https://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=19930091801 2020-06-17T02:38:00+00:00Z

NACATH 123

 36

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

REPORT No. 723

WIND-TUNNEL INVESTIGATION OF NACA 23012, 23021 AND 23030 AIRFOILS EQUIPPED WITH 40-PERCENT-CHORD DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

By THOMAS A. HARRIS and ISIDOR**E G. RECANT**

AERONAUTIC SYMBOLS

1. FUNDAMENTAL AND DERIVED UNITS

2. GENERAL SYMBOLS

 $Weight = mg$ $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ Standard acceleration of gravity=9.80665 m/s² or 32.1740 ft/sec²
Mass = $\frac{W}{a}$

 W

 \mathfrak{g}

 $\it m$

 \boldsymbol{I}

 μ

2626°

- Kinematic viscosity
-
- $\begin{tabular}{ll} ρ & Rmennatic viscosity \\ ρ & Density (mass per unit volume) \\ Standard density of dry air, 0.12497 kg-m⁻⁴-s² at 15^o C \\ and 760 mm; or 0.002378 lb-ft⁻⁴ sec² \\ Specific weight of "standard" air, 1.2255 kg/m³ or 0.07651 lb/cu ft \end{tabular}$
-

Mass = $\frac{1}{g}$
Moment of inertia= mk^2 . (Indicate axis of
radius of gyration k by proper subscript.)
Coefficient of viscosity

REPORT No. 723

WIND-TUNNEL INVESTIGATION OF NACA 23012, 23021 AND 23030 AIRFOILS EQUIPPED WITH 40-PERCENT-CHORD DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

By THOMAS A. HARRIS and ISIDORE G. RECANT **Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory**

 $I \sim \alpha$

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONALITICS

HEADQUARTERS, NAVY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Created by act of Congress approved March 3, 1915, for the supervision and direction of the scientific study of the problems of flight (U. S. Code, Title 50, Sec. 151). Its membership was increased to 15 by act approved March 2, 1929. The members are appointed by the President, and serve as such without compensation.

VANNEVAR BUSH, Sc. D., Chairman, ROBERT E. DOHERTY, M. S., Washington, D. C. Pittsburgh, Pa. GEORGE J. MEAD, Sc. D., Vicc Chairman, ROBERT H. HINCKLEY, A. B., Washington, D. C. Assistant Secretary of Commerce. JEROME C. HUNSAKER, Sc. D., CHARLES G. ABBOT, Sc. D., Secretary, Smithsonian Institution. Cambridge, Mass. HENRY H. ARNOLD, Major General, United States Army, SYDNEY M. KRAUS, Captain, United States Navy. Deputy Chief of Staff, Chief of the Air Corps, War Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department. Department. FRANCIS W. REICHELDERFER, Sc. D., GEORGE H. BRETT, Major General, United States Army. Chief, United States Weather Bureau. JOHN H. TOWERS, Rear Admiral, United States Navy, Acting Chief of the Air Corps, War Department. LYMAN J. BRIGGS, Ph. D., Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department. Director, National Bureau of Standards. EDWARD WARNER, Sc. D., DONALD H. CONNOLLY, B. S., Washington, D. C. Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. ORVILLE WRIGHT, Sc. D., Dayton, Ohio.

GEORGE W. LEWIS, Director of Aeronautical Research

S. PAUL JOHNSTON, Coordinator of Research

JOHN F. VICTORY, Secretary

HENRY J. E. REID, Engineer-in-Charge, Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory, Langley Field. Va.

SMITH J. DEFRANCE, Engineer-in-Charge, Ames Aeronautical Laboratory. Moffett Field. Calif.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEES

AERODYNAMICS
POWER PLANTS FOR AIRCRAFT
AIRCRAFT MATERIALS

Coordination of Research Needs of Military and Civil Aviation

Preparation of Research Programs

Allocation of Problems

Prevention of Duplication

Consideration of Inventions

LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

LANGLEY FIELD, VA.

Conduct, under unified control, for all agencies, of scientific research on the fundamental problems of flight.

OFFICE OF AERONAUTICAL INTELLIGENCE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Collection, classification, compilation, and dissemination of scientific and technical information on aeronautics

TT

AMES AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES
AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS
INVENTIONS AND DESIGNS

MOFFETT FIELD, CALIF.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

HEADQUARTERS, NAVY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Created by act of Congress approved March 3, 1915, for the supervision and direction of the scientific study of the problems of flight (U.S. Code, Title 50, Sec. 151). Its membership was increased to 15 by act approved March 2, 1929. The members are appointed by the President, and serve as such without compensation.

VANNEVAR BUSH, Sc. D., Chairman, ROBERT E. DOHERTY, M. S., Washington, D. C. Pittsburgh, Pa. GEORGE J. MEAD, Sc. D., Vice Chairman, ROBERT H. HINCKLEY, A. B., Washington, D. C. Assistant Secretary of Commerce. CHARLES G. ABBOT, Sc. D., JEROME C. HUNSAKER, Sc. D., Secretary, Smithsonian Institution. Cambridge, Mass. HENRY H. ARNOLD, Major General, United States Army, SYDNEY M. KRAUS, Captain, United States Navy. Deputy Chief of Staff, Chief of the Air Corps, War Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department. Department. FRANCIS W. REICHELDERFER, Sc. D., GEORGE H. BRETT, Major General, United States Army, Chief, United States Weather Bureau. Acting Chief of the Air Corps, War Department. JOHN H. TOWERS, Rear Admiral, United States Navy, LYMAN J. BRIGGS, Ph. D., Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department. Director, National Bureau of Standards. EDWARD WARNER, Sc. D., DONALD H. CONNOLLY, B. S., Washington, D. C. ORVILLE WRIGHT, Sc. D., Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. Dayton, Ohio.

