# Component mode synthesis

- Earlier (reduc.pdf)
  - Reduction principles
  - Reduction illustrations
- Now
  - coupling reduced models
  - Advanced reduction for coupling objectives








http://savoir.ensam.eu/moodle/course/view.php?id=1874 http://savoir.ensam.eu/moodle/course/view.php?id=490


## Moving complexity in the coupling part



## Sample CMS problems

- 1. Acoustic prediction from test shapes
- 2. Fluid structure interaction (in particular with heavy fluids)
- 3. Structural Dynamics Modification
- 4. Reduce a brake model while keeping
  - all elements of NL contact area
  - exact modes of linear model
- 5. Design of damping treatment for structure borne transfer
- 6. Non-linearity (contact on tip blade)





# Why CMS?

- A reason of procedure
  - Represent linear structural dynamics for coupling in another code (hybrid test/FEM, acoustics, multi-body dynamics, control, local non-linearity, ...)
  - Transmit a compact/confidential model to another group/company
  - Understand effects of components
  - Reduced data output
- For computational cost objectives
  - One step approximations (low cost linear model)
  - Iterative (often parallel) solution of exact problem

## Blackboard discussion

- Draw non conform contact case, gauss points (nodes special case) gap and sliding observation contact/friction constitutive law (surface laws) model loads
- Energy coupling (surface constitutive laws)
- Mathematically idealized bonding (constraints, Lagrange)
- $1 \epsilon$  compatibility
- Kinematic reduction for coupling
  - Remind McNeal & Craig-Bampton
  - Interface modes
  - Learning using exact solutions (CMT)

# Incompatible mesh contact


- · Gap (out of plane) incompatible
  - Define contact points matched
  - Match slave elements

$$g_g = [c_g]\{q\} = [N_{master}(r,s) - N_{slave}(r,s)]\{q\}$$



$$\{q^*\}^T \{P_{contact}\} = \sum_{g} \{q^*\} [c_g]^T w_g J_g P_g$$

- Gap compatible
  - Use nodal displacement
  - Define gap at gauss points (zero thickness cohesive element)
- Extension in plane: adhesion/sliding/friction




### Contact/friction


- Surface contact/friction model
- Idealization Signorini/Coulomb


$$\begin{cases}
 [u_n] \le 0 \\
 R_n \le 0 \\
 R_n[u_n] = 0
\end{cases}$$

$$R_t = -\mu |R_n| \frac{[\dot{u}_t]}{\|[\dot{u}_t]\|}$$


- Reality
  - micro-scale effects
  - structural effects
  - $F_N(gap)$  and  $F_T$  hysteretic + dependent on  $F_N$








From : L. Pesaresi. JSV 2018





# Stiffness/energy coupling


- Interface motion
- Interface stiffness

$$\{y_j(X,s)\} = [c_{j_{int}}(X)] \{q_j(s)\}$$


$$\begin{bmatrix} Z_{jj_{\text{int}}} & \dots & Z_{cj_{\text{int}}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ Z_{jc_{\text{int}}} & \dots & Z_{cc_{\text{int}}} \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} c_{\text{int}} \end{bmatrix} \left\{ q_j \right\} \\ \vdots \\ \left\{ q_{\text{int}} \right\} \end{array} \right\} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} F_{\text{int}} \\ \vdots \\ \left\{ 0 \right\} \end{array} \right\}$$

Coupled equations (sum of energies)

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} \overline{Z_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{Z_2} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c_1^T & 0 \\ 0 & c_2^T \end{bmatrix} \overline{Z_{\text{int}}} \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & 0 \\ 0 & c_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \left\{ \begin{array}{c} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{array} \right\} = [b] \left\{ u(s) \right\}$$





## Incompatible mesh: fluid/structure



$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} K & -C \\ 0 & F \end{array}\right] \left\{\begin{array}{c} U \\ p \end{array}\right\} - \omega^2 \left[\begin{array}{cc} M & 0 \\ C^T & K_p \end{array}\right] \left\{\begin{array}{c} U \\ p \end{array}\right\} = \left\{\begin{array}{c} F^{ext} \\ 0 \end{array}\right\}$$

#### Fluid





# Limiting case: continuity

Solve with zero relative interface motion

$$\{y_{1Int} - y_{2Int}\} = [c_1 - c_2]_{Ng \times (N_1 + N_2)} \begin{Bmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{Bmatrix} = 0$$

· Classical: eliminate constraint (T kernel)

$$[T] \text{ with } [c_{Int}] [T] = 0$$
$$\{q\} = [T] \{q_R\}$$
$$[T^T Z T] \{q_R\} = [T^T b] \{u\}$$

- Lagrange multiplier solution
- · Penalize


$$\begin{bmatrix} Z(s) & \mathbf{c}_{Int}^T \\ \mathbf{c}_{Int} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} q \\ \lambda \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} F \\ 0 \end{Bmatrix}$$


