A Unified Approach for the Aeroelastic Analysis of Considering Frequency Dependency of Aerodynamic Forces

Journal:	*18th IABSE Congress on Innovative Infrastructures*
Manuscript ID:	Seoul-0397-2012.R1
Theme:	Structures and Materials - extending the limits
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Jung, Kilje; Seoul National University, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering Lee, Hae Sung; Seoul National University, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering Kim, Ho Kyung; Seoul National University, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Eng. Hong, Yun Hwa; Seoul National University, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Type of Structure:	Bridges
Material and Equipment:	Steel
Other Aspects:	Wind

A Unified Approach for the Aeroelastic Analysis by Elimination of Frequency Dependence of Aerodynamic Force

Kilje Jung
Postdoctoral Res. Assoc.
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
kjjung01@snu.ac.kr

Hae Sung Lee
Professor
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
chslee@snu.ac.kr

Ho-Kyung Kim
Associate Professor
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
hokyungk@snu.ac.kr

Hong Yun Hwa
Postdoctoral Res. Assoc.
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
Hyh99@snu.ac.kr

Keywords: Aeoelastic analysis; Aerodynamic forces; Frequency dependency; Unified approach; Weighting function; Time domain; Frequency domain

1. Introduction

For aeroelastic analyses of bridge decks under wind action, numerous approaches have been proposed since Scanlan and Tomko[1] defined self-excited forces using flutter derivatives. The difficulty in aeroelastic analysis basically arises from the frequency dependence of self-excited forces. For the frequency-domain aeroelastic analysis, an iterative procedure is required to solve the nonlinear eigenvalue problem, which is referred to as branch method[2]. The critical issue in the time-domain approach is the elimination of the frequency-dependent characteristics of the aerodynamic forces, for which the convolution integral is usually utilized[3]. The impulse response functions are formed with the identified flutter derivatives through optimization in the frequency domain, and the aerodynamic forces are expressed as convolutions between the impulse response functions and the deck motion.

Although the convolution integral approach and the branch method can be successfully applied to time-domain and frequency-domain analyses, respectively, for various types of sections, they are based on different approximations. The impulse response functions used for the convolution integral become inconsistent with the given flutter derivatives of a section through optimization, while the aerodynamic forces are evaluated at only one assumed frequency in the branch method. Therefore, the consistency between results of a time-domain analysis and a frequency-domain analysis cannot be generally guaranteed.

2. A Unified Approach for the Aeroelastic Analysis

This paper presents a new unified approach for the aeroelastic analysis of a bridge structure by approximating each component of the aerodynamic transfer functions in frequency domain. A proposed method is formulated in case the aerodynamic transfer function matrix can be reasonably approximated by a linear function with respect to frequency as follows. Using this approximation, the equation of motion for an aeroelastic system becomes a set of simple second-order differential equations in the time domain. The unknown coefficient matrices are determined by minimizing the norm of the weighted errors. Here, the weighting functions in the error are introduced to consider the responses of an aeroelastic system in the approximated transfer function of the aerodynamic forces. Once the weighting functions are properly defined, each components of the coefficient matrices is easily obtained by solving the linear algebraic equations of the first-order optimality condition The coefficients of the second-order polynomial are determined through minimization of weighted errors between the exact and approximated aerodynamic transfer function in the frequency domain. The validity of the proposed method is demonstrated by applying to the section model of wind tunnel test.

3. Numerical Examples of the Section Model

For the verification of the proposed method, the free vibration response of a two dimensional section model is analyzed for the two types of representative section of bridge decks; a thin rectangular plate with width-to-depth (B/D) ratio of 20 and a bluff H-type section. However, in this two-page short version, only the results of the bluff H-type section are included.

The proposed method is applied to the frequency- and time-domain aeroelastic analysis of a section model. The results obtained by the proposed method are in good agreement with the values obtained by the conventional approaches. Fig. 1 shows the damping ratios of the aeroelastic system with the bluff H-type section, and the results are compared with those by the branch method. Fig. 2 illustrates the free vibration responses induced by the given initial displacements at the wind velocity of 8 m/s. Although the aeroelastic analysis is performed near the flutter onset velocity, the proposed method accurately yields displacements compared with those by the convolution integral.

