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The longitudinal differential equation of motion has been used to investigate various aerodynamic expansion techniques. The total drag coefficient was expanded using conventional polynomials and splines with and without floating knot locations. This paper discusses the various techniques and approaches, compares results obtained from simultaneously fitting four separate flights (time vs distance measurements) and outlines the potential advantages and/or disadvantages of the various aerodynamic expansion techniques. It is believed that this is the first time splines have been used in the aerodynamic coefficient estimation process and that these results and techniques are germane to other applications.
ABSTRACT

The longitudinal differential equation of motion has been used to investigate various aerodynamic expansion techniques. The total drag coefficient was expanded using conventional polynomials and splines with and without floating knot locations. This paper discusses the various techniques and approaches, compares results obtained from simultaneously fitting four separate flights (time vs distance measurements) and outlines the potential advantages and/or disadvantages of the various aerodynamic expansion techniques. It is believed that this is the first time splines have been used in the aerodynamic coefficient estimation process and that these results and techniques are germane to other applications.

NOMENCLATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reference area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Coefficient in Equation 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Slopess of spline segments (see Equations 4, 5, and 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0</td>
<td>Total drag coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C00</td>
<td>Zero angle of attack drag coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C02</td>
<td>Second order drag term (see Equations 2 and 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C04</td>
<td>Fourth order drag term (see Equation 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dv</td>
<td>Drag variation due to velocity change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Exponential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Model mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Number of straight line segments (see Equation 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Sum of residuals squared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTRODUCTION

Prior to 1969, the prevalent method of analyzing ballistic spark range data was based on the linear approximation method known as "linear theory" developed by Murphy and others. Stated briefly, the method uses a closed-form solution to the differential equations of motion. This approximate solution results from assuming a linearized aerodynamic model where the aerodynamic force and moment derivatives are constant with angle of attack (hence the name "linear theory"). Murphy extended this technique to include a quasi-nonlinear analysis where the linear aerodynamic force and moment derivatives are reduced in such a manner that certain nonlinearities could be included. This quasi-nonlinear analysis requires an assumed functional form for the nonlinearity (normally a quadratic or cubic polynomial).

In 1969 Chapman and Kirk, in analyzing free-flight data, documented the application of a technique they called parametric differentiation which permitted the free flight differential equation of motion to be used directly in the
data correlation process. This technique eliminated the requirement for closed-form solutions to the equations of motion. However, it is still required to assume a form of the nonlinearities in the equations of motion. Generally these forms have also been assumed to be polynomial expansions of the aerodynamic force and moment derivatives with angle of attack.\(^8\)\(^9\)

During the past several years, data analysts have discussed the possibility of using mathematical splines (two or more mathematical expressions) for the coefficient expansions. These splines permit the slopes of the aerodynamic expansions to be discontinuous and would offer the analyst a more general aerodynamic model, thereby relieving some of the requirements of assuming the form of the nonlinearities. This paper discusses various coefficient expansion techniques and compares results obtained using the various expansions.

**METHOD OF APPROACH**

In order to evaluate the various expansion techniques (continuous function vs splines), we will restrict our attention to a simple single degree of freedom system rather than the full six-degree of freedom system described in various references.\(^8\)\(^9\)

**Longitudinal Momentum Equation**

This paper will examine the determination of the total drag coefficient \(C_D\) as a function of instantaneous angle of attack and velocity from the longitudinal momentum equation and the associated experimental measurements of distance traveled vs time. The differential equation governing the longitudinal momentum is

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{mV}{2} \right) = -mg \sin \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \rho A C_D \sin \alpha \sin \alpha
\]

where \(\rho\) is the air density, \(A\) is the body reference area, \(m\) is the projectile mass, \(X\) is the longitudinal down range distance, and \((\cdot)\) and \((\cdot')\) indicate the first and second derivatives with respect to time. The total drag coefficient, \(C_D\), depends on the instantaneous total angle of attack, \(\alpha\), and velocity, \(V = X\). Equation (1) assumes that the angle between the velocity vector and the X axis is small.

