Use of the simplex method to optimize analytical condition in structural analysis
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The nonlinear behavior is approximated as a sequence of successively changing linear systems over a short time interval. Solution of nonlinear equations needs to iterative method such as Iterative algorithm. Iterative method attempts to solve a problem by finding successive approximations. The present study is concerned with methods of nonlinear static and dynamic analysis of structures, particularly for application to geometrically nonlinear space structures. The basis of the proposed method is a step-by-step procedure of parametric solution continuation using a predictor–corrector scheme. The prediction is made with help of some interpolation procedure. In this paper a simplex method of nonlinear dynamics response analysis is developed.
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INTRODUCTION

The Analytical method is amongst the most efficient methods known for finding null spaces, which is the final stage in integer factorization algorithms such as the quadratic sieve and number field sieve, and its development has been entirely driven by this application. The first iterative method for solving a linear system appeared in a letter of Gauss. The Analytical method is an iterative algorithm that is an adaptation of power methods to find Eigen values and eigenvectors of a square matrix or the singular value decomposition of a rectangular matrix (Brezinski and Sadok, 2002; Ghafari, 2008). Minimum potential dynamic energy asserts that a structure or body shall deform or displace to a position that minimizes the total potential energy, with the lost potential energy being dissipated as heat. The tendency to minimum total potential energy is due to the second law of thermodynamics, which states that the entropy of a system will maximize at equilibrium. The design process for nonlinear structure is a relatively complex problem. Indeed the equilibrium configuration is an unknown in the analysis of this kind of structures. The nonlinear structure may be analyzed as discrete system or continuous membrane (Silva and Vellasco, 2008).

PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION (PDE)

Nonlinear structural analysis uses analytical method under a partial differential equation (PDE) that it is a differential equation in which the unknown function is a function of multiple independent variables and the equation involves its partial derivatives. The partial differential equations are broadly classified as linear and nonlinear (George, 2009). The coefficients of the unknown function and its derivatives in a linear differential equation are allowed to be (known) functions of the independent variable or variables. Nonlinear differential equations can exhibit very complicated behavior over extended time intervals [Huu-Tai, 2010]. The procedures to solving nonlinear differential equation will be rapidly by minimizing of potential dynamic method.

EQUATION OF MOTION FOR MULTI DEGREE (MDOF)

Equations of motion are equations that describe the
behavior of a system. The equation of motion for a multi degree of freedom (MDOF) system can be written as (Liquis, 2003):

\[ M \ddot{x} + C(t) \dot{x} + K(t) x = P(t) \]  

(1)

Where; \( M \) = mass matrix; \( C(t) \) = damping matrix; \( K(t) \) = stiffness matrix; \( x \) = displacement vector; \( \dot{x} \) = velocity vector; \( \ddot{x} \) = acceleration vector; \( P(t) \) = Load vector

The assumption of a constant mass in the case of MDOF systems is arbitrary as it could be represented as a time varying quantity (Sundar, 2000).

Since \( m \) is a non-zero constant value, both sides of Equation (1) can be divided by \( m \), as follows:

\[ \ddot{x} + \frac{C(t)}{m} \dot{x} + K(t) \frac{x}{m} = \frac{P(t)}{m} \]

(2)

The mathematical solution of Equation (2) depends on the values of \( P, Q \) and \( F \). Equation (2) is a linear differential equation if \( P \) and \( Q \) are independent of \( x \) and remains so even if \( P \) and \( Q \) are functions of \( t \) (Jian-Bing, 2007).

**THE EXPRESSION FOR THE TOTAL POTENTIAL ENERGY**

The total potential energy is written as:

\[ W = U + V \]  

(3)

Where;

\( W \) = the total potential energy

\( U \) = the strain energy of the system, and

\( V \) = the potential energy of the loading.

Taking the unloaded position of the assembly as datum,

\[ W = \sum_{n=1}^{m} U_n + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{i=1}^{3} F_{ji} x_{ji} \]  

(4)

Where;

\( M \) = total number of members,

\( J \) = total number of cable joints,

\( F_{ji} \) = external applied load on joint \( j \) in direction \( i \), and

\( X_{ji} \) = displacement of joint \( j \) in direction \( i \).

