Research on Multiphysics Coupling Analysis and Optimization Design of Aircraft

Jialun Li

Bullis School , Potomac, MD 20854 United States

Abstract. Modern aircraft design has reached a level of complexity where multiphysics coupling – the interaction of aerodynamic, structural, thermal, electromagnetic, and other physical domains – must be considered to achieve optimal performance and reliability. Traditional model-driven approaches, which rely on fundamental physics-based models and equations, struggle to fully capture these complex coupled phenomena and are often limited by modeling assumptions and computational expense. At the same time, purely data-driven approaches using big data and machine learning have emerged as powerful tools to identify patterns and optimize designs, but they can lack physical interpretability and require extensive data. This paper provides a comprehensive review of the state-of-the-art methods for aircraft multiphysics coupling analysis and design optimization, bridging model-driven and data-driven paradigms. First, we introduce the concept of multiphysics coupling in aerospace engineering and discuss its inherent challenges and importance in modern design, citing industrial initiatives (e.g., digital engineering strategies and digital twin concepts) that underscore the need for integrated simulation. Next, we compare model-driven and data-driven approaches: model-driven methods (e.g., using computational fluid dynamics or finite element models) offer accuracy grounded in physics but cannot easily cover all aspects of highly complex systems, while data-driven methods (e.g., machine learning surrogates) excel at fitting complex relationships from data yet may sacrifice some accuracy or explanatory power. We highlight the historical transition from model-driven to data-driven techniques – for instance, the Monte Carlo method, first introduced during the Manhattan Project, enabled solving problems (like neutron diffusion) too complex for purely analytical models. Then, we examine modern hybrid approaches that integrate physics-based models with data-driven algorithms to leverage the strengths of both. Finally, we review optimization algorithms used for design in multiphysics contexts. Even with advanced models or data, effective design optimization often requires heuristic and evolutionary algorithms to navigate large design spaces with multiple conflicting objectives. We explain how heuristic algorithms can efficiently find “good enough” solutions without guaranteeing a global optimum, and how multi-objective optimization techniques (such as genetic algorithms and Pareto front analysis) are applied to balance trade-offs like weight vs. strength or efficiency vs. cost. This survey covers recent achievements in applying data-driven methods to complex coupled physics problems (e.g., using AI to predict structural and thermal behavior), and discusses outstanding challenges such as ensuring model interpretability, improving computational efficiency, and managing sparse data. After reading this abstract, the reader should understand that this paper discusses why combining physics-based models with data-driven tools is essential for next-generation aircraft design, what methods exist to do so, and how optimization algorithms help achieve the best designs under multiphysics constraints.

Keywords: digital engineering; Model-Based Systems Engineering (MBSE); physics-informed neural networks (PINNs); uncertainty quantification (UQ); trade-off studies

1. Introduction

The aerospace industry is undergoing a paradigm shift toward digital engineering and data-driven design, driven by the growing complexity of modern aircraft and the demand for better performance and efficiency. In traditional engineering practice, each subsystem (structures, aerodynamics, propulsion, etc.) was analyzed in isolation. However, cutting-edge aircraft designs – such as high-aspect-ratio flexible wings, more-electric aircraft systems, and advanced propulsion – involve strong multiphysics coupling where multiple physical domains interact simultaneously. For example, the deformation of a lightweight wing affects its aerodynamics and vice versa, so aerostructural coupling must be accounted for; indeed, coupling between aerodynamic flow and structural response makes it challenging to design optimal flexible wings. Likewise, in an electric aircraft or engine, electromagnetic, thermal, and mechanical phenomena all influence each other in complex ways. Ignoring these interactions can lead to suboptimal or even unsafe designs. In response, aerospace organizations and governments are actively promoting integrated modeling and simulation across disciplines. The United States Department of Defense released a Digital Engineering Strategy in 2018 to modernize engineering practices, encouraging the use of model-based systems and simulations throughout the design lifecycle. Similarly, the concept of the Digital Twin – a virtual replica of a physical system that is continuously updated with data – has gained traction. NASA defines a digital twin as an "integrated multiphysics, multi-scale, probabilistic simulation of a vehicle or system that uses the best available physical models, sensor updates, fleet history, etc., to mirror the life of its flying twin". This highlights that high-fidelity multiphysics models are central to the digital twin vision. In China, national initiatives for digital transformation also emphasize multi-domain simulation: for instance, policy plans describe digital twin systems that integrate "multi-disciplinary, multi-physics, multi-scale simulations" to mirror real-world operations. These trends underscore a broad consensus that combining data and physics-based modeling is crucial for tackling the complexity of next-generation aircraft design.

