T2R2 東京科学大学 リサーチリポジトリ Science Tokyo Research Repository

論文 / 著書情報 Article / Book Information

Title	Fluid drag reduction by penguin-mimetic laser-ablated riblets with yaw angles					
Authors	Ryosuke Saito, Takeshi Yamasaki, Hiroto Tanaka					
Citation	Bioinspiration & Biomimetics, Vol. 17, Issue 5,					
Pub. date	2022, 8					
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-3190/ac7f71					
Copyright	This is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in Bioinspiration & Biomimetics. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-3190/ac7f71.					
Creative Commons	See next page.					

License



Creative Commons: CC BY-NC-ND

1 Fluid drag reduction by penguin-mimetic laser-ablated riblets with

2 yaw angles

3

4 Ryosuke Saito¹, Takeshi Yamasaki², and Hiroto Tanaka¹

⁵ ¹Department of Mechanical Engineering, School of Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 2-12-1

6 Ookayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 152-8550 Japan

⁷ ²Yamashina Institute for Ornithology, 115 Konoyama, Abiko-shi, Chiba, 270-1145 Japan

8

9 Keywords

10 penguin, feather, riblet, hydrodynamics, drag reduction, laser ablation

11

12 Abstract

The bodies of penguins, which swim underwater to forage, are densely covered with feathers, in which the 13 14 barbs are oriented in the longitudinal direction. We hypothesize that these barbs act as riblets and reduce friction 15 drag during swimming. Considering various real-world swim conditions, the drag reduction effect is expected to 16 be robust against changes in the flow speed and yaw angle relative to the flow. To test this hypothesis, we created 17 trapezoidal riblets based on the morphology of these barbs and measured the drag of flat plates with these 18 fabricated riblets in a water tunnel. The spacing, width, and height of the barbs were found to be approximately 19 100, 60, and 30 μ m, respectively. This spacing resulted in a nondimensional spacing s⁺ of 5.5 for a typical penguin 20 swimming speed of 1.4 m/s. We fabricated four types of riblets on polyimide films by UV laser ablation. The 21 first was a small-scale riblet for which the spacing was decreased to 41 µm to simulate the surface flow condition 22 of the usual and slower swim behaviors in our water tunnel. The other three were manufactured to the actual scale 23 of real barbs (spacing of 100 μ m) with three different rib ridge widths: 10, 25, and 50 μ m. Yaw angles of 0°, 15°, 24 30°, and 45° were also tested with the actual-scale riblets. The drag reduction rate of the small-scale riblet was 25 maximized to 1.97% by the smallest s^+ of 1.59. For all three actual-scale riblets, increasing the yaw angle from 26 zero to 15° enhanced the drag reduction rate for the full range of s^+ up to 13.5. The narrow-ridge riblet reduced drag at an even higher yaw angle of 45°, but the drag increased with zero yaw angle. Overall, the medium-ridge
riblet, which was representative of the barbs, was well-balanced.

29

30 **1. Introduction**

31 Penguins demonstrate excellent swimming abilities, including high-speed swimming during foraging, long 32 travel distances, and deep diving. For example, the swim speed of penguins is approximately 2 m/s, and their 33 speed per body mass is faster than that of other breath-hold divers, such as marine mammals and sea turtles 34 (Watanabe et al., 2011). The Fiordland penguin Eudyptes pachyrhynchus can swim an average of 80 km per day 35 and a maximum of 6800 km in 70 days (Mattern et al., 2018). The diving depth of emperor penguins Aptenodytes 36 forsteri reaches 564 m (Wienecke et al., 2007). The king penguin Aptenodytes patagonicus can dive for up to 27 37 minutes (Sato et al., 2011). Since penguins spend a long time in the sea, it is natural to expect that their bodies 38 have evolved to reduce fluid drag to save energy.

39 The body surface of penguins is densely covered by feathers with no gaps (Williams et al., 2015; Kulp et 40 al., 2018). The micro barbs (i.e., hairs) of each feather exposed on the surface are oriented along the longitudinal 41 direction of the body. Here, we hypothesized that the body surface texture created by the feathers can act as a 42 riblet that suppresses or even reduces fluid frictional drag in swimming penguins. Moreover, considering the 43 body undulation due to the flapping of the wings by the penguins (Clark and Bemis, 1979; Harada et al., 2021), 44 it is favorable that the drag reduction function is effective not only when the barbs are parallel to the flow but 45 also when the barbs have a yaw angle to the flow to some extent. Additionally, penguins change their swim speed 46 from slow resting to fast foraging, demanding robustness of the drag reduction to the flow speed.

Previous biological studies claimed that the body feathers have water repellent and heat insulating functions to prevent heat loss to cold water (Kostina *et al.*, 1996; Gill *et al.*, 2007; Dawson *et al.*, 1999). On the other hand, drag reduction effect of the body feathers has never been investigated to date. Regarding the body drag, Lovvorn *et al.*, 2001 compared the drag of frozen body specimens of diving seabirds, including little penguin *Eudyptula minor*, with their smooth replica models by towing experiments in a water tank. Their results showed that the drag of the frozen specimens was 2-6 times greater than that of the models, suggesting that the body feathers may rather increase the body drag.

54 Previous study of drag reduction effect of hairy body surface of diving animals other than seabirds is 55 sparse too. Itoh *et al.*, 2006 measured the friction drag of a seal fur attached to a wall of a water channel. In 56 contrast to the above seabird study, they reported that friction drag was reduced up to 12% by the seal fur. 57 However, morphological parameters of the hairs such as spacing and cross-sectional shape were not investigated. 58 In engineering, drag reduction is important in industrial transportation equipment such as cars, aircraft, 59 trains, and ships for saving a tremendous amount of energy (Hefner, 1988). It has been reported that friction drag accounts for 10% of the total fluid drag for cars, 30-50% for aircraft, 40-90% for trains, and 70% for ships 60 61 (Bushnell et al., 1990; Ido and Kohama, 2005; Maeda, 2011). Therefore, determining the mechanism of frictional 62 drag and revealing the superior characteristics of animals found in nature may provide a new approach to reducing 63 frictional drag.

64 As a bioinspired surface structure for reducing friction drag, riblets have been widely studied since the 65 1980s, as thoroughly reviewed by Dean et al., 2010 and Bixler and Bhushan, 2013. The riblet was originally inspired by the denticles of migratory sharks. Generally, the riblet is composed of an array of micro ribs oriented 66 67 parallel to the direction of the surface flow. The ribs with appropriate spacing lift streamwise vortices in the 68 turbulent boundary layer away from the surface, and then the velocity gradient decreases, resulting in a reduction 69 in the viscous friction. Although various cross-sectional shapes of the rib have been investigated, such as thin 70 rectangular (blade), triangular (sawtooth), and scalloped ribs, the simple rectangular blade ribs with appropriate 71 spacing was found to achieve the maximum drag reduction of approximately 10% (Bechert et al., 1997). An array 72 of realistic replicated shark denticles was also tested, resulting in a maximum 3% reduction in the friction drag 73 (Bechert et al., 2000 a). Note that this replica was scaled up 100 times to assess drag in an oil channel.

While experimental application of the riblets to some aircraft and ships for more than thirty years has proved the feasibility of this approach, riblets have still not been widely adopted in aircraft and ships. Airbus covered an A320 aircraft with triangular riblet films produced by 3M, demonstrating that the total drag was reduced by 2% (Szodruch, 1991). Recently, Lufthansa Technik and BASF announced that Lufthansa Cargo's entire freighter fleet of Boeing 777F will be covered with riblet films called AeroShark, to obtain expected fuel savings of more than 1% (Lufthansa Technik, 2021). The 3M riblet film was also attached to a race yacht of the winner of America's cup in 1987 (NASA Langley Research Center, 1993).

