



**Università  
di Genova**

Department of Civil, Environmental and Architectural Engineering  
University of Genoa

**NUMERICAL SIMULATION OF THE  
UNSTEADY AERODYNAMICS OF  
FLAPPING FLIGHT**

**Joel GUERRERO**

A thesis submitted for the degree of  
*Doctor of Philosophy*

April 2009

**This page intentionally left blank**

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Objectives	4
1.3	Outline of the dissertation	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Aerodynamics of Flapping Flight</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Flight in Nature	7
2.1.1	Unpowered Flight: Gliding and Soaring	8
2.1.2	Powered Flight: Flapping	10
2.1.3	Hovering	12
2.1.4	Take-off and landing	13
2.1.5	Summary	15
2.2	Brief History of Flapping Wing Research: Experimentation, Observations, Analytical and Computational Approaches	15
2.3	The Physics of Drag and Thrust Generation Due to Wing Flapping	21
2.4	The Phenomenon of Dynamic Stall and Leading Edge Vortex (LEV) Shedding	24
2.5	Reynolds Number in Terms of Flapping Flight	25
2.6	Strouhal Number and Reduced Frequency	26
2.6.1	Strouhal Number as the Fundamental Aerodynamic Parameter in Flapping Flight	27
2.7	Flapping Airfoils Performance Parameters	28
2.8	Airfoil Geometry and Flapping Kinematics	30
<b>3</b>	<b>Governing Equations of Fluid Dynamics</b>	<b>34</b>
3.1	Navier-Stokes System of Equations	34
3.2	Nondimensionalization of the Governing Equations	37
3.3	Transformation of the Governing Equations to Generalized Curvilinear Coordinates	41
3.4	Simplification of the Navier-Stokes System of Equations: Incompressible Viscous Flow Case	47
<b>4</b>	<b>On Structured Overlapping Grids</b>	<b>52</b>
4.1	Approaches to Grid Generation	52
4.2	Overview and Historical Background of the Structured Overlapping Grids Method	57
4.3	Problem Formulation	61
4.3.1	Extension of the Overlapping Grids Method to Moving Boundaries Problems	67
4.3.2	Time Stepping Algorithm	68
4.4	Overlapping Grids Assembling Algorithm	69
4.5	Discretization on Overlapping Grids	73

4.6	Comments on Overlapping Grids . . . . .	75
<b>5</b>	<b>Numerical Method</b>	<b>76</b>
5.1	Primitive Variable Formulation of the Incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations . . .	76
5.2	Pressure-Poisson Equation (PPE) or Velocity-Pressure Formulation in Primitive Variables . . . . .	78
5.3	Remarks on the Pressure Boundary Condition . . . . .	78
5.4	Spatial Discretization of the Velocity-Pressure Formulation of the Incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations . . . . .	79
5.5	Time-Stepping Algorithm for the Velocity-Pressure Formulation of the Incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations . . . . .	83
5.6	Velocity-Pressure Formulation for Moving Overlapping Grids . . . . .	84
5.6.1	Boundary Conditions for Moving Walls . . . . .	85
5.7	Boundary Conditions . . . . .	86
5.8	Discrete Divergence Damping . . . . .	87
<b>6</b>	<b>Validation and Verification of the Navier-Stokes Flow Solver</b>	<b>89</b>
6.1	Flow Solver Validation and Verification. General Issues . . . . .	89
6.2	Numerical Results and V&V . . . . .	90
6.2.1	The Method of Manufactured Solutions or Forced Solutions . . . . .	90
6.2.2	Flow Past a Stationary Cylinder at Various Reynolds Number Values . . .	93
6.2.3	Comparison of Fixed Body Solution vs. Moving Body Solution . . . . .	100
6.2.4	Comparison to other Numerical and Experimental Results . . . . .	102
6.2.5	Comparison of Sequential Vs. Parallel Computations . . . . .	111
6.3	Grid Refinement Study . . . . .	113
6.3.1	Quantitative Study - Force Measurements . . . . .	114
6.3.2	Qualitative Validation - Wake Structures Resolution . . . . .	120
6.3.3	Summary of the Quantitative and Qualitative Grid Refinement Study . . .	120
6.4	Closing Remarks . . . . .	126
<b>7</b>	<b>Wake Structures and Aerodynamic Performance of Flapping Airfoils</b>	<b>127</b>
7.1	Introduction . . . . .	127
7.2	Heaving Airfoil Wake Signature and Aerodynamic Performance . . . . .	129
7.3	Leading Edge Vortex Shedding and Frequency Dependence . . . . .	138
7.4	Flapping airfoils (Coupled Heaving-and-Pitching Motion) . . . . .	147
7.4.1	Effect of Maximum Pitching Angle . . . . .	148
7.4.2	Effect of Heaving Amplitude . . . . .	149
7.4.3	Effect of Strouhal Number . . . . .	150
7.4.4	Effect of Phase Angle . . . . .	151
7.4.5	Propulsive Efficiency, Thrust Coefficient and Input Power Coefficient Contour Maps . . . . .	153
7.5	Heaving Airfoil Vs. Flapping Airfoil . . . . .	158
7.6	Effect of Flexibility on the Aerodynamic Performance . . . . .	162
7.7	Effect of Airfoil Cambering on the Aerodynamic Performance . . . . .	164
7.8	Summary . . . . .	168

