

# AERODYNAMIC BICYCLE HELMET DESIGN USING A TRUNCATED AIRFOIL WITH TRAILING EDGE MODIFICATIONS

**Bradford W Sims M.S.**

University of Colorado Denver  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
Denver, Colorado, United States  
Phone: 530-848-1300  
Email: [Bradford.Sims@email.ucdenver.edu](mailto:Bradford.Sims@email.ucdenver.edu)

**Peter E Jenkins Ph.D., P.E.**

University of Colorado Denver  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
Denver, Colorado, United States  
Office Phone: 303-556-2894  
Email: [Peter.Jenkins@ucdenver.edu](mailto:Peter.Jenkins@ucdenver.edu)

## ABSTRACT

Aerodynamic drag contributes the majority of the resistance experienced by a competitive cyclist. Low aerodynamic drag is a key quality of high performance equipment and many aerodynamic helmets have been developed. These helmets are designed with a teardrop shape that attempts to maintain attached air flow. This shape provides a drag reduction when the athlete has their head up and is looking forward but has adverse effects if the athlete rotates their head down. A helmet design that helps maintain attached airflow while presenting reduced frontal area when the athlete's head is down could significantly improve performance. The aerodynamic improvements of applying a truncated airfoil shape with a trailing edge modification to a helmet design were investigated. SolidWorks Flow Simulation was used to evaluate the aerodynamic forces. A common production helmet design was progressively truncated to determine the optimal truncation length and the effects of multiple trailing edge modifications were tested. A specific truncation length with a trailing edge base cavity was found to provide similar head up performance but significantly better head down performance compared to the production design. Scaled down models of the finalized improved design and the production helmet were tested in the wind tunnel to verify the computational results.

## INTRODUCTION

Aerodynamic drag contributes more than 80 percent of the resistance experienced by a cyclist traveling at 20 MPH on flat terrain [1]. With cyclists and tri-athletes reaching speeds in excess of 30 MPH; low aerodynamic drag is a key quality of high performance equipment. Many aerodynamic helmets have been developed to reduce the aerodynamic drag experienced by cyclists. Though not being optimized airfoils, current helmets are designed with a tear drop shape to try and maintain attached air flow. This shape provides a significant drag reduction when the athlete has his or her head up and

is looking forward but has adverse effects if the athlete is looking down or riding in a cross-wind. A helmet design that reduces aerodynamic drag while presenting less frontal area when the athlete's head is dropped could significantly improve a cyclist's performance in real world situations.

## STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Professional tri-athletes feel current aerodynamic helmets do not meet their needs. While participating in events that have cycling sections that take 4 to 5 hours they cannot keep their head up constantly. Riding with their head down, at a negative pitch angle, negates the benefit of a traditional aerodynamic helmet by increasing frontal area and altering the drag coefficient. Figure 1 shows how the helmet frontal area increases when the pitch angle is decreased. A proposed idea was to have a movable "armadillo" style tail section of the helmet that would not stick up if the athlete dropped their head. After reviewing the federal safety standards for helmets it became evident that a moving section on the helmet would prevent it from passing the required safety tests. Subsequently, with this conclusion, alternative helmet modifications that could improve the helmet's performance for a range of head positions were investigated. Research into truncated airfoil shapes used for wind turbine blades provided inspiration for an alteration to the existing helmet design. Truncating the airfoil shape of the production helmet and adding a trailing edge modification may lead to similar aerodynamic performance at a zero pitch angle and increased performance when the athlete drops their head.



(FIGURE 1)

PRODUCTION AERODYNAMIC HELMET HEAD POSITIONS

## LITERATURE REVIEW

During a long bicycle time trial or during the cycling portion of a triathlon, 80 to 90 percent of the power developed by the athlete is used to overcome aerodynamic drag [1]. Many of these events are won or lost by only seconds. Small reductions in overall aerodynamic drag can easily save seconds in any of these events, giving the athlete a decisive advantage [2]. Approximately 2 to 8 percent of the athlete's total drag is a result of their helmet [1]. Helmets must provide crash protection, adequate ventilation, and reduced aerodynamic drag. In air at typical cycling speeds the Reynolds number for an aerodynamic helmet is in the range of 300,000 to 500,000. Reynolds numbers in this range show that the aerodynamic properties are going to be dominated by inertial effects. The aerodynamic drag resulting from surface friction is quite low compared to the resulting pressure drag. Therefore, the largest reductions in coefficient of drag can be achieved when the pressure drag is reduced by maintaining attached airflow [5].