For practical usage of the riblets, robustness to variation in flow angle is desired. Previous experimental investigations on the yaw angle (the angle between the riblet and the flow directions) of the riblet have demonstrated that the rate of drag reduction decreased with increasing yaw angle (Walsh and Lindemann, 1984; Hage *et al.*, 2001). The drag increased when the yaw angle was 20° or higher (Hirschel *et al.*, 1988; Enyutin *et* *al.*, 1991). A study using numerical simulations of blade riblets in channel flow also reported that the total drag
with a yaw angle of 30° was larger than that without riblets, where the friction drag decreased but the pressure
drag increased (Zhang and Yin, 2019).

88 A riblet with a herringbone pattern inspired by the flight feathers of birds was recently studied, where each 89 rib had a yaw angle to the flow. Chen et al., 2014 a, reported that a triangular riblet with a herringbone pattern 90 with a yaw angle of 30° was used to realize a remarkable drag reduction of 17%. The reduction rate increased to 91 20% upon the implementation of a spatial distribution of the rib height. By contrast, the numerical simulation of 92 blade riblets with similar herringbone patterns showed a significant increase in the drag (Benschop and Breugem, 93 2017). We note that the 3-D (three-dimensional) shape of the flight feather is different from that of the body 94 feather of penguins. That is, the flight feather consists of a thick circular rachis, blade-like barbs, and plate-like 95 barbules, while in penguin body feathers both the rachis and barbs have semicircular cross-sections and there are 96 no barbules at the exposed region.

97 The fabrication of small riblets with a wide area is challenging. For air or water flow, the typical spacing 98 of the ribs is on the submillimeter scale. Thus, the fabrication method is an important issue in experimental studies 99 and applications. For example, previous studies employed CNC (computer numerical control) milling (Sasamori, 100 et al., 2014; Jung and Bushen, 2010), carving with a rotary blade (Chen et al., 2014 b; Denkena et al., 2010), and embossing with a micropatterned belt template (Stenzel et al., 2011; Kordy 2015). Point processing of the milling 101 102 procedure can be applied to realize an arbitrary pattern but requires excessive machining time due to the tiny 103 diameter of the mill. For the rotary blade and embossing processes, it is difficult to change the pattern and cross-104 sectional shape of the rib, requiring the recreation of the blade or template. For fast fabrication, scanning laser 105 ablation was used to create a riblet with a spacing of 300 µm (Kaakkunen et al., 2018; Tiainen et al., 2020). 106 However, the fabrication error in the rib height was considerable.

In this paper, we experimentally evaluated the possibility that penguin body feathers function as riblets based on the detailed observations of penguin feathers and the relationship between penguin swimming conditions and feather morphology. We created trapezoidal riblets based on the morphology of the body feathers by employing UV laser scanning ablation and then conducted drag measurements on a flat plate with the riblet in a water tunnel to simulate the surface flow of the swimming penguin. The robustness of this drag reduction function with respect to the yaw angle was also investigated. Moreover, laser-scanning ablation was employed to fabricate the riblets, enabling the comparison of different cross-sectional rib shapes on an actual scale or evena smaller scale in a small water tunnel.

- 115
- 116

2. Materials and Methods

117

2.1. Measurement of penguin body feathers

118 We measured the spacing of the dorsal barbs in three museum specimens: the king penguin Aptenodytes 119 patagonicus (Specimen ID: YIO-01245), Humboldt penguin Spheniscus humboldti (Specimen ID: YIO-01278), 120 and little penguin Eudyptula minor (Specimen ID: YIO-65171) at the Yamashina Institute of Ornithology, Japan. 121 The longitudinal lengths of the king, Humboldt, and little penguins were 800, 450, and 340 mm, respectively 122 (Figure 1(A)). The barbs of the body feathers were aligned in the longitudinal direction, as shown in Figure 1(B). 123 We measured the barb spacing at six different longitudinal positions for each specimen as follows. First, 1-3 124 images of the dorsal surface were obtained with a digital microscope (VR-3000, Keyence Corp., Japan) for each 125 longitudinal position. (Example image for the king penguin is shown in Figure 1(C)). The FOV (field of view) 126 was 3.81 by 2.875 mm² and 1024 by 768 pixels in resolution. Then, we calculated the spacing of the barbs, s_{Barb} , 127 at 1-4 different locations in each image by dividing the length of the measured section by the number of barbs at 128 each measurement location. The width of the barbs, was also measured at the same locations based on the 129 pixel size.

130 A cross-section of the barbs on a dorsal feather of the gentoo penguin *Pygoscelis papua* was observed by 131 SEM (scanning electron microscopy). The feathers were collected at Nagasaki Penguin Aquarium (Nagasaki, 132 Japan) during the molting period in August 2018 (Figure 1(D)). The distal black part was exposed on the surface, 133 and there were no barbules in this area. We manually cut the central barbs at approximately 3 mm from the tip 134 with a scalpel to expose the cross-sections, followed by imaging with an SEM (VE-8800, Keyence Corp., Japan). 135 The obtained images demonstrate that the cross-sections of the barbs are flattened where the width of the bottom 136 is larger than the width of the top (Figure 1(E, F)), which is similar to an observation made in a previous report 137 (Kulp et al., 2018). The width and height were approximately 60 µm and 30 µm, respectively.

138

139

2.2. Design parameters of the riblet

We model the cross-section of the rib as a trapezoid (Figure 2), where a, b, and h represent the width of the ridge, width of the base, and height, respectively. s is the spacing of the riblet. Based on the observation of the cross-sections of the barbs, the height-to-width ratio of the rib, h/b, was set to 0.5.

143 In this study, we tested four different cross-sectional shapes of riblets. Three of them were similar in size 144to the real barbs, while the ridge widths were different from each other. Hereafter, they are named "wide-ridge 145 riblets", "medium-ridge riblets", and "narrow-ridge riblets". The effect of the cross-sectional shape of the rib was 146 evaluated by comparing these three shapes. The other riblet was smaller than the real barbs to simulate the surface 147 flow of swimming penguins in our water tunnel setup. Hereafter, we call this riblet a "small-scale riblet". On the 148 other hand, the surface flow for wide-ridge, medium-ridge, and narrow-ridge riblets without a reduction in size 149 corresponds to a higher swimming speed. The actual design values are described in subsection 3.2. We note that 150we were not able to control the cross-sectional shape of the rib at the small scale.

To investigate the effect of the yaw angle on each rib shape, wide-ridge, medium-ridge, and narrow-ridge
riblets with the yaw angles of 15°, 30°, and 45°, respectively, were fabricated.

153

154

2.3. Fabrication process of the riblet sheets

155 To realize riblets with different cross-sectional shapes and spacings, we employed UV (ultraviolet) laser-156 scanning ablation of polyimide films (thickness of 125 µm; Kapton, Du Pont-Toray Co., Ltd., Japan). Since the 157 film is flexible, the product can be attached to a curved surface. Our system (OLMUV-355–7 W–K, OPI Corp., 158Japan) can scan with a DPSS (diode-pumped solid-state) nanosecond laser (Nd: YVO4; 355 nm; 7 W; AONano 159 Compact 355-7-50-V, Advanced Optwave Corp., USA) using 2-axis galvanometer mirrors (GM-1015, Canon 160 Inc., Japan). The theoretical diameter of the focusing spot was less than 15 µm. By ablating the grooves between 161 each rib with an appropriate spacing between each path of the laser, various riblet spacings and cross-sectional 162 rib shapes were realized. Moreover, we defocused the laser by lifting the surface up by 0.5–1.5 mm from the 163 focal plane so that the ablated surface became smooth. The actual parameters of the laser scanning process are 164 described in subsection 3.2. We note that it is possible to create riblets with arbitrary planar patterns, if needed, 165 because the scanning path is not limited to straight lines but can be used to realize arbitrary curves.

