

GEO – E1050 Finite Element Method in Geoengineering

Lecture 8-9. Advanced FEM Errors, error estimates, finite element refinement, nonlinear FEM, time dimension and more



1. What element shape functions are for?



Refresh

1. What element shape functions are for?







2. How to compute strains within finite element, knowing nodal displacements?



Refresh

2. How to compute strains within finite element, knowing nodal displacements?

$$\varepsilon_{ij} = 0.5 \left(-\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} \right), \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3$$







3. What is element stiffness matrix for?





3. What is element stiffness matrix for?







4. What is global stiffness matrix?



Refresh

4. What is global stiffness matrix?







5. How we apply boundary conditions?



Refresh 5. How we apply boundary conditions? Element 2 element number stiffness of node number 1 Element 1 K_{12xy}^1 in direction of x due to movement of node number 2 in direction of y $\Delta \mathbf{R}_{G}$ $\begin{bmatrix} K_{11xx}^{1} + K_{11xy}^{2} & K_{11xy}^{1} + K_{11xy}^{2} & K_{12xx}^{1} + K_{12xx}^{2} & K_{12xy}^{1} + K_{12xy}^{2} & K_{13xx}^{1} + 0 & K_{13xy}^{1} + 0 & K_{14xx}^{2} + 0 & K_{14xy}^{2} + 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} d_{x1} & d_{x1} &$ 0 0 ΔR_{x2} 0 $\mathbf{K}_{G}\Delta \mathbf{d}_{G} =$ $= \Delta \mathbf{R}_{G}$ ΔR_{x3} ΔR_{y3} $K_{44yy}^2 + 0 \parallel d_{y4}$



Department of Civil Engineering Finite Element Method in Geoengineering. W. Sołowski F

Refresh

6. Having calculated all nodal displacements, how do we get strains and stresses?





Where is the approximation of Finite Element Algorithm?

How to make a method which would be accurate?



Where is the approximation of Finite Element Algorithm?

$$dE = 0.5 \int_{V} d\mathbf{\varepsilon}^{T} d\mathbf{\sigma} dV = 0.5 \int_{V} d\mathbf{\varepsilon}^{T} \mathbf{D} d\mathbf{\varepsilon} dV = \dots$$

Approximation: substituting strain field by the nodal displacements and some functions when creating the element stiffness matrices!

$$= 0.5 \int_{V} (\mathbf{B} d\mathbf{d}_{E})^{T} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{B} d\mathbf{d}_{E} dV = 0.5 \int_{V} d\mathbf{d}_{E}^{T} \mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{B} d\mathbf{d}_{E} dV$$

Another approximation: numerical integration



Typically we define error in strain energy, that is:

$$E = \sqrt{\int_{V} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}})^{T} \mathbf{D} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}) dV}$$

And the strain energy as:

$$E_{Tot} = \sqrt{\int_{V} \mathbf{\epsilon}^{T} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{\epsilon} dV}$$

The relative error will be:

$$e = \eta = \frac{E}{E_{Tot}}$$











Zero energy modes



(a) Zero-energy (singular) modes for eight- and nine-node quadratic elements and (b) for a patch of bilinear elements with single integration points.





GEO – E1050 Finite Element Method in Geoengineering

Special elements

Infinite elements





Infinite elements



Zienkiewicz, chapter 7.6, linear interpolation





Zienkiewicz, chapter 7.6, quadratic interpolation



Interfaces: to allow for slippage & discontinuity



Reduced stiffness element







Aalto University School of Engineering





Interface elements...

Always check theory manual !!!





- Initial distance between nodal pairs is zero
- Each node 3 degrees of freedom
- Allows for creation of gaps, slippage etc.
- Friction coefficient can be defined, as well as static/dynamic friction coefficients



Interfaces: Optum in limit analysis



Figure 13.2: Lower bound elements joined by two zero-thickness elements to produce a statically admissible stress discontinuity.



