







Advanced Topics in Computational Solid Mechanics Industrial Applications

Section 1: Introduction

Eduardo N. Dvorkin

Stanford University Mechanical Engineering Winter Quarter 2010



The methodology





Linear and nonlinear problems

In the analysis of a solid under mechanical and thermal loads some of the nonlinearities that we may encounter when formulating the mathematical model are:



The equilibrium equations have to be satisfied in the unknown deformed configuration of the solid rather than in the known unloaded configuration.



When the analyst expects that for her/his purposes the difference between the deformed and unloaded configurations can be neglected she/he may disregard this source of nonlinearity obtaining an important simplification in the mathematical model.



An intermediate step would be to consider the equilibrium in the deformed configuration but to assume that the strains are very small (infinitesimal strains assumption). This also produces an important simplification in the mathematical model.



Of course, all the simplifications introduced in the mathematical model have to be checked for their properness when examining the numerical results.



Material nonlinearities

The material stress-strain relation is non linear.

E.g. plasticity, viscoplasticity, creep, fracturing materials (concrete), etc.



Geometrical nonlinearities (Ex. 1)

Infinitesimal strains: buckling of a straight column





Geometrical nonlinearities (Ex. 1)

Infinitesimal strains : buckling of a straight column

Even if we decide to model the material as "infinitely" linear elastic the geometrically linear model can only be used for very small displacement and a geometrically nonlinear analysis under the infinitesimal strains assumption should be otherwise performed if we need to predict the column buckling load



Geometrical nonlinearities (Ex. 2)

Infinitesimal strains





Geometrical nonlinearities (Ex. 3)





Geometrical nonlinearities (Ex. 3)

Infinitesimal strains

The expected displacements are very small and no equilibrium bifurcation can be expected.

However, after the yielding of the side bars, we can only get a solution if the geometrical nonlinearities, under the infinitesimal strains assumption, are included in the model.



Geometrical nonlinearities (Ex. 4)

Infinitesimal strains







Salt dome





Calibration of creep constitutive models with 1D lab tests











Material nonlinear only (Ex. 6)





Fracturing material: concrete



Geometrical and material nonlinearities(Ex. 6)

Finite strains





Geometrical and material nonlinearities(Ex. 7)

Finite strains



Undeformed sample

Deformed sample



Geometrical and material nonlinearities(Ex. 7)

Finite strains



Equivalent plastic strains



Geometrical nonlinear analysis: contact (Ex. 8)



μ (pipes/well)=0.0



µ (pipes/well)=0.1



Comparison at the central cross section



Couple:

- Eulerian formulation that describes the rolled steel deformation
- Standard Lagrangian formulation that describes the rolls deformation







Model Validation















Fields-Backofen constitutive equation

$$\sigma = \sigma_o \varepsilon^n \dot{\varepsilon}^m$$



Model Validation



Industrial applications Modeling the Mannesmann piercing process





Industrial applications Modeling the Mannesmann piercing process



Model Validation



Industrial applications Marine pipeline collapse





Industrial applications Marine pipeline collapse





Industrial applications OCTG Threaded connections





Industrial applications OCTG Threaded connections

Model Validation



Axial distance from box center [mm]

When the dope pressure distribution determined in the full-scale test was included in the finite element model, the numerical results showed a very good agreement with the experimental ones.

Industrial applications Waterhammer

Waterhammer experiment. The valve is closed at t=0; the pipe dimensions are L=100m; ID=0.016m and OD=0.018m. Fluid: water

Industrial applications Waterhammer

Model Validation

Normalized pressure at the valve. Comparison of calculated and experimental results

Nomenclature

Summation convention

$$\sum_{a=1}^{3} v_a r_a = v_a r_a$$

Tensors

Using Cartesian coordinates

Vectors

$$\underline{v} = v_a \underline{e}_a$$

Second order tensors (dyadic representation)

$$\underline{\underline{t}} = t_{ab} \underline{\underline{e}}_{a} \underline{\underline{e}}_{b}$$

In some references

$$\underline{\underline{t}} = t_{ab} \underline{\underline{e}}_a \otimes \underline{\underline{e}}_b$$

Nomenclature

Tensor operations

$$\underline{v} = \underline{c} \cdot \underline{\underline{t}} = c_l \underline{e}_l \cdot t_{ab} \underline{e}_a \underline{e}_b = (c_l t_{ab}) \delta_{la} \underline{e}_b$$
$$= (c_a t_{ab}) \underline{e}_b$$
$$\underline{b} = \underline{\underline{t}} \cdot \underline{c} = t_{ab} \underline{e}_a \underline{e}_b \cdot c_l \underline{e}_l = t_{ab} c_b \underline{e}_a$$
$$\alpha = \underline{a} : \underline{\underline{b}} = a_{ij} \underline{e}_i \underline{e}_j : b_{lm} \underline{e}_l \underline{e}_m = (a_{ij} b_{lm}) \delta_{il} \delta_{jm}$$
$$= a_{ij} b_{ij}$$
$$\beta = \underline{\underline{a}} \cdots \underline{\underline{b}} = a_{ij} \underline{e}_i \underline{e}_j \cdots b_{lm} \underline{e}_l \underline{e}_m = (a_{ij} b_{lm}) \delta_{jl} \delta_{im}$$
$$= (a_{ij} b_{ji})$$

Nomenclature

$$\underbrace{\underline{c}}_{\underline{=}} = \underbrace{\underline{a}}_{\underline{b}} = a_{ij}b_{lm}\underline{\underline{e}}_{\underline{i}}\underline{\underline{e}}_{\underline{j}}\underline{\underline{e}}_{\underline{l}}\underline{\underline{e}}_{m}$$