MUSCL approach and developed by Leer[26], is used to provide third order accuracy in space. The HMB solver uses the alternative form of the Alambad limiter[27] being activated in regions where a large gradients are encountered mainly due to shock waves, avoiding the non-physical spurious oscillations. An implicit dual-time stepping method is employed to performed the temporal integration, where the solution is marching in pseudo-time iterations to achieve fast convergence, which is solved using a first-order backward difference. The linearised system of equations is solved using the Generalised Conjugate Gradient method with a Block Incomplete Lower-Upper (BILU) factorisation as a pre-conditioner[28]. To allow an easy sharing of the calculation load for parallel job, a multi-block structured meshes are used.

B. Turbulence Models

Various turbulence models are available in HMB solver, including several one-equation, two-equation, three-equation, and four-equation turbulence models. Furthermore, Large-Eddy Simulation (LES), Detached-Eddy Simulation (DES) and Delay-Detached-Eddy Simulation (DDES) are also available. For this study, two and three equations models were employed using the fully-turbulent $k-\omega$ SST and the transitional model $k-\omega$ SST-$\gamma$ both from Menter[29, 30]. It is well known that the fully-turbulent $k-\omega$ SST model predicts the transition onset further upstream than nature, being needed the use of transitional models. In this regard, Menter et al.[31] developed a model for the prediction of laminar-turbulent transition flows, involving two transport equations for the intermittency factor $\gamma$ and the momentum thickness Reynolds number $Re_\theta$. The intermittency factor $\gamma$ is used to trigger and control the transition onset location, and value varies between 0 (laminar flow) to 1 (fully-turbulent flow). In 2015, a new one-equation local correlation-based transition model $\gamma$ was proposed by Menter et al.[30], where the $Re_\theta$ equation was avoided. The form of the transport equation for the intermittency factor $\gamma$ reads as:

$$\frac{\partial (\rho \gamma)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho U_j \gamma)}{\partial x_j} = P_\gamma - E_\gamma + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ \left( \mu + \frac{\mu_t}{\sigma} \right) \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial x_j} \right]$$

(2)

where $P_\gamma$ and $E_\gamma$ represent the production and destruction sources, respectively. A more detailed description of the $\gamma$ equation can be found in Menter et al.[30].

III. Rotor Geometry and Mesh Generation

A. XV-15 Rotor Geometry

The three-bladed XV-15 rotor geometry was generated based on the full-scale wind tunnel model performed by Betzina in the NASA Ames 80- by 120-foot wind tunnel facility[11]. NACA 6-series, five-digit aerofoil sections comprise the rotor blade (see Table 1).

The main geometric characteristics of the XV-15 rotor blades[11] are summarised in Table 2. Unlike convectional helicopter blades, tiltrotor blades are characterised by a high linear twist angle ($\Theta = -40.25^\circ$) and rotor solidity ($\sigma = 0.089$) along with a small rotor radius ($R = 150$ inches).
Table 1: Radial location of the XV-15 rotor blade aerofoils[8].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$r/R$</th>
<th>Aerofoil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>NACA 64-935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>NACA 64-528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>NACA 64-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>NACA 64-(1.5)12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>NACA 64-208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Geometric properties of the full-scale XV-15 rotor[11].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of blades ($N_b$)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor radius ($R$)</td>
<td>150 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor blade chord ($c$)</td>
<td>14 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio ($R/c$)</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor solidity ($\sigma$)</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear twist angle ($\Theta$)</td>
<td>$-40.25^\circ$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A detailed sketch of the XV-15 blade planform and the blade radial twist, and chord distributions are shown in Figure 1. The rotor blade chord is held constant, and extends at almost 80% of the rotor blade. The blade root, however, was not modelled due to the lack of information on the cuff geometry in the literature.