Despite advances, significant gaps and challenges remain in how we perform multiphysics coupling analysis. Classical model-driven methods rely on fundamental equations of physics and engineering—such as Newton's laws for structures, Maxwell's equations for electromagnetics, or Navier-Stokes equations for fluid dynamics—to represent system behavior. These methods are powerful and provide interpretable, trusted results within their range of validity. For example, computational physics models can simulate coupled fields in an electric motor: one can use finite element analysis to solve electromagnetic fields, heat transfer, and structural stresses together. However, as systems become more complex, purely model-driven approaches face limitations. It may be infeasible to derive an analytical model for every interacting effect, or to solve the resulting coupled equations in a reasonable time. Assumptions and simplifications (e.g., linearity, steady-state conditions) are often required, which can omit important nonlinear or emergent behavior.

There are important differences and complementary strengths between model-driven and data-driven approaches. A model-driven approach starts from a known theory: experts build a mathematical model (set of equations or rules) based on physics and domain knowledge. This model may then be calibrated with some data, but it fundamentally reflects preconceived structure (e.g., a formula for lift on a wing, or an equivalent circuit for an electrical system). Model-driven methods tend to be explainable – they can provide clear reasoning for outcomes because they operate under established rules and principles. However, they can struggle when a system defies the simplifying assumptions made, or when new phenomena emerge outside the model's scope. In contrast, a data-driven approach largely forgoes explicit physics and lets the data speak: large datasets are collected (from experiments, simulations, or operational sensors) and algorithms (like neural networks or other statistical models) are used to find patterns and relationships in that data. The data-driven approach "learns" the system behavior empirically, which makes it highly adaptable – it can capture effects that might have been overlooked or too complicated for a human to model, and it generally improves in accuracy as more data becomes available. For example, modern data-driven models have been applied to predict the performance of complex lattice structures under combined loads (mechanical, thermal, acoustic), something difficult to capture with equations alone. The downside is that data-driven models can be opaque ("black boxes") and may generalize poorly outside the range of the training data.

This paper aims to review the evolution of methods for multiphysics coupling analysis and optimization in aircraft design, with an emphasis on how data-driven approaches are complementing and transforming traditional model-driven engineering. We begin in Section 2 with an overview of what multiphysics coupling analysis entails in the aerospace context, and we outline the key challenges (such as solving coupled equations and the high computational cost). Section 3 compares model-driven and data-driven approaches in detail. We define each approach, provide examples (ranging from classical physics-based simulations to modern AI applications), and discuss the transition from purely model-based to data-enhanced methods. In Section 4, we discuss how design optimization is performed under multiphysics constraints – covering both classical optimization techniques and newer heuristic algorithms for single and multi-objective problems. We highlight how heuristic and evolutionary algorithms are enabling engineers to search large design spaces that arise from multiphysics analyses. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper, summarizing the findings and identifying open issues (such as the need for better integration of physics and data, and more efficient algorithms) and suggesting directions for future research in this rapidly evolving field.

2. Multiphysics Coupling Analysis in Aircraft Design

Complex engineering systems like aircraft inherently involve multiphysics coupling, meaning multiple physical domains interact and influence each other. Performing a multiphysics coupling analysis involves simultaneously modeling phenomena from different disciplines and capturing their interactions. In practice, this often comes down to solving a coupled system of partial differential equations (PDEs) representing each physical field and the coupling terms between them. For example, consider the aeroelastic behavior of an aircraft wing: the aerodynamic flow exerts pressure on the wing structure, causing it to deform, which in turn alters the airflow. This is a two-way fluid–structure interaction. Similarly, in a jet engine or electric propulsion motor, electromagnetic fields generate heat, which causes thermal expansion in materials, affecting mechanical stresses and clearances – a coupling of electromagnetic, thermal, and structural fields.