4. Conclusions

A unified approach for the aeroelastic analysis is proposed. The aerodynamic transfer functions are approximated as a linear function with coefficients determined through the minimization of the weighted error between exact and approximated transfer functions. With the proposed approximation, the frequency dependence of the aerodynamic transfer function is eliminated, and, as a result, the equation of motion for an aeroelastic system can be simply expressed as the same type of second-order differential equation in the time domain as that for a structural system. The validity of the proposed method is demonstrated for an section model with two extreme types of deck sections. Based on the results of the numerical simulations presented in this study, it can be concluded that the proposed approximation of the aerodynamic transfer function works well, even for the case of a bluff H-type section.

5. References

[1] SCANLAN, R. H., and TOMKO, J. J., "Airfoil and bridge deck flutter derivatives." *ASCE Journal of Engineering Mechanics Division,* Vol. 97, No. 6, 1971, 1717-1737.

[2] AGAR, T. J. A., "Aerodynamic flutter analysis of suspension bridges by a modal technique." *Engineering Structures*, Vol. 11, 1989, 75-82.

[3] JUNG, K., KIM, H. K., and LEE, H. S., "Evaluation of impulse response functions for convolution integrals of aerodynamic forces by optimization with a penalty function." *ASCE Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EM.1943-7889.0000355.



Fig. 1: Predicted damping ratio by the frequency-domain analysis of the thin rectangular section



Fig. 2: Free vibration responses at the wind velocity of 8m/s for the thin rectangular section

A Unified Approach for the Aeroelastic Analysis by Elimination of Frequency Dependence of Aerodynamic Force

Kilje Jung
Postdoctoral Res. Assoc.
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
kjjung01@snu.ac.kr

Hae Sung Lee
Professor
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
chslee@snu.ac.kr

Ho-Kyung Kim
Associate Professor
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
hokyungk@snu.ac.kr

Hong Yun Hwa
Postdoctoral Res. Assoc.
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea
Hyh99@snu.ac.kr

Summary

A unified approach for the aeroelastic analysis of bridge decks is presented. The aerodynamic transfer functions are approximated as a linear function with the coefficients determined through minimization of the weighted error between the exact and approximated transfer function. Using the proposed approximation, the dependence of the aerodynamic transfer function on frequency is eliminated, and a popular time marching algorithm is adopted for the aeroelastic analysis in the time domain. For the frequency domain analysis, a complete set of modal frequencies and modal shapes can be evaluated in a single eigenvalue analysis.

Keywords: Aeoelastic analysis; Aerodynamic forces; Frequency dependency; Unified approach; Weighting function; Time domain; Frequency domain

1. Introduction

For aeroelastic analyses of bridge decks under wind action, numerous approaches have been proposed since Scanlan and Tomko[1] defined self-excited forces using flutter derivatives. The difficulty in aeroelastic analysis basically arises from the frequency dependence of self-excited forces. For the frequency-domain aeroelastic analysis, an iterative procedure is required to solve the nonlinear eigenvalue problem, which is referred to as branch method[2]. The critical issue in the time-domain approach is the elimination of the frequency-dependent characteristics of the aerodynamic forces, for which the convolution integral is usually utilized. The impulse response functions are formed with the identified flutter derivatives through optimization in the frequency domain, and the aerodynamic forces are expressed as convolutions between the impulse response functions and the deck motion. The rational function approximation (RFA) has been the most popular approach for forming impulse response functions for the convolution integral[3]. Despite its popularity, however, Caracoglia and Jones[4] reported on the potential limitations of the RFA method on its applicability to bluff sections. Recently, Jung et al. [5] proposed a new algorithm for evaluating impulse response functions through a domain-discretization approximation to overcome the shortcomings of the RFA.

Although the convolution integral approach and the branch method can be successfully applied to time-domain and frequency-domain analyses, respectively, for various types of sections, they are based on different approximations. The impulse response functions used for the convolution integral become inconsistent with the given flutter derivatives of a section through optimization, while the aerodynamic forces are evaluated at only one assumed frequency in the branch method. Therefore, the consistency between results of a time-domain analysis and a frequency-domain analysis cannot be generally guaranteed.

This paper presents a new unified approach for the aeroelastic analysis of a bridge structure by approximating each component of the aerodynamic transfer functions in frequency domain. Using this approximation, the equation of motion for an aeroelastic system becomes a set of simple second-order differential equations in the time domain. The coefficients of the second-order polynomial are determined through minimization of weighted errors between the exact and approximated aerodynamic transfer function in the frequency domain. The validity of the proposed method is demonstrated by applying to the section model of wind tunnel test.

