

“Development of Methodologies for the Aerodynamic Design and Optimization of New Regional Turboprop Aircraft”

Copyright © 2013, Pierluigi Della Vecchia.

All rights reserved. Printed in Italy. This publication is protected by copyright, and permission must be obtained from the publisher prior to any prohibited reproduction, storage in a retrieval system, or transmission in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or likewise. For information regarding permissions, write to:

3D TECH SRLS Via San Vito, 65, 80014, Giugliano in Campania, Naples, Italy.



Logo designed by Lamberto Maglione

Text printed in Italy at Universal Book SRL, Via S. Botticelli, 22, 87036 Rende, Cosenza.



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI
FEDERICO II



DOCTORAL THESIS

Development of Methodologies for
the Aerodynamic Design and
Optimization of New Regional
Turboprop Aircraft

Author:
Pierluigi DELLA VECCHIA

Supervisor:
Prof. Luigi DE LUCA

Co-Supervisor:
Prof. Fabrizio NICOLSI

*A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy*

in the

Doctor of Philosophy School in Aerospace, Naval and Quality
Engineering

April 2, 2013

Declaration of Authorship

I, Pierluigi Della Vecchia, declare that this thesis titled, 'Development of Methodologies for the Aerodynamic Design and Optimization of New Regional Turboprop Aircraft' and the work presented in it are my own. I confirm that:

- This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University.
- Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated.
- Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed.
- Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work.
- I have acknowledged all main sources of help.
- Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself.

This PhD thesis has been defended in a public dissertation on May, 3rd 2013 under the judgment of a specialized commission composed by:

- Prof. Giorgio Guglieri, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Politecnico di Torino;
- Prof. Giulio Avanzini, Department of Innovation Engineering, Università del Salento;
- Prof. Salvatore Miranda, Department of Industrial Engineering, Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II".

Signed: _____

Date: _____

“Rem tene, verba sequentur...”

Marcus Porcius Cato (Tusculum, 234 a.C. - 149 a.C.), *Orationes*



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI FEDERICO II

University of Naples FEDERICO II

Abstract

Faculty of Aerospace Engineering

Doctor of Philosophy School in Aerospace, Naval and Quality Engineering

Doctor of Philosophy

Development of Methodologies for the Aerodynamic Design and Optimization of New Regional Turboprop Aircraft

by Pierluigi DELLA VECCHIA

The Development of Methodologies for the Aerodynamic Design and Optimization of New Regional Turboprop Aircraft is presented proposing innovative procedures and tools to improve the aerodynamic of this aircraft category. Nowadays the increase in oil price, the huge growth of air transport traffic and the increasing attention to the aircraft environmental footprint led to considerable interest of specialists in new configurations of regional transport aircraft. Airlines and aircraft industries forecast in the next twenty years about 12000 turboprop aircraft will be delivered. Of these aircraft about 7000 will replace the older turboprop which reach their product life-cycle, while the remaining amount of about 6000 aircraft will be new turboprop aircrafts to satisfy market needs. The 61% of new turboprop delivered expected to be under 70 seats category (20% under 50 seats and 41% of 70 seats), while the new 90+ seat segment is a strong percentage of the total, i.e. the 39%. For these reasons this work aims to provide some guidelines in the aerodynamic design of future regional turboprop aircraft with about 90 or more passengers. Currently there are no configurations on the market of this type, so a typical 70 passengers turboprop aircraft is taken as reference starting point to put in evidence those aircraft components which particularly affects the “aerodynamic”, especially in terms of aerodynamic drag. Particular emphasis is posed on aircraft performance, to highlight how a more accurate aerodynamic design can improve aircraft performance and so give aerodynamic guidelines in the design of new turboprop aircraft configurations. Research work can be divided into three main topics: *i*) airfoil design and optimization,

