Finite deflection analysis of elastic plate by the boundary element method
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An integral equation formulation for finite deflection analysis of thin elastic plates is presented, based on general nonlinear differential equations which are equivalent to the von Kármán equations and by virtue of generalized Green identities. Boundary element discretization is applied and a relaxation iterative approach is employed to solve the nonlinear plate bending problems. A number of numerical examples are given; the results of computation are compared with the analytical solutions and good agreement is observed. It appears that the approach developed in this paper is effective.

Key words: plate, finite deflection, BEM

Much progress has been made in plate bending analysis by the boundary element method (BEM). The rapid development of this method stems from the fact that a reduction in dimensionality can often be accomplished which may result in a significant decrease in computational effort. For the linear analysis of thin plates, various integral equation formulations have been established and numerical solutions have been obtained.1-9 The applications of BEM to plate analysis have also spread to the realms of free vibration and instability analysis,10 time-dependent inelastic analysis of transverse deflection,11 and Reissner’s plate model.12 The authors, however, know of little work which has been done on the finite deflection analysis of elastic plates by BEM. Tanaka13 and Kamiya14-15 are known to have published work in this field. Tanaka13 studied the application of BEM to elastic plate bending problems with large deflections. He presented incremental integral equation formulations, which are equivalent to the von Kármán equations, while Kamiya investigated the large deflection of elastic plates based on Berger’s equation.16 The theoretical validity of Berger’s equation is often questioned and its practical use is confined to such boundary conditions as the in-plane displacements being constrained on the boundary. Recently, on the basis of the weighted residual method, Kamiya and Sawaki have presented the formulation of finite deflection analysis of plate by virtue of von Kármán plate equations,17 but no numerical results have been given.

In this paper a complete formulation is presented, which is different from Tanaka’s13 and Kamiya’s.17 for the finite deflection analysis of thin elastic plates by the BEM. Starting with the general nonlinear differential equations of finite deflection of plates, which are equivalent to the von Kármán equations (see, for example, formulae (1.60) and (1.61) in reference 18, p. 36), the BIE formulation can be deduced by means of the generalized Green identities. These integral equations possess the ability to solve the large deflection problem of plates under arbitrary boundary conditions (e.g. clamped, simply-supported, free, in-plane constrained or unconstrained) and different load conditions (e.g. transverse load, in-plane load or a combination of these). Under certain boundary conditions, some difficulties may occur in the direct use of von Kármán equations. In the formulations presented here, the effect of the interaction of the bending and membrane strains is included in the nonlinear coupling terms. An iterative procedure is applied to achieve the linearization of the nonlinear equations. In the iteration process, the proceeding results are substituted into the nonlinear coupling terms to obtain the linearized formulations for the current calculation. By virtue of discretization, the boundary integral equations are transformed into two sets of algebraic equations which correspond to the bending and membrane actions respectively. A relaxation factor has been introduced in the computation to accelerate the convergence of the iteration process. Numerical examples show that the approach developed in this paper is effective to be employed to solve the finite deflection problems of plate with various boundary conditions and load conditions.

Basic relationships

The theory of finite deflection of the plate is developed in detail in the literature (e.g. reference 18). Basic relationships are outlined here. Consider a thin elastic plate with $x_1$ and $x_2$-coordinate axes corresponding to the planar
middle surface of the plate, Figure 1a. An infinitesimal element of the plate, subjected to stresses and loads, is portrayed in Figure 1b. The material constants of the plate are represented by $E$ (Young's modulus) and $v$ (Poisson's ratio) and the bending rigidity $D = Eh^3/12(1 - v^2)$, where $h$ is the thickness of the plate. The fundamental nonlinear differential equations for large deflection of the plate, which are equivalent to von Kármán equations, are:

$$DV^4w = q + ho_i w_{,ij}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

$$a_{ij} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

$$e_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(u_{i,j} + u_{j,i} + w_{,i}w_{,j})$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

$$a_{ij} = E_{ijkl} e_{kl}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where the repeated indices imply the Einstein summation convention with the indices $i, j, k, l, \ldots \epsilon \{1, 2\}$. The tensor:

$$E_{ijkl} = \frac{2G\rho}{1 - 2\rho} \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + G(\delta_{il} \delta_{jk} + \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl})$$

where $\rho = v/(1 + v)$, $G = E/(2(1 + v))$ and $\delta_{ij}$ is the Kronecker symbol.

