



Finite Element Developments and Applications in Structural Topology Optimization

by

Craig Stephen Long

*Submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree*

Philosophiae Doctor (Mechanical Engineering)

*in the Faculty of Engineering,
Built Environment and Information Technology,
University of Pretoria, Pretoria*

July 2007

Summary

Title:	Finite element developments and applications in structural topology optimization
Author:	Craig Stephen Long
Supervisor:	Prof. A.A. Groenwold
Co-supervisor:	Dr. P.W. Loveday
Department:	Department of Mechanical Engineering
Degree:	Philosophiae Doctor (Mechanical Engineering)
Keywords:	Finite element; piezoelectric; drilling degrees of freedom; reduced numerical integration; topology optimization; one-node hinge; checkerboard; compliant mechanism

In this two-part study, developments in finite element technology and the application thereof to topology optimization are investigated. Ultimately, the developed finite elements and corresponding topology optimization procedures are aimed at, but not restricted to, aiding the design of piezoelectrically driven compliant mechanisms for micropositioning applications. The objective is to identify and exploit existing, or to develop new, finite element technologies to alleviate the numerical instabilities encountered in topology optimization. Checkerboarding and one-node connected hinges are two commonly encountered examples which can directly be attributed to inadequacies or deficiencies in the finite element solution of structural problems using 4-node bilinear isoparametric finite elements (denoted Q4). The numerical behaviour leading to checkerboard layouts stems from an over-stiff estimation of a checkerboard patch of Q4 elements. The numerical model of a one-node connected hinge using Q4 elements, on the other hand, possesses no (or very little) stiffness in rotation about the common node.

In the *first* part of the study, planar finite elements with in-plane rotational (drilling) degrees of freedom are investigated. It is shown that the skew-symmetric part of the stress tensor can directly be used to quantitatively assess the validity of the penalty parameter γ , which relates the in-plane translations to the rotations. Thereafter, the variational formulations used to develop these planar finite elements with drilling degrees of freedom are extended to account for the piezoelectric effect. Several new piezoelectric elements that include in-plane rotational degrees of freedom (with and without assumed stress and electric flux density) are implemented, evaluated and shown to be accurate and stable.

Furthermore, the application of alternative reduced order integration schemes to quadratic serendipity (Q8) and Lagrangian (Q9) elements is investigated. Reduced or selective reduced integration schemes are often used to enhance element accuracy by ‘softening’ higher order deformation modes. However, application of reduced integration schemes to Q8 and Q9 elements is usually accompanied by element rank deficiencies. It is shown how the application of five and eight point modified integration schemes preserve the accuracy benefits of reduced integration, while preventing element rank deficiencies.

In the *second* part of the investigation, the salient features of elements with drilling degrees are utilized in two schemes to prevent, or improve the modelling of, one-node connected hinges. In principle, the first scheme uses the rotations computed at interior nodes to detect excessive rotations at suspect nodes. The second scheme essentially replaces planar elements forming a one-node hinge, where appropriate, with a more realistic beam model of the material layout while other elements in the mesh are modelled using planar elements as usual.

Next, the dependence of optimal topologies on element formulation is demonstrated. Attention is especially paid to plate and shell applications. It is shown that Mindlin-Reissner based elements, which employ selective reduced integration on shear terms, are not reliable in topology optimization problems. Conversely, elements based on an assumed natural strain formulation are shown to be stable and capable of reproducing thin plate topology results computed using shear-rigid elements. Furthermore, it is shown that an *ad hoc* treatment of rotational degrees of freedom in shell problems is sensitive to the related adjustable parameter, whereas optimal topologies, using a proper treatment of drilling degrees of freedom are not.

Finally, the use of reduced order integration schemes as a strategy to reduce the stiffness of a checkerboard patch of elements is considered. It is demonstrated that employing the five and eight point integration schemes, used to enhance the accuracy of Q8 and Q9 elements, also significantly reduce the stiffness of a checkerboard patch of elements, thereby reducing the probability of observing checkerboard layouts in optimal topologies.

Acknowledgements

It is my great pleasure and a tremendous honour to be able to acknowledge all the wonderful people who have contributed to the completion of this thesis. Looking back over the years I have spent at university, I can only now fully appreciate how privileged I have been to have received so much support and encouragement in perusing my interests.

Firstly to my Ph.D. supervisor, Prof. Albert Groenwold, I wish to extend my immeasurable thanks and appreciation for the enthusiasm, patients, encouragement, advice and wisdom, which you have so generously shared during the years we have worked together. It has been a real education, not only in structural optimisation, but in life. Thank you for being my guide on this adventure. I sincerely hope that our paths will cross frequently!

