

Gecko

Design for *IGA*-type discretization workflows



Funded by the European Union



DC1: CFD techniques for IBRA-type discretizations.

### **1st Technical Workshop**

Presenter name: Nicolò Antonelli Email: nantonelli@cimne.upc.edu Date: 28 Dic 2023

# Summary







### Introduction

.

٠

#### Fitted VS Un-fitted methods





# Introduction

0.7

0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2

Design for IGA-type

discretization workflows

#### Fitted VS Un-fitted methods





Body-fitted approach

### Introduction

#### Fitted VS Un-fitted methods

**Un-fitted Methods** 

The domain is meshed independently from the embedded boundary.







### The Shifted Boundary Method (SBM)



**Gecko** Design for *IGA*-type discretization workflows  $\begin{array}{c} -- \text{Skin Boundary } \Gamma \\ -- \text{Shifted Boundary } \tilde{\Gamma} \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{Deactive elements} \end{array}$ 

- Proposed recently by Professor Scovazzi
- Within the family of approximate boundary methods
- Does not try to reconstruct the embedded interface in the cut elements
- Impose *modified* Dirichlet boundary conditions at the shifted boundary

The shifted boundary method for embedded domain computations. Part I: Poisson and Stokes problems

A. Main, G. Scovazzi\*

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, United States

### The Shifted Boundary Method (SBM)









#### SBM in IGA Knot insertion

#### Knot insertion:

as h tends to zero, the surrogate boundary tends to coincide with the true one.









Gecko

Design for *IGA*-type discretization workflows



#### **Degree elevation**

Degree elevation is also possible. The Taylor expansion between the true and surrogate boundary must be up to the p+1 order.

#### Example:

using quadratic IGA basis function (p=2) we will use the following Taylor expansion to impose the surrogate BCs:

$$u(\mathbf{x}) = u(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \nabla u|_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}})^T \cdot \mathbf{H}u|_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}})$$

 $\mathbf{H} u|_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$  is the Hessian matrix evaluated at the surrogate location.





p=4 25 Gauss Points are taken for each knot span





### **SBM in IGA** Results: External and Optimal Boundary

We can enhance the Shifted Boundary Method by considering the *optimal* boundary instead of the *external* one.

In this way the Taylor Expansion should cover a distance which is at most *h*/2, instead of *h*.





OPTIMAL Surrogate Boundary
 True Boundary

**EXTERNAL Surrogate Boundary** 

Gauss Points



Using the optimal boundary

Using the external boundary



~ 1

# SBM in IGA

#### **Results: Convergence Studies**

All the convergence studies are performed on a 2D Poisson problem with Dirichlet BCs. We have an internal hole defined through an SB method. Therefore:

- External body-fitted Dirichlet BCs.
- Internal SB Dirichlet conditions

Penalty-Free weak formulation for imposing Dirichlet BCs:



A penalty-free Shifted Boundary Method of arbitrary order

J. Haydel Collins<sup>a</sup>, Alexei Lozinski<sup>b,\*</sup>, Guglielmo Scovazzi<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, USA <sup>b</sup>Université de Franche-Comté, CNRS, LmB, F-25000 Besancon, France

Poisson problem:

 $-\Delta u = f$  on  $\Omega$  $u = u_D$  on  $\Gamma_D = \partial \Omega$ 

Manufactured solution:

 $u(x, y) = \sin(x)\sinh(y)$ 

$$a_{h}^{\circ}(u_{h}, w_{h}) = (\nabla u_{h}, \nabla w_{h})_{\tilde{\Omega}_{h}} - \langle \nabla u_{h} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}, w_{h} \rangle_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{h}} + \langle \boldsymbol{S}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^{\circ}u_{h}, \nabla w_{h} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \rangle_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{h}}$$
$$l_{h}(w_{h}) = (f, w_{h})_{\tilde{\Omega}_{h}} + \langle \bar{u}_{D}, \nabla w_{h} \cdot \tilde{\boldsymbol{n}} \rangle_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{h}}.$$

$$(v_h) = \ ( \, 
abla u_h \,, \, 
abla w_h \,)_{ ilde{\Omega}_h} - \langle \, 
abla u_h \, \cdot \, ilde{oldsymbol{n}} \,, \, w_h \, 
angle_{ ilde{\Gamma}_h} + \langle \, \mathsf{S}^k_{oldsymbol{\delta}} u_h \,, \, 
abla w_h \,)_{ ilde{\Gamma}_h}$$

$$(u_h, w_h) = (\nabla u_h, \nabla w_h)_{ ilde{\Omega}_h} - \langle \nabla u_h \cdot ilde{m{n}}, w_h 
angle_{ ilde{\Gamma}_h} + \langle \mathsf{S}^k_{m{\delta}} u_h 
angle,$$

$$egin{aligned} & u_h^k(u_h\,,\,w_h) = \, (\,
abla u_h\,,\,
abla w_h\,)_{ ilde{\Omega}_h} - \langle \,
abla u_h\,\cdot\, ilde{m{n}}\,,\,w_h\,
angle_{ ilde{\Gamma}_h} + \langle \,m{\mathsf{S}}^k_{m{\delta}} u_h\,,\,
abla w_h\,,\,& u_h\,,\,& u_h$$





#### **Results: External Boundary**

Comparison p = 1, 2, 3 with **EXTERNAL** surrogate boundary with three shapes:



SQUARE









#### **Results: Optimal Boundary**

Comparison p = 1, 2, 3, 4 with **OPTIMAL** surrogate boundary with three shapes:



SQUARE



discretization workflows



DIAMOND





#### Results: Body-Fitted vs External & Optimal

DIAMOND

Comparison using p = 1, 2, 3 of the DIAMOND case (which has not any particular symmetry).

In the following cases:

- **Body-Fitted** approach along the surrogate boundary
- External Surrogate Boundary
- Optimal Surrogate
   Boundary





### SBM in IGA Results: Condition Number

The condition number is a measure of the matrix's sensitivity to numerical errors and its stability in solving the linear system.

 $\kappa(A) = rac{\lambda_{ ext{max}}}{\lambda_{ ext{min}}}$ 

Cut-FEM approaches suffer the *small cut-cell problem* which is caused by arbitrary small cut elements (huge condition numbers).

SBM avoids integrating the cut elements.



Design for *IGA*-type discretization workflows







### **SBM in IGA** Results: "Small active-support problem"

Why does the condition number explode when we do degree elevation?

There might be cases where a basis function has only a small portion of its support which is active [*Small active-support problem*].

For instance, when p = 4 the support of each basis function is 25 knot spans and might happen that only 1/25 is active and its small contribution causes instabilities.

(Still work in progress ...)

iecko Design for *IGA*-type

Design for *IGA*-type discretization workflows



### **SBM vs Trimming**

#### Trimming

Trimming is the technology that is now present in Kratos.

Using a *tessellation technique* we can integrate the "cut" knot spans.

(More details from Ricky Aristio in T1, January 2024)





ParameterU



ParameterU

## **SBM vs Trimming**



#### Comparison

Comparison between body-fitted, trimming and SBM approaches.

The polynomial order is p = 2 and we are using an embedded square.





Design for *IGA*-type discretization workflows



#### **Future Work**



Optimize the implementation of the SBM technique in IGA.

Pull request in the master of Kratos.

Analysis of the "small active-support problem"

Write a paper SBM in IGA for a Poisson problem





Gecko Design for *IGA*-type

discretization workflows



European Commission



### Thank you!

Presenter name: Nicolò Antonelli Email: nantonelli@cimne.upc.edu Date: 9 Jan 2024