ii) aircraft components design and optimization and *iii*) vertical tail design. Airfoil design and optimization is a typical aeronautic topic, which involves several aspects such as parameterization techniques, optimization algorithms and aerodynamic solvers. These aspects have been analyzed and put together into a user friendly code which allows to design and optimize a generic airfoil geometry choosing *i*) the parameterization technique, *ii*) the optimization algorithm and *iii*) the aerodynamic solver. Constraints and multi-objective optimization have been performed, highlighting the crucial features in the design and optimization of a regional turboprop airfoil. The second topic aims to provide an optimization procedure for several aircraft components, fast to use also in a preliminary design phase. By coupling non uniform rational b-spline (NURBS) and a panel code aerodynamic solver, the geometry of a regional turboprop nose, wing-fuselage junction and undercarriage vane have been optimized to reduce aircraft aerodynamic drag. Particular emphasis has been also posed on the winglet design, highlighting how an accurate design can give an improvement in the whole regional aircraft flight envelope. The last topic involves the design of vertical tail plane for turboprop aircraft. This is a crucial topic for all twin-engine commuter aircraft because of all the ground performance are strictly related to the minimum control speed (V_{MC}) which mainly depends from the engine failure speed (V_{EF}), clearly related to vertical tail design. As a matter of fact both Part 23 and Part 25 of the aircraft regulations relates the certification speeds (especially for ground performance) to the V_{MC} ; the lower will be the last, the better will be the performance. Moreover a performance improvement also means the commercial success of an aircraft, given the capability to be more competitive in several scenarios respect to competitors. In this research work, using a Navier-Stokes aerodynamic solver, a new method named VeDSC (Vertical tail Design Stability and Control) to design a vertical tail and a rudder has been carried out. More than 300 Navier-Stokes runs have been performed to accomplish with the objective. Particular care has been posed to the software set-up and several test-cases have been performed to validate the methodology. Finally the new method has been applied to several turboprop and twin-engine commuter aircraft and compared to typical semi-empirical methodologies to highlight the capabilities and reliability.

Contents

Declaration of Authorship	ii
Abstract	iv
Acknowledgements	vi
List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xvii
Abbreviations	xix
Symbols	xxi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Turboprop and Regional Aircraft Market	1
1.1.1 Economic Trends	2
1.1.2 Oil Price	3
1.1.3 Airline Industry Trends	4
1.1.4 Regional Market Forecast	6
1.2 Turboprop Aircraft Configuration	9
1.2.1 Typical Turboprop Characteristics	10
1.3 Turboprop Drag and Performance	13
1.3.1 Drag Breakdown	13
1.3.2 Performance evaluation	17
1.3.3 Performance improvements due to drag reduction	18
1.3.3.1 Zero lift drag coefficient reduction	18
1.3.3.2 Oswald factor improvement	19
1.4 Goals and Structure of this research work	23

2	Airfoil Design and Optimization	25
2.1	Introduction	25
2.2	Geometry Parameterization	27
2.2.1	Bezier Curves	28
2.2.2	Legendre Polynomials	29
2.2.3	PARSEC Method	34
2.3	Optimization Algorithms	35
2.3.1	Gradients Based	37
2.3.2	Genetic Algorithm	37
2.3.3	NashGA Algorithm	37
2.4	Constraints Selection	39
2.4.1	Geometrical constraints	39
2.4.2	Aerodynamic constraints	40
2.5	Objective function	41
2.6	Solvers	42
2.7	Applications	43
2.7.1	Single case optimization	44
2.7.2	Turboprop aircraft airfoil in cruise and climb	49
2.7.3	Turboprop aircraft airfoil in cruise, climb and stall	52
2.7.4	High efficiency airfoil applied to fan design	57
2.7.5	High efficiency airfoil applied to wind turbine	60
3	Aircraft Components Design and Optimization	65
3.1	Introduction	65
3.2	NURBS parameterization	68
3.2.1	B-Splines	69
3.2.2	NURBS Curves and Surfaces	70
3.2.3	NURBS in MATLAB environment	73
3.3	Objective Function	74
3.4	Turboprop Aerodynamic Analysis	77
3.5	Applications	82
3.5.1	Aircraft Fuselage nose	83
3.5.2	Wing-Fuselage junction	89
3.5.3	Undercarriage vane	95
3.5.4	Performance improvement due to Optimization	96
3.6	Winglet Design	99
3.6.1	Aerodynamics of the winglet	100
3.6.2	Turboprop winglet design	102
3.6.3	Performance improvements due to Winglet	114
4	Vertical Tail Design	119
4.1	Introduction	119

