Coupled PIEM/FEM Algorithm Based on Mindlin-Reissner Plate Theory for Bending Analysis of Plates with Through-Thickness Hole
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Abstract: The Infinite Element Method (IEM) is widely used for the analysis of elastostatic structures containing singularities. In the IEM method, the problem domain is partitioned into multiple element layers, where the stiffness matrix of each layer is similar to that of the other layers in the discretized domain. However, in Mindlin-Reissner plate theory, the stiffness matrix varies through the layers of the plate, and thus the conventional IEM algorithm cannot be applied. Accordingly, the present study proposes a Plate Infinite Element Method (PIEM) in which the element stiffness matrix is separated into two sub-matrices; each being similar to the equivalent sub-matrix of the element layers above and below it. The validity of the proposed algorithm is demonstrated by comparing the results obtained for the deflection contour of a plate under four-point bending with those obtained using conventional ABAQUS Finite Element Method (FEM) software. The PIEM algorithm is then coupled with an FEM algorithm and used to investigate the effects of the hole size, hole position and hole profile / area on the bending strength \( S_b \) of plates containing through-thickness holes. In general, the results show that the combined PIEM/FEM algorithm provides an accurate and computationally efficient means of analyzing the bending behavior of plates containing through-thickness holes.
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1 Introduction

A large number of structural components in engineering can be classified as plates. Plates with through-thickness holes are used in many civil, mechanical, biome-
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Mechanical and aeronautical structures as a means of adapting the flexural rigidity of the structure or interconnecting the various structural members [Yamamoto, Hongo, Berglund, Sperling, Cofield, An, and Steinmann (in press)]. As a result, the bending characteristics of plates containing opening holes have attracted significant attention in the literature for obtaining the design objectives of such structures. Various methods are available for measuring the flexural rigidity of such plates, including the three-point bending test (3PB), the four-point bending test (4PB), the ring-on-ring test, and the ball-on-ring test [Feraboli and Kedward (2003); Huurman, Gelpke, and Jacobs (2012)]. In the 4PB test, the plate is in a state of pure bending and thus the 4PB test is considered to be the most reliable method for estimating the relationship between the bending moment and the deflection. In performing the 4PB test, the flexural stiffness per unit width of the plate ($S_b$) [Lee and Park (2004)] is defined as

$$S_b = \frac{EI}{W} = \frac{ML^2}{8\omega_{\text{max}}W}$$

where $E$ is the Young’s Modulus, $I$ is the moment of inertia, $M$ is the bending moment, $L$ is the length of the plate, $W$ is the width of the plate, and $\omega_{\text{max}}$ is the maximum deflection of the plate.

The literature contains many numerical investigations into the mechanical response of plates subjected to various types of loading. For example, many researchers have examined the out-of-plane bending of finite thickness plates containing a circular hole using the Finite Element Method (FEM) [Komur and Sonmez (2008); Yu, Guo, She, and Zhao (2008); Yang, Kim, Cho, and Beom (2008); Maiorana, Pellegrino, and Modena (2009); Park, Kim, Kwon, and Chung (2012)]. Other researchers have investigated the bending response of elastostatic plates containing singularities using the Boundary Element Method (BEM) [Chen, Shen, and Chen (2006); Chen, Hsiao, and Leu (2006); Lee, Chen, and Lee (2007); Dong, Lo, and Cheung (2004)]. In addition, various researchers have analyzed the static and free vibration responses of complex-shaped plates using the Mesh-Free Method (MFM) [Liu and Chen (2001); Kee, Liu, and Lu (2008)]. However, in the FEM, BEM and MFM methods, a re-modeling process is required to evaluate the effects on the bending response of changes in the properties of the singularity (e.g., the hole size, hole number, hole position, and so on). As a result, such methods, while highly accurate, are time consuming and inefficient.