$$R_D = 1/2 \times \rho \times A_p \times C_D \times V^2 \quad [ \ ]$$

The aerodynamic drag force,  $R_d$ , shown in equation [ ] is dependent on  $\rho$  (air density),  $A_p$  (frontal area),  $C_d$  (coefficient of drag) and  $V$  (velocity). The drag force can be reduced by a reduction in frontal area and/or a reduction in the coefficient of drag. Production

aerodynamic bicycle helmets are designed with a long tapered tail, much like an airfoil, to help maintain attached airflow. This reduces the coefficient of drag when the helmet is horizontal. As the helmet is pitched down, caused by the rider tilting their head down, the coefficient of drag is increased and the long tail section increases the helmet's frontal area. Both of these factors cause an increase in drag force and a reduction in performance. During longer events it is very difficult for an athlete to keep their head up and maintain this helmet position.

Kim B. Blair and Stephanie Sidelko [2] performed an aerodynamic analysis of ten production aerodynamic helmets to study their performance. They also tested a standard non-aerodynamic road helmet for comparison. The tests were performed at 13.4 m/s (29.98 MPH) for three helmet pitch angles; 0, -15, and -80 degrees with respect to horizontal. At 0 and -15 degrees all ten aero helmets showed significantly lower drag than the standard helmet. At an angle of -80 degrees, nine of the aero helmets still showed a significant drag reduction compared to the standard helmet but significantly increased drag over the 0 and -15 degree positions. No individual aero-helmet showed a significantly higher reduction in drag for all angles when compared to the other helmets. Their data predicts that drag would be reduced by approximately 7.2 percent if an aerodynamic helmet, instead of a standard helmet, at a pitch angle of 0 degrees is used by a professional rider producing 450 Watts. Vincent Chabroux, Caroline Barelle, and Daniel Favier performed a similar study of six aerodynamic bicycle helmets. Their study was conducted with an air velocity of 13.9 m/s (31.1 MPH) and conducted at pitch angles of; -66.4 degrees, -36.2 degrees, and -16.8 degrees. Their results also showed that helmet inclination significantly influenced drag forces. Over all helmet angles they saw an average drag improvement of 2.4 percent over a standard non-aerodynamic helmet. They recommend reducing helmet length in order to minimize frontal area increases when the helmet is pitched down. These studies were performed in 2008 and they show that the available production helmets, of which all have similar designs, do provide a reduction in drag force but are not optimized for pitch angles lower than -20 degrees.

For athletes competing in longer cycling events, such as a 40k time trial or an Iron Man triathlon, proper head cooling is necessary. Up to 50 percent of an athlete's heat loss comes from their head and a helmet that inhibits proper convective cooling can reduce an athlete's performance [6]. As an athlete over-heats, blood is diverted from organs and muscle to the skin in order to increase heat shedding. This is accompanied by an increase in the athlete's heart rate. Combined, these two reactions lead to a reduction in muscle performance, cardiovascular efficiency, and possible dehydration [6]. Heat loss through the head must be maximized, which makes cooling vents an essential component of an effective aerodynamic helmet. The quantity and geometry of vents can affect the aerodynamic properties of a helmet. Firoz Alam, Aleksandar Subic, and Aliakbar Akbarzadeh [1] studied the effect of vent design on standard bicycle helmet aerodynamics. Both the vent roughness (how much the vent protrudes from the helmet surface) and how vents were channeled impacted the coefficients of drag. Vent roughness showed a direct correlation with coefficient of drag. Larger, closed channel, vents were also linked to increases in drag. Vincent Chabroux, Caroline Barelle, and Daniel Favier [3] also studied the effects of vents on drag forces using three similarly shaped aerodynamic helmets. One helmet had open vents, one had small vertical slit vents, and one had no vents. Their data showed no significant difference in drag forces between the three helmets. The vents did not protrude from the helmet and they did not have complex internal channels. These two studies suggest that

smaller non-protruding vents without complex channels can be used without significantly increasing drag.