<b>8</b>	<b>Wake Topology and Aerodynamic Performance of Finite-Span Flapping Wings</b>	<b>172</b>
8.1	Overview . . . . .	172
8.2	Computational Domain and Grid Setup . . . . .	172
8.3	Vortex Identification . . . . .	174
8.4	Heaving Wing . . . . .	181
8.5	Flapping Wing . . . . .	183
8.6	Aspect Ratio Influence on the Aerodynamics Performance . . . . .	189
8.7	Rolling Wing . . . . .	192
8.8	Summary . . . . .	195
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusions and Perspectives</b>	<b>201</b>
9.1	Conclusions . . . . .	201
9.2	Perspectives for future work . . . . .	204
<b>A</b>	<b>Companion DVD with selected animations</b>	<b>206</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>208</b>

# List of Figures

1.1	Published ranges (taken from [182]) of $St$ for cruising birds, bats, fishes, sharks and dolphins. Dotted lines mark the range $0.2 < St < 0.4$ , in which propulsive efficiency usually peaks; dashed line marks the modal peak at $St = 0.3$ . Unbroken lines indicate the range of variation in $St$ across other non-zero flight speeds, where such data exist. . . . .	3
2.1	A bird while gliding. Notice the separation between the wingtip feathers; these natural slots, help to reduce the induced drag while gliding. . . . .	8
2.2	In gliding flight, a bird’s wing deflect air downward, causing a lift force that holds the bird up in the air (see figure A). By tilting forward and going into a slight dive (figure B), the bird can maintain forward speed. . . . .	9
2.3	In soaring flight, birds use both the updraft thermals and orographic lifting to maintain or gain altitude and save energy. . . . .	9
2.4	A Mallard in powered flight (flapping flight). . . . .	10
2.5	In A, the wings twist as shown to maintain the correct angle of attack for the downstroke. In B, the bird’s wings produce lift and thrust during the downstroke. . . . .	11
2.6	In A, the inner part of the wing produces lift, even during the upstroke. In B, the outer part of the wing is angled to pass through the air with little resistance. . . . .	11
2.7	Wingtip paths relative to the body for two natural flyers. (A) Pigeon ( <i>Columba Livia</i> ), here we see the path transition from tip-reversal upstrokes during slow flight to feathered upstrokes at intermediate speeds and a swept-wing upstroke during fast flight. (B) Black-billed magpie ( <i>Pica Hudsonica</i> ) wingtip path at all flight speeds [187]. . . . .	12
2.8	Hovering flight: a) asymmetric hovering or “avian stroke” and b) symmetric hovering or “insect stroke”. . . . .	13
2.9	Illustration of a hummingbird in hovering flight. In the bottom figure, hummingbird’s wing figure-eight pattern is shown. . . . .	14
2.10	A bufflehead running atop the water while taking off. . . . .	14
2.11	Precision touchdown of an eastern imperial eagle on a tree branch. . . . .	15
2.12	Thrust ( $T$ ) and lift ( $L$ ) components of the normal force vector ( $N$ ) during heaving motion. . . . .	16
2.13	Dye visualizations of different wakes behind an oscillating airfoil (from von Karman vortex street, to neutral wake, to reverse von Karman vortex street, to deflected wake). . . . .	18
2.14	Vortex street indicative of drag production (drag producing wake) [93]. . . . .	21
2.15	Vortex street indicative of thrust production (thrust producing wake) [93]. . . . .	22
2.16	Vortex street indicative of zero drag (neutral wake) [93]. . . . .	23

