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Abstract: A fully-coupled partitioned fluid-structure interaction (FSI) scheme is developed for sub- and transonic aeroelastic structures undergoing non-linear displacements. The Euler equations, written in an Arbitrary Lagrangian Eulerian (ALE) coordinate frame, describe the fluid domain while the structure is represented by a quadratic modal reduced order model (ROM). A Runge-Kutta dual-timestepping method is employed for the fluid solver, and three upwind schemes are considered viz. AUSM\textsuperscript{+} -up, HLLC and Roe schemes. The HLLC implementation is found to offer the superior balance between efficiency and robustness. The developed FSI technology is applied to modelling non-linear flutter, and the quadratic ROM demonstrated to offer dramatic improvements in accuracy over the more conventional linear method.

1 INTRODUCTION

Present day aeroelastic modelling is mature with regards to linear flutter phenomena at subsonic flow speeds [1]. There is still, though, progress required to effect efficient FSI modelling in the transonic flow regime, particularly where a combination of shocks in the fluid domain and non-linear structural response are present. This has led to the growing research into non-linear Computational Aeroelastics [2–15].

Non-linear weakly coupled aeroelastic calculations, such as staggered timestepping methods, may be prone to inaccurate or divergent solutions [16–19]. As a result we employ a strongly coupled partitioned method where coupling is effected via non-linear iterations [19–22]. The fluid domain is resolved by using detailed Computational Fluid Dynamic (CFD) and the structure domain via a non-linear ROM.

To account for the transonic shocks, the fluid is described via the compressible Euler equations written in an ALE reference frame [23–27]. We use a vertex-centred edge-based finite volume method for spacial discretisation and three upwind schemes are compared
viz. AUSM+ up scheme [28], HLLC scheme [29] and Roe scheme [30]. The MUSCL scheme [31] with van Albada limiter [32] is employed throughout. A fourth order Runge-Kutta dual-time-stepping parallel solution method is employed.

The structure is represented via a quadratic modal ROM [33–35]. This is of particular interest due to its ability to describe non-linear motion from linear modal data. It is also readily applicable to three-dimensional systems. The fluid and solid domains are strongly coupled numerically, where information is passed between the detailed CFD and structural ROM at each sub-iteration.

The developed FSI technology is implemented into the multi-physics code Elemental followed by a verification and validation exercise. The ALE capability is first assessed via modelling of the forced oscillation of a NACA0012 airfoil under transonic flow. The three upwinding schemes are compared via a grid convergence study. Next, the two-dimensional flutter-response of a pitch/plunge airfoil is considered at sub- to transonic flow speeds. We assess the improvement in accuracy of the quadratic modal ROM over the traditional linear modal ROM by comparison to an analytical ROM.

2 GOVERNING EQUATIONS

2.1 Fluid Equations

The fluid dynamics is described via non-dimensional inviscid Euler equations written in an ALE coordinate frame as:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\mathcal{V}(t)} \mathbf{U} d\mathcal{V} + \int_{\mathcal{S}(t)} \mathbf{F}_n d\mathcal{S} = 0 \quad (1)$$

where \(\mathcal{V}(t)\) denotes an arbitrary moving volume, with surface \(\mathcal{S}(t)\) and outward pointing normal vector \(\mathbf{n}\), which is translating at velocity \(\mathbf{v}\) and

$$\mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho u_1 \\ \rho u_2 \\ \rho \\ \rho E \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{F} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho u_1 \\ \rho u_2 \\ \rho E + p \rho \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

In the above equation set, \(x_j\) is a fixed Eulerian cartesian reference frame axis, \(w_j = u_j - v_j\) is the velocity relative to the moving reference frame, \(u_j\) is the fluid velocity, \(\rho\) is the density, \(p\) is the pressure and \(E\) is the specific total energy of the fluid as:

$$E = \frac{p}{(\gamma - 1) \rho} + \frac{u_j u_j}{2} \quad (3)$$

Non-dimensional quantities are related to their dimensional counterparts (denoted by *) as:

$$t = \frac{t^* U^*}{L^*}, \quad x_i = \frac{x_i^*}{L^*}, \quad u_i = \frac{u_i^*}{U^*}, \quad \rho = \frac{\rho^*}{\rho^*_\infty}, \quad p = \frac{p^*}{p^*_\infty}, \quad T = \frac{T^*}{(U^* / C_p)}, \quad E = \frac{E^*}{E^*_\infty} \quad (4)$$
where $\infty$ denotes free-stream, $t$ is time, $L$ is the characteristic length, $T$ is the characteristic temperature and $C_p$ denotes the specific heat at constant pressure.