C.P. Van Dam, Daniel L. Kahn, and Dale E. Berg [4] looked at the application of truncated airfoils to the inboard region of wind turbine blades. The truncated shape provided increased lift and improved structural characteristics but also showed a significant increase in drag compared to an airfoil with a sharp trailing edge. The drag increase is a result of the low-pressure flow in the near wake of the blunt trailing edge [4]. Multiple trailing edge modifications were investigated to see how they increased base pressure and lead to reduced drag. Four main modifications were compared: a splitter plate, a trailing edge wedge, a ventilated cavity, and M shaped serrations. The slotted cavity and trailing edge wedge showed the most improvement by reducing the drag by 50-60%.

In summary, previous research has shown that helmet aerodynamics can play a significant role in performance and that production helmets do not perform well at decreased pitch angles. Current helmet design could be improved by reducing helmet length and applying a trailing edge modification.

## STATEMENT OF OVERALL PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study was to modify a production aerodynamic bicycle helmet in order to reduce the effect of head pitch angle on the aerodynamic performance. A truncated airfoil shape with trailing edge modifications was applied to the helmets design to achieve the desired results. SolidWorks solid modeling was used to design the helmet and SolidWorks Simulation was used to test the design's aerodynamic performance. The improved helmet design was compared to the production aerodynamic helmet. The method started with the 2-D analysis of the production helmet main cross-section. Truncations and trailing edge modifications were applied to the cross-section to test their effect on the drag force. The best performing combinations were then applied to the 3-D helmet design. This 3-D helmet design, on a human head model, was tested and optimized under a variety of conditions using the CFD software. To verify the 3-D CFD results a scaled down version of the production helmet and the improved helmet were tested in the wind tunnel at the University of Colorado Denver.

## EXPLANATION OF LIMITATIONS

In order to maintain a reasonable scope for the design of the helmet a few elements were not addressed. All cycling helmets are required to meet specific impact regulations. No structural analysis was made but the thickness of the helmet around the head was equal to that of the production design. No cooling vents were included in the design in order to reduce computational analysis time as well as simplify the construction of the physical models that were used in the wind tunnel. As mentioned in the literature review, small non-protruding vents with simple internal channels could be added to the design and not significantly increase the drag forces.

The helmet analysis and optimization was performed using SolidWorks Flow Simulation CFD software, which has distinct limitations in accuracy. The Flow Simulation software solves the Navier-Stokes equations and uses the Favre-averaged Navier-Stokes equations to predict flow in turbulent regions. The time averaged equations introduce additional terms, the Reynolds stresses, which require the use of addition equations to close the system. This software closes the system by using a  $k-\epsilon$  turbulence model which uses the transport equations for turbulent kinetic energy and its dissipation rate. The  $k-\epsilon$  model requires two experimentally attained coefficients which are not adjustable in Flow Simulation. This model and the experimental coefficients used are not optimal for calculating drag

forces on objects with separated flow. Despite this short coming, the Flow Simulations software was still used and should provide sufficiently accurate results given the comparison technique being used. The mesh size used was limited by the available computer RAM, but the models were simplified enough to allow this memory to provide accurate flow simulations.

## 2-D COMPUTATIONAL FLOW ANALYSES


Initial computational models of the 2-D air flow over the symmetric airfoil shape that forms the base of the production helmet were performed. Examining the 2-D flow provided insight into the behavior of the airflow while requiring minimal processor time. The effects of truncation lengths and base modifications were also examined in 2-D. Performing the initial computational runs in 2-D allowed rapid results and provided useful information for the 3-D design.

### Modeling Method


The symmetric airfoil shape that forms the base of the production helmet was modeled in SolidWorks and tested in SolidWorks Flow Simulation. The CFD software uses a one cell thick computational domain to simulate 2-D flow. The highest level of initial automatic mesh size was used which also enabled the adaptive mesh function. Due to the expected unstable flow conditions a physical run time of 3 seconds was selected and force results were averaged over 0.5 seconds. Simulations for the production profile, truncation lengths, splitter plate modification, base triangle modification, and base cavity modification were performed. From this data optimal truncation lengths and trailing edge modifications were concluded.

### Results

**Production Helmet:** The 2-D production helmet shape was tested at three velocities; 8.9 m/s (20 MPH), 11.2 m/s (25 MPH), and 13.4 m/s (30 MPH). As expected the flow separates from the helmet and forms an Oscillating Karman vortex street wake. An alternating pattern of a large vortex forming on the tapering rear section of the helmet and then moving down and shedding off the trailing edge developed; this can be seen in Fig 2. The pressure distribution around the helmet can be seen in Fig. 3; the low pressure vortex can be seen moving away from the helmet on the right side of the figure.



