

# Large Airfoil Models

Howon Lee <sup>\*</sup>, Pranay Seshadri <sup>†</sup>, and Juergen Rauleder <sup>‡</sup>  
*Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, 30322*

The development of a “Large Airfoil Model (LAM),” a transformative approach for answering technical questions on airfoil aerodynamics, requires a vast dataset and a model to leverage it. To build this foundation, a novel probabilistic machine learning approach, A Deep Airfoil Prediction Tool (ADAPT), has been developed. ADAPT makes uncertainty-aware predictions of airfoil pressure coefficient ( $C_p$ ) distributions by harnessing experimental data and incorporating measurement uncertainties. By employing deep kernel learning, performing Gaussian Process Regression in a ten-dimensional latent space learned by a neural network, ADAPT effectively handles unstructured experimental datasets. In tandem, Airfoil Surface Pressure Information Repository of Experiments (ASPIRE), the first large-scale, open-source repository of airfoil experimental data has been developed. ASPIRE integrates century-old historical data with modern reports, forming an unparalleled resource of real-world pressure measurements. This addresses a critical gap left by prior repositories, which relied primarily on numerical simulations. Demonstrative results for three airfoils show that ADAPT accurately predicts  $C_p$  distributions and aerodynamic coefficients across varied flow conditions, achieving a mean absolute error in enclosed area ( $MAE_{\text{enclosed}}$ ) of 0.029. ASPIRE and ADAPT lay the foundation for a future, more elaborate LAM that is coupled with a large language model, which will then enable users to perform design tasks based on design questions rather than explicit technical inputs.

## Nomenclature

$c$	=	chord length [ $m$ ]
$c_d$	=	sectional drag coefficient
$c_l$	=	sectional lift coefficient
$c_{l,\max}$	=	maximum sectional lift coefficient
$c_m$	=	sectional moment coefficient

---

<sup>\*</sup>Graduate Research Assistant, Daniel Guggenheim School of Aerospace Engineering, hlee981@gatech.edu

<sup>†</sup>Associate Professor, Daniel Guggenheim School of Aerospace Engineering, prse@gatech.edu.

<sup>‡</sup>Assistant Professor, Daniel Guggenheim School of Aerospace Engineering, juergen.rauleder@gatech.edu, Associate Fellow AIAA

$C_p$	=	sectional pressure coefficient
$k$	=	kernel function
$M_\infty$	=	freestream Mach number
$\mathbf{t}$	=	model hyperparameters
$\mathbf{u}$	=	model input variables
$\mathbf{w}$	=	deep neural network weights
$x/c$	=	non-dimensional chordwise location
$y/c$	=	non-dimensional airfoil thickness
$\hat{x}, \hat{y}$	=	conformal airfoil coordinates
$\mathbf{z}$	=	model latent variables
$\alpha$	=	angle of attack [degrees]
$\mu$	=	mean
$\Sigma$	=	covariance matrix
$\sigma^2, \sigma$	=	variance, standard deviation

## I. Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT [1], Claude [2], and Gemini [3], are now at the forefront of artificial intelligence (AI), rapidly gaining popularity as they make learning and understanding complex topics more accessible. Beyond general-purpose LLMs, it is also possible to create specialized models, designed to answer questions and provide insights on specific topics or datasets [4–6].

In the context of aerodynamics, there are several key questions that aerodynamicists have during the wing (fixed-wing, rotary-wing, or wind turbine) design process: What is the maximum lift coefficient? Does stall occur at the leading or trailing edge? How do drag and stall behavior change with Mach number? Is there a significant pitching moment? These questions inherently involve operations on sectional pressure coefficients,  $C_p$ . This motivates the idea that a LLM for airfoil aerodynamics, or a *large airfoil model* (LAM), could be used to answer these queries. To accurately respond to user inquiries, the LAM must be able to (1) obtain information by leveraging historical data, or (2) in lieu of available data, generate its own  $C_p$  distributions and perform the necessary operations to obtain chosen quantities of interest (QoIs).

As a first step in the development of the LAM, it is necessary to design a means to predict aerodynamic properties of airfoils, a requirement ubiquitous across fixed wings, rotorcraft, and turbomachinery. Traditionally, airfoil properties have been obtained by wind tunnel experiments or computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulations. With recent developments in computational power and data-driven modeling, there have been efforts to map airfoil geometric

information to its  $C_p$  directly using machine learning (ML). For example, Yilmaz and German [7] applied a classification framework to develop a convolutional neural network (CNN) trained on airfoil pressures obtained from a panel method code. The model successfully predicted the pressure distribution as a series of discretized  $C_p$  values. Hui et al. [8] proposed a five-layer CNN model to predict airfoil  $C_p$ , trained from their in-house airfoil database of RANS simulations. Zhang [9] utilized a variational autoencoder on a RANS dataset, where an encoder was used to extract latent features of the database of varying airfoil geometries, angles of attack ( $\alpha$ ), and freestream Mach numbers ( $M_\infty$ ). A decoder was then used to reconstruct the  $C_p$  within this latent space. Intrinsicly, these models seek to find a latent variable representation.

An alternate approach is to explicitly employ dimensionality reduction techniques; active subspaces [10] and related methods have had tremendous success in identifying subspaces for QoIs derived from  $C_p$  distributions. Active spaces were successfully used to map airfoil geometries and operating conditions to low-dimensional embeddings that capture the parameters' relations to lift and drag [11]. The orthogonal complement of the *active subspace*, termed the *inactive subspace* can prove useful for identifying insensitivities and robustness. Wong et al. [12] showed that samples from the inactive subspace could be used to ascertain whether a compressor blade with manufacturing variations or degradation could provide near identical performance to nominal. This answer to how “forgiving” an airfoil is to imperfections is a crucial component in robust aerodynamic design. Wong et al. [13] proposed employing embedded ridge approximations to find the dimension-reducing subspace based on an underlying pressure field around an airfoil.

There have also been multiple efforts to develop models that predict sectional lift, drag, and moment coefficients ( $c_l$ ,  $c_d$ , and  $c_m$ ). For example, Zhang et al. [14] predicted XFOIL-based  $c_l$  and  $c_d$  using deep learning methodologies such as CNNs and multi-layered perceptrons (MLP). Liu et al. [15] coupled a CNN with Bayesian optimization to predict the aerodynamic coefficients obtained from OpeanFOAM simulations. Cornelius and Schmitz [16] adopted a feed-forward neural network trained on an extensive database of OVERFLOW simulations named PALMO. However, these models treat each QoI independently, rather than taking advantage of the fact that  $C_p$  inherently is related to all of the coefficients. Building a model that is capable of leveraging the underlying physics would enjoy the added benefit of improved interpretability. For instance, one would be able to identify leading/trailing edge stall and reattachment, which translates pitch link loads, a critical element in rotor design.

A drawback found in some of the aforementioned approaches is the lack of a framework to characterize uncertainty. While it is not yet common to identify and rigorously propagate uncertainties into integrated metrics during design processes, incorporating uncertainty quantification techniques will be a crucial step towards making aviation much safer. Sources of uncertainty in airfoil data include the difference between theoretical and actual airfoil geometry, unsteadiness in the freestream, and unsteadiness introduced by flow separation. Neural networks, deterministic in nature, have difficulty quantifying such uncertainties. One way to develop an uncertainty-aware model is to take a Bayesian approach. For example, Anhichem et al., used Gaussian Process (GP) regression to build surrogate models for pressure

distributions over an OAT15A airfoil [17] and a RBC12 half-wing-fuselage multi-fidelity model [18] via data fusion.

From the survey of previous works, it becomes evident that existing ML models are dependent on an extensive sweep of CFD simulations for training. This is due to the fact that experimental data, the *ground truth*, are much more limited in accessibility. The architecture of certain neural networks, such as CNN, also require  $C_p$  values along a preset grid, which makes them unsuitable for training on data sourced from different experiments. Furthermore, the sole reliance on CFD may introduce numerical biases due to the researcher’s modeling decisions, such as the choice of turbulence models. The limitations in existing literature of ML airfoil prediction tools can be summarized as the following:

- reliance on a particular CFD simulation to build a training database, which may be prone to numerical biases,
- minimal leveraging of physical relationships between  $C_p$  and aerodynamic coefficients, and
- limited framework to characterize and propagate uncertainties associated with the training data and the model.

In addition to the AI analysis tool, the other requirement for a robust LAM is a rich historical database. Several open-source databases exist to train or adjust LLMs [19–21]. There have also been datasets created to fine-tune existing LLMs for aerospace applications, such as *aeroBERT-NER* [6] which was used to adapt the BERT language model to identify named entities in aerospace requirements. However, the vast, nearly century-old historical repository of experimental airfoil pressure data is largely left untapped by the wider aerospace community. This is because, while many reports and papers are available in NASA Technical Reports Server (NTRS) or Aerospace Research Central (ARC), the majority of the data is locked away in images or in poorly legible bulk scans. Digitizing the publicly available data into an accessible, open-source database is thus a paramount and time-critical task, as in a few decades, the next generation may be unaware of the existence of this wealth of experimental data.


Building this database would also be pivotal in creating a ML model that can overcome existing limitations. Ideally, a probabilistic ML model would be able to capture and propagate experimental uncertainty when predicting  $C_p$  and the related  $c_l$ ,  $c_d$ , and  $c_m$  for an airfoil under specific  $M_\infty$  and  $\alpha$ . Such a model will be free of numerical biases from CFD simulations and can be used to supplement existing databases with  $C_p$  predictions for untested operating conditions.

In this paper, the primary components of the Large Airfoil Model\* are introduced: a deep airfoil prediction tool (ADAPT) and the airfoil surface pressure information repository of experiments (ASPIRE). ADAPT is a novel machine learning model that employs a deep kernel learning architecture, combining deep learning for latent space identification and a probabilistic method for uncertainty characterization. Its input features are designed to incorporate the unstructured (relative to CFD) experimental data from ASPIRE, a digitized database of historical  $C_p$  measurements. Figure 1 depicts the workflow of the model. While only a forward problem is presented, the components can be applied to other tasks, including inverse problems. The complete model, coupled with a LLM, will allow users to perform a variety of design tasks based on the design questions that an aerospace engineer would ask, rather than requiring explicit technical inputs. Aspirationally, this represents a transformative shift in how aerodynamicists engage with data and models, paving the

---

\*Accessible online on <https://large-airfoil-model.azurewebsites.net>

way for a more intuitive and innovative approach to aerodynamic design.