I would also like to thank my co-supervisor, Dr. Philip Loveday for the faith you have shown in me, and for the patience you exercised in the time while I was completing my write-up. Thanks also for the dedication and vigour with which you have approached each undertaking I have consulted you on. I am grateful to be working with you now, and hope to do so for many years to come.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the faculty of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Pretoria who have helped shape my life. I would especially like to acknowledge Prof. Jan Snyman, not only for the technical guidance you have provided during my Masters and Ph.D. studies, but for brightening up life with the many colourful tales of your travels and other exploits. It has been an honour to have known you. Also, to Prof. Schalk Kok who was always willing to share his seemingly boundless knowledge. Thank you. Also, to my friends and colleagues at CSIR, thank you for your support and encouragement over the past year and a half.

To the Structural Optimization Research Group (SORG), and some honorary members, especially Albert, Schalk, Nico, Carl, Cheng, Derren, Lize, Antoinette, Michael, Sannelie, Christiaan, Gerhard, Jaco and Neo. Also, to all my friends especially Justin and Jonathan. The heated debates over a cup of steaming coffee, the cheap beer from various establishments in Hatfield, working together on assignments until late, stories of weekend adventures, chess and go tournaments, etc. are what made my varsity days the best of my life. Thank you for sharing in my life and for letting me share in yours.

Financial support provided by

- the South African National Research Foundation (NRF), who provided funding via the THRIP initiative (project number 2769), as well as general studentship funding,
- the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), and
- the University of Pretoria,

is most gratefully acknowledged.

Thanks go also to Prof. Krister Svanberg, for supplying me with his MMA implementation.

I would also like to acknowledge my family-in-law. Mr. and Mrs. Bredenkamp, thank you for letting me stay with you for so long and for treating me like a son. Also to Louis and Janine, thank you for making me part of your family. Lastly, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my family. Thank you Mom and Dad for all the sacrifices you've made to give your children every opportunity to succeed. Thanks also to my brothers, Mark, Gavin and Anthony and to my sister Sharon, and family, for always being there during the tough times and for supporting all my ventures. I love you all!

To **Michele**, my wife, my love and my best friend.

Let me not to the marriage of true minds
Admit impediments. Love is not love
Which alters when it alteration finds,
Or bends with the remover to remove.
O no, it is an ever fixed mark
That looks on tempests and is never shaken;
It is the star to every wand'ring barque,
Whose worth's unknown although his height be taken.
Love's not time's fool, though rosy lips and cheeks
Within his bending sickle's compass come;
Love alters not with his brief hours and weeks,
But bears it out even to the edge of doom.
If this be error and upon me proved,
I never writ, nor no man ever loved.
– William Shakespeare

Shell, these words are as true now as they were the day I first recited them to you, over 13 years ago. I truly love you and I dedicate this thesis to you.

Contents

Summary	iii
Acknowledgements	v
List of Figures	xiv
List of Tables	xxi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Structural topology optimization	2
1.2 Background to the study	6
1.2.1 Topology optimization	7
1.2.2 The finite element method	8
1.3 Objectives of the study	9
1.4 Thesis overview and list of contributions	11
PART 1: FINITE ELEMENT DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY	17
2 Stability of elastostatic elements with drilling degrees of freedom	19
2.1 Summary	19
2.1.1 A word on notation	19
2.2 Introduction	20
2.3 Historical development of elements with drilling DOFs	22
2.4 Variational formulation of elements with drilling DOFs	24
2.5 Finite element interpolation	28
2.6 Stability analysis	32
2.7 Consistency and stability	33
2.8 Numerical experiments	33
2.8.1 Cook's membrane	34