2. A Unified Approach for the Aeroelastic Analysis

2.1 Equation of motion of a section model

A section model with two degrees of freedom in vertical (h) and rotational (α) direction is subjected to self-excited forces in the direction of each DOF. Then, the equation of motion per unit length is expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} m_h\ddot{h} + c_h\dot{h} + k_h h &= L_{ae}(t) + L_{ex}(t) \\ m_\alpha\ddot{\alpha} + c_\alpha\dot{\alpha} + k_\alpha\alpha &= M_{ae}(t) + M_{ex}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where m_i, c_i and k_i are the mass, damping and stiffness in the direction of $i=h,\alpha$, respectively, while L_{ae}, M_{ae}, L_{ex}, M_{ex} are the self-excited lift force, moment and external excitation forces in the h and α direction, respectively. The overhead dot denotes differentiation with respect to time.

In accordance with the Scanlan and Tomko's formulation[1], the self-excited forces acting on a sinusoidally oscillating section in a single frequency are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{ae} &= \frac{1}{2}\rho U^2 B[KH_1^*\frac{\dot{h}}{U} + KH_2^*\frac{B\dot{\alpha}}{U} + K^2H_3^*\alpha + K^2H_4^*\frac{h}{B}] \\ M_{ae} &= \frac{1}{2}\rho U^2 B^2[KA_1^*\frac{B\dot{h}}{U} + KA_2^*\frac{B\dot{\alpha}}{U} + K^2A_3^*\alpha + K^2A_4^*\frac{h}{B}] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where ρ is the air density, U is the mean wind velocity, B is the width of the section model. $K=B\omega/U$ is the reduced frequency where ω is the angular frequency of the oscillation. The flutter derivatives are denoted as H_m^* and A_m^* (m=1,2,3,4), and are functions of the angular frequency.

The general solution of Eq. (1) consists of the homogeneous and particular solution. In case the aerodynamic forces are defined as Eq. (2) proposed by Scanlan and Tomko, the particular solution of Eq. (1) is easily determined for given external harmonic excitation forces. However, it is difficult to obtain the homogeneous solution of Eq. (1) because the aerodynamic forces of Eq. (2) are dependent on unknown modal frequencies and shapes of the 2-DOF system [5]. To circumvent this computational complexity, the aerodynamic forces are usually defined in the frequency domain as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} F(L_{ad}) \\ F(M_{ad}) \end{pmatrix} &= \frac{1}{2}\rho U^2 \begin{bmatrix} iK^2H_1^* + K^2H_4^* & B(iK^2H_2^* + K^2H_3^*) \\ B(iK^2A_1^* + K^2A_4^*) & B^2(iK^2A_2^* + K^2A_3^*) \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F(h) \\ F(\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{hh} & \Psi_{h\alpha} \\ \Psi_{\alpha h} & \Psi_{\alpha\alpha} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F(h) \\ F(\alpha) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{\Psi}(\omega)F(\mathbf{u}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where F denotes the Fourier transform, and $\mathbf{u}$ is the displacement vector containing displacements, i.e. h and α. $\Box_{mn}$ is the transfer function between the aeroelastic forces in the m direction and the motion in the n direction, and i is the imaginary unit. Then, by taking the Fourier transform of Eq. (1) and substituting the Eq. (3), the equation of motion for a section model subjected to the action of wind is derived in the frequency domain in matrix form as:

$$[-\omega^2\mathbf{M} + i\omega\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{K} - \mathbf{\Psi}(\omega)]\mathbf{u} = F(\mathbf{P}_{ex}) \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{M}$, $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathbf{K}$ and $\mathbf{P}_{ex}$ are the mass, damping, stiffness matrix of the section model and the excitation force vector, respectively. The frequency-domain aeroelastic analysis is usually based on Eq. (4). Since the structural transfer function is generally nonlinear, an eigenvalue analysis with iterational procedures is required. A popular approach for the eigenvalue analysis of Eq. (4), which is referred to as the branch method, is based on a simple successive substitution method.

The inverse Fourier transform of Eq. (4) yields the equation of motion in the time domain, which contains the well-known convolution expression for the aeroelastic force[3,5].

$$\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{C}\dot{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{P}_{ex} + \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\Phi}(t-\tau)\mathbf{u}(\tau)d\tau \tag{5}$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ is the aerodynamic impulse response function matrix of the structural system, which is the inverse Fourier transform of the aerodynamic transfer function matrix, $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$. The convolution integral in Eq. (5) is valid if and only if the aerodynamic impulse response function vanishes for $t < 0$, which is referred to as the causality condition[5]. Several approaches have been proposed for forming approximated transfer functions that satisfy the casualty condition using the measured flutter derivatives[3,5].