A 24.375 mm by 40 mm riblet area was created in our process. By shifting the worktable of the laser system in the horizontal plane, a 120 mm by 97.5 mm riblet sheet was obtained (Figure 3(A)). For drag measurements with a varying yaw angle, an 80 mm by 65 mm sheet was cut out from the riblet sheet at the angles
of 15°, 30°, and 45° (Figure 3(B)).

170

171 **2.4. Drag measurement of a flat plate in a water tunnel**

The fabricated riblet sheets were attached to both sides of a rigid and flat 1-mm-thick stainless steel (SUS304) plate with double-sided tape (General double-coated adhesive tape, Nitoms, Inc., Japan). As a reference smooth flat plate, polyimide sheets without any laser ablation were attached to the same flat stainless steel plate.

The drag of the plate was measured using a water tunnel (PT-100 Kai, West Japan Fluid Engineering
Laboratory Co., Ltd., Japan). The length, height and width of the measurement section were 1000, 200, and 300
mm, respectively. The maximum flow speed was 2.0 m/s.

179 A 240 mm by 195 mm riblet area was formed by arraying 2 by 2 straight riblet sheets (size of the single 180 sheet: 120 mm by 97.5 mm) or 3 by 3 angled riblet sheets (size of the single sheet: 80 mm by 65 mm) (Figure 181 4(B)). These riblet sheets were carefully attached to both sides of the plate with double-sided tape. The thickness 182 of the double-sided tape on a single side was approximately 100 µm. A tripping wire made of a 1-mm-diameter 183 metal rod was also glued at a position 10 mm from the leading edge to make the boundary layer turbulent. The 184 plate was fixed to a two-axis load cell (LMC-21426-10N, Nissho-Electric-Works Co., Ltd., Japan) via an 185 attachment part and square bar. The load cell was mounted on a rotation stage so that its x-axis was parallel to 186 the flow and y-axis was vertical to the flow. The angle of attack of the plate was adjusted to zero using the 187 rotational stage. The zero angle of attack was determined as the angle where both the perpendicular (y) and 188 parallel (x) forces were minimized while monitoring the output from the load cell with a certain flow speed. The 189 plate was inserted into a closed channel of the water tunnel from the top through a slit that was 250 mm long and 190 7 mm wide. The gap between the bottom edge of the plate and the bottom of the channel was set to 10 mm; thus, 191 the single-side area, S, of the riblet surface exposed to the flow was 45600 mm² (240 mm in length and 190 mm 192 in height). We note that the water level was set to be approximately 10 mm above the top of the slit to suppress 193 the ejection of the water from the slit when the flow speed was 1 m/s or higher.

194The output signal of the x-axis of the load cell was acquired to a PC (personal computer) via an AD195(analog-to-digital) converter (USB-6343, National Instruments Corp., USA) at a sampling rate of 1000 Hz. The

natural frequency of the system, checked by hammering, was 18.9 Hz. Thus, the raw data were digitally smoothed
with a low-pass filter, for which the cutoff frequency was 15 Hz in the postprocessing.

A single measurement of drag is conducted as follows. First, the initial force value at 0 m/s was obtained as a time-average value of the smoothed data over 10 sec, followed by an increase in the flow speed to the target speed. After the stabilization of the flow speed as evaluated by the stabilization of the output signals, the final force value at the target speed was obtained as a time-average value over 10 sec. Finally, the variation from the initial force at 0 m/s to the force at the target speed was obtained as the drag at the target speed. The flow speed was then decreased to 0 m/s and stabilized for the next measurement.

In a series of measurements, the drag at the flow speeds of 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0 m/s was measured. We conducted three series of measurements for all of the actual-scale riblet plates and the smooth plate in a day and repeated the same set of measurements on three successive days. We also performed the measurements for the small-scale riblet plate in another three successive days in the same manner. Hence, a total of nine data samples were obtained for each plate at each flow speed.

209

$$DR = \frac{F_{\text{Riblet}} - F_{\text{Smooth}}}{F_{\text{Smooth}}} \times 100 \tag{1}$$

where F_{Smooth} is the drag of the flat plate with the smooth films and F_{Riblet} is the drag of the flat plate with the riblet films.

The uncertainty analysis was conducted following the standard procedure (ANSI/ASME, 1987). We considered the variation of the nine measurements and the nonlinearity of the load cell. The most significant factor was the nonlinearity of the load cell, which was 0.02% of the capacity (2 N) according to the certificate sheet of the load cell. For example, the uncertainty, U_{RSS} (95% coverage), of the drag measurement was approximately 0.0023 N for the smooth flat plate and was approximately 0.0032 N for the small-scale riblet at a 2.0 m/s flow speed. The uncertainty of DR, δ , was calculated using the error propagation law as

$$\delta = |DR| \sqrt{\left(\frac{\sqrt{\delta_{\text{Riblet}}^2 + \delta_{\text{Smooth}}^2}}{F_{\text{Riblet}} - F_{\text{Smooth}}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\delta_{\text{Smooth}}}{F_{\text{Smooth}}}\right)^2}$$
(2)

where δ_{Riblet} is the measurement uncertainty of a flat plate with a riblet film and δ_{Smooth} is the measurement uncertainty of a flat plate with a smooth film. 220

221

2.5. Nondimensional fluid dynamics parameters

Flow around a swimming penguin was scaled to the plate with a riblet by considering the Reynolds number (Re) and mean thickness of the viscous sublayer of the turbulent boundary layer, $\delta_{\ell, \text{mean}}$.

We assumed the flow conditions of a swimming penguin, as shown in Table 1. The body length, swimming

speed, and water temperature are similar to those in our previous kinematic measurement of a gentoo penguin in

226 usual swimming behaviors at an aquarium. These flow conditions are almost the same as those measured by

Harada et al. (Harada et al., 2021). The kinematic viscosity, ν , of sea water was estimated through linear

228 interpolation between the data for 0°C and 20°C, assuming a temperature of 15°C and salinity of 3.5% (Bullard

E., 2017). The resultant Reynolds number for the body length was 6.75×10^5 .

To realize the Reynolds number of the penguin using the 240-mm-long plate in the water tunnel, the flow condition of the water tunnel was determined, as shown in Table 1. When the flow speed was 2.0 m/s, the Reynolds number (6.64×10^5) was similar to that of the model penguin in Table 1 (6.75×10^5) .

Assuming that the turbulent boundary layer starts at the leading edge, the thickness of the viscous sublayer,

234 δ_{ℓ} , for a flat plate is empirically expressed as

$$\delta_{\ell} \approx 5 \frac{\nu}{u_{\tau}} \tag{3}$$
$$u_{\tau} = \sqrt{\frac{\tau_w}{\rho}} \tag{4}$$

where u_{τ} (m/s) is the friction velocity in the y direction, τ_w (N/m²) is the shear stress at the wall, and ρ is the density (Schlichting, 1979). By simplifying the penguin model to a flat plate, δ_{ℓ} of the swimming penguin and the flat plate in our water tunnel can be illustrated in Figure 5. The mean thickness, $\delta_{\ell, \text{ mean}}$, is 91 mm for the penguin and 37 mm for the plate for the flow conditions in Table 1.