Contact between domains

'fake' boundary condition, using Lagrange multipliers (Zienkiewicz Chapter 11)





Finite Element Method in Geoengineering. W. Sołowski

Contact between domains

If we can do that, we also can do slip / Hertzian contact! Algorithms still under development...



(Zienkiewicz Vol 2 Chapter 8).





GEO – E1050 Finite Element Method in Geoengineering

Nonlinear Finite Element Method in Geoengineering

To learn today...

The lecture should give you overview of how non-linear problems in Finite Element Method in Geoengineering are solved.

1. Understand the problem: why non-linear problems require special treatment

2. Understand solutions and their limitations:

Initial (tangent) stiffness technique

Newton-Raphson

Modified Newton-Raphson

- 3. Understand idea behind the arc-length method
 - full derivation of arc-length method is not required

4. Bonus – geometric non-linearity



Element Stifness matrix

$$0.25h^2\mathbf{B}^T\mathbf{D}\mathbf{B}d\mathbf{d}_E = \Delta\mathbf{R}$$

ſ	Δσ		D			
	$\Delta \sigma_{11}$		$\lceil 1 - v \rceil$	V	0	
	$\Delta \sigma_{_{22}}$	$=\frac{E}{(1+v)(1-2v)}$	v	1 - v	0	$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta \varepsilon_{11} \\ \Delta \varepsilon_{22} \\ \Delta \varepsilon_{12} \end{bmatrix}$
	$\Delta \sigma_{33}$		v	v	0	
	$\Delta \sigma_{12}$		0	0	1 - 2v	
l						

$$\mathbf{K}_{E} = 0.25h^{2} \begin{bmatrix} -1/h & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/h & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/h & 0 & 1/h \\ 0 & -0.5/h & -0.5/h & 0 & 0.5/h & 0.5/h \end{bmatrix}^{T} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{p}{(1-v \quad v \quad 0)}}_{(1+v)(1-2v)} \begin{bmatrix} 1-v & v & 0 \\ v & 1-v & 0 \\ v & v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1-2v \end{bmatrix}$$



Global Stifness matrix





Initial (tangent) stiffness / incremental solution

In the incremental solution we divide the load into increments $\Delta P = \lambda P$ where λ is also known as a load factor and apply a repeated solution of

 $\Delta w = K_{T}^{-1} \Delta P$

Basically we divide the load into substeps and treat each as linear – but that is usually not accurate enough and inefficient

Initial (tangent) stiffness / incremental solution



Basically we divide the load into substeps and treat each as linear – but that is usually not accurate enough and inefficient

Initial (tangent) stiffness / incremental solution



Fig. 2.2 Incremental solution of the problem 1
Initial (tangent) stiffness / incremental solution



Basically we divide the load into substeps and treat each as linear – but that is usually not accurate enough and inefficient

Recalculate stresses in the elements



Depends on stress and strain state... Hence it is not constant.

In elasto-plasticity most often – material softens which means that the predicted displacements are too small (we assume that the material is "too stiff")

Recalculate stresses in the elements



For each element: $\Delta \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \mathbf{B} \Delta \mathbf{d}_{E}$

Having strain increment, we calculate stress increment accurately (various algorithms exist) $\Delta \sigma = \int \mathbf{D}^{ep} (...) d\varepsilon$

As material most often softens, the stresses are lower than what we assumed initially.

Having stresses, one can compute unbalanced forces in the system – and use those to compute next iteration $\Delta \mathbf{R}_i$

Newton - Raphson



Fig. 2.6 Graphical representation of the Newton-Raphson method

Department of Civil Engineering Finite Element Method in Geoengineering. W. Sołowski

Modified Newton Raphson



Department of Civil Engineering Finite Element Method in Geoengineering. W. Sołowski

Modified Newton Raphson



Idea: do not solve the exact load step, but solve as much as easily done and than proceed to solve the next bit...

