# Introduction to Isogeometric Elements in LS-DYNA





T.J.R. Hughes

#### **Entwicklerforum** October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2011, Stuttgart, Germany

#### Stefan Hartmann

Development in cooperation with: D.J. Benson: Professor of Applied Mechanics, University of California, San Diego, USA

Some slides borrowed from:

T.J.R. Hughes: Professor of Aerospace Engineering and Engineering Mechanics, University of Texas at Austin, USA





# Outline

- Isogeometric Analysis
   motivation / definition / history
- From B-splines to NURBS (T.J.R. Hughes) - basis functions / control net / refinements
- NURBS-based finite elements in LS-DYNA - \*ELEMENT\_NURBS\_PATCH\_2D
- Example 1: Square Tube Buckling - description / deformation
- Example 2: Underbody Cross Member (Numisheet 2005)
   description / comparison of results / summary
- Summary and Outlook





#### **Isogeometric Analysis** – motivation & definition

- reduce effort of geometry conversion from CAD into a suitable mesh for FEA
- ISOPARAMETRIC (FE-Analysis)

use same approximation for geometry and deformation (normally: low order Lagrange polynomials ---- in LS-DYNA basically only linear elements)

GEOMETRY	$\leftrightarrow$	DEFORMATION

#### **ISOGEOMETRIC (CAD - FEA)**

same description of the geometry in the design (CAD) and the analysis (FEA)

**FEA** CAD  $\leftrightarrow$ 

- common geometry descriptions in CAD
  - NURBS (Non-Uniform Rational B-splines) → most commonly used
  - T-splines

- subdivision surfaces

 $\rightarrow$  enhancement of NURBS

- and others

 $\rightarrow$  mainly used in animation industry



### Isogeometric Analysis - history

- start in 2003
  - summer: Austin Cotrell starts as PhD Student of Prof. T.J.R. Hughes at the University of Texas, Austin
  - autumn: first NURBS-based FE-code for linear, static problems provides promising results, the name "ISOGEOMETRIC" is used the first time
- 2004 up to now: many research activities to various topics
  - non-linear structural mechanics
    - $\rightarrow$  shells with and without rotational DOFs
    - $\rightarrow$  implicit gradient enhanced damage
    - $\rightarrow$  XFEM
  - shape- und topology-optimization
  - efficient numerical integration
  - turbulence and fluid-structure-interaction
  - acoustics
  - refinement strategies
  - ...
  - January 2011: first thematic conference on Isogeometric Analysis
    - "Isogeometric Analysis 2011: Integrating Design and Analysis", University of Texas at Austin





#### B-spline basis functions

- constructed recursively
- positive everywhere (in contrast to Lagrange polynomials)
- shape of basis functions depend on: knot-vector and polynomial degree
- knot-vector: non-decreasing set of coordinates in parameter space
- normally C<sup>(P-1)</sup>-continuity
  - $\rightarrow$  e.g. lin. / quad. / cub. / quart. Lagrange:  $\rightarrow$  C<sup>0</sup> / C<sup>0</sup>
  - $\rightarrow$  e.g. lin. / quad. / cub. / quart. B-spline:  $\rightarrow$  C<sup>0</sup> / C<sup>1</sup> / C<sup>2</sup> / C<sup>3</sup>

 $\rightarrow C^0 / C^0 / C^0 / C^0$  $\rightarrow C^0 / C^1 / C^2 / C^3$ 







- B-spline curves
  - control points  $\boldsymbol{B}_i$  / control polygon (control net)
  - knots







- NURBS Non-Uniform Rational B-splines
  - weights at control points leads to more control over the shape of a curve
  - projective transformation of a B-spline







7

Smoothness of Lagrange polynomials vs. NURBS



#### T.J.R. Hughes





NURBS – surfaces (tensor-product of univariate basis)





Entwicklerforum, October 12th, 2011, Stuttgart, Germany



# From B-splines to NURBS - summary

#### B-spline basis functions

- recursive
- dependent on knot-vector and polynomial order
- normally C<sup>(P-1)</sup>-continuity
- "partition of unity" (like Lagrange polynomials)
- refinement (h/p and k) without changing the initial geometry  $\rightarrow$  adaptivity
- control points are normally not a part of the physical geometry (non-interpolatory basis functions)

#### NURBS

- B-spline basis functions + control net with weights
- all mentioned properties for B-splines apply for NURBS





- A typical NURBS-Patch and the definition of elements
  - elements are defined through the knot-vectors (interval between different values)
  - shape functions for each control-point