GEORGE W. LEWIS, Director of Aeronautical Research

S. PAUL JOHNSTON, Coordinator of Research

JOHN F. VICTORY, Secretary

HENRY J. E. REID, Engineer-in-Charge, Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory, Langley Field, Va.

SMITH J. DEFRANCE, Engineer-in-Charge, Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEES

**LERODYNAMICS
POWER PLANTS FOR AIRCRAFT
LIRCRAFT MATERIALS**

AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES
AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS
INVENTIONS AND DESIGNS

Coordination of Research Needs of Military and Civil Aviation

Preparation of Research Programs **Allocation of Problems**

Prevention of Duplication

Consideration of Inventions

LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

LANGLEY FIELD, VA.

Conduct, under unified control, for all agencies, of scientific research on the fundamental problems of flight.

OFFICE OF AERONAUTICAL INTELLIGENCE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Collection, classification, compilation, and dissemination of scientific and technical information on aeronautics

 $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$

AMES AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

MOFFETT FIELD, CALIF.

REPO**RT N**o**.** *7***23**

WIND-TUNNEL INVESTIGATION O**F NACA 23012, 23021***,* **AND 23030 AIRFOILS EQUIPPED WITH 40-PERCENT-CHORD DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS**

By THOMAS A. HARRIS and ISADORE G. RECANT

teristics and envelope polar curves are given for each airfoil-

dan combination The effect of airfoil-thickness is shown thick airfoil are reported in reference 8. *flap* combination. The effect of airfoil thickness is shown,
and comparisons are made of single slotted flaps with The data presented in reference 8 indicated that the

for the 30-percent-thick *airfoil.* For *any airfoil thickness*, $\begin{bmatrix} 23030 \text{ artools}, \text{each} \\ \text{double} \text{ slotted flip}. \end{bmatrix}$ *the double slotted fla*p *gave a higher value of section* m*axi*- double slotted flap. mum lift coefficient than either the 40-percent-chord or the
25.66-percent-chord single slotted flaps. The large lift **container COVID-PLAIN AIRFOILS** 25.66 -percent-chord single slotted flaps. The large lift 20.66 -percent-chord single slotted flaps were accompanied *louble and the single slotted flaps gave about the same sec-*

INTRODUCTION SLOTTED **FLAPS**

mas undertaken an extensive investigation of various used in the single single single single single single in ref mproving the safety and the performance of airplanes, portion of the aircreductor of the aircreductor of the automation of the slot of the A high-lift device capable of producing high lift with shape was formed by cutting the trailing edge of the
variable drag for landing and high lift with low drag main flap. The slot shapes for the three airfoils are or take-off and initial climb is believed to be desirable. Shown in figure 1. Shown is figure 1. Shown in figure 1.)ther desirable aerodynamic features are no increase **Flaps.—**The flap contours were the same as those used
n drag with the flap neutral; small change in pitching in the investigation of the single slotted flaps reported noment with flap deflection; low forces required to in references 1 to 5. The main flap was hinged to the perate the flap; and freedom from possible hazard due \vert main portion of the airfoil by special fittings, and the perate the flap; and freedom from possible hazard due o icing.

ingle-slotted flap on airfoils of 12-, 21-, and 30-percent given in table II. The deflection of the main flap is
hickness are reported in references 1 to 3; results of a measured between the flap chord and the chord of th

SUMMAR**Y** 40-percent-chord single-slotted flap **o**n the same air**-***An* investigation was conducted in the NACA γ - by $\begin{bmatrix} \text{foils are reported in references 3, 4, and 5.} \end{bmatrix}$. The Fowler *lO-foot* wind *tunnel* to *determine* the *effect* of the *deflection* and the venetian-blind flaps have also been investigated of main and *auxiliary* slotted flaps on the *aerodynamic* on the 12-percent-thick airfoil, a of main and auxiliary slotted flaps on the aerodynamic on the 12-percent-thick airfoil, and the results are re-
section characteristics of large-chard NACA 23012 23021 ported in references 1 and 6. Data are presented in *section characteristics o*f *large*-*c*h*ord NACA 23012, 23021,* ported in references 1 and 6. Data are presented in and 23030 airfoils equipped with 40-percent-chord double reference 7 for split flaps of various chord on 12-, 21-, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ and 30-percent-thic *slotted flaps*. *The complete aerodynamic section charac*- and 30-percent-thick airfoils. T**h**e results *o*f tests of a

and comparisons are made of single slotted flaps with ^{The data} presented in reference 8 indicated that the data presented in reference 8 indicated that the data provide slotted flaps on each of the girloils *double slotted flaps* on each of the airfoils.
The maximum section lift coefficient of an airfoil with flap for high lift and for low drag at the high section *The maximum section lift coefficient of an airfoil with* $\begin{bmatrix} \text{map} \text{ for high-litt and for low drag at the high section} \\ \text{linear} \end{bmatrix}$ *lo-nercent-chard double slated flap was found to increase* lift coefficients. In the present report are given the *a* 40-percent-chord double slotted flap was found to increase $\begin{bmatrix} \text{hit coefficients.} \\ \text{in the present report are given the} \end{bmatrix}$ s*lowly* wi*th increasing thickness, reaching a value of 3*.*7* results of the tests of the NACA 23012*,* 23021*,* and