Then, the nondimensional spacing of the barbs or riblet, s^+ , was defined by the $\delta_{\ell, \text{ mean}}$ as

$$s^{+} = s \frac{5}{\delta_{\ell,\text{mean}}} \tag{5}$$

240	The swimming speeds of the penguins that we reproduced by equating the value of $\delta_{\ell, \text{ mean}}$ in our experiment
241	with flow velocities of 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0 m/s in the water tunnel were 0.35, 0.7, 1.05, and 1.41 m/s (small-
242	scale riblet) and 0.95, 1.89, 2.84, and 3.79 m/s (actual-scale riblet). Then, the s^+ values were 1.59, 2.96, 4.27,
243	and 5.53 (small-scale riblet) and 3.87, 7.23, 10.4, and 13.5 (actual-scale riblet), respectively.
244	
245	3. Results and Discussions
246	3.1. Morphology of the body feathers and range of s^+
247	Figure 6 shows the measured spacing of the barbs for the three species of penguins. For the locations 0.1
248	m or more away from the head, the pooled mean values for each species were 97 μ m for the king penguin, 85 μ m
249	for the Humboldt penguin, and 75 μ m for the little penguin. The differences in the spacings among the species at
250	each location were not significant. Thus, we determined a representative value of the barb spacing of 100 μ m.
251	The measured widths of the barbs are shown in Figure 7. For the locations 0.1 m or more away from the
252	head, the pooled mean values for each species were 42 μ m for the king penguin, 31 μ m for the Humboldt penguin,
253	and 39 μ m for the little penguin. These values are smaller than the bottom width of 60 μ m in the SEM image
254	(Figure 1 (F)), possibly because only the top surfaces of the barbs were illuminated and visible under the optical
255	microscope. Therefore, we determined the representative cross-sectional width and height of the barbs to be 60
256	μm and 30 $\mu m,$ respectively.
257	Based on the measured body length of our museum specimens and foraging speed measured in the wild
258	for the king (2.1 m/s), Humboldt (1.9 m/s), and little (1.9 m/s) penguins (Sato et al., 2007; Luna-Jorquera et al.,

- 259 1999; Watanuki *et al.*, 2006)), the 100 μ m spacing of the barbs corresponds to the *s*⁺ values of 7.8, 7.5, and 7.7,
- 260 respectively. The swimming condition of the gentoo penguin at aquarium shown in Table 1 results in a s^+ of 5.5.

261 These s^+ values are relatively small compared with the s^+ of the previous triangular riblets for maximum drag 262 reduction (approximately 17 (Bechert 1997 *et al.*, 1997)).

- 263
- **3.2. Design and fabrication of the riblets**

The design values of the wide-ridge, medium-ridge, narrow-ridge, and small-scale riblets are summarized in the upper half of Table 2. To realize these dimensions, we adjusted the laser path, number of scans, scan speed, power, and defocusing distance (Figure S1 and Table S1).

268 The 3-D shape of the fabricated riblet was measured with an industrial laser-scanning confocal microscope 269 (SFT-4500, Shimadzu Corp., Japan) at 9 locations in each scanned area, as shown in Figure 3(A). The obtained 270 3-D images for the central locations are shown in Figure 8, and the measured dimensions are summarized in the 271lower half of Table 2. The spacing s of the fabricated riblets was almost the same as the design values, due to the 272 high precision of the galvanometer mirrors. The rib ridge width, a, was also realized well with small error. 273 However, the rib height, h, and bottom width, b, were noticeably larger than the target values due to the difficulty 274 in controlling the ablation depth at this microscale with our laser system. The resultant a/b was also smaller than 275the design. Nevertheless, the relative shape differences among the wide-, medium-, and narrow-ridge trapezoidal 276riblets were realized.

The resultant h/s for the small-scale, wide-, medium-, and narrow-ridge riblets were 0.5, 0.4, 0.38, and 0.36, respectively; all of these values were larger than the target value of 0.3. A previous study of blade riblets reported that increasing h/s from 0.3 to 0.5 enhances the maximum reduction in drag but reduces the upper limit of s^+ , reducing the drag (Bechert *et al.*, 1997).

281 We note that shape variation among the nine measured locations in the narrow-ridge riblet was noticeable. 282 At the central location, the ridge width tended to be wider, and there were small ridges on the bottom of the valley 283 (Figure 8(E)), unlike the other eight locations (Figure 8(C)). This variation may be due to the difference in the 284 travel length of the laser from the galvanometer mirrors to the film surface: the travel length for the central 285 location is slightly shorter than those for the other surrounding locations. The wider ridge width than the design 286 value may blur the difference from the medium-ridge riblet in the following experimental results. The small 287 ridges on the valley floor, of which height was approximately 10 µm, may increase the friction drag due to the 288 increase in the surface area.

289

290

3.3. Drag of the smooth flat plate

The measured drags of the flat plate with the smooth films, F_{Smooth} , for the flow speeds of 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0 m/s are shown in Figure 9. Each error bar represents the uncertainty. The theoretical curve of friction 293 drag, F_{Friction}, for a flat plate, assuming a turbulent boundary layer, is also illustrated in Figure 9, and is calculated 294 according to

$$F_{\text{Friction}} = 2wl\frac{\rho}{2}u^2C_f = wl\rho u^2 \left(0.074\left(\frac{ul}{v}\right)^{-\frac{1}{5}} - \frac{x_T}{l}\left(0.074\left(\frac{ux_T}{v}\right)^{-\frac{1}{5}} - 1.328\left(\frac{ux_T}{v}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right)$$
(6)

295 where ρ (kg/m³) is the fluid density, u (m/s) is the flow speed, v (m²/s) is the kinematic viscosity, l (m) is the 296 length of the flat plate, w (m) is the wetted width of the flat plate, and x_T is the distance from the leading edge to 297 the tripping wire where the transition from the laminar boundary layer to the turbulent boundary layer is assumed 298 to occur (Schlichting, 1979). 2wl represents the wetted surface area of both sides of the plate. Additionally, C_f is 299 the friction drag coefficient that can be obtained from a one-seventh power law (Schlichting, 1979). The ratios 300 of F_{Friction} to F_{Smooth} ($F_{\text{Friction}}/F_{\text{Smooth}}$) were 0.66, 0.61, 0.58, and 0.56 for 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0 m/s, respectively. The difference between F_{Smooth} and F_{Friction} is assumed to be due to the pressure drag derived from the plate 301 302 thickness of 1 mm. Therefore, if the riblet reduced friction drag while the pressure drag was constant, the 303 reduction rate of the friction drag would be larger than the reduction rate of the drag that includes both the friction 304 and pressure drags.

305

306

315

3.4. Drag change ratio of the small-scale riblet

307 Figure 10 shows the drag change ratio of the small-scale riblet. The error bars represent the uncertainty 308 U_{RSS} (ANSI/ASME, 1987) (95% coverage). The $\delta_{\ell, \text{mean}}$ -based and Re-based corresponding swimming speeds of 309 the model penguin, where $\delta_{\ell, \text{mean}}$ or Re is identical, are given for each plot. The applied flow speeds of 0.5, 1.0, 310 1.5, and 2.0 m/s correspond to the swimming speeds of 0.35, 0.70, 1.05, and 1.41 m/s for the model penguin based on the $\delta_{\ell, \text{mean}}$, respectively. The corresponding swimming speeds based on Re (1.66 × 10⁵, 3.32 × 10⁵, 4.98 311 \times 10⁵, and 6.64 \times 10⁵) are 0.34, 0.69, 1.03, and 1.38 m/s, which are slightly smaller than those based on δ_{ℓ} , where 312 the Re values are 1.66×10^5 , 3.32×10^5 , 4.98×10^5 , and 6.64×10^5 , respectively. 313 314 It was found that the drag was reduced by the riblet for all cases. The maximum reduction in the drag was 1.97% at a s^+ of 1.59, corresponding to a swimming speed of approximately 0.35 m/s. The drag reduction at a s^+

of 5.5 representing a 1.4 m/s swimming speed was 0.98%. These results suggest that the penguin feathers reduce
 drag at the usual or lower swimming speed.