(FIGURE 2)  
PRODUCTION HELMET FLOW VISUALIZATION




(FIGURE 3)

PRODUCTION HELMET PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION

At 11.2 m/s the production helmet has a coefficient of drag of 0.59 and the 2-D section experiences a total drag force of 0.30 N with a shear drag force of 0.005 N. This shows that 98.5% of the drag is caused by form drag, while only 1.5% is a result of friction drag. Given the Reynolds number, around 100,000, this result was expected. The large low pressure vortices that form on the back section of the helmet significantly contribute to the drag force. Reducing the size and forcing these vortices to quickly shed could reduce the drag coefficient. Without significantly changing the shape of the helmet or employing a means of complex boundary layer control, keeping the airflow attached is not feasible.

**Truncation Optimization:** The helmet cross-section's coefficient of drag was measured as the helmet was progressively truncated to examine the effects that the reduced helmet length had on drag. The coefficient of drag versus truncation length can be seen in Fig. 4.




(FIGURE 4)

COEFFICIENT OF DRAG VS TRUNCATION LENGTH


Figure 4 shows distinct truncation lengths that result in lower coefficients of drag. The length of the helmet affects the size and shedding speed of the vortices. At truncation lengths of about 0.5 m and 0.85 m the helmet geometry forms smaller vortices on the blunt trailing edge that are shed quickly. This results in a lower coefficient of drag. The 0.5 m truncation would be the optimal length for reducing drag coefficient but the 0.85 m truncation length was selected. This length has a slightly higher drag coefficient but would present a reduced frontal area if the helmet were rotated 90 degrees into the air stream. Figure 5 shows air flow over the 0.85 m truncation

length. The vortex, which is significantly smaller than the vortex formed on the full length helmet, can be seen forming on the helmet.



(FIGURE 5)


TRUNCATED HELMET FLOW VISUALIZATION



(FIGURE 6)

TRUNCATED HELMET PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION


Figure 6 shows the pressure distribution around the truncated helmet. The increased pressure, compared to the full length helmet, can be seen on the rear portion. In order to verify that this optimal truncation length, which was found at 11.2 m/s, would also be optimal at other expected velocities, the truncation length versus Drag coefficient tests were performed at two other velocities. Figure 7 shows very similar changes to drag coefficient as the helmet is shortened for multiple velocities. These results showed that a helmet optimized at 11.2 m/s would also be optimized for velocities of 8.9 and 13.4 m/s.



(FIGURE 7)

## COEFFICIENT OF DRAG VS TRUNCATION LENGTH


**Trailing Edge Modifications:** The drag effects of select trailing edge modifications; multiple splitter plates, a base triangle, and multiple base cavities were tested. Figure 8 shows the splitter plate modification, which increased the coefficient of drag when added to the optimized truncation. The splitter plate stabilized the low pressure vortex allowing it to build significantly before being shed therefore reducing the pressure on the trailing edge and increasing drag.



(FIGURE 8)

TRUNCATED HELMET WITH SPLITTER PLATE FLOW VISUALIZATION


Figure 9 shows the base triangle modification. This modification reduced the pressure on the trailing edge by causing a smaller vortex to form on one side of the trailing edge and quickly shedding off.



(FIGURE 9)


TRUNCATED HELMET WITH BASE TRIANGLE FLOW VISUALIZATION

Figure 10 shows the optimal trailing edge modification, a base cavity with a 0.0025 m trailing edge thickness. This base cavity has the maximum depth possible without removing structural material from the helmet. This trailing edge modification results in the formation of small vortices that are quickly shed and result in the lowest coefficient of drag of all the tested geometries. The pressure distribution of the optimized shape can be seen in Fig. 11.