Conducting multiphysics analyses is computationally demanding and technically challenging. One challenge is ensuring consistency and convergence when coupling different physics solvers – the models might operate on different scales or numerical methods, and naive coupling can lead to instability or divergence. Another challenge is the sheer computational cost: a high-fidelity aerodynamic simulation (CFD) on its own is expensive, and a high-fidelity structural simulation (FEA) is likewise expensive; a coupled aero-structural simulation might require both to be solved repeatedly until an equilibrium is found, multiplying the cost. For instance, fully coupling aerodynamics and structures for a flexible wing design demands iterative computation of flow and structural deformation until they converge, which is why designing optimal flexible wings is so challenging. The curse of dimensionality also appears – a coupled model has an even larger parameter space (including all inputs from each domain). In many cases, to make the problem tractable, engineers resort to multi-fidelity approaches: using high-fidelity models for the most critical components and lower-fidelity or reduced-order models for others, or they decouple certain interactions deemed weak. Ensuring accuracy while managing cost is a constant trade-off. Despite these difficulties, multiphysics analysis is indispensable for today’s aircraft. It provides insight that single-physics analyses would miss. For example, purely structural analysis of a wing might suggest it is safe, and purely aerodynamic analysis might suggest good performance, but only a coupled analysis will reveal if aeroelastic flutter or divergence occurs at a certain speed. Integration of tools and data is a practical hurdle: often, different teams or software handle different domains, so coupling design tools into one coherent framework is non-trivial. A recent study on next-generation multidisciplinary design optimization (MDO) highlighted that, beyond just having various models, we need architectures that support multi-disciplinary and even multi-code environments – and identified coupling of design tools and model development as major challenges in realizing such integrated MDO frameworks. Overcoming these obstacles is part of the ongoing research: efforts like standardized co-simulation interfaces, common data models, and collaborative platforms (e.g., the AGILE paradigm in Europe) are attempting to make multiphysics integration more routine.

In summary, aircraft multiphysics coupling analysis requires solving coupled equations across domains and carefully balancing model fidelity vs. computational effort. It leverages advanced simulations but must deal with stability and efficiency issues. The next sections will discuss how we augment these physics-based methods with data-driven techniques and how we optimize designs under multiphysics considerations.

3. From Model-Driven to Data-Driven Approaches

One of the central themes in modern engineering is the synergy between model-driven and data-driven approaches. In the context of multiphysics problems, engineers historically started with model-driven methods and gradually incorporated data-driven techniques as the complexity of problems outpaced traditional methods. Here we review these approaches and their convergence.

3.1 Model-Driven Methods

Model-driven methods are rooted in classical physics and mathematics. Engineers formulate a model by using first principles and domain knowledge. This often means writing down governing equations (e.g., conservation laws, constitutive relations) and boundary conditions that describe the system. For instance, in structural dynamics, one uses Newton/Euler equations or continuum mechanics; in fluid dynamics, the Navier-Stokes equations; in electromagnetics, Maxwell's equations. These equations form a deterministic, physics-based representation of the system. The model-driven paradigm has several advantages. First, it is accurate and reliable within the domain of the model – since it's built on physical laws, a valid model can predict behavior even outside past observed data (extrapolation) as long as the underlying assumptions hold. Second, it is transparent: model-driven simulations allow us to inspect cause-and-effect (e.g., seeing how changing a wing's stiffness affects flutter speed) and provide explanations grounded in physics (e.g., "because pressure distribution changed, the stress increased"). This explainability is crucial in aerospace, where safety and verification are paramount. Moreover, model-driven approaches usually require less data – they can work from fundamental material properties and conditions, which is useful when limited prototypes or experiments exist.

However, model-driven methods also show clear weaknesses when facing very complex systems. Creating a model might be impossible or impractical if the physics are not fully understood or too complicated. Aircraft often operate in regimes with turbulence, combustion instabilities, or nonlinear material behavior that are not fully captured by simple equations. Engineers must make simplifying assumptions (e.g., assuming linearity, ignoring 3D effects, or decoupling certain physics) to make models solvable. These simplifications can reduce accuracy or miss critical interactions. Additionally, high-fidelity models can become computationally prohibitive. A model-driven high-fidelity CFD might require millions of mesh cells and small time-steps; coupling it with a finite element structural model, similarly fine, can push computational requirements beyond what's feasible for routine design iterations. As a result, in practice, model-driven methods often either operate at reduced fidelity (which can leave out detail) or they focus on one aspect at a time (which might miss cross-domain effects).

