

Multiobjective Evolutionary Structural Optimization Using Combined Static/Dynamic Control Parameters

Woo-Young Kim* and Ramana V. Grandhi†
Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45435

and

Mark Haney‡

U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433

A thermal protection system (TPS) is responsible for protecting a spacecraft's components from melting due to high reentry temperatures. In the design of TPS, both maximum thermal stress and minimum natural frequency must be considered due to the combined thermoacoustic environment inherent in high-speed vehicle applications. A multiobjective structural optimization method for the three-dimensional acreage TPS design is developed using an evolutionary structural optimization (ESO) algorithm. The static control parameter used to find the optimum in minimum thermal stress design is modified to address an irregular mode-switching phenomenon, as well as to improve the modal stiffness in dynamic analysis. Two objectives are optimized simultaneously, namely, the maximization of fundamental natural frequency and the minimization of maximum thermal stress. The proposed modified control parameter is demonstrated in the design of a metallic TPS using the method of weighted objectives. The results are then compared with the conventional ESO sensitivity approach. This work concludes by applying the methodology which makes use of both topology and shape optimization in the design of an acreage TPS.

Nomenclature

$\{F_r\}$	= external force vector for the r th natural mode
$\{f\}$	= global nodal force vector
$[K]$	= global stiffness matrix
$[M]$	= global mass matrix
N	= total number of degrees of freedom
n	= number of degrees of freedom
P	= correlation factor
$R_{j,l}$	= ratio between $\sigma_{j,l}^{vm}$ and $\sigma_{j,max}^{vm}$
S_j^{multi}	= multiobjective control parameter for the j th element
W_j	= j th criterion weighting factor
$\{x\}$	= global nodal displacement vector
$\{\ddot{x}\}$	= global nodal acceleration vector
α	= parameter for the element removal
$\{\varepsilon\}$	= modal displacement vector
$\sigma_{j,l}^{vm}$	= j th von Mises stress for the l th element
$\sigma_{j,max}^{vm}$	= maximum value of the j th von Mises stress
$\{\Phi\}$	= natural mode
ω	= natural frequency
$\ \cdot\ $	= L^2 norm

I. Introduction

PRIMARY challenges that must be addressed to enable lower-cost access to space are weight, reusability, and ease of maintenance. The current methodology for the design of space and high-speed air vehicles is to construct a low-temperature load-bearing structure and then to apply a thermal protective layer, also

known as a thermal protection system (TPS), whose purpose is to shield the low-temperature structure. A successful TPS not only will perform its primary function of maintaining the underlying vehicle structure within acceptable temperature limits, but also must be durable, operable, cost-effective, and lightweight. By its very nature, TPS is parasitic. Current research efforts in hot structures are investigating the feasibility of using advanced structural materials that can provide both structural rigidity and survivability in the high-temperature environment. No conclusion has yet been reached as to which of the two approaches will prove most efficient. Hence, continued research into parasitic TPS is extremely relevant.

Existing TPS consists of different types of materials that are distributed over the spacecraft. These various thermal insulators consist of felt blankets, ceramic blankets, ceramic tiles, and carbon-carbon leading edges, as well as metallic TPS. Metallic TPS has obvious advantages and disadvantages; the nature and response of metals is well understood. Furthermore, the durability and fracture toughness of metals are generally much greater than those of ceramics. One disadvantage of metallic systems is weight. This work attempts to mitigate this effect through weight minimization.

The metallic TPS design for a spacecraft operating in extreme environments of thermal and acoustic loading is of significant importance.¹ Design considerations for thermal and acoustic loading conditions tend to be at odds with one another. Floating or compliant designs will tend to reduce thermal stresses, whereas less compliant designs increase natural frequency and avoid excitation from wideband random engine noise. To address the TPS design efficiently, optimization methods are essential from the standpoint both of identifying a potentially small feasible region and of driving toward low-weight designs.

Traditional structural topology optimization methods, such as the density-based method,² the homogenization method,^{3,4} and the evolutionary structural optimization (ESO) method,^{5,6} are applicable to multiobjective optimization problems concerned with static or dynamic problems. Multiobjective optimization is the method of forming a solution that satisfies a number of conflicting objectives in the "best" way possible. That is, multiobjective optimization is the generation of a design that achieves the optimum performance of the structure while consideration is given to various criteria.^{7,8} The solution to the multiobjective problem is known as a Pareto optimum.^{8,9} Pareto optima are not unique solutions but rather consist of a series of solutions.¹⁰

Received 4 April 2005; presented as Paper 2005-2311 at the AIAA Structures, Structural Dynamics, and Materials Conference, Austin, TX, 18–21 April 2005; revision received 12 September 2005; accepted for publication 13 September 2005. This material is declared a work of the U.S. Government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Copies of this paper may be made for personal or internal use, on condition that the copier pay the \$10.00 per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923; include the code 0001-1452/06 \$10.00 in correspondence with the CCC.

*Postdoctoral Researcher, Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering.

†Distinguished Professor, Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering. Fellow AIAA.

‡Aerospace Engineer, Air Vehicles Directorate.

