NASA FECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

NASA TM X-62,478

ý

## TRANSONIC WIND-TUNNEL TESTS OF AN F-8 AIRPLANE MODEL EQUIPPED WITH 12- AND 14-PERCENT-THICK OBLIQUE WINGS

(NASA-TM-X-62478)TRANSONIC WIND-TUNNELN76-19142TESTS OF AN F-8 AIRFLANE MODEL EQUIPPED WITH12 AND 14-PERCENT THICK OBLIQUE WINGS (NASA)Unclas158 p HC \$6.75CSCL 01CUnclasG3/05 18553

Ronald C. Smith, Robert T. Jones, and James L. Summers

Ames Research Center Moffett Field, California 94035

Octuber 1975



ころう いいいます してき とうないのでき ちょうい

NASA TM X-62,478

2

https://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=19760012054 2020-03-22T16:54:11+00:00Z

1 Report No	2. Government Accessio	on No.	3. Recipient's Catalog	No.
TM X-62,478				
4 Title and Subtitle			5. Report Date OCTORER 19	75.
Transonic Wind Tunnel Tes	ts of an F-8 /	Airplane Model	6. Performing Organiza	ition Code
Equipped with 12- and 14-	Percent-Inick	UDITque wings		
7. Author(s)			8 Performing Organiza	tion Report No
Ronald C. Smith, Robert T	. Jones, and	James L. Summer	s A-6259	
			0. Work Unit No	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address			505-11-12	
Ames Research Center		1	1. Contract or Grant	No.
Moffett Field, California	94035			
			<ol> <li>Type of Report and Tochroight Mon</li> </ol>	d Period Covered
12, Sponsoring Agency Name and Address		L		orandulli
Ames Research Center, NAS	A	1	4. Sponsoring Agency	Code
Moffett Field, California	94035	l		
15. Supplementary Notes				
National Aeronautics and	Space Adminis	tration		
Washington, D.C. 20546				
16. Abstract				
An experimental investiga	tion was cond	ucted in the Am	es 14-Foot Tr	ransonic
Wind Tunnel to study furt	her the aerod	vnamic performa	nce and stabi	ility
characteristics of a 0.08	7-scale model	of an F-8 airp	lane fitted w	with an
oblique wing. Two ellipt	ical planform	(axis ratio =	8:1) wings, e	each having
a maximum thickness of 12	and 14 perce	nt, were tested	. Longitudir	nal stability
data were obtained with n	o wing and wi	th each of the	two wings set	t at sweep
angles of 0°, 45°, and 60	<sup>o</sup> . Lateral-d	irectional stab	ility data we	ere obtained
for the 12-percent wing o	nly. lest Ma	ch numbers rang	ed from U.6 1	to 1.2 1n
of attack were between -6	Pand 22° at	.2 LU IJ.I IIIII zoro cidoslin	Angles of s	. Angles
between $-6^\circ$ and $+6^\circ$ for t	wo angles of a	attack, denendi	na unon the w	ving con-
figuration.	no ungres or	actually acpende	ing upon one i	ting con
1				
1				
17. Key Words (Suggested by Author(s))		18. Distribution Statement		
wing-ruserage-tait COMDIN	actons -	Unlimited		
Stability Statio		(STAR Categor	y O2 & O5)	
Performance. Aerodynamic				
19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security Classif. (o	f this page)	21. No. of Pages	22 Price*
Unclassified	Unclassi	fied	156	\$6,25

1

:

. 4

ŝ.

)

\*For sale by the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151

## CONTENTS

ŝ

	Page
SUMMARY	٦١
INTRODUC	TION 1
NOMENCLA	TURE
TEST FAC	CILITY
MODEL DE	SCRIPTION 4
TESTING	AND PROCEDURE
RESULTS	AND DISCUSSION
CONCLUDI	NG REMARKS
REFERENC	ES
TABLES	
1.	MODEL GEOMETRY
2.	WING DIMENSIONAL DATA
3.	TEST CONDITIONS
4.	INDEX OF DATA FIGURES14
FIGURES	
1.	AXIS SYSTEMS15
2.	OBLIQUE-WING/BODY MODEL DETAILS AND PHOTOGRAPH
3.	VARIATION OF MAXIMUM LIFT-TO-DRAG RATIO WITH MACH NUMBER FOR THREE WING SWEEP ANGLES
4.	DATA

. PRECEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

;;

1

•

. .

•

•

:

ċ

1.1.1

;

:

• •

:

;

1 2

a ser a ser and the ser and the series

÷

iii

TRANSONIC WIND-TUNNEL TESTS OF AN F-8 AIRPLANE MOF. EQUIPPED WITH 12- AND 14-PERCENT-THICK OBLIQUE WINGS Ronald C. Smith, Robert T. Jones, and James L. Summers

Ames Research Center

#### SUMMARY

An experimental investigation was conducted an A = A = 1-Foot Transonic Wind Tunnel to study further the aerodynamic per ormance and stability characteristics of a 0.087-scale model of an operational F-8 airplane fitted with an oblique wing. Two elliptical planform (axis ratio = 8:1) wings, each having a maximum thickness of 12 and 14 percent, were tested. All other external geometric features of the model were scaled to the basic full size airplane with the engine inlet faired closed.

Longitudinal stability data were obtained with no wing and with each of the two wings set at sweep angles of 0°, 45°, and 60°. Lateral-directional stability data were obtained for the l2-percent wing only. Test Mach numbers ranged from 0.6 to 1.2 in the unit Reynolds number range from 11.2 to 13.1 million per meter. Angles of attack were between  $-6^{\circ}$  and  $22^{\circ}$  at zero sideslip. Angles of sideslip were between  $\pm 6^{\circ}$  for two angles of attack, depending upon the wing configuration.

The lift-drag ratios for the 12-percent-thick wing indicate no performance penalty relative to a reference 10-percent-thick oblique wing and a small but significant penalty for the 14-percent-thick wing. The s\_atic longitudinal data show both configurations to be generally stable over the lift range of the investigation. The data indicate that the lateral-directional stability characteristics for the 12-percent-thick wing configuration are generally good.