**Expansions for the Total Drag Coefficient**

Several expansion techniques for \(C_D\) were investigated. The first two involved continuous functions, beginning with the classical quadratic dependence on angle of attack, or

\[
C_D = C_{D_0} + C_{D_1} \alpha + C_{D_2} \alpha^2
\]

Equation (2) represents the classical expression for which Murphman\(^{1,2}\) developed a methodology of determining \(C_{D_0}\) and \(C_{D_2}\) by plotting the effective measured drag coefficients vs the mean of \(\alpha\). A straight line through this data yields the intercept, \(C_{D_0}\), and the slope, \(C_{D_2}\). The second continuous function is much more versatile and is valid for a wider range of angle of attack dependence and a linear velocity dependence, that is

\[
C_D = C_{D_0} + C_{D_1} \alpha + C_{D_2} \alpha^2 + C_{D_3} \alpha^3 + C_{D_4} \alpha^4 + C_{D_5} \alpha^5
\]

Note this expansion has five unknown coefficients, \(C_{D_0}\), \(C_{D_1}\), \(C_{D_2}\), \(C_{D_3}\), and \(C_{D_4}\), as do all the remaining expansion techniques considered within this paper. The \(\alpha^5\) term is somewhat unconventional but allows a nonzero slope at zero angle of attack. The \(C_{D_0}\) coefficient is normally small but for high drag configurations which experience large velocity decays during the flight or when time-distance data obtained from several flights (albeit different launch velocities) are simultaneously analyzed this term can be important. This \(C_{D_0}\) term accounts for variations in drag coefficients with Mach number and Reynolds number. The two effects cannot be simply separated because they both depend linearly on velocity. This term appears in all of the expansions discussed except for the classical quadratic dependence shown in Equation (2).

Several expansions using spline functions were also evaluated. The first of these uses multiple straight line segments (see Figure 1) and the general expansion is

\[
C_D = \sum_{i=1}^{5} C_{D_i} \alpha_i \sin \alpha \sin \alpha
\]

where \(i\) is the index for the segment, \(\alpha_i\) are the knot locations, \(C_{D_i}\) are the slopes of each segment, and \(\alpha_i\) are the switches \(\alpha_i = 0\) or \(1\) depending on whether or not the instantaneous value of \(\alpha\) is within the range of the segment. For the investigation discussed, the evaluations of the various expansion techniques were restricted to four unknown coefficients plus the \(C_{D_0}\) term. Hence only two cases utilizing straight line segments were considered. The first case is three segments \((n=3)\) with the knots fixed at \(1\) and \(6\). These knot locations were chosen by dividing the range into three equal parts, \(\alpha = \text{max}/3\), \(\alpha = 2\text{max}/3\), and \(\alpha = \text{max}\). The five unknown coefficients then become \(C_{D_0}\), \(C_{D_1}\), \(C_{D_2}\), \(C_{D_3}\), and \(C_{D_4}\), and it should be noted that other methods of dividing the range into segments and selecting the knot locations were considered. Initially, it was felt that the segments should be chosen such that those associated with the higher angles of attack would be small compared to the segments associated with the smaller angles of attack. The reasoning for this was that it was assumed that the rate of change of the drag coefficient with respect to \(\alpha\) was much higher at larger angles of attack thereby requiring smaller segments. Although this assumption is certainly true for most free flight range data, the nature of a well-behaved dynamically stable configuration in free flight is that the large initial angles of attack rapidly decrease (damps) during the flight. Hence only a relatively few data points...
representing the initial high angles of attack are normally obtained compared with the number of data points associated with the smaller angles of attack (for example, see Figure 2). Considering this, if a small segment was chosen for the higher angles of attack, only a very few data points would fall within this segment thereby invalidating the resultant slope parameter. After this anomaly was recognized it was felt that perhaps the knot locations should be selected such that each segment contained an equal number of data points. However it immediately became obvious that due to the nature of the data, a very small segment resulted at the smaller angles of attack, where it wasn't needed, and a large segment resulted at the large angles of attack where a small segment was desired (see Figure 3). With these considerations in mind, dividing the range into equal parts appeared to be a reasonable compromise. However, if this technique is applied to other free flight data (i.e., dynamically unstable configurations) or to another application altogether, the logic associated with selecting the knot locations should be revisited.

