Proceedings of CONF-MPCS 2026 Symposium: Theoretic Physics and Plasma Physics
DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.DL33792

A Brief Introduction to Aircraft Aerodynamic Design: Airfoil, Wing, Fuselage, and Trade-offs

Yao Rong

Admiral Farragut Academy, Tianjin, China
yumirong92@163.com

Abstract. This paper talks about three key aerodynamic parts of a fixed wing airplane. These parts are the airfoil, the wing, and the fuselage. The airfoil is described first. This paper look at its camber, thickness, and angle of attack. These features control how lift and drag are produced. Lift happens because the top surface has lower pressure than the bottom surface. This follows Bernoulli's principle. Next, the wing is discussed. Two important parameters are sweep angle and aspect ratio. Sweep angle helps delay shock waves at high speed. Aspect ratio affects induced drag. The fuselage is then considered. This paper look at its cylindrical shape, how the area rule reduces drag, and how the fuselage changes the airflow around the wing. Several design trade offs are shown in this paper. These include low speed versus high speed flight, aerodynamic efficiency versus structural weight, and manufacturing quality versus cost. Two example aircraft are used. One is the Cessna 172. The other is the Boeing 787. They show that different flight missions lead to very different design choices. The main conclusion is that aircraft design is always about balanced compromise. It is never about perfect or pure optimization.

Keywords: Airfoil, wing, fuselage, aerodynamic design

1. Introduction

When designing a fixed wing airplane, you have to think about three main parts. These parts are the airfoil, the wing, and the fuselage. The airfoil decides how much lift the plane gets and how much drag it makes. The wing takes the shape of the airfoil and stretches it into three dimensions. Stretching the airfoil brings new effects into play. These include induced drag and wing sweep. The fuselage carries the payload, which includes passengers, cargo, and fuel. But the fuselage also adds extra drag. It also changes the way air moves around the wing.

None of these three parts can be designed by itself. You cannot optimize one part alone. Real aircraft design is always about trade offs. For instance, an airfoil that works very well at low speed may do a poor job at high speed. A wing with a high aspect ratio lowers induced drag. But that same wing becomes heavier in structure. A cylindrical fuselage is cheap and easy to build. Yet it may break the area rule at transonic speeds.

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.DL33792

2. Airfoil: geometry, lift generation, and families

2.1. Definition and basic geometry

An airfoil is the cross sectional shape of a wing. You also see this shape on rotor blades and propellers. The geometry of an airfoil directly controls how lift and drag are produced. Three geometric parameters matter most. These are camber, thickness, and angle of attack (AOA). Camber describes how much the middle line of the airfoil curves between the front edge and the back edge. If an airfoil is symmetric, its camber is zero. A cambered airfoil can still generate lift even when the angle of attack is zero. Thickness is normally given as a percentage of the chord length. A thicker airfoil is stronger in structure, but it also produces more drag.

2.2. How an airfoil generates lift

Lift happens because of a pressure difference. The top surface of an airfoil has low pressure. The bottom surface has high pressure. Why does this difference occur? Air moves faster over the curved top surface. That is what Bernoulli's principle says. The slower air under the wing stays at a higher pressure. Together, these pressures push the wing upward. That upward force is lift. The angle of attack also matters a lot. Angle of attack is the angle between the chord line and the incoming air. If you increase this angle, lift goes up. But only to a limit. After that limit, the airfoil stalls and lift drops fast.

2.3. Common airfoil families

The most famous airfoil family is the NACA series, developed by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in the 1920s–1940s. The NACA four-digit series, such as the NACA 2412, encodes camber and thickness in its designation [1]. The first digit is the maximum camber in percent of chord, the second digit is the location of maximum camber in tenths of chord, and the last two digits are the maximum thickness in percent of chord. For example, a NACA 2412 airfoil has 2% camber, the maximum camber at 40% of chord, and 12% thickness. Later families, such as the NACA six-series, were designed specifically for laminar flow [2], which reduces drag by delaying the transition from laminar to turbulent boundary layer.