2.17	Dual-mode or nonsymmetric vortex street indicative of thrust and lift production (deflected wake) [93]. . . . .	23
2.18	Dynamic stall on a heaving airfoil during downstroke (sequence is top-to-bottom left column, then top-to-bottom right column). . . . .	25
2.19	Airfoil geometry and airfoil motion. In the figure, heaving motion $y(t)$ of the pivot point, pitching motion $\alpha(t)$ of the airfoil about the pivot point, maximum heaving amplitude $h_a$ , maximum pitching amplitude $\alpha_a$ , airfoil chord $c$ , pivot point $x_p$ and free-stream velocity $U_\infty$ are shown. . . . .	30
2.20	Different possible combination of motions and effect of phase angle in 2D. . . . .	32
2.21	3D flapping wing kinematics. . . . .	33
2.22	Positional, elevation and feathering angle variations for one period for a hovering hawkmoth [167]. . . . .	33
3.1	Correspondence between the physical space (Cartesian coordinates) and the computational space (generalized curvilinear coordinates). . . . .	42
3.2	Transformation from physical space to computational space. Left: structured grid in physical space. Right: logically uniform grid in computational space. . . . .	43
4.1	Single-block C-type structured grid around a NACA 4412 airfoil. . . . .	53
4.2	Multi-block structured grid around a NLR 7301 airfoil with flap. . . . .	54
4.3	Overlapping structured grid around a NLR 7301 airfoil with flap. . . . .	55
4.4	Unstructured mesh around a NHLP-2D three element airfoil. . . . .	56
4.5	Cartesian grid around a Drela DAE11 low Reynolds number airfoil. . . . .	57
4.6	Simple overlapping grid system in physical space $\mathcal{P}$ . . . . .	59
4.7	Simple overlapping grid system consisting of two component grids $\mathcal{G}_g$ . An annular boundary fitted grid ( $\mathcal{G}_2$ ) and a background Cartesian grid ( $\mathcal{G}_1$ ). The top view shows the overlapping grid in physical space $\mathcal{P}$ while the bottom view shows each grid in computational space $\mathcal{C}$ . . . . .	63
4.8	Interpolation scheme for overlapping grids. The interpolation is performed in computational space $\mathcal{C}$ . . . . .	65
4.9	Explicit and implicit interpolation for a one-dimensional overlapping grid. . . . .	66
4.10	Moving overlapping grid. The new overlapping grid system $\mathbb{G}$ interpolation stencils and chimera holes are determined by Ogen at each time step. . . . .	67
4.11	Pseudo C++ Code for the basic time stepping algorithm for overlapping grids. . . . .	69
4.12	Left. Initial overlapping grids system $\mathbb{G}$ . Right. Individual component grids $\mathcal{G}_g$ . . . . .	70
4.13	Overlapping grid system $\mathbb{G}$ after cutting holes and removing all exterior or unused points. The hole cutting algorithm generates a barrier of unused points and interpolation points that bounds the entire hole region. . . . .	71
4.14	Overlapping grid system $\mathbb{G}$ after marking points on the physical boundaries (stairstep boundary) and interpolation boundaries. . . . .	71
4.15	Overlapping grid system $\mathbb{G}$ after marking all proper interpolation. . . . .	72
4.16	Final overlapping grid system $\mathbb{G}$ after removing excess of interpolation points . . . . .	73
4.17	Overlapping grid discretization in one dimension. . . . .	74
5.1	General boundary configuration for external flows. . . . .	86

6.1	Forced solutions of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations around a circle in a square with slip wall boundaries and $\omega_0 = \omega_1 = \omega_3 = 1$ . Top-to-bottom left column, grid system from coarser grid to finer grid. Top-to-bottom right column, corresponding grid level velocity $u$ contours. Notice how the quality of the solution improves as the grid is refined. . . . .	92
6.2	Domain and overlapping grid system of the unsteady flow past a cylinder case. Top view: overall domain. Bottom view: close-up of the grid around the cylinder. .	93
6.3	Streamlines for $Re = 20$ (top figure) and $Re = 40$ (bottom figure) for a nondimensional time $t = 400$ . . . . .	94
6.4	Vorticity contours for $Re = 100$ and $Re = 200$ for a nondimensional time $t = 500$ . .	96
6.5	Time dependent lift and drag coefficient for $Re = 100$ . . . . .	98
6.6	Von Karman street onset (stopping criteria for solver benchmarking). . . . .	100
6.7	Left: computational domain for the fixed cylinder case. Right: computational domain for the moving cylinder case (the cylinder is in the initial position and it moves from right to left). . . . .	102
6.8	Moving cylinder vs. fixed cylinder, pressure coefficient $c_p$ comparison at a nondimensional time $t = 7.0$ . . . . .	103
6.9	Comparison of average thrust coefficient $\bar{c}_t$ results for the pitching airfoil case (negative values indicate drag production). . . . .	104
6.10	Comparison of average thrust coefficient $\bar{c}_t$ results for the flapping airfoil case (negative values indicate drag production). . . . .	106
6.11	Comparison of vorticity contours for the heaving-and-pitching airfoil case (case F1 in table 6.10). Left column: vorticity contours obtained by Pedro <i>et al.</i> [140]. Right column: present results. The first row is the beginning of one period, the second row is 1/8 of the period, the third row is 1/4 of the period and the last row is 3/8 of the period. . . . .	107
6.12	Comparison of vorticity contours for the heaving-and-pitching airfoil case (case F6 in table 6.10). Left column: vorticity contours obtained by Pedro <i>et al.</i> [140]. Right column: present results. The first row is the beginning of one period, the second row is 1/8 of the period, the third row is 1/4 of the period and the last row is 3/8 of the period. . . . .	108
6.13	Comparison of variation of thrust coefficient with reduced frequency (negative values indicate drag production). . . . .	109
6.14	Comparison of vorticity contours between the serial case and the parallel case for a nondimensional time $t = 100$ . In the figure, NP stands for number of processors. . . . .	112
6.15	Parallel speed up. . . . .	112
6.16	Top: instantaneous drag coefficient $c_d$ (negative values indicate thrust generation). Bottom: instantaneous lift coefficient $c_l$ . Both quantities are shown for an interval equal to $6 < t < 7$ . . . . .	116
6.17	Plot of observed quantity values (average thrust coefficient $\bar{c}_t$ ) for each grid. The equivalent zero grid spacing value is also plotted. . . . .	117
6.18	Instantaneous drag coefficient $c_d$ iterative convergence comparison for the heaving airfoil benchmarking case (negative values indicate thrust production). . . . .	118
6.19	Grid refinement study of the wake structures resolution for the heaving airfoil benchmarking case. Vorticity contours corresponding to $\mathbb{G}_5$ (see table 6.19) are shown. . . . .	120