2.8.2	Cantilever beam subjected to end shear	35
2.8.3	Orthotropic membrane cantilever	35
2.9	Conclusions	36
3	Piezoelectric elements with drilling degrees of freedom	41
3.1	Summary	41
3.1.1	Another brief word on notation	41
3.2	Introduction	41
3.3	Governing equations	43
3.3.1	Constitutive equations	43
3.3.2	Compatibility conditions	45
3.3.3	Equilibrium conditions	45
3.3.4	Rotational momentum balance conditions and definition of infinitesimal rotation	45
3.4	Variational formulation	45
3.4.1	Hu-Washizu-like variational formulations	46
3.4.2	Irreducible formulations	49
3.4.3	Fully mixed Hellinger-Reissner-like formulations	50
3.4.4	Degenerate Hellinger-Reissner-like formulations	52
3.4.5	Relationships between the functionals	57
3.5	Finite element interpolations	59
3.6	Finite element implementation	62
3.6.1	Irreducible piezoelectric elements with drilling DOFs	62
3.6.2	Fully mixed piezoelectric element with drilling DOFs	64
3.6.3	Degenerate assumed flux density piezoelectric element with drilling DOFs	66
3.6.4	Degenerate assumed stress piezoelectric elements with drilling DOFs	68
3.7	Partitioned stiffness matrices	70
3.8	Numerical evaluation	71
3.8.1	Effect of γ	73
3.8.2	Eigenvalue analysis	75
3.8.3	Patch test	75
3.8.4	Two element beam	76
3.8.5	Ten element beam	77
3.8.6	Cook's membrane	83
3.8.7	Piezoelectric bimorph beam	87

3.9	Conclusions	89
4	Modified reduced order quadratures for quadratic membrane elements	91
4.1	Summary	91
4.2	Introduction	91
4.3	Derivation of numerical integration schemes	94
4.3.1	A five point rule	96
4.3.2	An eight point rule	97
4.4	Numerical evaluation	98
4.4.1	Eigenvalue analysis	98
4.4.2	Effect of element aspect ratio	99
4.4.3	Cantilever beam in pure bending	101
4.4.4	A near mechanism	103
4.4.5	Highly constrained square plate	104
4.4.6	Cook's membrane	104
4.5	Conclusion	107
PART 2: APPLICATIONS OF FINITE ELEMENT TECHNOLOGY IN TOPOLOGY OPTI-		
MIZATION		115
5	New schemes to deal with problematic material layouts	117
5.1	Summary	117
5.2	Introduction	118
5.3	Elements with drilling degrees of freedom	120
5.4	Problem formulations	120
5.4.1	The minimum compliance topology optimization problem using SIMP	121
5.4.2	Comments on checkerboarding	123
5.4.3	Compliant mechanism design using topology optimization and SIMP	124
5.4.4	Mirror scanning design using topology optimization and SIMP	125
5.5	Schemes to prevent checkerboarding and one-node hinges	132
5.5.1	Scheme I: A modified scheme based on NoHinge	132
5.5.2	Scheme II: A new scheme to improve checkerboard, one-node hinge and diagonal member modelling	133
5.6	Numerical examples and applications	137
5.6.1	Application of Scheme I	138
5.6.2	Application of Scheme II	139
5.6.3	Discussion of results	143

5.7	Conclusions	143
6	Effect of element formulation on membrane, plate and shell topology optimization problems	145
6.1	Summary	145
6.2	Introduction	146
6.3	Topology optimization problem formulation	149
6.3.1	Material parameterization	149
6.3.2	Layer models	152
6.3.3	Problem formulation and sensitivities	153
6.3.4	Design update and filtering strategies	153
6.4	Finite element formulations	154
6.4.1	Membrane elements	155
6.4.2	Plate elements	158
6.4.3	Membrane-bending components	160
6.4.4	Warp correction and local-global transformation	161
6.4.5	Shell element denotation	161
6.5	Numerical Examples	162
6.5.1	Membrane example	163
6.5.2	Analysis of membrane results	164
6.5.3	Plate examples	165
6.5.4	Analysis of plate results	169
6.5.5	Shell examples	170
6.5.6	Analysis of shell results	171
6.6	Conclusions	171
7	Effect of reduced order integration schemes on the stiffness of checkerboard patterns in topology optimization	177
7.1	Summary	177
7.2	Introduction	177
7.3	Modified reduced order quadrature integration rules	179
7.3.1	Numerical integration schemes	179
7.3.2	A five-point rule	180
7.3.3	An eight-point rule	181
7.4	Elements with drilling degrees of freedom	182
7.5	On the stiffness of a checkerboard patch of elements	183