This paper incorporates the multiobjective optimization problem into the ESO algorithm using the weighted objectives technique. The ESO method developed by Xie and Steven in 1992 slowly removes inefficient material from a structure, and the residual shape of the structure evolves as an optimum.⁵ The ESO procedure does not address the mode-switching phenomenon that is common in three-dimensional dynamic problems. Mode switching is a phenomenon that changes the ordering of natural modes with structural modification. The phenomenon often occurs between the natural mode of interest and the neighboring orthogonal natural modes. The natural frequency of interest and the modal stiffness are drastically affected, resulting in convergence difficulties and/or nonoptimal configurations. In two-dimensional structures, Xie and his colleagues attempted to prevent the phenomenon by increasing the separation between frequencies.¹¹ However, this method is not applicable to three-dimensional structures in which the phenomenon occurs unpredictably during design iterations. In addition, as the number of elements eliminated increases during the iterative ESO process, a sudden drop in the natural frequency of interest is observed. This is a direct result of the modal stiffness decrease associated with the current level of element removal. The ESO method and the associated dynamic sensitivity number⁵ fail to consider modal stiffness directly. Consequently, these problems make it harder for the ESO method to determine the Pareto optimum in the multiobjective optimization⁶ that contains dynamic characteristics.

In this paper, the modified static control parameter using von Mises stress is newly formulated to prevent nonsmooth changes in modal stiffness and the associated natural frequency of interest. This modified static control parameter smoothes the iterative process by introducing a correlation between the natural mode of interest and its neighboring modes, as well as a consideration of the modal stiffness. Using the proposed control parameter, the ESO method results in a lightweight TPS model with improved static and dynamic characteristics even though the mode-switching phenomena are observed frequently in the iterative steps. These improvements are accomplished through efficient material volume reduction.

In the next section, control parameters for static and dynamic analysis based on von Mises stress are formulated. Section III presents the details of the multiobjective optimization technique. The evolutionary optimization algorithm is described in Sec. IV. In Sec. V, two relevant metallic TPS models with different load cases are presented to demonstrate the applicability of the ESO method with the proposed control parameter.

II. Sensitivity Analysis

Like most other structural optimization methods, the ESO method must be iterated many times. It is important to search for the removal positions where the effect is high for achieving the objective as accurately and quickly as possible. In this section, two kinds of control parameters (called sensitivity numbers⁵), based on static analysis, are presented as guidelines for the removal of the finite elements. In particular, the modified static control parameter is newly developed to reduce the problems of the weakness of the modal stiffness and the mode-switching phenomenon in dynamics.

A. Control Parameter for Static Analysis

The stress level in each element can be measured by an average of all of the stress components. For this purpose, the von Mises stress has been one of the most frequently used criteria for isotropic materials. The von Mises stress σ_l^{vm} of the l th element for a three-dimensional structure is defined as

$$\sigma_l^{\text{vm}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{(\sigma_{x,l} - \sigma_{y,l})^2 + (\sigma_{y,l} - \sigma_{z,l})^2 + (\sigma_{z,l} - \sigma_{x,l})^2 + 6(\tau_{xy,l}^2 + \tau_{yz,l}^2 + \tau_{zx,l}^2)} \quad (1)$$

Here, $\sigma_{x,l}$, $\sigma_{y,l}$, and $\sigma_{z,l}$ are normal stresses of the l th element in the x , y , and z directions, respectively, and $\tau_{xy,l}$, $\tau_{yz,l}$, and $\tau_{zx,l}$ are the shear stresses of the l th element.

According to the ESO algorithm, a reliable sign of potential structural failure is excessive stress or strain, and a low-stressed element is assumed to be underutilized in the structure. Ideally, the stress in every part of a structure should be near the same safe level. By gradual removal of material that has a lower stress, the stress level in the new designs becomes more and more uniform. By defining the von Mises stress as the static control parameter in the static analysis, a number of elements with the smallest static control parameter are removed so that the increase of the maximum von Mises stress is minimal. The removal process must be slightly modified when the stresses are primarily thermally induced.¹²

B. Control Parameter for Dynamic Analysis

The dynamic control parameter in the ESO method^{5,11} is derived from the Rayleigh quotient and is based on the natural mode of interest. This control parameter estimates only the change of the natural frequency of interest. No direct consideration is given to the modal stiffness. Also, when mode switching is observed during the optimization process, the characteristic of the dynamic control parameter varies drastically due to the change in the natural mode of interest. These effects can make the modal stiffness very small bringing about a drastic change in the natural frequency of interest when a large number of elements are eliminated from the structure through many iterative steps.

To address the shortcomings of the traditional ESO method, a static control parameter using von Mises stress is developed, which gives direct consideration to the modal stiffness as a substitute for the conventional dynamic control parameter based on the Rayleigh quotient. In addition, this static control parameter is modified so that consideration is given to adjacent natural modes, as well as the natural mode of interest thus preventing a rapid change in the characteristic of the control parameter.