Assuming that the riblets reduce only friction drag and the friction drag can be expressed by equation (6), the maximum reduction rate in friction drag can be calculated as 2.96% at an s^+ of 1.59 and as 1.74% at an s^+ of 5.5 (Figure S2).

321 In comparison to the previous triangular riblet, the s^+ of the penguin is small. It was reported that the 322 triangular riblet achieves the maximum reduction in drag at an s^+ of approximately 17 when h/s was 0.5 and the 323 ridge angle of the rib was 90° (Bechert *et al.*, 1997). The performance for a small s^+ below 10 was not reported, 324 possibly because a further reduction does not appear to be expected. This small spacing of the penguin barbs may 325 have other functions in addition to drag reduction, such as prevention of heat loss with dense and narrow barbs; 326 this would subsequently prevent gaps between the barbs and minimize their surface area. In fact, penguin feathers 327 exert a heat insulation effect, and it is reasonable to assume that the spacing of the barbs is related to heat transfer 328 as well as drag reduction (Dawson et al., 1999).

- 329
- 330

3.5. Effect of the rib shape and yaw angle on the drag change ratio

Figure 11 shows the drag change ratio of the wide-, medium-, and narrow-ridge riblets with varying yaw angles. The corresponding swimming speeds of the model penguin based on $\delta_{\ell, \text{ mean}}$ and Re are given for each s^+

333 value. Each error bar represents the uncertainty, U_{RSS} (ANSI/ASME, 1987) (95% coverage).

The medium-ridge riblet, which represents the real barb, reduces drag for yaw angles up to 15° , even at high speeds beyond realistic penguin speeds (Figure 11(A)). Interestingly, the small yaw angle of 15° promoted a further reduction. The maximum reduction of 1.26% was recorded at an s^+ of 3.87 with a yaw angle of 15° . With a yaw angle of 30° , drag was increased for all s^+ . With a yaw angle of 45° , the rate of increase in the drag increased, even though a reduction in drag was observed at an s^+ of 3.87. These results imply that the penguin feathers reduce drag in foraging or higher-speed swimming, allowing a small deviation in the yaw angle up to 15° .

The results for the wide-ridge riblet were similar to those of the medium-ridge riblet until the yaw angle
 reached 30° (Figure 11(B)). However, a yaw angle of 45° further increased the drag.

Narrow-ridge riblets slightly increased the drag at a yaw angle of zero (Figure 11(C)). A small yaw angle of 15°, however, resulted in a reduction in the drag. In this study, the maximum drag reduction of 1.19% was recorded at an s^+ of 10.4. The drag reduction effect was maintained even with the largest yaw angle of 45° up to an s^+ of 10.4. The maximum drag increase at the largest yaw angle and s^+ was only 0.63%.

The comparison of the three rib shapes for each yaw angle is summarized in Figure 12. When the yaw angle was small, up to 15° , the medium-ridge riblet effectively reduced the drag for a wide range of s^{+} values among the three types of riblets, where the corresponding swimming speed of the gentoo penguin was $0.95 \sim 3.79$. When the yaw angle was not zero and varied strongly up to 45° , the narrow-ridge riblet worked well to reduce the drag. The wide-ridge riblet was the poorest design in that the drag reduction with a small yaw angle was lower and the drag increase with a large yaw angle was drastic.

Assuming that the riblets reduce only friction drag and that the friction drag can be expressed by equation (6), the reduction rate in the friction drag was also calculated, as summarized in Figures S3-S4. The maximum reduction rate in the friction drag was estimated to be 2.08% for the narrow-ridge riblet at an s^+ of 13.5 with a 15° yaw angle.

357 Comparing these results with the results obtained in previous studies, the maximum drag reduction rate of 358 our riblet of 2.08% marked by the narrow-ridge riblet at an s^+ of 13.5 with a 15° yaw angle is similar to that of 359 the triangular riblets with a ridge angle of 90° (h/s = 0.5), which is approximately 3% at an s^+ of approximately 360 20 (Bechert *et al.*, 1997). However, the narrow-ridge riblet with a yaw angle of 0° increased drag for all s⁺ ranges, 361 while the triangular riblets with a ridge angle of 90° used by Bechert *et al.*, 1997 reduced drag up to an s^+ of 32. 362 This difference may be attributed to the smaller value of h/s for our narrow-ridge riblet (h/s = 0.36). On the other 363 hand, our medium-ridge riblet reduced drag with a yaw angle of 0° for all s⁺ ranges even with a small h/s = 0.38, 364 which is also contrary to the result by Bechert *et al.*, 1997 showing that a smaller ridge angle (60°) of the 365 triangular riblet achieved a higher maximum drag reduction rate (approximately 5%) than a larger ridge angle 366 (90°). Hence, a moderate width of the rib ridge may be suitable for a riblet with a small h/s below 0.4.

Regarding the robustness with respect to the yaw angle, a previous experiment by Enyutin *et al*, 1991 using a triangular riblet (h/s = 1.0; ridge angle = 53°) showed that the robustness was improved by reducing s^+ . This trend was also observed in the present study (Figure 12(D)). On the other hand, Enyutin *et al*, 1991 also reported that the triangular riblet always increased drag when the yaw angle was 40° or greater even with the smallest s^+ , while our narrow-ridge riblet reduced drag at a high yaw angle of 45° when s^+ was small (3.87 and 372 7.23). This higher robustness of the narrow-ridge riblet may be attributed to the small h/s of 0.36. Moreover, the 373 drag reduction rate of our riblets at a yaw angle of 15° was always greater than that at a yaw angle of 0° regardless 374 of the ridge type (Figure 11), which is in disagreement with a previous study of triangular and scallop riblets that 375 showed that the drag reduction rate always decreased with increasing yaw angle (Hage *et al*, 2001). This is the 376 unique feature of our penguin-mimetic riblet of the trapezoidal cross-section with small h/s less than 0.4.

In summary, the penguin feather, represented by the small scale and the medium-ridge riblet in this study, reduced drag for the wide range of swimming speeds ranging from 0.35 to 3.79 m/s, allowing small fluctuations up to 15° in the flow angle. By narrowing the ridge width, the robustness with respect to the yaw angle was improved even though the drag increased for the zero yaw angle case.

381

382

3.6. Possible effect of other features in real feathers on drag

This paper focuses on the effect of feather barb spacing and cross-sectional shape on drag as a rigid riblet.
 However, real feathers possess more complex features that may affect drag.

The body feathers partially overlap with another feather behind; thus, a gap in height may exist between the feathers. Bechert *et al.*, 2000 b, reported that an array of thin strings parallel to the flow above the flat surface reduced friction drag in a similar way to the riblets, although the reduction rate was modest up to 1.5%. We note that the diameter of the strings was only 0.08 times the string spacing, while our barb width (60 μ m) was comparable to the barb spacing (100 μ m). Moreover, overlapping barbs can be regarded as a permeable substrate. Gómez-de-Segura *et al.*, 2019 argued that permeable substrates can reduce turbulent friction drag.