7.5.1	Topology optimization using homogenization	183
7.5.2	Effective properties of a checkerboard	185
7.6	Numerical results	187
7.6.1	Effect of element formulation on local χ field	188
7.6.2	Effect of element selection and integration scheme on effective properties of a checkerboard	189
7.6.3	Effect of integration scheme on strain energy density of quadratic elements	191
7.6.4	Effect of integration scheme on penalty bounds p_1^* and p_2^*	196
7.7	Conclusions	197
8	Conclusion	203
8.1	PART I: Development of finite element technology	204
8.2	PART II: Application of F.E. to topology optimization	205
8.3	Suggested future work	207
	Bibliography	209
A	A brief introduction to topology optimization	223
A.1	Implementational issues	225
A.1.1	Mesh dependency	225
A.1.2	Checkerboarding, one-node connected hinges	228
A.1.3	Other complications	230
A.2	Compliant mechanism design	230
B	Additional plate and shell results	233
B.1	Additional membrane results	233
B.1.1	MBB beam	233
B.2	Additional plate results	235
B.2.1	Simply supported square plate with centre point load	235
B.2.2	Clamped square plate with centre point load	242
B.2.3	Corner supported square plate with centre point load	248
B.2.4	Corner supported square plate with distributed load	254
B.3	Additional shell results	258
B.3.1	Cylindrical shell	258
B.3.2	Pretwisted beam	262

List of Figures

1.1	Three categories of structural optimization.	2
1.2	Schematic of the process of structural topology optimization.	4
1.3	Schematic of thesis layout.	12
2.1	Flat element subject to in-plane membrane and bending actions.	20
2.2	Displacement of an element side 1–2.	23
2.3	Relationship among functionals.	26
2.4	Applications of functionals proposed by Hughes and Brezzi in discrete form.	29
2.5	Four node element with drilling degrees of freedom.	30
2.6	Modified shear patch test	34
2.7	Cook’s membrane	34
2.8	Cook’s membrane: Effect of γ on displacement, rotation and skew σ for the 4×4 mesh	35
2.9	Cook’s membrane: Effect of γ on displacement, rotation and skew σ for the 32×32 mesh	36
2.10	Cantilever beam under shear load	37
2.11	Cantilever beam: Effect of γ on tip displacement and skew σ	38
2.12	Orthotropic membrane cantilever	38
2.13	Orthotropic membrane cantilever: Effect of γ for a 0 degree ply arrangement (regular mesh)	39
2.14	Orthotropic membrane cantilever: Effect of γ for a 30 degree ply arrangement (regular mesh)	39
2.15	Orthotropic membrane cantilever: Effect of γ for a 30 degree ply arrangement (distorted mesh)	40
3.1	Relationships between the functionals.	56
3.2	Relationships between the functionals in terms of their finite element implementation.	58
3.3	A planar 4-node piezoelectric element with drilling rotations.	60
3.4	Effect of γ on eigenvalues (normalised with respect to their values at $\gamma/c_{33} = 1$).	73

3.5	Effect of γ on skew part of stress and other accuracy measures.	74
3.6	Ten element piezoelectric cantilever beam subjected to pure bending.	74
3.7	Mesh for piezoelectric patch test.	75
3.8	Two element piezoelectric cantilever beam subjected to pure bending.	76
3.9	Two element piezoelectric beam subjected to pure bending: Effect of distortion on v_A	78
3.10	Two element piezoelectric beam subjected to pure bending: Effect of distortion on ϕ_A	79
3.11	Four element piezoelectric beam subjected to pure bending: Effect of distortion on v_A	80
3.12	Four element piezoelectric beam subjected to pure bending: Effect of distortion on ϕ_A	81
3.13	Piezoelectric Cook's membrane.	83
3.14	Cook's membrane: y -displacement at C (u_{yC}).	85
3.15	Cook's membrane: Electric potential at C (ϕ_{yC}).	86
3.16	Bimorph based on MacNeal's elongated beam.	87
4.1	Typical spurious mode of Q8 employing a 4 point Gauss-Legendre scheme.	93
4.2	5 Point integration scheme.	96
4.3	8 Point integration scheme.	97
4.4	λ_{13} of Q8 with different integration schemes (plane stress, $ \mathbf{J} = 1$, $E = 1$, $\nu = 1/3$).	101
4.5	λ_{15} of Q9 element for different integration schemes (plane stress, $ \mathbf{J} = 1$, $E = 1$, $\nu = 1/3$).	103
4.6	Effect of aspect ratio on λ_{13} of Q8 for different integration schemes.	104
4.7	Effect of aspect ratio on λ_{13} of Q9 for different integration schemes.	106
4.8	Distorted cantilever beam.	106
4.9	Distorted cantilever beam: Effect of distortion d on v_B for various integration schemes with Q8 elements.	107
4.10	Near mechanism with point load.	108
4.11	Incremental displacement \hat{v} at A	109
4.12	Lowest six eigenvalues and eigenvectors for constrained mesh with Q9 elements and 4 point integration scheme (mesh size 6×6 , $E = 2.4$, $\nu = 0.2$).	109
4.13	Lowest six eigenvalues and eigenvectors for constrained mesh with Q9 elements and 9 point integration scheme (mesh size 6×6 , $E = 2.4$, $\nu = 0.2$).	110
4.14	Lowest six eigenvalues and eigenvectors for constrained mesh with Q9 elements and 8 point integration scheme (mesh size 6×6 , $E = 2.4$, $\nu = 0.2$).	110
4.15	Cook's membrane	111