4.1.1	Semi-Empirical Methods	122
4.2	CFD Approach	129
4.2.1	Test Cases	129
4.3	Parametric Analysis on typical turboprop geometries	137
4.3.1	Preliminary CFD analyses	138
4.3.2	CFD model analyses and discussion	139
4.3.2.1	Isolated Vertical tail	144
4.3.2.2	Fuselage Effect	146
4.3.2.3	Wing Effect	147
4.3.2.4	Horizontal tailplane effect	150
4.3.3	Rudder Effect	152
4.3.3.1	Isolated vertical tail with rudder Effect	153
4.3.3.2	Body Effect on vertical tail with rudder	153
4.3.3.3	Wing Effect on vertical tail with rudder	155
4.3.3.4	Horizontal tailplane Effect on vertical tail with rudder	156
4.3.3.5	Final remarks on rudder Effect	158
4.4	New Vertical Tail Design Method	161
4.4.1	Isolated vertical tailplane lift curve slope	162
4.4.2	Fuselage correction factor	163
4.4.3	Wing correction factor	164
4.4.4	Horizontal tailplane correction factor	165
4.4.5	Rudder correction factor	168
4.5	Applications	168
5	Conclusions	173
A	Airfoil Optimization Tool	177
A.1	Input from GUI	178
A.2	Input from file	187
A.3	AOT Output	188
B	VeDSC - Tables of configurations	189
Bibliography		197

List of Figures

1.1	World real GDP growth %, 2011	2
1.2	Commercial Aircraft orders and GDP growth	3
1.3	Oil Price forecast	4
1.4	U.S. Airline segmentation profitability/loss	6
1.5	Long term demand for Large Turboprop, ATR Forecast, March 2010	7
1.6	Turboprop Forecast,Delivery Stream (2010-2029)	8
1.7	Turboprop Forecast,Delivery Stream (2010-2029)	8
1.8	Regional Turboprop Industry Consolidation	10
1.9	ATR-72 and DASH8-Q400 aircraft.	11
1.10	ATR-72-500/600 Composite Materials	11
1.11	ATR-72 3-View	14
1.12	ATR-72 drag breakdown main sources	16
1.13	ATR-72 drag contribution	16
1.14	ATR-72 drag polar	17
1.15	Turboprop power ratio	18
1.16	Maximum true airspeed variation due to zero lift drag coefficient	19
1.17	Fuel consumption variation due to zero lift drag coefficient . . .	20
1.18	Maximum true airspeed variation due to Oswald factor e . . .	21
1.19	Fuel consumption variation due to Oswald factor e	21
1.20	Maximum rate of climb variation due to Oswald factor e	22
1.21	Ceiling altitude variation due to Oswald factor e	22
2.1	Direct Numerical Optimization scheme.	26
2.2	Single 3 rd order Bezier curve.	28
2.3	Bezier airfoil geometry reconstruction.	29
2.4	Bezier airfoil approximation, piecewise technique.	30
2.5	Legendre polynomials.	32
2.6	Legendre's airfoil modification, small perturbation technique. .	33
2.7	PARSEC variable definition.	34
2.8	PARSEC airfoil reconstruction.	36
2.9	Nash genetic algorithm structure.	39