*,*_*oe*ffi*cients for the double slotted flaps* w*ere accompanied* Th**r**ee bas**i**c mode**ls***,* **o**r p**l**ain air**f**oils*,* were used in for *large pitching-moment coefficients*. *The section profile-* these tests; each had a chord of 3 feet and a span of 7 drag coefficient of an airfoil with a double slotted flap in-_r*ag coe*ffi*cient of a*n *airfoil* wi*th* a *double slotted fla*p *in*- feet. The models were constructed of laminated wood _*reased* wi*t*h *an increase in thickness at all except very* and were built to the NACA 23012*,* 23021*,* and 23030 *touble and* the single stolled *flaps* gave about the same sec-
ion profile-drag coefficients for section lift coefficients less $\begin{bmatrix} \text{respectively, } 12, 21, \text{ and } 30 \text{ percent of the airfoil chord.} \end{bmatrix}$ *form profile-drag* coefficients for section tift coefficients less The airfoil ordinates are given in table I. These air-
han 2.0; above this value the double slotted flap gave the toils had proviously been used for th *han z*.*0; above this value the abuvee slotted jup gave the* foils had previously been used for the split-flap investi-
ower section profile-drag coefficients. :*ower section* p*rofile***-***d*r*ag coe*ffi*cients*, gation reported in re**f**erence *7*.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics Slot shapes.—The slot shapes used were the same as
is undertaken an extensive investigation of various those used for the single slotted flaps reported in referirfoil-flap combinations to furnish information applic- ences 1 to 5. The piece forming the slot shape for the
ible to the aerodynamic design of high-lift devices for main slotted flap was attached directly to the main main slotted flap was attached directly to the main portion of the airfoil; for the auxiliary flap the slot main flap. The slot shapes for the three airfoils are

in the investigation of the single slotted flaps reported
in references 1 to 5. The main flap was hinged to the icing.
The results of an investigation of a 25-percent-chord shapes are shown in figure 1 and the flap ordinates are The results of an investigation of a 25-percent-chord shapes are shown in figure 1 and the flap ordinates arce
ingle-slotted flap on airfoils of 12-, 21-, and 30-percent given in table II. The deflection of the main flap i measured between the flap chord and the chord of the

main airfoil; whereas, for the auxiliary flap the deflec- were the same airfoils used in the investigation of the tion is measured between its chord and the chord of the sult flaps reported in reference 7. Tests were made tion is measured between its chord and the chord of the \vert split flaps reported in reference 7. Tests were made, main flap.

section of the NACA 7- by 10-foot wind tunnel so as \vert auxiliary flaps on each airfoil, it was assumed that the to span the iet completely except for small clearances to span the jet completely except for small clearances optimum paths for the single slotted flaps (references at each end. (See references 1 and 9). The main single $\frac{1}{1}$ to 5) would be the optimum paths for the combi at each end. (See references 1 and 9.) The main air- $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & to & 5 \ 1 & to & 5 \end{pmatrix}$ would be the optimum paths for the combina-
foil was rividly attached to the balance frame by torous. Tests were therefore made for each p foil was rigidly attached to the balance frame by torque

(b) NACA 23021 airfoil with double slotted flap.

(c) NACA 23030 airfoil with double slotted flap. FIGURE 1.—Sections of NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils with 40 percent-chord
double slotted flaps.

tubes, which extended through the upper and the lower where boundaries of the tunnel. The angle of attack of the model was set from outside the tunnel by rotating the $\vert l \vert$ section lift torque tubes with a calibrated electric drive. Approximately two-dimensional flow is obtained with this type of installation and the aerodynamic section characteristics of the model under test can be determined.

A dynamic pressure of 16.3*7* pounds per square fool was maintained for all the tests, which corresponds to a velocity of about 80 miles per hour under standard at-
mospheric conditions and to an average test Reynolds nospheric conditions and to an average test Reynolds $c_{i_{max}}$ section maximum lift coefficient number of about 2,190*,000*. Because of the turbulence was approximately 3,5000,000. (See reference 10.) For maximum lift coefficient all tests, R_{ϵ} is based on the chord of the airfoil with the flap retracted and on a turbulence factor of 1.6 for the

No tests were made of the plain airfoils because they expressed in airfoil chords

however, to determine the effects of the breaks in the The models were made to a tolerance of ± 0.015 inch. \vert surface of the airfoil with the flaps undeflected.

TESTS Because of the large number of tests involved in The models were mounted vertically in the closed test determining the optimum paths for the main and the and deflection of the main flap as previously determined. *Lips .00/c hick* **For each position and deflection of the main flap, the** auxiliary flap was tested at its previously determined $\frac{7}{5c}$ $\frac{7}{5c}$ $\frac{7}{5c}$ $\frac{7}{7c}$ $\frac{7}{7c}$ *Chord line* .099c 372 $\frac{1}{4}$ | flap combination, the flaps were deflected through a

 $\frac{1.076c'}{1.70c}$ ^{.07}⁷⁶c[.] 40c^o An angle-of-attack range from -6° to the angle of attack for maximum lift was covered in 2[°] increments for each test. Lift*,* drag, and pitching moment were (a) NACA 23012 airfoil with double slotted flap.
measured at each angle of attack.