**Fig. 1** Flowchart depicting the proposed forward problem workflow. The proposed LAM is wrapped in red.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, ADAPT, a novel deep probabilistic model to predict airfoil  $C_p$  based on experimental training data, is proposed. In Section III, ASPIRE, providing the training data for ADAPT, is introduced. The methodology and challenges of the data digitization process are detailed, followed by a description of the range of available data. The accuracy and computational efficiency of the model are assessed in Section IV.

## II. A Deep Airfoil Prediction Tool

As discussed in Sec. I, training on experimental data instead of simulations allows the model to benefit from the reported measurement uncertainties. Additionally, the approach helps avoid potential biases associated with choosing a specific simulation tool—such as Reynolds-Averaged Navier–Stokes (RANS) solver with a particular turbulence model, which may not be suitable for all flow regimes—or relying on a set of tools with varying levels of fidelity.


### A. Machine Learning Model

ADAPT is deep kernel learning model, specifically designed to accommodate the training data structure made available by ASPIRE, as described in Sec. III. Its architecture is inspired by the modeling framework introduced by Wilson et al., 2013 [22]. In ADAPT, a neural network is used to learn a nonlinear feature mapping from the input space to a latent space. Gaussian process model is applied on these transformed features, conditioned on the output observations of  $C_p$ . This approach allows the construction of kernels that capture the expressive power of deep neural network architectures. At its core, ADAPT is a Bayesian method, resulting in a multivariate Gaussian distribution over the space of  $C_p$  values. This can be written as

$$C_p \left( \underbrace{\alpha, M_\infty}_{\text{operating conditions}}, \underbrace{\mathbf{x}/c, \mathbf{y}/c}_{\text{geometry}}, \underbrace{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}_{\text{coordinates}} \right) \equiv C_p \left( \underbrace{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{all inputs}} \right) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{t}), \Sigma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{t})), \quad (1)$$

where  $\underbrace{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{latent variable}} = \underbrace{f_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{u})}_{\text{deep neural network with weights } \mathbf{w}},$

where the notation  $f_{\mathbf{w}} : \mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$  denotes the deep neural network that is parameterized with weights  $\mathbf{w}$ , where  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  comprises the operating conditions, geometry and specific *conformal* airfoil coordinates, i.e.,  $\mathbf{u} = \{\alpha, M_\infty, \mathbf{x}/c, \mathbf{y}/c, \hat{x}, \hat{y}\}$ . The outputs of the deep neural network are latent variables  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ . In this latent space, a Gaussian process model is built, fully specified by a mean and covariance function. The covariance function is based on a two-point kernel function  $k_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}')$ , where the subscript  $\mathbf{t}$  indicates certain hyperparameters to parameterize the kernel function. The overall structure of the model is presented in Fig. 2. A useful advantage of this process is that the number of discrete locations at which  $C_p$  may be evaluated can be tailored by the user after training, making this functional form more advantageous than many deep neural networks that utilize a pre-defined fixed discretization for the output.



**Fig. 2 Overview of the deep kernel learning model that maps a 60-dimensional training input to a 10-dimensional active space which is used to predict  $C_p$  distributions.**

In ADAPT, a fully connected neural network (FCNN) with a [60-1000-1000-500-50-10] architecture maps the space of inputs  $\mathbf{u}$  to the space of latent variables  $\mathbf{z}$ . The number of input variables is  $d = 60$  and the number of latent variables, which is driven by the network architecture, is  $s = 10$ . For the Gaussian process layer, the Matérn 5/2 kernel function is used. The choice allows the model to more accurately capture aerodynamic phenomena on airfoils, such as the rapid pressure changes at the suction peak, transition from laminar to turbulent boundary layer, and compressibility/shock effects—all of which lead to large derivatives in  $C_p$ . Further details on the Gaussian process model and model training are provided in Appendices A–C.

As with most Bayesian frameworks, ADAPT requires the user to define the likelihood (i.e., the noise model). To this end, fixed noise values for each pressure measurements are first provided based on the reported accuracy of the original experiments. If the source material did not quantify the uncertainty of its measurements, the standard deviation was assumed to be 0.01, which was approximately the order of magnitude in errors observed in many sources. Some

additional noise was also inferred to account for the human error introduced during the digitization process outlined in Sec. III.A. It was found that the additional noise resulted in improved numerical stability of the predictions.

## B. Model Training

The data were split into a training set and a test set, used to train the model and assess model accuracy, respectively. The sets were partitioned with respect to airfoils as opposed to withholding a certain percentage of available  $C_p$ . This ensures that the predictions are performed on airfoils that the model was not trained on. Experimental measurements of three airfoils were selected as the test set: SC1095 [23], NASA Supercritical Airfoil 9a [24], and NACA 63-415 [25]. The selections covered all applications within ASPIRE (general aviation, rotor, wind turbine) and supercriticality. In total, 40416  $C_p$  data points were utilized to train the model and 879 data points were reserved for testing.

The training was performed on an NVIDIA A100 GPU. The Adam optimizer [26] maximized the model’s marginal likelihood, which served as the loss function, given the training data. The optimizer had an initial learning rate of  $1.0 \times 10^{-3}$ , with a step decay of 0.5 every 1000 epochs, resulting in a learning rate of  $1.0 \times 10^{-4}$  after 3000 epochs of training. Beyond that point, the learning rate was set to decay linearly between  $1.0 \times 10^{-3}$  and  $1.0 \times 10^{-4}$  over 200-epoch cycles, for a total of 2000 additional epochs. Stochastic Weight Averaging (SWA), which equally averages the weights traversed by the optimizer, was performed by restoring the best weights for each cycle. As also reported by Refs. [27] and [28], the SWA procedure improved generalization of the LAM.

The mean absolute error in the area enclosed by the predicted  $C_p$  curves ( $\text{MAE}_{\text{enclosed}}$ ) was found to be 0.033. The model accuracy is reported in terms of  $\text{MAE}_{\text{enclosed}}$  due to the fact that mean absolute error (MAE) or the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) of  $C_p$  can be misleading. When using MAE, even slight misalignment between predicted and actual  $C_p$  values across the entire airfoil can result in consistently large absolute errors, exaggerating the overall error metric. In the case of MAPE, small absolute errors can result in extremely high percentage errors when the true value is near zero, which occurs commonly in  $C_p$ .  $\text{MAE}_{\text{enclosed}}$  avoids the limitations while remaining intuitive, since the error in the area enclosed by the pressure curves is analogous to an error in  $c_l$ .

The model was trained via an exact GP inference, where the covariance matrix of the training set is directly inverted. The operation was bottle-necked by the high memory requirement and high computational complexity. To accommodate the continuous expansion of ASPIRE, it is essential to enhance the model’s scalability. Approximate methods, such as stochastic variational inference [29] and inducing point methods [30], offer potential solutions. However, findings here indicate that these approaches result in considerably reduced accuracy, with only marginal improvements observed from increasing the number of inducing points. With 1000 inducing points, the  $\text{MAE}_{\text{enclosed}}$  was 0.148, an order of magnitude greater than that of the exact method. Increasing the number to 10,000 yielded in approximately the same error. As the model is fully open-source, contributions from the community are encouraged to address this issue.

### C. Model Limitations

The main limitation of LAM is the same as that of most other ML models; for inputs beyond the range of the training data, the predictions become significantly less reliable. Therefore, it is necessary to understand how the training data are distributed. For example, predictions for a wind turbine airfoil would be less reliable at higher freestream Mach numbers compared to results in the incompressible regime due to the relative lack of available training data.

In the user input, the airfoil thickness locations ( $x/c$ ) are fixed. With only 60 discrete chordwise locations, it can be challenging to accurately model small geometric features. As a result, the model cannot capture the effects of subtle variations in geometry, such as small cavities in the trailing edge and surface roughness, both of which can influence aerodynamic performance. The model is thus best suited for predictions on smooth airfoils.

Lastly, the model is more memory intensive than traditional neural networks. The GP element of ADAPT requires the model to store the full covariance matrix of the training data of size  $40,416 \times 40,416$ . The model thus requires more overhead memory compared to neural networks which only require the storage of the weights and biases of each layer. Reduction of required memory could be achieved via low-rank approximation of the covariance matrix using techniques such as singular value decomposition. Exploration of different methods are attractive subjects for future study.

## III. Airfoil Surface Pressure Information Repository of Experiments

### A. Data Mining

A data mining campaign was undertaken to create a digital database of *strictly experimental* pressure distributions for numerous airfoils. This large-scale, open-source repository, ASPIRE, consists of experimental  $C_p$  measurements for various airfoil geometries at different angles of attack, chord-based Reynolds numbers, and freestream Mach numbers. The test articles of these experiments are of an *infinite wing* configuration as seen in Fig. 3, where the wing spans the entire wind tunnel test section to minimize three-dimensional effects. ASPIRE’s data sources range from nearly a century-old historical documents to more recent, readily accessible sources, including government reports, technical notes, theses, and published papers.



Fig. 3 “Infinite wing” test articles for wind tunnel experiments. From left to right: Refs. [31, 32, 33]



In each source, the pressure distribution data was reported in either a tabulated or graphical format. These data were then digitized as a comma separated values (CSV) file. For tabulated results, the data were digitized using an online optical character recognition (OCR) tool called ExtractTables [34], followed by manual proofreading to correct any inaccuracies. The conversion accuracy was dependent on the legibility of the original document. Due to the early publication dates of many technical reports, the quality of PDF files were often poor. Examples of the varying legibility from different documents can be inferred from Fig. 4. In some cases, it was difficult to accurately identify experimental values. If an entry was considered unreliable, its value was determined indirectly by comparing it to the plotted results (if available), estimating based on the authors' best knowledge of airfoil  $C_p$  trends, or omitting the data point.