391 Feathers and barbs may move in response to the surface flow. Sundin et al., 2019 numerically investigated 392 the flexible vertical hairs on the surface in a turbulent boundary layer and reported that stiff and low-mass (i.e., 393 similar density to fluid) hairs with higher resonant frequency than turbulent fluctuation resulted in an increase in 394 drag. Bechert et al., 2000 b, conducted experiments with shark scale models in which each basement was 395 elastically movable with springs and reported that elasticity increased the drag even though the rigid case with 396 the same scales led to a modest reduction in drag up to 3%. By contrast, experimental studies using real shark 397 skin specimens reported that each scale passively flaps up in response to reverse flow, stopping the reverse flow 398 and suppressing further flow separation and pressure drag (Lang et al, 2014; Afroz et al., 2017; Du clos et al, 399 2018).

400 Moreover, Davenport et al., 2011 argued that the body drag of penguins is reduced by the release of air 401 bubbles from the feathers because the bubble coating reduces friction drag. They observed that the emperor 402 penguins Aptenodytes forsteri always released bubbles from the body during rapid ascent to jump out of the water. 403 We note that the penguins do not release bubbles during descent or during horizontal diving. A video camera 404 attached to the back of a gentoo penguin Pygoscelis papua swimming near the water surface captured other 405 swimming Magellanic penguins Spheniscus magellanicus in the wild (Handley et al., 2018: Movie S4), showing 406 that the Magellanic penguins did not release bubbles. In our previous investigations of gentoo penguins 407 Pygoscelis papua at an aquarium (Harada et al., 2021), no penguin released bubbles in horizontal diving.

The hydrophobicity of the feathers affects friction drag. Min and Kim, 2004, numerically revealed that streamwise slip due to hydrophobicity decreases friction drag. Jung and Bhushan, 2010, experimentally showed that friction drag is decreased by the hydrophobic surface for both laminar and turbulent boundary layers.

In summary, moving feathers presumably increase friction drag, while pressure drag due to flow separation can be suppressed by passive flap-up motion of the feathers. The hydrophobicity of the feathers will reduce friction drag.

414

415 **4. Conclusion**

416 The function of drag reduction in penguin body feathers modeled as rigid riblets was experimentally 417 evaluated for the first time. Morphological and hydrodynamic modeling demonstrated that the nondimensional 418 riblet spacing s^+ of the feathers was 5.5 for usual swim at aquarium and 8 for foraging swim in wild, which are 419 small compared with conventional riblets. The cross-sectional shape of the rib was modeled to be trapezoidal. 420 The penguin-mimetic riblets were fabricated by UV-laser-scanning ablation of polyimide films with variations 421 in the ridge width and yaw angle. The drag of the flat plate with the film with and without riblets was measured 422 in a water tunnel. The penguin-representative small-scale riblet reduced drag with a decrease in s^+ : the maximum 423 drag reduction rate was 1.97% at an s^+ of 1.59. The actual-scale medium-ridge riblet that was also representative 424 of the feather morphology reduced drag for a wide range of s^+ values from 3.87 to 13.49, corresponding to a wide 425range of penguin swimming speeds from 0.95 to 3.79 m/s when the yaw angle was equal to or less than 15°. The 426 maximum drag reduction rate of the medium-ridge riblet was 1.26% at an s^+ of 3.87 with a yaw angle of 15° . The 427 narrow-ridge riblet reduced the drag even with a higher yaw angle of 45° when s^{+} was 10.4 or less, but the drag 428 increased when the yaw angle was zero. The drag reducing performance of the wide-ridge riblet was inferior to that of the medium-ridge riblet, particularly when the yaw angle was as large as 45°. Unlike the previously studied triangular riblets, all three wide-, medium- and narrow-ridge riblets showed a higher drag reduction rate at a yaw angle of 15° than at 0°. These results suggest that the body feathers of penguins can reduce drag for the full range of their swim speed, and small fluctuations in the flow angle up to 15° can be advantageous. These penguinmimetic riblets can be applied to underwater drones operating with various speeds and carrying out different maneuvers.

We note that real feathers include more complex features, such as overlapping, flexibility, movability, and hydrophobicity. Appropriate implementation of such features can enhance the drag reduction performance of the penguin-mimetic riblets.

- 438
- 439 Acknowledgment

We thank Nagasaki Penguin Aquarium (Nagasaki, Japan) for the gentoo penguin feather sample. We thank the Collaboration Center for Design and Manufacturing for using an industrial laser-scanning confocal microscope. We also thank Hiroaki Kishine for the microscopy and SEM imaging of the feathers. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI JP18H05468 and JP20K04283.

444

445 **References**

- 446 Afroz, F., Lang, A., Habegger, M., Motta, P. and Hueter, R. (2017). Experimental study of
 447 laminar and turbulent boundary layer separation control of shark skin. *Bioinspiration & Biomimetics*,
 448 Vol.12, 016009.
- 449 **ANSI/ASME.** (1987). Measurement uncertainty, supplement on instruments and apparatus.
- Bechert, D. W., Bruse, M. and Hage, W. (2000 a). Experiments with three-dimensional riblets as
 an idealized model of shark skin. *Experiments in Fluids*, Vol. 28, pp. 403–412.
- 452 Bechert, D.W., Bruse, M. and Meyer, R. (2000 b). Fluid mechanics of biological surfaces and their
 453 technological application. *Naturwissenschaften*, Vol. 87, pp. 157-171.
- Bechert, D. W., Bruse, M., Hage, W., Vanderhoeven, J. G. T. and Hoppe, G. (1997).
 Experiments on drag-reducing surfaces and their optimization with an adjustable geometry. *Journal of Fluid*
- 456 *Mechanics*, Vol. 338, pp. 59-87.

457	Benschop, H. O. G. and Breugem, W. P. (2017). Drag reduction by herringbone riblet texture in
458	direct numerical simulations of turbulent channel flow. Journal of Turbulence, Vol. 18, No. 8, pp. 717-759.
459	Bhushan, B. (2019). Lessons from nature for green science and technology: an overview and
460	bioinspired superliquiphobic/philic surfaces. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, Vol. 377,
461	20180274.
462	Bixler, G. D. and Bhushan, B. (2013). Fluid drag reduction with shark-skin riblet inspired
463	microstructured surfaces. Advanced Functional Materials, Vol. 23, pp. 4507-4528.
464	Bullard, E. (2017). 2. 7. 9 Physical properties of sea water. Kaye & Laby Table of Physical &
465	Chemical Constants. Physical properties of sea water 2.7.9 (archive.org), (Retrieved on February 25, 2021).
466	Bushnell, D. M. and Hefner, J. N. (1990). Viscous Drag Reduction in Boundary Layers. Progress
467	in Astronautics and Aeronautics, Vol.123, pp.203-261.
468	Chen, H., Rao, F., Shang, X., Zhang, D. and Hagiwara, I. (2014 a). Flow over bioinspired 3D
469	herringbone wall riblets. Experiments in Fluids, Vol. 55, No. 1698.
470	Chen, H., Zhang, X., Ma, L., Che, D., Zhang, D. and Sudarshan, T. S. (2014 b). Investigation on
471	large-area fabrication of vivid shark skin with superior surface functions. Applied Surface Science, Vol. 316,
472	pp. 124-131.
473	Clark, B. D. and Bemis, W. (1979). Kinematics of Swimming of Penguins at the Detroit Zoo.
474	<i>Journal of Zoology</i> , Vol. 188, pp. 411-428.
475	Davenport, J., Hughes, R. N., Shorten, M. and Larsen, P.S. (2011). Drag reduction by air release
476	promotes fast ascent in jumping emperor penguins – a novel hypothesis. Marine Ecology Progress Series,
477	Vol. 430, pp. 171-182.
478	Dawson, C., Vincent, J. F. V., Jeronimidis, G., Rice, G. and Forshow, P. (1999). Heat transfer
479	through penguin feathers. Journal of Theoretical Biology, Vol. 199, pp. 291-295.
480	Dean, B. and Bhushan, B. (2010). Shark-skin surfaces for fluid-drag reduction in turbulent flow: a
481	review. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering
482	Sciences, Vol. 368, pp. 4775-4806.
483	Denkena, B., Köhler, J. and Wang, B. (2010). Manufacturing of functional riblet structures by
484	profile grinding. CIRP Journal of Manufacturing Science and Technology, Vol. 3, pp. 14-26.