2.10	NACA 23015 lift coefficient, solvers comparison, $M = 0.1$, $Re = 2.6 \cdot 10^6$	43
2.11	Automated structured airfoil mesh used in the optimization loop.	44
2.12	AOT single optimization of C_d , results, fixed transition.	46
2.13	AOT single optimization of $\frac{C_l^{3/2}}{C_d}$, results, fixed transition.	48
2.14	AOT single optimization of $C_{l_{max}}$, results, fully turbulent flow.	50
2.15	AOT multi-optimization of Cruise $C_{d_{min}}$ and Climb maximum efficiency, results, fixed transition, $M = 0.43$, $Re = 19.5 \cdot 10^6$	52
2.16	AOT multi-optimization in Cruise, Climb and Stall Conditions, airfoils comparison.	54
2.17	Example of turboprop wing designed with optimized airfoil in cruise, climb and stall condition.	55
2.18	AOT multi-optimization in Cruise, Climb and Stall Conditions, results.	56
2.19	AOT high efficiency airfoil, aerodynamic results, fixed transition.	58
2.20	Fan of wind-tunell at DII.	59
2.21	AOT Variable assignment scheme.	60
2.22	Original and Optimized NashGa Airfoils. Example of solutions.	62
2.23	AOT Aerodynamic efficiency vs. drag coefficient for both not constrained and constrained case.	63
3.1	Optimization strategy scheme. MATLAB Environment.	67
3.2	NURBS curve, an example.	71
3.3	NURBS surface, an example.	71
3.4	NURBS Curves and Surface example and modifications.	75
3.5	NURBS example of Coons surface creation.	76
3.6	NURBS example wing-fuselage reconstruction.	76
3.7	ATR-72 model for the aerodynamic analysis.	77
3.8	ATR-72 wing body mesh components.	78
3.9	C_p distribution along upper, middle and lower streamlines, Cruise condition.	80
3.10	C_p contour, Cruise condition.	80
3.11	C_f distribution along upper, middle and lower streamlines, Cruise condition.	81
3.12	C_f contour, Cruise condition.	81
3.13	Example of NURBS control points and boundary curves, Karman component application, rear view.	82
3.14	Example of NURBS surface, Karman component application, rear view.	83
3.15	Aircraft nose geometry involved in the optimization loop.	84
3.16	Aircraft nose NURBS variation in height and length.	84
3.17	Aircraft nose sections comparison.	86

3.18	Aircraft nose drag coefficient during optimization process. . . .	86
3.19	Aircraft nose pressure coefficient comparison, Original and Optimized geometry.	87
3.20	C_p distribution along upper, middle and lower streamlines, Cruise condition. Comparison of Original and Optimized nose geometry.	88
3.21	ATR-72 and Bombardier Dash Q-400 Nose geometry.	88
3.22	NURBS and control points for Karman optimization.	89
3.23	Karman geometry comparison, Original (green), Optimized (red).	91
3.24	Karman main sections geometry comparison, Original (green), Optimized (red).	92
3.25	Pressure and friction coefficient on the Original and Optimized Karman geometry.	93
3.26	C_p and C_f distribution along upper streamline, Cruise condition. Comparison of Original and Optimized karman geometry. . . .	94
3.27	ATR-72 and Bombardier Dash Q-400.	94
3.28	NURBS for Fairing component optimization.	95
3.29	Original and Optimized Fairing geometry and pressure coefficient.	97
3.30	Typical turboprop mission profile.	101
3.31	Vorticity due to finite wing.	101
3.32	Winglet's main design parameters.	102
3.33	Reference wing geometry.	103
3.34	Reference wing mesh and pressure coefficient, Cruise.	104
3.35	Reference wing, square lift coefficient versus induced drag, Climb condition.	105
3.36	Reference wing lift and wing span loading distribution, Climb condition.	106
3.37	Winglet design parameters.	107
3.38	Wing lift coefficient distribution and Oswald factor variation due to toe angle.	110
3.39	Effect of cant and winglet height on e_w	111
3.40	Effect of cant and winglet height on AR	111
3.41	Effect of cant and winglet height on ARe_w	112
3.42	Effect of cant and winglet height on S_{wet}/S_{ref}	112
3.43	Effect of winglet sweep on e_w	113
3.44	Wing and Winglet geometry comparison.	114
3.45	Winglet pressure coefficient distribution.	115
3.46	Comparison of lift coefficient and wing span loading distribution for reference wing and optimal winglet, Climb condition. . . .	116
3.47	Aircraft drag coefficient variation due to winglet.	117
4.1	ATR-42 three-view.	124