(FIGURE 10)

TRUNCATED HELMET WITH BASE CAVITY FLOW VISUALIZATION



(FIGURE 11)

TRUNCATED HELMET WITH BASE CAVITY PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION

**Conclusion:** The 2-D computational data provided an understanding of the flow patterns over the helmet and insight into the major causes of drag. Given the geometry and the Reynolds number, the flow separates from the helmet and develops an oscillating vortex street as expected. The majority of the drag force is a result of the pressure drag induced by this separation and vortex formation. It was also found that the aerodynamic performance was not only maintained but improved upon by truncating the shape. There are distinct optimal truncation lengths that are not dependent on speed in the velocity ranges that are applicable to the helmet design. A rectangular base cavity with a distinct trailing edge width was shown to further reduce the coefficient of drag. From these results it was predicted that the 3-D production helmet could be truncated with a square base cavity and the coefficient of drag could be reduced. The 2-D model's optimal truncation length was not a function of velocity and it was expected that the 3-D model would behave similarly.

## 3-D DESIGN AND COMPUTATIONAL ANALYSIS

The air flow over a 3-D model of the production helmet on a head was simulated and the effects of pitch angle on drag forces were examined. The optimal truncation length to apply to the production helmet and the effects of trailing edge modifications were studied. The optimized "improved" helmet was then tested at various pitch angles to compare its performance with the production helmet.

### Modeling Method

The symmetric production helmet on a head was modeled in SolidWorks and tested in SolidWorks Flow Simulation. The highest level of initial automatic mesh size possible given the computer RAM available was used; this also enabled the adaptive mesh function. Due to the expected unstable flow conditions a physical run time of 2 seconds was selected and force results were averaged over 0.5 seconds. Simulations for the production helmet, truncation lengths, and trailing edge modification were performed. Using this data a helmet that had a reduced coefficient of drag at 11.2 m/s and at a pitch angle of zero degrees was designed. The production and improved helmet were tested at multiple angles of attack to compare the performance of each helmet when the athlete drops his or her head.

**Results**

**Production Helmet:** Initially the helmet was modeled and placed on a 3-D scan of a human head for computational testing as can be seen in Fig. 12.



(FIGURE 12)  
PRODUCTION HELMET AND HEAD MODEL

This model looked quite realistic but presented meshing problems. The complex geometry of the human head model required a fine mesh, and therefore significant RAM, which limited the mesh available to capture the air flow effects around the helmet. When simulations of this model were run the unsteady flow around the helmet was not modeled correctly. The mesh around the head could have been manually modified to mend this error but reducing the geometric complexity of the helmet and head provided an easier solution to the problem. Given the comparison being drawn between the production helmet and the improved helmet a simplified head model should not have significantly altered the results. The simplified helmet and head model can be seen in Fig. 13.




(FIGURE 13)  
SIMPLIFIED PRODUCTION HELMET AND HEAD MODEL


The simplified production helmet was tested at 11.2 m/s and showed an alternating vortex street developing around the sides of the helmet

and a mostly steady separated flow over the top. Due to the asymmetry of the flow over the top of the helmet an alternating vortex street was not expected here. The production helmet and head model have a coefficient of drag of 0.28. Given the similarities in the flow around the sides of the 3-D helmet and the 2-D shape it was expected that similar truncations and trailing edge modifications would improve the production helmet.

**Truncation Optimization:** The helmet and head coefficients of drag were measured as the helmet was progressively truncated to examine the effects that the reduced helmet length had on drag for the 3-D model. The coefficient of drag versus truncation length can be seen in Plot 3. Figure 14 shows a distinct truncation length of 0.9 m, which results in a lower coefficient of drag than the full length helmet. This optimal length significantly reduces the overall helmet length and will reduce the frontal area of the helmet at low pitch angles improving head down performance. The air flow over the helmet and head can be seen in Fig. 15.




(FIGURE 14)  
COEFFICIENT OF DRAG VS TRUNCATION LENGTH,  
11.2 M/S, 0 DEGREE PITCH ANGLE




(FIGURE 15)  
TRUNCATED HELMET FLOW VISUALIZATION

**Trailing Edge Modifications:** The drag effects of select trailing edge modifications that could not be modeled in 2-D and the base cavity were tested on the optimized truncated 3-D helmet. The effect of adding vents to the base cavity was tested. The flow can be seen in Fig. 16. The geometry showed an increase in drag forces. In the flow visualization it appears the vents increase the size of the low pressure vortex that forms on the side of the helmet resulting in the drag increase.




(FIGURE 16)  
VENTED BASE CAVITY FLOW VISUALIZATION

Like the 2-D simulations a max depth base cavity with a specific trailing edge thickness produced the lowest coefficient of drag. The optimal trailing edge thickness can be seen in Fig. 17. At a velocity of 11.2 m/s and a 0 degree pitch angle the improved helmet shows a 6% decrease in coefficient of drag compared to the production helmet.