485	Du Clos, K. T., Lang, A., Devey, S., Motta, P. J., Habegger, M. L. and Gemmell, B.J. (2018).
486	Passive bristling of mako shark scales in reversing flows. Journal of the Royal Society Interface, Vol. 15,
487	20180473.
488	Enyutin, G. V., Lashkov, Yu. A., Samoilova, N. V., Fadeev, I. V. and Shumilkina, E. A. (1991).
489	Influence of downwash on the aerodynamic efficiency of fine-ribbed surfaces. Fluid Dynamics, Vol. 26, pp.
490	31-35.
491	Gill, F. B. (2007). Ornithology 3rd ed., W. H. Freeman and Company.
492	Gómez-de-Segura, G. and García-Mayoral, R. (2019). Turbulent drag reduction by anisotropic
493	permeable substrates - analysis and direct numerical simulations. Journal of Fluid Mechanics, Vol. 875, pp.
494	124-172.
495	Hage, W., Bechert, D. W. and Bruse, M. (2001). Yaw angle effects on optimized riblets.
496	Aerodynamic Drag Reduction Technologies, pp. 278-285.
497	Handley, J. M., Thiebault, A., Stanworth, A., Schutt, D. and Pistorius, P. (2018). Behaviourally
498	mediated predation avoidance in penguin prey: in situ evidence from animal-borne camera loggers. Royal
499	Society open science, Vol. 5, 171449.
500	Harada. N., Oura, T., Maeda, M., Shen, Y., Kikuchi, D. M. and Tanaka, H. (2021). Kinematics
501	and hydrodynamics analyses of swimming penguins: wing bending improves propulsion performance.
502	Journal of Experimental Biology, Vol. 224, No. 21.
503	Hefner J. N. (1988). Dragging down fuel costs. Aerospace America, January, pp. 14.
504	Hirschel E. H., Thiede P. and Monnoyer F. (1988). Turbulence management applications aspects.
505	AGARD, Fluid Dynamics of Three-Dimensional Turbulent Shear Flows and Transition, CP-438.
506	Ido, A. and Kohama, Y. (2005). A study on reducing aerodynamic drag of trains by smoothing the
507	under-floor surface. Transactions of the Japan Society of Mechanical Engineers. B, Vol. 71, No. 703.
508	Itoh, M., Tamao, S., Iguchi, R., Yokota, K., Akino, N., Hino, R. and Kubo, S. (2006). Turbulent
509	drag reduction by the seal fur surface. Physics of Fluids, Vol. 18, 065102.
510	Jung, Y. C. and Bhushan, B. (2010). Biomimetic structures for fluid drag reduction in laminar and
511	turbulent flows. Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, Vol. 22, 035104.

512	Kaakkunen, J. J. J., Tiainen, J., Värri, A. J., Grönman, A. and Lohtander, M. (2018).
513	Fabrication of surface with reduced friction using nanosecond laser. Procedia Manufacturing, Vol. 17, pp.
514	14-21.
515	Kordy H. (2015). Process abilities of the riblet-coating process with dual-cure lacquers. CIRP
516	Journal of Manufacturing Science and Technology, Vol. 11, pp. 1-9.
517	Kostina, G. N., Sokolov, V. E., Romanenko, E. V., Sidorova, T. N., Tarchevskaya, V. A. and
518	Chernova, O. F. (1996). Hydrophobicity of penguin feather structures (Aves Sphenicsciformes).
519	Zoologichskii Zhurnal, Vol. 75, No. 2, pp. 237-248.
520	Kulp, F. B., D'Alba, L., Shawkey, M. D. and Clarke, J. A. (2018). Keratin nanofiber distribution
521	and feather microstructure in penguins. The Auk, Vol. 135, pp. 777–787.
522	Lang, A. W., Bradshaw, M. T., Smith, J. A., Wheelus, J. N., Motta, P. J., Habegger, M. L. and
523	Hueter, R. E. (2014). Movable shark scales act as a passive dynamic microroughness to control flow
524	separation. Bioinspiration & Biomimetics, Vol. 9, 036017.
525	Lovvorn, J. R., Liggins, G. A., Borstad, M. H., Calisal, S. M. and Mikkelsen, J. (2001).
526	Hydrodynamic drag of diving birds: Effects of body size, body shape and feathers at steady speeds. The
527	Journal of Experimental Biology, Vol. 204, pp. 1547-1557.
528	Lufthansa Technik. (2021). Nature as a role model: Lufthansa Group and BASF roll out sharkskin
529	technology. https://www.lufthansa-technik.com/de/press-releases/-
530	/asset_publisher/Xix57wMv0mow/content/pm_sharkskin_aeroshark_lhcargo (Retrieved on April 15, 2022).
531	Luna-Jorquera, G. and Culik, B. M. (1999) Diving behavior of Humboldt penguins Spheniscus
532	humboldti in northern Chile. Marine Ornithology, Vol. 27, pp. 67-76.
533	Maeda, K. (2011). Development of automotive aerodynamics and approach trend. Wind Engineers,
534	<i>JAWE</i> , Vol. 36, No. 3.
535	Mattern, T., Pütz, K., Garcia-Borboroglu, P., Ellenberg, U., Houston, D. M., Long, R., Lüthi, B.
536	and Seddon, P. J. (2018). Marathon penguins-Reasons and consequences of long-range dispersal in
537	Fiordland penguins/Tawaki during the premolt period. PLoS One, Vol. 13, e0198688.
538	Min, T. and Kim, J. (2004). Effects of hydrophobic surface on skin-friction drag. Physics of Fluids,
539	Vol. 16, No. 7, pp. L55-L58.

