Optimization of the aerodynamic configuration of a tubular projectile based on blind Kriging

Qiang Zhao, Zhihua Chen*, Zhengui Huang, Huanhao Zhang, Jie Ma**

National Key Laboratory of Transient Physics, Nanjing University of Science and Technology,
Nanjing 210094, Jiangsu, China.

* Corresponding author: Zhihua Chen, Tel.: +86 25 84303929, Email address: chenzh@njust.edu.cn
** Present address: School of Mechanical and Power Engineering, Nanjing Tech University, Nanjing 211816, Jiangsu, China.

Abstract

Based on optimal Latin hypercube design for computer experiments, blind Kriging surrogate model and sequential quadratic programming method, the optimal design of the aerodynamic configuration of a 30mm tubular projectile is carried out with the use of commercial softwares, such as UG, ICEM CFD, FLUENT etc. The aerodynamic configuration has been optimized to minimize the drag coefficients at different Mach numbers and maximize the kinetic energies at given flight ranges. The optimal configuration is obtained and discussed. Finally, the similarities and differences of the flow structure and aerodynamic characteristics between the original and optimal tubular projectiles are compared. The numerical optimal method proposed in this paper for optimizing the tubular projectile can provide important guidances for the aerodynamic configuration design of projectiles.
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1. Introduction

Tubular projectiles, also known as hollow projectiles, are virtually thin-walled tubes with beveled ends. Compared with conventional solid projectile, the tubular projectile has many advantages [1,2], such as small
drag, high accuracy and precision, low cost and small recoil force. The tubular projectile has broad application background in the ammunition field of air defense, and it has been proved to be very promising. Therefore, the research on optimal design of the configuration of the tubular projectile is quite necessary and important.

The research on tubular projectile has attracted much attention for many years due to its superiority, mainly focusing on its applications [3,4] and wind tunnel tests [5,6]. With the rapid improvement of computer capacity and the development of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) in recent years, much research has focused on numerical simulation of the flow field around the tubular projectile [7,8], and the flow structure and aerodynamic characteristics are studied. Our research group has also done a lot of work from numerical simulation to numerical optimization of the tubular projectile [1,2]. Li Y.L. et al. [2] detailly studied the aerodynamic characteristics of the tubular projectile under real conditions with the use of FLUENT. Based on numerical simulations of the two-dimensional flow fields around different configurations at Mach number 3.0, Huang Z.G. et al. [1] optimized the aerodynamic configuration of a simplified tubular projectile by using the exhaustive method, and the optimal configuration with minimum drag coefficient was obtained. However, it appears that the exhaustive method may be appropriate based on the extremely limited number of design variables.

This paper presents an approach for the optimal design of supersonic tubular projectiles based on blind Kriging surrogate model. Up to now, surrogate model has been successfully applied to the aerodynamic configuration optimization of airfoils [9], rockets [10], guided projectiles [11] and missiles [12]. As a typical surrogate model, Kriging is widely used [13-15]. Blind Kriging is the extension of Kriging whose predictor is more complicated and more robust, and it has been successfully applied to many different kinds of optimization problems [16].

In this paper, numerical simulations are performed for a 55.09mm tubular projectile, and the drag coefficients at Mach number of 2.3-4.5 are obtained. Simultaneously, the computational predictions are compared with the free-flight results. Based on blind Kriging surrogate model, the research on optimal design
of the aerodynamic configuration of our previously studied 30mm tubular projectile is then carried out by use of the sequential quadratic programming (SQP) method.

2. Optimization process of the aerodynamic configuration of supersonic tubular projectiles

Surrogate-based optimization approach, which has recently attracted much attention due to the fact that it can reduce the computational cost substantially, has proven quite useful for engineering design problems. The actual process of aerodynamic configuration optimization based on surrogate model is shown in Figure 1, and it involves the following four primary steps:

1. Choose the numerical method for the flow simulation.
2. Design computational experiments for a collection of pairs of inputs and responses for use.
3. Build blind Kriging surrogate models with high accuracy.
4. Conduct an optimization search based on the surrogate models.

