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Scope of the work

- Analyse the potential of meta-modelling techniques based on Radial Basis Functions (RBF) in aeroacoustics.

- Develop dynamic meta-models for high-efficiency optimisation in presence of aeroacoustic objectives and constraints.

- Estimate the uncertainty related to breakthrough technologies in general-purpose analysis tools.
Sustainable development of civil aviation is strongly **noise-constrained**

Aeroacoustics must be considered in the conceptual design phase

Simple noise models are not available for innovative concepts

**ARTEM** *(Aircraft noise Reduction Technologies and related Environmental iMpact)*

Robust MOCDO of unconventional configurations including **low-noise objectives and/or constraints**

**ANIMA** *(Aviation Noise Impact Management through Novel Approaches)*

Stand-alone models to include **new technologies** and concepts in **impact** management and analysis tools
The tool

FRIDA (FRamework for Innovative Design in Aeronautics)

Multi–Objective, Multi–disciplinary Robust Design Optimization environment developed by Roma Tre Aircraft Design Group for classic (T&W) and innovative (BWB, PP) configurations
Summary

- Meta-Models (MM) definition
- RBF-based deterministic and adaptive-stochastic MM
- Simple 1D benchmark
- An early application to shielding (1D and 2D)
- Current activity
Meta-model = the model of a model

In our context: a fast model reproducing the response of a costly simulation
Meta-model = the model of a model

The Training Set (TS) gives the response at a set of points
Meta-model = the model of a model

The Meta-Model (MM) reproduces the response at any \( x \in D_{TS} \)
Accuracy is strongly application–dependent

- Location and number of TS points
- Properties of the target response $f(x, y)$
- Characteristics of the surrogate model $\hat{f}(x, y)$

Many different approaches are available . . .
In the present work we focus on Radial Basis Fuctions (RBF)

- Simple implementation
- Demonstrated effectiveness in medium– to high–dimensional problems
- Versatility: the choice of the RBF kernel makes possible the tailoring of the MM
Deterministic RBF MM

**RBF MM**

Given a training set TS of \( M \) points \( [\xi_i, f(\xi_i)]_{i=1}^{M} \), with \( \text{Dim}(\xi) = N \), the RBF model of the sampled response is

\[
\hat{f}(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} w_i \varphi\left( |\xi - \xi_i| \right)
\]

Weights \( w_i \) are obtained by imposing the reproduction of TS, \( \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{f} \), with \( [\mathbf{A}]_{ij} = \varphi\left( |\xi_i - \xi_j| \right) \).

**RBF Kernels**

Kernel choice is a key point (Gaussian \( \varphi(r) = e^{-(\gamma r)^2} \), Inverse quadratic \( \varphi(r) = 1 / \left[ 1 + (\gamma r)^2 \right] \) \ldots ). For the moment, let’s start with simple polyharmonic splines

\[
\varphi(r) = r^\epsilon, \quad \epsilon = 1, 3, 5, \ldots
\]
Deterministic RBF MM

**RBF tuning**

Specifically, we will use the cubed Euclidean distance

\[
\varphi(|\mathbf{\xi} - \mathbf{\xi}_i|) = \left( \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{N} (\xi_k - \xi_k^i)^2} \right)^3
\]

The RBF sensitivity to local curvature can be mitigated with an auto–tuning procedure

\[
\varphi(|\mathbf{\xi} - \mathbf{\xi}_i|) = \left[ \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k^2 (\xi_k - \xi_k^i)^2} \right]^3
\]

where \(c_k\) is a function of max local curvature.
A simple benchmark

The problem

- **Target**: field induced by a moving isotropic point source in a co–moving region
- **Design variable**: position of the source $x_s$
- **Parameters**: Mach number $M_s$, observer location $x_M$
A simple benchmark

**Design and Training spaces**

- **Design space**: region of the physical space where the source can be located
- **Training space**: region of the abstract space of all the possible experiments

\[ \xi = \begin{cases} x_s & \text{M (proc. var.)} \\ M_s & \text{x_M (design var.)} \end{cases} \]
A simple benchmark

- $\mathbf{x}_s \in [(0.5, 0.5), (2, 2)]$
- A line of $N$ microphones along $z = 0$
- $M_s \in (0.2, 0.4)$

Here, the training set comprises $N_s = 5$ source positions, $N = 40$ monitoring points and 3 values for Mach.

**Number of training experiments is $N_p = 600$**

**Off–set and off–domain evaluations**

- TS reproduction
- Off-set prediction
- Off-domain prediction
A simple benchmark

\[ M_s = 0.2, \ x_s \equiv (1.5, 1.5) \]

\[ M_s = 0.2, \ x_s \equiv (0.5, 0.5) \]

Training set reproduction

\[ M_s \notin TS, \ x_s \in TS \]

\[ M_s \in TS, \ x_s \notin TS \]

\[ M_s \notin TS, \ x_s \notin TS \]

Off set prediction

\[ M_s \notin D_T, \ x_s \in D_T \]

\[ M_s \in D_T, \ x_s \notin D_T \]

\[ M_s \notin D_T, \ x_s \notin D_T \]

Off domain prediction
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So, for deterministic MM...