So we have sort of automatic load – stepping (can be achieved differently too)

We choose the arc-length ΔI and converge to the loaddisplacement curve...

Arc-length more and more commonly used (e.g. now it is used in Plaxis)

Deals with softening well!



Department of Civil Engineering

Fig. 2.8 Explanation of the arc length ineited Element Method in Geoengineering. W. Sołowski



Fig. 2.8 Explanation of the arc length method

Department of Civil Engineering Finite Element Method in Geoengineering. W. Sołowski



Department of Civil Engineering Finite Element Method in Geoengineering. W. Sołowski

W

Using a Taylor series expansion we can write for the equilibrium equation:

$$\delta R(w, \lambda) = \frac{\partial R}{\partial w} \delta w + \frac{\partial R}{\partial \lambda} \delta \lambda = 0$$





$$\frac{\partial R}{\partial w} = K_{T} \quad , \quad \frac{\partial R}{\partial \lambda} = -P$$

$$\delta a = 2\Delta w \delta w + 2\Delta \lambda (\psi P)^2 \delta \lambda = 0$$

Department of Civil Engineering Finite Element Method in Geoengineering. W. Sołowski



After substitution of

$$\delta R = R_n - R_o$$
 , $\delta a = a_n - a_o$

where the subscripts n and o mean new and old value, we obtain a system of equations.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{o} \\ \mathbf{a}_{o} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{T} & -\mathbf{P} \\ 2\Delta \mathbf{w} & 2\Delta\lambda(\mathbf{\psi}\mathbf{P})^{2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta \mathbf{w} \\ \delta \lambda \end{bmatrix}$$

which can be solved for the change in displacement δw and change in load factor $\delta \lambda$.

Fig. 2.8 Explanation of the arc length method



GEO – E1050 Finite Element Method in Geoengineering









3D FEM

Corner nodes:

$$\begin{split} N_1 &= \frac{1}{8}(1-S)(1-T)(1-U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_9 + N_{12} + N_{13}) \\ N_2 &= \frac{1}{8}(1+S)(1-T)(1-U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_9 + N_{10} + N_{14}) \\ N_3 &= \frac{1}{8}(1+S)(1+T)(1-U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{10} + N_{11} + N_{15}) \\ N_4 &= \frac{1}{8}(1-S)(1+T)(1-U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{11} + N_{12} + N_{16}) \\ N_5 &= \frac{1}{8}(1-S)(1-T)(1+U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{13} + N_{17} + N_{20}) \\ N_6 &= \frac{1}{8}(1+S)(1-T)(1+U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{14} + N_{17} + N_{18}) \\ N_7 &= \frac{1}{8}(1+S)(1+T)(1+U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{15} + N_{18} + N_{19}) \\ N_8 &= \frac{1}{8}(1-S)(1+T)(1+U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{16} + N_{19} + N_{20}) \end{split}$$



Mid - side nodes: .

$$\begin{split} N_{9} &= i/4 (1 - S^{2})(1 - T)(1 - U) \\ N_{10} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 + S)(1 - U) \\ N_{11} &= i/4 (1 - S^{2})(1 + T)(1 - U) \\ N_{12} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 - S)(1 - U) \\ N_{13} &= i/4 (1 - U^{2})(1 - S)(1 - T) \\ N_{14} &= i/4 (1 - U^{2})(1 + S)(1 - T) \\ N_{15} &= i/4 (1 - U^{2})(1 + S)(1 + T) \\ N_{16} &= i/4 (1 - U^{2})(1 - S)(1 + T) \\ N_{17} &= i/4 (1 - S^{2})(1 - T)(1 + U) \\ N_{18} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 + S)(1 + U) \\ N_{19} &= i/4 (1 - S^{2})(1 + T)(1 + U) \\ N_{20} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 - S)(1 + U) \\ N_{20} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 - S)(1 + U) \\ \end{split}$$