In this paper, we choose the original 30mm tubular projectile as an optimization object. Firstly, the same numerical method used in Ref. [1] is selected for the flow simulation of the tubular projectile. Then, a computational experiment is conducted by using the optimal Latin hypercube design, and the drag coefficients of a few selected tubular projectile configurations at different Mach numbers are obtained respectively. Afterwards, blind Kriging surrogate models are built for the drag coefficients at different Mach numbers. Finally, the SQP is selected as a method for optimal design of the configuration of a supersonic tubular projectile. Following sections give detailed process of each step.

2.1. Computational method

Considering that the supersonic tubular projectile is mainly used for air defense, it must make full use of the kinetic energy of the ascending stage. During the ascending stage, the tubular projectile almost flies with zero angle of attack, and hence the zero attack-angle flight model reflects the practical flight of a tubular projectile
within the effective range. Therefore, the zero angle of attack is used in our calculation model during the simulation process.

We choose the same numerical method as used in Ref. [1]. The compressible Navier-Stokes equations and the Spalart-Allmaras turbulence modeling are adopted. The convection term and viscosity term are discretized by the second order Advection Upstream Splitting Method (AUSM) scheme and second order central difference scheme, respectively. And the second order Runge-Kutta scheme is used for time stepping. In order to validate the above method, a tubular projectile [6], shown in Figure 2, is selected as the example. The drag coefficient results of CFD and free-flight at Mach number 2.3-4.5 are shown in Figure 3. As illustrated, our numerical results agree well with free-flight results of Ref. [6].

Our previously studied 30mm tubular projectile with a length to diameter ratio of 2.7 is selected as the original model, and its two-dimensional model is shown in Figure 4. The tubular projectile is composed of the nose, the cylindrical body, the boattail and the internal part. The internal part is a tube which consists of the convergence section, the cylinder tube and the divergence section. The computational domain is taken as a cylinder topology, and the tubular projectile is placed in the center of the symmetry plane. The diameter and depth of the cylinder are 8D and 12D, respectively, and D is the diameter of the tubular projectile. The computational mesh is generated by the mesh generation software ICEM CFD. Moreover, considering the particular structure of the tubular projectile, the O-grid generation technique is applied for the generation of three-dimensional body-fitted structured mesh. After repeated calculations and the convergence test at Ma=3.0, shown in Figure 5, about 4 million mesh cells in computational domain is selected. Figure 6-8 show the computational domain size and the final mesh, the surface and sectional meshes, and the mesh around the tubular projectile, respectively. As for the boundary conditions, the no-slip wall condition and pressure far-field condition are used for the projectile surface and flow inlet and exit, respectively. The first layer distance from the wall is selected to maintain the y+ value in the range of 30-60 for all the cases at different Mach numbers. Taking Ma=3.0 as an example, the first layer distances from the
inner and external walls are $1.7 \times 10^{-3}$ m and $2.0 \times 10^{-3}$ m, respectively, and the range of $y+$ values is 31.62-57.81.

2.2. Design of computational experiments

Design of experiments (DOE), also known as sampling, is a collection of pairs of inputs and responses from runs of a computer model, and it has a significant impact on the accuracy of a surrogate model. The actual process of the DOE involves intelligent selection of sample points in the design space. A great variety of methods exist for this purpose, such as the full factorial design [17], the fractional factorial design [17], the Latin hypercube design (LHD) [18] and the optimal Latin hypercube design (OLHD) [19].

The LHD and OLHD are just two of the most common methods for designing computer experiments. The OLHD is an improvement of the LHD. LHD is proposed by Mckay et al. [18]. Consider the sample of size $M$ that we wish to get in the $n$-dimensional vector space. The LHD strategy is as follows:

1. Divide the range of each dimension into $M$ intervals with equal marginal probability.
2. Sample once from the intervals in each dimension and pair them at random.

Because the sample points obtained by using LHD are made of combinations of each dimension randomly, the potential lack of uniformity is unavoidable. To improve the uniformity, the enhanced stochastic evolutionary algorithm and efficient methods for evaluating optimality criteria are developed [19]. This computer experiment strategy is the so-called OLHD adopted in this paper. It has been proved that the OLHD offers a substantial improvement over the LHD on the uniformity and maintains a good computational efficiency in sampling. Furthermore, we can easily determine the sample size according to the prediction accuracy of a surrogate model in a OLHD. Therefore, in order to establish the functional relation between the drag coefficient and design variables $X={X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n}$, OLHD is the method chosen for DOE. Considering the trade-off between computational complexity and prediction accuracy of a surrogate model, the sample size of 35 is finally determined.
Generation of an LHD for design variables \( X = \{ X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n \} \) produces a set of \( M \) vectors of length \( n \).