The Infinite Element Method (IEM) provides an alternative approach for solving singularity-type engineering problems. In essence, the IEM approach involves discretizing the problem domain into a predefined number of element layers in such a way that the stiffness matrix of each layer is similar to that of all the other layers in
the domain. Ying [Ying (1992, 1995)] proved the existence of a transformation matrix which relates the nodal displacement vectors of the inner and outer layers and showed that the total stiffness matrix of the body under consideration can therefore be degenerated to form a combined stiffness matrix relating only to the boundary nodes and tractions. Liu proposed a two-dimensional hybrid IEM/FEM scheme for analyzing various types of elastic and singularity problems [Liu and Chiou (2003, 2004); Liu, Tu, and Chung (2012)]. However, the IEM algorithm cannot be applied directly to Mindlin-Reissner bending problems due to the incompatible differential order of the shear stiffness component.

Figure 1: Physical and PIEM/FEM models of rectangular plate containing through-thickness holes
Accordingly, the present study proposes a Plate IEM (PIEM) algorithm based on Mindlin-Reissner theory in which the conventional IEM element stiffness matrix is decomposed into two sub-matrixes, where each sub-matrix is similar to the equivalent sub-matrix of all the other element layers in the discretized domain. The validity of the proposed PIEM algorithm is confirmed by comparing the numerical results obtained for the 4PB deflection of a plate with those obtained using commercial FEM software (ABAQUS). The PIEM algorithm is then integrated with a FEM scheme in order to evaluate the bending response of plates containing through-thickness holes with various sizes, positions and profiles / areas. In the proposed PIEM/FEM algorithm, the region of the plate containing the through-thickness hole is modeled using the PIEM scheme, while the remainder of the computational domain is meshed using the conventional FEM scheme (see Fig. 1). As a result, in evaluating the effect on the plate stiffness of changes in the diameter, position and profile / area of the through-thickness hole, it is necessary only to re-mesh the PIEM region of the domain. Consequently, the numerical efficiency of the solution procedure is significantly improved.

2 Mindlin-Reissner plate theory

Mindlin-Reissner plate theory is an extension of Kirchhoff-Love plate theory which takes into account shear deformations through the thickness of the plate [Mindlin (1951); Wang, Lim, Reddy, and Lee (2001)]. In applying Mindlin-Reissner theory, the following assumptions are imposed: (a) the thickness of the plate is unchanged during deformation; (b) the normal stress through the thickness can be ignored; and (c) the normal line of the thickness is perpendicular to the neutral axis line following deformation [Nguyen-Xuan, Rabczuk, Bordas, and Debongnie (2008); Cui, Liu, and Li (2010)].

Given the assumptions above, the full three-dimensional solid mechanics problem reduces to a two-dimensional problem. Therefore, the in-plane displacements are given as shown in Eqs. (2) and (3), respectively, while the transverse displacement has the form given in Eq. (4).

\[ u = -z \theta_x(x,y) = -z \left( \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x} - \gamma_{xz} \right) \] (2)

\[ v = -z \theta_y(x,y) = -z \left( \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial y} - \gamma_{yz} \right) \] (3)

\[ \omega = \omega(x,y) \] (4)
where \( \theta_x \) and \( \theta_y \) are the rotations of the mid-plane about the \( y \)- and \( x \)- axes, respectively; and \( \gamma \) is the angle caused by the transverse shear deformation. Figure 2 shows the free body diagram of the plate element, where the degrees of freedom of each node in the plate element are transferred from \([u, v, \omega]\) to \([\theta_x, \theta_y, \omega]\).

![Figure 2: Free-body diagram of plate element](image)

The 4-node-plate finite element stiffness matrix can be derived by Mindlin-Reissner theory and mapping the physical coordinates to the natural coordinates. The associated plate stiffness is given by Eq. (5), in which \( k_b \) is the bending stiffness and \( k_s \) is the shear stiffness. Note that the plate material is assumed to be linear elastic, isotropic, and homogenous. The resultant equation of each element has the form shown in Eq. (12).