B. XV-15 Rotor Mesh

A mesh generated using the Chimera technique was used for the aerodynamic study of the XV-15 rotor, and it was composed by a Cartesian off-body mesh used as background and a body-fitted mesh for the blade. The use of an overset grid method allowed for the blade pitch angle to be changed by rotating the body-fitted
mesh. The flow around the hovering XV-15 rotor was solved as a steady-state problem, and only a third of the computational domain was meshed, assuming periodic conditions for the flowfield in the azimuthal direction. A view of the computational domain along with the employed boundary conditions is given in Figure 2 (a). Farfield boundaries were extended to \(2R\) (above rotor) and \(4R\) (below rotor and in the radial direction) from the rotor plane, which is only adequate with the boundary conditions employed. Furthermore, an ideal rotor hub was modelled and approximated as a cylinder, extending from inflow to outflow with a radius of \(0.05R\).

A C-topology was selected for the leading edge of the blade, while an H-topology was employed at the trailing edge. This configuration permits an optimal resolution of the boundary layer due to the orthogonality of the cells around the surface blade (see Figure 2 (b)). The height of the first mesh layer above the blade surface was set to \(1.0 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ref}\), which leads to \(y^+\) less than 1.0 all over the blade. Considering the chordwise and spanwise directions of the blade, 264 and 132 mesh points were used, whilst the blunt trailing-edge was modelled with 42 mesh points.

To guarantee a mesh independent solution, two computational domains were built. Table 5 lists the grids used and shows the breakdown of cells per blade. Coarse and medium meshes have 6.2 and 9.6 million cells per blade (equivalent to 18.6 and 28.8 million cells for three blades), with the same grid resolution for the body-fitted mesh (3.6 million cells). The background mesh, however, was refined at the wake and near-body regions, increasing the grid size from 2.6 to 6 million cells.

![Computational domain](image1.png) ![XV-15 rotor mesh](image2.png)

Fig. 2: Computational domain and boundary conditions employed (left) and detailed view of the XV-15 rotor mesh (right).

C. PSP Rotor Geometry

The four-bladed PSP rotor has an aspect ratio \((R/c)\) of 12.2 and a nominal twist of -14 degrees. The main characteristics of the rotor blades are summarised in Table 4. The blade planform has been generated using three radial stations. First, the RC(4)-12 aerofoil was used up to 65% \(R\). Then, the RC(4)-10 aerofoil from 70% \(R\) to 80% \(R\). Finally, the RC(6)-08 aerofoil was used from 85% \(R\) to the tip. The aerodynamic characteristics of these aerofoils can be found in [33, 34].
Table 3: Meshing parameters for the XV-15 rotor mesh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coarse Mesh</th>
<th>Medium Mesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background mesh size (cells)</td>
<td>2.6 million</td>
<td>6.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade mesh size (cells)</td>
<td>3.6 million</td>
<td>3.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mesh size (cells)</td>
<td>6.2 million</td>
<td>9.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of the first mesh layer at blade surface</td>
<td>$1.0 \cdot 10^{-5} c_{ref}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \cdot 10^{-5} c_{ref}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Geometric properties of the PSP rotor[20].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of blades ($N_b$)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor radius ($R$)</td>
<td>66.50 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor blade chord ($c$)</td>
<td>5.45 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio ($R/c$)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor solidity ($\sigma$)</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear twist angle ($\theta$)</td>
<td>-14°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Meshing parameters for the PSP rotor mesh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background mesh size (cells)</td>
<td>7.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade mesh size (cells)</td>
<td>5.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mesh size (cells)</td>
<td>12.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of the first mesh layer at blade surface</td>
<td>$1.0 \cdot 10^{-5} c_{ref}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points along the span</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points around the aerofoil</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Test Conditions and Computations

A. XV-15 Computations

The hovering flight condition was selected from the available literature on the XV-15 [8, 10, 11]. The tip Mach number was set to 0.69, and four collective angles were considered, covering low, medium, and high disc loadings. The Reynolds number, based on the reference blade chord of 14 inches and on the tip speed, was $4.95 \cdot 10^6$. 