Then we use commercial softwares, such as UG, ICEM CFD and FLUENT, to calculate the drag coefficient of each configuration. The flowchart of the DOE process is shown in Figure 9 and the detailed process is as follows:

1. Choose the numerical experiment method, OLHD, and design numerical experiment.
2. Update the configuration \( i \) as well as output the mass of the tubular projectile by use of a C++ program, which is developed on the UG platform.
3. Run the file ICEM_CFD.rpl which contains a recording of the commands used to generate the computational structured mesh automatically via a script.
4. Run the file FLUENT.jou which contains a sequence of FLUENT commands via a script, and the corresponding drag coefficient is obtained.
5. Return to Step 2-4 until \( i \) reaches the sample size \( M \).

### 2.3. Blind Kriging surrogate model

A wide variety of approaches can be used to construct a surrogate model, including polynomial regression, Kriging, support vector regression and radial basis functions. Kriging is of particular popularity for approximating deterministic computer experiments, and it is widely used for obtaining a surrogate model.

Blind Kriging, proposed by Joseph et al. [16], extends Kriging with a Bayesian feature selection method.

The mathematical formula of blind Kriging is given as follows:

\[
Y(x) = \mu(x) + Z(x)
\]

(1)

where \( \mu(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu_i \nu_i(x) \), is a trend function, and \( Z(x) \) is a stochastic process with mean 0 and variance \( \sigma_m^2 \). The \( \nu_i(x) \), \( \mu_i \) and \( m \) are the basis function, the corresponding coefficient and the number of basis functions, respectively.
Consider the predicted value $\hat{y}(x)$ at a new point $x$ by a linear model:

$$\hat{y}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \mu_i v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{t} \beta_i u_i$$

(2)

where $u_i$ denotes the candidate function and $t$ is the number of candidate functions. As to the $\sum_{i=0}^{t} \beta_i u_i$, it includes the linear effects, quadratic effects and two-factor interactions. The linear effects and quadratic effects are defined respectively as,

$$x_{jl} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{2}} (x_j - 2)$$

(3)

$$x_{jq} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( 3(x_j - 2)^2 - 2 \right)$$

(4)

where $j = 1, 2, \cdots, p$, and $p$ denotes the number of input dimensions. Taking a two-dimensional input $x^T = (x_1, x_2)$ as an example, from the Eq. (2) we get the expression for $\hat{y}(x)$, $\sum_{i=0}^{m} \mu_i v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{t} \beta_i u_i$, where $u_0 = 1, u_1 = x_1, u_2 = x_2, u_3 = x_1^2, u_4 = x_2^2, u_5 = x_1 x_2, u_6 = x_1 x_2^2, u_7 = x_1^2 x_2$ and $u_8 = x_1 x_2^3$.

Considering the fact that the number of sample points available may be less than the number of candidate functions, then a frequentist estimation of $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \cdots, \beta_t)^T$ becomes impossible, therefore, a prior distribution is postulated for $\beta$:

$$\beta \sim N(0, \sigma^2_R)$$

(5)

where $0$ is a vector of length $t+1$ and $R$ is a $(t+1) \times (t+1)$ diagonal matrix.

Define the vectors $l_j$ and $q_j$ with following properties: (1) If $\beta_j$ includes the linear effect of factor $j$, $l_j = 1$, otherwise $l_j = 0$; (2) If $\beta_j$ includes the quadratic effect of factor $j$, $q_j = 1$, otherwise, $q_j = 0$. Then the diagonal matrix $R$ can be expressed as,

$$R = \begin{bmatrix}
    r_{l_1}^{i_1} \cdot r_{q_1}^{i_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
    0 & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
    \vdots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots \\
    0 & \cdots & 0 & r_{l_t}^{i_t} \cdot r_{q_t}^{i_t}
\end{bmatrix}$$