\[
k = k_b + k_s
\]

where

\[
k_b = \frac{h^3}{12} \int_{-1}^{1} [B_b]^T [D_b] [B_b] \det |J| d\zeta d\eta
\]

\[
k_s = h \kappa \int_{-1}^{1} [B_s]^T [D_s] [B_s] \det |J| d\zeta d\eta
\]
in which $h$ is the thickness of the plate, $\kappa$ is the shear energy correction factor (usually equal to 5/6), and $J$ is the Jacobian matrix.

$$
[B_b] = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial y} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial y} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial y} & 0 \\
\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial x} & 0 & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial x} & 0 & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial x} & 0 & \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial y} & 0 & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial y} & 0 & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial y} & 0 & \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial y} & 0
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(8)

where $H_i$ is a 4-node plate finite element shape function.

$$
[D_b] = \frac{E}{1 - v^2} \begin{bmatrix}1 & v & 0 \\
v & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{1 - v}{2}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(9)

where $E$ is the Young’s Modulus of the plate and $v$ is the Poisson ratio.

$$
[B_s] = \begin{bmatrix}
-H_1 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial x} & -H_2 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial x} & -H_3 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial x} & -H_4 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial x}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(10)

3 Plate Infinite Element Method

3.1 Similarity characteristic

As shown in Fig. 3, the basic concept of IEM involves partitioning the computational domain into multiple layers of geometrically-similar elements. For element
$I$ in the upper-most layer, the local nodes are labeled as 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the counterclockwise direction, while the global coordinates of each node are denoted as $(x^I_i, y^I_i)$. Taking the origin $O$ as the reference point and assigning the proportionality ratio $\xi$ a value in the interval of $[0, 1]$, element $II$ is obtained as shown in Fig. 3 with global coordinates of $(x^{II}, y^{II})$. The global coordinates of elements $I$ and $II$ are related as follows:

$$(x^{II}, y^{II}) = \xi (x^I, y^I)$$

(13)

![Figure 3: Illustration of the 2-D similar isoparametric elements](image)

The coordinates of any point within element $I$ can be expressed in terms of the nodal coordinates by means of a shape function $H_i$, as shown in Eqs. (14) and (15). Multiplying both sides of Eqs. (14) and (15) by the proportionality ratio $\xi$, the coordinates of the corresponding point in element $II$ are obtained as shown in Eqs. (16) and (17), respectively.

$$x^I = \sum_{i=1}^{4} H_i x^I_i$$

(14)

$$y^I = \sum_{i=1}^{4} H_i y^I_i$$

(15)

$$x^{II} = \xi x^I = \sum_{i=1}^{4} H_i x^{II}_i$$

(16)

$$y^{II} = \xi y^I = \sum_{i=1}^{4} H_i y^{II}_i$$

(17)
From Eqs. (16) and (17), and recalling Eqs. (8) and (9), it can be shown that:

\[ [B_b]_{II} = \frac{1}{\xi} [B_b]_I \] (18)

\[ [D_b]_{II} = [D_b]_I \] (19)

\[ \det[J]_{II} = \xi^2 \det[J]_I \] (20)

From Eqs. (18) to (20), it is seen that the bending stiffness of the second element layer is the same as that of the first element layer, i.e.,

\[ [k_b]_{II} = h^3 \frac{1}{12} \int\int_{-1}^{1} [B_b]_{II}^T [D_b]_{II} [B_b]_{II} \det[J]_{II} d\zeta d\eta \]

\[ = h^3 \frac{1}{12} \int\int_{-1}^{1} \frac{1}{\xi} [B_b]_I^T [D_b]_I \frac{1}{\xi} [B_b]_I \xi^2 \det[J]_I d\zeta d\eta \] (21)

\[ = h^3 \frac{1}{12} \int\int_{-1}^{1} [B_b]_I^T [D_b]_I [B_b]_I \det[J]_I d\zeta d\eta \]

\[ = [k_b]_I^{-1} \]