4.2 Sideforce due to sideslip coefficient as a function of vertical tail aspect ratio. 125

4.3 Sideforce due to sideslip coefficient as a function of wing position. 126

4.4 Sideforce due to sideslip coefficient as a function of wing aspect ratio. 127

4.5 Sideforce due to sideslip coefficient as a function of horizontal tailplane position. 127

4.6 Sideforce due to sideslip coefficient as a function of tailplanes' relative size. 128

4.7 Sideforce due to sideslip coefficient as a function of fuselage depth. 128

4.8 CAD drafting of the model of NACA Report 540. 131

4.9 Mesh of NACA 540 test case. 131

4.10 Results of the mid-wing combination of NACA Report 540. . . 132

4.11 CAD drafting of the model of NACA TN-730. 133

4.12 Mesh of NACA TN-730 test case. 133

4.13 Results of the body-wing-fin combination of NACA TN-730. . . 134

4.14 CAD drafting of the model of NACA Report 1049. 135

4.15 Mesh of NACA 1049 test case. 135

4.16 Results of the fuselage-wing-vertical combination of NACA Report 1049. 136

4.17 CAD drafting of the CFD model. 138

4.18 The configurations of the CFD model. 140

4.19 The CAD model imported in Star-CCM+. 141

4.20 Aerodynamic coefficients as a function of base size and number of cells for the configuration of Fig. 4.21. 141

4.21 Mesh on the model used for the base size trend study. 142

4.22 CPUs scalability for a body-vertical configuration with 1800000 polyhedral cells. 142

4.23 Influence of the Reynolds number on the complete aircraft model. 142

4.24 Block shape that defines the fluid domain around the model. . 143

4.25 Isolated vertical tail geometries analyzed. 144

4.26 Lift gradient vs. aspect ratio for the isolated vertical tailplanes and sideforce coefficient. 145

4.27 Configuration involved in the analysis of the effect of the fuselage. 146

4.28 Streamlines approaching the vertical tailplane. 146

4.29 Lift gradient vs. aspect ratio for the isolated vertical tailplanes and sideforce coefficient. 147

4.30 Configurations involved in the analysis of the effect of the wing. 148

4.31 Effect of the wing at various aspect ratios and positions, with two vertical tailplanes. 148

4.32 Resume of wing effect. 149

4.33 Qualitatively representation of the windward wing-tip vortices. 150

4.34	Horizontal tailplanes' configuration.	151
4.35	Horizontal tailplane position effect	152
4.36	Effect of the relative size of tailplanes.	153
4.37	Configurations involved in the analysis of the relative size of the tailplanes.	154
4.38	Configurations involved in the rudder effect.	155
4.39	The vertical tailplane and the NACA 0012 airfoil with the trailing edge rotated to simulate a rudder deflection.	156
4.40	Linearity of the lateral force coefficient at several angles of sideslip and rudder deflection for the isolated vertical tailplane.	156
4.41	The lateral force coefficient vs. rudder deflection at zero sideslip angle for the isolated vertical tailplane.	157
4.42	Streamlines showing the asymmetric flow path in the rear part of the fuselage.	157