6.20	Grid refinement study of the wake structures resolution for the heaving airfoil benchmarking case. Vorticity contours corresponding to $\mathbb{G}_4$ (see table 6.19) are shown. . . . .	122
6.21	Grid refinement study of the wake structures resolution for the heaving airfoil benchmarking case. Vorticity contours corresponding to $\mathbb{G}_3$ (see table 6.19) are shown. . . . .	122
6.22	Grid refinement study of the wake structures resolution for the heaving airfoil benchmarking case. Vorticity contours corresponding to $\mathbb{G}_2$ (see table 6.19) are shown. . . . .	124
6.23	Grid refinement study of the wake structures resolution for the heaving airfoil benchmarking case. Vorticity contours corresponding to $\mathbb{G}_1$ (see table 6.19) are shown. . . . .	124
6.24	Overlapping grid system layout. . . . .	125
7.1	Left: wake structure behind a heaving NACA 0012 airfoil (vorticity contours). Right: horizontal velocity profile measured at a distance equal to 5 times the airfoil chord away from the trailing edge. Flapping parameters: $St = 0.1, h_a = 0.05, Re = 1100$ . This configuration is indicative of drag production. . . . .	128
7.2	Left: wake structure behind a heaving NACA 0012 airfoil (vorticity contours). Right: horizontal velocity profile measured at a distance equal to 5 times the airfoil chord away from the trailing edge. Flapping parameters: $St = 0.3, h_a = 0.15, Re = 1100$ . This configuration is indicative of thrust production. . . . .	128
7.3	Left: wake structure behind a heaving NACA 0012 airfoil (vorticity contours). Right: horizontal velocity profile measured at a distance equal to 5 times the airfoil chord away from the trailing edge. Flapping parameters: $St = 0.15, h_a = 0.25, Re = 1100$ . This configuration is indicative of a net balance between thrust production and drag generation (neutral wake). . . . .	129
7.4	Top figure: time dependent drag and lift coefficients (where negative values of drag coefficient indicate thrust production). Bottom figure: heaving kinematics. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4, h_a = 0.2$ ( $\bar{c}_l = 0.8834, \bar{c}_l = 0.0098$ ). . . . .	130
7.5	Variation of thrust coefficient and propulsive efficiency with the Strouhal number. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, f_h = 1$ . Notice that the propulsive efficiency is only shown for positive thrust. . . . .	131
7.6	Variation of thrust coefficient and propulsive efficiency with the Strouhal number. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, f_h = 0.5$ . Notice that the propulsive efficiency is only shown for positive thrust. . . . .	131
7.7	Variation of thrust coefficient and propulsive efficiency with heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3$ . . . . .	132
7.8	Variation of thrust coefficient and propulsive efficiency with heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4$ . . . . .	132
7.9	Plot showing the wake structure classification. Lines of constant Strouhal number value are included to demonstrate the approximate dependence of the wake topology on the Strouhal number. . . . .	133
7.10	Deflected wake (vorticity contours). In the left figure the wake is deflected upwards (the motion was started from the bottommost position), while in the right figure the wake is deflected downwards (the motion was started from the topmost position). Flapping parameters for both cases: $Re = 1100, St = 0.5, h_a = 0.3$ . . . . .	134
7.11	Horizontal velocity profile evolution as function of the Strouhal number. . . . .	134