The governing equations are closed via the ideal gas law as:

$$\rho = \frac{p}{T \gamma - 1} \quad (5)$$

while the non-dimensional acoustic velocity is given by

$$c = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma p}{\rho}} \quad (6)$$

which results in $c = c^*/U_\infty$.

In order to obtain a unique solution to the ALE Euler equations, appropriate boundary conditions must be specified. For the purpose of this work slip conditions are prescribed on the airfoil surface as:

$$u \cdot n = v \cdot n \quad (7)$$

where $n$ and denotes the boundary outward pointing normal unit vector. Characteristic boundary conditions [36] are applied at outer boundaries.

### 2.2 Solid Equations

For the purpose of this work the aeroelastic structural model is governed by a two degree-of-freedom pitch and plunge system. The equations of motion are

$$m \ddot{h} + S_\alpha \ddot{\alpha} + K_h h = -L$$
$$S_\alpha \dot{h} + I_\alpha \dot{\alpha} + K_\alpha \alpha = M_{ea} \quad (8)$$

where

- $m$ : mass of the airfoil per unit span
- $S_\alpha$ : static imbalance
- $I_\alpha$ : sectional moment of inertia of the airfoil
- $K_h$ : plunging spring coefficient
- $K_\alpha$ : pitching spring coefficient
- $h$ : vertical displacement (positive down)
- $\alpha$ : angle-of-attack
- $L$ : sectional lift per unit span
- $M_{ea}$ : sectional moment about the elastic centre (positive nose up).

and " quantities relate to second-derivatives with respect to time.
3 FLUID DISCRETISATION AND SOLUTION PROCEDURE

3.1 Spacial Discretisation

We discretise the fluid domain via a vertex-centred edge-based finite volume algorithm [37, 38]. It was selected as the method allows natural generic mesh applicability, second-order accuracy without odd-even decoupling, and computational efficiency which is greater than element based approaches.

![Figure 1: Schematic diagram of the construction of the median dual-mesh on hybrid grids. Here, Υ_{mn} depicts the edge connecting nodes m and n.](image)

The discrete form of the surface integral in Equation (1), computed for the volume V_m(t) surrounding the node m, is written as:

\[ \int_{S_m(t)} F_j n_j dS \approx \sum_{\Upsilon_{mn} \cap V_m(t)} F_{jn} C_{mn} \]

(9)

where \( \bar{\omega}_{mn} \) quantities denote edge-face values and the volume bounding surface is represented in a discrete manner via edge coefficient \( C_{mn} \). The latter for a given internal edge \( \Upsilon_{mn} \) connecting nodes m and n, is defined as a function of time as

\[ C_{mn}(t) = n^{mn1} S_{mn1}(t) + n^{mn2} S_{mn2}(t) = n^{mn} S_{mn}(t) \]

(10)

where \( S_{mn1} \) is a bounding surface-segment intersecting the edge (Figure 1) and the normal unit vectors are similarly a function of time. For the purpose of calculating the edge-face values, 3 schemes are considered and compared viz. AUSM\(^+\) –up, HLLC and Roe schemes. In all cases, 2\(^{nd}\) order MUSCL with van Albada limiter [32] is employed.

3.1.1 Roe Scheme

The ALE Roe flux is defined as [39, 40]:

\[ \bar{F}_{mn}^j = \frac{1}{2} [F_j(U_m) + F_j(U_n)] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{4} |\hat{\lambda}_i^j| \hat{a}_i^j \hat{K}_i^j \]

(11)
where $\hat{\cdot}$ are the Roe averaged values, $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ is the eigenvector and $\hat{\lambda}$ is the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix respectively. The wave speed is denoted by $\hat{\alpha}$.