The second case utilizing straight line segments splined together possessed only two segments, n=2 in Equation (4), but the knot ($i_1$) was allowed to be a free variable and determined by the data reduction procedure. Hence the five unknown coefficients become \(C_{D0}, C_1, C_2, C_3\) and \(C_{Dv}\) (see Figure 4).

Another set of splines used in the present investigation involves quadratic segments similar to Equation (2). Here, the knot locations are free variables and are determined by the data reduction routine (see Figures 5a and 5b). This expansion can be defined such that not only is the \(C_D\) function continuous at the knot, but also the derivative can be made continuous at the knot. Both of these approaches are discussed. First, consider the approach where only \(C_D\) is continuous at the floating knot location. This expansion is written as

\[
C_D = \sum_{i=0}^{n} S_i C_i \quad (i = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, n)
\]

Here \(C_{D0}, C_1, C_2, C_3\), and \(C_{Dv}\) are the five free variables and the function has a discontinuous slope at \(i_1\). \(S_1\) and \(S_2\) are the determining switches for the polynomials and are set similarly to those in Equation (4) (i.e., if \(i^2 < \frac{1}{2}\) then \(S_1 = 1\) and \(S_2 = 0\) or if \(i^2 > \frac{1}{2}\), then \(S_1 = 0\) and \(S_2 = 1\)). This approach requires the evaluation of only one set of partial derivatives with respect to \(C_1\) or \(C_2\) depending on the magnitude of \(i^2\).

Equation (5) can be modified by adding an additional term such that the slope of the \(C_D\) vs curve is also continuous at the floating knot location to yield

\[
C_D = \sum_{i=0}^{n} S_i C_i + S_{i1} C_{i1} - S_{i2} C_{i2} \quad (i = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, n)
\]

The unknown coefficients for this expression are the same as for Equation (5), and the switches are set similarly.
There are many other spline expansions that could be considered using five free unknown coefficients; however, it is believed the ones defined herein are sufficient to illustrate the applicability and usefulness of these techniques.
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**Fig. 4** Two straight line segments with floating knot location

**Fig. 5** Two quadratic segments with floating knot location

Parameter Identification

The unknown free coefficients in the various expansions Equations (2) through (6) are determined by fitting the experimentally measured time and distance data with the numerical solution of Equation (1). This fitting process is a least squares technique and the angle of attack history is provided as an input. The method used is the one described by Chapman and Kirk. This method will be described briefly to illustrate the technique when spline functions are employed for expansion of the total drag coefficient. The steps utilized in applying the technique are as follows:

1. Identify/formulate the associated equation of motion. For the application discussed this has been accomplished and is Equation (1).

2. Select an appropriate expansion of the aerodynamic coefficients. This step is the subject of this paper: the investigation of several expansion techniques as defined in Equations (2) through (6).

3. Partially differentiating the equation of motion, Equation (1), with respect to each of the free unknown coefficients, form a set of parametric differential equations. This is illustrated below by using the expansion shown in Equation (5). Let

\[ P_1 = \frac{1}{\rho_o}, \quad P_2 = \frac{1}{\rho_o}, \quad P_3 = \frac{1}{\rho_o}, \quad P_4 = \frac{1}{\rho_o}, \quad P_5 = \frac{2}{\rho_o}, \quad P_6 = \frac{1}{\rho_o}, \quad \text{and} \quad P_7 = \frac{1}{\rho_o} \]  

Applying this to Equations (1) and (2) the following set of parametric differential equations are derived.

\[ \begin{align*}
D_1 &= -k \frac{1}{\rho_o} (1 + CD_0) - k \frac{1}{\rho_o} \frac{d}{dx} CD_0 \\
D_2 &= -k \frac{1}{\rho_o} (2CD_0(x_0) + CD_0(x) - CD_0(x_0)) \\
D_3 &= -k \frac{1}{\rho_o} (1 - CD_0(x_0)) \left( \frac{d}{dx} CD_0 \right) \\
D_4 &= -k \frac{1}{\rho_o} (1 - CD_0(x_0)) \left( \frac{d^2}{dx^2} CD_0 \right)
\end{align*} \]  

where \( K = \alpha \lambda_2/2 \) and \( \left( \right)_0 \) implies the quantity was evaluated with given coefficients (either initial guesses or corrected values) at the start of each iteration cycle.