(6)

where
\[
\begin{align*}
    r_i &= \frac{3 - 3\psi(2)}{3 + 4\psi(1) + 2\psi(2)} \\
    r_q &= \frac{3 - 4\psi(1) + \psi(2)}{3 + 4\psi(1) + 2\psi(2)}
\end{align*}
\] (7) (8)

Subsequently, the posterior mean of \( \beta \) is derived as follows:

\[
\hat{\beta} = \frac{r_m}{\sigma_m} RU \psi^{-1} (y - v_m \hat{\mu}_m)
\] (9)

where \( U \) is the model matrix of all candidate variables, \( \psi \) is the correlation matrix of the sample points and \( v_m \) is the model matrix of currently chosen candidate variables. The larger the absolute coefficient \( |\beta| \), the more important the candidate variable. Thus the candidate variable with the largest \( |\beta| \) will be selected at each step \( m=0,1,2\cdots \). The best value of \( m \) is chosen by using cross validation prediction error (CVPE), which is defined as follows:

\[
CVPE(m) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} (y(x_i) - \hat{y}(x_i))^2}
\] (10)

where \( \hat{y}(x_i) \) is the predicted value after removing the \( i \)th sample point, \( y(x_i) \) denotes the corresponding actual value and \( M \) is the number of sample points. Then \( m \) with minimum \( CVPE(m) \) is chosen as the best value. Subsequently, choose the current best set of features to construct the final blind Kriging.

2.4. SQP method

The SQP is selected as the method of trajectory optimization. The SQP represents the state of the art in nonlinear programming methods, which has advantages of fast convergence and high precision, and it is one of the most effective methods available for trajectory optimization [20]. The basic idea of SQP is to model the nonlinear programming problems for a given iteration, by a quadratic programming (QP) subproblem, and then the solution is used to construct this subproblem to obtain a better approximation of the solution. This process is conducted iteratively till a converged solution is obtained.

The constrained nonlinear programming problem has the following form:
Min $f(x)$  
$G_i(x) = 0, i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_e$  
$G_i(x) \leq 0, i = n_e + 1, \cdots, n_i$ \hfill (11)

where $f(x)$ is the objective function, $G(x) = [g_1(x), g_2(x), g_3(x), \cdots, g_n(x)]$, is a function vector, and $g_i(x)$ is a linear or nonlinear function. $G_i(x)$ denotes an equality constraint for $i = 1 \sim m_e$. While for $i = m_e + 1 \sim m$, $G_i(x)$ denotes the inequality constraint.

After linearizing the nonlinear constraints, the following form of the QP subproblem can be obtained:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Min} & \quad \frac{1}{2} d^T B_k d + (\nabla f(x_k))^T d \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad [\nabla g_i(x_k)]^T d + g_i(x_k) = 0, i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_e \\
& \quad [\nabla g_i(x_k)]^T d + g_i(x_k) \leq 0, i = n_e + 1, \cdots, n_i
\end{align*}
\]

where $d$ is the search direction, $\nabla f(x_k)$ is the gradient of the objective function at the current iterate $x_k$, $B_k$ is a positive definite approximation of the Hessian matrix of the Lagrangian function updated by the Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (BFGS) algorithm. The QP subproblem can be solved through a quadratic approximation of the Lagrangian function:

\[
L(x, \lambda) = f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i g_i(x)
\]

where $\lambda$ is the vector of Lagrange multipliers and $\lambda_i$ is the $i$th Lagrange multiplier.

The main steps of the SQP method can be summarized as follows [21]:

1. Give the first iterate $x_1$, a positive definite matrix $B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ (an identity matrix) and let $k=1$.

2. Compute the search direction $d_k$ and the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda_{k,1}$ by solving the QP subproblem (12).

3. Determine the stepsize $\alpha_k$ by an appropriate line search procedure to obtain a sufficient decrease in a merit function, and then a new iterate $x_{k+1}$ can be obtained, $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k$.

4. Calculate the difference in $x_k$, and the difference $\|\Delta x_k\|$ is obtained. $\|\Delta x_k\| = \|\alpha_k d_k\| = \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|$. If $\|\Delta x_k\|$ is sufficient small, then the iteration is over, otherwise, return to Step (5).