- Definition of the best TS is not a trivial task (D.O.E.? ...EXPENSIVE !)
- Verification of MM accuracy needs the time-consuming model to be run
- Improvement of the MM can be a resource-draining task
So, for deterministic MM...

- Definition of the best TS is not a trivial task (D.O.E.? ... EXPENSIVE!)
- Verification of MM accuracy needs the time-consuming model to be run
- Improvement of the MM can be a resource-draining task

Let's go
DYNAMIC, ADAPTIVE and STOCHASTIC!
**Stochastic RBF MM**

**Stochastic RBF**

\[
\varphi (|\xi - \xi_i|) = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \left( \xi_k - \xi_{i_k} \right)^2}, \quad \epsilon \sim \text{Unif} [\epsilon_{\text{min}}, \epsilon_{\text{max}}] \equiv D_\epsilon
\]

**Stochastic MM**

Is the expected value \( EV \) of \( \hat{f} \) over \( \epsilon \)

\[
\hat{f}_s(\xi) = EV \left[ \hat{f}(\xi, \epsilon) \right] = \int_{D_\epsilon} \hat{f}(\xi, \epsilon) P(\epsilon) \, d\epsilon
\]
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Each estimate of \( \hat{f}_s(\xi) \) is associated to an uncertainty \( U_{\hat{f}}(\xi) \).

It is defined as the difference of the relevant \( \alpha \)-quantiles

\[
U_{\hat{f}}(\xi) = q(\alpha_1, \xi) - q(\alpha_2, \xi) = CDF^{-1}(\alpha_1, \xi) - CDF^{-1}(\alpha_2, \xi)
\]

with

\[
CDF(y, \xi) = \int_{D_\epsilon} H[y - \hat{f}(\xi, \epsilon)] P(\epsilon) \, d\epsilon
\]
Dynamic–Adaptive MM

**MM quality**

$U_\hat{f}(\xi)$ can be used to measure the local reliability of the MM.

A dynamically adaptive MM can be built

1. Build the MM on the current TS
2. Search for $\text{Max}[U_\hat{f}(\xi)], \xi \in D_T$
3. Increase TS with new point at $U_{\text{max}}$ and update MM (with the costly model)
4. Stop when $U_{\text{max}} \leq U_{\text{conv}}$
The simple benchmark

Same as before, but now with dynamic, stochastic approach

- $U(f(\xi)) = q(0.975, \xi) - q(0.025, \xi)$ (95% confidence band)
- $U_{conv} = 10^{-5}$
- Initial TS with $M = 3$
- Monte Carlo method with 15 random samples for $\epsilon \in [1, 3]$
A simple benchmark

Progressive update of TS
A simple benchmark

- Additional samples only where needed (high uncertainty)
- Uncertainty quantification using the MM $\Rightarrow$ FAST!
- Minimises the calls to the high-fidelity model (only TS update)
- Once that $U_{\hat{f}} < \epsilon$ a deterministic model (faster, no Monte Carlo) can be built on the converged TS
A simple 1D shielding exercise

The problem

- **Target**: $\Delta SEL$ at a monitoring point located 2 chords underneath a NACA 0012 foil
- **Design variable**: position of the source along the chord, $x_s$ at 0.1 chord above the foil

The TS is one–dimensional and coincides with $\mathcal{D}$

$$\xi = x_s$$
A simple 1D shielding exercise

The TS is updated when $U_{\text{max}} \leq 0.001$

- $U_{\tilde{f}}(\xi) = q(0.975, \xi) - q(0.025, \xi)$ (95% confidence band), $U_{\text{conv}} = 10^{-5}$
- Monte Carlo method with 15 random samples for $\epsilon \in [1, 3]$
- Airfoil scattering calculated with in-house convective 2D BEM code

Progressive update of TS
A simple 2D shielding exercise

The problem

- **Target**: $\Delta SEL$ at a monitoring point located 2 chords underneath a NACA 0012 foil
- **Design variable**: position of the source along the chord, $x_s$ at 0.1 chord above the foil
- **Parameter**: Mach number $M_s$ of the uniform stream

$$\xi = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} x_s \\ M_s \end{array} \right\}$$
A simple 2D shielding exercise

Same procedure: the TS is updated when $U_{\text{max}} \leq 0.001$

- $U_f(\xi) = q(0.975, \xi) - q(0.025, \xi)$ (95% confidence band), $U_{\text{conv}} = 10^{-5}$
- Monte Carlo method with 15 random samples for $\epsilon \in [1, 3]$
Current activity

- Tailored RBF kernel (oscillating, decaying, complex . . . )
- Selection of appropriate stochastic parameters
- High–dimensional training spaces
- Adaptive strategies for dynamic update
The work is a preliminary analysis of modern meta–modelling techniques applied to aeroacoustic problems.

- The general approach adopting RBF with standard polyharmonic kernels appears to be promising.
- The potentiality of tailored RBF kernels deserves a careful investigation to be completely disclosed.
Concluding remarks

- The work is a preliminary analysis of modern meta-modelling techniques applied to aeroacoustic problems.
- The general approach adopting RBF with standard polyharmonic kernels appears to be promising.
- The potentiality of tailored RBF kernels deserves a careful investigation to be completely disclosed.

Thank you!