The condition for structural equilibrium is that the total potential energy of the system is a minimum, that is to say (Laier, 2010).

\[ \frac{\partial W}{\partial X_{ji}} = 0 \quad (j = 1,2,\ldots, J) \quad \& \quad (i = 1,2,3) \]  

(5)

Thus at the solution the gradient vector of the total potential energy function is zero (Hashamdar et al., 2011).

**The gradient of the total potential energy**

Differentiating Equation (12) with respect to \( X_{ji} \) gives the \( g_{ji} \) element of the gradient vector \( g \) as;

\[ g_{ji} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial X_{ji}} = \sum_{n=1}^{q} \frac{\partial U_n}{\partial X_{ji}} - F_{ji} \]  

(6)

Let

\[ T_{jn} = \text{the initial tension in member } jn, \]
\[ T_{jn} = \text{the instantaneous tension in member } jn, \]
\[ e_{jn} = \text{elastic elongation of member } jn, \]
\[ E = \text{young Modulus of Elasticity}, \]
\[ A = \text{cross-sectional area of cable}, \]
\[ L_{jn} = \text{length of member } jn, \]
\[ Q = \text{number of member meeting at joint } j \]

The expression for \( g_{ji} \) can then be written as:

\[ g_{ji} = \sum_{n=1}^{q} \frac{\partial U_n}{\partial e_{jn}} \frac{\partial e_{jn}}{\partial X_{ji}} - F_{ji} \]  

(7)

The strain energy of member \( jn \) is given as:

\[ U_{jn} = T_{jn} e_{jn} + \frac{EA}{2L_{jn}} e_{jn}^2 \]  

(8)

Differentiating \( U_{jn} \) with respect to \( e_{jn} \) yields

\[ \frac{\partial U_{jn}}{\partial e_{jn}} = T_{jn} + \frac{EA}{L_{jn}} e_{jn} = T_{jn} \]  

(9)

The initial and elongated length of member \( jn \) may be expressed as:

\[ L_{jn}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{3} (X_{ni} - X_{ji})^2 \]  

(10)
\[(L_{jn} + e_{jn})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{3} (X_{ni} - X_{ji} + x_{ni} - x_{ji})^2 \quad (11)\]

Where \(X_{ji}\) is the coordinate of joint j in direction i.

Simplifying Equation (19) and substituting for \(L_{jn}\) from Equation (18) yields the following expression for \(e_{jn}\) [Man-Chung, 2005]:

\[e_{jn} = \frac{1}{2L_{jn} + e_{jn}} \sum_{i=1}^{3} (X_{ni} - X_{ji}) \]

\[2X_{ni} - 2X_{ji} + X_{ni} - X_{ji}) \}

\[\quad (2) \]

Differentiating Equation (12) with respect to \(X_{ji}\) yields

\[
\frac{\partial e_{jn}}{\partial X_{ji}} = \frac{-1}{L_{jn} + e_{jn}}(X_{ni} - X_{ji} + X_{ni} - X_{ji}) \quad (13)
\]

Substituting Equations (12) and (11) into Equation (13) yields the expression for the gradient as [Peterson, 2008]:

\[g_{ji} = -\sum_{n=1}^{q} t_{jn}(X_{ni} - X_{ji} + X_{ni} - X_{ji}) - F_{ji} \quad (14)\]

Where; \(t_{jn} = T_{jn}/(L_{jn} + e_{jn})\) is the tension coefficient of member \(j_n\).

Minimum total potential energy

The correct value of X for which W is a minimum, that is, \(g = 0\) can now be found by the iterative process.

\[X_{ji(k+1)} = X_{ji(k)} + S_{(k)} V_{ji(k)} \quad (15)\]

Where the suffices (k) and (k+1) denote the (k)th and (k+1)th iterate respectively and where (Benner and Martin, 2010).

\(V_{ji}\) = the element of the direction vector, and

\(S_{(k)} = \) the step length which defines the position along \(V_{ji(k)}\), where the total potential energy is a minimum.