2.4. The role of airfoils in aircraft design

The choice of airfoil has a big impact on what an aircraft can do. A high lift airfoil usually has a large camber. It works well for low speed planes like the Cessna 172. However, at transonic speeds this same airfoil creates strong shock waves. A supercritical airfoil is different. Its upper surface is flatter and its leading edge radius is larger. This design delays shock wave formation. That is why modern airliners like the Boeing 787 use supercritical airfoils. No single airfoil works well under all flight conditions. Therefore, selecting an airfoil is always a compromise among low speed lift, high speed drag, and how much structural depth is needed.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.DL33792

3. Wing: planform parameters, induced drag, and trade-offs

3.1. From airfoil to wing

A wing is essentially a three-dimensional extension of an airfoil. While the airfoil defines the cross-sectional shape, the wing adds span, planform geometry, and structural components. The performance of a wing cannot be fully predicted from the airfoil alone, because three-dimensional effects, most notably induced drag, become significant.

3.2. Key planform parameters

The most important wing planform parameters are sweep angle and aspect ratio.

Sweep angle is the angle by which the wing is swept back (or forward) relative to the fuselage. Sweeping the wing delays the formation of shock waves at transonic and supersonic speeds, because only the component of airflow perpendicular to the leading edge determines the pressure gradient. Almost all modern jet airliners, such as the Boeing 787 and Airbus A350, use swept wings.

Aspect ratio (AR) is defined as the square of the wingspan divided by the wing area: $AR = \frac{b^2}{S}$ [3]. A high aspect ratio wing (long and narrow) reduces induced drag, which is the drag created by wingtip vortices. Gliders and long-range aircraft therefore use very high aspect ratios. However, a high aspect ratio also increases structural weight and bending moments, because the wing must be stiff enough to avoid excessive deflection.

3.3. Induced drag and wingtip devices

Induced drag is a direct consequence of generating lift [4]. As the wing produces lift, high-pressure air from below spills around the wingtips to the low-pressure region above, creating rotating vortices. These vortices carry kinetic energy that is extracted from the aircraft, effectively adding drag. Induced drag is inversely proportional to aspect ratio: higher aspect ratio means lower induced drag.

Wingtip devices, such as winglets or raked wingtips, reduce induced drag by weakening the tip vortices [5]. The Boeing 787 uses a raked wingtip [6], while many Airbus aircraft use blended winglets. These devices improve fuel efficiency by 3–5% on long flights.

3.4. Trade-offs in wing design

Wing design is dominated by compromises. A high aspect ratio improves aerodynamic efficiency but adds structural weight. Sweep improves high-speed performance but reduces lift at low speed and may cause tip stall. A thick wing provides more internal fuel volume and structural strength but increases wave drag at transonic speeds. As a result, every wing is a carefully balanced solution for a specific mission: high aspect ratio for gliders, moderate sweep for airliners, and straight, thick wings for low-speed cargo aircraft.

4. Fuselage: shapes, area rule, and wing interference

4.1. Functions and basic shape

The fuselage is the main body of an aircraft. It accommodates the payload, including passengers, cargo, and fuel. It also connects the wing, tail, and landing gear. Unlike the wing, which is optimized

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.DL33792

for lift, the fuselage is primarily a structural and volumetric component. Its shape is therefore driven by mission requirements rather than aerodynamic efficiency alone.

The most common fuselage shape is cylindrical. A circular cross-section handles internal pressure well, which is important for high-altitude aircraft with pressurized cabins. It is also relatively easy to manufacture.

4.2. Aerodynamic considerations

Although the fuselage is not primarily a lifting surface, its shape significantly affects overall drag. Two types of drag are particularly relevant: pressure drag and interference drag.

Pressure drag depends on how smoothly the fuselage cross-section changes along its length. A well-designed fuselage has a slender nose and a tapered tail to reduce flow separation. Interference drag occurs where the fuselage meets the wing or tail. The intersection creates local flow acceleration and separation, which adds drag. Engineers use fairings, smooth coverings at the junctions, to reduce interference drag.

4.3. The area rule

When an aircraft flies at transonic speeds, which is roughly Mach 0.8 to 1.2, a new problem appears. This problem is called the area rule. The area rule says that wave drag becomes small only if the cross-sectional area of the whole aircraft changes smoothly along its length [7]. It should look almost like the wing and fuselage are one single smooth body. To achieve this, the fuselage is often made narrower right where the wing attaches. That way there is no sudden jump in cross sectional area. Richard Whitcomb first discovered this idea in the 1950s [8]. The Convair F-102 was one of the first aircraft to use it. Modern transport planes like the Boeing 787 also follow the area rule when their fuselage shape is designed. In their case, the narrowing is much less obvious than on older supersonic fighters.