The derivation of the modified static control parameter for dynamics is as follows. The equation of motion for an undamped system is described by

$$[M]\{\ddot{x}\} + [K]\{x\} = \{f\} \quad (2)$$

where $[M]$ and $[K]$ are the global mass matrix and global stiffness matrix, respectively, and $\{x\}$ and $\{f\}$ are the global nodal displacement and nodal force vectors, respectively. The displacement in the spatial coordinates of Eq. (2) can also be expressed by using the modal coordinates by

$$\{x\} = \varepsilon_1\{\Phi_1\} + \varepsilon_2\{\Phi_2\} + \cdots + \varepsilon_N\{\Phi_N\} = [\Phi]\{\varepsilon\} \quad (3)$$

where N is the total number of degrees of freedom, and $\{\Phi\}$ and $\{\varepsilon\}$ represent natural modes and modal displacements, respectively.

Using Eq. (3) and the characteristics of generalized orthogonality, the response in the spatial coordinates is derived as

$$\{x\} = \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{\{\Phi_r\}\{\Phi_r\}^T\{F\}}{-\omega^2 m_r + k_r} e^{j\omega t} \quad (4)$$

where ω is the natural frequency, $\{\Phi_r\}^T[M]\{\Phi_r\} = m_r = 1$, $\{\Phi_r\}^T[K]\{\Phi_r\} = k_r$, and $\{f\} = \{F\}e^{j\omega t}$.

In this method, the displacement of each nodal point is computed by implementing the concept of a virtual static displacement for each mode shape. The virtual static displacement is chosen to be the same displacement shape as that of the mode shape. The displacement for each mode shape is derived by assuming $\omega = 0$. The absolute value of the displacement is given by

$$\{x\} = \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{\{\Phi_r\}\{\Phi_r\}^T\{F\}}{k_r} = [\Phi][k_r]^{-1}[\Phi]^T\{F\} \quad (5)$$

Note that $[k_r] = \text{diag}(k_1, \dots, k_N)$. From Eq. (5), $[k_r]^{-1}[\Phi]^T \{F\}$ indicates a modal displacement that is generated by the external force $\{F\}$. The natural mode $\{\Phi_r\}$ can be treated as a response (displacement) by applying the external force whose modal displacement is 1 for the r th mode and 0 for other modes. When $\{F_r\}$ is the external force satisfying this condition, $\{F_r\}$ is easily obtained by the relationship between the displacement and external force, as shown in Eq. (6):

$$\{F_r\} = [K]\{\Phi_r\} \quad (6)$$

In general, the magnitude of the external force will vary from mode to mode, with higher natural modes requiring larger external forces due to the complexity of the higher mode shapes. This tendency is exploited in the development of a novel control parameter which simultaneously considers all frequencies of interest. The hypothesis uses relative force magnitudes as a surrogate for closeness of natural frequencies. The nodal force vectors are scaled such that large nodal forces (corresponding to complicated mode shapes) are reduced by the factor $(\|F_i\|/\|F_r\|)^P$. Thus $\{F_r\}_{\text{new}}$ is given by

$$\{F_r\}_{\text{new}} = (\|F_i\|/\|F_r\|)^P \{F_r\} \quad (7)$$

Here, the subscript i shows the order of interest, $0 < i \ll N$. Exponent P , which adjusts the magnitude of the scaling factor between the i th natural mode and the r th natural mode, is the correlation factor (typically $P = 1$). A larger value of P emphasizes the relative importance of the natural mode of interest. The same scaling can be used for the response:

$$\{\Phi_r\}_{\text{new}} = (\|F_i\|/\|F_r\|)^P \{\Phi_r\} \quad (8)$$

The scaled eigenvectors $\{\Phi_r\}_{\text{new}}$ are then applied as static displacement fields.

Using Eqs. (1) and (8), von Mises stresses of each element are obtained from the i th natural mode to the n th natural mode. Each natural mode is used as a displacement vector, and the stress components for each natural mode are obtained by using the strain-displacement and stress-strain relations. Finally, for each finite element, the maximum von Mises stress value between the i th and the n th natural modes is selected as the new dynamic control parameter, as expressed by

$$\sigma_i^{\text{vm}} = \max(\sigma_{i,l}^{\text{vm}}, \sigma_{i+1,l}^{\text{vm}}, \sigma_{i+2,l}^{\text{vm}}, \dots, \sigma_{n,l}^{\text{vm}}) \quad (0 < i \ll n, n < N) \quad (9)$$

Because Eq. (9) considers not only the i th natural frequency, but also its neighboring natural frequencies, smooth change of natural frequency can be possible even if mode switching occurs in the iterative processes. For example, when other natural frequencies are much higher than the i th natural frequency, only the maximum von Mises stress of the i th natural mode is selected for each finite element because $(\|F_i\|/\|F_r\|)^P$ for other natural modes has small values ($\ll 1$). On the other hand, as the neighboring natural frequencies approach the i th natural frequency during the iterative process, other natural modes are also gradually considered [i.e., $(\|F_i\|/\|F_r\|)^P \cong 1$]. Note that it is not necessary to consider frequencies lower than the i th natural frequency because they do not switch with the i th natural frequency in most cases.

Because the proposed dynamic control parameter is derived using the von Mises stress, a number of elements having some of the smallest von Mises stresses, that is, the most inefficient elements, are removed from the structure, identical to the static optimization problem of the ESO method.