(FIGURE 17)  
OPTIMAL TRAILING EDGE THICKNESS

**Pitch Angle Testing:** After the optimal geometry for minimizing drag at a zero degree pitch angle was determined the effects that the shorter helmet had on drag forces at multiple pitch angles were tested. The drag forces were tested on the production and improved helmet for angles 0 to -90 every 15 degrees. Figure 18 shows the result of this drag and pitch angle comparison.



(FIGURE 18)  
DRAG FORCE VS PITCH ANGLE

The improved helmet shows a significantly lower drag force at pitch angles of 0 to -25 degrees and at angles from -50 to -90 degrees. At pitch angles near -40 degrees the production helmet has slightly lower drag, less than 1%, compared to the improved helmet. In this region the coefficient of drag of the improved helmet is slightly higher than the production helmet and the decrease in frontal area has not yet started having an effect.

**Conclusion:** Significant simplifications to the 3-D model geometry were required to allow a fine enough mesh in the turbulent separated flow region to achieve accurate results. By truncated the simplified 3-D production model and applying a base cavity the drag force was reduced. Similarly to the 2-D simulations, the truncation and cavity control the size and shedding speed of the alternating vortices that form on the sides of the helmet. The percent reduction in drag is significantly less when compared to the 2-D model because of the flow that comes over the top of the helmet. This flow does not form distinct vortices and is not significantly altered by the truncation or base modification. For the majority of pitch angles the improved helmet shows a significant reduction in drag force.

## WIND TUNNEL VERIFICATION OF COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS

In order to verify the computational results, which were used to design the improved helmet, a series of experimental wind tunnel tests were performed. The results from these tests were compared to those from the computational simulations.


### Method

The CU Denver Mechanical Engineering wind tunnel was used to perform the verification tests. The wind tunnel has an 18 inch by 18 inch test area and uses a parallel plate dynamometer capable of measuring drag and lift forces to three decimal places in kgf. Dynamic pressure, vacuum pressure, atmospheric pressure, and atmospheric temperature were recorded for each run and were used to calculate air velocities. Two scale models, the production helmet and the improved design, were tested. These models were scaled to block less than 10% of the cross sectional area of the wind tunnel while not requiring speeds in excess of 50 m/s to maintain similitude. The two helmets were tested at multiple speeds and at pitch angles of 0 degrees, -45 degrees, and -90 degrees. The data attained from the wind tunnel testing were used to examine the drag area versus air speed behavior and used to compare the drag forces at changing head pitch angles.

### Results


**Input Turbulence Comparison:** The computational model requires an input turbulence to drive the turbulence model. Before wind tunnel testing was performed the computation result's sensitivity to input turbulence was tested. Input, or air stream turbulence, in the wind tunnel is not known and cannot be adjusted. If the computational results are significantly altered by changes in input turbulence then the computational results and experimental results cannot be compared accurately. The input turbulence used for the helmet design, was 0.1%, which is the default value in SolidWorks Flow Simulation. Input turbulence values of 0.2% and 1.0% were tested on both helmet designs. These tests were performed at 0 degrees, -45 degrees, and -90 degrees. Figure 19 shows the drag force at 0.2% input turbulence compared to the default 0.1% input

turbulence. This plot shows little difference in the computational results at the 0.1% and 0.2% input turbulences across the pitch angles.



(FIGURE 19)  
**DRAG FORCE VS PITCH ANGLE,  
 INPUT TURBULENCE COMPARISON**

Plot 6 shows the drag force at 1.0% input turbulence compared to the default 0.1% input turbulence. This plot shows a significant drag difference at a zero degree pitch angle but similar results at a -45 and -90 degree pitch angles. This result is expected as the increased input turbulence increases the boundary layer turbulence. This moves the airflow separation point farther down the model and reduces form drag. This phenomenon is only apparent at a pitch angle of 0 degrees when the models are somewhat streamlined and not apparent at -45 or -90 degree pitch angles where the sharp edge at the base of the helmet prevents airflow from staying attached. Despite the drag force change at no pitch the comparison between the production and improved helmets is maintained and the wind tunnel results can be confidently compared to the computational data.