4.4. Fuselage-wing interference and trade-offs

Where the wing meets the fuselage is a very important part of the design [9]. The wing changes the airflow near the fuselage, and the fuselage also changes the airflow near the wing. If the two parts do not fit together well, the flow can separate early. That separation increases drag. A good design uses fillets or fairings to make the transition smoother. Fuselage design always involves trade offs. For example, a wider fuselage can carry more passengers, but it also creates more drag. A longer fuselage helps satisfy the area rule, but it adds weight and may hit the runway during takeoff. A circular cross section handles pressure well, but it is not always the best choice for high speed aerodynamics. Like wings and airfoils, the fuselage is always a compromise among volume, weight, drag, and manufacturing cost.

5. Design limitations

5.1. The inevitability of trade-offs

There is no perfect aircraft for every flight situation. A plane that works very well at low speed might struggle at high speed. An airfoil that gives a lot of lift often comes with high drag. A wing that is very good aerodynamically may be too heavy in terms of structure. These conflicts do not happen by chance. They come from basic physical limits. So that every aircraft is built around a

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.DL33792

specific set of compromises. Those compromises are chosen based on what the plane is supposed to do.

This section summarizes four common design limitations that engineers must balance: low speed versus high speed, aerodynamics versus structure, manufacturing versus performance, and volume versus drag.

5.2. Low speed versus high speed

A very basic conflict in aircraft design is between low speed flight and high speed flight. Low speed flight includes takeoff, landing, and climbing. It needs a lot of lift and mild stall behavior. High speed cruise needs low drag. For transonic planes, it also needs to delay shock waves. An airfoil with large camber produces strong lift at low speed. But at transonic speeds, the same airfoil creates strong shock waves and high wave drag. A thin airfoil with small camber works well at high speed. However, it may not produce enough lift during takeoff and landing. To solve this problem, engineers use high lift devices like flaps and slats [10]. These devices change the wing shape during low speed flight. The downside is that they add complexity, weight, and cost.

5.3. Aerodynamic efficiency versus structural weight

What works best for aerodynamics is often bad for structure. Take a wing with a high aspect ratio as an example. This wing design lowers induced drag. But the bad side is that it creates a larger bending moment at the wing root. A thin airfoil helps cut wave drag. The problem is that it leaves very little room for strong spars inside the wing. A slim fuselage reduces pressure drag, but it may not be stiff enough to handle bending loads.

Because of these conflicts, designers have to find a middle ground. Composite materials have made this trade off easier to manage. Carbon fiber reinforced polymers are a good example. They give you high stiffness and high strength without adding much weight [11]. The Boeing 787 and the Airbus A350 use composites in many parts of the plane. Even so, composites come with their own limits. They cost more to make. They also fail in different ways than metals do.

5.4. Manufacturing cost and surface quality

Getting good aerodynamic performance often requires very precise manufacturing. Natural laminar flow airfoils are a good example. They need extremely smooth surfaces [12]. Any small roughness can be a problem. This includes rivets, uneven paint, or even insect impacts. These things can make the flow turn from laminar to turbulent too early. When that happens, drag goes up a lot. So there is a weigh between performance and practicality. A wing surface polished like a mirror may give low drag, but it costs a lot to make and is hard to keep clean. That is why many production aircraft accept a little more drag. They prefer lower manufacturing and operating costs. The same trade off applies to fuselage surface quality and how precisely the wing fuselage fairings are made.

5.5. Volume, payload, and drag

The fuselage must carry the payload. But when you make the fuselage larger, drag almost always goes up. Think about a wider fuselage. It can hold more passengers and more cargo. But it also has a bigger frontal area. A bigger frontal area leads to more pressure drag. Now think about a longer fuselage. A longer shape can help satisfy the area rule at transonic speeds. But it also adds more

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.DL33792

wetted area. More wetted area means more skin friction drag. A longer fuselage also brings extra structural weight.

You can see this trade off clearly when you compare regional jets with long range airliners. Regional jets usually have a narrower fuselage. This helps reduce drag on short flights. For these short missions, fuel efficiency is less important than how often the plane can fly. Long range airliners take a different approach. They put passenger comfort and cargo volume first. They accept the drag penalty because the extra revenue from more seats and more cargo is worth it.