### 3.1.2 HLLC Scheme

The HLLC flux [41] is calculated as:

$$
\overline{F}_{mn}^j = \begin{cases} 
F_m^j & \forall \ S_m > 0 \\
F_m^j(U_m^*) & \forall \ S_m \leq 0 < S^* \\
F_n^j(U_n^*) & \forall \ S^* \leq 0 \leq S_n \\
F_n^j & \forall \ S_n < 0
\end{cases}
$$

(12)

where

$$
\mathbf{F}(U^*) = \begin{pmatrix} 
S^*(\rho u_1)^* + p^*\delta_{i1} \\
S^*(\rho u_2)^* + p^*\delta_{i2} \\
S^*\rho^* \\
S^*(\rho E)^* + (S^* + v_j)p^*
\end{pmatrix}
$$

(13)

and the $^*$ quantities are related to the middle wave speed.

![Diagram showing the HLLC Riemann Solver and how the wave speeds $S_m$, $S^*$ and $S_n$ separate the different regions.](image)

The wave speed $S^*$, $S_m$ and $S_n$ as shown in Figure 2 are defined as

$$
S^* = \frac{\rho_n w_n (S_n - w_n) - \rho_m w_m (S_m - w_m) + p_m - p_n}{\rho_n(S_n - w_n) - \rho_m(S_m - w_m)}
$$

(14)

and

$$
S_m = \min[w_m - c_m, (\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} - \hat{c}], \quad S_n = \max[w_n + c_n, (\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} + \hat{c}]
$$

(15)

where $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\hat{c}$ are the Roe averages for the velocity vector and the acoustic velocity respectively, which are a function of the left and right nodes.
3.1.3 AUSM+ -up Scheme

The numerical flux of the AUSM+ -up scheme [28] between nodes \( n \) and \( m \) is defined as follows:

\[
\mathbf{F}_{mn}^{j} = \dot{m}_{mn} \vec{\psi}_{mn} + p_{mnj} \tag{16}
\]

where

\[
\vec{\psi}_{mn} = \begin{cases} 
\vec{\psi}_m & \text{if } \dot{m}_{mn} > 0 \\
\vec{\psi}_n & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} ; \\
\mathbf{p}_{mn} = \begin{pmatrix} p_{\delta_{1j}} \\
p_{\delta_{2j}} \\
0 \\
\rho v_j \end{pmatrix} _{mn} ; \\
\vec{\psi} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\
u_2 \\
1 \\
H \end{pmatrix} \tag{17}
\]

and \( H = E + p/\rho \). Further the mass flux is defined as:

\[
\dot{m}_{mn} = c_{mn} M_{mn} \begin{cases} 
\rho_m & \text{if } M_{mn} > 0 \\
\rho_n & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \tag{18}
\]

where \( c_{mn} \) is the acoustic velocity at the interface and the Mach number at the interface is given by

\[
M_{mn} = \mathcal{M}^+(M_m) + \mathcal{M}^-(M_n) - K_p \max(1 - \sigma \overline{M}^2, 0) \frac{p_n - p_m}{0.5(\rho_m + \rho_n)c_{mn}^2} \tag{19}
\]

where \( M \) is the reference Mach number and \( \mathcal{M} \) is the Mach number split function. The pressure flux can be written as:

\[
p_{mn} = \mathcal{P}^+(M_m)p_m + \mathcal{P}^-(M_n)p_n - K_u \mathcal{P}^+(M_m)\mathcal{P}^-(M_n)(\rho_m + \rho_n)c_{mn}(w_n - w_m) \tag{20}
\]

where \( \mathcal{P}^+ \) and \( \mathcal{P}^- \) are the pressure split function.

In the above equations \( 0 \leq K_p \leq 1, \sigma \leq 1 \) and \( 0 \leq K_u \leq 1 \), for all the calculations in this work we set \( K_p = 0.25 \), \( \sigma = 1 \) and \( K_u = 0.75 \).