(FIGURE 20)  
**DRAG FORCE VS PITCH ANGLE,  
 INPUT TURBULENCE COMPARISON**


**Wind Tunnel Test Models:** A model of the production and the improved helmet designs that could be tested in the wind tunnel were constructed. These models needed to block less than 10% of the 18 inch by 18 inch, or 0.209 m<sup>2</sup>, wind tunnel area. This resulted in a maximum allowable model frontal area of 0.021 m<sup>2</sup>. The

production helmet at a -90 degree pitch angle has the most frontal area at 0.0596 m<sup>2</sup>. The radius that results in this area is 0.138 m; therefore the model must be scaled down to 59% size or smaller. In order to maintain Reynolds Number similitude at the air speeds capable of the wind tunnel, using effective frontal area radius, the model must be greater than 27% original size. A 40% scale was selected as this blocked significantly less than 10% of the wind tunnel area and required air speeds easily capable in the wind tunnel while reducing building costs. The rapid prototyping of the scaled helmet and head models was completed using a Nylon 12 material. The surface finish of the nylon models was quite poor, showing significant material gridding and ridges. High build primer and sanding were used to improve the surface finishes. The models were mounted in the wind tunnel using three 1/4"-20 all thread rods. These rods held the models at pitch angles of 0, -45, and -90 degrees and approximately 6 inches forward of the dynamometer. The mounting rods attached to 1/4"-20 studs mounted in the back of each head model.

**Wind Tunnel Testing:** The drag forces on the scale models were tested in the wind tunnel. The models were tested at three pitch angles; 0, -45, and -90 degrees each at four motor settings; 30 Hz (about 24 m/s), 40 Hz (about 32 m/s), 50 Hz (about 41 m/s), and 60 Hz (about 50 m/s). Atmospheric temperature and atmospheric pressure were recorded. These values combined with the dynamic pressure and vacuum pressure for each run were recorded and used to calculate exact air velocity for each run. Drag force results, in kgf, were also recorded for each run. While most angles and velocities exhibited a small amount of side-to-side or vertical vibration, the improved helmet experienced significant oscillating vertical motion at a pitch angle of 90 degree and motor settings of 30 and 40 Hz. The significant motion caused fluctuating drag readings. An approximate average drag force was attained for these runs but is subject to significant error. Results were corrected using data from other velocities and these corrected results can be seen on the various plots.




(FIGURE 21)  
**PRODUCTION HELMET AT PITCH ANGLE = -45 DEGREES**



(FIGURE 22)  
**IMPROVED HELMET AT PITCH ANGLE = -90 DEGREES**




**Data:** The collected data were first used to examine how the model's coefficients of drag changed with Reynolds Number. Figure 23 shows how the coefficient of drag changes with Reynolds Number at a pitch angle of zero degrees. Here we see the coefficient of drag decrease with increased Reynolds Number at about the same rate for both models. At this pitch angle the helmet's geometry is similar to a domed ellipse and the decrease in coefficient of drag with increased velocity matches existing ellipse data. At this pitch angle both helmets have the same frontal area and given the slightly lower coefficient of drag for the production helmet the production helmet would have slightly less drag at this head angle.




**(FIGURE 23)**  
**COEFFICIENT OF DRAG VS REYNOLDS NUMBER**  
**PITCH ANGLE = 0 DEGREES**

Figure 24 shows how the coefficient of drag changes with Reynolds Number at a pitch angle of -45 degrees. Here we see the coefficient of drag decrease with increased Reynolds Number at about the same rate for both models but at a slower rate than the zero degree pitch angle. At this pitch angle the helmet's geometry is similar to an ellipse but with some of the air flowing over the sharp edge at the base of the helmet. This separation point acts similarly to the edge of the flat plate and makes the plot more horizontal. At this head angle the production and improved helmet have nearly identical coefficients of drag and given the improved helmet's decreased frontal area at this angle the drag forces for the improved helmet will be lower than those of the production helmet.




**(FIGURE 24)**  
**COEFFICIENT OF DRAG VS REYNOLDS NUMBER**  
**PITCH ANGLE = -45 DEGREES**

Figure 25 shows how the drag area changes with velocity at a pitch angle of -90 degrees. Here we see the drag area remains nearly constant as speed is increased. At this pitch angle the helmet's geometry results in flow similar to the flat plate with the airflow separating at the edge on the base of the helmet. This separation point acts similarly to the edge of the flat plate and makes the plot more horizontal. At this head angle the production helmet has a significantly higher coefficient of drag and frontal area when compared to the improved helmet resulting in the improved helmet performing much better than the production helmet.



