Nonlinear analysis of tape springs: Comparison of two geometrically exact finite element formulations

Florence Dewalque, Valentin Sonneville and Olivier Brüls

Dept. of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Liège, Belgium



11th World Congress on Computational Mechanics 5th European Conference on Computational Mechanics Barcelona, July 22, 2014



Outline

Tape springs

- Motivations for a formulation of shells on the special Euclidean group
- Comparison with a classical formulation
 - Test cases
 - Tape springs



Tape springs – Main features

Definition: Thin plate curved along its width used as a compliant mechanism characterised by its elastic deformation

General characteristics:

- Elastic energy
- Deformation
- No external energy sources
- Space applications





Tape springs – Mechanical behaviour

- Nonlinear behaviour
- Buckling, hysteresis and self-locking phenomena
- Senses of bending





Formulation of shells on SE(3)

Motivations:

- Framework based on the Lie group theory where rotations and translations are treated in a unified and frame invariant way
- Equilibrium equations formulated in a parameterization-free way
- Singularities due to rotation parameterization naturally avoided
- Significant reduction of the geometrical nonlinearities
- Locking-free and coupled nonlinear interpolation field for translations and rotations
- No need to update the tangent stiffness matrix at each iteration/time step

Classical formulation = use of the commercial software SAMCEF in which shells are based on the Mindlin-Reissner model

Flat plate with a lumped mass submitted to bending (10 Nm)



Classical formulation = use of the commercial software SAMCEF in which shells are based on the Mindlin-Reissner model

Flat plate with a lumped mass submitted to bending (10 Nm)



Flat plate with a lumped mass submitted to bending (500 Nm)



Flat plate with a lumped mass submitted to bending (500 Nm)



Flat plate submitted to a surface force (1000 N/m²)



Circular plate submitted to a surface force (100 N/m²)



Square plate submitted to a surface force (1000 N/m²)



Rhombic plate submitted to a surface force (1 N/m²)









Barrel roof submitted to a surface force (6250 N/m²)





Tape spring submitted to a surface force (10 000 N/m²)



Conclusions

- Convergence to the same results for the formulation on SE(3) and the classical formulation (Samcef)
- No need to always update the tangent stiffness matrix
- Reduction of the amount of geometric nonlinearities
- Good representation of nonlinear behaviours
- Good representation of structures with an initial curvature (tape springs)

Next developments:

- Improvement of the convergence rate
- Dynamic formulation
- Add a continuation method to model the buckling in tape springs

Thank you for your attention

Nonlinear analysis of tape springs: Comparison of two geometrically exact finite element formulations

Florence Dewalque, Valentin Sonneville and Olivier Brüls

Dept. of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Liège, Belgium



11th World Congress on Computational Mechanics 5th European Conference on Computational Mechanics Barcelona, July 22, 2014