All test results are given in standard section non-dimensional coefficient form corrected for tunnel-wall $\frac{1}{\sqrt{36}}$ *8033c* effect and turbulence as explained in reference 1.

 c_l section lift coefficient (*l*/g*c*)

 $c_{m_{(a),c,0a}}$ section pitching-moment coefficient $\frac{Chord_line}{for d_line}$. $\frac{.0715c}{for d/}$ $\frac{.075c}{.02c}$ $\frac{.02c}{.02c}$ about aerodynamic center of plain airfoil $(m_{(a,c.)_0}/qc^2)$

23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils with 40 percent-chord
double slotted flaps. Coefficient
$$
\left(c_{l_{max}} + \frac{c_{m_{(a,c)}}}{l_t}\right)
$$

PRECISION

The accuracy of the various measurements in the tests is believed to be within the following limits:

The data from the tests with the main and the auxiliary flaps retracted and undeflected have been corrected both for the effect of breaks in the surface at the

slot entries and exits and for the effect of the flap hinges. No such corrections were applied when the flaps were deflected because of the large number of tests required, but it is believed that the relative merits of the various arrangements are inappreciably affected.

AERODYNAMIC SECTION CHARACTERISTICS

Plain airfoils.—The complete aerodynamic section characteristics of the three basic airfoils tested are

given in figures 2, 3, and 4. Because these data have already been discussed in reference 7, no further comment is believed necessary.

Effect of breaks in surface. The effect on the section profile-drag coefficient of the breaks in the airfoil surfaces at the slot entries and exits when the flaps are retracted is shown in figure 5. In these tests the slots were sealed so that there was no air flow through them. The breaks in the surface of the NACA 23012 airfoil cause an increase in the section profile-drag coefficient from 0.003 to 0.004 throughout the lift range. For the NACA 23021 airfoil, the increment of the section

FIGURE 3.-Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23021 plain airfoil.

profile-drag coefficient is 0.0055 at a section lift coefficient of 0, increases to 0.0072 at $c_i=0.75$, and then decreases to 0.0048 at $c_i=1.2$. For the NACA 23030 airfoil, the increment of the section profile-drag coefficient decreases from about 0.012 at low section lift coefficients to about 0.008 at $c_i=0.8$. With properly designed doors and flaps to close the breaks in the lower surface of the airfoils, all or most of the drag increment may be eliminated

Airfoils with double slotted flaps. The aerodynamic section characteristics of the airfoils tested with 40percent double slotted flaps are presented in figures 6 to 10 for the NACA 23012 airfoil, in figures 11 to 15 for the NACA 23021 airfoil, and in figures 16 to 20 for the NACA 23030 airfoil. These figures show the effect of variation of auxiliary flap deflection δ_{f_2} for a given

out, a complete investigation of all the combinations of the auxiliary flap, in general, increases the slope of the auxiliary flap, in general, increases the slope of the plan airfoil. This effect of flap deflection and position for the main and the the lift curve over that of the plain airfoil. This effect
airculary flaps on each airfoil would require a probibitive is apparently a function of airfoil thickness, the auxiliary flaps on each airfoil would require a prohibitive is apparently a function of airfoil thickness, the increase
number of tests. It was therefore decided to move in slope being about 5 percent, 13 percent, and 60 p number of tests. It was therefore decided to move in slope being about 5 percent, 13 percent, and 60 per-
and to deflect the main and the auxiliary flaps of each cent for the NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils, and to deflect the main and the auxiliary flaps of each cent for the NACA 23012 , 23021 , and 23030 airfoils $\frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ airfoil along the optimum paths determined in previous respectively. (See figs. 6, 11, and 16.) It may be
tests of each flap as a single slotted flap. The follow-
noted, however, that the slopes of the lift curves for the tests of each flap as a single slotted flap. The follow-

ing table gives the source from which each flap path $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ was obtained.

airfoil is the optimum indicated by reference 1 only for tion lift coefficient for a constant main flap deflection.

a main flap deflection of 0° For other values of δ . In the case of the NACA 23012 airfoil (fig. the auxiliary flap was moved along a path as close to shown that, for section lift coefficients less than 1.2, the
the optimum as the hinge fittings permitted. This plain airfoil gives the lowest section profile-drag coeff tested. In any case, the actual paths followed by the flaps are shown on the figures.

lift curves to some degree, which is determined by the

main flap deflection δ_{f_1} . As has been previously pointed flap deflection and the airfoil thickness. Any deflection of all the combinations of the auxiliary flap, in general, increases the slope of three airfoils with the auxiliary flaps deflected are about the same. Deflection of the main flaps for all but the 30-percent-thick airfoil tends to decrease the lift-curve .*o.¢4* slope although the slope still remains higher than for

the plain airfoils.
At a given section lift coefficient and main flap de-The section pitching-moment coefficient also increases $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ rapidly with main flap deflection. The change in slope of the pitching-moment curves for large flap deflections may be undesirable. It should be noted*,* however*,* that $\frac{c}{4}$ the destablizing effect at these large flap deflections and
high lift coefficients is not very pronounced for flap de*h* and the set of the optimum for maximum lift coefficients*,* except for the 30-percent-thick airfoil.

obtained from figures 6 to 20*,* are plotted in figures 21*,*

 $\begin{bmatrix} \text{Main} & \text{if } 0.40c & \text{Again } 0.40c & \text{if } 0.40c & \text{if$ FIGURE 5.-Increment of section profile-drag coefficient due to breaks in the surfaces double slotted flaps. $\delta_{f_1} = \delta_{f_2} = 0$.