X/C	CP	ML
0.0	0.7343	0.4223
0.0130	-0.5057	0.9785
0.0440	-0.1889	0.8412
0.1040	-0.1491	0.8243
0.1640	-0.7798	1.1035
0.2480	-0.7161	1.0727
0.3300	-0.8561	1.1401
0.4100	-0.7009	1.0661
0.4770	-0.4114	0.9763
0.7380	-0.3025	0.9894
0.9000	-0.3394	0.8824
1.0000	-0.1413	0.8202

X/C	UPPER SURFACE	CP	MLUC
0.0000	1.1641	1.0012	0.0000
0.0132	-2.030	0.8101	0.8033
0.0259	-0.5062	0.3151	1.0240
0.0759	-0.8779	0.1173	1.1910
1.003	-0.8041	0.1184	1.1090
1.507	-0.7218	0.1106	1.1093
2.003	-0.6099	0.1130	1.1191
2.503	-0.5261	0.0954	1.2086
3.001	-0.4709	0.3053	1.2327
3.502	-0.3774	0.3048	1.2342
4.003	-0.2714	0.3063	1.2309
4.501	-0.1678	0.258	1.1762
5.002	-0.0640	0.213	1.1066
6.002	-0.027	0.008	1.2077
7.003	-0.0104	0.000	1.2262
8.000	-0.000	0.000	1.2121
9.000	-0.000	0.000	1.2121
10.000	-0.000	0.000	1.2121

X/C	CP	X/C	CP
0.0000	1.0498	0.040	0.6720
0.0020	-0.0428	0.100	0.4722
0.0200	-1.4012	0.200	0.752
0.300	-1.2324	0.300	0.0866
0.500	-0.9981	0.500	-0.0013
0.700	-0.8742	0.700	-0.0575
1.000	-0.7242	1.000	-0.0936
1.500	-0.6883	1.500	-0.1215
2.000	-0.5816	2.000	-0.0822
2.500	-0.5341	2.500	-0.0822
3.000	-0.5160	3.000	-0.0804
3.500	-0.4755	3.500	-0.0746
4.000	-0.4571	4.000	-0.0842
4.500	-0.4530	4.500	-0.0804
5.000	-0.4548	5.000	-0.1100
5.500	-0.4556	5.500	-0.1304
6.000	-0.4615	6.000	-0.1129
6.500	-0.4781	6.500	0.0209
7.000	-0.4969	7.000	0.2492
7.500	-0.5120	7.500	0.3423
8.000	-0.5190	8.000	0.4067
8.500	-0.5042	8.500	0.4514
9.000	-0.4497	9.000	0.4796
9.300	-0.3391	9.300	0.4770

X/C	CP	X/C	CP
0.0000	1.1110	0.0000	0.9221
0.0132	-0.6054	0.0000	0.7004
0.0259	-0.4491	0.0000	0.9024
0.0759	-0.8004	0.0000	0.9337
1.003	-0.5773	0.0000	0.9449
1.507	-0.5038	0.0000	0.9307
2.003	-0.5336	0.0000	0.9343
2.503	-0.453	0.0000	0.9360
3.001	-0.3578	0.0000	0.9363
3.502	-0.2532	0.0000	0.9364
4.003	-0.1593	0.0000	0.9364
4.501	-0.0647	0.0000	0.9364
5.002	-0.027	0.0000	0.9364
6.002	-0.0104	0.0000	0.9364
7.003	-0.000	0.0000	0.9364
8.000	-0.000	0.0000	0.9364
9.000	-0.000	0.0000	0.9364
10.000	-0.000	0.0000	0.9364

X/C	CP	X/C	CP
0.0000	-0.0044	0.0000	0.7050
0.0020	-0.0004	0.0000	0.0154
0.0200	-0.1545	0.0000	-0.0087
0.300	-0.3475	0.0000	-0.1470
0.500	-0.5600	0.0000	-0.5883
0.700	-0.4300	0.0000	-0.4416
1.000	-0.3684	0.0000	-0.3587
1.500	-0.2434	0.0000	-0.2093
2.000	-0.1725	0.0000	-0.1287
2.500	-0.1270	0.0000	-0.2033
3.000	-0.0849	0.0000	-0.1751
3.500	-0.0493	0.0000	0.1887
4.000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0410
4.500	0.0000	0.0000	-0.8892
5.000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.8643
5.500	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7906
6.000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7557
6.500	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7242
7.000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7151
7.500	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7354
8.000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7551
8.500	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7418
9.000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7647
9.300	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7929
9.600	0.0000	0.0000	-0.8343


X/C	CP	X/C	CP
0	-1.72	-1.48	-0.95
0.005	-2.05	-2.22	-2.56
0.015	-1.49	-1.67	-2.26
0.027	-1.11	-1.20	-1.38
0.051	-0.89	-0.96	-1.03
0.080	-0.67	-0.72	-0.81
0.106	-0.62	-0.66	-0.69
0.154	-0.50	-0.52	-0.55
0.199	-0.44	-0.47	-0.49
0.253	-0.39	-0.42	-0.45
0.305	-0.37	-0.39	-0.40
0.351	-0.34	-0.36	-0.38
0.399	-0.32	-0.35	-0.37
0.448	-0.29	-0.32	-0.34
0.502	-0.25	-0.28	-0.29
0.551	-0.22	-0.26	-0.24
0.600	-0.18	-0.20	-0.21
0.65	-0.15	-0.16	-0.16
0.708	-0.11	-0.11	-0.11
0.804	-0.06	-0.07	-0.06
0.904	0.02	0.01	0.02
0.955	0.03	0.03	0.04
1.000	0.29	0.18	0.11

X/C	UPPER SURFACE	CP	MLUC
0.0000	1.1110	0.9941	0.9221
0.0132	-0.6054	0.8006	0.7004
0.0259	-0.4491	0.6050	0.9024
0.0759	-0.8004	0.5539	0.9337
1.003	-0.5773	0.5629	0.9449
1.507	-0.5038	0.5064	0.9307
2.003	-0.5336	0.5007	0.9343
2.503	-0.453	0.500	0.9360
3.001	-0.3578	0.501	0.9363
3.502	-0.2532	0.503	0.9364
4.003	-0.1593	0.503	0.9364
4.501	-0.0647	0.503	0.9364
5.002	-0.027	0.503	0.9364
6.002	-0.0104	0.503	0.9364
7.003	-0.000	0.503	0.9364
8.000	-0.000	0.503	0.9364
9.000	-0.000	0.503	0.9364
10.000	-0.000	0.503	0.9364

Fig. 4 Varying document legibility encountered during data mining. From left to right, top row: Refs. [35, 36, 37, 24], bottom row: Refs. [38, 39, 40, 41].

If presented in a graphical format with no accompanying tabulated results, the data were digitized using WebPlot-Digitizer [42]. This online tool enables manual extraction of individual data points. However, extracting certain points, particularly those at near the leading and trailing edges, proved challenging as the  $C_p$  values converge. This issue was especially pronounced in graphs where multiple pressure distributions were plotted on the same axes. Figure 5 illustrates an example of such difficult cases. In these instances, the data points were carefully obtained by zooming in or by the authors' informed estimates based on airfoil physics. If neither method was viable, the point was omitted.

In many sources, experimental accuracy was noted by the authors. These were often reported as a single scalar value in terms of the maximum magnitude of the error, or the maximum percentage error. In ASPIRE, these values



**Fig. 5** Areas of highly concentrated data points typically found in airfoil pressure distribution plots. Original graph from [23].

were recorded in an accompanying tag file. Additionally, if the uncertainties in the independent variables such as those of the freestream Mach number, angles of attack, or pressure sensor locations were found in source documents, they were also recorded. An example of a tag file included in the database can be seen in Fig. 6.

```


1  {
2  |   "flow_conditions" : { Wind tunnel conditions
3  |     "reynolds" : "1.85e6 - 4.0e6", Reynolds number, provided or calculated
4  |     "mach" : "0.3 - 0.83", Freestream Mach number, provided or calculated
5  |     "freestream" : "", Freestream velocity [m/s], provided or calculated
6  |     "alpha" : "0, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8" Geometric angles of attack [deg]
7  |   },
8  |   "uncertainty" : { Experimental uncertainties, 1σ unless stated otherwise
9  |     "x" : "", Uncertainty in pressure orifice location [x/c]
10 |     "cp" : "0.005 + 0.01|Cp|", Uncertainty in pressure coefficient
11 |     "alpha" : "0.04", Uncertainty in angle of attack [deg]
12 |     "mach" : "0.003" Uncertainty in Mach number
13 |   },
14 |   "airfoil" : { Airfoil information
15 |     "name" : "NACA 0012", Airfoil name
16 |     "camber" : "N", Is the airfoil cambered? "Y" or "N"
17 |     "supercritical" : "N", Is the airfoil supercritical? "Y" or "N"
18 |     "application" : "General" Airfoil applications: "General", "Rotor", "Wind Tunnel", etc.
19 |   },
20 |   "source" : { Source material
21 |     "name" : "AGARD-AR-138", Source name
22 |     "year" : "1979", Year of publication
23 |     "page" : "A1-A13", Pages of where the data was presented
24 |     "type" : "tabulated", Original data format: "graph", "tabulated", etc.
25 |     "url" : "https://www.sto.nato.int/publications/AGARD/AGARD-AR-138/AGARD-AR-138.pdf" URL of source PDF file
26 |   },
27 |   "meta" : { Information related to data digitization
28 |     "num_cases" : "19", Number of digitized pressure distributions
29 |     "num_remaining" : "", If not finished, how many remain?
30 |     "notes" : "" Any points of note
31 |   }
32 | }

```

**Fig. 6** An example ASPIRE tag file for a NACA 0012; experimental data from [43].

## B. Available Data

Currently, ASPIRE consists of 2802 unique pressure distributions from 68 airfoils taken across various airfoil families and applications. This makes the database a useful resource of experimental pressure measurements, all presented in an easily accessible format. All profiles of the airfoils included in the database, compared against the commonly studied NACA 0012, are illustrated in Fig. 7. Airfoil profiles thicker than a NACA 0012 at the given chordwise location are colored in shades of red. Profiles thinner than the NACA 0012 are colored in shades of blue.




**Fig. 7 Geometric profiles of airfoils in the database, colored by thickness compared to the baseline NACA 0012**


The available data ranges from  $-30^\circ$  to  $30^\circ$  in angles of attack ( $\alpha$ ) and 0.0 to 1.0 for freestream Mach number ( $M_\infty$ ) that span subsonic (including incompressible), transonic, and sonic regimes. The distribution of available  $C_p$  data at a given operating condition is shown in Fig. 8. The color and the number in the center plot denotes the number of unique airfoils available for a given  $M_\infty$ - $\alpha$  combination. Marginal histograms are plotted to provide a clear visualization of the available data at specific  $\alpha$  or  $M_\infty$ . The data distribution is presented in terms of airfoil families, design usage, and supercriticality.