The aerodynamic transfer functions used for the convolution integral approach and the branch method become different from those formed by the given flutter derivatives. The transfer functions of a section in Eq. (3) are modified in the optimization to enforce the causality condition in the convolution integral approach in Eq. (5). Meanwhile, the aerodynamic transfer functions of Eq. (4) in the branch method represent aerodynamic information related to only one assumed frequency rather than on the whole frequency range. Therefore, the results of an aerodynamic analysis in one analysis domain are generally inconsistent with those for the other analysis domain, which is a crucial drawback of methodologies that are currently used in aeroelastic analyses.

A new unified approach for the aeroelastic analysis can be formulated in case the aerodynamic transfer function matrix can be reasonably approximated by a linear function with respect to frequency as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\Psi}(\omega) \approx \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}(\omega) = i\omega\tilde{\mathbf{C}} + \tilde{\mathbf{K}} \tag{6}$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}(\omega)$ is the approximated aerodynamic transfer function while $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ are unknown coefficient matrices. By use of Eq. (6) and the inverse Fourier transform of Eq. (4), the approximated equation of motion is defined as a usual second order differential equation in the time domain.

$$\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{u}} + \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{ae}\dot{\mathbf{u}} + \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{ae}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{P}_{ex} \tag{7}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{ae} = \mathbf{C} - \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{ae} = \mathbf{K} - \tilde{\mathbf{K}}$. The unknown coefficient matrices in Eq. (7) are determined through minimization in the frequency domain.

2.2 Minimization of the weighted least square error

The weighted error matrix of the approximation in Eq. (6) is defined by the modulus of a complex number of each component.

$$E_{kl} = \left|\Psi_{kl} - \tilde{\Psi}_{kl}\right| w_{kl} = ((\Psi^R_{kl} - \tilde{K}_{kl})^2 + (\Psi^I_{kl} - \omega\tilde{C}_{kl})^2)^{0.5} w_{kl} \tag{8}$$

where w_{kl}, Ψ^R_{kl} and Ψ^I_{kl} are predefined weighting functions, the real and imaginary part of Ψ_{kl}, respectively, while $|\cdot|$ denotes the modulus of a complex number. $\tilde{C}_{kl}$ and $\tilde{K}^r_{kl}$ are the kl-components of the corresponding coefficient matrices. The unknown coefficient matrices are determined by minimizing the norm of the weighted errors in Eq. (8).

$$\underset{\tilde{C}_{kl},\tilde{K}_{kl}}{\mathrm{Min}}\,\Pi = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\omega_{\max}} E^2_{kl}d\omega = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\omega_{\max}} (\Psi^R_{kl} - \tilde{K}_{kl})^2 w^2_{kl}d\omega + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\omega_{\max}} (\Psi^I_{kl} - \omega\tilde{C}_{kl})^2 w^2_{kl}d\omega \tag{9}$$

where $\omega_{\max}$ is the maximum frequency that defines the maximum frequency range of the aerodynamic transfer function. The first-order optimality condition yields the following linear algebraic equations:

$$\tilde{C}_{kl} = \int_0^{\omega_{max}} \omega \Psi^I_{kl} w^2_{kl} d\omega \Bigg/ \int_0^{\omega_{max}} \omega^2 w^2_{kl} d\omega, \quad \tilde{K}_{kl} = \int_0^{\omega_{max}} \Psi^R_{kl} w^2_{kl} d\omega \Bigg/ \int_0^{\omega_{max}} w^2_{kl} d\omega \tag{10}$$

The weighting functions in the error matrix are introduced to consider the responses of an aeroelastic system in the approximated transfer function of the aerodynamic forces. The approximation errors at frequencies where the responses of an aeroelastic system become small have little effect on the final solution of the aeroelastic analysis, regardless of their magnitude, and thus may be safely neglected in the minimization. Once the weighting functions are properly defined, the frequency-domain integrals in Eq. (10) can be evaluated by means of a numerical integration scheme such as the trapezoidal rule, and the *kl*-components of the coefficient matrices are easily obtained by solving the numerically integrated form of Eq. (10).