In adapting the conventional IEM method to Mindler-Reissner plate problems, let the shear stiffness of the first element layer \( B_s \) be partitioned into two sub-matrices, \( B_s^* \) & \( B_s^{**} \), i.e.,

\[ [B_s] = [B_s^*] + [B_s^{**}] \] (22)

\[ [B_s^*] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial x} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial y} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial y} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial y} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial y} \end{bmatrix} \] (23)

\[ [B_s^{**}] = \begin{bmatrix} -H_1 & 0 & 0 & -H_2 & 0 & 0 & -H_3 & 0 & 0 & -H_4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -H_1 & 0 & 0 & -H_2 & 0 & 0 & -H_3 & 0 & 0 & -H_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \] (24)

Substituting Eq. (22) into Eq. (7), it follows that

\[ k_s = h \kappa \int_{-1}^{1} [[B_s^*] + [B_s^{**}]]^T [D_s] [[B_s^*] + [B_s^{**}]] \det[J] d\zeta d\eta \] (25)
Let

\[
[S^*] = h \kappa \int_{-1}^{1} [B_s^*]^T [D_s] [B_s^*] \det |J| d\zeta d\eta
\]

\[
[S^{**}] = h \kappa \int_{-1}^{1} \{[B_s^*]^T [D_s] [B_s^{**}] + [B_s^{**}]^T [D_s] [B_s^*]\} \det |J| d\zeta d\eta
\]

\[
[S^{***}] = h \kappa \int_{-1}^{1} [B_s^{**}]^T [D_s] [B_s^{**}] \det |J| d\zeta d\eta
\]

Thus, Eq. (25) becomes

\[
k_s = [S^*] + [S^{**}] + [S^{***}]
\]

Recalling Eqs. (16) and (17), the relationship between the shear stiffness of element layers \(I\) and \(II\) is given as

\[
[k_s]_{II} = [S^*]_{II} + \xi [S^{**}]_{II} + \xi^2 [S^{***}]_{II}
\]

(30)

Bring Eq. (21) & Eq. (30) into Eq. (5), the plate stiffness matrix becomes

\[
[k]_I = [k_b]_I + [S^*]_I + [S^{**}]_I + [S^{***}]_I
\]

(31)

\[
[k]_{II} = [k_b]_I + [S^*]_I + \xi [S^{**}]_I + \xi^2 [S^{***}]_I
\]

(32)

\[
[k]_m = [k_b]_I + [S^*]_I + \xi^{m-1} [S^{**}]_I + \xi^{2(m-1)} [S^{***}]_I
\]

(33)

### 3.2 Combined stiffness of PIEM

Figure 4 illustrates the IEM modeling process. The basic steps in the meshing process can be summarized as follows: (1) Discretize the outer boundary \(\Gamma_0\) using a total of \(m\) nodes ordered in the counterclockwise direction. (2) Choose the reference point, \(O\), and using the specified proportionality constant, \(\xi\), automatically construct multiple similar curves \(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \ldots, \Gamma_s\) of \(\Gamma_0\) centered at reference point \(O\) with proportionality constants \(\xi^1, \xi^2, \ldots, \xi^s\), respectively. Note that \(s\) denotes the number of element layers (specified in advance). Let the region bounded by curves \(\Gamma_{i-1}\) and \(\Gamma_i\) be denoted as the \(i\)th element layer \((i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, s)\). (3) Regularly discretize each element layer \(\Gamma_i\) using the same number of nodes as that used for
layer $\Gamma_0$ and determine the coordinates of each node using Eq. (13). Each layer elements are meshed automatically into four nodes quadrilateral elements in a radial direction.