III. Multiobjective Optimization Technique

In the weighted objectives method, this multiobjective problem is converted to a single-objective problem using a weighted sum of the original multiple objectives. That is, the control parameter for the static characteristic in Eq. (1) and the control parameter for the dynamic characteristic in Eq. (9) are combined to form a new single

criterion:

$$F_l^{\text{multi}} = W_1 R_{1,l} + W_2 R_{2,l} = \sum_{j=1}^2 W_j R_{j,l} \quad (10)$$

where F_l^{multi} is the multiobjective function that determines element removal for each element l . W_j is the j th criterion weighting factor with $0 \leq W_j \leq 1$, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^2 W_j = 1$$

$R_{j,l} = \sigma_{j,l}^{\text{vm}}/\sigma_{j,\text{max}}^{\text{vm}}$ is the ratio of the j th criterion control parameter $\sigma_{j,l}^{\text{vm}}$ for the l th element to the maximum value of the j th criterion control parameter $\sigma_{j,\text{max}}^{\text{vm}}$. Because both control parameters are derived from von Mises stress, a number of elements with the smallest F_l^{multi} are removed so that both characteristics can be improved, as in the conventional ESO method for statics.

IV. Evolutionary Structural Optimization Algorithm

The ESO algorithm of the weighted objectives method for stress and the fundamental natural frequency is implemented as follows:

- 1) Discretize the structure using a fine mesh of finite elements.
- 2) Solve the linear static analysis problem under thermal loads (or mechanical loads).
- 3) Calculate the von Mises stress using Eq. (1).
- 4) Solve the eigenvalue problem.
- 5) Calculate the von Mises stress using Eq. (9).
- 6) Combine the two control parameters using Eq. (10).
- 7) Remove several elements from the current structure that have relatively small contributions.
- 8) Repeat steps 2–7 until the weight of the structure reaches the predetermined value.

The typical ESO process is operated by a rejection ratio that determines which elements to eliminate. During the iterative process, the rejection ratio is gradually increased by the evolutionary rate.⁵ The rejection ratio is simply implemented by comparing the relative reference levels of candidate elements with the maximum value. In general, the maximum value of the reference criterion does not decrease during the evolutionary process for most mechanical load cases. This allows the threshold levels to increase steadily with material removal. Conversely, for cases involving thermal stress, the maximum stress level can decrease as the evolutionary process progresses.¹² For this reason, a new rejection ratio, RR_{new} , is determined as the α th lowest F^{multi} value. Note that α should be sufficiently small to guarantee a smooth change between two iterations. In this method, α is set to 1–2% of the total number of elements for the initial iteration.

V. Thermal Protection Systems Design

Because the TPS composes the external surface of a spacecraft, several requirements must be satisfied to design a TPS for all environments experienced by the vehicle:

- 1) To minimize operational costs, a TPS should be as lightweight as possible while maintaining its stiffness and high natural frequency.
- 2) A thin TPS plate is needed to protect a spacecraft from heat, and a frame structure may be attached to prevent fluttering due to aerodynamic and/or acoustic loading. If required, a honeycomb sandwich can be affixed to the plate if the spacecraft encounters a maximum surface temperature for an extended period of time.
- 3) A long support connecting the plate to the fuselage is recommended to decrease heat transfer to the fuselage. This construction provides for extra volume of insulation to be placed in the cavity and facilitates the generation of novel attachment by ESO (or other topological) methods.
- 4) The maximum thermal stress in the TPS is required to remain below yield strength to avoid permanent deformation.

In this section, two relevant TPS models with different initial conditions are presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of the ESO




Fig. 1 Initial metallic TPS.

method with the proposed control parameter. An efficient means for designing a TPS is shown for various requirements by employing the proposed control parameter. The initial TPS design is shown in Fig. 1. Inconel alloy 693 is utilized because of its excellent resistance to metal dusting and high-temperature corrosion, as well as for its favorable fabrication and joining properties.¹³ The TPS models are discretized with hexahedron isoparametric linear elements for finite element analysis, and the p-version of the linear finite element method with Guyan reduction is applied to enhance the accuracy of the analysis and reduce computational effort.¹⁴ Structural characteristic matrices with more degrees of freedom are generated, although the sizes of the matrices are identical to those obtained with the h-version finite element method. For both examples, α , a parameter for the element removal, as shown in the previous section, is set at 1%, and n in Eq. (9) is set at 10.

A. Example 1: Thermal Protection System Model with External Forces

The conventional ESO method and the new ESO method with the proposed control parameter are both applied to a TPS model with a mechanical load case. The TPS model, which has the dimensions $A = 0.5$ m, $B = 0.45$ m, $C = 0.03$ m, and $D = 0.27$ m, as shown in Fig. 1, is loaded at room temperature, with a Young's modulus of 196 GPa, a material density of 7770 kg/m³, and a Poisson ratio of 0.32. The model is meshed with $0.05 \times 0.05 \times 0.03$ m rectangular isoparametric elements with fixity prescribed on the bottom side. External tractions of magnitude 10 N in the X direction are applied to each nodal point on the top side. The elements identified with the external force, which include those in the plate-frame region, are set as unremovable elements. This unremovable region renders the evolutionary process unstable in the conventional ESO method because adjacent regions with high modal mass are eliminated without consideration of the modal stiffness.

