

Sensitivity Derivatives for Static Test Loading Boundary Conditions

Zafer Gürdal* and Raphael T. Haftka†
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

THE adjoint variable technique (known also as the dummy load technique¹) is widely used for calculating sensitivity derivatives of stress and displacement constraints in structural optimization applications. It is more efficient than the direct method for obtaining these derivatives when the number of design variables is larger than the number of active displacement or stress constraints.

The application of the method is straightforward for simple displacement or stress boundary conditions. For more generalized boundary conditions it requires specialized treatment. Hsieh and Arora,² for example, employ Lagrange multipliers to extend the method to general displacement boundary conditions. The present Note is concerned with the application of the adjoint variable method under the special combination of displacement and stress boundary conditions which occurs when static test conditions are simulated.

In a typical loading apparatus the load is transmitted to the specimen through components which are much more rigid than the specimen itself. When the test is to be simulated by a finite element analysis it is possible to model both the specimen and the loading device and employ only force (or stress) boundary conditions. However, aside from the increased computational cost due to a more complex model, the problem becomes ill conditioned because of the disparity between the rigidities of the specimen and loading apparatus.

It, therefore, is preferable to solve the problem employing a two-stage process. First, unit displacements (in the direction of the load) are applied to a finite element model of the specimen. The internal stresses and displacements are calculated, as well as the total reaction force at the boundary. Next, the ratio between the applied load and the total reaction force due to unit displacements is calculated and the fields of internal stresses and displacements are multiplied by that ratio.

The partitioned form of the equilibrium equation for a structure discretized by a finite element model can be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_{aa} & K_{ad} \\ K_{ad}^T & K_{dd} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} U_I \\ I \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ R_I \end{Bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where K_{aa} , K_{ad} , and K_{dd} are submatrices of the stiffness matrix, U_I the unknown displacement vector per unit applied displacements, I the vector of unit boundary displacements, R_I the reaction vector per unit applied displacement, and 0 a null vector.

The total load applied to the specimen when the displacement vector I is specified is

$$f_I = I^T R_I \quad (2)$$

If the required applied load is f , then the total displacement vector U is

$$U = s U_I \quad (3)$$

where

$$s = f/f_I \quad (4)$$

Assume that the derivative of some function g of the displacement field (e.g., a stress component) with respect to a design parameter x is required. The function can also depend explicitly on the design parameter so that $g = g(x, U)$. The derivative of g with respect to x may be written as

$$\frac{dg}{dx} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x} + Z^T \frac{dU}{dx} \quad (5)$$

where Z denotes a vector with $z_i = \partial g / \partial u_i$. Using Eq. (3) we obtain

$$\frac{dg}{dx} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x} + Z^T \left[\frac{ds}{dx} U_I + s \frac{dU_I}{dx} \right] \quad (6)$$

To obtain dU_I/dx , differentiate Eq. (1) with respect to x

$$K_{aa} \frac{dU_I}{dx} = - \frac{dK_{ad}}{dx} I - \frac{dK_{aa}}{dx} U_I \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{dR_I}{dx} = \frac{dK_{ad}^T}{dx} U_I + K_{ad}^T \frac{dU_I}{dx} + \frac{dK_{dd}}{dx} I \quad (8)$$

Finally, to obtain ds/dx , differentiate Eqs. (2) and (4)

$$\frac{ds}{dx} = \frac{df}{dx} / f_I - \frac{s}{f_I} I^T \frac{dR_I}{dx} \quad (9)$$

The direct method for obtaining dg/dx starts by solving Eq. (7) for dU_I/dx , then obtaining dR_I/dx from Eq. (8) and ds/dx from Eq. (9), and, finally, using Eq. (6). The direct method has a disadvantage that the entire process of calculation has to be repeated for any other design variable.

To obtain the adjoint method we first transform Eq. (9) with the aid of Eqs. (1), (7), and (8)

$$\frac{ds}{dx} = \frac{df}{dx} / f_I - \frac{s}{f_I} \left[2I^T \frac{dK_{ad}^T}{dx} U_I + I^T \frac{dK_{dd}}{dx} I + U_I^T \frac{dK_{aa}}{dx} U_I \right] \quad (10)$$

An adjoint variable Λ is now defined as the solution to

$$K_{aa} \Lambda = Z \quad (11)$$

Using Eqs. (7) and (11), Eq. (6) becomes

$$\frac{dg}{dx} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x} + \frac{ds}{dx} Z^T U_I - s \Lambda^T \left(\frac{dK_{ad}}{dx} I + \frac{dK_{aa}}{dx} U_I \right) \quad (12)$$

Now, dg/dx can be evaluated from Eq. (12), where ds/dx is given by Eq. (10). The major difference between the adjoint variable and the direct method is that instead of solving Eq.

Received Oct. 6, 1983. Copyright © 1984 by Z. Gürdal. Published by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics with permission.

*Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Aerospace and Ocean Engineering. Student Member AIAA.

†Professor, Department of Aerospace and Ocean Engineering. Member AIAA.

(7) for dU_1/dx one solves Eq. (11) for Λ . For large systems the solution process for these equations is the major computational cost in the derivative calculation. Because Eq. (7) depends only on the design variable x and Eq. (11) on the constraint g , the use of the adjoint method is preferred when the number of design variables is larger than the number of constraints. The direct method is better when the number of constraints is larger than the number of design variables.

Acknowledgment

This work was sponsored by NASA grant NAG-1-168.

References

- ¹Haug, E. J. and Arora, J. S., *Applied Optimal Design*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1979.
- ²Hsieh, C. C. and Arora, J. S., "Structural Design Sensitivity Analysis with General Boundary Conditions," University of Iowa Tech. Rept. CAD-SS-83.5, March 1983.

From the AIAA Progress in Astronautics and Aeronautics Series...

ENTRY HEATING AND THERMAL PROTECTION—v. 69

HEAT TRANSFER, THERMAL CONTROL, AND HEAT PIPES—v. 70

Edited by Walter B. Olstad, NASA Headquarters

The era of space exploration and utilization that we are witnessing today could not have become reality without a host of evolutionary and even revolutionary advances in many technical areas. Thermophysics is certainly no exception. In fact, the interdisciplinary field of thermophysics plays a significant role in the life cycle of all space missions from launch, through operation in the space environment, to entry into the atmosphere of Earth or one of Earth's planetary neighbors. Thermal control has been and remains a prime design concern for all spacecraft. Although many noteworthy advances in thermal control technology can be cited, such as advanced thermal coatings, louvered space radiators, low-temperature phase-change material packages, heat pipes and thermal diodes, and computational thermal analysis techniques, new and more challenging problems continue to arise. The prospects are for increased, not diminished, demands on the skill and ingenuity of the thermal control engineer and for continued advancement in those fundamental discipline areas upon which he relies. It is hoped that these volumes will be useful references for those working in these fields who may wish to bring themselves up-to-date in the applications to spacecraft and a guide and inspiration to those who, in the future, will be faced with new and, as yet, unknown design challenges.

Volume 69—361 pp., 6 × 9, illus., \$22.00 Mem., \$37.50 List
Volume 70—393 pp., 6 × 9, illus., \$22.00 Mem., \$37.50 List

TO ORDER WRITE: Publications Dept., AIAA, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10104