D. PSP Rotor Mesh

Like for the XV-15 rotor, a mesh generated using the Chimera technique was used for the aerodynamic study of the PSP rotor. Only a quarter of the computational domain was meshed, assuming periodic conditions for the flowfield in the azimuthal direction. A view of the computational domain along with the employed boundary conditions is given in Figure 3. The meshing parameters for the PSP mesh rotor blade along with the grids used are shown in Table 5.
All flow solutions were computed by solving the RANS equations, coupled with Menter’s \( k - \omega \) SST turbulence model\[29\]. The flow equations were integrated with the implicit dual-time stepping method of HMB, using a pseudotime Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy (CFL) equal to 4. Typically, 40,000 iterations were necessary to drop the residual by 6 orders of magnitude for the flow solutions. Table 6 lists the flow conditions employed for the aerodynamic study of the XV-15 tiltrotor blade.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blade-tip Mach number ( M_{\text{tip}} )</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds number ( Re )</td>
<td>( 4.95 \cdot 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade pitch angle ( \theta_{75} )</td>
<td>3,5,10,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid</td>
<td>Coarse and Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbulence model</td>
<td>( k-\omega ) SST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Flow conditions for the full-scale XV-15 tiltrotor blade.

B. PSP Computations

Regarding the PSP blade, the tip Mach number was set to 0.65, and seven collective angles were considered, covering low, medium, and high disc loadings. The Reynolds number, based on the reference blade chord of 5.45 inches and on the tip speed, was \( 2.16 \cdot 10^6 \). Like the XV-15 blade, all flow solutions were computed by solving the RANS equations, coupled with Menter’s \( k - \omega \) SST turbulence model\[29\].
V. Results and Discussions

A. Results for the XV-15 Rotor

1. Mesh Convergence

The effect of the mesh density on the figure of merit, and torque coefficient as functions of the thrust coefficient are shown in Figure 4. Experimental data of the full-scale XV-15 rotor is also shown, carried out by Felker et al.[8] at the Outdoor Aerodynamic Research Facility (OARF), and Light[10] and Betzina[11] at the NASA 80x120ft wind tunnel. The majority of works on performance analysis of rotor blades do not model the hub and apparatus tares, mainly due to the complexity of mesh generation. In this regard, experiments were corrected for hub and apparatus tares effects [11]. Vertical lines labeled as empty (4,574 kg) and maximum gross (6,000 kg) weight, define the hovering range of the XV-15 helicopter rotor[1], which highlights a limited hovering operational range. Momentum-based estimates of the figure of merit are also included and its expression is given in Equation 3, where an induced power factor $k_i$ of 1.1 and overall profile drag coefficient $C_D$ of 0.01 were used. This theory, is limited to low and medium thrust, leading to a wrong trend of the power divergence, due to flow separation[35].

\[
\text{FoM} = \frac{C_T^{3/2}}{\sqrt{2}\left(\sigma C_D + k_i C_T^{3/2}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)}
\]  

(3)

Solutions with the coarse and medium grids (represented with square and triangle symbols) were established by second-order least-squares. Considering the set of experiments, an overall good agreement was found between all of them, with a maximum discrepancy of 4.11% in figure of merit. The reason for this disagreement (4 counts FoM) may be partly due to the variations in experimental data between wind tunnel facilities. CFD results present an excellent agreement with the test data of Betzina[11] for all blade collective angles. It is found that the effect of the grid size on the overall performance is negligible at low thrust, with a small influence a high thrust.

To quantify the accuracy of the present CFD method in capturing the peak figure of merit, a comparison between predicted and measured [8, 10, 11] peak FoM and its percent change % (with respect to Betzina’s experiments) is reported in Table 7. It is interesting to note that both Betzina and Light’s experiments have the same peak FoM, while Felker’s experiments show a higher peak figure of merit (2.7 counts) if compared with Betzina’s experiments. A large recirculation zone was reported in the 80x120 test section of NASA by Felker, which may be the reason of this disagreement. Predictions with the medium grid indicate good correlation with the experiments (0.91% with Betzina and Light, and 2.53% with Felker), which highlights the ability of this medium grid in accurately predicting the peak of FoM with a modest CPU time.