²³⁰³⁰ ^I Aux iary 0.2566*c*flap 1-b ³ 22*,* and ²³ for the NACA 23012*,* 23021*,* and ²³⁰³⁰ air**-**foils, respectively. These polars show the lowest sec-The path of the auxiliary flap on the NACA 23012 tion profile-drag coefficient obtainable at a given sec-
rfoil is the optimum indicated by reference 1 only for tion lift coefficient for a constant main flap deflection.

a main flap deflection of 0°. For other values of δ_{f_1} , In the case of the NACA 23012 airfoil (fig. 21) it is the auxiliary flap was moved along a path as close to shown that, for section lift coefficients less than the optimum as the hinge fittings permitted. This plain airfoil gives the lowest section profile-drag coeffi-
procedure was perceptited by the feet that the fittings cients. At higher section lift coefficients, a main flap procedure was necessitated by the fact that the fittings cients. At higher section lift coefficients, a main flap
had been altered after the single sletted flap had been had been altered after the single slotted flap had been deflection of 30° gives the lowest section profile-drag
tested. In any case, the actual paths followed by the coefficient. In reference 4 it is pointed out that flaps are shown on the figures.
Inspection of figures 6 to 20 shows that deflection of that the values of c_{d_0} over the lift range from $c_l = 1.4$ to Inspection of figures 6 to 20 shows that deflection of that the values of c_{d_0} over the lift range from $c_l=1.4$ to either auxiliary or main flaps affects the slopes of the $c_l=1.9$ should be disregarded. The 30° defl $c_i=1.9$ should be disregarded. The 30° deflection is optimum for maximum section lift coefficient.

NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

 $\overline{5}$

FIGURE 6.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23012 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_{f1} = 0^{\circ}$; $x_1 = 11.50$; $y_1 = 5.86$. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent airfoil chord.

NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

 $\overline{7}$

FIGURE 9.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23012 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. δ_{I} = 30°; x_1 = 1.50; y_1 = 3.50. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent airfoil chord.

NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

REPORT NO. 723-TAATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

FIGURE 11.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23021 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_{f_1}=0^{\circ}$; $x_1=11.50$; $y_1=9.20$. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent airfoil chord.

NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

FIGURE 12.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23021 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. δ_{f_1} = 10°; x_1 = 8.50; y_1 = 9.50. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent airfoil chord.

 $\frac{1}{36}$ Ä مح $\frac{1}{3}$ Ă ٠a N ò s, p $\frac{1}{2}$ 4 Ŋ À $\frac{1}{2}$ b $\frac{1.2}{3}$ $\frac{1.6}{1.6}$ $\frac{2.0}{2.0}$ ۴I वि $\frac{1}{2}$ l A \downarrow ė छि r $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ ^p \mathcal{A} y \sim Ñ, \overline{a} \mathbf{r} f, ้า $\left.\frac{\partial_{\gamma_{e}}}{\partial x_{a}}\right|^{deg}$ O $\frac{1}{4}$ -6 $|o'$ $\vec{\theta}$ \cdot 36 $.32$ $\overline{\mathscr{E}}$ $\overline{\circ}$ $\overline{54}$ \overline{c} \cdot /6 \overline{z} $|e$ \overline{q} $\overline{6}$ $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ ᅙ $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ \int Section piłching-mement coefficient, c $\pi_{\alpha\alpha}$ Section profile-drag coefficient, c_{ao} fap ' p ' γραμρ μο aμ fup

-Acrodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23021 airfoll with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_0 = 20^\circ$; $x_1 = 4.50$; $p_1 = 8.50$, x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent

ó

4

FIGURE 13.

ę

À

しんしゅ あいしょう しんしゅう しゅうしょう かいしん かいしゅう

 $C\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$

 $\beta_{\theta_{\rm th}}$

s.

 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$

 $\frac{1}{2\pi}$

 $\hat{\vec{r}}$ Ň,

 $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\gamma_{\rm s}$

-NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS REPORT NO. 723-

 \mathcal{P}°

 \downarrow

 -2

 \overline{r}

 12

 $\tilde{\sigma}$

NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

FIGURE 14.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23021 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_{f_1}=30^\circ$. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent airfoil chord.

REPORT NO. 723-NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

FIGURE 19.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23030 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_{f_1}=30^\circ$. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent airfoil chord.

FIGURE 20.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23030 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_{I_1} = 40^\circ$; $x_1 = 4.50$; $y_1 = 9.00$. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent

FIGURE 21. - Envelope polar curves for NACA 23012 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap.

FIGURE 22.-Envelope polar curves for NACA 23021 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap.