$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} Z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & Z_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c_1^T \\ -c_2^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \epsilon \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & -c_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \left\{ \begin{array}{c} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{array} \right\} = [b] \{u(s)\}$$

Other approach: continuity enforced over volume (Ben Dhia, Arlequin)

## Incompatible meshes

- Occur regularly
  - Result of automated meshing (conform mesh generation can be very difficult)
  - Contact problems
- Test case: compression of 2 cubes
  - Cube over drilled cube
  - Coarse upper cube
  - Refined lower cube
  - Master upper cube





## Incompatible mesh issues


Solution depends of interpolation strategy


- Number of contact points matched


- Number of slave elements matched


· Poor results when using coarse mesh as


master












## Discontinuity: numerical implementation


- Construction of a third interface
  - Domain intersection
  - Nodes of both surfaces
  - Delaunay triangulation
- Gap observation at nodes or Gauss points  $\Gamma$ 
  - Projection for  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$
  - Cross product operator

$$[A] = [C_{NOR}] [C_{NOR}]^T$$




- Under integration
- Master points not matched







## Incompatibility and locking




742 Hz C<sub>i</sub>=1.00, dual, .1, 3@741.7 Hz



### 873 Hz=locking



- Strong continuity = locking
- Weak sense for continuity needed Vermot, Balmes, Ben Dhia EJCM 2010



Skip to Vector sets and bases


### Quality measurement (1-E)-compatibility

- Measure the norm difference between the basis vectors of  $\Gamma_1$  and  $C_2^1(\{q_1\}) = \frac{\|\pi_2^1\{q_1\}\|}{\|\{q_1\}\|}$  their projection on  $\Gamma_2$
- Realize this leads to an eigenvalue problem  $C_2^1(\{q_1\})^2 = \frac{\{q_1\}^T \left[A_{21}\right]^T \left[A_{21}\right]^T \left[A_{21}\right] \{q_1\}}{\{q_1\}^T \left[A_{11}\right] \{q_1\}}$

 Use of an inner product with mechanical meaning (pressure load with surface stiffness density)

### Illustration on a brake model

- Master/Slave strategy not obvious
- · Mesh refinement differences
- Application to the pad/caliper interface
- Compatibility issues
  - Spurious movements for partially matched contact elements
  - Movement over drilled parts



### Classical reduction bases + variants

### CMS = coupling + reduction


- Static condensation + fixed interface modes = Craig-Bampton
- Free modes + attachment modes (static correction)
- · ... + residual vectors for parametric changes

#### Discuss now:

- · ... + interface modes
- CMT: Trace of assembled modes
- ... + component modes
- ODS, POD, Snapshot POD, ... (see Avanded\_Modal\_Periodic.pdf)

### Interface reduction / model size / sparsity

Craig-Bampton often sub-performant because of interfaces



- Unit motion can be redefined: interface modes Fourier, analytic polynomials, local eigenvalue 5000 -> 500 interface DOFs.
- Disjoint internal DOF subsets



bandwidth, inputs external & parameter truncation, sparsity

# Interfaces for coupling

#### Classical CMS: continuity coupling

- Reduced independently
- All interface motion (or interface modes)
- Assembly by continuity

#### Difficulties


- Mesh incompatibility
- · Large interfaces
- Strong coupling (reduction requires knowledge of coupling)


#### Disjoint components: energy coupling

 Assembly by computation of interface energy (example Arlequin)

#### Difficulties

Use better bases than independent reduction






### Revised notion of interface


#### Classical CMS (Craig-Bampton)


System is brake without contact area



Reduction: modes of system and interface loads

 Many interface DOFs needed heavily populated matrix






#### <u>Disjoint component with exact</u> <u>modes</u>


- No reduction of DOFs internal to contact area
- Reduction: trace of full brake modes on reduced area (no need for static response at interface)

# Interface reduction: wave/cyclic

Best interface reduction = learn from full system modes

- 1. Learn using wave (Floquet)/cyclic solutions
- 2. Build basis with left/right compatibility
- 3. Assemble reduced model





### Open issues: nominally exact reduced model


1980: interest large linear solution


2017: enhanced coupling


- Component Mode Tuning method
  - free/free real modes (explicit DOFs)
  - trace of the assembled modes on the component


$$[T_{ci}] = [ \phi_{ci} ] \quad [\Phi_{|ci}]_{Orth}.$$

- Reduced model is sparse
- Free mode amplitudes are DOFs
- Reduced model has exact nominal modes









PhD Vermot des Roches 2010


Disc
OuterPad
Inner Pad
Anchor
Caliper
Piston
Knuckle
Hub


# CMT & design studies

 One reduced model / multiple designs

### Examples

- impact of modulus change
- · damping real system or component mode





## Component modes as design parameters

 Component modes can be used as explicit reduced DOFs

Brake application:
 which mode of which component should be modified

 Engine application: effect of blade mistuning