#### INTRODUCTION

An experimental investigation was conducted in the Ames 14-Foot Transonic Wind Tunnel as part of a continuing study of the aerodynamic performance and stability characteristics of a 0.087-scale model of an operational F-8 airplane fitted with an oblique wing. In a previous investigation (ref. 1), this model was tested with a 10:1 (span-to-chord ratio) elliptic wing with 10-percent maximum thickness. This is the wing referred o by R. T. Jones in ref. 2. Preliminary design studies reported in ref. 3 indicated that the 10:1 wing was structurally heavy and that an 8:1 planfc. with between 12- and 14-percent maximum thickness would improve overall performance. It is essented that a 14 percent-thick wing would be lighter and have a slightly higher cruise drag than a 12-percent-thick wing.

The present investigation was motivated by the need to define the performance and stability characteristics of the aircraft configuration with a structurally more efficient wing planform. In order to provide the drag data necessary for evaluating the weight-drag trade-off, two 8:1 elliptical wings having maximum thicknesses of 12- and 14-percent chord were built and tested. The center section airfoils were NACA 3612-02, 40 and NACA 3614-02, 40. All other external geometric features of the mode: were scaled to the operational airplane except the engine inlet, which was closed with a smooth fairing beginning ahead of the original nose station.

The tests reported herein were made over the Mach number range from 0.6 to 1.2 in the unit Reynolds number range from 11.2 to 13.1 million per meter. Sim-component force and moment measurements were made on the model in pitc at zero sideslip for both wings set in three wing sweep positions and for the wing-off configuration. Additional measurements were made on the model with the 12-percent-thick wing in sideslip for two angles of attack typical of cruise flight.

A complete set of results are provided in this report with essentially no analysis.

#### NOMENCLATURE

The axis systems and sign conventions are shown in figure 1. Lift, drag, and pitching moment are presented in the stability-axis coordinate system and all other forces and moments are presented in the body-axis coordinate system. Because the data were computer-plotted, the corresponding plot symbol (where used) is given together with the conventional symbol.

Symbol	Plot Symbol	Definition
b		wing span
c <sub>D</sub>	CD	drag coefficient, drag/qS
с <sub>L</sub>	CL	lift coefficient, lift/qS
C <sub>l</sub>	CBL	rolling-moment coefficient, rolling moment/qSb
с <sub>пі</sub>	CLM	pitching-moment coefficient, pitching moment/qScroot

Symbol	Plot Symbol	Definition
<sup>C</sup> n	CYN	yawing-moment coefficient, yawing moment/qSb
с <sub>ү</sub>	СҮ	side-force coefficient, side force/qS
с		wing chord
<sup>c</sup> root		wing root chord
н		vertical distance from wing reference plane to wing base line at 0.4c
(L/D)	L/D	lift-drag ratio
Μ	MACH	free-stream Mach number
q		free-stream dynamic pressure
S		wing area
t		wing thickness
x		Cartesian coordinate
Y-Lo		maximum distance from wing base line to wing lower surface measured perpendicular to the wing base line
Y-Up		maximum distance from wing base line to wing upper surface measured perpendicular to the wing base line
Z-Lo		vertical distance from wing chord to wing lower surface
Z-Up		vertical distance from wing chord to wing upper surface
z		Cartesian coordinate
α	ALPHA	angle of attack
β	BETA	angle of sideslip
٨	LAMBDA	wing skew angle measured between a perpendicular to the body longitudinal axis and the 0.25 chord line of the wing in a horizontal plane

\*

1

3

ţ

		Subscripts
max		maximum value
		Configuration Code
<sup>B</sup> 2	B2	body with pointed inlet fairing
Ţ	T	taíl
W <sub>5</sub>	W5	wing with 12-percent maximum thickness
W <sub>6</sub>	₩6	wing with 14-percent maximum thickness

#### TEST FACILITY

The tests were conducted in the Ames 14-Foo: Transonic Wind Tunnel which is a sea-level-density, closed-return, continuous-flow facility. This tunnel has an adjustable nozzle (two flexible walls) and a slotted test section to permit transonic testing over a Mach number range continuously variable from 0.6 to 1.2.

#### MODEL DESCRIPTION

The model consisted of either of two elliptical planform wings mounted on top of the fuselage of a 0.087-scale model of an operational F-8 fighter type airplane as shown in fig. 2. Pertinent dimensions of the wing are shown in tables 1, 2 and in fig. 2. A photograph of the model mounted in the wind tunnel is shown in figure 2(g). The wing was pivoted in the horizontal plane about the 0.4 root-chord point to obtain angles of 0°, 45°, and 60°. The wings had an clliptical planform with an elliptic axis ratio of 8:1 (unswept aspect ratio of 10.2) and a straight 25-percent chord line. The wings had the airfoil sections NACA 3612-02, 40 and NACA 3614-02, 40 at the center, perpendicular to the unswept chord line. The maximum thickness varied along the span as shown in figure 2(f). The horizontal and vertical tail surfaces bid NACA 65A006 airfoil sections and a 45° swept quarter-chord line. The horizontal tail was set at -11/2° incidence relative to the body center line. All external geometric features of the model, other than the ding, were 0.087 scale of the full size operational fighter-type airplane, except that the engine inlet was faired closed as shown in figure 2(a) Model body contours are shown in figure 2(b).

#### TESTING AND PROCEDURE

The model was sting-supported through the base of the model body shown in figure 2(a) and force and moment data were obtained from an internally mounted six-component strain-gage balance. The moment center was located longitudinally at the wing pivot point  $(0.4c_{root})$  and 0.442 cm. above the model center line (fig. 2(a)). Tests were conducted at a atmospheric total pressure giving a unit Reynolds number range from 11.2 million to 13.1 million per meter over the test Mach number range from 0.6 to 1.2. Angle of attack ranged from -6° to 22° at zero sideslip. Angles of sideslip were set between  $\pm 6°$  for two angles of attack, 3° and 5°. These angles of attack correspond approximately to  $(L/D)_{max}$  for 0° and 45° sweep, respectively.