4.16	Effect of weight on v_C for Cook's membrane (Q8, 1×1 mesh).	111
4.17	Effect of weight on v_C for Cook's membrane (Q9, 1×1 mesh).	112
5.1	Checkerboard, diagonal member and one node hinge material layouts.	119
5.2	The minimum compliance problem for the MMB beam.	121
5.3	A reference optimal topology for the MBB beam discretized using 180×30 elements.	122
5.4	MBB beam optimal designs for a 30×90 mesh employing different elements.	123
5.5	Compliant mechanism design of a force inverter.	125
5.6	A reference optimal topology for the force inverter problem using 48×48 elements.	126
5.7	Design domain and problem definition for mirror scanning device.	127
5.8	Optimal topologies for different problem formulations.	131
5.9	Four paths around node to check for quasi-monotonicity.	133
5.10	Post-processed interpretation of a 2×2 hinge.	134
5.11	Two different beam models of a hinge.	134
5.12	Beam replacement scheme.	135
5.13	Orthogonal basis vectors.	136
5.14	Patch of nine elements around element i, j .	137
5.15	Illustration of the effect of the proposed scheme to overcome one-node hinges.	138
5.16	Application of different filters to the force inverter.	139
5.17	Modelling accuracy benchmark problems.	140
5.18	MBB beam with various elements.	142
5.19	Mirror mechanism design using new scheme, $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, Beam2, $V=2V^0$.	142
6.1	Schematic representation of a general material layup.	150
6.2	Various multilayer models with solid and design layers.	152
6.3	Quadrilateral element with drilling degrees of freedom.	155
6.4	Quadrilateral Mindlin-Reissner plate element.	155
6.5	Warped and projected shell element.	161
6.6	MBB beam geometry and constraints.	163
6.7	Compliance and constraint function values for the MBB beam problem.	164
6.8	Optimal topologies of MBB beam for various values of α .	165
6.9	Example plate problems, geometry and constraints.	166
6.10	Optimal topology compliance as a function of plate thickness for the simply supported plate problem.	167
6.11	Optimal topologies of a simply supported plate.	173

6.12	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.01$	174
6.13	Displaced shape of optimal topology computed using DKQ analyzed using SRI elements.	174
6.14	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to uniform distributed load, ribbed model, $t = 0.01$	174
6.15	Corner supported cylinder geometry and constraints.	175
6.16	Optimal topologies of a corner supported cylinder with single layer material model.	175
6.17	Pretwisted beam geometry and constraints.	176
6.18	Optimal topologies of a pretwisted beam with single layer material model.	176
7.1	Modified reduced order integration schemes.	180
7.2	Example base cells often used in topology optimization.	183
7.3	Checkerboard patch with average density $\rho = 1/2$	185
7.4	Local χ fields for various elements resulting from mean strain field $\bar{\epsilon}_{11} = \bar{\epsilon}_{22} = 1$ and $\bar{\epsilon}_{12} = 0$	188
7.5	Optimal topologies of the MBB beam using symmetry and employing Q4 and Q4X elements.	189
7.6	Strain energy density of fully integrated Q8 elements.	193
7.7	Variation of p^* for fully integrated Q8 elements.	194
7.8	Strain energy density of Q8 elements with 5-point integration scheme.	195
7.9	Zoom of strain energy density of Q8 elements with 5-point integration scheme.	196
7.10	Strain energy density of Q8 elements with 8-point integration scheme.	197
7.11	Zoom of strain energy density of Q8 elements with 8-point integration scheme.	198
7.12	Effect of integration scheme setting on p_1^* : 5-point scheme.	199
7.13	Effect of integration scheme setting on p_1^* : 8-point scheme.	200
7.14	Effect of integration scheme setting on p_2^* : 5-point scheme.	200
7.15	Effect of integration scheme setting on p_2^* : 8-point scheme.	201
B.1	Convergence histories for MBB beam for various values of α	234
B.2	Optimal topologies of a simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.01$	236
B.3	Optimal topologies of a simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.1$	237
B.4	Optimal topologies of a simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.01$	238