- A typical NURBS-Patch Connectivity of elements
  - Possible "overlaps" ( $\rightarrow$  higher continuity!)
  - Size of "overlap" depends on polynomial order (and on knot-vector)







NURBS-Patch

(parameter space)

- New Keyword: \*ELEMENT\_NURBS\_PATCH\_2D
  - definition of NURBS-surfaces
  - 4 different shell formulations with/without rotational DOFs
- Pre- and Postprocessing
  - work in progress for LS-PrePost ... current status (lspp3.2beta)
  - → visualization of 2D-NURBS-Patches
  - → import IGES-format and construct \*ELEMENT\_NURBS\_PATCH\_2D
  - → modification of 2D-NURBS geometry
  - $\rightarrow$  ... much more to come!
- Postprocessing and boundary conditions (i.e. contact) currently with
  - interpolation nodes (automatically created)
  - interpolation elements (automatically created)
- Analysis capabilities
  - implicit and explicit time integration
  - eigenvalue analysis
  - other capabilities (e.g. geometric stiffness for buckling) implemented but not yet tested
- LS-DYNA material library available (including umats)













 NISR/NISS – Number of Interpolation Elements per Nurbs-Element (r-/s-dir.) important for post-processing, boundary conditions and contact treatment









#### LSPP: Preprocessing

- control-net
- nurbs surface

LSPP: Postprocessing

- Interpolation nodes/elements

nisr=niss=2

nisr=niss=10





### Square Tube Buckling – Description



D.J. Benson





perturbation to initiate buckling mode

standard benchmark for automobile

quarter symmetry to reduce cost

mesh:

- 640 quartic (P=4) elements
- 1156 control points

crashworthiness

- 3 integration points through thickness



# **Square Tube Buckling**



#### D.J. Benson





# **Square Tube Buckling**





Entwicklerforum, October 12th, 2011, Stuttgart, Germany









### **Underbody Cross Member** – Simulation models

#### identical for all

- material model: \*MAT\_TRANSVERSELY\_ANISOTROPIC\_ELASTIC\_PLASTIC (\*MAT\_037)
- nip=5 number of integration points through the thickness
- istupd=0 no thickness update
- imscl=0 no "selective" mass scaling (no mass scaling at all!)
- SMP, double precision, ncpu=4 (Dual Core AMD Opteron, 2.2 GHz)

#### standard elements

- ELFORM=16: fully integrated (4-noded) shell-elements with assumed strain formulation
- discretizations: with adaptivity (mesh size:  $4mm \rightarrow 2mm \rightarrow 1mm$ ) as reference solution without adaptivity: mesh-sizes: 2mm; 4mm; 8mm

#### 2D-NURBS elements

- Formulation: FORM=2 (rotation free formulation)
- Integraion rule: INT=0 (reduced integration)
- Polynomial: p2 (quadratic), p3 (cubic), p4 (quartic), p5 (quintic)
- discretizations: mesh-sizes: 4mm; 8mm; 16mm
- number of interpolation elements/ NURBS-elements: NISR=PR; NISS=PS















Entwicklerforum, October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2011, Stuttgart, Germany



### Underbody Cross Member – Draw-in









### Underbody Cross Member – Draw-in









Iarger mesh size → less draw-in (behavior is too stiff)





### Underbody Cross Member – Draw-in























### **Underbody Cross Member** – CPU-time









### **Underbody Cross Member** – Summary

- Detailed discretization of "Drawbead" needs a fine discretization (<=4mm), no matter what type of elements</li>
- Rotation free elements with reduced integration show best behavior



- CPU-time for comparable discretizations (i.e: p1\_2mm ← → p2\_4mm) are promising (no CODE optimization yet!) → cost competitive
- CPU-time increase for NURBS with same discretizations for next order of polynomial (i.e.: p2\_4mm→p3\_4mm): Factor 2.5-2.8
- Higher order does not help anything in this example (spacing of control points define mesh size)





# Summary

- NURBS-based elements run stable
- higher order accurate isogeometric analysis can be cost competitive
  but missing a couple of "special" issues for industrial sheet metal forming applications
- code optimization necessary to make it faster
- in this example: geometry dictates the mesh size (independent of polynomial order!)
- NEW: mpp-implementation available!

# Outlook

- perform a lot more studies in different fields  $\rightarrow$  experience
- motivate customers (and researchers) to "play" with these elements
- further implementation
  - post-processing directly with NURBS
  - (selective) mass scaling
  - use NURBS for contact (instead of interpolation elements)
  - make pre- and post-processing more user-friendly
  - introduce 3D NURBS elements
  - ... much more





# Thank you!