Despite these issues, model-driven simulations remain the cornerstone of aerospace analysis and will continue to be. They form the "ground truth" by which new data-driven surrogates are often trained or validated. For example, a multiphysics simulation of an electric machine might produce a database of results for various operating conditions (fields, temperatures, stresses), which then can be used to train a faster surrogate model. In essence, even the data we use for data-driven approaches often comes from model-driven simulations when real experiments are too costly. In summary, model-driven methods offer a foundation of understanding and accuracy, but they need augmentation to handle the full scope of modern problems.

3.2 The Transition to Data-Driven Techniques

As the limitations of pure model-driven approaches became apparent, engineers increasingly turned to data-driven techniques to fill the gaps. Data-driven approaches invert the traditional process: instead of deriving the solution from physics, one infers or learns it from data (which could be experimental measurements or simulation outputs). The transition began decades ago in limited forms – for example, using wind tunnel test data to create empirical correlations for aerodynamics, or using lookup tables from experiments in engine control units. These are simple data-driven elements embedded in engineering.

However, the transition has not been without challenges. Engineers initially were (and still are) cautious about trusting purely data-driven models for high-stakes decisions because such models might not obey physical laws (e.g., they might violate energy conservation, or predict nonsensical behavior outside the training range). Additionally, data-driven models need a lot of data – and for new aerospace designs, real data is often scarce (you can't get data on a plane that hasn't been built yet, except by creating synthetic data via simulations). There is also the issue of explainability and certification: regulatory bodies like the FAA or EASA require understanding how a design works; a black-box ML model saying "this wing won't flutter" is not sufficient evidence unless it can be explained or corroborated by physics. As a result, current research is focusing on Physics-Informed Machine Learning (PIML) and hybrid models, which incorporate physical laws into learning algorithms (for instance, structuring a neural network to respect known symmetries or conservation laws). The goal is to ensure the data-driven models are not only accurate but also consistent with known physics and more interpretable.

In this evolution from model-driven to data-driven, a key realization has been that combining the two yields the best results. Rather than viewing them as competing paradigms, the state-of-the-art is to blend them. A good example is the field of digital twin: a digital twin uses physics models to simulate expected behavior, but continuously updates and corrects the simulation with real data feeds (sensor data) to stay accurate. Another example is using data-driven surrogates to accelerate parts of a physics simulation – e.g., replacing a costly chemistry calculation in a CFD code with a neural network that was trained on that calculation, thereby speeding up the overall simulation. Engineers also use model outputs to augment data training: if physical tests are limited, simulation data (from trusted models) can be added to enlarge training sets (sometimes known as synthetic data augmentation). In multiphysics optimization, one might use a coarse model to scan a design space, then a data-driven model to refine the promising regions quickly, and then a high-fidelity model to verify the final candidates – an intelligent interplay of data and models.

In summary, the field has transitioned from a primarily model-driven approach to one where data-driven methods play an indispensable role. This transition is motivated by the need to handle complexity and improve efficiency. The ongoing challenge is to maintain trustworthiness: ensuring that as we rely more on data, we do not lose the rigor and confidence that physics-based analysis provides. The next section (3.3) will elaborate on pure data-driven methodologies in use today, and then Section 4 will discuss how both types of methods feed into the optimization of aircraft designs.

3.3 Data-Driven Methods in Aerospace

In aerospace and multiphysics engineering, data-driven methods encompass any technique where empirical data is central to building the model of a system. Today, this often implies machine learning algorithms, but it also includes classical system identification and statistical modeling. Key data-driven techniques used in aircraft multiphysics problems include:

Regression analysis and system identification: Early data-driven modeling involved fitting algebraic formulas to data. For example, statistical regression might be used to create an equation for fuel burn as a function of flight conditions based on flight test data. System identification techniques can derive dynamic models (like transfer functions) of a system from input–output time-series data. These approaches result in simplified models(sometimes called surrogate models or metamodels) that are fast to evaluate. A simple case would be wind tunnel measurements feeding into a polynomial that predicts aerodynamic coefficients – widely used for preliminary design.