The stiffness matrix of the upper-most element layer has the form shown in Eq. (34), where $k_a$, $k_b$ and $A$ are the sub-matrices of the stiffness matrix.

\[
k_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
    [k_a]_1 & [-A]^T_1 \\
    [-A]_1 & [k_b]_1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Substituting Eq. (34) into Eq. (12) and expanding, the stiffness matrices of the $s$ element layers in the computational domain are obtained as follows:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    [k_a]_1 & [-A]^T_1 \\
    [-A]_1 & [k_b]_1
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
    \delta_0 \\
    \delta_1
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
    f_0 \\
    f_1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(35)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    [k_a]_i & [-A]^T_i \\
    [-A]_i & [k_b]_i
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
    \delta_{i-1} \\
    \delta_i
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
    -f_{i-1} \\
    f_i
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(36)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    [k_a]_s & [-A]^T_s \\
    [-A]_s & [k_b]_s
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
    \delta_{s-1} \\
    \delta_s
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
    -f_{s-1} \\
    f_s
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(37)

where $\delta_i$ is the nodal displacement vector associated with element layer $\Gamma_i$ and $f_i$ is the corresponding nodal force vector. Note that $\Gamma_i$ and $f_i$ are defined respectively as

\[
\delta_i = [\theta_{x1}^i \theta_{y1}^i \omega_1^i \ldots \theta_{xm}^i \theta_{ym}^i \omega_m^i]^T
\]

(38)

\[
f_i = [M_{x1}^i M_{y1}^i f_{z1}^i \ldots M_{xm}^i M_{ym}^i f_{zm}^i]^T
\]

(39)

Keep the first and last equation of Eq. (35) and Eq. (37), and combine the second equation for the $i$th element-layer and the first equation for the $(i + 1)$th element-layer. Assuming that no internal force is applied to $\Gamma_s$ (i.e., $f_s = 0$), Eqs. (35) to (37) become

\[
[k_a]_1 \cdot \delta_0 - [A]^T_1 \cdot \delta_1 = f_0
\]

(40)

\[
-\begin{bmatrix} k_b \end{bmatrix}_i \cdot \delta_{i-1} + [k_a]_i + [k_a]_{i+1} \cdot \delta_i - [A]^T_{i+1} \cdot \delta_{i+1} = 0
\]

(41)

\[
-\begin{bmatrix} k_b \end{bmatrix}_s \cdot \delta_{s-1} + [k_b]_s \cdot \delta_s = 0
\]

(42)
Let

\[ [M]_s = [k_b]_s \]  \hspace{1cm} (43) \]

\[ [M]_1 = [[k_b]_1 + [k_a]_1] - [A]_1^T \cdot [M]_1^{-1} \cdot [A]_1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (44) \]

\[ ... \]

\[ [M]_1 = [[k_b]_1 + [k_a]_2] - [A]_2^T \cdot [M]_2^{-1} \cdot [A]_2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (45) \]

Since \([M]_s\) is equal to known \([k_b]_s, [M]_{s-1}, [M]_{s-2}, \ldots, [M]_2, [M]_1\) can be calculated iteratively by means of Eqs. (43) to (45). Finally, substituting Eq. (48) into Eq. (40), the combined stiffness matrix \(k_{IEM} = \{[k_a]_1 - [A]_1^T \cdot [M]_1^{-1} \cdot [A]_1\} \) is obtained with the form shown in Eq. (49). In other words, all of the inner elements layers are combined to form a single super-element with master nodes at the outer boundary \(\Gamma_0\) only.

\[ \delta_s = [M]_s^{-1} \cdot [A]_s \cdot \delta_{s-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (46) \]

\[ ... \]

\[ \delta_i = [M]_i^{-1} \cdot [A]_i \cdot \delta_{i-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (47) \]

\[ ... \]

\[ \delta_1 = [M]_1^1 \cdot [A]_1 \cdot \delta_0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (48) \]

\[ \{[k_a]_1 - [A]_1^T \cdot [M]_1^{-1} \cdot [A]_1\} \cdot \delta_0 = f_0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (49) \]