The expression for \(V_{ji}\) is used, given by:

\[W = C_1S^4 + C_2S^3 + C_3S^2 + C_4S + C_5 \quad (22)\]
\[
\frac{\partial W}{\partial S} = 4C_1 S^3 + 3C_2 S^2 + 2C_3 S + C_4
\]  
(23)

Where;

\[
C_1 = \sum_{n=1}^{m} \left( \frac{EA}{2L(2L+e)^2} a_{j}^2 \right)_n
\]  
(23 a)

\[
C_2 = \sum_{n=1}^{m} \left( \frac{EA}{L(2L+e)^2} a_{2} a_{3} \right)_n
\]  
(23 b)

\[
C_3 = \sum_{n=1}^{m} \left( \frac{T_o}{2L+e} a_{1} + \frac{EA}{2L(2L+e)^2} (a_{2}^2 + 2a_{2}a_{3}) \right)_n
\]  
(23 c)

\[
C_4 = \sum_{n=1}^{m} \left( \frac{T_o}{2L+e} a_{2} + \frac{EA}{L(2L+e)^2} a_{2}a_{3} \right)_n - \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{3} F_{j} V_{j}
\]  
(23 d)

\[
C_5 = \sum_{n=1}^{m} \left( \frac{T_o}{2L+e} a_{2} + \frac{EA}{2L(2L+e)^2} a_{2}^2 \right)_n - \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{3} F_{j} X_{j}
\]  
(23 e)

The diagram of frame made and members at joint are shown in Figures 1 and 4. The graph about vector decent is shows in Figure 2, and Figure 3 and it show that how of vectors decent to reach the minimum of energy are shown.

**ANALYTICAL TEST**

The development of a mathematical control to ensure stability when using larger time steps is desirable. The mathematical model chosen is a circle flat net with 39 degrees of freedom. The circle flat net was also built as a finite element model and tested in order to verify the optimizing Analytical method theory given in this paper.

The mass density influence the stability limit, under some circumstance scaling the mass density can potentially increase the efficiency of an analysis and the explicit dynamic uses a central difference rule to integrate the equation of motion explicitly through time.

From Table 1, comparisons are made by deflections due to concentrated load at node 4 and the results are similar to other of finite element modeling. A mode shape describes the expected curvature of a surface vibrating at a particular mode.

The damping matrix used an orthogonal damping matrix in which the damping ratio could be varied in the different mode. Figure 5 shows the displacement of node increase with distance to center of circle flat net.

The maximum amplitudes of response of the whole node are in the Z-direction on node 4. This size of time step coming from Analytical method was proved to be adequate. When the solution becomes unstable, the time
Table 1. Deflections due to concentrated load at node 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOAD(N) = 1000</th>
<th>Opt. Lanczos (T)</th>
<th>Finite element (E)</th>
<th>(T - E) / T*100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z AXIS DEFLECTIONS(m) NODE 2 (LVDT)</td>
<td>178.6E-03</td>
<td>177.6E-03</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z AXIS DEFLECTIONS(m) NODE 3 (LVDT)</td>
<td>129.3E-03</td>
<td>127.9E-03</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z AXIS DEFLECTIONS(m) NODE 4 (LVDT)</td>
<td>50.75E-03</td>
<td>50.11E-03</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z AXIS DEFLECTIONS(m) NODE 5 (LVDT)</td>
<td>127.9E-03</td>
<td>127.15E-03</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z AXIS DEFLECTIONS(m) NODE 6 (LVDT)</td>
<td>50.75E-03</td>
<td>50.15E-03</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z AXIS DEFLECTIONS(m) NODE 9 (LVDT)</td>
<td>25.83E-03</td>
<td>24.33E-03</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z AXIS DEFLECTIONS(m) NODE 10 (LVDT)</td>
<td>74.46E-03</td>
<td>72.56E-03</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z AXIS DEFLECTIONS(m) NODE 11 (LVDT)</td>
<td>135.7E-03</td>
<td>133.25E-03</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z AXIS DEFLECTIONS(m) NODE 12 (LVDT)</td>
<td>135.7E-03</td>
<td>134.99E-03</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5. The displacements according to nodes.

Figure 6. Distribution of general mass over of modes.
frequency. The object of this work was principally to develop an Analytical method analysis theory and verify the theory by numerical and finite element testing. The propose method was found to be stable for time steps equal to less or less than half the smallest periodic time of the system. Comparison of finite element and theoretically predicted values showed that the deflection calculated by the proposed theory gives reasonably accurate results.
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Table 2. Differences frequency results in 5 mode shapes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Frequency (Hz) renovation explicit</th>
<th>Frequency (Hz) finite element</th>
<th>Differentials percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4083</td>
<td>1.4321</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42645</td>
<td>1.4151</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5645</td>
<td>1.4945</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7224</td>
<td>1.7041</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1568</td>
<td>2.0823</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. comparison graph for finite element and optimization of energy.