3. Numerical Examples of the Section Model

For the verification of the proposed method, the free vibration response of a two dimensional section model is analyzed for the two types of representative section of bridge decks; a thin rectangular plate with width-to-depth (B/D) ratio of 20 and a bluff H-type section. The flutter derivatives are extracted from forced vibration tests in wind tunnel. The experiment for the thin rectangular section of B/D=20 was performed by Matsumoto at el. at the Kyoto University, Japan [6] and the experiment for a bluff H-type section was performed by King at el. at the Boundary Layer Wind Tunnel Laboratory of the University of Western Ontario in Ontario, Canada [7].

3.1 A thin rectangular section of B/D=20

The proposed method is applied to the aeroelastic analysis of a section model with a thin rectangular section. Fig. 1 shows the damping ratios of the aeroelastic system obtained by the proposed method and by the branch method. The results obtained by the proposed method are in good agreement with the values obtained by the branch method. The time-domain aeroelastic analysis is performed for the free vibration at a wind velocity of 15 m/s. A free vibration of the section model is induced by initial displacements of 1 cm in vertical direction and 0.01 rad in the rotational direction. Although the aeroelastic analysis is performed near the flutter onset velocity, the proposed method accurately yields displacements compared with those by the convolution integral.

3.2 A bluff H-type section

The aeroelastic analysis of the section model with a bluff H-type section is performed. Fig. 3 shows the damping ratios of the aeroelastic system, and Fig. 4 illustrates the free vibration responses at the wind velocity of 8 m/s. Even in the case of the bluff H-type section, the results obtained by the proposed method are also in good agreement with the values obtained by the branch



Fig. 1: Predicted damping ratio by the frequency-domain analysis of the thin rectangular section



Fig. 2: Free vibration responses at the wind velocity of 15m/s for the thin rectangular section

method as well as the convolution integral.

4. Conclusions

A unified approach for the aeroelastic analysis is proposed. The aerodynamic transfer functions are approximated as a linear function with coefficients determined through the minimization of the weighted error between exact and approximated transfer functions. With the proposed approximation, the frequency dependence of the aerodynamic transfer function is eliminated, and, as a result, the equation of motion for an aeroelastic system can be simply expressed as the same type of second-order differential equation in the time domain as that for a structural system. The validity of the proposed method is demonstrated for an section model with two extreme types of deck sections. Based on the results of the numerical simulations presented in this study, it can be concluded that the proposed approximation of the aerodynamic transfer function works well, even for the case of a bluff H-type section.

5. Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the grant (09CCTI-A052531-05-000000) from the Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime of Korean government through the Core Research Institute at Seoul National University for Core Engineering Technology Development of Super Long Span Bridge R&D Center.

6. References

[1] SCANLAN, R. H., and TOMKO, J. J., "Airfoil and bridge deck flutter derivatives." *ASCE Journal of Engineering Mechanics Division,* Vol. 97, No. 6, 1971, 1717-1737.

[2] AGAR, T. J. A., "Aerodynamic flutter analysis of suspension bridges by a modal technique." *Engineering Structures*, Vol. 11, 1989, 75-82.

[3] CHEN X., MATSUMOTO M., and KAREEM A., "Aerodynamic coupling effects on flutter and buffeting of bridges." *ASCE Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, Vol. 126, No. 1, 2000, 17-26.

[4] CARACOGLIA, L., and JONES, N.P., "Time domain vs. frequency domain characterization of aeroelastic forces for bridge deck sections." *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, Vol. 91, No. 3, 2003, 371-402.

[5] JUNG, K., KIM, H. K., and LEE, H. S., "Evaluation of impulse response functions for convolution integrals of aerodynamic forces by optimization with a penalty function." *ASCE Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EM.1943-7889.0000355.

[6] MATSUMOTO M., KOBAYASHI K., NIIHARA Y., SHIARTO H., and HAMASAKI H.,



Fig. 3: Predicted damping ratio by the frequency-domain analysis of the bluff H-type section



Fig. 4: Free vibration responses at the wind velocity of 8m/s for the bluff H-type section

"Flutter mechanism and its stabilization of bluff bodies", *Proceedings of Ninth ICWE.*

[7] KIM J.D., and KING J.P.C., "The development of wind tunnel test technique for an aeroelastic buffeting analysis of long-span bridges", BLWTL-SS19-2007-DRAFT report submitted to Korea Wind Engineering Research Center, the Boundary Layer Wind Tunnel Laboratory of the University of Western Ontario.