



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY  
DENMARK

## Selective Integration in the Material-Point Method

Andersen, Lars; Andersen, Søren; Damkilde, Lars

*Published in:*

Proceedings of the Twenty Second Nordic Seminar on Computational Mechanics

*Publication date:*

2009

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Andersen, L., Andersen, S., & Damkilde, L. (2009). Selective Integration in the Material-Point Method. In L. Damkilde, L. Andersen, A. S. Kristensen, & E. Lund (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Twenty Second Nordic Seminar on Computational Mechanics* (pp. 125-128). Department of Civil Engineering, Aalborg University. DCE Technical Memorandum No. 11

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- ? Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- ? You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- ? You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Selective Integration in the Material-point Method

Lars Andersen\*, Søren M. Andersen and Lars Damkilde

Department of Civil Engineering  
Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark  
e-mail: la@civil.aau.dk

**Summary** The paper deals with stress integration in the material-point method. In order to avoid parasitic shear in bending, a formulation is proposed, based on selective integration in the background grid that is used to solve the governing equations. The suggested integration scheme is compared to a traditional material-point-method computation in which the stresses are evaluated at the material points. The deformation of a cantilever beam is analysed, assuming elastic or elastoplastic material behaviour.

## Introduction

The material-point method (MPM) was proposed by Sulsky and coworkers [1, 2] as an alternative to the finite-element method (FEM) for analysis of problems in solid mechanics. The MPM can be described as a variation of the FEM, in which the material and any state variables are tracked at a finite set of material points that are allowed to move through a background grid of finite elements or cells. In contrast to a Lagrangian finite-element scheme, this allows the simulation of solids undergoing extreme deformation and displacements without mesh entanglement. Further, since the material follows the material points, mass diffusion occurring in Eulerian descriptions is avoided. Finally, the MPM automatically accounts for the exchange of momentum between adjacent bodies by solving the governing equations of motion at the nodes of the background grid.

Hence, apparently the MPM is useful for the analysis of problems in solid mechanics in which huge displacements and interaction between colliding bodies must be accounted for. However, in a standard MPM formulation, the stresses are evaluated at the material points. This may lead to *grid-crossing errors* as well as *parasitic shear*, in particular when linear interpolation functions are employed within the background grid.

Grid-crossing errors occur when a material point moves from one cell to another in a time step. This changes the sign of the stress contribution from that material point to the interior force at the adjacent grid nodes. As described by Bardenhagen et al. [3] this problem may be solved to some extent by smearing out the mass associated with a material point, leading to the so-called generalised-interpolation material-point (GIMP) method. Alternatively, higher-order interpolation may be applied as proposed by Andersen and Andersen [5].

Parasitic shear was reported by Cook et al. [4] in relation to linear quadrilateral elements applied to the analysis of bending. Thus, for first-order shape functions, the shear strains and stresses are only defined correctly at the centre of the element. Hence, full integration with two Gauss points in each direction may cause shear locking in bending. A similar effect occurs in the MPM since the material points are generally not placed at the centre of the computational cells. As described in this paper, it may therefore be advantageous to apply an integration scheme in the MPM corresponding to selective integration in the FEM.

## Stress integration in the material-point method

The material-point method builds on the weak formulation. For the solid domain,  $\Omega$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{a} dV = - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \mathbf{w} : \rho \boldsymbol{\sigma}^s dV + \int_{\partial\Omega_{\tau}} \mathbf{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} dS + \int_{\Omega} \rho \mathbf{b} dV, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is the virtual field,  $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  the material acceleration,  $\rho = \rho(\mathbf{x}, t)$  the mass density,  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^s = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^s(\mathbf{x}, t)$  the specific stress,  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  the external body force field, and  $\boldsymbol{\tau} = \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  signifies the surface traction on  $\partial\Omega_\tau$  where mechanical boundary conditions are prescribed. Here,  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^s = \boldsymbol{\sigma}/\rho$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau} = \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}$  with  $\mathbf{n}$  denoting the unit outward normal to the boundary of the domain.

The density field  $\rho(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{p=1}^{N_p} M_p \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_p)$  is employed, where  $M_p$  is the mass of material point number  $p$ ,  $p = 1, \dots, N_p$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_p = \mathbf{x}_p(t)$  is its position. Further, linear interpolation within the computational background grid, discretization of time and lumping the mass at the grid nodes provide the following system of equations for node number  $i$  and time step  $k$ :

$$m_i^k \mathbf{a}_i^k = \boldsymbol{\tau}_i^k + \mathbf{b}_i^k - \sum_{p=1}^{N_p} M_p \boldsymbol{\sigma}_p^{s,k} \cdot \mathbf{G}_{ip}^k, \quad m_i^k = \sum_{p=1}^{N_p} M_p \Phi_i(\mathbf{x}_p^k) \quad (2)$$

where, for example,  $m_i^k$  is the mass associated with node number  $i$  at time step  $k$ . The interpolation function belonging to node  $i$  is denoted  $\Phi_i(\mathbf{x})$ , and  $\mathbf{G}_{ip}^k = \nabla \Phi_i(\mathbf{x})|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_p^k}$ . The first two terms on the left of Eq. (2) are identified as the external force on the body, whereas the final term represents the internal forces. In each time step, the velocities at the material points and nodes are updated as

$$\mathbf{v}_p^{k+1} = \mathbf{v}_p^k + \Delta t \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{a}_i^k \Phi_i(\mathbf{x}_p^k), \quad m_i^{k+1} \mathbf{v}_i^{k+1} = \sum_{p=1}^{N_p} M_p \mathbf{v}_p^{k+1} \Phi_{ip}(\mathbf{x}_p^k). \quad (3)$$