6. Applications

6.1. Cessna 172 for low speed

The Cessna 172 is a small trainer aircraft. It flies at low speed. The wing is straight and uses a NACA 2412 airfoil. This airfoil gives gentle stall behavior and easy handling. The fuselage is cylindrical and simple to build. The whole design puts low cost and safety first, not aerodynamic perfection.

6.2. Boeing 787 for high speed

The Boeing 787 Dreamliner is a large airliner for long flights. It is designed to save fuel at transonic speeds. The wing is swept back and uses a supercritical airfoil. This design delays shock waves and lowers wave drag. The fuselage uses composite materials, which cut weight and allow higher cabin pressure. The raked wingtips reduce induced drag.

6.3. What the examples show

These two aircraft sit at opposite ends of the design spectrum. The Cessna 172 focuses on low speed handling, simple structure, and low cost. The Boeing 787 focuses on high speed cruise, advanced materials, and complex aerodynamics. Together, these examples make the main point clear. Aircraft design always involves trade offs. The best solution depends completely on the mission.

7. Conclusion

This paper has reviewed three fundamental components of aircraft aerodynamic design: the airfoil, the wing, and the fuselage. Each component serves a distinct function, yet none can be optimized in isolation.

The airfoil determines the basic lift and drag characteristics at the sectional level. The wing extends the airfoil into three dimensions, introducing sweep, aspect ratio, and induced drag. The fuselage accommodates the payload but adds drag and interferes with the wing's airflow.

A central theme has emerged throughout this review: aircraft design is dominated by trade-offs. Low-speed performance conflicts with high-speed efficiency. Aerodynamic shapes often conflict with structural weight. Manufacturing precision conflicts with cost. Volume and payload capacity conflict with drag.

These trade-offs are not design failures but physical realities. Every aircraft, from the simple Cessna 172 to the advanced Boeing 787, represents a specific set of compromises chosen for a specific mission. There is no single "the best" design, only designs that are more or less suited to their intended purpose.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.DL33792

Understanding these compromises is what aeronautical engineering is about. New aircraft in the future may reduce some of these limits. Engineers could use active flow control, new design like the blended wing body, or better materials. Even so, the basic need to balance different requirements will still remain.

References

[1] Abbott, I. H., & Von Doenhoff, A. E. (1959). Theory of Wing Sections. Dover Publications.
[2] Ramaswamy, M. A. (1978). Supercritical airfoils: a survey. Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Sciences Section C: Engineering Sciences, 1(1), 27-55. https: //doi.org/10.1007/BF02843514
[3] Anderson, J. D. (2016). Introduction to Flight (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
[4] Korbacher, G.K. and Sridhar, K. (1960) A note on the induced drag of jet-flapped wings. Journal of the Royal Aeronautical Society, 64(598), 617-618.
[5] Gharbia, Y., Farrokhi Derakhshandeh, J., Alam, M.M. and Amer, A.M. (2024) Developments in wingtip vorticity mitigation techniques: a comprehensive review. Aerospace, 11(1), 36. https: //doi.org/10.3390/aerospace1101003
[6] Boeing Commercial Airplanes. (2013). 787 Dreamliner: Aerodynamic design features — Raked wingtips. Boeing Technical Information.
[7] Evans, C., et al. (2024). A Mesh-Based Approach for CFD-Free Aerodynamic Optimization Using Area Ruling. Aerospace, 11(3), 182.
[8] Whitcomb, R. T. (1956). A Study of the Zero-Lift Drag-Rise Characteristics of Wing-Body Combinations Near the Speed of Sound. NACA Report 1273.
[9] Matos, N.M.B. and Marta, A.C. (2025) Aerodynamic shape optimization of wing-fuselage intersection for minimum interference drag. Aerospace, 12(5), 369. https: //doi.org/10.3390/aerospace12050369
[10] van Dam, C. P. (2002). The aerodynamic design of multi-element high-lift systems for transport airplanes. Progress in Aerospace Sciences, 38(2), 101–144. https: //doi.org/10.1016/S0376-0421(02)00002-7
[11] Raymer, D. P. (2018). Aircraft Design: A Conceptual Approach (6th ed.). AIAA.
[12] Somers, D.M. (1981) Design and experimental results for a natural-laminar-flow airfoil for general aviation applications. NASA Technical Paper 1861.