7.12	Time dependent lift coefficient for two different heaving cases. Notice that for the case $St = 0.5$ ( $h = 0.3$ ), the lift coefficient evolution is not symmetric about the horizontal mean line, this is due to the angle of attack induced by the deflected wake, the bumps on the lift curve are due to the dynamic stall ( $\bar{c}_l = 0.10923$ ). For the case $St = 0.3$ ( $h = 0.15$ ) the lift evolution is symmetrical about the horizontal mean line ( $\bar{c}_l = 0.00242$ ).	135
7.13	Jet-switching phenomenon (vorticity contours). Notice how the wake first goes to the upward position, then goes to the downward position and then returns to the upward position. Also notice that the wake deflection angles are different for the upward and downward deflection. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.9$ , $h_a = 0.45$ .	136
7.14	Lift coefficient and drag coefficient time histories for the jet-switching wake. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.9$ , $h_a = 0.45$ . Negative values of drag coefficient indicate thrust production.	137
7.15	Contour map of propulsive efficiency vs. Strouhal number and heaving amplitude.	137
7.16	Contour map of thrust coefficient vs. Strouhal number and heaving amplitude.	138
7.17	Contour map of input power coefficient vs. Strouhal number and heaving amplitude.	138
7.18	Pressure field during upstroke. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.35$ , $h_a = 0.40$ , $f = 0.4375$ ( $k = 1.3744325$ ). The sequence is from A (bottommost position) to H (topmost position), where: A) $t = 13.725$ , B) $t = 13.860$ , C) 14.0, D) 14.168, E) 14.345, F) 14.476, G) 14.652, H) 14.828.	140
7.19	Pressure coefficient distribution on the airfoil surface. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.35$ , $h_a = 0.40$ , $f = 0.4375$ ( $k = 1.3744325$ ). The sequence is from A (bottommost position) to D (topmost position). The pressure coefficient $c_p$ was measured at the following instants: A) $t = 13.728$ , B) $t = 14.124$ , C) 14.476, D) 14.828.	141
7.20	Thrust coefficient distribution on the airfoil surface. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.35$ , $h_a = 0.40$ , $f = 0.4375$ ( $k = 1.3744325$ ). The sequence is from A (bottommost position) to D (topmost position). The thrust coefficient distribution $c_t(x/c)$ was measured at the following instants: A) $t = 13.728$ , B) $t = 14.124$ , C) 14.476, D) 14.828.	142
7.21	Pressure field during upstroke. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.35$ , $h_a = 0.15$ , $f = 1.166667$ ( $k = 3.665166$ ). The sequence is from A (bottommost position) to H (topmost position), where: A) $t = 5.120$ , B) $t = 5.184$ , C) 5.248, D) 5.317, E) 5.376, F) 5.456, G) 5.536, H) 5.6.	143
7.22	Pressure coefficient distribution on airfoil surface. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.35$ , $h_a = 0.15$ , $f = 1.166667$ ( $k = 3.665166$ ). The sequence is from A (bottommost position) to D (topmost position). The pressure coefficient $c_p$ was measured at the following instants: A) $t = 5.120$ , B) $t = 5.280$ , C) 5.456, D) 5.6.	144
7.23	Thrust coefficient distribution on airfoil surface. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.35$ , $h_a = 0.15$ , $f = 1.166667$ ( $k = 3.665166$ ). The sequence is from A (bottommost position) to D (topmost position). The thrust coefficient distribution $c_t(x/c)$ was measured at the following instants: A) $t = 5.120$ , B) $t = 5.280$ , C) 5.456, D) 5.6.	145
7.24	Peak lift coefficient versus reduced frequency $k$ . Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.35$ .	146

7.25	Top figure: time dependent thrust and lift coefficients (where negative values of drag coefficient indicate thrust production). Bottom figure: Heaving and pitching kinematics. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3, h_a = 0.4, \alpha_a = 20^\circ, \varphi = 90^\circ$ ( $\overline{c_t} = 0.354186, \overline{c_l} = -0.001725$ ).	147
7.26	Average thrust coefficient and propulsive efficiency versus maximum pitching angle. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3, h_a = 1.0$ .	148
7.27	Propulsive efficiency versus heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3$ .	149
7.28	Average thrust coefficient versus heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3$ .	150
7.29	Average input power coefficient versus heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3$ .	150
7.30	Propulsive efficiency versus heaving amplitude for three different Strouhal number values. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, \alpha_a = 20.0$ .	151
7.31	Thrust coefficient versus heaving amplitude for three different Strouhal number values. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, \alpha_a = 20.0$ .	152
7.32	Input power coefficient versus heaving amplitude for three different Strouhal number values. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, \alpha_a = 20.0$ .	152
7.33	Propulsive efficiency and average thrust coefficient in function of the phase angle $\varphi$ . Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, \alpha_a = 30.0, h_a = 0.5, St = 0.25$ .	153
7.34	Comparison of the vorticity field for two different flapping cases during upstroke. Left column: flapping airfoil with a phase angle equal to $\varphi = 100^\circ$ . Right column: flapping airfoil with a phase angle equal to $\varphi = 90^\circ$ . Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.25, h_a = 0.25, \alpha_a = 10^\circ$ . The sequence is shown for four instants during the upstroke motion, where: A) $t = 8.0$ B) $t=8.35$ C) $t=8.70$ D) $t = 9.0$	154
7.35	Contour map of propulsive efficiency vs. maximum pitching angle and heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.2$	155
7.36	Contour map of thrust coefficient vs. maximum pitching angle and heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.2$ .	156
7.37	Contour map of input power coefficient vs. maximum pitching angle and heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.2$ .	156
7.38	Contour map of propulsive efficiency vs. maximum pitching angle and heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3$	157
7.39	Contour map of thrust coefficient vs. maximum pitching angle and heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3$ .	157
7.40	Contour map of input power coefficient vs. maximum pitching angle and heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3$ .	158
7.41	Contour map of propulsive efficiency vs. maximum pitching angle and heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4$	158
7.42	Contour map of thrust coefficient vs. maximum pitching angle and heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4$ .	159
7.43	Contour map of input power coefficient vs. maximum pitching angle and heaving amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4$ .	159