4.43	Values of the vertical tail lateral force coefficient at several angles of sideslip.	158
4.44	Comparison of the three wing-body-vertical combinations and the body vertical combination.	158
4.45	Streamlines around tailplanes for body-mounted and tip-mounted horizontal stabilizer configurations.	160
4.46	Comparison among 3 angles of sideslip and 2 angles of rudder deflection for the mid wing, body-mounted configuration.	160
4.47	Definition of the vertical stabilizer	162
4.48	Definitions for K_F	163
4.49	K_F coefficient	163
4.50	Definitions for K_W	164
4.51	K_W coefficient	164
4.52	Definitions for K_{Hp}	166
4.53	K_{Hp} coefficient	166
4.54	Definitions for K_{Hs}	167
4.55	K_{Hs} coefficient	167
4.56	CFD model application.	169
4.57	P2012 Geometry.	171
4.58	P2012 CFD Analysis.	171
5.1	Future Large Turbopropeller.	175
A.1	AOT main GUI.	177
A.2	AOT Import airfoil GUI.	178
A.3	AOT Airfoil to optimize dialog GUI.	178
A.4	Example of airfoil coordinates for AOT.	179
A.5	AOT Parameterization method GUI.	179

A.6	AOT Boundaries and Constraints GUI.	180
A.7	AOT Details of Bezier boundary settings.	181
A.8	AOT Details of constraints settings.	182
A.9	AOT Details of Legendre boundary settings.	183
A.10	AOT Details of PARSEC boundary settings.	184
A.11	AOT Optimization algorithm GUI.	184
A.12	AOT Objective function multi condition GUI for GA and GB algorithm.	185
A.13	AOT Objective function single condition GUI for NashGA. . .	186
A.14	AOT Text file configuration, example of settings.	187
A.15	AOT Output figures.	188

List of Tables

1.1	Airline Industry net profits (Billions U.S. dollars).	5
1.2	Fleet growth forecast.	6
1.3	Large turboprop aircraft main characteristics.	12
1.4	ATR-72 main characteristics and conditions.	15
1.5	ATR-72 Estimated performance.	18
2.1	PARSEC parameters definition.	34
2.2	AOT geometrical constraints.	40
2.3	AOT aerodynamic constraints.	40
2.4	Objective function scalar values.	42
2.5	Reference aerodynamic conditions.	44
2.6	AOT settings, low drag in cruise airfoil optimization.	45
2.7	AOT settings, high efficiency in climb airfoil optimization.	47
2.8	AOT settings, maximum lift coefficient in stall airfoil optimization.	49
2.9	AOT settings, Cruise $C_{d_{min}}$ and Climb maximum efficiency optimization.	51
2.10	AOT results, Cruise $C_{d_{min}}$ and Climb maximum efficiency optimization.	51
2.11	AOT settings, Cruise $C_{d_{min}}$ and Stall $C_{l_{max}}$ optimization.	53
2.12	AOT results, Cruise $C_{d_{min}}$ Climb maximum efficiency, Stall lift coefficient.	55
2.13	AOT settings, Wind-Tunell Fan high efficiency airfoil optimization.	57
2.14	AOT settings, Maximum Airfoil efficiency optimization.	61
3.1	Reference aerodynamic conditions	78
3.2	Wing-Body reference analysis, Cruise Condition.	79
3.3	Fuselage Nose Optimization, Cruise condition.	85
3.4	Wing-fuselage junction Optimization, Cruise condition.	90
3.5	Fairing Optimization, Cruise condition.	96
3.6	Optimized results, drag coefficient reduction for Nose, Karman and Fairing components.	98
3.7	Original and Optimized Aircraft performance comparison.	98
3.8	Reference wing geometry.	103