It is evident from the data distribution plots that there is a wide variety of airfoil families and applications. It can also be observed that the available experimental data are primarily concentrated around  $\alpha = -4.0^\circ - 12.0^\circ$  and  $M_\infty = 0.3 - 0.9$ . This is attributable to the fact that airfoils for general aviation or rotor applications are operated in the compressible regime, resulting in an experimental focus on the higher freestream Mach numbers. For a similar reason, the wind turbine airfoil experiments are concentrated at lower  $M_\infty$ . Extreme angles of attack, both positive and negative, are typically not explored thoroughly in experimental literature, explaining the dearth of data at  $\alpha \leq -4.0^\circ$  or  $\alpha \geq 12.0^\circ$ .


By releasing the database as a publicly available repository, the database can be expanded to fill in gaps existing in terms of airfoil families and years of publication through contributions from the aerospace community. The distribution of digitized and not yet digitized data is presented in Fig. 9.



(a) Distribution of available airfoil pressure data and the marginal histograms categorized by airfoil family




(b) Distribution of available airfoil pressure data and the marginal histograms categorized by airfoil usage



(c) Distribution of available airfoil pressure data and the marginal histograms categorized by airfoil supercriticality

**Fig. 8** The distribution of available  $C_p$  data in terms of the number of unique airfoils at each freestream Mach number and angles of attack. The marginal histograms are organized by different categories.




**Fig. 9** Bubble plot of data that have and have not been digitized. The number on each circle represents the number of unique pressure distributions available within the source material.

### C. Data Pre-processing

In many experimental reports,  $C_p$  is plotted with respect to the normalized coordinates in the chordwise direction,  $x/c$ . The coordinate system spans from 0 to 1, where 0 corresponds to the leading edge and 1 to the trailing edge. Such a coordinate system does not permit a ML model to distinguish between the airfoil’s upper and lower surfaces. Since a model trained on the dataset should adhere to the true *physical* behavior of airfoils, it is necessary that the pressures at the leading and trailing edges match in lieu of severe trailing edge separation. As the training data does not currently include any cases with trailing edge separation, the periodicity at the boundaries must be maintained.

To address this, a conformal mapping-based approach was adopted; the normalized airfoil chordwise location is transformed to  $\hat{x}$  and  $\hat{y}$  in a polar coordinate system. In this procedure,  $x/c = \{x \in \mathbb{R} | 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$  is transformed to  $\hat{x} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} | -1 \leq x \leq 1\}$ , corresponding to the  $x$ -value of the equivalent unit circle. The equivalent angle is obtained via  $\theta = \cos^{-1}(x/c)$ , implying  $\hat{y} = \sin \theta$ , where  $\hat{y} = \{y \in \mathbb{R} | -1 \leq y \leq 1\}$  is the  $y$ -value of the unit circle. The transformation is visualized in Fig. 10, where it is evident that the sign of  $\hat{y}$  corresponds to the upper and lower surfaces. At the leading and trailing edges,  $\hat{y} = 0$ , which enforces periodicity.



**Fig. 10** Transformation of airfoil coordinates  $(x/c, y/c)$  to polar coordinates  $(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$  via conformal mapping

The input data matrix for ADAPT was created by down-selecting the data in ASPIRE to constrain  $-4.0^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 12.0^\circ$

and  $0.0 \leq M_\infty \leq 0.75$ . These ranges for  $\alpha$  and  $M_\infty$  were chosen due to the abundance of data available. Additionally, only data points with a chord-based Reynolds number ( $Re_c$ ) on the order of  $10^6$  were included. Fixing the  $Re_c$  helped to eliminate Reynolds number effects and reduce the data dimensionality. A Reynolds number on the order of  $10^6$  was chosen because, in this regime, the viscous effects of the freestream are considered minimal compared to the inertial effects [44]. In order to eliminate inconsistencies with the boundary layer transition behavior, data sets where the boundary layer was artificially tripped were excluded. The data were then pre-processed to extract the input variables necessary for the model to predict the pressure distributions. These input variables were: 28  $y$ -values of the airfoil geometry at set chordwise locations for upper and lower surfaces respectively,  $M_\infty$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\hat{x}$ , and  $\hat{y}$ . This corresponded to a total of 60 input variables. This approach is ideal for datasets compiled from various experiments, as it enables explicit definition of pressure sensor locations, which often differ between sources.


## IV. Results and Discussion

### A. Pressure Distributions

To initially assess the capability of the LAM, a random subset of the training data was selected and input into the model. The predicted mean  $C_p$  and two standard deviations are displayed in Fig. 11. The plots showcase the LAM’s capability to fit the training data, which is important as the ADAPT evaluations at the training data point need not necessarily interpolate the training data. Moreover, the 95% confidence intervals of predicted pressure distributions differ significantly for each airfoil. Regions of higher uncertainty exist for cases where the noise reported by the source material is inherently high (e.g. the NACA 0012 airfoil), or for cases where the amount of training data is sparse (e.g. negative angles of attack for NASA LS(1)-0013 and OLS/TAAT cases). A significant increase in the uncertainty also occurs on regions of pronounced shock effects, as seen on the suction side of the MBB-A3 at  $M_\infty = 0.70$ .

Figure 12 confirms that, with the conformal transformation during data pre-processing, the  $C_p$  at the upper and lower surfaces of the trailing edge match (red line). In contrast, the blue lines clearly show that a model trained on the one-dimensional input  $x/c$  yields a mismatch in the trailing edge pressure, which is a non-physical behavior when there is no trailing edge separation.


The remaining figures represent the predictions on the test set, airfoils previously untrained by the model. Figure 13 shows the predicted  $C_p$  for the SC1095 airfoil, designed for rotorcraft applications. The comparison between predictions and the test data yielded a  $MAE_{\text{enclosed}}$  of 0.027 for the data subset. As the metric is directly correlated to the airfoil  $c_l$ , the error is equivalent to less than 2% error relative to the airfoil  $c_{l,\text{max}}$ . It is notable that the model captures compressibility effects for  $\alpha \geq 6.1^\circ$  when transitioning from  $M_\infty = 0.40$  to 0.60. The model also predicts the onset of stall, as the change in the pressure distribution is minimal when increasing the angle of attack beyond  $\alpha = 9.0^\circ$ . While some inaccuracies in the mean  $C_p$  can be observed for negative angles of attack, the experimental measurements fall



**Fig. 11** Predicted  $C_p$  for the training set. The error bars represent two standard deviations.

within the 95% confidence interval of the predictions.

The predicted  $C_p$  and the corresponding uncertainty for the Supercritical Airfoil 9a is presented in Fig. 14. The  $MAE_{\text{enclosed}}$  for the airfoil was found to be 0.018. Surface pressures of this supercritical airfoil are significantly “flatter” on the suction side compared to those of conventional airfoils. The low error between the predictions and



**Fig. 12 Zoom view of a trailing edge  $C_p$  and two standard deviations, predicted from models trained on normalized airfoil chordwise location (blue) and conformal coordinates (red).**

the experimental data (approximately 1.26% of the airfoil  $c_{l,max}$ ) suggests that the model accurately captures the aerodynamic characteristics associated with supercritical geometries. Furthermore, the model is able to accurately predict the onset of shock on the airfoil, as indicated by the rapid change in the pressure observed in the  $M_\infty = 0.70$  cases (bottom row). The locations of shock formation are often very sensitive to various factors such as the surface roughness of the test article or chord-based Reynolds number. This inherent uncertainty is captured by the model through an increase in the confidence interval.

Lastly, Fig. 15 demonstrates the model capability for the NACA 63-415, typically used for wind turbines. The  $MAE_{enclosed}$  between the predictions and the experimental data from the test set was found to be 0.041 (approximately 3% of the airfoil's  $c_{l,max}$ ), higher than that of the other two airfoils. The increased errors arise from regions of noticeable underprediction at the suction peak. This is most notable at  $\alpha = 4.0^\circ$  and  $12.0^\circ$ . The reduced performance can be attributed to the relatively smaller size of wind turbine airfoil data, a total of 4055  $C_p$  data points. The number of data points for rotor airfoils, the next smallest subset of the training set, amounted to 11892. This number is approximately triple that of wind turbine airfoils. Expanding the database to match the quantity will likely make the model's predictions more robust.

In summary, the results clearly indicate that the LAM generates accurate predictions on both training and test sets. The model has the ability to generalize well to different airfoil geometries, while capturing their unique behaviors. The strong generalization capability arises from the fact that different airfoil families occupy separate regions within the model's active space. Appendix D provides a basic analysis of ADAPT's latent space for in-depth understanding of the model.








Fig. 13 SC1095: Predicted  $C_p$  under various  $M_\infty$  and  $\alpha$ . The error bars represent two standard deviations.



**Fig. 14** NASA Supercritical Airfoil 9a: Predicted  $C_p$  under various  $M_\infty$  and  $\alpha$ . The error bars represent two standard deviations.



**Fig. 15** NACA 63-415: Predicted  $C_p$  under various  $M_\infty$  and  $\alpha$ . The error bars represent two standard deviations.

## B. Aerodynamic Force Coefficients

The normal, axial, and moment coefficients about the quarter-chord for a two-dimensional body are defined below:

$$c_n = \int_0^1 \left( C_{p,l} \left( \frac{x}{c} \right) - C_{p,u} \left( \frac{x}{c} \right) \right) d\frac{x}{c} + \int_0^1 \left( c_{f,u} \frac{d(y_u/c)}{d(x/c)} + c_{f,l} \frac{d(y_l/c)}{d(x/c)} \right) d\frac{x}{c}, \quad (2)$$

$$c_a = \int_0^1 \left( C_{p,u} \left( \frac{x}{c} \right) \frac{d(y_u/c)}{d(x/c)} - C_{p,l} \left( \frac{x}{c} \right) \frac{d(y_l/c)}{d(x/c)} \right) d\frac{x}{c} + \int_0^1 (c_{f,u} + c_{f,l}) d\frac{x}{c}, \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_m = & \int_0^1 \left[ \left( C_{p,l} \left( \frac{x}{c} \right) - C_{p,u} \left( \frac{x}{c} \right) \right) \left( \frac{x}{c} - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right] d\frac{x}{c} \\ & - \int_0^1 \left( c_{f,u} \frac{d(y_u/c)}{d(x/c)} - c_{f,l} \frac{d(y_l/c)}{d(x/c)} \right) \left( \frac{x}{c} - \frac{1}{4} \right) d\frac{x}{c} \\ & + \int_0^1 \left( C_{p,u} \left( \frac{x}{c} \right) \frac{d(y_u/c)}{d(x/c)} + c_{f,u} \right) \frac{y_u}{c} d\frac{x}{c} \\ & + \int_0^1 \left( -C_{p,l} \left( \frac{x}{c} \right) \frac{d(y_l/c)}{d(x/c)} + c_{f,l} \right) \frac{y_l}{c} d\frac{x}{c} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $c_f$  is the skin friction coefficient,  $\alpha$  is the angle of attack, and the subscripts  $u$  and  $l$  denote quantities of interest on upper and lower surfaces respectively. Here,  $C_p$  is a function of the normalized chordwise location,  $\frac{x}{c}$ .

