

Technical Comments

TECHNICAL COMMENTS are brief discussions of papers previously published in this journal. They should not exceed 1500 words (where a figure or table counts as 200 words). The author of the previous paper is invited to submit a reply for publication in the same issue as the Technical Comment. These discussions are published as quickly as possible after receipt of the manuscripts. Neither AIAA nor its Editors are responsible for the opinions expressed by the authors.

Comment on “Thickness and Camber Effects in Slender Wing Theory”

Ana Laverón-Simavilla* and José Manuel Perales†
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, E-28040 Madrid, Spain

IN the paper by Plotkin,¹ first-order corrections to slender wing theory² were developed due to spanwise thickness and camber distributions. The velocity potential $\phi(x, y, z)$ calculated in the paper¹ actually corresponds to the flow having zero normal velocity at the body contour and a vertical velocity at infinity proportional to the angle of attack $[\phi_z(x, y, |z| \rightarrow \infty) = U\alpha]$. The mentioned velocity potential ϕ is not the perturbation velocity potential of the inner flow, $\phi'(x, y, z)$, having a vertical velocity $-\alpha U$ at the body contour and zero velocity at infinity.³ Therefore, the lift obtained by an integration of the pressure jump over the wing surface, calculated using ϕ , should have been calculated using ϕ' in Plotkin's

Eqs. (20–22), the difference in the lift value being

$$\rho U^2 S_b \alpha \quad (1)$$

where S_b is the area of the final section, which is zero for wings without thickness but should be retained in the case considered in Plotkin's paper.

Particularly, for the elliptical cross-sectional wing solved in Plotkin's paper,¹ this new term cancels out the perturbation term $\frac{1}{2}\pi A\alpha\epsilon$ calculated in the paper, which is, finally,

$$C_L = \frac{1}{2}\pi A\alpha \quad (2)$$

Up to the considered approximation, there is no contribution of the thickness of a wing with the considered shape to the lift.

For the elliptical section wing, Eq. (2) can also be obtained using the Joukowski conformal transform to map the ellipse into a circle. It is not necessary, for this particular case, to use the expansion in Plotkin's paper¹ Eq. (4). Therefore, it can be stated that for slender wings with elliptical sections, there is no contribution to the lift due to its thickness.

References

- ¹Plotkin, A., “Thickness and Camber Effects in Slender Wing Theory,” *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 12, 1983, pp. 1755–1757.
- ²Jones, R. T., “Properties of Low-Aspect-Ratio Pointed Wings at Speeds Below and Above the Speed of Sound,” NACA Rept. 835, 1946.
- ³Ashley, H., and Landahl, M., *Aerodynamics of Wings and Bodies*, Addison Wesley, Reading, MA, 1965, Chap. 6.

Received 12 January 2004; accepted for publication 1 February 2005.
Copyright © 2005 by Ana Laverón-Simavilla. Published by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc., with permission. Copies of this paper may be made for personal or internal use, on condition that the copier pay the \$10.00 per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923; include the code 0001-1452/05 \$10.00 in correspondence with the CCC.

*Associate Professor, Instituto Ignacio da Riva, Escuela Técnica Superior de Ingenieros Aeronáuticos.

†Professor, Instituto Ignacio da Riva, Escuela Técnica Superior de Ingenieros Aeronáuticos. Member AIAA.

H. Reed
Associate Editor