Machine Learning (ML) and Artificial Intelligence: This is the modern powerhouse for data-driven modeling. In the aerospace context, popular ML methods include neural networks (including deep learning models), support vector machines, Gaussian process regression (kriging), and ensemble methods like random forests. These methods can handle high-dimensional inputs (for instance, a neural network could take a full pressure distribution on a wing as input and predict lift and structural stress). They excel at recognizing complex patterns. An example from recent research is using deep neural networks as surrogate models to predict outcomes of expensive simulations. Brunton et al. (2020) note that emerging ML methods can be thought of as "data-driven optimization techniques" ideal for high-dimensional problems, and they improve with increasing volumes of data. Data-driven models have been successfully demonstrated in predicting aerodynamic force coefficients, stress distributions, or even unsteady phenomena that are difficult for humans to model. They are also heavily used in anomaly detection and predictive maintenance (training on normal behavior and detecting deviations).

Hybrid physics-data models: As emphasized, pure black-box models may not always be ideal. A current trend is physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) and other hybrids where the training of a data-driven model is constrained by physics equations. In one approach, a neural network is set up to output a field (say, temperature distribution), and the loss function penalizes it if it violates known governing equations (like the heat equation). This way, even with sparse data, the model can interpolate and extrapolate in a physically consistent manner. These approaches have been applied to problems like solving inverse design tasks (find the shape that yields a target performance), where a purely data-driven approach might guess nonsensical shapes, but a physics-informed approach stays within realistic boundaries.

It is also important to mention data quality and availability. In aerospace, gathering data can be expensive and time-consuming (wind tunnel campaigns, flight tests, etc.). Thus, a lot of data-driven work relies on synthetic data from simulations. There is ongoing work on improving the realism of synthetic data and on efficient experimental design to maximize information gain from minimal tests. Additionally, when data from multiple sources or physics need to be combined, techniques like data fusion are used. For example, one might fuse vibration data and thermal images to diagnose a problem in an engine – a data-driven algorithm can combine those into a single prediction.

Data-driven methods have already shown impressive results in specific applications. For instance, researchers have demonstrated predicting the multifunctional performance of lattice materials (stiffness, energy absorption, thermal conductivity, etc.) under multi-physical loading by training models on simulation data. In aerodynamics, data-driven reduced-order models can predict unsteady flow fields for control purposes much faster than CFD. In structural health monitoring, algorithms analyze sensor data to detect damage or fatigue hotspots in near real-time, which is essentially a data-driven inference of structural state.

To illustrate a practical example: consider an electric motor design (part of an aircraft's electrical system). The design involves electromagnetic performance, heat dissipation, structural integrity, and noise/vibration. A model-driven analysis would solve Maxwell's equations for magnetics, Fourier's law for heat, etc., but a data-driven approach might train a model on many simulated design variations. One study notes that designing such motors is inherently multidisciplinary and often involves conflicting objectives; a holistic approach is needed, and indeed, multi-physics simulation becomes essential to generate the data in the first place. A data-driven model can then learn how changing geometric parameters influences multiple performance metrics simultaneously. Moreover, optimization algorithms (like we will discuss in Section 4) can hook into these data-driven models to search for the best design. Ansys, for example, markets that its simulation software can integrate with AI (SimAI) to "rapidly predict simulation results based on AI", combining high simulation accuracy with the speed of generative AI for quick design iterations.

In conclusion, data-driven methods have become indispensable in the aerospace engineer's toolkit. They are accelerating design cycles and enabling analysis of phenomena that were previously out of reach. Yet, engineers use them judiciously alongside physics models. The trust in a data-driven approach often comes from validating it against physics-based analysis or experimental results. As we move forward, the boundary between model-driven and data-driven will continue to blur, with most advanced methodologies incorporating elements of both. Next, we will examine how these approaches (model-based and data-based) are applied in the optimization of designs, which is ultimately where analysis results are used to make engineering decisions.