The bending and twisting moments $M_{ij}$ can be evaluated by the following relationships in terms of the deflection $w$:

$$M_{11} = -D(w_{,11} + vw_{,22})$$

$$M_{22} = -D(w_{,22} + vw_{,11})$$

$$M_{12} = M_{21} = -D(1 - v) w_{,12}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

The bending and twisting moments on the boundary $\Gamma$ can be written as:

$$M_n = M_{11}n_1^2 + M_{22}n_2^2 + 2M_{12}n_1n_2$$

$$M_{nn} = (M_{22} - M_{11})n_1n_2 + M_{12}(n_1^2 - n_2^2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $n_i = \cos(n, x_i)$ are direction cosines of the outward normal $n$ at the boundary.

The shear forces:

$$Q_i = M_{ij, j}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

On the boundary, the shear force $Q_n$ and the Kirchhoff equivalent shear force $K_n$ can be expressed as:

(1) linear case:

$$Q_n = Q_n n_k$$

$$K_n = Q_n + M_{nt, t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

(2) nonlinear case:

$$Q_n^{(NL)} = Q_n n_k + p_k w_{,kh}$$

$$K_n^{(NL)} = Q_n^{(NL)} + M_{nt, t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

The boundary conditions are:

(1) geometrical boundary conditions:

$$w = w_0$$

$$w_{,n} = w_{,n}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

$$u_i = \bar{u}_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

(2) mechanical boundary conditions:

$$M_n = M_n$$

$$K_n^{(NL)} = K_n^{(NL)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

$$p_i = a_{ij}n_j = \bar{p}_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where (*) means that the value is prescribed on the boundary.

Integral equation formulation

If the left-hand side of equation (1) is defined by:

$$q = q + ho_i w_{,ij}$$

a pseudo-transverse distributed load exists. It implies that the actual load $\mathcal{g}$ is adjusted by the corrector $ho_i w_{,ij}$ due to the nonlinearity of large deflection of plates. Thus, equation (1) is of the form:

$$DV^4w = q$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

The fundamental solution of biharmonic equation is:

$$w^* = w^*(P, P_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln r$$

where $r = |P_0P|$, see Figure 1a.

Substitution of equation (15) into expressions (6) and (8) gives the bending moment $M^*_n$ and the equivalent shear force $K^*_n$ corresponding to the fundamental solution $w^*$.

According to equation (14), by means of the Rayleigh-Green identity, the integral equation corresponding to the nonlinear bending deformation can be obtained in the form:

$$\int_{\Gamma} [w^*K_n - wK_n^* + w_{,n}w_{,n}M_n - w_{,n}w_{,n}M_n] d\Gamma + \int_{\Omega} qw^* d\Omega$$

$$= \left[ Dw(P_0) - Dw(P_0) \right] P_0 \in \Omega$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

$$= \left[ \frac{1}{2} Dw(P_0) - \frac{1}{2} Dw(P_0) \right] P_0 \in \Gamma$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

where the boundary $\Gamma$ is supposed to be smooth enough in the sense of Lyapunov.