FIGURE 23.—Envelope polar curves for NACA 23030 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap.

FIGURE 24.-Comparison of 40-percent-chord double slotted flap on NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils.

22) show that the plain wing gives the lowest value of tion profile-drag coefficient that may be obtained with section profile-drag coefficient for section lift coeffi-
the three airfoils at any section lift coefficient. section profile-drag coefficient for section lift coeffi- the three airfoils at any section lift coefficient. As has cients less than 1.0. From $c_i=1.0$ to about $c_i=2.4$, the periodical protection in the profile-drag dat cients less than 1.0. From c_l =1.0 to about c_l =2.4*,* the been previously noted, the profile-drag data for the lowest section profile-drag coefficient is given by a NACA 23012 airfoil with δ_{f_1} =30° and δ_{f_2} =0 lowest section profile-drag coefficient is given by a main flap deflection of 0° ; whereas, for section lift main flap deflection of 0° ; whereas, for section lift ratic; the values of c_{d_0} over the lift range of $c_i=1.4$ to coefficients above 2.4, the minimum section profile- $c_i=1.9$ have been disregarded in drawing th drag coefficient is given by $\delta_{f_1}=20^\circ$. The section maxi-
mum lift coefficient is given by $\delta_{f_1}=30^\circ$.

NACA 23030 airfoil (fig. 23) gives the lowest section where the 30-percent thick airfoil gives a lower section lift coefficients and profile-drag coefficient than the others. profile-drag coefficient at low section lift coefficients. profile-drag coefficient than the others.
From $c = 0.5$ to $c = 1.9$, the section minimum profile. Effect of thickness on maximum lift.—The effect of From $c_i=0.5$ to $c_i=1.9$, the section minimum profile-
drag coofficients are obtained with a main flap deflection of the auxiliary flap deflection on the increment of section drag coefficients are obtained with a main flap deflec- $\frac{1}{2}$ the auxiliary flap deflection on the increment of section
tion of 0° In the lift range of 1.9 to 3.2, a 20° main maximum lift coefficient with various main tion of 0°. In the lift range of 1.9 to 3.2, a 20° main maximum lift coefficient with various main flap deflec-
flap deflection is required for optimum section profile- tions is shown in figure 25 for the three airfoils. T flap deflection is required for optimum section profile- tions is shown in figure 25 for the three airfoils. The
dreg conditions while a main flap deflection of 30^o increment of the section maximum lift increases not drag conditions, while a main flap deflection of 30^o increment of the section maximum lift increases not
gives the lowest section profile-drag coefficients at only with the auxiliary and the main flap deflections gives the lowest section profile-drag coefficients at only with the auxiliary and the main flap deflections section lift coefficients above 3.2. Maximum section but also with the airfoil thickness. The maximum section lift coefficients above 3.2. Maximum section but also with the airfoil thickness. The maximum
lift is obtained with $\delta_c = 40^\circ$.

CO**MPARIS**O**N OF AIR**FO**IL**S **OF DIFFERENT THICKNESS W**ITH

Effect of thickness on profile drag.—Envelopes of mum $\Delta c_{l_{max}}$ when $\delta_2 = 30^\circ$.
e envelope polar curves of figures 21 to 23 are given The effect of the main flap deflection on the increment the envelope polar curves of figures 21 to 23 are given

The polar envelopes for the NACA 23021 airfoil (fig. \vert in figure 24. These envelopes show the minimum sec-
(a) show that the plain wing gives the lowest value of \vert tion profile-drag coefficient that may be obtained $c_i=1.9$ have been disregarded in drawing the envelope of the envelopes. The section profile-drag coefficient increases with the airfoil thickness throughout the lift range except above a section lift coefficient of about 3.2, As in the case of the other two airfoils, the plain range except above a section lift coefficient of about 3.2,
ACA 23030 airfoil (fig. 23) gives the lowest section where the 30-percent thick airfoil gives a lower section

lift is obtained with $\delta_{I_1}=40$.
is obtained with the NACA 23012 and 23030 airfoils **DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS** " when $\delta_{f_2} = 40^\circ$; the NACA 23021 airfoil gives the maxi-
mess on profile drag.—Envelopes of mum $\Delta c_{l_{max}}$ when $\delta_{f_2} = 30^\circ$.

FIOUR_ 25**.**--Effect of auxiliary flap deflection on the increment of section nmximum lift coefficient fo**r** the various airfoils.

The highest $\Delta c_{t_{max}}$ for the NACA 23012 and 23021 have been obtained with split flaps (reference 3). airfoils was given by a main flap deflection of 30[°] and, for the NACA 23030 airfoil, by a deflection of 40° . **COMPARISON OF VARIOUS SLOTTED FLAPS ON EACH AIRFOIL**
The maximum increments increase with airfoil thick-
Comparisons of a 25.66 negent eletted flap, a 4 The maximum increments increase with airfoil thick-

comparisons of a 25.66-percent slotted flap, a 40

nega and this effect becomes many manked as λ is ness, and this effect becomes more marked as δ_{f_1} is <u>percent slotted flap</u>, and a 40-percent double slotted flap increased. The rapid increase in the increment of the section maximum lift coefficient with airfoil thickness