Six-component force and moment data were obtained for the wing at sweep angles of  $0^{\circ}$ , 45°, and 60° rotated left wing forward.

Boundary layer transition was not fixed on the model. It is known from flow visualization studies made on the l2-percent-thick wing that natural transition occurred between 60- and 70-percent chord for  $\Lambda = 0$  and between 10- and 20-percent chord for  $\Lambda = 45^{\circ}$  and 60°.

The measured balance data were adjusted to a condition corresponding to free-stream static pressure on the model base. The Mach number range for each sweep angle tested is shown in table 3.

A complete index of the data figures is given in table 4.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### Lift-Drag-Ratio

The maximum L/D ratios for the two wings reported herein are summarized in fig. 3. The horizontal tail incidence used was  $-1 1/2^{\circ}$ , which trims the model at lift coefficients we'l beyond that for  $(L/D)_{max}$ . These L/D values then, while comparable with each other, are not comparable to those reported in ref. 1 which used zero tail incidence. Results of later tests made on the 12-percent-thick wing configuration with zero tail incidence are compared to the 10-percent-thick wing of reference 1 in figure 3(b). These data indicate no loss in  $(L/D)_{max}$  for the 12percent, 8:1 wing. It is noted that the inlet fairings for the two sets of data are different, the ref. 1 fairing being somewhat blunter and resulting in higher drag at supersonic speeds. The reduction in the L/D due to increasing the wing thickness ratio from 0.12 to 0.14 is two units, about 10 percent, at M = 0.6 and decreases with increasing wing sweep to 4 percent for  $\Lambda = 60^{\circ}$ . It thus appears that a 12-percent-thick wing provides a definite aerodynamic advantage over a 14-percent-thick wing and that the structural benefit of a 14-percent-thick wing would have to overcome a significant performance penalty. It is known that the flow over the wing sections normal to the span axis is subcritical at M = 1.2 for  $\Lambda = 60^{\circ}$  and therefore higher L/D ratios would be exhibited at Mach numbers up to 1.2 if a somewhat smaller sweep (e.g., 55°) had been used to provide higher aspect ratio.

#### Aerodynamic Characteristics in Pitch

The aerodynamic characteristics in pitch for the 12- and 14-percentthick wings are plotted in fig. 4. The differences in aerodynamic characteristics other than drag and L/D are generally not large. There are, however, some differences in rolling moment for  $\Lambda = 45^{\circ}$  which appear to be related to nonuniform shock-induced separation, which become fairly large at M = 0.98 and 1.05 (see fig. 4(f)). In practice, the wing sweep would be increased to avoid such separation. Also, the nonlinearities in the pitching moments are worse for the 14-percent-thick wing, indicating a stronger effect of the nonuniform separation.

Both configurations generally have adequate longitudinal static margin at all test Mach numbers for the chosen moment center location and are trimmed at lift coefficients between 0.5 and 0.8 with -1 1/2° tail incidence.

The results for 45° and 60° sweep exhibit substantial rolling and yawing moment variations with changes in lift. These variations are typical of rigid oblique wings and should not be viewed as representative of flexible wing characteristics.

Wing-off - The aerodynamic characteristics in pitch for the wing-off configuration are plotted in fig. 5 for all eight test Mach numbers. These data have been reduced using the same reference lengths and area so that they may be used in combination with the fig. 4 data to estimate the wing contribution to the forces and moments.

#### Aerodynamic Characteristics in Sideslip

The aerodynamic characteristics in sideslip for the l2-percent-thick wing are plotted in fig. 6. The lateral-directional characteristics are essentially linear with sideslip except for cases where the flow over the wing is supercritical (e.g. see fig. 6(f));  $\Lambda = 45^{\circ}$ ). As in the case of the previously noted wing sweep effect on rolling moment, the cause appears to be related to nonuniform shock-induced separation.

The model has good directional stability and positive dihedral effect for all conditions for which the model was tested in sideslip. The model exhibits unsymmetrical lift and drag changes with sideslip which are typical for oblique wings. Such changes result from the unsymmetrical

r

changes in effective wing sweep angle due to sideslip.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

The lift-drag ratios measured on 12- and 14-percent-thick oblique wings iddicate no performance penalty for the 12-percent wing and a small but significant penalty for the 14-percent-thick wing compared to the 10percent thick, higher aspect ratio wing reported in reference 1. The model has adequate longitudinal and lateral-directional stability characteristics. Pitch-induced roll and yaw which are typical of rigid oblique wings are present throughout the data for 45° and 60° sweep. These moments however, should not be viewed as deleterious for a real airplane because of the large expected stable influence of wing flexibility on these moments.

Ames Research Center National Aeronautics and Space Administration Moffett Field, California 94035 Ser embed 11 1975

#### REFERENCES

- Graham, Lawrence A.; Jones, Robert T.; and Summers, James L.: Wind Jurnel Terror of a -8 Aimplane Model Equipped with An Oblique Wing. NASA TM X-62,273, June 1973.
- 2. Jones, Robert T.: New Design Goals and a New Shape for the SST. Astronautics & Aeronautics, Dec. 1972, pp. 66-70.
- 3. Kulfan, Robert M.; et al: High Transonic Speed Transport Aircraft Study-Final Report. NASA CR-114658, Sept. 1973.

### TABLE 1. - MODEL GEOMETRY

\$

Wings	W <sub>5</sub>	Wе
Planform 8:1 ellipse a Span (reference) Area (reference) Root chord Aspect ratio Maximum t/c Incidence 0.25c sweep Section Taximum thickness location Leading-edge nose radius	Not c/4 136.30 cm 1823.87 cm <sup>2</sup> 17.04 cm 10.2 0.12 0° 0° NACA 3612-02,40 0.40c 0.0288c	136.30 cm <sub>2</sub> 1823.87 cm <sup>2</sup> 17.04 cm 10.2 0.14 0° 0° NACA 3614-02,40 0.40c 0.0392c
norizo.ital tail		
Area Root chord Tip chord Aspect ratio Maximum t/c Incidence 0.25c sweep Section		trapezoidai 48.16 cm 333.55 cm 23.80 cm 3.56 cm 6.95 0.06 -1.5° 45° NACA 65A006
Planform		trapezoidal
Span Area Root chord Tip chord Aspect ratio Maximum t/c 0.25c sweep Section		31.93 cm 697.42 cm 34.80 cm 8.90 cm 1.46 0.06 52.5° NACA 654006

## TABLE 2. - WING DIMENSIONAL DATA<sup>a</sup> (a) 12-Percent-Thick Wing

ì

ないで、「「「「「」」」で、「」」

¥.