3D FEM

Corner nodes:

$$\begin{split} N_1 &= \frac{1}{8}(1-S)(1-T)(1-U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_9 + N_{12} + N_{13}) \\ N_2 &= \frac{1}{8}(1+S)(1-T)(1-U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_9 + N_{10} + N_{14}) \\ N_3 &= \frac{1}{8}(1+S)(1+T)(1-U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{10} + N_{11} + N_{15}) \\ N_4 &= \frac{1}{8}(1-S)(1+T)(1-U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{11} + N_{12} + N_{16}) \\ N_5 &= \frac{1}{8}(1-S)(1-T)(1+U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{13} + N_{17} + N_{20}) \\ N_6 &= \frac{1}{8}(1+S)(1-T)(1+U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{14} + N_{17} + N_{18}) \\ N_7 &= \frac{1}{8}(1+S)(1+T)(1+U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{15} + N_{18} + N_{19}) \\ N_8 &= \frac{1}{8}(1-S)(1+T)(1+U) - \frac{1}{2}(N_{16} + N_{19} + N_{20}) \end{split}$$



Mid - side nodes: .

$$\begin{split} N_{9} &= i/4 (1 - S^{2})(1 - T)(1 - U) \\ N_{10} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 + S)(1 - U) \\ N_{11} &= i/4 (1 - S^{2})(1 + T)(1 - U) \\ N_{12} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 - S)(1 - U) \\ N_{13} &= i/4 (1 - U^{2})(1 - S)(1 - T) \\ N_{14} &= i/4 (1 - U^{2})(1 + S)(1 - T) \\ N_{15} &= i/4 (1 - U^{2})(1 + S)(1 + T) \\ N_{16} &= i/4 (1 - U^{2})(1 - S)(1 + T) \\ N_{17} &= i/4 (1 - S^{2})(1 - T)(1 + U) \\ N_{18} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 + S)(1 + U) \\ N_{19} &= i/4 (1 - S^{2})(1 + T)(1 + U) \\ N_{20} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 - S)(1 + U) \\ N_{20} &= i/4 (1 - T^{2})(1 - S)(1 + U) \\ \end{split}$$

3D FEM

$$\left[K_{G}\right]\left\{\Delta d\right\}_{nG} = \left\{\Delta R_{G}\right\}$$





iterative solutions are used, not direct inverse; direct inversion still may be quicker for highly non-linear problems





GEO – E1050 Finite Element Method in Geoengineering

Geometric non-linearity

Geometric non-linearity

1.3.1 Rigid bar with rotational spring - vertical load

The structural system in Fig. 1.4 consists of a rigid bar and a spring of stiffness k and is loaded by a vertical force at the end. It is clear that as the deflection at the end increases, the geometry change during loading can no longer be neglected.



Fig. 1.4 Example of geometrically nonlinear bahviour

The Equilibrium condition is written as:

 $PL\cos\theta = k\theta$



Geometric non-linearity

The relationship between applied load and rotation is



Fig. 1.5 Linear and non-linear equilibrium paths of the spring beam system



Geometric non-linearity



Fig. 1.7 Equilibrium paths for beam-spring example with horiz. loading





GEO – E1050 Errors and error control

To learn today...

How automatic re-meshing works

- elasticity
- elasto-plasticity

Limitations and pitfalls in numerical analyses:

- discretisation errors
- boundary conditions
- selection of elements
- contact detection / no contact
- input parameters consistency

How to avoid errors...



Automatic re-meshing

Linear Elasticity:

- we discretise the domain into elements
- internal work = external work

$$dE = 0.5 \int_{V} d\mathbf{\varepsilon}^{T} d\mathbf{\sigma} dV \qquad \qquad dL = \int_{S} d\mathbf{d}_{E}^{T} \mathbf{T} dS = d\mathbf{d}_{E}^{T} \Delta \mathbf{R}$$

- 1) Error minimised when internal work in each element is the same... So we reduce / increase the size of elements as long as we get constant internal work...
- 2) Alternative: each element has same average strain

In an "optimal mesh" it is desirable that the distribution of element energy norm error should be equal for all elements.