Subsequently, the strain increments at the material points are determined by

$$\Delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_p^k = \frac{\Delta t}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \{ \mathbf{G}_{ip}^k \mathbf{v}_i^{k+1} + (\mathbf{G}_{ip}^k \mathbf{v}_i^{k+1})^T \}, \quad (4)$$

and the stresses are updated by a constitutive law. Two schemes are now compared: (1) a computation based on a standard MPM approach with the strain increments provided by Eq. (4), and (2) an alternative scheme with  $\mathbf{G}_{ip}^k$  replaced by  $\mathbf{G}_{ic}^k = \nabla \Phi_i(\mathbf{x})|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_c}$  for the determination of the shear strain increments, whereas Eq. (4) without modification for the computation of the normal strains. In the second approach,  $\mathbf{x}_c$  denotes the coordinates of the point at the centre of the cell in which the material point resides. Hence, scheme no. 2 corresponds to selective integration.

### Analysis of a cantilever beam

A cantilever beam is analysed by the MPM method, employing the explicit scheme described in the previous section. The length is  $L = 8$  m in the  $x$ -direction, the height is  $H = 2$  m in the  $y$ -direction and the beam has a mass density of  $\rho = 10$  kg/m<sup>3</sup>. The mesh size is 0.5 m and  $2 \times 2$  material points are employed within each cell. Over a period of 0.5 s the beam is subjected to an increasing body force in terms of gravity with the final acceleration  $10$  m/s<sup>2</sup> in the negative  $y$ -direction. After this, the external force is kept constant.

Firstly, the analysis is carried out for an elastic material with Young's modulus  $E = 10$  MPa and Poisson's ratio  $\nu = 0$ . Figure 1 shows the the normal and shear stresses,  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xx}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xy}$  after  $t = 1$  s for Schemes 1 and 2, i.e. with standard MPM stress evaluation or 'selective integration'. Parasitic shear is clearly identified for  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xy}$  and, to some extent, the equivalent Mises stress  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e$ . On the other hand, selective integration provides a smooth shear stress variation without reducing the accuracy of the normal stresses. However, the development of the mechanical energy is almost the same and only small differences are present in the displacement obtained with Schemes 1 and 2.




Figure 1: Stresses in the elastic beam at the end of the simulation.


The second analysis concerns a von Mises material with the yield criterion  $f = \bar{\sigma} - \sigma_0 \leq 0$ , where  $\sigma_0$  is the yield stress ( $\sigma_0 = 4$  kPa in this analysis). Otherwise, the parameters are the same as before. The results are illustrated in Fig. 2, and again parasitic shear occurs in the case of standard MPM integration of the stresses. Nonetheless, no significant change can be seen in the extent and shape of the plastified zone. This is likely a result of the fact that  $\sigma_{xx} \gg \sigma_{xy}$  in the present case.

### Concluding remarks


Selective integration in the material-point method provides a better approximation of the shear stress distribution in a beam subjected to bending than standard MPM analysis with shear stress evaluation at the material points. Nonetheless, for beams with a length-to-height ratio of more than 4, standard MPM integration does not degenerate the solution for plastic problems since the axial normal stresses are dominating in bending. However, for other classes of problems in which shear stresses dominate, selective integration may be necessary in order to have a physically sound transition from elastic into plastic response.

### Standard material-point integration


### Selective integration




Normal stress,  $\sigma_{xx}$  (● = -12151 Pa ; ○ = 12051 Pa)




Normal stress,  $\sigma_{xx}$  (● = -13192 Pa ; ○ = 13094 Pa)




Shear stress,  $\sigma_{xy}$  (● = -1916 Pa ; ○ = 715 Pa)



Shear stress,  $\sigma_{xy}$  (● = -1666 Pa ; ○ = 245 Pa)



Mises stress,  $\sigma_e$  (○ = 22 Pa ; ● = 3965 Pa)



Mises stress,  $\sigma_e$  (○ = 72 Pa ; ● = 3989 Pa)





Figure 2: Stresses in the elastic-plastic beam at the end of the simulation.

## References

- [1] D. Sulsky, Z. Chen and H.L. Schreyer. A particle method for history-dependent materials. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, **118**, 179–196, (1994).
- [2] D. Sulsky, S.J. Zhou and H.L. Schreyer. Application of a particle-in-cell method to solid mechanics. *Computer Physics Communications*, **87**, 236–252, (1995).
- [3] S.G. Bardenhagen and E.M. Kober. The generalized interpolation material point method. *Computer Modeling in Engineering and Sciences*, **5**(6), 477–495, (2004).
- [4] R.D. Cook, D.S. Malkus and M.E. Plesha. *Concepts and Applications of Finite Element Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, Third edition, (1989).
- [5] S.M. Andersen and L. Andersen. Material-Point Method Analysis of Bending in Elastic Beams. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Civil, Structural and Environmental Engineering Computing*. Civil-Comp Press, Stirlingshire, Scotland, (2007).