

Gu, Y. T. and Zhang, L. C. (2008) Coupling of the meshfree and finite element methods for determination of the crack tip fields. *Engineering Fracture Mechanics* 75:pp. 986-1004.

**This is the author-manuscript version of this work - accessed from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au>**

**Copyright 2008 Elsevier**

# Coupling of the meshfree and finite element methods for determination of the crack tip fields

Y. T. Gu<sup>1,2</sup> and L. C. Zhang<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Engineering Systems  
Queensland University of Technology  
GPO Box 2434, Brisbane, QLD, 4001 Australia

<sup>2</sup> School of Aerospace, Mechanical & Mechatronic Engineering,  
The University of Sydney,  
NSW, 2006, Australia

## Abstract

This paper develops a new concurrent simulation technique to couple the meshfree method with the finite element method (FEM) for the analysis of crack tip fields. In the sub-domain around a crack tip, we applied a weak-form based meshfree method using the moving least squares approximation augmented with the enriched basis functions, but in the other sub-domains far away from the crack tip, we employed the finite element method. The transition from the meshfree to the finite element (FE) domains was realized by a transition (or bridge region) that can be discretized by transition particles, which are independent of both the meshfree nodes and the FE nodes. A Lagrange multiplier method was used to ensure the compatibility of displacements and their gradients in the transition region. Numerical examples showed that the present method is very accurate and stable, and has a promising potential for the analyses of more complicated cracking problems, as this numerical technique can take advantages of both the meshfree method and FEM but at the same time can overcome their shortcomings.

KEYWORDS: Crack; Meshfree; Meshless, Finite Element Method; Concurrent Simulation;  
Fracture Mechanics; Numerical Analysis

---

\* Corresponding author. E-mail: zhang@aeromech.usyd.edu.au; Fax:+61-2-93517060

## Nomenclature

$\mathbf{a}$	vector of interpolation coefficients, defined in Eq. (2)
$\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$	interpolation matrices, defined in Eqs. (7) and (8)
$\mathbf{A}_{(\text{FE})}, \mathbf{A}_{(\text{MM})}$	transition matrices for FEM and meshfree method, defined in Eqs. (44) and (45)
$\mathbf{b}$	vector of body force, defined in Eq. (14)
$\mathbf{B}_{(\text{FE})}, \mathbf{B}_{(\text{MM})}$	transition matrices for FEM and meshfree method, defined in Eqs. (36) and (38)
$\mathbf{D}$	Matrix of material constants
$\mathbf{f}_{(\text{MM})k}, \mathbf{f}_{(\text{MM})k}$	force vectors at a particle $k$ obtained by the FEM and meshfree method, defined in Eqs. (26) and (27)
$\mathbf{F}_{(\text{FE})}, \mathbf{F}_{(\text{MM})}$	force vectors for FEM and meshfree method, defined in Eqs. (23) and (24)
$g_k$	generalized displacement of a transition particle $k$ , defined in Eq. (28)
$g_{k(x)}$	generalized derivative of a transition particle $k$ , defined in Eq. (41)
$K_I, K_{II}, K_{III}$	stress intensity factors for mode-I, mode-II, and mode-III
$\mathbf{K}_{(\text{FE})}, \mathbf{K}_{(\text{MM})}$	stiffness matrices for FEM and meshfree method, defined in Eqs. (21) and (22)
$\mathbf{n}$	vector of the unit outward normal, defined in Eq. (14)
$N$	FEM shape function, defined in Eq. (18)
$p_j$	monomial of polynomial basis functions, defined in Eq. (2)
$(R, \theta)$	cylindrical coordinate, defined in Eqs. (26) and (10)
$\mathbf{u}$	displacement vector, defined in Eq. (14)
$\mathbf{u}_{(\text{MM})k}, \mathbf{u}_{(\text{MM})k}$	displacement vectors at a particle $k$ obtained by the FEM and meshfree method, defined in Eqs. (26) and (27)
$\bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{\mathbf{t}}$	prescribed boundary displacement and traction, defined in Eqs. (15) and (16)
$w$	weight function, defined in Eq. (3)
$\mathbf{x}$	coordinate vector
$\Gamma$	global boundary
$\phi$	shape function, defined in Eq. (6)
$\Phi$	shape function matrix, defined in Eq. (29)
$\Pi$	functional
$\Gamma_u, \Gamma_t$	boundaries for displacement and traction boundary conditions, defined in Eqs. (15) and (16)
$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}$	vectors of Strain and stress, defined in Eqs. (17) and (14)
$\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}$	Lagrange multiplier, defined in Eqs. (34) and (42)
$\Lambda, \Psi$	selected interpolation for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ , defined in Eqs. (34) and (44)
$\Omega$	problem domain
$\Omega_s$	local domain to construct meshfree shape functions