Semi-Span	Chord	Z-Up	Z-Lo	Н
0	17.038	1,491	0.650	0
2.54	17.028	1.488	.650	0.0025
5.08	16.992	1.483	.647	.013
7 <b>.6</b> 2	16.931	1.476	.643	.025
10.16	16.848	1.465	.635	.048
12.70	16.741	1.450	.625	.076
15.24	16.606	1,430	.614	.109
17.78	16.449	1.409	. 602	.152
20.32	16.264	1.384	. 587	.200
22.86	16.053	1.356	. 569	.259
25.40	15.811	1.323	. 551	. 322
27.109	15.634	1.300	.538	. 368
23 <b>.8</b> 77	15.433	1.272	.523	.421
30 <b>.503</b>	15.237	1.247	.508	.475
32.009	15.042	1.222	. 493	.523
33 <b>.409</b>	14.851	1.199	. 480	.574
34.722	14.661	1.176	. 467	.622
35 <b>.954</b>	14.475	1.150	.455	.670
37.114	14.290	1.127	.442	.716
38.214	14.109	1.107	.429	.762
39.253	13.929	1.084	.416	.805
40.244	13.751	1.064	.406	.948
41.183	13.576	1.041	. 394	.891
42.080	13.403	1.021	. 383	.932
42.936	13.233	1.003	. 373	.972
43.754	13.063	0.983	. 363	1.013
44.539	12.898	.962	. 353	1.051
45.288	12.733	. 945	. 343	1.089
46.007	12.570	.927	. 335	1.125
47.722	12.164	.881	. 312	1.214
48.979	11.849	.848	. 295	1.282
50.142	11.542	.815	.279	1.349
01.222	11.239	. 785	.264	1.409
52.222	10.947	.754	.249	1.468
53.157	10.663	.726	. 236	1.524
54.028	10.386	.698	.223	1.577
54.841	10.117	.673	.213	1.626
55.603	9.852	.647	.200	1.674
50.314	9.596	.625	. 190	1.719
50.582	9.34/	.602	.180	1.760
57.609	9.106	.579	.170	1.800
00.190	8.867	.559	.162	1.841
58 <b>.748</b>	8.638	. 538	. 155	1.877

<sup>a</sup> All dimensions are centimeters

TABLE 2.(a). - Concluded.<sup>a</sup>

ł

ì

1

١

,

Semi-Span	Chord	Z-Up	ما-2	Н
<b>59.</b> 268	8.412	0.518	0.145	1.910
59.756	8.194	.500	.139	1.943
60.216	7.980	.582	.132	1.970
60.647	7.775	.467	.124	2.004
61.056	7.572	.449	.119	2.032
61.440	7.376	.434	.114	2.060
61.803	7.183	. 419	.109	2.083
62.143	6.998	.406	.102	: 108
62.466	6.815	. 391	.099	2.131
62.771	6.637	.378	.094	2.151
63.058	6.464	. 366	.029	21
63.329	6.297	.353	.084	2.19
63.586	6.134	.343	.081	2.209
64.196	5.722	.315	.071	2.253
64.625	5.413	.292	.063	2.283
65.009	5.118	.274	.053	2.311
65.346	4.841	.256	.053	2.337
65.649	4.577	.239	.048	2.359
65.918	4.331	.223	.046	2.379
66.157	4.094	.211	.041	2.397
<b>66.</b> 373	3.873	.198	.038	2.413
66.563	3.662	.185	.035	2.425
66.733	3.464	.173	.033	2.438
<b>66.</b> 883	3.276	.162	.030	2.451
67.139	2.931	.145	.025	2.468
67.394	2.542	.124	.020	2.489
67 648	2.077	.099	.017	2.507
67.902	1.470	.071	.010	2.527
68.156	0	0	0	2.548

<sup>a</sup> All dimensions are centimeters

## TABLE 2. - WING DIMENSIONAL DATA<sup>a</sup> (b) 14-Percent-Thick Wing

Semi-Span	Chord	Z-UP	Z-Lo	Н
0	17.038	1.659	0.803	0
2.54	17.028	1.659	.800	0.0025
5.08	16.992	1.651	.797	.015
7.62	16.931	1.643	.789	.033
10.16	16.848	1.628	.782	.058
12.70	16.741	1.613	.772	.094
15.24	16.606	1.590	.757	.135
17.78	16.449	1.567	.742	.185
20.32	16.264	1.537	.723	.244
22.86	16.053	1.504	.701	.312
25.40	15.811	1.468	.678	.386
27.109	15.634	1.443	.663	.442
28.877	15.433	1.412	.645	.503
30.503	15.237	1.384	.625	.564
32.009	15.042	1.354	.609	.622
33.409	14.851	1.328	.592	.678
34.772	14.661	1.300	.574	.737
35 <b>.954</b>	14.475	1.275	.559	.789
37.114	14.290	1.249	.543	.843
38.214	14.109	1.224	.528	.897
39.253	13.929	1.199	.513	.947
40.244	13,751	1.176	.500	. 996
41.183	13.576	1.151	.585	1.044
42.080	13,403	1.128	.472	1.092
42.936	13.233	1.105	.459	1.138
43.754	13.063	1.084	.447	1.184
44.539	12.898	1.062	.434	1.227
45.288	12.733	1.041	.424	1.270
46.007	12.570	1.021	.411	1.310
47.722	12.164	.970	.383	1.415
48 <b>.979</b>	11.849	.932	.363	1.491
50.142	11.542	.896	.343	1.565
51.222	11.239	.861	.325	1.636
52.222	10.947	.828	.307	1.702
53.157	10.663	.795	.292	1.765
54.02 <b>8</b>	10.386	.764	.277	1.824
54.841	10.117	.736	.262	1.882
55.603	9.852	.708	.249	1.935
56.314	9,596	.681	.233	1.986
56.982	9.347	.655	.223	2.034
57.609	9.106	.632	.211	2.080
<b>5</b> 5.196	8.867	.609	.200	2.123
58.748	8.638	.581	.190	2.164

<sup>a</sup> All dimensions are centimeters

11

いいまするというないないないないで、「ないないない」

TABLE 2.(b). Concluded.<sup>a</sup>

16-1

...