is not readily apparent in the final section maximum *Airfoil thickness, percent* c
lift coofficient which (as can be seen from fig. 27) is not lift coefficient, which (as can be seen from fig. 27) is not FIGURE 27.-Effect of airfoil thickness on section maximum lift greatly affected by thickness; and*,* whereas values of $\Delta c_{l_{max}}$ increase about 40 percent with an increase in on the NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils are airfoil thickness from 12 to 30 percent, the section presented in figures 28, 29, and 30, respectively. At airfoil thickness from 12 to 30 percent, the section presented in figures 28, 29, and 30, respectively. At maximum lift coefficient increases by only about 7 section lift coefficients below about 2.0, the double maximum lift coefficient increases by only about $7 \mid$ section lift coefficients below about 2.0, the double percent over the same thickness range. In view of the slotted flaps have about the same section profile-drag percent over the same thickness range. In view of the slotted flaps have about the same section profile-drag fact, however, that the section maximum lift coefficient coefficients as the single slotted flaps for all three fact, however, that the section maximum lift coefficient coefficients as the single slotted flaps for all three
of the plain airfoils decreases 30 percent with the airfoils. For the higher section lift coefficients, the of the plain airfoils decreases 30 percent with the airfoils. For the higher section lift coefficients, the increase in thickness, the small magnitude of the double slotted flaps give less section drag than the increase in thickness, the small magnitude of the double slotted flaps increase in maximum lift for the flapped airfoils is single slotted flaps. increase in maximum lift for the flapped airfoils is

of section maximum lift coefficient is shown in figure 26. expected. It is of interest to note that similar results
The highest Δc , for the NACA 23012 and 23021 have been obtained with split flaps (reference 7) and

On the basis of the maximum obtainable section lift coefficient, the double slotted flaps show a considerable gain over the single slotted flaps on the airfoils (fig. 27). On the NACA 23012 airfoil, the increase in section maximum lift coefficient over that of the plain airfoil is 81 percent, 87 percent, and 123 percent for the 25.66-percent slotted flap, the 40-percent slotted flap, and the 40-percent double slotted flap, respectively. In the case of the NACA 23021 airfoil, the respective increases are 107 percent, 110 percent, and 162 percent;

FIGURE 31. Section effective maximum lift coefficients for slotted flaps on NACA 23012 airfoil.

while the increases for the NACA 23030 airfoil are 160 percent, 182 percent, and 260 percent.

Although the section maximum lift coefficients obtained with the double slotted flaps are greater than the coefficients obtained with either of the single slotted flaps regardless of airfoil thickness, it must be remembered that the pitching-moment coefficients are also greater. Thus, a double-slotted-flap installation will require a greater negative tail load to balance the pitching moment than will a single-slotted-flap installation, and it therefore appears desirable to take the tail load into consideration when the maximum lift coefficients are compared. Accordingly, section effective maximum lift coefficients were computed for each airfoil-flap combination for various tail lengths by the \mathbf{L} \mathbf{I} formula-

$$
c_{i_{e_{max}}} = c_{i_{max}} + \frac{\Gamma^{m_{(a,c.)_0}} f_{c_{i_{max}}}}{l_i}
$$

These data are presented in figures 31, 32, and 33. For

FIGURE 32.-Section effective maximum lift coefficients for slotted flaps on NACA 23021 sirfoil.

30 REPORT NO. 723-NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

each of the airfoils, the effective maximum lift coeffi-
cient obtained with the double slotted flap is greater $\begin{bmatrix} R \text{E}} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ Worsings: Carl Land Hamis ma cient obtained with the double slotted hap is greater 1. Wenzinger, Carl J., and Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel
The than the coefficient obtained with either of the single The structure of an N. A. C. A. 23012 Airfoil with slotted flaps. The superiority of the double slotted Arrangements of Slotted Flaps. Arrangements of Slotted Flaps. $\frac{1939}{1930}$

flaps in this respect increases with tail length.
The pitching-moment coefficients plotted in figures 28 to 30 are those obtained when the flaps are moved Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23021 Airfoil with Various
Arrangements of Slotted Flaps. Rep. No. 677, NACA, and deflected to the positions that give minimum $\begin{bmatrix} \text{Array} \\ \text{1939}, \end{bmatrix}$ values of section profile-drag coefficient at a given $\begin{bmatrix} 1939 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$.
coefficient The difference in pitching 3. Recapt I. G.; Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A. section lift coefficient. The difference in pitching- 3. Recant, I. G.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A.
23030 Airfoil with Various Arrangements of Slotted Flaps. moment coefficients of the various slotted flaps is most T. N. No. 755*,* NACA, 1940. marked for the NACA 23012 airfoil. On that airfoil
the 25.66-percent-chord single slotted flap gives the the 25.66-percent-chord single slotted flap gives the $\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c} \text{4. Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A.} \end{array}$
Lowest values of pitching-moment coefficient while the $\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c} \text{4. Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A.} \end{array}$ lowest values of pitching-moment coefficient while the Chord Slotted Flap. T.N. No. 715, NACA, 1939.
double slotted flap gives the highest values throughout double slotted hap gives the highest values throughout 5. Duschik, Frank: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A.
the lift range. On the NACA 23021 airfoil the lowest values of pitching-moment coefficient are given by the 40-percent-chord single slotted flap while the 25.66percent single slotted flap and the double slotted flap Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23012