In ADAPT,  $C_p$  is a Gaussian process; for a given set of inputs, the deep neural network projects  $\mathbf{u}$  to the latent space  $\mathbf{z}$ , where  $C_p$  has a mean and covariance defined over the conformal domain, as defined in Sec. III.C. If one introduces the assumption that contributions of skin friction are negligible—valid in most non-zero angles of attack and at higher  $M_\infty$  [45]—then,  $c_l$ ,  $c_d$  and  $c_m$  can be approximate as

$$c_n \approx \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 (C_{p,l}(\hat{x}) - C_{p,u}(\hat{x})) d\hat{x}, \quad (5)$$

$$c_a \approx \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 \left( C_{p,u}(\hat{x}) \frac{d(y_u/c)}{d(x/c)} - C_{p,l}(\hat{x}) \frac{d(y_l/c)}{d(x/c)} \right) d\hat{x}, \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_m \approx & \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \int_{-1}^1 (C_{p,l}(\hat{x}) - C_{p,u}(\hat{x})) \left( \hat{x} + \frac{1}{2} \right) d\hat{x} \right. \\ & + \int_{-1}^1 \left( C_{p,u}(\hat{x}) \frac{d(y_u/c)}{d(x/c)} \frac{y_u}{c} \right) d\hat{x} \\ & \left. - \int_{-1}^1 \left( C_{p,l}(\hat{x}) \frac{d(y_l/c)}{d(x/c)} \frac{y_l}{c} \right) d\hat{x} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$c_l = c_n \cos \alpha - c_a \sin \alpha, \quad (8)$$


$$c_d = c_n \sin \alpha + c_a \cos \alpha, \quad (9)$$

where  $C_{p,u}(\hat{x})$  and  $C_{p,l}(\hat{x})$  are model-predicted pressure coefficients with respect to the  $x$ -location in *conformal coordinates*. The bounds of the integral differ from Eqs. 2–4 due to the change of coordinate systems.

The above quantities are linear operators acting on a Gaussian process; therefore, they must also be Gaussian [46].

However, because the inputs are passed through a deep neural network, a series of non-linear operations, it is not possible to express the posterior distribution of the aerodynamic quantities analytically. They must be obtained by performing the integral numerically instead, using the Monte Carlo method.


To begin, 10,000 samples are generated from the multivariate normal distribution associated with  $C_p$ , which was deemed sufficient for convergence. Each sample is pushed through Eqs. 5–9 to obtain  $c_l$ ,  $c_d$ , and  $c_m$ . From the integrated samples, the mean and the standard deviation of the aerodynamic coefficients are calculated. The overall workflow is captured in Fig. 16.



**Fig. 16** Workflow of obtaining key aerodynamic quantities of interest of an airfoil based on model output  $C_p$ . While this investigation is limited to the green blocks in this paper, more intermediate design parameters in orange can be obtained similarly.

Figure 17 shows the predicted sectional lift coefficients. Overall, good correlation between the predictions and the experimental measurements can be observed, where the deviation from each respective airfoil’s  $c_{l,max}$  never exceeds beyond 4%. Figures 17a and 17b show that the lift curve slope increases and  $c_{l,max}$  decreases with increasing freestream Mach number. These trends, in agreement with the experimental data points, is the expected behavior of airfoils [44]. Accurate predictions of stall are obtained, with the lift curve slope approaching zero at higher  $\alpha$ . However, it was found that there was some underprediction of  $c_l$  in Fig. 17b at  $M_\infty = 0.70$  although the experimental data points are near the 95% confidence interval. The error between the predicted mean and measurement was greatest at  $\alpha = 2.5^\circ$  where  $\Delta c_l = 0.05$ . The discrepancy can be attributed to the fact that the model predicts a slightly earlier onset of shock as observed in Fig. 14.


Figure 18 highlights the comparison between the predicted and experimentally measured  $c_d$  for the SC1095 airfoil. The results from NASA Supercritical Airfoil 9a and NACA 63-415 are omitted as the assumption that the  $c_{d,p} \approx c_d$  does not hold. As the only available measurements are from wake rakes that measure the total drag, it is difficult to validate



(a) SC1095: Experimental  $c_l$  of Ref. [23] derived from  $C_p$  integration (b) NASA Supercritical Airfoil 9a: Experimental  $c_l$  of Ref. [24] from balance measurements (c) NACA 63-415: Experimental  $c_l$  of Ref. [25] from strain gauge balance


**Fig. 17 Predicted  $c_l$  at various angles of attack, freestream Mach numbers, and airfoils. The error bars represent two standard deviations.**

the drag predictions from the model for these two cases. For the Supercritical Airfoil 9a, the operating conditions of the test data are at near-zero angles of attack. At the low values of  $\alpha$ , skin friction drag can comprise a greater portion of the total drag [45]. Supercritical airfoils are optimized for minimal pressure drag at high  $M_\infty$  compared to conventional airfoils, which deviates from the assumption even further. As for the NACA 63-415, the experimental conditions are at a much lower freestream Mach number than the SC1095, which corresponds to a relatively higher skin friction drag. Thus, significant underprediction would be expected for these airfoils when using the method to calculate  $c_d$ . For the SC1095, where the assumption of a dominant pressure drag is valid, the maximum error ( $\Delta c_d$ ) was found to be 0.018 at  $\alpha = 6^\circ$  for one of the measurements. However, a second measurement at the same operating condition has a much lower error of 0.005.



**Fig. 18 Predicted  $c_d$  at various angles of attack and freestream Mach numbers for SC1095. The error bars represent two standard deviations. Experimental  $c_d$  are wake rake measurements from Ref. [24].**

In Fig. 19, the predicted  $c_m$  is compared against the measurements. The error in  $c_m$  was found to never exceeds 0.01 at all angles and airfoils, indicating the the overall trend is captured. Fig. 19a shows that the the increase in the pitching moment magnitude of SC1095 with increasing  $\alpha$  is captured especially well. Figures 19b and 19c also show that the experimental measurements fall within or is close to the 95% confidence interval.



**Fig. 19** Predicted  $c_m$  at various angles of attack, freestream Mach numbers, and airfoils. The error bars represent two standard deviations.

The presented figures demonstrate that the proposed method effectively predicts the aerodynamic force coefficients, with the predictions generally correlating well with experimental measurements. The trends in lift, drag, and moment coefficients match the expected behavior of the airfoils across different freestream Mach numbers and angles of attack. Overall, the model shows promise as a comprehensive aerodynamic analysis of an airfoil, when applied under conditions where the assumptions hold.

### C. Beyond the Training Data


As discussed in Sec. II.C, the model demonstrates the highest accuracy when making predictions within the range of the training data. In the case of the LAM, this range corresponds to  $-4.0^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 12.0^\circ$  and  $0.0 \leq M_\infty \leq 0.75$ . Recognizing the model's limitation and its reduction of performance beyond the training data is particularly valuable for users, as it facilitates informed decision-making about the appropriate use of the tool.

Figure 20 illustrates the model's performance beyond the training data. For a SC1095 airfoil, the  $C_p$  is predicted for high values of angles of attack and freestream Mach numbers not included in the training range. It is evident that, in this region, the unreliability is marked by a substantial increase in the posterior uncertainties. With further deviation from the training data—such as an extremely high freestream Mach number ( $M_\infty = 10.0$ ) or angle of attack ( $\alpha = 90^\circ$ )—the bias-variance trade-off becomes apparent, leading to a physically implausible mean  $C_p$ , such as a flat line.

### D. Grid Resolution


The model allows the  $C_p$  to be generated at an arbitrary set of locations. In contrast, results from CFD simulations depend on cell coordinates, and NN-based ML models typically produce outputs on pre-defined grids.

Figure 21 illustrates LAM's capability to generate results on a very fine grid. The  $C_p$  distribution of a S809 airfoil at  $\alpha = 5.13^\circ$  and  $M_\infty = 0.15$  was predicted by the LAM and compared against results from a RANS simulation and CNN-based ML model presented by Hui et al [8]. The RANS simulation was performed using SU2 [47] on a single



**Fig. 20** Predictions of  $C_p$  and two standard deviations for SC1095 under operating conditions beyond the training data. The extent of the training data in  $\alpha$  and  $M_\infty$  is highlighted by the black dotted box.

processor with a C-grid mesh that consists of 65,845 points. The run was considered converged when the variations in  $c_l$  and  $c_d$  fell below  $1 \times 10^{-5}$ . The figure confirms that the LAM has the finest resolution of points along the airfoil of 700 points, compared to 281 points of the SU2 simulation and 98 points of the CNN model. Moreover, increasing the resolution of the model is trivial, requiring only a change in the size of the input matrix.



**Fig. 21** Comparison of  $C_p$  predictions between RANS, CNN-based model, and LAM. Note the difference in grid resolution for each model. Experimental measurements are from Ref [48].

### E. Computational Performance and Capability


Lastly, the computational cost and accuracy of LAM are compared against two physics-based solvers: RANS (SU2) and XFOIL [49], per Table 1. The comparison was performed for S809 at  $\alpha = 5.13^\circ$  and  $M_\infty = 0.15$  (Sec. IV.D) and NACA 0012 at  $\alpha = 1.89^\circ$  and  $M_\infty = 0.70$ . The mesh for NACA 0012 was obtained from the SU2 tutorial repository and consists of 229,336 grid points. The numerical simulation was conducted at  $\alpha = 1.50^\circ$ , the angle that best matched the experimental validation data as determined in Ref. [50]. As with the S809 case, the convergence criteria were  $\Delta c_l, \Delta c_d \leq 1 \times 10^{-5}$ . XFOIL results were obtained with 494 panels, the highest resolution possible in the program.