. . . .

. . . . . .

;

•

.

a

3

• -• •

ł

Semi-Span	Chord	Z-Up	Z-Lo	Н
59.268	8.412	0.564	0.180	2.205
59.756	8.194	.543	.173	2.240
60.216	7.981	.526	.162	2.276
60.647	7.775	.505	.155	2.311
61.056	7.572	.487	.147	2.312
61.463	3.376	.469	.139	2.372
61.803	7.183	.455	.132	2.400
62.144	6.998	.439	.127	2.428
62.466	6.815	.424	.122	2.454
62.771	6.637	.409	.114	2.476
63.058	6.464	. 396	.109	2.502
63.482	6.297	. 381	.104	2.522
63.586	6.134	.368	.099	2.542
64.196	5.723	.338	.089	2.593
64.625	5.413	.315	.081	2.629
65,009	5.118	.295	.074	2.659
65.346	4.841	.274	.066	2.687
65.649	4.577	.265	.061	2.713
65.918	4.331	.241	.056	2.735
66.157	4.094	.226	.051	2.756
66.373	3.873	.211	.048	2.774
66.563	3.663	.198	.043	2.789
66.733	3.464	.185	.041	2.804
66.883	3.277	.175	.038	2.817
66.139	2.931	.155	.033	2.839
67.394	2.542	.132	.028	2.860
67.648	2.078	.107	.020	2.883
67.902	1.471	.074	.015	2.906
68.156	0	0	0	2.926

<sup>a</sup> All dimensions are centimeters

TABLE 2 - TEST CONDITIONS

1

\$

And And And

مخبر ليحاد بالالمرام ماليلام

.

1

	٥													
	hedu	8	0	9 + 9	0	9 + 2 9	9 + 9	0	9 +9 +	9+ 9-	0	0	0	c
	2 N	ø	-6 +22	2	-6 +15	5	m	-6 +18	2	ъ	-6 +22	-6 +15	-6 +18	<u>۔</u>
		311.8						×	×	×			×	×
1.5.4	ter)	\ 												L
	lion/me	1.12						×	×	×			×	×
	ers(mil	1.05			×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	,
	lds numt	.98			×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	>
	{eyno	0												
mbers	Ť	0.95			×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	>
- Nu		0.60	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	,
														┢
		0 	×	×	×	×	×				×	×		<b>×</b>
		.69	×	×							×			>
		0 (6												╞
		( )	°	0	45	45	45	60	60	60		45	60	
		Ę												
		uratio												
		onfigu	W5 <sup>B</sup> 2								W6B2			F a

13

## TABLE 4. - INDEX TO DATA FIGURES

,

Figure	Title	Page
4	Aerodynamic characteristics in pitch; comparison of 12-percent and 14-percent-thick wings for wing sweep angles of 0°, 45°, and 60°.	
	Mach no. = 0.60 .70 .80 .95 .98 1.05 1.10 1.20	1 8 15 22 29 36 43 50
5	Aerodynamic characteristics in pitch with wing off.	57
6	Aerodynamic characteristics in sideslip with the 12-percent-thick wing at 0°, 45°, and 60° of wing sweep and angles of attack of 3° and 5°	
	Mach no. = 0.60 .70 .80 .95 .98 1.05 1.10 1.20	71 78 85 92 99 106 113 120



ļ

ý ·

The state of the s

.

• ;

ý

;

.



Figure 1. - Axis systems, sound direction and sense of force and moment coefficients, angle of attack, and sideslip angle.

A THE REPORT OF THE ADDRESS OF THE A

ţ



1

1111

í

2, 2 ,

.....

.....

:

í

: ب



ł

1111

•

.

•

i,

Figure 2. - Continued.

ł

(b) Fuselage contours

ł

11

162.56

142.24

121.92

101.60

81.28

60.96

10.64

20.32

Fuselage station, cm (b) Fuselage contours.

Figure 2.- Continued.



• 7

š

۰,

1

1



.

.

(c) Wing curvature.

1

, ; .

ł





x/c	t/c	Camber	Z-Up	<u>Z-10</u>
, -		c	с	e
0.001	.01444	.00008	.00730	00714
0.010	.04072	.00078	.02114	01958
0.025	.05819	.00195	.03104	02715
0.050	.07343	.00389	.04060	03282
0.075	.08269	.00582	.04716	03553
0.100	<b>.</b> 08934	.00772	.05239	03695
0.150	.09899	.01144	.06093	03806
0.200	.10622	.01498	.06808	03813
0.300	.11625	.02129	.07942	03683
0.400	.11997	.02621	.08619	03378
0.500	.11571	.02925	.08711	02861
0.600	.10263	.02995	.08127	02136
0.700	.08144	.02785	.06856	01287
0.800	.05467	.02246	.04980	00487
0.900	.02687	.01334	.02677	00009
1.000	.00456	.0	.00228	00228

## $\frac{\text{L.E. radius}}{c} = .0288$

(d) Wing section drawing and tabulated geometry at wing span station  $_{\eta}$  = 0; 12-percent thick wing,  $W_{5}$ 

Figure 2. - Continued.



x/c	t/c	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	<u>Z-Up</u> c	Z-Lo c
0.001	.01685	• •	.00850	00834
0.010	.04751	•L L F	.02454	02298
0.025	.06789	. 20195	•035 <b>89</b>	03199
0.050	.08567		.04672	03894
0.075	.09647	• •	.05405	04242
0.100	.10423	(12	.05984	04440
0.160	•11549	• 1-4	.06918	04631
0.200	.12392	.01498	.07694	04698
0.300	.13562	02129	.08911	04652
0.400	•13 <b>99</b> 6	2621	.09619	04377
0.500	.13500	i2925	·09675	03825
0.600	.11974	. J2995	.08982	02992
0.700	.09501	.02785	.07535	01966
0.800	•063 <b>79</b>	.02246	.05436	00943
0.900	.03134	.01334	.02901	<b>0023</b> 3
1.000	.00532	.0	.00266	00266

 $\frac{\text{L.E. radius}}{\text{c}} = .0392$ 

(e) Wing section drawing and tabulated geometry at wing span station n = 0; 14-percent thick wing,  $W_6$ 

Figure 2. - Continued.