give about the same pitching-moment coefficients below Airfoil with Various Arrangements of Venetian-Blind give about the same pitching-moment coefficients below Airfoil with Various Arrangement
 $e = 1.2$ In the asse of the NACA 23030 sirfoil there Flaps. Rep. No. 689, NACA, 1940. $c_1 = 1.2$. In the case of the NACA 23030 airfoil there Flaps. Rep. No. 689, NACA, 1940.
is little difference in the pitching-moment coefficients 7. Wenzinger, Carl J., and Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel is little difference in the pitching-moment coefficients 7. Wenzinger, Carl J., and Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel
Investigation of N. A. C. A. 23012, 23021, and 23030 Airgiven by the three flaps for lift coefficients up to 1.6. For lift coefficients less than 1.6, the 40-percent single For the coefficients less than 1.6, the 40-percent single NACA, 1939.
slotted flap gave the lowest pitching-moment coefficients while, at higher lift coefficients, the 25.66-percent single 8. Wenzinger, Carl *J*., and Gauvain, William E.: *Wind-Tunnel* Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23012 Airfoil with a Slotted slotted flap gives the lowest value slotted flap gives the lowest value of pitching-moment Flap and Three Types of Auxiliary Flap. Rep. No. 679,

NACA, 1939.

The effect of increasing the airfoil thickness on the aerodynamic characteristics of airfoils with double slotted flaps was to increase the section profile drag Characteristics as Affected by Variation
through most of the lift range although, at very high Number. Rep. No. 586, NACA, 1937. through most of the lift range although, at very high section lift coefficients*,* the section profile drag was reduced by an increasing thickness. The section maxi-
mum lift coefficient increased slowly with increasing mun increased slowly with increasing ORDINATES FOR NACA 230 AIRFOILS
airfoil thickness.
For a given airfoil thickness.

For a given airfoil thickness, the section profile drag of the 40-percent-chord single slotted flap, the 25.66percent-chord single slotted flap, and the 40-percentchord double slotted flaps was about the same at section lift coefficients less than 2.0. For higher section lift coefficients, the double slotted flap gave the lowest section profile-drag coefficient regardless of airfoil thickness. The section maximum lift coefficients of the airfoils with double slotted flaps were considerably higher than those of the airfoils with single slotted flaps for all airfoil thicknesses. The large lift coefficients for the double slotted flaps were accompanied by large pitching-moment coefficients.

LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY,

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS*,* LANGLEY FIELD*,* VA.*,* August 6, 1940.

- Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23012 Airfoil with Various
Arrangements of Slotted Flaps. Rep. No. 664, NACA,
- 2. Wenzinger, Carl J. and Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel
Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23021 Airfoil with Various
-
-
- C. A. 23021 Airfoil with Two Arrangements of a 40-Per-cent-Chord Slotted Flap. T. N. No. 728, NACA, 1939.
- 40-percent-chord single slotted flap while the 25.66- 6. Wenzinger*,* Carl J., and Harris, Thomas A.: Preliminary
- foils with Various Sizes of Split Flap. Rep. No. 668,
- *c*oefficient. NACA*,* 1939.
- CONCLUDING REMARKS 9. Harris, Thomas A.: The 7 by 10 Foot Wind Tunnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Rep. No. 412, NACA, 1931.
	- 10. Jacobs, Eastman N., and Sherman, Albert: Airfoil Section
Characteristics as Affected by Variations of the Reynolds

NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1942

Positive directions of **a**xes **a**nd **a**ngles (forces **a**nd moments) **a**re shown by **a**rrows

 $C_l = \frac{L}{qbS}$ $C_m = \frac{M}{qcS}$ $C_n = \frac{N}{qbS}$

(rolling) (pitching) (yawing)

Absolute coefficients of moment
 $C_i = \frac{L}{qbS}$ $C_m = \frac{M}{qcS}$ $C_n = \frac{N}{qbS}$ $C_n = \frac{N}{qbS}$ C_n (Indicate surface by proper subscript.) position), δ . (Indicate surface by proper subscript.)

4. **PR**O**P**ELLE**R** SYMBOLS

D, Diameter *p* Power sheelute coefficient $C = \frac{P}{P}$ *p*, Geometric pitch $\frac{1}{2}$ $\rho n^3 D^5$ $m_{\rm cion} = \frac{5}{\rho V^5}$ V' , Inflow velocity V^{p_n} V_s , Slipstream velocity v_, Efficiency v, Efficiency *n*, Efficiency *T n,* Revolutions per second, r.p.s. Thrust, absolute coefficient $C_T = \frac{T}{\rho n^2 D^4}$ a₉, $T_{\rm s}$ Effective helix angle= $\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{V}{2\pi rn}\right)$ *Q*, Torque, absolute coefficient $C_q = \frac{Q}{\rho n^2 D^5}$

5. NUMERICAL RELATIO**NS**

- 1 hp.=76.04 kg-m/s=550 ft-lb./sec. 1 lb.=0.4536 kg.
1 metric horsepower=1.0132 hp. 1 kg=2.2046 lb.
- 1 metric horsepower=1.0132 hp.
1 m.p.h.=0.4470 m.p.s.
-
- 1 m.p.s. $=2.2369$ m.p.h.
-
- 1 mi.=1,609.35 m=5,280 ft.
1 m=3.2808 ft.
-