Ying [Ying (1995)] proved that \(k_{IEM}\) converges toward a certain constant quantity as the number of element layers approaches infinity, i.e.,

\[ \lim_{s \to \infty} k^{(s)}_{IEM} = k_{IEM} \]  \hspace{1cm} (50) \]

where \(s\) denotes the number of the defined element layers. However, Eq. (50) could not be directly applied to the numerical formulation due to the infinity element layers is not countable in a physical sense. Therefore, Liu [Liu and Chiou (2003)] proposed a convergence method to observe the diagonal trace terms \(k^{(s)}_{IEM}(j,j)\). When the desired accuracy criteria \(\varepsilon = \left| \frac{k^{(i+1)}_{IEM}(j,j) - k^{(i)}_{IEM}(j,j)}{k^{(i+1)}_{IEM}(j,j)} \right| \times 100\% \leq 10^{-6}\) is satisfied, the iterative program is terminated and the critical element layers number, “\(S_{cr}\)”, is determined as equal to the terminated iterative value, “\(i\)”. \(S_{cr}\) is the minimum element layers needed for the convergence; this implies that there are enough elements to
cover the entire domain. The proportionality ratio $\xi$ is another important factor in the convergence study. Basically, the greater $\xi$ is chosen, the more $S_{cr}$ is needed. In other words, given a sufficiently large value of $s$, the stiffness $k_{IEM}^{(s)}$ is approximately equal to the combined stiffness $k_{IEM}$.

![IEM mesh and reference point](image)

Figure 4: IEM mesh and reference point

### 3.3 Integration of IEM and FEM schemes

Meshing the entire computational domain using the IEM scheme is not favorable when the body of interest has a concave or complex characteristic. Accordingly, the present study constructs a combined PIEM/FEM scheme in which the region of the computational domain containing the singularity (i.e., a through-thickness hole in the present case) is meshed using the PIEM scheme, while the remainder of the domain is meshed using the conventional FEM scheme. As shown in Fig. 5, the two regions of the domain are denoted as $\Pi$ and $\Omega$, respectively, and are connected by a coupling interface $\Gamma_0$ comprising common nodes, $\delta_0$. Note that the common nodes are converted directly from the original master nodes on the boundary region of the IE domain. Liu [Liu and Chiou (2003)] showed that the stiffness matrix for the combined IEM/FEM domain has the form

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
k_{coupled} + k_{IEM} & k_{cf}^T \\
k_{cf} & k_{FEM}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\delta_0 \\
\delta_{FEM}
\end{bmatrix}
= [k_{IE-FE}]
\begin{bmatrix}
\delta_0 \\
\delta_{FEM}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
f_{FEM}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

where $\delta_0$ and $\delta_{FEM}$ are the displacement vectors of the interface and non-interface nodes, respectively; $f_{FEM}$ is the associated loading force vector; and $k_{IE-FE}$ is the global system stiffness matrix.
4 Numerical Examples

In this section, the validity of the proposed PIEM algorithm is demonstrated by comparing the results obtained for the deflection of a plate under 4PB testing with those obtained using conventional ABAQUS Finite Element Method (FEM) software [Hibbitt, Karlsson, and Sorensen (2004)]. The combined PIEM/FEM scheme is then used to investigate the effects of the hole size, hole position and hole profile / area on the bending strength (flexural rigidity) of simply-supported rectangular plates containing a single through-thickness hole. (Note that the PIEM/FEM scheme is programmed using MATLAB software [Kwon and Bang (2000)].)

4.1 Validation of PIEM algorithm

Consider the rectangular plate shown in Fig. 6 with dimensions of $100mm \times 50mm \times 0.5mm$ (length×width×thickness). Assume that two of the opposite edges are simply supported (i.e., $\omega = 0$), while the other two edges are free such that the applied bending moment ($M = 100N - mm$) vanishes along the two simply-supported edges. Assume also that the plate has a Young’s Modulus of $E = 200GPa$ and a Poisson ratio of $\nu = 0.30$. Figure 7 presents the corresponding PIEM mesh pattern before the mesh is degenerated to form a single super-element.