The optimization problem is to minimize the maximum von Mises stress and to maximize the fundamental natural frequency while reducing the TPS weight. These two objectives are applied as weighted objectives as shown in Eq. (10). The relationship between maximum von Mises stress and the fundamental natural frequency is investigated by varying both weighting factors and volume reduction.


Figure 2 shows the comparison between the fundamental natural frequency and the maximum von Mises stress when reductions in volume are 20% and 50%. The plots show results for both the conventional ESO⁶ and the proposed method. The weighting factor for the dynamic characteristic (W_{dynamic}) and the weighting factor for the static characteristic (W_{static}) for each point in Fig. 2 are as follows:

$$(A) \text{ and } (A'): W_{\text{dynamic}}:W_{\text{static}} = 0.0:1.0$$


$$(B) \text{ and } (B'): W_{\text{dynamic}}:W_{\text{static}} = 0.2:0.8$$

$$(C) \text{ and } (C'): W_{\text{dynamic}}:W_{\text{static}} = 0.5:0.5$$

$$(D) \text{ and } (D'): W_{\text{dynamic}}:W_{\text{static}} = 0.8:0.2$$



a) 20% volume reduction



b) 50% volume reduction

Fig. 2 Relationship between the fundamental natural frequency and the maximum stress.

$$(E) \text{ and } (E'): W_{\text{dynamic}}:W_{\text{static}} = 1.0:0.0$$

Points of (A)–(E) and (A')–(E') are results from the conventional and the proposed method, respectively.

In the proposed method, it is observed that each objective is improved by increasing its respective weighting factor (e.g., both the fundamental natural frequency and the maximum von Mises stress increase when the dynamic weighting factor is increased and the static weighting factor is decreased). Because the proposed method applied to the modified static control parameter directly considers the mode-switching phenomenon and the modal stiffness, smooth changes are observed in the static and dynamic characteristics even as a large number of elements are removed through many iterations. It is shown that any improvement of one criterion requires a clear tradeoff with the other, and a clear Pareto solution (or a Pareto curve) can be observed.

Unlike the proposed method, a desirable solution is not obtained in the conventional method. As shown in Fig. 2, the maximum von Mises stresses obtained with the conventional method are higher than those obtained from the proposed method with increasing W_{dynamic} . Even though the conventional method addresses the relative ratio between modal stiffness and modal mass, the deficiency arises from no direct consideration of modal stiffness. In addition, it is shown that the fundamental natural frequencies at $W_{\text{dynamic}}:W_{\text{static}} = 1.0:0.0$ are decreased by this lack of modal

stiffness as well as the changing control parameter characteristics due to mode switching. Determining the trend of the Pareto solution with volume reduction is extremely difficult. Consequently, compared with the conventional method, the proposed control parameter for an eigenvalue problem can be used to design an optimum structure that requires the elimination of a large number of elements through many iterative processes in addition to favorable dynamic modification.

B. Example 2: Thermal Protection System Model with Heat Transfer Considerations

When a spacecraft reenters the atmosphere from low Earth orbit, a metallic TPS creates a temperature distribution due to tremendous heat flux. The temperature distribution changes the material characteristics of a metallic TPS, such as thermal conductivity and Young's modulus. This temperature dependence in the thermal problem results in nonlinearity and requires an iterative solution technique.

For the second example, a transient conduction analysis is applied to the initial TPS model in Fig. 1. It is assumed that the (void) space inside the TPS and the vertical surface boundaries (with the exception of the surface of the plate) are insulated. The plate temperature (T_{plate}) on the top side varies according to a temperature profile, as shown in Ref. 15. In this method, the temperature is simply represented as $T_{\text{plate}} = (1.2540t + 200)^\circ\text{C}$ when $t < 500$ s and $T_{\text{plate}} = 827^\circ\text{C}$ when $t \geq 500$ s, regardless of the elimination of elements from the structure. This assumption is a severe restriction. In the true structure, convection and radiation play major roles in the


transfer of energy. For instance, to address the internal radiative heat transfer that will occur as material is removed, an efficient method for constructing view factors during the iterative process would be needed. Because the purpose of this work was to develop an ESO method for simultaneous consideration of thermal stress and frequency, prescribed temperature boundary conditions were used to ensure tractability.

A numerical time integration scheme,¹⁶ similar to Newmark's method, is used to solve the following transient heat transfer problem:


$$\{(1/\Delta t)[M_i] + \beta[K_i]\}\{T_{i+1}\} = \{(1/\Delta t)[M_i] - (1 - \beta)[K_i]\}\{T_i\} + (1 - \beta)\{F_i\} + \beta\{F_{i+1}\} \quad (11)$$

where $[M_i]$ is the consistent-mass matrix, $[K_i]$ is the thermal conductivity matrix, $\{F_i\}$ is the force matrix defined by heat source (or heat sink), heat flux, and convection, Δt is time step, β is a parameter, which is set as 0.5 by the Crank–Nicolson rule, and $\{T_i\}$ and $\{T_{i+1}\}$ are temperatures at times t_i and t_{i+1} , respectively.