4. Optimization Algorithms for Multiphysics Design

Performing multiphysics analyses or creating high-fidelity models is only part of the engineering task. The ultimate goal is often to optimize the design – that is, to find the best configuration of a system given certain objectives and constraints. In aircraft design, optimization problems abound: minimize weight while meeting strength requirements, maximize fuel efficiency while maintaining safety margins, or find the best trade-off between performance and cost. However, once we consider multiphysics, these optimization problems become extremely complex. They tend to be multimodal, non-linear, high-dimensional, and multi-objective. Traditional analytical optimization methods (like setting derivatives to zero to find optima) are usually not feasible due to the complexity of the functions involved (often black-box outputs from simulations or experiments). This is where specialized optimization algorithms come into play, many of which are heuristic or metaheuristic in nature.

4.1 Heuristic and Metaheuristic Algorithms

Heuristic algorithms refer to strategies designed to find a sufficiently good solution for an optimization problem when classic methods are too slow or fail to find any exact solution. They are essentially intelligent search procedures that explore the design space efficiently without guaranteeing to find the absolute global optimum. In engineering design, heuristics are invaluable because many design spaces are riddled with local optima or are too large to search exhaustively. By “good enough” strategies, heuristics trade optimality for computational efficiency. In other words, rather than spending enormous time to maybe find the perfect design, a heuristic will find a very good design in a reasonable time, which is often an acceptable trade-off in practice. Some widely used metaheuristic algorithms in aerospace design include:

Genetic Algorithms (GA) and Evolutionary Algorithms: These are inspired by natural selection. A population of candidate solutions (designs) is evolved over many generations. At each generation, candidates are evaluated (e.g., run through simulations to get performance metrics), and the better ones are chosen to “reproduce” – they are mutated or combined to form new designs for the next generation. Over time, the population tends to improve, exploring the search space in a broad yet directed way. GAs are particularly popular for discrete or combinatorial design problems and have been used for everything from airfoil shape optimization to optimal placement of sensors. There is a well-known variant for multi-objective problems called Non-dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm (NSGA-II), which finds a set of Pareto optimal solutions in one run. GAs do not guarantee finding the global best, but they are good at avoiding getting stuck in local optima, especially if set up with proper diversity.

It’s important to note that heuristic algorithms do not eliminate the need for good models – they rely on either model-driven simulations or data-driven surrogates to evaluate each design iteration. They are essentially the strategists who guide which designs to test, but the quality of the final solution still depends on the accuracy of the evaluation. Therefore, there’s synergy: a fast data-driven model can dramatically speed up optimization by providing quick evaluations for the algorithm, whereas a high-fidelity model ensures that the evaluation is correct but might reduce the number of designs that can be tested given time limits.

4.2 Multi-Objective Optimization and Trade-offs

Most real engineering design problems involve multiple objectives that often conflict. In aircraft design, common competing objectives include: maximize performance (speed, range, payload) vs. minimize cost and weight; maximize fuel efficiency vs. maximize thrust; maximize safety/reliability vs. minimize weight and cost; or, in multiphysics terms, maximize one physics outcome while minimizing a side-effect in another domain (like maximize cooling but minimize drag due to cooling inlets). Multi-objective optimization deals with such problems by seeking solutions that strike the best balance between objectives rather than optimizing a single metric.

In multi-objective optimization, the concept of Pareto optimality is key. A design is Pareto-optimal if you cannot improve any one objective without worsening at least one other objective. The set of all Pareto-optimal solutions is known as the Pareto frontier or Pareto front. The goal of a multi-objective optimization algorithm is often to find a representation of this Pareto front so that a decision-maker can see the trade-off curve. For example, one Pareto front might show the trade-off between weight and strength for a component: designs at one end are very light but just meet minimum strength, designs at the other end are very strong but heavier, and those in-between compromise.

Algorithms like NSGA-II, multi-objective PSO, etc., are tailored to maintain a population of solutions that approximates the Pareto front in each iteration. They include mechanisms to promote diversity (so the solutions spread out along the front rather than clumping in one region). In the end, such algorithms yield not one solution, but a set of solutions. The engineer can then apply higher-level criteria or preferences (like assigning cost value to weight vs. performance) to pick one. In some cases, if the optimization must yield a single answer (e.g., for automated design), one can convert the multi-objective problem into a single-objective one by weighting the objectives (though picking weights a priori is tricky and often multiple runs are needed).

