..." Dr. Rodden insisted that "solution procedure" should be read as "a new solution." Thus, the author's intention of developing a finite element procedure was misinterpreted as claiming a new solution. By twisting such key words, Dr. Rodden found himself a chance to tell a long story in the *AIAA Journal* about his Ph.D. thesis.

Dr. Rodden asked "What's new?" between the finite element displacement method the author used and the kind of old, obsolete flexibility influence coefficient method he used. The answers are as follows:

1) The finite element displacement model in this paper has displacement and slope degrees-of-freedom at nodal points and provides a 4×4 stiffness matrix. In the examples, four elements and six degrees of freedom are used. Dr. Rodden included only the displacements at the nine collocation control points, neglected the important slope degrees of freedom, and formulated the 9×9 flexibility matrix for the ten-segment span. Although Dr. Rodden claimed that his approach was the finite element method, clearly it was not. Not all the matrix methods are finite element methods!

2) In this paper, the consistent mass matrix is used. Dr. Rodden used a lump mass diagonal matrix. The obvious difference in the resulting accuracy between the consistent mass and the lumped mass diagonal matrices for the case of beams or infinite plates was pointed out by Archer (Ref. 13 in the Comment). In the dynamic eigenvalue problems of beams or infinite plates, it is possible that one can use an inferior flexibility matrix and an inferior lumped mass matrix simultaneously and be satisfied with the results due to the compensation of modeling errors.

3) The incremental stiffness matrix in this paper can accurately account for the important effect of initial in-plane stresses. This point is studied by the author. Examples are performed and results are presented in Figs. 6-8. Such effect was not considered by Dr. Rodden in his thesis.

4) The beauty of a numerical method does not necessarily lie in its sophistication. When the simple trapezoidal rule can achieve excellent accuracy in approximating the aerodynamic pressure, the use of sophisticated higher-order numerical integration method is of no value, especially when the structural model is crude.

Since their appearance in 1956[1] the finite element methods have sometimes been criticized for the emphasis on the methodology rather than new theory. The methods have gradually gained widespread acceptance because of their powerfulness in solving the practical problems which cannot be solved otherwise. In the development of each new finite element method, it is necessary to choose some examples with known solutions for comparison and evaluation. Once the method is evaluated, it can be used for more general and practical cases. In this paper, Cunningham's examples and solution in Ref. 7 were chosen for such an evaluation purpose. Reference 7 was published earlier than Dr. Rodden's thesis. It is absolutely pointless to reference a thesis later published by Dr. Rodden which provides the same solution as Ref. 7.

This paper establishes a basic procedure of extending the finite element method (displacement models) to include the aerodynamic effects for flutter analysis. Previous similar attempts have been made by Olson (Refs. 1 and 2 of original paper), Kariappa et al.[2] (Refs. 3 and 4 of original paper), and Sander et al.[2] The basic development in this paper has recently been extended to include the effect of thermal buckling and geometric nonlinearity[3] and three-dimensional supersonic unsteady potential flow.[4] Contrary to a footnote in the Comment, it has been shown in Ref. 4 that the computing expense is not prohibitive in using the supersonic Mach box method.

References

[1]Turner, M. J., Clough, R. W., Martin, H. C., and Topp, L. J., "Stiffness and Deflection Analysis of Complex Structures," *Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences*, Vol. 23, Sept. 1956, pp. 805-823.

[2]Sander, G., Bon, C., and Geradin, M., "Finite Element Analysis of Supersonic Panel Flutter," *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, Vol. 7, 1973, pp. 379-394.

[3]Yang, T. Y. and Han, A. D., "Flutter of Thermally Buckled Finite Element Panels," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 14, July 1976, pp. 975-977.

[4]Sung, S. H. and Yang, T. Y., "A Finite Element Procedure for Flutter Analysis of Plates in 3-D Supersonic Unsteady Potential Flow," *2nd International Symposium on Finite Element Methods in Flow Problems*, Santa Margherita Ligure, Italy, June 14-18, 1976, pp. 651-662.

Comment on "Localized Diamond-Shaped Buckling Patterns of Axially Compressed Cylindrical Shells"

P. Kaoulla*
Husband & Company, London, England

I READ with great interest several articles on the isometric buckling of shells.[1] However, I am unable to trace how the vital coefficients K_I, K_I are derived so perhaps El Naschie could give the derivation of these coefficients in detail. This would be of great help to the reader.

I would also like to ask about the connection to the work of Yoshimura.[2] El Naschie does not refer to this work although it seems to me to deal with similar ideas.

Finally, great interest has been awakened in an engineering approach to shell buckling along similar lines since the publication of El Naschie's first work. This is mainly due to the recent works of Edlund,[3] Fritz and Wittek,[4] and Croll.[5] Perhaps El Naschie could comment on these works and their interrelationship. Such a comparison would help to lessen the confusion arising from the numerous shell buckling theories.

References

[1]El Naschie, M.S., "Localized diamond shaped buckling patterns of axially compressed cylindrical shells," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 13, June 1975 pp. 837-838.

[2]Yoshimura, Y., "On the mechanism of buckling of a circular cylindrical shell under end compression," NACA TM 1390 1955.

[3]Edlund, B. L. O., "Thin-walled cylindrical shells under axial compression. Pre-buckling, buckling and post buckling behaviour. Monte Carlo simulation of the scatter in load carrying capacity," DSc thesis, Chalmers Tekniska Hogskola, Goteborg, 1974.

[4]Fritz, H. and Wittek, U., "On the stability of surface structures," (In German with English summary). "Zur Stabilität der Flachentragwerke," Technisch-wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen des Instituts für konstruktiven Ingenieurbau der Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Nr. 74-6, July 1974.

[5]Croll, J. G. A. "Towards simple estimates of shell buckling loads" *Der Stahlbau*, Vol. 44, No. 8, p. 243-248 and No. 9, p. 283-285 1975.

Received Aug. 31, 1976
Index category: Structural Stability Analysis.
*Consulting Engineer.

Reply by Author to P. Kaoulla

M. S. El Naschie*
University of Riyadh, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

I WOULD like to thank P. Kaoulla for his interest in the work and for his relevant remarks. As for the derivation of

Received Jan. 5, 1977.
Index category: Structural Stability.
*Member, Faculty of Engineering.