4. Numerically integrate the equation of motion, Equation (1), utilizing initial guesses for the unknown aerodynamic coefficients and estimated initial conditions \( (X_0, x_0) \). The numerical integration technique used is a Gauss-Newton iterative method.

5. Integrate parametric equations, Equations (8), numerically such that the partial derivatives with respect to each of the free unknown coefficients are evaluated.

6. The method of differential corrections is then used to obtain corrections to the initial guesses of the unknown aerodynamic coefficients.
and estimated initial conditions \((X_e \text{ and } X_b)\). This method consists of expanding the calculated value of position \(X_i \text{ cal}\) about a given set of coefficients in a Taylor series. Or

\[
X_i \text{ cal} = X_i \text{ cal} \cdot \left[ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{X_i - X_i \text{ cal}}{j!} \right) C_j \right]_0 + \text{Higher Order Terms}
\]

Note the subscript \(o\) again indicates calculated values using the given set of coefficients and the summation, ignoring the higher order terms, provides the contribution to \(X_i \text{ cal}\) associated with small changes in the coefficients \((C_j's)\). The sum of the squares of the residuals, RSQ, (difference between measured and calculated downrange distance traveled) is given as

\[
\text{RSQ} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( X_i - X_i \text{ cal} \right)^2
\]

The subscript \(i\) denotes the \(i\)th measurement and \(N\) the total number of measurements. Equation (10) can accommodate the reduction/analysis of several simultaneous data sets; however, for simplicity the notation will indicate only one set of time and distance measurements (see Reference 2 for details on simultaneous fitting of multiple data sets).

Now, substituting Equation (9) into Equation (10), taking the derivative of RSQ with respect to each of the unknown coefficients \((C_k)\) and setting equal to zero, after some manipulation one can arrive at the following matrix equation,

\[
C = (A_k)^{-1} B_k
\]

where

\[
A_k = \begin{bmatrix}
2 & 1 & \cdots & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and

\[
B_k = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
x_1 - x_{1 \text{ cal}} \\
\vdots \\
x_N - x_{N \text{ cal}}
\end{array} \right]
\]

Here, \(C\) is the matrix of corrections to be added to each of the unknown coefficients to be determined including the initial conditions \(X_e\) and \(X_b\). Once the experimental data is compared to the numerically integrated position profile in a least squares sense, the corrections to the unknown coefficients and initial conditions can be determined using Equation (11).

Steps 1 through 4 are then repeated, using the newly adjusted coefficients and initial conditions, and the process continues until desired convergence is obtained.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The estimated total drag coefficient \((C_D)\) values obtained using the various expansion techniques, Equations (2) through (6), are shown in Figures 4 through 8. Each of these \(C_D\) expansions were evaluated by simultaneously fitting four sets of experimentally measured time and distance data obtained from four separate flights of a 25mm spin stabilized projectile tested in the Aeroballistics Research Facility. This set of data was used to evaluate the \(C_D\) expansions because of the relatively high angles of attack experienced during some of the flights and the apparent highly nonlinear characteristics of \(C_D\) with total angle of attack. The initial velocity (muzzle) varied from 3168 to 3245 ft/sec for the four flights and the average mid-range velocity \((V_{mid})\) of all four flights being 3098 ft/sec.

Here it should be cautioned that because some of the expansion techniques fit this particular set of data better than others, it doesn't necessarily mean that one expansion method is superior to another. In fact, the analyst should recognize that when selecting an expansion (whether it is one of the expansions discussed herein or another) for a particular application the inherent nature of the data itself should be the dominate consideration. For example, if time and position data obtained from the flight of a sphere were being analyzed (angle of attack is of no concern) the expansion would only include the \(C_D\) terms. Or, if a highly nonlinear spring-mass-damper system was being analyzed, the frequency of oscillation and/or damping may be modeled as a function of the displacement using multiple straight line segments with or without floating knots. For this case, one may possess information which identifies where the knot should be located. Also, a good rule of thumb to remember is to use the simplest expansion which adequately matches that particular set of data. With these considerations in mind, the \(C_D\) expansions using the various techniques previously discussed are presented to show the applicability and versatility of these methods. Furthermore, they graphically illustrate to any potential user that the more conventional continuous functions are not the only choices available.