540	NASA Langley Research Center. (1993). NASA riblets for starts & stripes.
541	https://www.nasa.gov/centers/langley/news/factsheets/Riblets.html (Retrieved on April 15, 2022).
542	Sasamori, M., Mamori, H., Iwamoto, K. and Murata, A. (2014). Experimental study on drag-
543	reduction effect due to sinusoidal riblets in turbulent channel flow. Experiments in Fluids, Vol. 55, No.
544	1828.
545	Sato, K., Shiomi, K., Marshall, G., Kooyman, G. L. and Ponganis, P. J. (2011). Stroke rates and
546	diving air volumes of emperor penguins: implications for dive performance. The Journal of Experimental
547	<i>Biology</i> , Vol. 214, pp. 2854-2863.
548	Sato, K., Watanuki, Y., Takahashi, A., Miller, P. J. O., Tanaka, H., Kawabe, R., Ponganis, P. J.,
549	Handrich, Y., Akamatsu, T., Watanabe, Y., et al. (2007). Stroke frequency, but not swimming speed, is
550	related to body size in free-ranging seabirds, pinnipeds and cetaceans. Proceedings of the Royal Society B:
551	Biological Sciences, Vol. 274, pp. 471–477.
552	Schlichting, H. (1979). Boundary-Layer Theory 7th ed., Springer.
553	Stenzel, V., Wilke, Y. and Hage, W. (2011). Drag-reducing paints for the reduction of fuel
554	consumption in aviation and shipping. Progress in Organic Coatings, Vol. 70, pp. 224-229.
555	Sundin, J. and Bagheri, S. (2019). Interaction between hairy surfaces and turbulence for different
556	surface time scales. Journal of Fluid Mechanics, Vol. 861, pp.556-584.
557	Szodruch, J. (1991). Viscous drag reduction on transport aircraft. AIAA 29th Aerospace Science
558	Meeting.
559	Tiainen, J., Grönman, A., Jaatinen-Värri, A. and Pyy, L. (2020). Effect of nonideally
560	manufactured riblets on airfoil and wind turbine performance. Renewable Energy, Vol. 155, pp. 79-89.
561	Walsh, M. J. and Lindemann, A. M. (1984). Optimization and application of riblets for turbulent
562	drag reduction. AIAA 22 nd Aerospace Sciences Meeting, pp. 347-356.
563	Watanabe, Y. Y., Sato, K., Watanuki, Y., Takahashi, A., Mitani, Y., Amano, M., Aoki. K.,
564	Narazaki, T., Iwata, T., Minamikawa, S. and Miyazaki, N. (2011). Scaling of swim speed in breath-hold
565	divers. Journal of Animal Ecology, Vol. 80, pp. 57-68.
566	Watanuki, Y., Wanless, S., Harris, M., Lovvorn, J. R., Miyazaki, M., Tanaka, H. and Sato, K.
567	(2006). Swim speeds and stroke patterns in wing-propelled divers: a comparison among alcids and a
568	penguin. Journal of Experimental Biology, Vol. 209, pp. 1217-1230.

569	Wienecke, B., Robertson, G., Kirkwood, R. and Lawton, K. (2007). Extreme dives by free-
570	ranging emperor penguins. Polar Biology, Vol.30, pp. 133-142.
571	Williams, C. L., Hagelin, J. C., and Kooyman, G. L. (2015). Hidden keys to survival: the type,
572	density, pattern and functional role of emperor penguin body feathers. Proceedings of the Royal Society B:
573	Biological Sciences, Vol. 282, 20152033.
574	Zhang, Y. F. and Yin, Y. H. (2019). Study on riblet drag reduction considering the effect of sweep

575 angle. *Energies*, Vol. 12, 3386.

Figures and tables



Figure 1. Morphology of penguin body feathers. (A) Longitudinal lengths of the museum specimens of the king, Humboldt, and little penguins. (B, C) Example photos of the dorsal surface from the king penguin specimen taken at 0.5 m from the head. The "measurement section" in the figure indicates the location where the spacing and width of barbs were measured. (D) A single body feather of a gentoo penguin. (E) SEM image of the gentoo penguin's barbs. The tips of the barbs were cut with a scalpel. (F) The cross-sectional shape of the gentoo penguin barb.





Figure 3. Planar dimensions of riblet sheets. (A) Outline design of the riblet sheet. A laser scanning machine created the riblet area of 40 mm by 24.375 mm. By shifting the worktable of the machine and repeating the scanning, the riblet area of 120 mm by 97.5 mm was formed. To create an angled riblet sheet, an inclined rectangular outline of 80 mm by 65 mm was cut out. \times marks indicate the locations for 3D shape measurement of the riblet. (B) Photograph of a fabricated riblet sheet with the straight riblet.



Figure 4. Experimental setup of the drag measurement in a water tunnel. (A, C) Sideview photograph and schematic of the flat plate inserted in the water tunnel. (B) Sideview photograph of the flat plate with the straight riblet. (D) Top view schematic of the slit of the water tunnel for insertion of the plate.

576





70 Width of barbs, $W_{\text{Barb}}(\mu m)$ ┫ **⊕** 甲 本 Φ ₫ ФŦ King penguin \triangle Humboldt penguin • Little penguin 0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0 0.7 Distance from leading edge (m) Figure 7. The measured widths of the barbs for the three penguin specimens. The vertical bar indicates the standard deviation.



Figure 8. Measured 3-D surface shapes of the actual- and small-scale riblets. (A) Wide-ridge riblets. (B) Medium-ridge riblets. (C) Narrow-ridge riblets. (D) Small-scale riblets. (E) Narrow-ridge riblets in the central location of Fig. 3(A). The design schematic for each riblet is presented on the right.



Figure 9. Measured drag of the smooth flat plate (open circles and black line), small-scale riblet (open circles and blue line) and the theoretical calculation of the friction drag of a flat plate (dashed line).



on the Re and $\delta_{\ell, \text{ mean}}$.



Figure 11. Measured drag-change ratio varying with the yaw angle. (A) Medium-ridge riblets. (B) Wide-ridge riblets. (C) Narrow-ridge riblets. The error bars represent the uncertainty U_{RSS} (ANSI/ASME, 1987) (95% coverage). The corresponding flow speeds based on the Re and $\delta_{\ell, \text{mean}}$ are displayed in the graph legend.



Figure 12. Measured drag-change ratio varying with s^+ . (A) Yaw angle of 0°. (B) Yaw angle of 15°. (C) Yaw angle of 30°. (D) Yaw angle of 45°. The error bars represent the uncertainty U_{RSS} (ANSI/ASME, 1987) (95% coverage). The numbers next to each plot are the corresponding flow speeds based on the Re and $\delta_{\ell, \text{ mean}}$.

	Water temperature (°C)	Length (mm)	Flow speed (m/s)	Kinematic viscosity (m ² /s)	Reynolds number	
Penguin	15	600	1.4	1.25×10 ⁻⁶	6.75×10 ⁵	
	35	240	2.0		6.64×10 ⁵	
Elet plate			1.5	7 22×10-7	4.98×10 ⁵	
Flat plate			1.0	7.23×10	3.32×10 ⁵	
			0.5		1.66×10 ⁵	

 Table 1.
 Flow conditions for the gentoo penguin and water tunnel.

 Table 2.
 Design values and measurement results for the actual- and small-scale riblets.

	Parameter	S	s (µm)	<i>h</i> (µm)	<i>a</i> (µm)	<i>b</i> (µm)	α(°)	eta(°)	h/s	a/b
	Actual- scale	Wide-ridge	100	30	50	60	81	81	0.3	0.83
Design		Medium-ridge	100	30	25	60	60	60	0.3	0.42
values		Narrow-ridge	100	30	10	60	50	50	0.3	0.17
	Small-scale		41	12	12.5	30	62	62	0.29	0.42
	Actual- scale	Wide-ridge	100±0.2	40±1.3	48±3.0	77±2.1	70±4.6	69±3.6	0.4	0.62
Measurement		Medium-ridge	100±0.2	38±3.0	22±4.9	73±1.6	55±2.0	57±1.7	0.38	0.30
results*		Narrow-ridge	100±0.1	36±1.9	9±3.0	69±3.1	51±4.0	50±2.7	0.36	0.13
	Small-scale		41±0.1	21±2.2	13±4.3	34±3.0	61±6.4	60±7.9	0.51	0.38

*The average values and standard deviations are presented. The number of measurement locations for each sheet was 9.