Automatic re-meshing

Elasto - plasticity $dE = 0.5 \int_{V} d\mathbf{\epsilon}^{T} d\mathbf{\sigma} dV$

Error minimised when internal work in each element is the same... So we reduce / increase the size of elements as long as we get constant internal work...

we need to take into account plastic work

AND WE FIND THAT THE IDEA DOES NOT ALWAYS WORK

why: element with very high elastic stress with little plastic strain will lead to higher work than an element with lots of plasticity and deformations, but low stress

so – error related to the amount of work – but also to more general deformations and plastic deformation



Automatic re-meshing elasto - plasticity

Options:

- shear dissipation

- + assumes that most errors and displacements in soils are in the shear zones
- + / related to plastic work

poor if material has points with high stress and little shearing and actually errors are somewhere else
superb for limit analysis as in limit analysis the only dissipation is shear dissipation

$$D_s = (\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathbf{m} p)^{\mathrm{T}} (\varepsilon - \mathbf{m} \varepsilon_v)$$



Automatic re-meshing elasto - plasticity

Options:

- total dissipation
 - + / related to plastic work
 - poor if material has points with high stress and little shearing and actually errors are somewhere else

- not well suitable for materials where we have really dissipation due to shearing (e.g. Mohr – Coulomb)

$$D={\pmb\sigma}^{\scriptscriptstyle\mathsf{T}}{\pmbarepsilon}$$
 .



Automatic re-meshing elasto - plasticity

Options:

- Total strain

$$\|arepsilon\|$$

- not related to plastic work
- can be useful, but we forgo idea of work totally...
- Plastic multiplier λ
 - related to plastic strain
 - similarly, we let go the idea of work...



We will concentrate on issues related to numerical simulation mostly

Observational error & conceptual models are all the same in all design

(though in FEM it is especially tempting to make complex conceptual model)



Figure 15.1: From question to decision using numerical analysis.



Mathematical model:

- constitutive model for material THE issue of Advanced Soil Mechanics course
- other errors model for water flow, thermal conduction
- the differential equations we discretise have rather limited intended area of use
 - generally related to very slow processes which are steady state
- Correct choice of parameters for them is **tough Numerical Methods in Geotechnics course**



Discretization errors

wrong input data – we just defined the problem correctly
Usually we can see it during input...

If not, we can see it when checking results

But sometimes things are difficult to detect

Especially when we do not have clear idea what the results should be, both qualitatively and quantitatively (roughly)



Mars Orbiter lost (1999)

Discretization errors: wrong input

units... kPa vs MPa...

SI vs imperial zero level definition

element defined twice in the same place - especially easy for 1D elements in 2D simulation etc.

Laufenburg bridge (2003)

wrong material assigned

Countless errors, in FEM and outside of FEM



Discretization errors: element selection

Element order:

tempting to lower it because simulation 'works' negative jacobian errors, shape distortion...



Discretization errors: element selection

Different type of elements in the same simulation (now rarely allowed, apart of 1D elements)

In very large models, useful to check parts of them for correctness...



Discretization errors: element selection

Quality of mesh may lead to 'game breaking errors' in 3D





© Mansikkamäki 2015

3D geometry, 240 000 element (10 node tetrahedral)





© Mansikkamäki 2015

1 m long section of an embankment... More elements, same 10 node tetrahedral


Limitations & pitfalls



For smaller models – differences due to convergence criteria set (remember your Comsol exercise)



Limitations & pitfalls

Discretization errors: contact

Contact is expensive, does not always work

But otherwise elements not in contact initially will not be in contact at any point in analysis

No easy solution – but always check when in doubt

Divide load into two – before contact occurs ... and after contact occurs...

e.g. apply corrective loads to the right elements...