In conclusion, optimization algorithms – especially heuristics and multi-objective strategies – are essential to turn analysis into design. In the multiphysics arena, where each design evaluation is expensive and multiple criteria must be satisfied, these algorithms enable finding feasible and improved designs that human intuition alone might miss. The interplay of analysis and optimization is a defining feature of modern aerospace engineering: powerful models (whether physics-based or data-driven) generate the data on performance, and advanced optimization algorithms guide the search through the vast design possibilities. By intelligently exploring and exploiting the design space, these methods help answer the ultimate question: Given what we know from model-driven and data-driven analysis, what is the best aircraft design we can create?

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a comprehensive review of the approaches and methodologies used for multiphysics coupling analysis and optimization in aircraft design, with a particular focus on the interplay between model-driven and data-driven techniques. We began by highlighting the growing complexity in modern aerospace systems and the consequent need for integrated multiphysics simulations. Through examples and references to industry initiatives (such as digital twin frameworks and digital engineering strategies), we showed that the aerospace field is moving toward embracing both high-fidelity physics models and data-centric methods to tackle design challenges that span multiple physical domains.

We then compared model-driven versus data-driven approaches in detail. Model-driven methods, grounded in physics and first principles, provide a reliable and interpretable foundation for analysis. They excel when theories are tractable and have been the backbone of aerospace engineering for decades. However, we noted their limitations in coping with highly complex coupled systems where deriving or solving comprehensive analytical models becomes impractical. To address these gaps, the field has increasingly turned to data-driven methods – leveraging computational power, experiments, and machine learning to learn system behavior directly from data. We discussed how data-driven models can capture extremely complex relationships and have been successfully applied to predict and optimize outcomes in multi-physics problems (for example, using AI to predict structural and thermal performance metrics that would be expensive to obtain via full simulations). Importantly, our review stressed that the best results often arise from a hybrid of both approaches. Physics-based models ensure that any data-driven inferences remain grounded in reality, while data-driven techniques enhance and accelerate physics-based analysis by handling aspects that are too convoluted for manual modeling. Historical perspective (such as the introduction of Monte Carlo simulation) and modern developments (such as physics-informed neural networks) illustrated the evolution and fusion of these paradigms.

We also surveyed optimization algorithms that operate on top of these analysis methods to actually find improved designs. Aerospace design optimization was shown to be inherently multi-objective and constrained, requiring advanced algorithms to navigate.

In summary, this review has outlined what has been achieved so far in applying both physics-based and data-driven methods to complex aircraft design problems. The key takeaway is that neither approach alone is sufficient for state-of-the-art challenges: model-driven methods ensure the soundness and safety of designs, while data-driven methods provide the agility and power to deal with complexity and vast data. By combining them, engineers can build predictive models that are both accurate and efficient, enabling faster design iterations and potentially revolutionary design concepts that were previously infeasible to explore.

Looking forward, we identify a few promising future research directions. First, the development of hybrid modeling frameworks should continue, aiming to seamlessly integrate high-fidelity simulations with machine learning. This includes tools that can automatically extract simulation data and train surrogates, as well as frameworks that allow co-simulation with AI components in the loop. Second, advances in computing power (HPC and quantum computing)could be leveraged to solve larger coupled problems directly or to train even more sophisticated models – researchers should keep an eye on how emerging computing paradigms can be applied to multiphysics optimization. Third, a greater focus on robust design and uncertainty quantification is needed. Both model-driven and data-driven predictions have uncertainties (from modelling assumptions or from statistical error); propagating these uncertainties through to the design objective and incorporating them in optimization (robust or reliability-based optimization) is crucial for real-world adoption. Techniques like probabilistic machine learning or stochastic optimization algorithms may play a bigger role in ensuring designs are not just optimal for nominal conditions but also resilient to variations and uncertainties. Lastly, the concept of continuous learning in operation – where an aircraft's digital twin learns and updates from in-service data – could dramatically improve maintenance and future design; research into online learning algorithms that remain stable and accurate over time will be important.