Figure 2. - Continued.

. :

• • •

ł

}



1

• 1

1

(f) Wing maximum thickness distributions.



Figure 2. - Concluded.

ţ

7.

RIGINAL PAGE IN OF POOR QUALITY

ļ

:

ź



i

\*\* \*\*

(a) Tail incidence =  $-1.5^{\circ}$ ; Re :  $13.2\times10^{6}$  per meter Figure 3. - Variation of maximum lift-to-drag ratio with Mach number for three wing sweep angles.



1

ţ

ì

(b) Tail incidence = 0°; R<sup>n</sup> = 20.0X10<sup>6</sup> per meter Figure 3. - Concluded.

D/\.TA

Ŧ

•

т 7

3

¢



# PRECEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILM

ar and the state of the state o



LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

a na anna an anna an ann ann an

• •



and particular sets

空気

やいたが

19-11-1-1

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

windsteiner ?.)

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



۰. ۲

> . 7

> > . . . .



**的现在分词的一种的新生物的** 





. . . . . . .

:

;



1

......

ŝ

;

ė


LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

Į





\* \* \*

6' A16'5 \$9'573'358"\*\*\*

·法告告 (中书)

and merion



LIFT COEFFICIENT. כר

ĺ



כר LIFT COEFFICIENT.

į

, **,** ļ 5

inter and a start with the state of the state of the state of the



LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

and the second sec

· •



: . .

. . .

÷

\* I = 114

UT AFAFA



ڊ ه

ŝ

\*\* 20 \*\*

ł

;

.....



1. . . . .



;;

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

, THEIGIERS (191)



5° 🐏 🖓

常可是的问题的情况的情

和已发出的情况

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

. ÷



÷

2

ŝ

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

19 11919197969 131





. . . .

í

;

-\* \*



LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

1



\*

3

The state



ì

, ,

1.1.2.1.1

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

---9

- イン・トラインとなって見たいのである。 ディー・ビー・ション・シー・ション・シー・ション・シー・ション・シー・ション・シー・ション・シー・ション・シー・ション・シー・ション・シー・ション・シー・ション

N. S. C. M. C. M.

ł



\*



¥ ×.

÷

LIFT COEFFICIENT, CL

<del>،</del> ار

and the state of t

ふ ほうかいてんない



\*. . ...

FIGURE 4. AERO. CHARACTERISTICS IN PITCH- COMPARISON OF 12 AND 14-PERCENT WINGS. CEDMACH = .98 PAGE 29 25 20 ⊿∳ 20 ₹ <u>8</u>888888 20 Ø 40  $\mathbf{X}$ Ø Ô L COF JGAATION DESCRIPTION DATA 137 AVALLABLE DATA 137 AVALLABLE DATA 137 AVALLABLE VE 327 VG 327 . ۱ 200 - .0 ....**j**. 44 ....ļu ....h.. itririti V - 2 a ke in 

]

And the state of t

. .. ...

ł

2

DATA SET SYHOL

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

・いれい、 ヨード・マート としたいできなながらからな 



11

Å

• • • •

с :-

• \* • \* •

ţ

. . . . . . . .

.

;

• • • •

a .



- BURER PERCHANNEL

A - WANDAR - AND

うなっているないでいてないないないであると

• • • •

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

こうちょう ちょうちょう

. . . . .



2 - Jat 2

.....

. Þ

¢

, . 1.

í

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

. . . . .

7

. . . . . .



11.50 51 9385

i i

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

ę

20

. . . . .



· · ·

• • • •

н, <sub>8</sub> г

\*\*\*\*\*\*

ŝ

. . .

- 1

ц. .

•

.

•

-1 447

......



والعامية والمركبة والمستعلمية والمرام الأمطالية والأعلى والترك

ちょうまん 日本 しょう しょう うちょう ない ひょう かん ひょう ひょう しょう しょう しょう しょう しゅうしん しょうしゅつ

44. v. v. v. v.

「ないたいないないないないないないないないない」

three is a starting and

:



1

•

.

ŝ

ł

į

; • ;

• • • •

;

\*\*\*\* \* \* \*\*

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



日本が新聞のための

,

• ; ,

\*



11->

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

•

.



、 1 #

ないとなると、ことできないないないとう いうちょう ちょう

1

.

¢,

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

.



\* ,

ź

I TET COEFFICIENT. CL



i

- 1

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

and the second of the second o



× • • •

5.5

î

-----

• • • • •

1

1.1. 1.1

.

....

1

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

1



- 195.

î, ۰.

- A second second

÷

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

こうとう いうない 東京語 あいろう 東京 常大学 いため 最大学の学 ありていたち いい

ł

:

t

· · · · · ·



1

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

1-2 1 4

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

. . . . .

.


. . . . . . . . . .

•

こうしょう ちょうしょう かんてい ないない ない しょうしょう しょういん しょうい しょうしん しんしょう しょうしょう かんしょう しゅうしょう しょうしょう しょうしょう

----

Antipet " Latting to an or an

4.5

•

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



ł

たま

3

-

. . . . . .

t

: , ,

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



\*

;

. . . . . . . . . .