Check, check and check again

Are the results looking all right?

- stress concentrations where they should occur?
- stress, strain, displacement fields continous?
- no areas which may be in contact?
- sharp edges in elasticity or Poisson equation problems (steady flow, thermal conduction, diffusion, ...)

- if so, maybe needed small rounding



Check, check and check again

Are the results are **quantitatively sensible**?

- values similar to those from hand made calculations?
- no outragous large or too small values?
- you only do calculations to confirm what you know and make sure that you are not wrong, but if the **expectations** and **calculations** do not match, it is a **red light**



Check, check and check again Are the numerics correct?

- elastic energy > 0?
- error norms sensible? Less than say 5%?

- if you make better mesh and recalculate, are the results only **negligibly different?**



Check, check and check again

When you are experienced FEM modeller, you can calculate results which are close to reality...

But you can easily fudge the calculations so it will be invisible to most, in order to get any results your boss wants

- especially easy in 3D
- be careful...
- don't yield to pressure...





GEO – E1050 Finite Element Method in Geoengineering

Dynamic problems

Dynamic problems: require time in the equation...

We add time dependent parts to the equation:

$$M\ddot{\tilde{u}} + C\dot{\tilde{u}} + K\tilde{u} - f = 0$$
$$\dot{\tilde{u}} = \frac{d\tilde{u}}{dt} \quad \text{and} \quad \ddot{\tilde{u}} = \frac{d^2\tilde{u}}{dt^2}$$



Dynamic problems...

We add time dependent parts to the equation:

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{C}\dot{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{\tilde{u}} - \mathbf{f} &= \mathbf{0} \\ \dot{\mathbf{u}} &= \frac{d\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} \quad \text{and} \quad \ddot{\mathbf{u}} &= \frac{d^{2}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}{dt^{2}} \\ \mathbf{K}^{e} &= \mathbf{H}^{e} = \int_{\Omega_{e}} \mathbf{b}^{T}\mathbf{k}\mathbf{b}\,\mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_{qe}} \mathbf{N}^{T}H\mathbf{N}\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\ \mathbf{C}^{e} &= \int_{\Omega_{e}} \mathbf{N}^{T}c\mathbf{N}\,\mathrm{d}\Omega \\ \mathbf{M}^{e} &= \int_{\Omega_{e}} \mathbf{N}^{T}\rho\mathbf{N}\,\mathrm{d}\Omega \\ \mathbf{f}^{e} &= \mathbf{s}^{e} = \int_{\Omega_{e}} \mathbf{N}^{T}Q\,\mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_{qe}} \mathbf{N}^{T}(\bar{q} - H\phi_{0})\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \end{split}$$



Dynamic problems: require time...

We add inertial parts to the equation:

$$\mathbf{K}^{e} = \mathbf{H}^{e} = \int_{\Omega_{e}} \mathbf{b}^{T} \mathbf{k} \mathbf{b} \, d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_{qe}} \mathbf{N}^{T} H \mathbf{N} \, d\Gamma$$
$$\mathbf{C}^{e} = \int_{\Omega_{e}} \mathbf{N}^{T} c \mathbf{N} \, d\Omega \longrightarrow \text{viscous forces}$$
$$\mathbf{M}^{e} = \int_{\Omega_{e}} \mathbf{N}^{T} \rho \mathbf{N} \, d\Omega \longrightarrow \text{inertial forces}$$
$$\mathbf{f}^{e} = \mathbf{s}^{e} = \int_{\Omega_{e}} \mathbf{N}^{T} Q \, d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_{qe}} \mathbf{N}^{T} (\bar{q} - H\phi_{0}) \, d\Gamma$$





GEO – E1050 Finite Element Method in Geoengineering

Problem solving strategy

Problem solving strategy











Total displacements: 10000 m













Total displacements: 0.08 m





Y stress







Y stress



Thank you

Aalto University School of Engineering