In conclusion, the integration of physics-based and data-driven approaches for multiphysics analysis and optimization represents a powerful paradigm for aerospace engineering. By harnessing the strengths of both and continuing to address their weaknesses, engineers and researchers can push the boundaries of what designs are possible and do so with greater confidence and speed. The path forward will require interdisciplinary collaboration – combining insights from classical engineering, computer science, and applied mathematics – but the reward is the potential for safer, more efficient, and more innovative aircraft designs that meet the ever-increasing demands of the future. The work surveyed here forms a foundation upon which such future advancements can be built, pointing towards a design process that is as much guided by data and algorithms as it is by equations and expert intuition.

References

[1] U.S. Department of Defense. Digital Engineering Strategy. 2018. PDF: https://ac.cto.mil/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/USA001603-18-DSD.pdf

[2] Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 5000.97. Digital Engineering. 2023-12-21. PDF: https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/500097p.PDF

[3] INCOSE. Systems Engineering Vision 2035. 2022–2023. Site: https://www.incose.org/publications/se-vision-2035

[4] European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA). Artificial Intelligence Roadmap 2.0. 2023-05-10. Site: https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/general-publications/easa-artificial-intelligence-roadmap-20

[5] Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Digital Twin Futurescape (initiative/resources). 2022. Site: https://www.faa.gov/headquartersoffices/ang/digital-twin-futurescape

[6] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Economics of Digital Twins: Costs, Benefits, and Economic Decision-Making (AMS 100-61). 2024-10. PDF: https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ams/NIST.AMS.100-61.pdf

[7] NIST Interagency/Internal Report (NISTIR) 8356. Security and Trust Considerations for Digital Twin Technology(Final). 2025-02. Site: https://csrc.nist.gov/pubs/ir/8356/final

[8] Glaessgen, E.; Stargel, D. "The Digital Twin Paradigm for Future NASA and U.S. Air Force Vehicles." AIAA/ASME/ASCE/AHS/ASC Structures, Structural Dynamics, and Materials Conference, 2012. NASA NTRS: https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/20120008178

[9] Martins, J. R. R. A.; Lambe, A. B. "Multidisciplinary Design Optimization: A Survey of Architectures." AIAA Journal 51(9), 2049–2075 (2013). https://doi.org/10.2514/1.J051895

[10] Modelica Association. Functional Mock-up Interface (FMI) 3.0 — Specification & Resources. https://fmi-standard.org/ (Spec: https://fmi-standard.org/docs/3.0/)

[11] Brunton, S. L.; Kutz, J. N. Data-Driven Science and Engineering (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, 2022. (Front matter preview: https://assets.cambridge.org/97810090/98489/frontmatter/9781009098489_frontmatter.pdf)

[12] Brunton, S. L.; Noack, B. R.; Koumoutsakos, P. "Machine Learning for Fluid Mechanics." Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics 52, 477–508 (2020). https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-fluid-010719-060214

[13] Forrester, A. I. J.; Sóbester, A.; Keane, A. J. Engineering Design via Surrogate Modelling: A Practical Guide. Wiley, 2008. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470770801

[14] Kennedy, M. C.; O'Hagan, A. "Predicting the Output from a Complex Computer Code When Fast Approximations Are Available." Biometrika 87(1), 1–13 (2000). https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/87.1.1

[15] Peherstorfer, B.; Willcox, K.; Gunzburger, M. "Survey of Multifidelity Methods in Uncertainty Propagation, Inference, and Optimization." SIAM Review 60(3), 550–591 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1082469

[16] Raissi, M.; Perdikaris, P.; Karniadakis, G. E. "Physics-Informed Neural Networks: A Deep Learning Framework for Solving Forward and Inverse Problems Involving Nonlinear PDEs." Journal of Computational Physics 378, 686–707 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2018.10.045

[17] Deb, K.; Pratap, A.; Agarwal, S.; Meyarivan, T. "A Fast and Elitist Multiobjective Genetic Algorithm: NSGA-II." IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation 6(2), 182–197 (2002). https://doi.org/10.1109/4235.996017

[18] AGILE / AGILE 4.0 Projects (EU H2020). Collaborative MDO/MBSE-MDAO for Aircraft Development. Project portal: https://www.agile4.eu/ ; CORDIS: https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/815122/results

[19] Lei, G.; Zhu, J.; Guo, Y.; Liu, C.; Ma, B. "A Review of Design Optimization Methods for Electrical Machines." Energies 10(12), 1962 (2017). https://doi.org/10.3390/en10121962