5. Update the positive definite matrix $B_k$ to $B_{k+1}$ by the BFGS algorithm and let $k=k+1$. Then return to Step (2).
3. Optimal design of a typical tubular projectile

Case studies seek to solve the problem of optimal design of the tubular projectile. Firstly, based on blind Kriging surrogate model, the configuration of the tubular projectile has been optimized for minimum drag coefficient by using the SQP method. The minimum drag coefficient and optimal configuration parameters at Ma=2.5-4.5 are obtained, respectively. Then, with application of the simple particle trajectory model [20], the configuration of the tubular projectile is optimized to maximize the kinetic energy at given flight ranges through the SQP method, and the variation range of each configuration parameter is obtained. Finally, the similarities and differences of the flow structure and aerodynamic characteristics between the original and optimal tubular projectiles are compared.

3.1. Main design variables

Our previously numerical simulation shows that the ratio of the inner throat area to inlet area and effective Mach number essentially govern the flight condition of a specific tubular projectile. Since the throat and inlet diameters have been defined in the early design phase, they are not design variables. The design variables of a typical tubular projectile and their ranges are shown in Figure 10 and Table 1, respectively.

3.2. Minimization of the drag

Based on the softwares UG, ICEM CFD, FLUENT etc., the whole calculation process is conducted automatically via scripting, and the drag coefficients corresponding to 35 numerical samples at Ma=2.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0 and 4.5 are obtained, respectively. Then blind Kriging surrogate model is established for the drag coefficients at different Mach numbers. As for the drag coefficient of a specific configuration at any Mach number within the range, it is obtained by using the Lagrange interpolation method.
In order to evaluate the prediction accuracy of the blind Kriging surrogate model and Lagrange interpolation method, the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) is used, defined as:

$$\text{MAPE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left| \frac{C_d - \hat{C}_d}{C_d} \right| \times 100\%$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

where $N$ is the number of testing samples, $C_d$ and $\hat{C}_d$ are the actual numerical and predicted values of the drag coefficient, respectively. In this paper, 8 testing samples are obtained by using the OLHD, and the MAPE values at $Ma=2.5-4.5$ are obtained and shown in Figure 11. It can be seen that the minimum and maximum MAPE values are 0.83% and 2.56%, respectively, which indicates both the blind Kriging surrogate model and Lagrange interpolation method have good prediction accuracy.

Table 2 gives the optimal configuration parameters with minimum drag at $Ma=2.5-4.5$. The value of the optimal configuration parameter $X_2$ is the same at different Mach numbers. For the optimal configuration parameters $X_1$, $X_3$ and $X_4$, their variation ranges are 44.16-46.65mm, 40.37-45.00mm and 30.50-35.48mm, respectively.

The comparison of the drag coefficients of the original and optimal tubular projectiles is shown in Figure 12. Compared with the drag coefficient of the original tubular projectile at the same Mach number, the drag coefficient of the optimal tubular projectile is smaller, and the percentage decreases of the drag coefficients at $Ma=2.5-4.5$ are all over 35.0%, which indicates the optimal results are satisfactory.

3.3. Maximization of the Kinetic energy

Considering that the 30mm tubular projectile is mainly used for short range air defense, hence, reaching a target with maximum kinetic energy is of vital importance. It is necessary to conduct an optimal design of the tubular projectile to maximize the kinetic energy at a given flight range. With the application of simple particle trajectory model, based on the blind Kriging surrogate models established for the drag coefficients at $Ma=2.5-4.5$ in section 3.2, the configuration has been optimized for maximum kinetic energy at flight
ranges of 800m and 1600m, respectively, and the results are shown in Table 3 and Figure 13, where RF denotes the flight range and EK denotes the kinetic energy. In addition, all of tubular projectiles have the same muzzle kinetic energy, EK=220KJ.

From Table 3, we can conclude that the variation ranges of optimal configuration parameters \(X_1, X_2, X_3\) and \(X_4\), are 40.83-42.41mm, 14.71-14.78mm, 40.02-40.18mm and 31.15-31.69mm, respectively. Figure 13 shows the comparison of the kinetic energies of end-points of both original and optimal tubular projectiles at different launch angles. As for the average kinetic energies of three different launch angles of the original and optimal tubular projectiles, their values are 145.03KJ and 164.84KJ, 92.07KJ and 121.56KJ for given flight ranges of 800m and 1600m, respectively. The percentage increases of the kinetic energies of the optimal tubular projectile are respectively above 10% and 30% compared with those of the original tubular projectile. The optimization results of the tubular projectile are satisfactory, and greatly improve the aerodynamic performance of the original tubular projectile.