Figure 8 shows the results obtained for the bending displacement of the plate using commercial ABAQUS FEM software. Meanwhile, Fig. 9 compares the results obtained for the deflection profile of edge $AE$ of the plate (see Fig. 6) using the proposed PIEM scheme with those obtained via the FEM method. Note that in implementing the PIEM scheme, the proportionality ratio is assigned various values in the range of $\xi = 0.5 \sim 0.9$, while the number of element layers is specified in the range of $s = 10 \sim 50$. As mentioned in the Section 3, the greater $\xi$ is chosen,
the more \( s \) is need. Otherwise, the void will exist around the reference point in the plate and reduce the plate stiffness. Therefore, the maximum deflection increases rapidly under the improper setting (e.g., \( \xi = 0.9, s = 10 \)).

The detail PIEM, ABAQUS result and relative difference (RD) estimate are provided in the Tab. 1. It is seen that a good agreement is observed when the proportionality ratio and number of element layers are specified as \( \xi = 0.9 \) and \( s = 50 \), respectively. The RD reduce from 126.504 \% (\( \xi = 0.95, s = 10 \)) to 0.016 \% (\( \xi = 0.9, s = 50 \)). Thus, the basic validity of the proposed PIEM algorithm is confirmed. In addition, it is observed that the accuracy of the PIEM scheme improves as \( \xi \) and \( s \) increase.

Table 2 shows the comparisons of PIEM and FEM by execution time and number of DOFs on an Intel Core-4.0 GHz computer. For the PIEM solver, the execution time is only 0.254s, whereas, the execution time for the similar mesh configuration using FEM is 1.8s. The present method reduces by about 85.88\% the execution time when compared with that of full FEM. Similarly, the complicated models are more significant. This is due to the fact that number of DOFs of the PIEM model is much fewer.

Accordingly, in performing the remaining simulations, the proportionality ratio and number of element layers were specified as \( \xi = 0.9 \) and \( s = 50 \), respectively.

![Figure 6: Simply-supported rectangular plate subject to 4BP testing](image)

**Table 1:** Maximum deflection (mm) by PIEM in variation of proportionality ratios \( \xi \) with specified element layers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \xi )</th>
<th>( s )</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>RD (%)</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>RD (%)</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>RD (%)</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>RD (%)</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>RD (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17229</td>
<td>4.931</td>
<td>1.17218</td>
<td>4.940</td>
<td>1.1722</td>
<td>4.938</td>
<td>1.1722</td>
<td>4.938</td>
<td>1.1722</td>
<td>4.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20743</td>
<td>2.981</td>
<td>1.20533</td>
<td>2.251</td>
<td>1.20534</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>1.20534</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>1.20534</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25766</td>
<td>1.993</td>
<td>1.2243</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>1.2239</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>1.2239</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>1.2239</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.63912</td>
<td>32.928</td>
<td>1.27733</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>1.23824</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>1.23349</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>1.23289</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.793</td>
<td>126.504</td>
<td>1.66826</td>
<td>35.291</td>
<td>1.37839</td>
<td>11.783</td>
<td>1.28483</td>
<td>4.196</td>
<td>1.25257</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max. deflection of ABAQUS is 1.23309 mm
4.2 Application of proposed PIEM / FEM scheme

Consider the rectangular plate shown in Fig. 10 containing a single through-thickness hole in the center-point position and subject to four-point bending. Assume that the region of the plate surrounding the hole is meshed using the proposed PIEM scheme, while the remainder of the plate is meshed using the FEM scheme. Thus, in investigating the effects on the bending strength of changes in the hole characteristics (e.g., position, size and profile / area), it is necessary only to re-mesh the PIEM region of the computational domain and to substitute the combined stiffness of the IEM element into the global stiffness matrix.
Figure 9: Comparison of ABAQUS and PIEM solutions for edge deflection of simply-supported rectangular plate

Figure 10: Combined PIEM/FEM mesh of simply-supported rectangular plate subject to 4PB testing