From a point of view of the turbulent model employed, it seems that the fully turbulent flow assumption is able to capture the trend of FoM and torque coefficient (see Figure 4 (b)). Similar conclusions were drawn in previous works by Kaul et al.[13], Yoon et al.[16], and Sheng et al.[17], where fully turbulent flows were successfully employed.
Fig. 4: Effect of the mesh density on the figure of merit (left) and torque coefficient (right) for the full-scale XV-15 rotor. Conditions employed: $M_{tip} = 0.69$, $Re = 4.95 \cdot 10^6$, and Menter’s $k$-$\omega$ SST turbulence model[29].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FoM</th>
<th>$\Delta$FoM (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felker et al.[8]</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light[10]</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betzina[11]</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse mesh</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium mesh</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Comparison of the predicted and experimental peak FoM for the full-scale XV-15 rotor. Conditions employed: $M_{tip} = 0.69$, $Re = 4.95 \cdot 10^6$, and Menter’s $k$-$\omega$ SST turbulence model[29].

2. Surface Pressure Predictions

Due to the lack of experimental surface pressure measurements, a comparison between HMB and CFD data published by Kaul et al.[14] using the OVERFLOW2 solver at three radial stations ($r/R$=0.72, 0.83, and 0.94) was carried out, and it is shown in Figure 5. CFD results using HMB correspond to the coarse grid (18.6 million cells for the three blades) where the $k$-$\omega$ SST turbulence model[29] was employed, while Kaul’s results were obtained with a grid size of 35 million cells using the Spalart-Allmaras turbulence model[36]. Despite that a variation on the predicted peak $C_P$ seen by the different numerical simulations, a fair agreement is found for all radial stations. Regarding the radial stations $r/R = 0.72$ and $r/R = 0.83$, it is clear that the suction peak does not exceed the critical $C_P$ values, while the most outboard section ($r/R = 0.94$), reaches sonic conditions.
Fig. 5: Comparison of predicted surface pressure coefficients between HMB using a coarse grid and OVERFLOW2 from Kaul et al. [14]. Conditions employed: $M_{tip} = 0.69$, $Re = 4.95 \times 10^6$, and $\theta_{75} = 10^\circ$.

3. Sectional Loads

Figure 6 shows the distribution of blade section thrust and torque coefficients along the rotor radius for collective pitch angles from $3^\circ$ to $13^\circ$. The influence of the tip vortex on the tip region (from $0.92R$ to $1.0R$) is visible in terms of loading and torque coefficients.

4. Effect of the Turbulence Model

In this study, the effect of the $k-\omega$ SST-$\gamma$ transition model is investigated in predicting the figure of merit. The predicted skin friction coefficient is compared with measurements by Wadcock et al. [12]. Moreover, a comparison with the solution obtained with the fully-turbulent $k-\omega$ SST model is presented.

Figures 7 and 8 show the computed skin friction coefficient $C_f$ compared with the available experimental data of Wadcock et al. [37] for collective pitch angles of $3^\circ$ and $10^\circ$ at the radial stations $r/R = 0.28, 0.50, 0.72, 0.83$ and $0.94$. At low disc loading (Figure 7), the experiment shows a natural transition for all stations at about 50% chord. It seems that the present transition model is able to capture the onset and length of the natural transition with some discrepancies found at the inboard station $r/R = 0.28$. As
expected, results obtained with the fully-turbulent model indicate lack of transition. Moreover, the values of skin friction coefficient are under and over-predicted in the laminar and turbulent flow regions. Considering the $C_f$ at collective pitch angle of 10° (Figure 8), the experimental $C_f$ presents a similar pattern as seen for the lower collective pitch angles. However, the onset of the natural transition is moved towards the blade leading edge, with a fully-turbulent flow region observed at the outboard station $r/R = 0.94$. Results corresponding to the transition model accurately predicted the onset location and length of the transition. This phenomenon is not captured for the fully-turbulent solution. The surface skin friction coefficient of both turbulence models is shown in Figure 9, where the laminar-turbulent region can be only identified for the $k-\omega$ SST-$\gamma$ model.

