

# **MULTI-OBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION OF FREQUENCY** AND DAMPING OF VERTICAL STABILIZER SKIN **STRUCTURE PLACED WITH VARIABLE-ANGLE TOWS** Xianzhao Xia, Lei Zu\*, Qian Zhang, Guiming Zhang Hefei University of Technology, China \*Corresponding author: zulei@hfut.edu.cn

## Theoretical development of optimization model

### Numerical optimization process



### **Optimization results**

Corresponding to any point of the reference points C1 to C6 in Figure on the right, select any two points (optimization points) on the **Pareto Frontier** of VAT-L for comparison; any of the two parameters (fundamental frequency or modal One of SDC) of both the reference point and the two corresponding optimization points is kept the same, and the other parameter is compared.

Layup and vibration properties of VSC and VAT laminates of Pareto Fronts

Laminate	Boundary condition	Ply	Frequency (Hz)	SDC (%)	Gain (%)
C1		$[\pm 45^{\circ}]_{28}$	9.05	1.83	
V1		$[\pm \langle 55.39^{\circ}, 38.61^{\circ} \rangle, \pm \langle 52.18^{\circ}, 42.60^{\circ} \rangle]_{s}$	9.05	2.16	17.80
V2	CFFF	$[\pm \langle 50.36^\circ, 34.69^\circ \rangle, \pm \langle 52.67^\circ, 43.12^\circ \rangle]_s$	10.02	1.84	10.76
C2		$[\pm 30^{\circ}]_{28}$	12.41	1.16	
V3		$[\pm \langle 39.39^{\circ}, 26.65^{\circ} \rangle, \pm \langle 32.87^{\circ}, 32.74^{\circ} \rangle]_{s}$	12.42	1.31	12.70
V4		$[\pm (35.14^{\circ}, 22.39^{\circ}), \pm (32.18^{\circ}, 21.33^{\circ})]_{s}$	13.37	1.17	7.66
C3		$[\pm 45^{\circ}]_{28}$	46.15	1.70	
V5	CFCF	$[\pm \langle 35.55^{\circ}, 52.84^{\circ} \rangle, \pm \langle 42.06^{\circ}, 46.92^{\circ} \rangle]_{s}$	46.17	1.85	9.12
V6		$[\pm \langle 34.83^{\circ}, 48.50^{\circ} \rangle, \pm \langle 42.43^{\circ}, 52.33^{\circ} \rangle]_{s}$	48.77	1.70	5.66
C4		$[\pm 30^{\circ}]_{28}$	62.13	1.14	
V7		$[\pm \langle 26.41^{\circ}, 36.41^{\circ} \rangle, \pm \langle 25.34^{\circ}, 25.17^{\circ} \rangle]_{s}$	62.13	1.22	6.82
C5	CCCC	$[\pm 45^{\circ}]_{28}$	158.11	1.00	
V9		$[\pm \langle 38.00^{\circ}, 27.84^{\circ} \rangle, \pm \langle 38.79^{\circ}, 27.65^{\circ} \rangle]_{s}$	158.20	1.07	7.17
V10		$[\pm \langle 59.97^{\circ}, 47.19^{\circ} \rangle, \pm \langle 54.21^{\circ}, 54.82^{\circ} \rangle]_{s}$	164.80	1.00	4.23
C6		$[\pm 30^{\circ}]_{28}$	150.01	1.11	
V11		$[\pm \langle 29.10^{\circ}, 19.47^{\circ} \rangle, \pm \langle 22.65^{\circ}, 14.56^{\circ} \rangle]_{s}$	150.02	1.18	6.29



Pareto Fronts of different boundary conditions, obtained from multi-objective optimizations to maximize fundamental frequency and SDC of the first vibration mode



Gains achieved by different Pareto Fronts

The modal SDC and fundamental frequency can be greatly improved by optimizing the fiber trajectory Improvement degree: modal SDC > fundamental frequency improvement degree : CFFF>CFCF>CCCC

The damping in the direction 12,  $\psi$ 12, is generally the main one to be improved when regarding improving the damping of a structure by optimizing the fiber trajectory.

## **Experimental validation**



Vibration properties of 6 conventional constant stiffness laminates and their 6 optimally damped Pareto Fronts under three kinds boundary conditions

#### hammer-hitting method



#### Prepreg curve-steered AFP machine



## Acceptance point Fixed support hammer-hitting method

Production process of test laminates.

Hammer-hitting method for modal test and their test points

#### Comparison of test and calculation results

	Fundamental frequency			Damping (%)		
Laminate	Calculatio n (Hz)	Test (Hz)	Error (%)	Calculatio n	Test	Error
C1	9.05	9.64	6.52	1.83	1.63	10.93
V2	10.02	10.89	8.69	1.84	1.68	8.69