### 3.4. Comparison of aerodynamic characteristics

Taking the optimal configuration of the tubular projectile as the example for numerical simulation, it has the averaged optimized parameters of \(X_1=40.90\)mm, \(X_2=14.77\)mm, \(X_3=40.14\)mm and \(X_4=31.67\)mm. The comparison of pressure contours of both original and optimal tubular projectiles at Ma=2.5, 3.5 and 4.5 is shown in Figure 14-16.

From Figure 14-16, despite different configurations, the flow fields around the two tubular projectiles are symmetrical and the main flow structures are the same. As for the external flow, the oblique shock and expansion waves are generated at the nose tip and the boattail, respectively. Behind the expansion waves, the pressure decreases sharply. Compared with the external flow, the internal flow is more complicated. The oblique shock waves interact with each other and reflect from the corresponding inner walls, which
generates a series of similar structures of oblique and reflected shock waves. The highest pressures around two tubular projectiles all occur in internal flows.

Despite the above described similarities, there are some obvious differences between two tubular projectiles. On the one hand, the intensity of oblique shock waves of the optimal one is weaker than that of the original one at the same Mach number. Then the external wall pressure around the optimal tubular projectile is much smaller than that around the original one, and hence the optimal tubular projectile has smaller external wall drag. In addition, the location and pressure of the first intersection point of oblique shock waves are different. The location of the optimal one is farther from the nose tip, and its value of pressure is also smaller. However, for Ma=2.5, the pressure of the second intersection point of oblique shock waves of the optimal one is a little bigger than the internal pressure of the original one.

Flow structures of two tubular projectiles also vary with Mach number. According to Figure 14-16, it is observed that the higher the Mach number, the smaller the oblique angle of shock wave at the nose, and the pressure shows an opposite trend. In addition, the first intersection point of oblique shock waves moves toward the boattail with the increase of Mach number.

The total drag coefficients of both original and optimal tubular projectiles at different Mach numbers are shown in Figure 17. As we can see, the $C_d$ of both original and optimal tubular projectiles decreases with the increase of Mach number for supersonic flow, which agrees well with the variation of normal projectiles. The value of $C_d$ of the optimal tubular projectile is much smaller, and its decrease percentage at Ma=2.5-4.5 is above 29%.

The comparison of drag coefficients of each portion of two tubular projectiles is presented in Figure 18-20. $C_{de}$, $C_{di}$ and $C_{db}$ denote the external wall, inner wall and base drag coefficients, respectively. The external wall drag accounts for the most of the total drag, approximately 60-70%. The inner wall drag is comparatively lower, and the base drag is the least. Therefore, it is the optimization of external configuration...
that mainly causes the decrease of the total drag. Both $C_{dl}$ and $C_{db}$ of the two tubular projectiles decrease with the increase of Mach number, while it is not the same for the $C_{di}$ due to the complexity of the internal flow.

4. Conclusions

A method for aerodynamic configuration optimization of a supersonic tubular projectile using DOE and surrogate model has been proposed and validated in this paper. The whole process of the DOE is conducted automatically with the use of commercial softwares, such as UG, ICEM CFD and FLUENT. The method incorporates a SQP algorithm that, when coupled to the blind Kriging surrogate model, produces an optimal configuration design of the tubular projectile with respect to the objectives of minimum drag coefficient and maximum kinetic energy.

The optimal design of our previously studied 30mm tubular projectile is taken as an example, our computational results show that optimal aerodynamic configurations with minimum drag coefficient are different at different Mach numbers, however, the variations of the configurations are small. This changing trend is also true for optimal aerodynamic configurations with maximum kinetic energy at different flight ranges. Meanwhile, the comparison of drag coefficients of each portion of the original and optimal tubular projectiles has been made, and the optimization of the external configuration is mainly the cause of total drag decrease. The method proposed in this paper can provide important guidances for the aerodynamic configuration design of projectiles.
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Nomenclature