Let $\xi$ be a vector at a point $P_0$ in the domain $\Omega$ of the plate (see Figure 1a). But, if the point $P_0$ is on the boundary $\Gamma$, $\xi$ denotes the outward normal. Differentiating both sides of equations (16) and (17) with respect to $\xi$, one obtains:

$$\int_{\Gamma} [w^*K_n - wK_n^* + w_{,n}w_{,n}M_n - w_{,n}w_{,n}M_n] d\Gamma + \int_{\Omega} qw^* d\Omega$$

$$= \left[ Dw, \xi(P_0) - Dw, \xi(P_0) \right] P_0 \in \Omega$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

$$= \left[ \frac{1}{2} Dw, \xi(P_0) - \frac{1}{2} Dw, \xi(P_0) \right] P_0 \in \Gamma$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

Equations (17) and (19) are the boundary integral equations equivalent to the differential equation (1). Once the unknowns included in these equations have been determined the deflection and rotation at any interior point of the domain can be calculated by use of equations (16) and (18).
Differentiation of equation (18) with respect to \( \eta \) yields:

\[
Dw_{\xi\eta}(P_0) = \int \left[ w_{\xi\eta}^* K_n - w_{n(\xi\eta)} M_n \right] \, d\Gamma + \int q w_{\xi\eta} \, d\Omega
\]

\[

to \quad \Omega
\]

where \( \eta \) is another vector at the point \( P_0 \).

Equation (20) can be applied to calculate the value of \( w_{ij} \) at any point in the domain \( \Omega \), then, substitution of these values into equation (5) provides the bending and twisting moments. The second set of boundary integral equations, which represents the nonlinear membrane deformation state, is established as follows: the fundamental solution of the two-dimensional elasticity equation is that which satisfies the equation:

\[
D_{ik} u^*_{ik} + \delta_{ij}(P, P_0) = 0
\]

(21)

here \( \delta_{ij}(P, P_0) \) is the Dirac \( \delta \)-function which represents a component in the direction \( x_j \) of a unit force acting at point \( P_0 \) in the direction \( x_i \).

In conformity with the linear fundamental solution, the strain-displacement and stress-strain relations can be written, respectively, as:

\[
\varepsilon_{ij}^* = \frac{1}{2}(u_{ij}^* + u_{ji}^*)
\]

(22)

\[
\sigma_{ij}^* = E_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{kl}^*
\]

(23)

As a consequence of the application of the Green formula, taking into account equations (3), (4), (22) and (23), the following identity can be established:

\[
\int_{\Omega} \sigma_{ij} u_{ij}^* \, d\Omega - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{ij}^* u_{ij} \, d\Omega = \int_{\Gamma} p_{ij} u_{ij}^* \, d\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma} p_{ij} u_{ij} \, d\Gamma - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{ij}^{\ast} w_{ij}\, d\Omega
\]

(24)

Substitution of equations (2) and (21) into (24) gives:

\[
\int_{\Gamma} p_{ij} u_{ij}^* \, d\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma} p_{ij} u_{ij} \, d\Gamma - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \sigma_{ij}^{\ast} w_{ij}\, d\Omega = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{1}{2} u_i(P_0) & P_0 \in \Omega \\
\frac{1}{2} u_i(P_0) & P_0 \in \Gamma
\end{array} \right.
\]

(25)

(26)

where the boundary \( \Gamma \) is smooth and the subscript \( i \) indicates that the direction of the unit force is \( x_i \).

The fundamental solution \( u_{ij}^* \) and \( p_{ij}^* \) for the isotropic material is given in reference 19, p. 139, and the expression for \( \sigma_{ij}^{\ast} \) is written as:

\[
\sigma_{ij}^{\ast} = \frac{1}{4 \pi (1 - \nu)} \left[ 2 \delta_{ij} \delta_{ik} \delta_{kl} + (1 - 2 \nu) \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + (1 - \nu) \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} \right]
\]

(27)

where \( \nu = \nu_1(1 + \nu) \), \( r_i = \partial \eta / \partial x_i \).

Equation (26) is the boundary integral equation which is equivalent to the differential equations of nonlinear membrane deformation (2)-(4).