\*\*\*\*\*

47 The 14 The 14 The

΄,

;

. . ;

-

and a constant of the state of the 1 × 1 - 1

î î

- 11日日の日日 - ついたい

おかいないです。これでいたなななないというできましたが、 しょう ちょうかんてい シー・・・・・ ノ

LIFT COEFFICIENT. כר

and the second  . ....

.



;

Ê

i

;

. . . . .

, ,

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

2 INJ12133302 I31



いちないしょう いたななない も あいいにんない しんない

un e la sur e su

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

ł

. . . .

. . .

. . . . . . .



i

P. . . .

. . . . .

;

` \*

e

÷

;

i

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



í

· · ,

:

;

• • • •

2

1

-4

Just is seen and the server all the second of the second

ł

÷

ŝ

۰ ٦

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



· -4 · ...

4.74

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

ありまたあるなどのないないではないないで、これのないには、「ないない」ないないです。



11:5

\* 1

9 -1 -

•

2

. .

· ·

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



ł

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

\* • • •

and the second se

•



ł

j

ļ ;

ş

K

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

ż

ł

· · .,

•.

1

----

· · ·····

----

A I ANTA ANALYSIA .

• • • • •

\*\*\*\*

:



. . . . . . .

;

.

1 • • •

. .

「「「「「「「」」」、「「」」、「「」」、「」」、「」、「」、「」、

-



. . . . . . . .

.

i

ł



(ZFJ007)

:

. .

\*\*\*\*

. . . . . . . . shi a



VIOLE OF ATTACK. AUPHA. DEGREES

ł

PAGE

•

\* 7.2



- - - - - -

, , , , ,

:

`. \*,

•

VNOLE OF ATTACK. ALPHA. DEGREES

.....

ł

- 1

\$

4 · · 4

. . . . . . . . . .

÷

ň

4

わえい



l

÷

VNOLE OF ATTACK. ALPHA. DEGREES

PAGE

-----

:

... 0





VNOLE OF ATTACK. ALPHA. DEGREES

. .

1

s. .

2

:

. .

0.45



63

}



+

. . . . . . .

j

VNGLE OF ATTACK. ALPHA. DEGREES



- 77.4

5

VNOLE OF ATTACK. ALPHA. DEGREES

65



-

-

## VNOLE OF ATTACK. ALPHA. DEGREES

;;;



· Nº ··· untra ···

ł



;;

i

ì



A THE PART OF A THE PART

(ZFJU07)

Ţ,

the second

1



VIGLE OF ATTACK. ALPHA. DEGREES

69

and the second sec



ANGLE OF ATTACK. ALPHA. DEGREES

C.2

÷



.

Ż

1 - - C 1 1 - - + - + - +

- 424

1 1 1

. .

ŝ

1

والاستراب المراجع

and a training and a second second

SIDE FORCE COEFFICIENT. CY



1. 1. 1.

. . . . . .

E,

4

;

• • •

•

3

ķ

AVMING WOWENT COEFFICIENT. CYN (800Y AXIS)



Ŧ -----

į

BOLLING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CBL (SIXV A008)



ANCINES LANGUAGE

"w \* . . .

3

.\*\* . .\* .

در مودد

· "

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



ť ł,

÷

ŗ ٩,

;

÷

.....

•

. . .

エヨヤイン ・・・シットデス

2 --

. . . .

. . . . . . . .

والمراجع والمراجع والمتراطع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع

د د

. . . .

المعالمة المراجعة والمراجعة المراجع المراجعة المراجعة المراجعة المراجعة المراجعة المراجعة المراجعة المراجعة الم

4

1

ų.

DANG COEFFICIENT.CD



i

.\*

A THE COMPANY

111

2

. . . .

ŝ

-

• • • •

. . . . .

· · · · · · · · · · · · ·

PITCHING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CLM



ŝ \*\*\* "

ç., 4

\* \*\*\*

, , ۰

; ŝ

1999 - 19

£

م ر م

2 . . . ş 

. ;,

LIFT/ORAG RATIO. L/O



å

٤

;

í,

:

· • • •

1, 1,

•

. . . .

1

÷

•

11.251 4

,

. . . . . . .

\* . \*

-----

SIDE FORCE COEFFICIENT. CY



· · · · · ·

· · · ·

.

. . . .

:

1 10 17

•

. . . . .

-

,

5

× . . .

. .....

Me we a share

AVAING WOWENT COEFFICIENT. CYN (BODY AXIS)



. . . .

.

1 .

A week

4 (Pr) 6 W. 4

.

· · · · »

÷

i

£

5

\*

•

÷

· \*\*\*\*

 ROLLING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CBL (800Y AXIS)


4

.

5 K 1

\*

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

\*



i

.

.

۰. ۱

,

÷

----

•

ž

.

•

1 - 454 ÷

14

•

.

. . . . . . 4

••

.

CSYG COEFFICIENT.CO



ĩ

:

\$

¢

, ž

۶.

PITCHING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CLM

L. COFIGLANTION DESCRIPTION VS 82 T VS 





LIFT/DRAG RATIO. L/D

84

÷

2

17

•

「「「」」では、「「「」」」をいいていていた。

(B)YACH



\* \* \*\* \* \*

1....

\*\*\*\*

ř

1.1.1.5

14.

ŝ

ź

\*\*\*\*

SIDE FORCE COEFFICIENT. CY



, ;

í

v

ì

í

5 44

ł

AAWING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CYN (800Y AXIS)

ŧ,

. Į



ļ

2

2

1.1

لينافع القدار فالالار فالاستراد

i i i ÷

ŝ

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



•

A . . .

. . .

2

· ....

ł

÷

1

:

e

, ,

ł

•

. . . . .

, ,

1

2 . . F

. ; ,

•

419 Fight -



1 - 11 - 12 - 14 - 1

10.011

· v

6 P

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

. . . . . . . . . .

\* . \* . .

ł,

ſ

i,

<u>\_</u>•

DRAG COEFFICIENT.CD



**BITCHING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CLM** 

1

, 1 n l . .

. . . . .

------

1 - 1 - 1

1. . . . . . . . . .