7.44	Comparison of the vorticity field for four different flapping cases during upstroke. First column: $Re = 1100, St = 0.2, h_a = 1.0, \alpha_a = 5^\circ, \varphi = 90^\circ$ . Second column: $Re = 1100, St = 0.2, h_a = 1.0, \alpha_a = 10^\circ, \varphi = 90^\circ$ . Third column: $Re = 1100, St = 0.2, h_a = 1.0, \alpha_a = 20^\circ, \varphi = 90^\circ$ . Fourth column: $Re = 1100, St = 0.2, h_a = 1.0, \alpha_a = 30^\circ, \varphi = 90^\circ$ . The sequence is shown for six instants during the upstroke motion, where: A) $t = 30.0$ B) $t = 31.0$ C) $t = 32.0$ D) $t = 33.0$ E) $t = 34.0$ F) $t = 35.0$ . . . . .	160
7.45	Comparison of the vorticity field for four different flapping cases during upstroke. First column: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4, h_a = 1.0, \alpha_a = 5^\circ, \varphi = 90^\circ$ . Second column: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4, h_a = 1.0, \alpha_a = 20^\circ, \varphi = 90^\circ$ . Third column: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4, h_a = 1.0, \alpha_a = 30^\circ, \varphi = 90^\circ$ . Fourth column: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4, h_a = 1.0, \alpha_a = 40^\circ, \varphi = 90^\circ$ . The sequence is shown for six instants during the upstroke motion, where: A) $t = 20.0$ B) $t = 20.5$ C) $t = 21.0$ D) $t = 21.5$ E) $t = 22.0$ F) $t = 22.5$ . . . . .	161
7.46	Heaving and flapping motions propulsive efficiency comparison. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3, \alpha_a = 30.0$ . . . . .	162
7.47	Heaving and flapping motions thrust coefficient comparison. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3, \alpha_a = 30.0$ . . . . .	162
7.48	Heaving and flapping motions input power coefficient comparison. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3, \alpha_a = 30.0$ . . . . .	163
7.49	Comparison of propulsive efficiency and average thrust coefficient versus flexure amplitude. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.3, h_a = 0.25$ . . . . .	164
7.50	Vorticity field for the flexible airfoil study. The sequence is shown for eight instants during the downstroke motion, where: A) $t = 8.33$ B) $t = 8.45$ C) $t = 8.55$ D) $t = 8.70$ E) $t = 8.80$ F) $t = 8.90$ G) $t = 9.0$ H) $t = 9.16$ . Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, h_{flex} = 0.3, h_a = 0.25, St = 0.3$ . . . . .	165
7.51	Vorticity field for the flexible airfoil study (rigid airfoil case). The sequence is shown for eight instants during the downstroke motion, where: A) $t = 8.33$ B) $t = 8.45$ C) $t = 8.55$ D) $t = 8.70$ E) $t = 8.80$ F) $t = 8.90$ G) $t = 9.0$ H) $t = 9.16$ . Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, h_{flex} = 0.0, h_a = 0.25, St = 0.3$ . . . . .	166
7.52	Comparison of the vorticity field for two different airfoils. Left column: NACA 0012 airfoil. Right column: Selig S1223 airfoil. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4, h_a = 0.3$ . The sequence is shown for four instants during the upstroke motion, where: A) $t = 9.0$ B) $t = 9.25$ C) $t = 9.50$ D) $t = 9.75$ . . . . .	169
7.53	Comparison of the vorticity field for two different airfoils. Left column: NACA 2212 airfoil. Right column: NACA 4612. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100, St = 0.4, h_a = 0.3$ . The sequence is shown for four instants during the upstroke motion, where: A) $t = 9.0$ B) $t = 9.25$ C) $t = 9.50$ D) $t = 9.75$ . . . . .	171
8.1	Three-dimensional computational domain layout in the xy plane. . . . .	173
8.2	Three-dimensional computational domain layout in the zy plane. . . . .	173
8.3	Typical grid system employed in the current three-dimensional study. A) Side view. B) Front view. C) Top view. D) Perspective view. . . . .	174
8.4	Isosurfaces of $ \omega $ -criterion at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t = 7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, Re = 500$ . . . . .	176
8.5	Isosurfaces of Q-criterion at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t = 7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, Re = 500$ . . . . .	177