Solver	Case	Wall Clock Time	MAE <sub>enclosed</sub>	MAE	Compressibility	Separation
RANS (SU2)	S809	1349.76s	0.028	0.055		
	NACA 0012	1021.20s	0.016	0.034	✓	✓
LAM	S809	CPU: 5.81s / GPU: 1.55s	0.030	0.056		
	NACA 0012	CPU: 5.78s / GPU: 1.79s	0.036	0.042	✓	✓
XFOIL	S809	1.98s	0.030	0.052		
	NACA 0012	2.08s	0.071	0.100	×	×

**Table 1 Computational efficiency and capabilities of different types of airfoil aerodynamic tools. All cases were run with a single processor CPU, except for the LAM GPU case, which was run on one NVIDIA A100 GPU.**

While both airfoils were included in the training sets, the operating conditions were not.

Figure 22 illustrates the comparison between the predicted  $C_p$  distributions. RANS simulations model the governing equations of fluid dynamics, which permits accurate capture of airfoil physics. This is reflected by the lowest error overall in both MAE<sub>enclosed</sub> and MAE. However, it consumes the longest wall clock time and requires the user’s technical skills such as meshing techniques and turbulence modeling decisions.



**Fig. 22 Comparison of predicted  $C_p$  for different aerodynamic solvers: RANS simulations, LAM, and XFOIL.**

The S809 case is in the incompressible regime. One notable feature of the  $C_p$  curve is the drop in pressure that occurs at mid-chord, which is caused by boundary layer transition. In this case, XFOIL was found to yield accurate results, on-par with CFD, with a low computational cost of 1.98 seconds. However, the program has certain limitations that affect its accuracy. Firstly, XFOIL requires controlling parameters such as the critical amplification factor ( $N_{crit}$ ) and transition locations. Using these parameters to model precisely transition requires user expertise, and can still underperform compared to other methods such as the Langtry-Menter model in CFD. Secondly, as a potential flow solver, XFOIL cannot resolve complex aerodynamics such as compressibility effects and flow separation. This is observed in the NACA 0012 case at  $M_\infty = 0.70$ , where there is significant mismatch in  $C_p$  at the suction peak and an increase in the errors.



In contrast, LAM has a significantly reduced runtime compared to that of RANS, and even outperforms XFOIL when utilizing a GPU. The model yields a similar accuracy to that of XFOIL at low freestream  $M_\infty$ , and successfully captures the boundary layer transition with no user input on transition modeling. Furthermore, the model also captures compressibility effects as demonstrated in the NACA 0012 case.

## V. Conclusion

In this study, the development of a Large Airfoil Model (LAM) was presented<sup>†</sup>. The novel machine learning model will be able to answer technical questions on aerodynamic characteristics of airfoils, paving the way for new and intuitive aerodynamic design tools. Central to the effort is A Deep Airfoil Prediction Tool (ADAPT), a new machine learning model that adopts a probabilistic approach through deep kernel learning, enabling it to make uncertainty-aware predictions of airfoil pressure coefficient  $C_p$  distributions. Alongside ADAPT, Airfoil Surface Pressure Information Repository of Experiments (ASPIRE), the first large-scale, open-source repository of airfoil experimental data, was presented. It was developed to be a vast dataset that the LAM can easily access and serve as the training data for ADAPT.

ADAPT was designed and developed to best accommodate the unstructured nature of a dataset built from various experimental sources. The Gaussian process layer of the deep kernel learning architecture, which learns the underlying function rather than outputs at pre-defined locations discretely, enables the flexibility. Additionally, the model, trained on experimental data as opposed to numerical simulations, offers a Bayesian means of pressure prediction. This allows the proper characterization of the uncertainties associated with measurements and digitization. The model yielded a  $MAE_{\text{enclosed}}$ , the mean absolute error in the area enclosed by the pressure curves, of 0.029 on the test data. This was equivalent to under 4% error in each airfoil's maximum lift coefficient, indicating good correlation. While a single general model was created to leverage the breadth of data made available from this work, it would also be possible to create multiple specialized LAMs depending on the user's requirements.

The database ASPIRE was created from a data mining campaign, extracting wind tunnel experimental data that were locked behind bulk scans of tables and images. It includes digitized pressure measurements for various airfoil families and applications such as general aviation, rotorcraft, and wind turbines. The database covers a wide variety of operating conditions, ranging from  $-30^\circ$  to  $30^\circ$  in  $\alpha$  and 0.0 to 1.0 in freestream Mach number,  $M_\infty$ . It contains 2802 unique pressure distributions of 68 airfoils, obtained from sources that span the past century. The goal is to continue expanding the database and address any existing gaps. Contributions can be made on the aforementioned website.

As a natural consequence of the  $C_p$  predictions, the LAM predictions permitted the calculation of aerodynamic force coefficients using a Monte Carlo approach. These one-dimensional metrics are crucial as they underpin all aerodynamic design processes. The predicted coefficients, compared to the experimental lift, drag, and moment coefficients ( $c_l$ ,  $c_d$ , and  $c_m$ ) yielded maximum errors of 0.05, 0.018, and 0.01, respectively.

---

<sup>†</sup>also accessible online on <https://large-airfoil-model.azurewebsites.net>

Since the LAM is fundamentally a Gaussian process model, the predictions can be performed at an arbitrary set of locations. This allows the model to yield  $C_p$  values at an infinite grid resolution, which provides greater flexibility than convolutional neural networks based airfoil aerodynamics models, which predict  $C_p$  on a preset grid.

Finally, the model was found to be computationally efficient, requiring an average of 5.80 seconds on a single CPU to generate predictions for a S809 airfoil at  $M_\infty = 0.15$ ,  $\alpha = 5.13^\circ$  and NACA 0012 at  $M_\infty = 0.70$ ,  $\alpha = 1.86^\circ$ . When accelerated by a single A100 GPU, the developed model outperformed XFOIL, a potential-flow based solver, with an average of 1.67 seconds. Unlike the low-fidelity method, the LAM has the capability to capture complex aerodynamic phenomena, such as compressibility effects, transition, and flow separation, having been trained on such effects. This means that the LAM does not require the user's expertise on a particular software to model specific aerodynamic phenomena accurately.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Aaditya Hingoo, Ryan McKee, Tom Hoang, Bipin Koirala, and Grant Ewing for their assistance in the digitization of airfoil experimental data, and Chris Silva, Vengalattore Nagaraj, and Robert Scott for their guidance on key design questions.

This research was partially funded by the U.S. Government under Cooperative Agreement No. W911W6-21-2-0001. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Government purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation thereon.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official policies or position, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Army Combat Capabilities Development Command (DEVCOM), Aviation & Missile Center (AvMC), or the U.S. Government.

## References

- [1] Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., and Amodei, D., "Language Models are Few-Shot Learners," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33, Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 1877–1901. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.14165>.
- [2] Anthropic, "Introducing Claude," <https://www.anthropic.com/news/introducing-claude>, 2023.
- [3] Anil, R., Borgeaud, S., Alayrac, J.-B., Yu, J., Soricut, R., Schalkwyk, J., Dai, A. M., Hauth, A., Millican, K., Silver, D., Johnson, M., Antonoglou, I., Schrittwieser, J., et al., "Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models," <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11805>, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.11805>.

- [4] Thirunavukarasu, A. J., Ting, D. S. J., Elangovan, K., Gutierrez, L., Tan, T. F., and Ting, D. S. W., “Large language models in medicine,” *Nature Medicine*, Vol. 29, 2023, p. 1930–1940. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-023-02448-8>.
- [5] Wang, L., Chou, J., Zhou, X., Tien, A., and Baumgartner, D. M., “AviationGPT: A Large Language Model for the Aviation Domain,” <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17686>, 2023.
- [6] Tikayat Ray, A., Pinon Fischer, O. J., Mavris, D. N., White, R. T., and Cole, B. F., “aeroBERT-NER: Named-Entity Recognition for Aerospace Requirements Engineering using BERT,” *AIAA SCITECH 2023 Forum*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2023-2583>.
- [7] Yilmaz, E., and German, B., “A Convolutional Neural Network Approach to Training Predictors for Airfoil Performance,” *18th AIAA/ISSMO Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization Conference*, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2017-3660>.
- [8] Hui, X., Bai, J., Wang, H., and Zhang, Y., “Fast pressure distribution prediction of airfoils using deep learning,” *Aerospace Science and Technology*, Vol. 105, 2020, p. 105949. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ast.2020.105949>.
- [9] Zhang, H., “A novel deep-learning-based pressure distribution prediction approach of airfoils,” *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part G: Journal of Aerospace Engineering*, Vol. 237, No. 16, 2023, pp. 3786–3799. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09544100231206570>.
- [10] Constantine, P. G., Dow, E., and Wang, Q., “Active Subspace Methods in Theory and Practice: Applications to Kriging Surfaces,” *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, Vol. 36, No. 4, 2014, pp. A1500–A1524. <https://doi.org/10.1137/130916138>.
- [11] Grey, Z. J., and Constantine, P. G., “Active Subspaces of Airfoil Shape Parameterizations,” *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 56, No. 5, 2018, pp. 2003–2017. <https://doi.org/10.2514/1.J056054>.
- [12] Wong, C. Y., Seshadri, P., Scillitoe, A., Duncan, A. B., and Parks, G., “Blade Envelopes Part I: Concept and Methodology,” *Journal of Turbomachinery*, Vol. 144, No. 6, 2022, p. 061006. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4053239>.
- [13] Wong, C. Y., Seshadri, P., Parks, G. T., and Girolami, M., “Embedded ridge approximations,” *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, Vol. 372, 2020, p. 113383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2020.113383>.
- [14] Zhang, Y., Sung, W. J., and Mavris, D. N., “Application of Convolutional Neural Network to Predict Airfoil Lift Coefficient,” *2018 AIAA/ASCE/AHS/ASC Structures, Structural Dynamics, and Materials Conference*, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2018-1903>.
- [15] Liu, R.-L., Hua, Y., Zhou, Z.-F., Li, Y., Wu, W.-T., and Aubry, N., “Prediction and optimization of airfoil aerodynamic performance using deep neural network coupled Bayesian method,” *Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 34, No. 11, 2022, p. 117116. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0122595>.
- [16] Cornelius, J., and Schmitz, S., “Dragonfly Rotor Optimization using Machine Learning Applied to an OVERFLOW Generated Airfoil Database,” *Vertical Flight Society Forum 80*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.4050/F-0080-2024-1316>.
- [17] Anhichem, M., Timme, S., Castagna, J., Peace, A., and Maina, M., “Bayesian Approaches for Efficient and Uncertainty-Aware Prediction of Pressure Distributions,” *AIAA SCITECH 2024 Forum*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2024-0253>.