FIGURE 6. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN SIDESLIP- 12-PERCENT-THICK WING. SIDESLIP ANGLE. BETA. DEGREES 8. łi COMACH

6



÷.

LIFT/DRAG RATIO. L/D



2.2

;

5

;,

;

,= ,

. . . . .

2

:

-

•

:,

, 1 -

•

۲.

SIDE FORCE COEFFICIENT. CY

a 100/1

DATA 1









AVAING WOWENT COEFFICIENT. CYN (SIXV ADD8)



· · · · ·

•

i "

ž

- - 4

;

-

:

.

. . .

. ş

\* \* \*

\$

:

\*\* 18 \*\*

. ....







LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

95

. ...



DSAG COEFFICIENT.CD

.

•

5 T.

-----

;\_\_\_\_

....

7

1

-



. . .

,• -

> . ,

> , <u>, ,</u> ,

•

Ξ,

<u>ە</u> FIGURE 6. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN SIDESLIP- 12-PERCENT-THICK WING. PAGE -2 0 2 SIDESLIP ANGLE, BETA, DEGREES 4 -95 -Ģ 11 - **.**205. -.10+ - 15 **CDJMACH** 

BITCHING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CLM

S.

6



7 7 1

and a starter

25

--05

Ŧ

Į,

Ż

d

2<u>1</u>

0

ģ

.15

<u>н</u>

4

..

201

ø

þ

.....

-95 -

2) 2

. . . .

· + + + +++ - + + + + +



LIFT/DRAG RATIO. L/D

**)** •



ļ

ç

:

-

5

 ∱ იოოო ¥ 888888

L. COFIGANTON DESCRIPTION DATA NOT AVAILABLE VS 92 T VS 92 T VS 92 T VS 92 T

aksi

0474 States

08-45

SIDE FORCE COEFFICIENT. CY



.

.....

. . . . . . . .

;; ;

••••••

\* • •

. .

. . . . . .

rear and the second and a second seco

1.2 mm

1

YAWING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CYN (800Y AXIS)



12 ::

. . . . . .

. .. . . . .

- \* # - H - P - \* \*

.....

\*

......

-

ì

٥ ١

2

.



きちばいこ エピー・コンドゥ

- 2 - 21 - 2 - 2 - 2

а, <u>т</u>

- Control and the statement of the

١

5.

," •

Mar Marin

241.

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



۰.

H







PITCHING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CLM

ŕ

:



LIFT/DRAG RATIO. L/D



SIDE FORCE COEFFICIENT. CY

•



AVAING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CYN (SIXV A008)

ę

108 O മ FIGURE 6. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN SIDESLIP- 12-PERCENT-THICK WING. FJMACH = 1.05 PAGE Y **ل** -2 0 2 SIDESLIP ANGLE, BETA, DEGREES F 9 7 4488 988888 9888888 Ĩ Ē i ŀ 仰 COMPANY CONTROL CATA NOT AVAILURE SECT 4 6 Ģ Ó .015Fo .025pm -020-50. - .0251 00. 0 - .010 --015 --020 - . . (F JMACH a::04/1 DATA SET

ROLLING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CBL (BODY AXIS)



٠

į

-•

;

1 · · · · · · · · · · ·

. . . .

. . . .

. . . . . . . . .

6

í

å

š

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

2. CC-FIGARATIC, DESCRIPTION 2.1.1.1.2. AVALUALE 5.2.1 15.3.2.1 15.3.2.1 15.3.2.1 15.3.2.1 15.3.2.1 0.041 VIA MT

1

; ;••







DRAG COEFFICIENT.CD

FIGURE 6. AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN SIDESLIP- 12-PERCENT-THICK WING.

ころよんにょう

A STATE A

. . . . .

110



:

かんよう

• • • • •

. . . . . . . . . . .

· ·

. . . . . .

4 5

. . .

1

ť

Į

ę

PITCHING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CLM



LIFT/DRAG RATIO. L/D

Ş. \*



SIDE FORCE COEFFICIENT. CY

, , ,

E

1111

.030 fundmulud

.0255











m



a

A

4

ঠ

(SIXV XOD8)

010

.005

0:51

-020F

AVMING WOWENT COELEICIENT. CYN

ц Ч



114

Ē



ROLLING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CBL (BODY AXIS)

\* \* \* \*

î,

ł

· · · · · · ·

•

Ň



.

. . . . .

.,

.....

ŝ

ţ.

. . . . . .

•

. . . . .

. .

÷...

;

. . . . ....

, , . ....

LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL

-----

"and the second

×1

. . . . .


1.5

•

-

÷

F 5

.

DRAG COEFFICIENT.CO

-.. ,



------

÷. . . .

....

\*\*\*\* \* \*\*\*\*\*\* \*

î. 1

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

···· · · ·

. . .

3

•

. . . . .

11.1.1 × × × × × × ×

\* \*

.

ة. م DITCHING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CLM



. ,

. . .

• • •

· · · · . . .

•

. . . . . .

÷

\* \* \* \* \* \*

-

. .. . . . .

. . .

i

•.,`

LIFT/DRAG RATIG. L/D



ļ

, r , # 7 .

international second

; 1

-

ł

;

;

, , ,

 $c_{1} = c_{1}$ 

\* ~ \*

SIDE FORCE COEFFICIENT. Y)



(SIXV A008)

Ł ,

. . . .

2 :

-

.

**AVAING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CYN** 



. . .

\* \* 2 1 \*

و :

÷ 1<sup>6</sup> 2

- •

÷

. .

-

- - - - - -

- ----

. . . . .

۔ د اتع

. .

, E 4 1

----

ł ;



LIFT COEFFICIENT. CL



\* \* \* \* \* \* \*

. . . .

.....

- -

1

-

: -

· · · · ·

•

; ; .• . . . .

÷.

DRAG COEFFICIENT.CD



. .. .

1

. . . .

i

\* • •

PITCHING MOMENT COEFFICIENT. CLM



÷

.

. . .

4~ · · · · · · · · · · · ·

a v\*-

· · · · · · ·

LIFT/DRAG RATIG. L/D