**(FIGURE 25)**  
**COEFFICIENT OF DRAG VS REYNOLDS NUMBER**  
**PITCH ANGLE = -90 DEGREES**

Figure 26 shows the drag force versus pitch angle for both helmets. Both the computational and experimental results are shown on this plot. The experimental results show higher drag forces than the computational data over nearly the entire range of head pitch angles. As the pitch angle approaches -90 degrees the computational and experimental results match more closely. The wind tunnel results differ from the computational results on average by 17%. Despite this difference in the results the comparison between the production and improved helmet is maintained. The production and improved helmet show similar drag forces at pitch angles of 0 and -45 degrees while the improved helmet shows significantly less drag at pitch angles over -45 degrees.



**(FIGURE 26)**  
**DRAG FORCE VS PITCH ANGLE**  
**11.2 M/S**

**Conclusion:** The wind tunnel data showed different magnitude forces, averaging 17% different, when compared to the computational results. Taking into account the inaccuracies of the computational model and the variations in physical model placement, the wind tunnel and computational results correlated reasonable well. More important than the different force magnitudes is the similarity in comparison between the production and improved helmets. The experimental results show the same general performance difference between the two helmets. The helmets perform similarly from a pitch angle of 0 to -45 degrees and the improved helmet performs significantly better at pitch angles from -45 to -90 degrees.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

This project investigated the causes of drag on aerodynamic bicycling helmets and presented solution to improving the performance at multiple head pitch angles. Research examining the performance of current helmets has shown that they do not perform well when the user is not looking directly forward. This investigation was performed in three main steps. First the 2-D flow over the main helmet cross-section was examined and the effects of truncation and trailing edge modification were studied. From this analysis it was concluded that an optimal truncation length could be applied in conjunction with a rectangular base cavity to significantly reduce the helmet's coefficient of drag. Next, these findings were implemented in the design of the 3-D helmet. The improved helmet was optimized in 3-D and compared to the production model. The computational models of the improved 3-D helmet showed lower drag from pitch angle 0 to -25 degrees and significantly lower drag from angle of -50 to -90 degrees. The improved helmet showed a slight higher, less than 1%, increase in drag from -30 to -45 degrees. Lastly the computational results were compared to scaled models tested in a wind tunnel. The wind tunnel results showed coefficients of drag that differed on average 17% from the computational results but showed similar trends in performance compared to pitch angle. Given these results the improved helmet could significantly increase athlete performance.

## Future Directions

From the results of this project it is apparent that there is potential for significant improvements in aerodynamic helmet design. A new

helmet design, not based on modifying a current model, could implement several unique features. Ducting airflow from the stagnation point through the helmet to vents just past the separation point could keep the air flow attached longer. This used in conjunction with a truncated helmet shaped to divert air around the sides could provide much lower drag. In order to accurately model this design a CFD software package with a more valid turbulence model, possibly a  $k-\omega$  model would be beneficial. This combined with a very fine mesh could provide accurate computational results.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Firoz Alam, Aleksandar Subic and Aliakbar Akbarzadeh, 2008, "Aerodynamics of Bicycle Helmets," *The Engineering of Sport* 7, 1, pp. 337-334.
- [2] Kim B. Blair and Stephanie Sidelko, 2008, "Aerodynamic Performance of Cycling Time Trial Helmets," *The Engineering of Sport* 7, 1, pp. 371-377.
- [3] Vincent Chabroux, Caroline Barelle and Daniel Favier, 2008, "Aerodynamics of Time Trial Bicycle Helmets," *The Engineering of Sport* 7, 2, pp. 401-410.
- [4] C.P. Van Dam, Daniel L. Kahn, and Dale E. Berg, 2008, "Trailing Edge Modifications for Flatback Airfoils," Sandia Report, SAND2008-1781.
- [5] David Gordon Wilson, 2004, *Bicycling Science*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, pp. 110-120 and 174-205.
- [6] Asker E. Jeukendrup, 2002, *High-Performance Cycling*, Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc, pp. 43-55 and 103-112.
- [7] *The Navier-Stokes Equations for Laminar and Turbulent Fluid Flows, Governing Equations*, Flow Simulation 2010 Technical Reference.