- [18] Anhichem, M., Timme, S., Castagna, J., Peace, A., and Maina, M., “Multifidelity Data Fusion Applied to Aircraft Wing Pressure Distribution,” *AIAA AVIATION 2022 Forum*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2022-3526>.
- [19] Common Crawl Foundation, “Common Crawl,” <https://commoncrawl.org/>, 2007.
- [20] Gao, L., Biderman, S., Black, S., Golding, L., Hoppe, T., Foster, C., Phang, J., He, H., Thite, A., Nabeshima, N., Presser, S., and Leahy, C., “The Pile: An 800GB Dataset of Diverse Text for Language Modeling,” <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.00027>, 2020.
- [21] Penedo, G., Malartic, Q., Hesslow, D., Cojocar, R., Cappelli, A., Alobeidli, H., Pannier, B., Almazrouei, E., and Launay, J., “The RefinedWeb Dataset for Falcon LLM: Outperforming Curated Corpora with Web Data, and Web Data Only,” <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.01116>, 2023.
- [22] Wilson, A. G., Hu, Z., Salakhutdinov, R., and Xing, E. P., “Deep Kernel Learning,” *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Vol. 51, PMLR, Cadiz, Spain, 2016, pp. 370–378. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1511.02222>.
- [23] Flemming, R. J., “An Experimental Evaluation of Advanced Rotorcraft Airfoils in the NASA Ames Eleven-foot Transonic Wind Tunnel,” NASA CR-166587, 1984.
- [24] Harris, C. D., “Experimental Investigation of a 10 Percent Thick NASA Supercritical Airfoil Section,” AGARD-AR-138, 1979.
- [25] Bak, C., Fuglsang, P., Johansen, J., and Antoniou, I., “Wind tunnel tests of the NACA 63-415 and a modified NACA 63-415 airfoil,” Risø-R-1193(EN), 2000.
- [26] Kingma, D. P., and Ba, J., “Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization,” <https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>, 2017.
- [27] Izmailov, P., Podoprikin, D., Garipov, T., Vetrov, D., and Wilson, A., “Averaging weights leads to wider optima and better generalization,” *34th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 2018, UAI 2018*, Association For Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (AUAI), 2018, pp. 876–885. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1803.05407>.
- [28] Athiwaratkun, B., Finzi, M., Izmailov, P., and Wilson, A. G., “There Are Many Consistent Explanations of Unlabeled Data: Why You Should Average,” *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1806.05594>.
- [29] Hensman, J., Matthews, A., and Ghahramani, Z., “Scalable Variational Gaussian Process Classification,” *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Vol. 38, PMLR, 2015, pp. 351–360. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1411.2005>.
- [30] Titsias, M., “Variational Learning of Inducing Variables in Sparse Gaussian Processes,” *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Vol. 5, PMLR, 2009, pp. 567–574.
- [31] Spaid, F. W., Dahlin, J. A., Bachalo, W. D., and Stivers Jr., L. S., “An Experimental Study of Transonic Flow About a Supercritical Airfoil,” NASA TM-81336, 1983.

- [32] Chen, J., Wang, Q., Zhang, S., Eecen, P., and Grasso, F., “A new direct design method of wind turbine airfoils and wind tunnel experiment,” *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, Vol. 40, No. 3, 2016, pp. 2002–2014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2015.09.051>.
- [33] Ragni, D., Ferreira, C. S., and Correale, G., “Experimental investigation of an optimized airfoil for vertical-axis wind turbines,” *Wind Energy*, Vol. 18, No. 9, 2015, pp. 1629–1643. <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.1780>.
- [34] Saradhi, “ExtractTable,” <https://extracttable.com/>, 2024.
- [35] Johnson, P. J., “Pressure Distributions on the Blade Sections of the NACA 10-(3)(090)-03 Propeller under Operating Conditions,” NACA RM-L50A26, 1950.
- [36] Stanewsky, E., and Thibert, J. J., “Airfoil SKF 1.1 with Maneuver Flap,” AGARD-AR-138, 1979.
- [37] Ladson, L. C., Hill, S. A., and Johnson, J. G. W., “Pressure Distributions from High Reynolds Number Transonic Tests of an NACA 0012 Airfoil in the Langley 0.3-Meter Transonic Cryogenic Tunnel,” NASA TM-100526, 1987.
- [38] Pinkerton, R. M., “The Variation with Reynolds Number of Pressure Distribution over an Airfoil Section,” NACA TR-613, 1938.
- [39] Stivers Jr., L. S., “Effects of Subsonic Mach Number on the Forces and Pressure Distributions on Four NACA 64a-series Airfoil Sections at Angles of Attack as High as 28 Degrees,” NACA TN-162, 1985.
- [40] Johnson Jr., W. G., Hill, A. S., and Eichmann, O., “Pressure Distributions From High Reynolds Number Tests of a NASA SC(3)-0712(B) Airfoil in the Langely 0.3-Meter Transonic Cryogenic Tunnel,” NASA TM-86370, 1985.
- [41] Cook, P. H., McDonald, M. A., and Firmin, M. C. P., “Airfoil RAE 2822 - Pressure Distributions, and Boundary Layer and Wake Measurements,” AGARD-AR-138, 1979.
- [42] Rohatgi, A., “WebPlotDigitizer,” <https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer.html>, 2024.
- [43] Thibert, J. J., Grandjacques, M., and Ohman, L. H., “NACA 0012 Airfoil,” AGARD-AR-138, 1979.
- [44] Leishman, G. J., *Principles of Helicopter Aerodynamics*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [45] Anderson, J. D., *Fundamentals of Aerodynamics*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., McGraw-Hill, 2011.
- [46] Montgomery, D. C., and Runger, G. C., *Applied Statistics and Probability for Engineers*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., Wiley, 2018.
- [47] Economon, T. D., Palacios, F., Copeland, S. R., Lukaczyk, T. W., and Alonso, J. J., “SU2: An Open-Source Suite for Multiphysics Simulation and Design,” *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 54, No. 3, 2016, pp. 828–846. <https://doi.org/10.2514/1.J053813>.
- [48] Somers, D. M., “Design and Experimental Results for the S809 Airfoil,” NREL/SR-440-6918, 1997. <https://doi.org/10.2172/437668>.
- [49] Drela, M., “XFOIL,” <https://web.mit.edu/drela/Public/web/xfoil>, 2001.

- [50] Coakley, T., “Numerical simulation of viscous transonic airfoil flows,” *25th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting*, 1987. <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.1987-416>.
- [51] Rasmussen, C. E., and Williams, C. K. I., *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*, The MIT Press, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/3206.001.0001>.
- [52] Stein, M. L., *Interpolation of Spatial Data*, Springer, 1999.
- [53] Grey, Z. J., Doronina, O. A., and Glaws, A., “Separable shape tensors for aerodynamic design,” *Journal of Computational Design and Engineering*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2023, pp. 468–487. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcde/qwac140>.

## Appendix

### A. Mathematical Preliminaries of Gaussian Process

First, it is assumed that a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  exists, which contains  $N$  input vectors related to airfoil geometry and operating conditions (i.e. the latent variables obtained from ADAPT's FCNN) and the corresponding pressure coefficient,  $C_p$ , at a given chordwise location;  $(\mathbf{z}_n, y(\mathbf{z}_n))$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . It is assumed that each observation of  $C_p$  is a noisy version of the underlying "true" value,  $y_n = f(\mathbf{z}_n) + \epsilon_n$ , where  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$ . The values of  $\sigma_n^2$  of the likelihood model is obtained from the experimental accuracy recorded in ASPIRE. It will also be useful to assume that the predictive pressure coefficient values at other locations are required. This training data and testing data is given by

$$\mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{z}_N \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y(\mathbf{z}_1) \\ \vdots \\ y(\mathbf{z}_N) \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \mathbf{Z}^* = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_1^* \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{z}_M^* \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{f}^* = \begin{bmatrix} f^*(\mathbf{z}_1) \\ \vdots \\ f^*(\mathbf{z}_M) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where the asterisk indicates the testing locations. In GP regression, the target variable is modeled as a Gaussian process, which is fully characterized by its mean function ( $\mu(\mathbf{z})$ ) and covariance function ( $k(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}')$ ). The GP regression model can be defined as

$$f(\mathbf{z}) \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mu(\mathbf{z}), k(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}')). \quad (11)$$

Then, the joint density of the observed data and the latent, noise-free function on the test points is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{f}_* \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \mu_Z \\ \mu_* \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{Z,Z} + \sigma_n^2 \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{K}_{Z,*} \\ \mathbf{K}_{Z,*}^T & \mathbf{K}_{*,*} \end{pmatrix} \right). \quad (12)$$

$\mathbf{K}_{\cdot, \cdot}$  denotes the covariance matrix between the GPs evaluated at either  $\mathbf{Z}$  or  $\mathbf{Z}^*$ . For example,  $\mathbf{K}_{Z,Z}$  represents the  $N \times N$  covariance matrix between the GP at training data  $\mathbf{Z}$  while  $\mathbf{K}_{Z,*}$  represents the  $N \times M$  covariance matrix between the GP at the training data  $\mathbf{Z}$  and a set of test points  $\mathbf{Z}^*$ .