Differentiating both sides of equation (25), yields:

\[
\frac{\partial u_{ij}(P_0)}{\partial x_{ij}} = \int p_{ik} \frac{\partial u_{ij}^*}{\partial x_{ij}} \, d\Gamma - \int \frac{\partial \sigma_{ikj}}{\partial x_{ij}} u_{ij} \, d\Omega
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{ij}} \int \sigma_{ikj} w_{ij} \, d\Omega
\]

(28)

Considering that the expression (27) includes singularity, the derivative of the improper integral:

\[
\int \sigma_{ikj} w_{ij} \, d\Omega
\]

with respect to the parameter \( x_{ij} \) can be performed as:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{ij}} \int \sigma_{ikj} w_{ij} \, d\Omega
\]

(29)

where:

\[
\int \frac{\partial \sigma_{ikj}}{\partial x_{ij}} w_{ij} \, d\Omega
\]

is a Cauchy-type integral.

Substituting (29) into (28) and taking into account the geometric relationship (3) and the constitutive relationship (4), one obtains the membrane stress expression:

\[
a_{ij}(P_0) = \int D_{ijk} P_k \, d\Gamma - \int S_{ijk} u_k \, d\Gamma
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{2} \int T_{ijk} w_{ij} \, d\Omega
\]

\[
+ \frac{G}{8(1 - \nu)} \left( 2 w_{ij} w_{ij} + w_{ij} w_{ij} \delta_{ij} \right) P_0 \in \Omega
\]

(30)

The expressions for \( D_{ijk} \) and \( S_{ijk} \) are shown in reference 19, p. 130, and \( T_{ijk} \) is of the form:

\[
T_{ijk} = \frac{\phi_{ijk}(P, P_0)}{r^2}
\]

(31)

where:

\[
\phi_{ijk} = \frac{G}{2\pi (1 - \nu)} \left[ 8 r_{ij} r_{ij} r_{kl} + \left( 1 - 4 \nu \right) \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} \right]
\]

\[
- \left( 1 - 2 \nu \right) \left( 2 \delta_{ijk} \delta_{ij} + 2 \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} \right)
\]

\[
+ \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} - 2 \delta_{ik} r_{ij} r_{ij} + \delta_{kl} r_{ij} r_{ij}
\]

\[
+ \delta_{ik} r_{ij} + \delta_{kl} r_{ij} + \delta_{ij} r_{ij} + \delta_{kl} r_{ij} \]

(32)
therefore, in equation (30) the integral:

\[ \int_{\Omega} T_{ijkl} w_{ij}w_{kl} \, d\Omega = \int_{\Omega} \Phi_{ijkl} \, w_{ij}w_{kl} \, d\Omega \]

is a singular integral. Let \( L \) be a circle of radius \( \rho \) with the centre at point \( P_0 \). It can be proved that the function \( \Phi_{ijkl} \) satisfies the condition:

\[ \int_{\Gamma} \Phi_{ijkl} \, d\Gamma = 0 \]

This is the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of the Cauchy principal value of the aforementioned singular integral.\(^{20}\)

Thus, the boundary integral equation formulations (17), (19) and (26) for the finite deflection analysis of elastic plates have been obtained. However, these boundary integral equations cannot be solved by the conventional technique due to the nonlinear bending and membrane coupling terms.

**Technique of iterative solution**

For the purpose of solution, an iterative procedure is developed. In the process of iteration, the values of \( w_{ij} \) and \( q_{ij} \) obtained in the preceding cycle of iteration are substituted into the \( q = q + h q_{ij} w_{ij} \) to approximate the pseudo-transverse distributed load for the calculation of the current cycle. Thus, the nonlinear boundary integral equations (17), (19) and (26) are transformed into the linear equations for each cycle of iteration.