The impact of the turbulence model on the hovering performance of the XV-15 blade is now investigated. Table 8 reports the predicted $C_T$, $C_Q$, and FoM using the fully-turbulent $k-\omega$ SST and transitional model $k-\omega$ SST-$\gamma$ at two disc loading conditions. It is shown that results are sensitive to the turbulence model employed, with a high figure of merit presented by the transitional model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$C_T$</th>
<th>$C_Q$</th>
<th>FoM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT $3^\circ$</td>
<td>0.00293</td>
<td>0.000249</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM $3^\circ$</td>
<td>0.00297</td>
<td>0.000233</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT $10^\circ$</td>
<td>0.00906</td>
<td>0.000807</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM $10^\circ$</td>
<td>0.00909</td>
<td>0.000803</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Comparison of predicted $C_T$, $C_Q$, and FoM at 3° and 10° collective angles between the fully-turbulent $k-\omega$ SST and transition model $k-\omega$ SST-$\gamma$. Conditions employed: $M_{tip} = 0.69$ and $Re = 4.95 \cdot 10^6$. FT=Fully-Turbulent; TM=Transitional-Model.
Fig. 7: Comparison between the computed skin friction coefficient using a fully turbulent and transition model solutions with the experimental data of Wadcock et al.[37]. Conditions employed: $M_{tip} = 0.69$, $Re = 4.95 \cdot 10^6$, and $\theta_{75} = 3^\circ$. 

(a) Radial stations.

(b) $r/R = 0.28$.

(c) $r/R = 0.50$.

(d) $r/R = 0.72$.

(e) $r/R = 0.83$.

(f) $r/R = 0.94$. 

Wadcock 1999
Fig. 8: Comparison between the computed skin friction coefficient using a fully turbulent and transition model solutions with the experimental data of Wadcock et al. [37]. Conditions employed: $M_{tip} = 0.69$, $Re = 4.95 \cdot 10^6$, and $\theta_{75} = 10^\circ$. 
Fig. 9: Surface skin friction coefficient for the fully turbulent and transition model cases.
B. Results for the PSP Rotor

A study of the performance of the PSP (Pressure Sensitive Paint) rotor in hover was also carried out. The blade-tip Mach number was set to 0.65, and seven collective pitch angles were considered, from $\theta_{75}=6^\circ$ to $12^\circ$ with a delta of 1 degree. The Reynolds number, based on the reference blade chord of 5.45 inches and on the tip speed, was $2.16 \cdot 10^6$. Figure 10 shows the figure of merit (left) and blade torque coefficient $C_Q/\sigma$ (right) as functions of the blade loading coefficient $C_T/\sigma$ for the PSP blade. Momentum-based estimates of the figure of merit are also included, where induced power factors $k_i$ of 1.1 and 1.15, and overall profile drag coefficient $C_D$ of 0.01 were used. No experimental data is available at present for further comparisons.

![Fig. 10: Figure of merit (left) and blade torque coefficient (right) as function of the blade loading coefficient for the PSP rotor. Conditions employed: $M_{\text{tip}} = 0.65$, $Re = 2.16 \cdot 10^6$, and Menter’s $k-\omega$ SST turbulence model[29].](image)

An overview of the surface pressure coefficient at collective pitch angle of $11^\circ$ is shown in Figure 11a. The flowfield below the PSP blade is visualised by iso-surfaces of $Q$-criterion (Figure 11b). The computations captured the rotor wake up to 3-4 blade passages.

![Fig. 11: Surface pressure coefficient (left) and wake of the PSP rotor blade. Conditions employed: $M_{\text{tip}} = 0.65$, $Re = 2.16 \cdot 10^6$, $\theta_{75}=11^\circ$, and Menter’s $k-\omega$ SST turbulence model[29].](image)
VI. Conclusions

Fully turbulent and transitional flow solutions were obtained for the XV-15 tiltrotor blade in hover. The results of CFD compare well with test data for the integrated blade load. The transport-based transition model captured well the evolution of the transition but this did not affect the integral aerodynamic loads. Nevertheless, adding the transition model did not result in more expensive computations and the solutions were obtained starting from a clean initial state, showing the robustness of the transport-based model. The work with the XV-15 is to be extended to include unsteady computations in addition to the steady-state results presented here. The employed chimera method resulted in mesh savings over previous studies even if the accuracy of the results was increased. Regarding the PSP blade results, experimental data is necessary for detailed comparisons. The agreement with the theory for the integrated loads is, however, encouraging.
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