8.6	Isosurfaces of $\lambda_2$ -criterion at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t=7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, Re = 500$ . . . . .	178
8.7	Isosurfaces of $N_k$ -criterion at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t=7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, Re = 500$ . . . . .	179
8.8	Isosurfaces of pressure field at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t=7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, Re = 500$ . . . . .	180
8.9	Spanwise vorticity contours at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t=7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, Re = 500$ . A) Spanwise vorticity contours for the infinite-span wing (2D case). B) Rear view of the wing-tip vortices for the finite-span wing, where TVL is the left wing-tip vortex and TVR is the right wing tip vortex. C) Spanwise vorticity contours for the finite-span wing at the symmetry plane (3D case). D) Spanwise vorticity contours for the finite-span wing in the plane located at a distance equal to $d = 0.4 \times c$ measured from the wing symmetry plane (3D case). . . . .	184
8.10	Vortex topology at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t=7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, Re = 500$ . A) Side view. B) Perspective view. . . . .	185
8.11	Vortex topology at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t=7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, Re = 500$ . A) Side view. B) Top view. . . . .	186
8.12	Vortex topology at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t=7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.15, h_a = 0.075, Re = 500$ . A) Side view. B) Perspective view. . . . .	187
8.13	Vortex topology at the beginning of the upstroke ( $t=7.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.15, h_a = 0.075, Re = 500$ . A) Side view. B) Top view. . . . .	188
8.14	Vortex topology during downstroke ( $t=6.75$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, \alpha_a = 10^\circ, Re = 500$ . A) Side view. B) Top view. C) Perspective view. . . . .	190
8.15	Vortex topology during downstroke ( $t=6.75$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, \alpha_a = 20^\circ, Re = 500$ . A) Side view. B) Top View. C) Perspective view. . . . .	191
8.16	Streamlines visualization during downstroke ( $t=6.75$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, \alpha_a = 10^\circ, Re = 500$ . A) Front view. B) Top View. C) Perspective view. D) Perspective view. . . . .	192
8.17	Streamlines visualization during downstroke ( $t=6.75$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.5, h_a = 0.25, \alpha_a = 20^\circ, Re = 500$ . A) Front view. B) Top View. C) Perspective view. D) Perspective view. . . . .	193
8.18	Different wing platforms used for the study of aspect ratio influence on the aerodynamic performance. . . . .	194
8.19	Vortex topology for the rolling wing case ( $t=5.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.10, f_{roll} = 1.0, Re = 500$ . A) Perspective view. B) Top view. In this view the right wing-tip corresponds to the hinged extreme. C) Side view. . . . .	196
8.20	Vortex topology for the rolling wing case ( $t=5.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.25, f_{roll} = 1.0, Re = 500$ . A) Perspective view. B) Top view. In this view the right wing-tip corresponds to the hinged extreme. C) Side view. . . . .	197
8.21	Vortex topology for the rolling wing case ( $t=5.0$ ). Flapping parameters: $St = 0.38, f_{roll} = 1.0, Re = 500$ . A) Perspective view. B) Top view. In this view the right wing-tip corresponds to the hinged extreme. C) Side view. . . . .	198
8.22	Streamlines visualization during downstroke (top view), the streamlines are colored according to the velocity magnitude values. In this view the right wing-tip corresponds to the hinged extreme. Flapping parameters: $St = 0.38, f_{roll} = 1.0, Re = 500$ . A) $t=5.0$ B) $t=5.05$ C) $t=5.10$ D) $t=5.15$ . . . . .	199

8.23 Streamlines visualization during downstroke (perspective view), the streamlines are colored according to the velocity magnitude values. In this view the left wing-tip corresponds to the hinged extreme. Flapping parameters:  $St = 0.38$ ,  $f_{roll} = 1.0$ ,  $Re = 500$ . A)  $t=5.0$  B)  $t=5.05$  C)  $t=5.10$  D)  $t=5.15$ . . . . . 200

# List of Tables

4.1	Some of the currently used grid generation methods. . . . .	58
4.2	Some of the codes that are currently available for assembling overlapping grid systems. . . . .	61
6.1	Maximum error at $t=1.0$ and $\nu = 0.1$ for a trigonometric analytic solution ( $\omega_0 = \omega_1 = \omega_3 = 1$ ). The estimated convergence rate $p$ is also shown. The column entitled as $h_1/h_g$ denotes the ratio of the grid spacing on grid 1 to the spacing on grid $g$ . . . . .	91
6.2	Drag coefficient ( $c_d$ ) and length of wake bubble (L) for $Re = 20$ and $Re = 40$ . . . . .	95
6.3	Drag coefficient ( $c_d$ ) and lift coefficient ( $c_l$ ) for $Re = 100$ and $Re = 200$ . . . . .	97
6.4	Summary of the overlapping grid system used for the cases where $Re = 20$ , $Re = 40$ , $Re = 100$ and $Re = 200$ . . . . .	98
6.5	Summary of the overlapping grid system used for the benchmarking computations. . . . .	99
6.6	Comparison of the performance of different direct and iterative solvers. . . . .	101
6.7	Comparison of $c_d$ and $c_l$ coefficients for both cases at $t = 7.0$ . . . . .	102
6.8	Kinematics parameters for the pitching airfoil case. . . . .	103
6.9	Average thrust coefficient $\bar{c}_t$ and maximum lift coefficient $\hat{c}_l$ comparison for the pitching airfoil case. . . . .	104
6.10	Kinematics parameters for the heaving-and-pitching airfoil case. . . . .	105
6.11	Average thrust coefficient $\bar{c}_t$ and maximum lift coefficient $\hat{c}_l$ comparison for the heaving-and-pitching airfoil case. . . . .	105
6.12	Average thrust coefficient $\bar{c}_t$ comparison between the present results and the results obtained by Wang [207]. . . . .	106
6.13	Comparison of average thrust coefficient $\bar{c}_t$ . . . . .	110
6.14	Comparison of average thrust coefficient $\bar{c}_t$ . . . . .	111
6.15	Parallel computations benchmarking results. . . . .	111
6.16	Description of grids used for the grid refinement study (for force measurements). . . . .	115
6.17	Observed values of the average thrust coefficient $\bar{c}_t$ for each grid. The observed order of convergence and the equivalent zero grid spacing values are also shown. . . . .	117
6.18	Comparison of the performance of different direct and iterative solvers. . . . .	119
6.19	Description of grids used for the grid refinement study (wake structures resolution). . . . .	121
6.20	Description of grids used for the grid refinement study. . . . .	123
6.21	Computational resources used in each benchmarking case. . . . .	125
7.1	Flapping parameters for the pure heaving case. . . . .	129
7.2	Kinematics parameters for the study of the effect of maximum pitching angle on flapping airfoils aerodynamic performance. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.3$ , $h_a = 1.0$ . . . . .	148