3.2 Temporal Discretisation and Solution Procedure

Consider the following semi-discrete form for the fluid governing equation

\[
\frac{dU}{dt} = - \int_{S(t)} \mathbf{F}^jn_j dS \tag{21}
\]

A dual-time-stepping procedure is employed for solution purposes as

\[
\frac{\Delta U}{\Delta \tau^*} V^\tau = - \int_{S(t)} \mathbf{F}^jn_j dS \bigg|_{\tau^*}^\tau + S^* V^\tau = R(U^{n+1}) \tag{22}
\]

where the \( \tau \) superscript denotes the previous (existing) solution or pseudo time-step and \( \Delta \tau = t^{\tau+1} - t^\tau \). The source \( S \) is the real-time temporal term which is discretised via a second order backward difference method and fourth-order Runge-Kutta is employed for solution purposes.
4 STRUCTURAL REDUCED ORDER MODEL

The aeroelastic governing Equation (8) may be cast into a non-dimensional ROM form in a manner suitable for solution as

\[ \dot{r} = [\Psi] r + \{\Phi\} \]

where the state vector \( r = \{r_1, r_2\} \), with \( r_1 = \{h/b, \alpha\} \) and \( r_2 = \dot{r}_1 \). Here \( b \) is the airfoil semi-chord. Further

\[ \Psi = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & [I] \\ -[M]^{-1}[K] & 0 \end{bmatrix} \; \Phi = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ [M]^{-1}[Q] \end{bmatrix} \]

where \( M, K \) and \( I \) respectively denote the modal mass, stiffness and identity matrices given as

\[ M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_\alpha \\ x_\alpha & r_\alpha^2 \end{bmatrix} \; K = \begin{bmatrix} \left(\frac{\omega_h}{x_\alpha}\right)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & r_\alpha^2 \end{bmatrix} \]

where \( x_\alpha \) and \( r_\alpha^2 \) denote structural parameters defined as \( \frac{S}{mb} \) and \( \frac{I}{mb^2} \) respectively. Further, \( \omega_h \) and \( \omega_\alpha \) denote the uncoupled natural frequencies of plunge and pitch respectively. The generalised force vector, \( Q \), is calculated for the general case as

\[ Q_i = \sum_{j}^{nodes} f_j \cdot \frac{dx^j}{dr_1} \]

where \( x^j \) and \( f^j \) respectively denote displaced coordinate and aerodynamic force at node \( j \) on the airfoil surface. The manner in which \( x \) is related to the state vector \( r \) determines the type of ROM which results. In the 2D pitch-plunge case the following analytical expression may be employed

\[ \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \alpha & -\sin \alpha \\ \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1^0 - x_1^c \\ x_2^0 - x_2^c \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} x_1^c \\ x_2^c \end{bmatrix} \]

where \( x_1^0 \) is the position at rest (\( \alpha = 0 \)) and \( x_1^c \) is the coordinate of the airfoil elastic axis at rest. When considering extension to 3D, an analytical expression is typically not known for the general case, and the norm is to employ an expression which is derived from linear modal analysis viz.

\[ x^j = x^{0j} + \sum_{i}^{nodes} r_i \hat{u}_i^j \]
where \( \hat{u} \) is a normalised linear mode shape (eigen vector), which for the 2D pitch-plunge case is \( \hat{u}_1 = (0, -b) \) and \( \hat{u}_2 = (x_2 - x_2^c, x_1^c - x_1) \). This results in the following generically applicable linear expression for the generalised force vector:

\[
Q_i = \sum_{j}^{\text{nodes}} f^j \cdot \hat{u}_i^j
\]  

(29)

In this work however, we propose to improve on the accuracy of the linear ROM via the use of a so-called quadratic extension viz.

\[
x^j = x^0 + \sum_{i}^{\text{modes}} r_i \hat{u}_i^j + \sum_{i}^{\text{modes}} \sum_{k} r_i r_k \hat{g}^j_{ik}
\]  