Given the training data of input-output pairs  $(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{y})$ , the posterior Gaussian distribution at  $\mathbf{Z}_*$  can be written as

$$\mu_{*|Z} = \mathbf{K}_{Z,*}^T (\mathbf{K}_{Z,Z} + \sigma_y^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{y} \text{ and} \quad (13)$$

$$\Sigma_{*|Z} = \mathbf{K}_{*,*} - \mathbf{K}_{Z,*}^T (\mathbf{K}_{Z,Z} + \sigma_y^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{Z,*}. \quad (14)$$

Due to numerical instability that may arise from directly calculating the inverse  $(\mathbf{K}_{Z,Z} + \sigma_n^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1}$ , a Cholesky decomposition

is performed where,  $\mathbf{K}_\sigma = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^T$ . This allows the rewriting of Equations 13 and 14 as

$$\mu_{*|Z} = \mathbf{K}_{Z,*}^T \alpha, \text{ and} \quad (15)$$

$$\Sigma_{*|Z} = \mathbf{K}_{*,*} - \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\alpha = \mathbf{L}^T \backslash (\mathbf{L} \mathbf{y})$  and  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{L} \backslash \mathbf{K}_{Z,*}$ .

## B. Kernel Function

As observed in the previous equations, the covariance function (also known as the kernel function) is a crucial ingredient in a Gaussian process regression, as it encodes the assumptions about the function that is learned [51]. One of the most widely used kernel function is the Squared Exponential (SE) kernel, also known as the Radial Basis Function (RBF) kernel. The function is of the form

$$k_{SE}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') = \sigma_f^2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2l^2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\|^2\right), \quad (17)$$

where the hyperparameter  $\sigma_f^2$  denotes the kernel amplitude (or variance) and  $l$  denotes the length scale. One property of the SE kernel is that it is infinitely differentiable, indicating that any GP employing this covariance function has mean square derivatives of all orders. Consequently, the model outputs have strong smoothness. This property of the SE kernel can prove detrimental in modeling some physical phenomena [52].

A commonly used alternative to the SE kernel is the Matérn class of covariance functions. The class includes a smoothness parameter, often denoted by  $\nu$ , which allows the user to control the smoothness of the resulting GP sample paths. The parameter allows the function to perform better in modeling processes with discontinuities or sharp changes. The covariance is given by

$$k_{\text{Matérn}}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') = \sigma_f^2 \frac{2^{1-\nu}}{\Gamma(\nu)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2\nu} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\|}{l}\right)^\nu K_\nu\left(\frac{\sqrt{2\nu} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\|}{l}\right) \quad (18)$$

where  $\Gamma$  is the gamma function and  $K_\nu$  is the modified Bessel function of the second kind. The most commonly used cases of the Matérn classes in machine learning are those where  $\nu$  is a non-negative half-integers [51], namely  $\nu = 1/2, 3/2$ , and  $5/2$ . In this work,  $\nu = 5/2$  is used, which simplifies Eq. 18 to

$$k_{\nu=5/2}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') = \sigma_f^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{5}}{l} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\| + \frac{5}{3l^2} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\|^2\right) \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{5}}{l} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\|\right). \quad (19)$$

With the Matérn 5/2 kernel function, the Gaussian Process  $f(\mathbf{z})$  is twice differentiable in the mean-square sense. This allows the model to capture the rapid changes in the pressure curves, often occurring at the suction peak or shocks,



while maintaining some level of smoothness.

### C. Training Objectives

Training the model involves finding optimal values of the weights and biases of the fully connected network and GP hyperparameters  $\mathbf{t}$  ( $\sigma_f^2$  and  $l^2$ ), which are obtained by maximizing the marginal likelihood given the training targets  $\mathbf{y}$ :

$$\log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{t}) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{y}^T (\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{Z}} + \sigma_n^2\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{y} - \frac{1}{2}\log |\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{Z}} + \sigma_n^2\mathbf{I}| - \frac{N}{2}\log(2\pi), \quad (20)$$

where  $N$  is the number of training data,  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{Z}}$  represents the  $N \times N$  covariance matrix between the GP at training data  $\mathbf{Z}$ , and  $\sigma_n^2$  is the reported variance of the training data.

The model *jointly* learns all deep kernel hyperparameters, weights of the neural network ( $\mathbf{w}$ ) and the parameters of the base kernel ( $\mathbf{t}$ ), in an end-to-end fashion. The approach allows the incorporation of all components of the DKL process into a single model.

### D. Analysis of Model Active Space

The LAM predicts an airfoil's pressure distribution by first projecting the input data into a 10-dimensional latent space and then mapping these latent variables to an output multivariate normal distribution as a Gaussian process. In this section of the Appendix, the model's behavior in this active space is analyzed. This is important for ensuring that the model operates with a robust and interpretable parameterization [53]. Dimensionality reduction, the process of simplifying the data while preserving its essential structure, plays a key role in this analysis.

In many studies, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is the preferred technique for improving the interpretability of the active space. The method decomposes a data matrix  $\mathbf{Z}$  into  $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$  where  $\mathbf{U}$  is the matrix of left singular vectors,  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  is the diagonal matrix of singular values, and  $\mathbf{V}$  is the matrix of right singular vectors. The decomposition allows for the identification of the principal components, the directions in the data that exhibit the most variance.

However, real-world data is often represented through noisy measurements, including the digitized data in ASPIRE. The presence of noise can significantly alter the principal component directions. Therefore, in this work, Robust Principal Component Analysis (RPCA) is employed as opposed to the standard PCA. RPCA is an optimization strategy where a data matrix is decomposed into a low-rank component and a sparse component, effectively separating the underlying data structure from the outliers.


Mathematically, RPCA solves the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{S}} \|\mathbf{L}\|_* + \lambda\|\mathbf{S}\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{S}, \quad (21)$$

where  $\mathbf{L}$  is the low-rank component,  $\mathbf{S}$  is the sparse component,  $\|\mathbf{L}\|_*$  denotes the sum of singular values of  $\mathbf{L}$ , and  $\|\mathbf{S}\|$

denotes the  $L_1$  norm of  $\mathbf{S}$ . The parameter  $\lambda$  balances the trade-off between the low-rank approximation and the sparsity of the outliers. When  $\lambda$  is set to a high value, the influence of  $\mathbf{S}$  is minimized, and  $\mathbf{L}$  dominates the decomposition. In this case, the decomposition closely resembles that of standard PCA. Once the decomposition is achieved,  $\mathbf{L}$  is subjected to standard PCA procedure to obtain the principal components. These components, denoted as  $L_s$ , serve as the primary directions that capture the most variance in the cleaned, low-rank data.


In this investigation, an artificial test dataset was generated, consisting of all airfoils from the training set. The operating conditions ranged from  $-4.0^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 12.0^\circ$  and  $M_\infty = 0.30, 0.60, 0.70$ . To better understand the overall behavior of the airfoils,  $c_l$  was studied instead of individual  $C_p$  values. The process required the generation of 601 points along the entire airfoil for each  $\alpha$ - $M_\infty$  pair. The artificial test set was fed into the deep neural network which produces the 10 latent variables, resulting in a matrix  $\mathbf{Z}$  of size  $1,060,164 \times 10$ . The same integral operator used to calculate  $c_l$  was then applied to this matrix. The final  $1,764 \times 10$  array of integrated latent variables was processed through RPCA to obtain  $\mathbf{L}$ . From the cumulative explained variance by individual  $L$  components (Fig. 23), it was found that 3 components were sufficient to explain approximately 95% of the variance. This allowed us to analyze contributions of all variables using the  $1,764 \times 3$  matrix, which conveniently could be visualized in a 3D plot.




**Fig. 23 Individual and cumulative explained variances of the integrated latent variables**

Figure 24 depicts the distribution of the latent variables within the active space, where each point is colored by its angle of attack. A clear trajectory with respect to  $\alpha$  can be observed. The trend is clearest in the  $L_1$ - $L_2$  plane, where increasing  $\alpha$  in the pre-stall regime corresponds to a parabolic path in the plane. The latent variables deviate from this crescent curve as the angle of attack approaches stall. At  $\alpha = 12^\circ$ , it can be seen that the latent variables decrease along  $L_2$  with relatively smaller changes in the  $L_1$  direction.

Figure 24b presents 3 airfoil families in isolation in the same active space at  $M_\infty = 0.70$ . NACA 4-digit series, NASA Supercritical airfoils, and SSC-AXX airfoils were chosen as they were designed for different purposes and thus exhibit different behaviors with respect to  $\alpha$  and  $M_\infty$ . For instance, the 3 airfoil families have different degrees of camber and airfoil thicknesses. Consequently, with changing  $\alpha$  and a fixed  $M_\infty = 0.70$ , it is observed that the 3 airfoil families follow distinct trajectories. This is most noticeable in the  $L_1$ - $L_2$  plane, where NASA Supercritical airfoil



(a) Distribution of the latent variables within the active space, colored by  $\alpha$




(b) Trajectories followed by NACA 4-digit, NASA Supercritical and SSC-AXX families in response to changing  $\alpha$

**Fig. 24** Analysis of the model active space with varying  $\alpha$  and  $M_\infty = 0.70$

follows the outermost, SSC-AXX the middle, and NACA 4-digit series the innermost trajectories respectively.

The behavior of the latent variables with respect to varying freestream Mach numbers is illustrated in Fig. 25. With increasing  $M_\infty$ , a decrease in the  $L_1$  direction, and an increase in  $L_2$  and  $L_3$  directions can be observed. The identified trends are less distinct than those in relation to  $\alpha$ . This is likely due to the fact that angle of attack, in general, has a greater impact on  $c_l$  compared to the freestream Mach number. In Fig. 25b, the 3 separate trajectories are followed by different airfoil families. NASA Supercritical airfoil follows the outermost, and NACA 4-digit series the innermost diagonal paths. The SSC-AXX family follows a path between these two airfoil families. As with Fig. 24b, the clearly

discernible trajectories are due to the fact that the airfoils are optimized for different freestream Mach number regimes. NACA 4-digit series airfoils were designed for incompressible flows and NASA Supercritical airfoils for transonic regimes. SSC-AXX airfoils, on the other hand, is a rotorcraft airfoil which must perform well in a wide range of  $M_\infty$ .



(a) Distribution of the latent variables within the active space, colored by  $M_\infty$

(b) Trajectories followed by NACA 4-digit, NASA Supercritical and SSC-AXX families in response to changing  $M_\infty$

**Fig. 25** Analysis of the model active space with varying  $M_\infty$  and  $\alpha = 4.0^\circ$

The analysis of the active space learned by ADAPT's deep neural network showed that the latent variables are grouped into distinct clusters in terms of  $\alpha$  and  $M_\infty$ . While the overall behavior remains similar, the trajectories taken by an airfoil within the active space differs based on the airfoil family. The results serve as the evidence that the model has captured an interpretable and physical mapping between the input space and the latent space during training.