To reduce the computational time of the transient analysis, only the tendency of the temperature profile at $t = 1500$ s is evaluated by assuming that $[M_i]$ and $[K_i]$ are constant with time, because thermal conductivities $[K_{xx} = K_{yy} = K_{zz} = 20 \text{ W/(m}^\circ\text{C)}]$, density ($\rho = 7770 \text{ kg/m}^3$), and specific heat [$c = 530 \text{ J/(kg}^\circ\text{C)}]$ are treated as temperature-independent variables. A constant time of $\Delta t = 10$ s is considered. The initial temperature distribution $\{T_0\}$ for each iterative process is assumed to be a linear profile through




a) Frequency histories by the conventional method



c) Maximum stress histories by the conventional method



b) Frequency histories by the proposed method



d) Maximum stress histories by the proposed method

Fig. 3 Evolutionary histories of the fundamental natural frequencies and the maximum thermal stress.

the thickness with 127°C on the top side and 27°C on the bottom side.

1. Availability of the Proposed Control Parameter in the Heat Transfer Problem

Both conventional and proposed methods are compared to demonstrate the applicability of the proposed control parameter to topology optimization of a TPS. The TPS model has the dimensions $A = 0.48$, $B = 0.42$, and $C = 0.03$ m, and D is specifically set 0.27 m longer than in conventional structures¹⁷ to reduce thermal stress in the fixed regions at the bottom side (interface to low-temperature material). The plate and frame regions are treated as unremovable. The model is divided into $0.03 \times 0.03 \times 0.03$ m regular hexahedron isoparametric elements, and the 0.06×0.06 m bottom corner regions are considered fixed. The coefficient of expansion and Young's modulus are considered as functions of temperature.¹³ In much the same way as in example 1, the weighted objectives method considers both the maximum thermal stress and the fundamental natural frequency by changing both weighting factors and volume reduction.

Figure 3 shows the changes in fundamental natural frequencies and maximum thermal stresses with varying weighting factors and sensitivities. Both methods improve the fundamental natural frequencies by increasing the weighting factors for dynamics, as in the mechanical load case. In general, when a structure is overdesigned, in other words, when it consists of more elements than needed, the fundamental natural frequency can be increased by removing inefficient elements. However, when the stiffness of the structure becomes weak, the fundamental natural frequency is decreased. In Fig. 3, as a large number of elements are removed from the structure through many iterative steps, the proposed method keeps the fun-

damental natural frequencies much higher than that obtained from the conventional method, even though there is no inertia consideration in the proposed control parameter. Conversely, the results using the conventional control parameter show that the fundamental natural frequency decreases quickly due to 1) the small modal stiffness in the connecting region between the assumed fixity and the plate-frame region and 2) the characteristic change in the control parameter due to the discontinuous change in the natural modes (i.e., the mode-switching phenomenon).

On the other hand, the analysis of the change in the maximum thermal stress reveals different behavior when compared with the mechanical load case. A higher static weighting factor does indeed result in a lower maximum thermal stress. In the conventional method, minimization of the maximum thermal stress can be obtained by applying a large weighting factor for the static control parameter in the early stages of the analysis, similarly to the mechanical load case. As the volume removal percentage increases, the maximum thermal stress that results from dynamic considerations alone becomes less than the maximum thermal stress that results from static considerations alone. These seemingly inconsistent results are due to heat transfer considerations. With constant temperature boundary conditions prescribed, the heat flux to the bottom side is decreased with the elimination of elements that connect the plate-frame to the support region. The results from the proposed method have analogous tendencies to the conventional method with changing weighting factors. However, the proposed method can restrain the maximum stresses for $W_{\text{dynamic}}:W_{\text{static}} = 1.0:0.0$ from increasing in early stages of the process.

Figure 4 shows resulting models close to 900 Hz in fundamental natural frequency obtained by both the conventional and proposed methods. Each model is developed using solely dynamic




Fig. 4 Resultant TPS models with 900-Hz fundamental natural frequency.




Fig. 5 Initial model for designing TPS support.

considerations, that is, $W_{\text{dynamic}}:W_{\text{static}} = 1.0:0.0$. The fundamental natural frequency, the maximum stress, and the number of elements are 933.6 Hz, 0.523 GPa, and 740 (155.2 kg) using the conventional method, and 906.8 Hz, 0.330 GPa, and 568 (119.2 kg) by the proposed method. The main difference between the two resulting topologies is the location of the elements that are adjacent to the plate-frame region: one is located toward the center of the plate-frame region, and the other is located toward the edges of the plate-frame region.

From these results, the ESO method with the proposed control parameter can be used to design a lightweight TPS model with a high fundamental natural frequency and a low maximum thermal stress. Using the assumption that only conduction affects the support region, a practical TPS design is developed in the next section using $W_{\text{dynamic}}:W_{\text{static}} = 1.0:0.0$.