(30)

which results in no significant additional FSI computational cost. The resulting generalised force expression reads

\[
Q_i = \sum_{j}^{\text{nodes}} f^j \cdot \hat{u}_i^j + \sum_{j}^{\text{nodes}} \sum_{k} 2r_k f^j \cdot \hat{g}^j_{ik}
\]  

(31)

where for the 2D pitch-plunge case

\[
\hat{g}_{11} = (0, 0); \quad \hat{g}_{12} = (0, 0); \quad \hat{g}_{21} = (0, 0); \quad \hat{g}_{22} = \left( \frac{x_1 - x_1^c}{2}, \frac{x_2 - x_2^c}{2} \right)
\]  

(32)

The above results in an initial value problem, for which the spatial accuracy depends on whether the analytical, linear or quadratic expressions are employed. In this work we solve each resulting system accurately via a fourth order Runge-Kutta method, where fourth order Lagrange polynomials are employed to calculate \( Q \) at the second and third steps.

5 FSI SOLUTION AND DYNAMIC MESH MOVEMENT

At the fluid-solid interface, the following equations for traction, displacement and velocity are prescribed:

\[
(p_f) n_j = -(p_s) n_j \\
\mathbf{u}_f = \mathbf{v}_s \\
\mathbf{x}_f = \mathbf{x}_s
\]  

(33)

where the subscripts \( f \) and \( s \) respectively denote fluid and solid and \( n_j \) is the related outward pointing normal unit vector. The above are prescribed as part of the pseudo-stepping iterative procedure.
For the purpose of mesh movement, we employ a simple and efficient interpolation scheme which is well suited to parallel computing. Here, an internal node is moved as a function of the displacement of the closest two boundary points (identified at the start of the simulation) as follows:

\[ \delta \mathbf{x} = r \delta \mathbf{x}_1 + (1 - r) \delta \mathbf{x}_2 \]

where \( \delta \mathbf{x}_1 \) and \( \delta \mathbf{x}_2 \) are respectively the displacements of the closest internal and external boundary points, and \( r \), which varies between zero and one, is computed as

\[ r = \frac{D_2^p}{D_1^p + D_2^p} \text{ with } p = 3/2 \]

Here \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) are the distances to the identified boundary points. Since the closest points and the values of \( r \) are calculated only once at the beginning of the analysis, the application of the mesh movement function is essentially instantaneous, and the mesh does not deteriorate due to repeated oscillations.

6 EVALUATION

6.1 Transonic Forced Oscillation

Prior to applying the developed technology to an FSI problem, we evaluate its efficiency to predict time-dependent loads. The benchmark problem selected for this purpose is the AGARD test case No. 5 [42], which involves a NACA0012 undergoing forced sinusoidal pitching in flow at a Mach number of \( M_\infty = 0.755 \). The angle of attack of the airfoil is varied as a function of non-dimensional time \( t \) as

\[ \alpha = \alpha_0 + \alpha_{max} \sin(2k_c t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (34)

where \( k_c = 0.0814 \) denotes the reduced frequency, and the mean and maximum angles of attack are respectively \( \alpha_0 = 0.016^\circ \) and \( \alpha_{max} = 2.51^\circ \).

The three upwinding schemes were evaluated via a grid convergence study. For this purpose three unstructured meshes were employed consisting of 5,000; 15,000 and 40,000 vertexes (sample mesh shown in Figure 3). The predicted time varying lift and moment coefficients are depicted in Figures 4. As shown, the calculated unsteady loads compare well with experimental data as well as that of others [23, 24, 26, 43] thus verifying the transonic load calculation aspect of the developed solver.

With regards to scheme comparison, the grid converges indexes (GCIs) [44] for the three upwind schemes on the three meshes are given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upwind Scheme</th>
<th>GCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roe scheme</td>
<td>1.09 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLLC scheme</td>
<td>0.93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSM\textsuperscript{+}–up scheme</td>
<td>0.38 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Table GCIs for the upwind schemes

The rate of convergence for the three upwind schemes was calculated using the Richardson Extrapolation. Figure 5 shows that the three schemes are between 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} order
Figure 3: (a) Mesh employed for the transonic forced oscillation of a NACA0012 airfoil, the mesh consists of 15,000 vertexes. (b) Pressure contours around the NACA0012 airfoil.