After performing the discretization by use of various kinds of boundary elements (e.g. constant element, linear element or high-order element), the boundary integral equations (17) and (19) become a set of algebraic equations:

\[ A x = q(\alpha_{ij} ; w_{ij}) \quad (33) \]

and the equation (26) is transformed into another set of algebraic equations:

\[ B y = f(w_{ij}) \quad (34) \]

In equations (33) and (34) \( A \) and \( B \) are the matrices of coefficients of the algebraic equations; \( x \) and \( y \) are the unknown vectors of boundary variables. On the right-hand side of the equation (33), the vector \( q \) is determined by \( \alpha_{ij} \) and \( w_{ij} \), and in (34) the vector \( f \) can be found if \( w_{ij} \) is known.

The relaxation iterative procedure can be illustrated as follows: suppose that \( w_{ij}(K) \), \( \alpha_{ij}(K) \), etc. express the \( K \)th approximations. The initial values of the iteration \( (K = 0) \) can be set arbitrarily, for example, \( \alpha_{ij}^{(0)} = 0, w_{ij}^{(0)} = 0 \). In the iteration one can solve for \( K = 0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots \):

1. \[ A x^{(K+1)} = q(\alpha_{ij}^{(K)} ; w_{ij}^{(K)}) \]

2. \[ B y^{(K+1)} = f(w_{ij}^{(K+1)}) \]

\[ \text{to obtain } x^{(K+1)}, \text{ and then to evaluate } w^{(K+1)}, w_{ij}^{(K+1)} \text{ and } w^{(K+1)} \text{ in the domain} \]

\[ \text{to find } y^{(K+1)}, \text{ and then to calculate } u_{ij}^{(K+1)} \text{ and } \alpha_{ij}^{(K+1)}. \]

The iteration is continued until the change in the current estimate of the maximum deflection is small enough, i.e. until:

\[ |w_{\text{max}}^{(K+1)} - w_{\text{max}}^{(K)}| < \varepsilon \quad (35) \]

where \( \varepsilon \) is the convergence tolerance; otherwise:

\[ w_{ij}^{(K+1)} = \beta w_{ij}^{(K)} + (1 - \beta) w_{ij}^{(K)} \]

where \( \beta \) is the relaxation factor, and then continue the iteration.

It is interesting to note that in (33) and (34) the matrices \( A, B \) and other matrices for the calculation of all values in the domain depend only upon the geometric and material parameters of plates. Once these matrices have been formed, they can be stored in the core and used in each cycle of iteration without any change. It can reduce the computing time by about three-quarters.

**Numerical examples**

Numerical examples are presented to show the feasibility and efficiency of the proposed approach. In these examples constant elements are used. The boundary element division and the interior mesh are illustrated in Figure 2.

**Example 1: Clamped circular plate under uniform lateral load**

Figure 3 shows the numerical results of the maximum deflection \( w_{\text{max}} \) obtained in this study, which are compared with those given in reference 21. The error of \( w_{\text{max}}/h \) with 20 boundary elements in comparison with the analytical solutions is less than 0.60%.

**Example 2: Clamped square plate under uniform lateral load**

In addition to the case of the in-plane immovable boundary condition, i.e. the case of existing constraints on the membrane deformations on the boundary, the case of movable boundary condition (without constraints on the membrane deformations on the boundary) is also considered in this example. Numerical results are shown in Figure 4.

**Example 3: Simply supported square plate under uniform lateral load**

As in Example 2, immovable and movable edges are studied separately. The numerical results obtained and the analytical solutions are shown in Figure 5 for comparison.
In the case of in-plane movable boundary conditions of Examples 2 and 3, the first order approximations given in reference 18 are cited for comparison with the present results for lack of exact solutions. For the simply supported square plate with movable edges, the present results are very close to the experimental data. It appears that the approach developed in this paper gives more accurate results than the first-order approximation.

The rate of convergence depends upon the appropriate choice of relaxation factors. In the above examples, the cycles of iteration are, on average, less than 20 with an error tolerance \( \varepsilon = 0.00005 \).

**Conclusions**

The effectiveness of the approach developed in this paper has been shown by numerical examples. This approach appears to be very promising for the finite deflection analysis of thin elastic plates with various boundary conditions and load conditions.
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