Figure 4 shows the comparison of the classical quadratic (Equation 2) with the fourth order polynomial including both the \(C_D^w\) and \(C_D^p\) terms (Equation 3). As shown in this figure, the fourth order polynomial resulted in a significantly better fit to the four separate flights than the quadratic (note sum of the residuals squared, RSQ, for both expansions). However, this should not be unexpected since the fourth order polynomial has three additional unknown coefficients \((C_D^w, C_D^p)\), and this added flexibility would be expected to yield a lower RSQ. The real question here is whether or not the dramatic rise in \(C_D\) at the highest angles of attack is real. The four flights used for these comparisons had a total of 119 data points of which only four data points possessed angles of attack greater than 20 degrees. Hence the added flexibility may be providing erroneous results at the higher angles of attack. This would be especially true if one of the four data points above 20 degrees, is in error. Normally, because of the paucity of data at the higher angles of
attack, the $C_p$ expansions would only be presented up to about 20 degrees. But for the purpose of this paper, the expansions are shown up to the maximum angle of attack.

It is also of interest to see the effect of the various terms in the fourth order polynomial expansion. Table I presents the results obtained from running five different cases with various terms held at zero in the fourth order polynomial. Case 1 shown in this table represents the classical quadratic as plotted in Figure 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$C_0$</th>
<th>$C_1$</th>
<th>$C_2$</th>
<th>$C_3$</th>
<th>$C_4$</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case 5 represents the complete fourth order polynomial expansion, also shown in Figure 6. Cases 2 through 4 represent the results obtained when the remaining three unknown coefficients, $C_1$, $C_2$, and $a$, are included in the reduction routine. When viewing the results shown in Table I, it is apparent that the $C_4$ term is important for this particular set of data (note RSQ for Case 2 compared with Case 1) and appears to be consistently determined for all cases. What is remarkable about the results shown in this table is the dramatic improvement in the overall quality of fit (lower RSQ) when all of the unknown coefficients are determined simultaneously (see Case 5). This indicates that this particular set of time-position data requires a relatively complex expansion of $C_D$ with angle of attack and velocity.

The comparison of the three segment linear spline, Equation (4) with $n=3$, containing fixed knot locations, to the two segment linear spline (also Equation 4 with $n=2$) containing a floating knot location is shown in Figure 7. This figure illustrates that the fit containing three segments is superior to the two segments fitted with the floating knot (note RSQ for both) and $a$, knot location is shown in Figure 7. It is also of interest to see the effect of illustrates that the fit containing three segments is superior to the two segments fitted with the floating knot (note RSQ for both). It is expected that this is a result of the fortuitous knot location (chosen by dividing the $i$ space into three equal segments) at 18.3 degrees.
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**Figure 6:** Comparison of classic quadratic and fourth order expansions
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**Figure 7:** Comparison of the quadratic and fourth order segment fits for both $a$ and $b$.
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**Figure 8:** Comparison of quadratic splines with continuous and discontinuous slopes.
The quadratic splines with a continuous $C_p$ expansion only (Equation 5) and a continuous $C_p$ and slope expansion (Equation 6) are compared in Figure 8. Part a of this figure shows both expansions plotted against $x$; whereas, Part b shows the expansions plotted vs $y$. Neither of these expansions resulted in a fit to the chosen set of data as well as the fourth order polynomial or the three segment linear spline.

Both of these expansions also contain a condition in which the coefficient extraction technique becomes indeterminate. This condition exists when the $C_p$ permits the knot location to be a free variable and the slope of the first segment is nearly equal to the slope of the second segment ($C_p^2 = C_p^3$). When this occurs, the minimum RSS is insensitive to the location of the knot and the iteration process fails to converge. However, if it is recognized that this condition exists, the knot location can be held constant and the iteration process again becomes stable. This condition is also indicative of an overly defined system. For instance, a single quadratic expansion would fit the data as well as the two quadratic expansions splined together.

It seems that the two quadratic expansions splined together, for the selected set of data as well as the fourth order polynomial or the three segment linear spline, would hold an advantage over the quadratic expansion only (Equation 7). This condition is also indicative of a complex asymmetric missile configuration.

The technique appears to hold promise for modeling other aerodynamic coefficients which are highly nonlinear such as engine maps.
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