- \( B_d \): positive definite matrix
- \( C_d \): drag coefficient
- \( \hat{C}_d \): predicted drag coefficient
- \( C_{db} \): base drag coefficient
- \( C_{de} \): external wall drag coefficient
- \( C_{di} \): inner wall drag coefficient
- \( d \): search direction
- \( EK \): kinetic energy (KJ)
- \( f(x) \): objective function
- \( g_i(x) \): linear or nonlinear function
- \( G(x) \): function vector
- \( l_i \): indicator vector for linear term
- \( m \): number of basis functions
- \( M \): size of the sample
- \( n_e \): number of equality constraints
- \( n_t \): number of equality and inequality constraints
- \( N \): number of testing sample
- \( p \): number of input dimensions
- \( q_i \): indicator vector for quadratic term
- \( R \): diagonal matrix
- \( RF \): flight range (m)
- \( t \): number of candidate functions
- \( u_i \): \( i \)th candidate function
- \( U \): model matrix of all candidate variables
- \( v_i(x) \): \( i \)th basis function
- \( v_m \): model matrix of currently chosen candidate variables
- \( x \): vector of design variables
- \( x_k \): current iterate
- \( \Delta x_k \): difference in \( x_k \)
\( x_i \) \hspace{1cm} \text{linear component of the } j\text{th factor} \\
\( x_{ij} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{quadratic component of the } j\text{th factor} \\
y \hspace{1cm} \text{data vector} \\
y(x_i) \hspace{1cm} \text{actual value at } x_i \\
\hat{y}(x_i) \hspace{1cm} \text{predicted value at } x_i \\
Z(x) \hspace{1cm} \text{stochastic process} \\
\alpha_i \hspace{1cm} \text{positive scalar stepsize} \\
\beta \hspace{1cm} \text{vector containing } \beta_0, \cdots, \beta_i \\
\lambda_i \hspace{1cm} \text{ith Lagrange multiplier} \\
\lambda \hspace{1cm} \text{vector of Lagrange multipliers} \\
\mu(x) \hspace{1cm} \text{trend function} \\
\mu_i \hspace{1cm} \text{ith coefficient} \\
\hat{\mu}_m \hspace{1cm} \text{vector containing } \hat{\mu}_0, \cdots, \hat{\mu}_m \\
\sigma_m^2 \hspace{1cm} \text{variance of } Z(x) \\
\tau_m^2 \mathbf{R} \hspace{1cm} \text{prior variance-covariance matrix of } \beta \\
\psi \hspace{1cm} \text{correlation matrix} \\
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**Figure 12.** Comparison of the drag coefficients of two tubular projectiles at different Mach numbers

**Figure 13.** Comparison of the kinetic energies of two tubular projectiles at different launch angles

**Figure 14.** The pressure contours of two tubular projectiles at Ma=2.50

**Figure 15.** The pressure contours of two tubular projectiles at Ma=3.50

**Figure 16.** The pressure contours of two tubular projectiles at Ma=4.50

**Figure 17.** Comparison of total drag coefficients of two tubular projectiles

**Figure 18.** Comparison of the external wall drag coefficients of two tubular projectiles

**Figure 19.** Comparison of the inner wall drag coefficients of two tubular projectiles

**Figure 20.** Comparison of the base drag coefficients of two tubular projectiles
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**Table 1.** Design variables and their ranges

**Table 2.** The optimal configuration parameters with minimum drag

**Table 3.** The optimal configuration parameters with maximum kinetic energy at given flight ranges
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Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Lower Bound /mm</th>
<th>Upper Bound /mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mach Number</th>
<th>$X_1$ /mm</th>
<th>$X_2$ /mm</th>
<th>$X_3$ /mm</th>
<th>$X_4$ /mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>46.65</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>44.62</td>
<td>30.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>45.57</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>33.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>44.16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>35.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>46.29</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>40.37</td>
<td>30.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RF /m</th>
<th>Launch Angle /º</th>
<th>$X_1$ /mm</th>
<th>$X_2$ /mm</th>
<th>$X_3$ /mm</th>
<th>$X_4$ /mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>40.02</td>
<td>31.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.34</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>31.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42.41</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>40.08</td>
<td>31.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.90</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>40.18</td>
<td>31.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>40.13</td>
<td>31.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.83</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>40.12</td>
<td>31.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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