3.9	Winglet reference parameters.	108
3.10	Winglet parameters variation range.	108
3.11	Results for the optimal winglet.	113
3.12	Original and Winglet Aircraft performance comparison.	115
4.1	ATR-42 geometric parameters.	124
4.2	Results comparison for the ATR-42, DATCOM and ESDU method.	125
4.3	Mesh and physics data for NACA Report 540.	130
4.4	Mesh and physics data for NACA TN-730.	130
4.5	Mesh size (in % base size) for NACA TN-730.	132
4.6	Mesh and physics data for NACA Report 1049.	134
4.7	Mesh size (in % base size) for NACA Report 1049.	135
4.8	Fuselage parameters. CFD Models and reference turboprop.	137
4.9	Vertical tailplane parameters. CFD Models and reference turboprop.	137
4.10	Horizontal tailplane parameters. CFD Models and reference turboprop.	138
4.11	Mesh and physics data for the CFD model.	139
4.12	Mesh size (in % base size) for the CFD model.	143
4.13	Effects of the tip-mounted horizontal tail on different vertical tail aspect ratios.	151
4.14	Fuselage interference factors.	155
4.15	Wing interference factors.	159
4.16	Tip-mounted horizontal tail interference factors.	159
4.17	Body-mounted horizontal tail interference factors.	159
4.18	CFD Model data.	169
4.19	CFD Model results.	169
4.20	ATR-42 data.	170
4.21	ATR-42 results.	170
4.22	P2012 data.	170
4.23	P2012 results.	171

Abbreviations

AEO	All Engine Operative
AOT	Airfoil Optimization Tool
CAD	Computer Aided Design
CFD	Computetional Fluid Dynamic
CPU	Central Processing Unit
DII	Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale
DNO	Direct Numerical Optimization
EASA	European Aviation Safety Agency
ESDU	Engineering Science Data Unit
FAR	Federal Aviation Regulations
FEM	Finite Element Method
GB	Gradient Based
GA	Genetic Algorithm
ID	Inverse Design
MATLab	Matrix Laboratory (a MathWorks software)
N-S	Navier Stokes
NACA	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NURBS	Non Uniform Rational B-Spline
OEI	One Engine Inoperative
SCoPE	Sistema Cooperativo Per Elaborazioni Scientifiche Multidisciplinari
USAF DATCOM	United States Air Force Data Compendium
VeDSC	Vertical tail Design Stability and Control

Symbols

A	aspect ratio
AR	aspect ratio
C_D	3-D Drag coefficient
C_L	3-D Lift coefficient
$C_{\mathcal{L}}$	3-D Rolling moment coefficient
C_M	3-D Pitching moment coefficient
C_N	3-D Yawing moment coefficient
C_Y	3-D Sideforce coefficient
C_d	2-d Drag coefficient
C_f	friction coefficient
C_l	2-d Lift coefficient
C_m	2-d Pitching moment coefficient
C_p	pressure coefficient
P_0	maximum shaft horsepower
R/C	rate of climb
S	wing surface
S_H	horizontal tailplane surface
S_V	vertical tailplane surface
S_{TO}	take-off distance
S_{LAN}	landing distance
SHP	shaft horsepower
V_{EF}	engine failure speed
V_{MC}	minimum control speed
V_{TAS}	true airspeed

$2r$	fuselage diameter at vertical tail aerodynamic center
b	wing span
b_H	horizontal tailplane span
b_V	vertical tailplane span
b_{v1}	vertical tailplane span extended on fuselage centerline
c	wing chord
$cant_w$	winglet cant angle
c_{mac}	mean aerodynamic chord
c_v	vertical tailplane chord
d_f	fuselage diameter
e	oswald factor
e_w	wing induced drag factor
h_w	winglet height
r_w	winglet radius
r_f	fuselage half equivalent diameter
toe_w	winglet toe angle
z_w	wing position
Δ_w	winglet sweep angle
Λ	wing and tailplane sweep angle
α	angle of attack
β	angle of sideslip
ϵ_w	winglet twist angle
η_p	propeller efficiency
θ	fuselage upsweep angle
λ	taper ratio
λ_w	winglet taper ratio