Figure 4: Graph of (a) $C_L$ versus $\alpha$ and (b) $C_M$ versus $\alpha$ for the forced oscillation of the NACA0012 airfoil.

accuracy. This is to be expected as the upwind schemes are reduced to 1$^{st}$ order in the region of the shock. Though AUSM$^+$-up offers superior GCI performance, HLLC shows consistent asymptotic behaviour while being the least costly to compute. As a result, the latter method was employed for the FSI test–cases.

Figure 5: Graph of the difference between the predicted $C_L$ and the Richardson Extrapolation $C_L$ versus mesh size.
6.2 Subsonic Flutter

The first FSI test-case consists of the subsonic flutter problem for a NACA64A010 airfoil at \( M = 0.3 \). The test case is based on the classical incompressible two degree–of–free example of Rodden [45]. In this problem damping has been included into the structural governing equations with the employed structural parameters being

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\alpha & \beta & \alpha & a \\
0.1 & 0.25 & 0.4 & 20 & -0.2
\end{array}
\]

where \( \beta \) denotes the airfoil mass ratio and \( a \) denotes the non-dimensionalised position along the chord of the elastic centre. The reduced frequency, \( k_c \), corresponds to the linear flutter speed. We use an unstructured mesh consisting of around 5,000 vortexes. The airfoil is given one forced pitching oscillation where \( \alpha_{\text{max}} = 1.0^\circ \) and the mean angle of attack is zero after which it is allowed to interact freely with the fluid. The flutter response calculated via the linear and quadratic ROMs is compared to the analytical method in 6. It is noteworthy that the quadratic ROM offers not only an accurate solution, but a significant improvement over the linear ROM.

![Graph of the Plunge Displacement and Pitch Angle versus time for the NACA64A010 airfoil, \( M_\infty = 0.3 \)](image)

6.3 Transonic Flutter

The last FSI benchmark problem considers the transonic flow over a two-dimensional representation of a swept-wing (similar to that proposed by Isogai [46]). We however employ the FFAST airfoil (see Acknowledgements), with the following parameters:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
x_\alpha & r_\alpha & \frac{\alpha_{\text{max}}}{\infty} & \beta & a \\
1.8 & 3.48 & 1.0 & 60 & -2.0
\end{array}
\]

Here we non-dimensionalise \( a \) with the semichord, thus the the elastic centre is positioned half a chord length in front of the leading edge for this problem. The airfoil is given the same forced oscillation as the subsonic case. As previously, the quadratic ROM offers an
accurate solution, while the linear ROM exhibits non-physical decaying amplitudes. The mesh consisting of circa 5,000 vortexes and is shown in Figure 7.

The results of the analytical, linear ROM and quadratic ROM methods of moving the airfoil are compared in Figure 8. In this problem it is noted that the linear ROM approximation is not as inaccurate as the subsonic case, this is due to smaller rotation of the airfoil.

![Figure 7: (a) Mesh employed for the transonic swept-wing model of a FFAST airfoil, the mesh consists of 5000 vertexes. (b) Pressure contours around the FFAST airfoil](image)

![Figure 8: Graph of the (a) Plunge Displacement and the (b) Pitch Angle versus time for the FFAST airfoil, $M_\infty = 0.8$](image)

7 CONCLUSION

A fully-coupled partitioned FSI scheme was developed for sub- and transonic aeroelastic structures undergoing non-linear displacements. The Euler equations, written in an ALE coordinate frame, described the fluid domain while the structure was represented by a quadratic modal ROM. A Runge-Kutta dual-timestepping method was employed for the fluid solver, and three upwind schemes considered viz. AUSM$^+$ -up, HLLC and Roe schemes. HLLC and AUSM$^+$ -up were shown to be notionally second-order accurate, but the HLLC implementation was found to offer the superior balance between efficiency and robustness. The developed FSI technology was applied to modelling non-linear flutter, and the quadratic modal ROM demonstrated to offer dramatic improvements in accuracy over the more conventional linear modal method.
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