2. Thermal Protection System Design with Heat-Transfer Problem

In contrast to the static case, the convergence of the eigenvalue maximization problem presents a more daunting task. In an evolutionary optimization that requires a large number of element removals through many iterative steps, the ordering of natural modes can be altered by the selection of the initial geometry. This input can result in considerable variations of the problem's structural characteristics (i.e., neighboring natural frequencies, weight of the structure, etc.). Therefore, based on the topological results of the previous section (Fig. 4b), the initial TPS model is chosen to be that of Fig. 4b with a slight modification. Elements are removed from inside the

structure, as shown in Fig. 5. The shape optimization method using the ESO technique (called "nibbling ESO"⁵) is then applied to the support region to avoid the checkerboard pattern that occurred in Fig. 4b. That is, only the structural boundaries in the Z direction between layers 1 and 10 (with the exception of the unremovable region of layer 0) are removed from the model. The frame region, as well as the support region, is designed to reduce the TPS weight. Using the proposed method, the objectives take the following form:

Minimize TPS weight

subject to

1. maximization of the fundamental natural frequency ($f_1 \geq 900$ Hz)

2. minimization of the maximum thermal stress below yield strength ($\sigma_{\text{max}} \leq 3.0$ GPa)

In early iterations, the fundamental natural mode is the bending mode of the support region. The elements of the frame part are eliminated to improve the dynamic characteristics of the support. The local bending mode of the thin top plate becomes the lowest mode of the structure. If the original model is too coarse or too much material is removed at each iteration, the plate may not satisfy the frequency constraint and could result in undesirable flutter or acoustic excitation. The problem becomes a multiscale phenomenon. Inefficient material still exists in the base, but the optimization algorithm is focusing on the low frequency of the plate. Therefore, to address the problem efficiently, the design optimizations for the support region and the frame region are conducted separately.

a. Thermal protection system support design. First, the support region for the initial model in Fig. 5 is set up with identical boundary conditions and mesh size, as with that of Sec. V.B.1. However, additional fixed regions are established at the edges of the plate to prevent a local mode from occurring in the unremovable region due to dynamic considerations. By including additional stiffness [k_x, k_y, k_z] = [0, 0, 10^8] (N/m), the local mode of the unremovable region will have a higher natural frequency when compared with the fundamental natural frequency of the support's first bending mode. Figure 6 shows the change in the fundamental natural frequency and the maximum thermal stress as a function of volume reduction, which is the ratio percentage between the current and the fully populated structure's volume. For this case, the structure at 77.7% volume removal is the most lightweight that satisfies the two constraints (Fig. 7). When additional stiffness is removed from the plate, the fundamental natural frequency is less than 900 Hz due to the increase in modal mass of the unremovable region. In this case, the TPS model has a fundamental natural frequency of 871.9 Hz, and the maximum thermal stress occurs in the support region.

b. Thermal protection system frame design. Using the modified TPS model in Fig. 7, the model is then designed to be lightweight with a fundamental natural frequency greater than 900 Hz by modifying the frame shape. In the frame design, it is possible to increase




Fig. 6 Evolutionary histories for TPS support design.




Fig. 7 Optimum TPS support.

the fundamental natural frequency because all elements in the frame region have a high fundamental modal mass. The modal stiffness of the plate and the frame can be also considered by applying the proposed control parameter. The plate and the frame regions are remeshed with two element sizes, $0.03 \times 0.03 \times 0.007$ m in the frame and $0.03 \times 0.03 \times 0.002$ m in the plate. As in the element size of the plate, the thickness is set at 0.002 m. The four corners at the bottom of the support region are assumed fixed, as in the




Fig. 8 Evolutionary history of the fundamental natural frequency for TPS frame design.

example of Sec. V.B.1. Shape optimization is applied by eliminating elements from the bottom surface of the frame region for ease of manufacture, as with the support design. Because the maximum thermal stress exists in the support region, no thermal stress analysis is applied. Only the temperature profile of the TPS model in Fig. 7 is used for the evaluation of the material properties.

Figure 8 shows the evolutionary history of the fundamental natural frequency due to modifications of the frame region. Up to the 41st iteration, the fundamental frequency increases because excessive modal mass is removed from the frame. Then the frequency drastically decreases because the modal stiffness is reduced by the lack of elements in the frame region, even though the frame has excessive modal mass. In the frame design, the modified TPS model satisfies the frequency constraints at the 45th iteration and has a fundamental natural frequency of 920.2 Hz.

Finally, a transient heat transfer analysis is applied to the TPS model at the 45th iteration for the evaluation of the exact solution. In this case, the model has a fundamental natural frequency of 919.8 Hz, a maximum thermal stress of 0.228 GPa, and 816 elements (76.50 kg), which consist of 224 elements (3.13 kg) in the plate, 316 elements (15.47 kg) in the frame, and 276 elements (57.90 kg) in the support region. The fundamental natural frequency is reduced slightly by the change of the material properties, and the maximum thermal stress is also reduced slightly by the volume reduction of the frame. The final modified TPS model and the cross section of the frame-plate are shown in Fig. 9. To prevent flutter of the plate, it is shown that the stiffness of the center region on the plate is reinforced by the existence of the elements in the frame, even though the elements have a high modal mass about the natural mode of the plate.