4.3 Example 1: effect on bending strength of hole diameter and plate thickness

Assume that the rectangular plate has a length of 100 mm, a width of 50 mm and a thickness in the range of 0.2 ∼ 0.5 mm. Assume also that the through-thickness hole has a diameter in the range of 0 ∼ 40 mm. Figure 11 presents the results obtained using the combined PIEM/FEM scheme for the variation of the flexural stiffness of the plate ($S_b$) with the hole diameter as a function of the plate thickness. As expected, the results show that the flexural stiffness reduces rapidly with a reducing plate thickness. Moreover, it is seen that the flexural stiffness reduces as the hole diameter increases; particularly at higher values of the plate thickness.
4.4 Example 2: effect on bending strength of hole position

Assume that the through-thickness hole is located at various x- and y-axis positions of the plate, as shown in Fig. 12. Assume also that the plate has dimensions of 100 mm x 50 mm x 0.2 (length x width x thickness). Figures 13 and 14 show the variation of the flexural stiffness with the x- and y-axis positions of the hole, respectively, as a function of the hole diameter. In general, the results show that the flexural stiffness reduces as the hole location moves toward the upper central region of the plate (i.e., the point of maximum deformation).
4.5 Example 3: effect on bending strength of hole profile / area

Assume that the plate considered in the previous examples contains a single elliptical hole in the center-point position. As shown in Fig. 15, let the major axis of the hole be denoted as $2a$, the minor axis be denoted as $2b$, and the edge angle (i.e., the angle between the major axis and the horizontal axis) be denoted as $\theta$. The analysis considers four different elliptical holes. As shown in Tab. 3, the major and minor axis lengths of elliptical hole 1 ($E_1$) are defined in such a way that the area of the hole is identical to that of a circular hole with a diameter of 20 mm. Meanwhile,
the axis lengths of the remaining elliptical holes are specified in such a way that the corresponding areas are equal to 0.8, 0.6 and 0.4 times the area of the circular hole, respectively. Figure 16 shows the variation of the flexural stiffness with the edge angle for each of the four considered elliptical holes. It is seen that the flexural stiffness reduces significantly as the major axis of the elliptical hole rotates towards 90° (i.e., parallel to the bending moment \( M \)); particularly as the hole size increases.

Table 3: Areas of four considered elliptical holes relative to area of circular hole with diameter of \( d = 20\text{mm} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Circular</th>
<th>( E_1 )</th>
<th>( E_2/E_1 )</th>
<th>( E_3/E_1 )</th>
<th>( E_4/E_1 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>( \pi \times 10 \times 10 )</td>
<td>( \pi \times 20 \times 5 )</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: Schematic illustration showing simply-supported rectangular plate with elliptical hole subject to 4PB testing

Figure 16: Variation of flexural rigidity with edge angle of elliptical hole as function of hole area
5 Conclusion

In Mindlin-Reissner plate bending problems, the conventional IEM formulation cannot be directly applied due to the incompatible differential order of the shear stiffness component. Accordingly, the present study has proposed a Plate IEM (PIEM) scheme in which the shear element stiffness matrix is decomposed into two shear stiffness sub-matrices ($k_b$ and $k_s$) such that each sub-matrix is similar to the equivalent sub-matrix in all of the other element layers in the discretized domain. The validity of the proposed scheme has been demonstrated by comparing the results obtained for the deflection of a simple plate under 4PB testing with those obtained using conventional ABAQUS FEM software. The PIEM scheme has been combined with the conventional FEM scheme and used to analyze the effect of the through-thickness hole size, position and profile/area on the bending strength of a rectangular plate under 4PB testing. In combining the two schemes, the region of the computational domain containing the hole is meshed using the PIEM scheme, while the remainder of the domain is meshed using the FEM method. The combined PIEM/FEM method enables the effects of the hole size, hole position and hole profile/area to be analyzed by simply re-meshing the PIEM region of the domain and then updating the combined stiffness of the corresponding super-element in the global stiffness matrix accordingly. In other words, the computational efficiency of the proposed scheme is significantly higher than that of the conventional FEM method, in which the entire domain must be re-meshed each time a change in the through-thickness hole properties occurs. In general, the results presented in this study have shown that the proposed PIEM/FEM scheme provides an easily-implemented, computationally-efficient and accurate means of analyzing various common engineering plate bending problems.
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