B.5	Optimal topologies of a simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.1$	239
B.6	Optimal topologies of a simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.01$	240
B.7	Optimal topologies of a simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.1$	241
B.8	Optimal topologies of a clamped square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.01$	243
B.9	Optimal topologies of a clamped square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.1$	243
B.10	Optimal topologies of a clamped square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.01$	244
B.11	Optimal topologies of a clamped square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.1$	245
B.12	Optimal topologies of a clamped square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.01$	246
B.13	Optimal topologies of a clamped square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.1$	247
B.14	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.01$	248
B.15	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.1$	249
B.16	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.1$. Solved using MMA not OC.	250
B.17	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.1$	251
B.18	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.01$	252
B.19	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.1$	253
B.20	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to uniform distributed load, ribbed model, $t = 0.1$	254
B.21	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to uniform distributed load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.01$	255
B.22	Optimal topologies of a corner supported square plate subjected to uniform distributed load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.1$	256
B.23	Displaced shape of optimal topology, computed using DKQ analyzed using SRI elements.	257

B.24 Displaced shape of optimal topology, computed using ANS analyzed using SRI elements.	257
B.25 Optimal topologies of corner supported cylinder with single layer material model for various values of α	259
B.26 Convergence histories for corner supported cylinder with single layer material model for various values of α	259
B.27 Optimal topologies of a corner supported cylinder with ribbed material model.	260
B.28 Optimal topologies of corner supported cylinder with ribbed material model for various values of α	261
B.29 Convergence histories for corner supported cylinder with ribbed material model for various values of α	261
B.30 Optimal topologies of a corner supported cylinder with honeycomb material model.. . . .	262
B.31 Optimal topologies of corner supported cylinder with honeycomb material model for various values of α	264
B.32 Convergence histories for corner supported cylinder with honeycomb material model for various values of α	264
B.33 Optimal topologies of pretwisted beam with single layer material model for various values of α	265
B.34 Convergence histories for pretwisted beam with single layer material model for various values of α	266

List of Tables

3.1	Ten element piezoelectric cantilever subject to pure bending.	82
3.2	Relative percentage error on stress and electric displacement for Cook's membrane.	84
3.3	Relative percentage error on vertical tip displacement of piezoelectric bimorph.	88
4.1	Eigenvalues of a square Q8 serendipity element for different integration schemes (plane stress, $ \mathbf{J} = 1$, $E = 1$, $\nu = 1/3$).	99
4.2	Eigenvalues of a square Q9 Lagrange element for different integration schemes (plane stress, $ \mathbf{J} = 1$, $E = 1$, $\nu = 1/3$).	100
4.3	Displacement results for distorted cantilever beam.	102
4.4	Cook's membrane: Center displacement v_C	105
4.5	Cook's membrane: Stress analysis.	105
5.1	Normalised tip displacement of a diagonal member.	140
5.2	Normalised displacement of a one-node hinge.	140
5.3	Output displacement of optimal mirror mechanisms.	141
6.1	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.01$	168
6.2	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to uniform distributed load, ribbed model, $t = 0.01$	169
7.1	Effective constitutive terms for different elements employing various integration schemes.	192
B.1	Percentage difference: Simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.01$	236
B.2	Percentage difference: Simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.1$	236
B.3	Percentage difference: Simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.01$	238

B.4	Percentage difference: Simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.1$	238
B.5	Percentage difference: Simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.01$	240
B.6	Percentage difference: Simply supported square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.1$	241
B.7	Percentage difference: Clamped square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.01$	242
B.8	Percentage difference: Clamped square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.1$	243
B.9	Percentage difference: Clamped square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.01$	244
B.10	Percentage difference: Clamped square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.1$	244
B.11	Percentage difference: Clamped square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.01$	246
B.12	Percentage difference: Clamped square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.1$	246
B.13	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.01$	248
B.14	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, single layer model, $t = 0.1$	249
B.15	Percentage difference	250
B.16	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, ribbed model, $t = 0.1$	251
B.17	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.01$	252
B.18	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to center point load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.1$	253
B.19	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to uniform distributed load, ribbed model, $t = 0.1$	254
B.20	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to uniform distributed load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.01$	255
B.21	Percentage difference: Corner supported square plate subjected to uniform distributed load, honeycomb model, $t = 0.1$	256