7.3	Flapping parameters for the study of the effect of heaving amplitude $h_a$ on the aerodynamic performance. . . . .	149
7.4	Flapping parameters for the study of the effect of Strouhal number $St$ on the aerodynamic performance. . . . .	151
7.5	Flapping parameters for the study of the effect of phase angle $\varphi$ on the aerodynamic performance. . . . .	153
7.6	Flapping parameters for the study of the flexible heaving airfoil. . . . .	163
7.7	Airfoils used for the study of cambering effect on the aerodynamic performance of heaving airfoils. . . . .	167
7.8	Heaving parameters for the study of airfoil cambering effect on the aerodynamic performance. . . . .	167
7.9	Comparison of the aerodynamic performance of eight different airfoils for the study of cambering effect on the aerodynamic behavior. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.4$ , $h_a = 0.1$ , $f_h = 2.0$ . . . . .	167
7.10	Comparison of the aerodynamic performance of eight different airfoils for the study of cambering effect on the aerodynamic behavior. Flapping parameters: $Re = 1100$ , $St = 0.4$ , $h_a = 0.3$ , $f_h = 2.0$ . . . . .	167
8.1	Kinematics parameters for the pure heaving wing case. . . . .	182
8.2	Simulation results for the pure heaving wing case (positive $\bar{c}_t$ values indicate thrust production whereas negative $\bar{c}_t$ values indicate drag production). . . . .	182
8.3	Simulation results for the pure heaving wing case. Comparison of the 3D results versus the 2D results (positive $\bar{c}_t$ values indicate thrust production whereas negative $\bar{c}_t$ values indicate drag production). . . . .	183
8.4	Kinematic parameters for the flapping wing case. . . . .	184
8.5	Simulation results for the flapping wing case. . . . .	189
8.6	Kinematics and geometrical parameters for the heaving wing case with different aspect ratios. . . . .	189
8.7	Simulation results for the heaving wing case with different aspect ratios (positive $\bar{c}_t$ values indicate thrust production whereas negative $\bar{c}_t$ values indicate drag production). . . . .	192
8.8	Kinematics parameters for the rolling wing case. . . . .	194
8.9	Summary of results for the rolling case with different dorsoventral stroke angles (positive $\bar{c}_t$ values indicate thrust production whereas negative $\bar{c}_t$ values indicate drag production). . . . .	194



# Acknowledgements

Financial support of the Marie Curie actions EST project FLUBIO, through grant MEST-CT-2005-020228 is acknowledged.

I would like to specially thank my thesis advisor Prof. Alessandro Bottaro, for giving me the opportunity to conduct my doctoral studies at the University of Genova and for supervising my research work and for constantly keeping me busy with new challenging and interesting subjects.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all the people I met during these last three years, who in one or another way influenced on my decisions and helped me during this period. Just to name a few: Joao, Ana, Bart, Giovanni, Andreas, Damian, Julien, Houssam, Hakan, Laura, Thomas, Bill, Dominic, Anna, Antoine, Marco, Simona, Valeria, Stephano, Gaby, Ernesto, Max, Sam, Laly (and I am deeply sorry for those I do not remember at the moment).

My successes are largely due to the quiet support of my family. I thank my parents for supporting the choices that I have made in my life, I also thank my brother and sister for always being there. Finally, I cannot pass this page without thanking the universal architect.

*E Pluribus Unum*

## **Abstract**

The aim of this dissertation is to contribute to a better comprehension of the mechanism of flapping airfoils/wings propulsion and the associated unsteady aerodynamics, independently of their possible practical applications. We describe an accurate and stable numerical method to numerically solve the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, which, used together with the overlapping grids method and to the numerical tools implemented, constitutes a very powerful tool to solve fluid dynamics problems with fixed and moving/deforming boundaries in two and three space dimensions. The two-dimensional results are presented for airfoils undergoing heaving and coupled heaving-and-pitching motion. The interest here is to determine the values of flapping frequency and flapping amplitude best suited for flapping flight, in terms of maximum propulsive efficiency and thrust production. We also study the influence of airfoil cambering and airfoil flexibility on the aerodynamic performance. Finally, three-dimensional rigid finite-span wings undergoing heaving, coupled heaving-and-pitching and root-flapping motion modes are investigated, with focus on the wake topology and aerodynamic performance, and their dependence on the flapping motion parameters. We also establish the best criteria for vortical structures identification and assess whether the assumption of two-dimensionality has some validity in three-dimensional cases.