Fig. 9 Optimum TPS model including heat transfer effects.

VI. Summary

A metallic TPS concept provides the possibility of decoupling the thermal and structural functions by providing metallic substructures to encapsulate internal insulation, maintain panel shape, and support thermal and mechanical loads. This decoupling allows the use of structurally efficient internal insulation. However, these two functions cannot be decoupled perfectly, and so each substructure in the metallic TPS model should be designed to reduce thermal defects, as well as to allow for structural modification.

In this paper, a multiobjective optimization problem for the thermal stress and the fundamental natural frequency was conducted to make a lightweight TPS model using the ESO algorithm. Two objectives were optimized simultaneously, namely, the maximization of the fundamental natural frequency and the minimization of the maximum thermal stress, through efficient volume reduction. Specifically, the modified static control parameter based on static analysis was newly proposed for the TPS design concerned with dynamic analysis. Through comparison between the conventional and the proposed control parameter, it was shown that the proposed control parameter can prevent several problems that are induced by failing to consider the mode-switching phenomenon and the reduced modal stiffness directly when a large number of elements are eliminated through many iterative steps (although the proposed control parameter ignores inertia terms of the equation of motion). Additionally, an efficient way to obtain a metallic TPS model was shown by designing the frame and the support region separately, using the ESO method with the proposed control parameter. In future work, consideration will be given to more realistic thermal conditions. Inclusion of convection and radiation, as well as a maximum temperature constraint, will potentially result in new and innovative designs.

Acknowledgment

The first two authors acknowledge the U.S. Air Force for supporting this research through Contract F33615-98-D-3210, DO Number 48.

References

- ¹Penmetsa, R. C., Grandhi, R. V., and Haney, M., "Topology Optimization for Evolutionary Design of Thermal Protection System," *AIAA Journal* (submitted for publication).
- ²Bendsoe, M. P., "Optimal Shape Design as a Material Distribution Problem," *Structural Optimization*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1989, pp. 193–202.
- ³Bendsoe, M. P., and Kikuchi, N., "Generating Optimal Topologies in Structural Design Using a Homogenization Method," *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, Vol. 71, Nov. 1988, pp. 197–224.
- ⁴Ma, Z.-D., Kikuchi, N., and Chang, H.-C., "Topological Design for Vibrating Structures," *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, Vol. 121, Nos. 1–4, 1995, pp. 259–280.
- ⁵Xie, Y. M., and Steven, G. P., *Evolutionary Structural Optimization*, Springer-Verlag, London, 1997.
- ⁶Proos, K. A., Steven, G. P., Querin, O. M., and Xie, Y. M., "Multicriterion Evolutionary Structural Optimization Using the Global Criterion Methods," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 10, 2001, pp. 2006–2012.
- ⁷Grandhi, R. V., Bharatram, G., and Venkayya, V. B., "Multiobjective Optimization of Large Scale Structures," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 7, 1993, pp. 1329–1337.
- ⁸Carmichael, D. G., "Computation of Pareto Optima in Structural Design," *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, Vol. 15, No. 6, 1980, pp. 925–952.
- ⁹Das, I., and Dennis, J. E., "A Closer Look at Drawbacks of Minimizing Weighted Sums of Objectives for Pareto Set Generation on Multicriteria Optimization Problems," *Structural Optimization*, Vol. 14, No. 7, 1997, pp. 63–69.
- ¹⁰Pietrzak, J., "Pareto Optimum Tests," *Computers and Structures*, Vol. 71, No. 1, 1999, pp. 35–42.
- ¹¹Xie, Y. M., and Steven, G. P., "Evolutionary Structural Optimization for Dynamic Problems," *Computers and Structures*, Vol. 58, No. 6, 1996, pp. 1067–1073.
- ¹²Li, Q., Steven, G. P., and Querin, O. M., "Structural Topology Design with Multiple Thermal Criteria," *Engineering Computations*, Vol. 17, No. 6, 2000, pp. 715–734.
- ¹³INCONEL Alloy 693—Excellent Resistance to Metal Dusting and High Temperature Corrosion [online document], URL: <http://www.specialmetals.com/documents/Inconel%20alloy%20693.pdf> [cited January 2005].
- ¹⁴Kim, W.-Y., Nakahara, T., and Okuma, M., "An Evolutionary Optimization Method for Designing the Three-Dimensional Structures," *Transaction of Japan Society for Computational Engineering and Science*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2003, pp. 25–31.
- ¹⁵Blosser, M. L., "Thermal Protection Systems for Reusable Launch Vehicles," 14th Annual Thermal and Fluids Analysis Workshop, NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA, Aug. 2003.
- ¹⁶Logan, D. L., *A First Course in the Finite Element Method*, 3rd ed., Series in Engineering, PWS, Boston, 2000.
- ¹⁷Blosser, M. L., Martin, C. J., Daryabeigi, K., and Poteet, C. C., "Reusable Metallic Thermal Protection Systems Development," Third European Workshop on Thermal Protection Systems, NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA, March 1998.

E. Livne
Associate Editor