## 1 Introduction

The finite element method (FEM) is currently a dominant numerical tool in the analysis of fracture mechanics problems, especially for stationary cracks. A large variety of approaches have been developed in the analysis of the field of crack tip by FEM. However, FEM often experiences difficulties in re-meshing and adaptive analysis. In addition, FEM is often difficult (or even impossible) to simulate some problems such as the large deformation problems with severe element distortions, crack growth problems with arbitrary and complex paths which do not coincide with the original element interfaces, and the problems of breakage of material with large number of fragments. Meshfree (or meshless) methods have recently become attractive alternatives for problems in computational mechanics, as they do not require a mesh to discretize the problem domain, and the approximate solution is constructed entirely by a set of scattered nodes. Some meshfree methods have been developed and achieved remarkable progress, such as the smooth particle hydrodynamics (SPH) [1], the element-free Galerkin (EFG) method [2], the reproducing kernel particle method (RKPM) [3][4], the meshfree local Petrov-Galerkin (MLPG) method [5][6][7], and the local radial point interpolation method (LRPIM) [8][9][10][11]. The principal attraction of the meshfree methods is their capacity in dealing with moving boundaries and discontinuities, such as phase changes and crack propagations, and their ease in using the enriched basis functions based on the asymptotic displacement fields near the crack-tip [12].

However, the meshfree method usually has worse computational efficiency than FEM, because more computational cost is required in the meshfree interpolation and numerical integrations [13]. Although the burden of the computational cost is being alleviated due to the development of computer technologies, to improve the computational efficiency is still a key factor for the simulations of many practical problems, for example, the three-dimensional dynamic crack problem, etc. Some strategies have been developed for the alleviation of the

above-mentioned problems, but how to improve the efficiency of the meshfree methods is still an open problem. Coupling the meshfree methods with FEM can be a possible solution.

In the analysis of crack problems, we can find that a crack region usually occupies only a small part in the whole problem domain. It is desirable and beneficial to combine the meshfree methods with FEM in order to exploit their advantages while evading their disadvantages. In the coupling, the meshfree method can be used only in a sub-domain including the crack and its unique advantages are beneficial to get accurate and stable results. FEM can be employed in the remaining parts of the domains and its good computational efficiency can save much computational cost. In some previous research on the coupling of EFG/FEM/boundary element method (BEM), MLPG/FEM/BEM, and so on [14][15][16][17][18], the major difficulty was how to satisfy the compatibility conditions on the interface between the domains of two methods[19], even with interface element methods and methods based on extension of weak forms. In these techniques, a common interface boundary (e.g. a curve for a two-dimensional problem, as shown in Figure 1) is often used between FEM domain,  $\Omega_{(FE)}$ , and the meshfree domain,  $\Omega_{(MM)}$ . The meshfree nodes and the FEM nodes along this interface boundary coincide with each other, and are dependent on each other. In addition, it is difficult to ensure the high-order compatibility using the interface boundary[19].

This paper aims to develop an advanced coupled meshfree method (MM)/FEM for crack problems. The problem domain is divided into several sub-domains: one domain including the crack is simulated by the meshfree method, the other sub-domains are simulated by FEM, and these two parts are connected by a transition region (or bridge region). A new transition algorithm is proposed to ensure a smooth transition between the meshfree and FEM sub-domains. To simplify the numerical integrations, several layers of transition particles are inserted in the transition region and the Lagrange multipliers method is used to ensure the

compatibility conditions. The meshfree shape functions augmented with the enriched basis functions to predict the singular stress fields near a crack tip are constructed. Around the crack, the relay model [20] is used for the nodal selection and computing the influence of nodes. Several numerical examples of crack problems are presented to demonstrate the validity and efficiency of the new coupled method.

## 2 Enriched moving least squares approximation

To approximate a function  $u(\mathbf{x})$  in  $\Omega_s$ , a finite set of  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})$  called basis functions is considered in the space coordinates  $\mathbf{x}^T=[x, y]$ . The basis functions in two-dimension is given by

$$\mathbf{p}^T(\mathbf{x})=[1, x, y, x^2, xy, y^2 \dots] \quad (1)$$

The moving least square approximation (MLSA) interpolant  $u^h(x)$  is defined in the domain  $\Omega_s$  by

$$u^h(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j(\mathbf{x}) a_j(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{p}^T(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (2)$$

where  $m$  is the number of basis functions, the coefficient  $a_j(x)$  in equation (2) is also functions of  $\mathbf{x}$ ;  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x})$  is obtained at any point  $\mathbf{x}$  by minimizing a weighted discrete  $L_2$  norm of:

$$J = \sum_{i=1}^n w(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i) [\mathbf{p}^T(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}) - u_i]^2 \quad (3)$$

where  $n$  is the number of nodes in the neighborhood of  $\mathbf{x}$  for which the weight function  $w(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i) \neq 0$ , and  $u_i$  is the nodal value of  $u$  at  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i$ .

The stationarity of  $J$  with respect to  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x})$  leads to the following linear relation between  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\mathbf{u}$ :

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{u} \quad (4)$$

Solving  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x})$  from Equation (4) and substituting it into Equation (2), we have

$$u^h(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(\mathbf{x}) u \quad (5)$$

where the MLSA shape function  $\phi_i(\mathbf{x})$  is defined by

$$\phi_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j(\mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{A}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}))_{ji} \quad (6)$$

In which  $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x})$  are the matrices defined by

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{p}^T(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_i), \text{ where } w_i(\mathbf{x}) = w(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i) \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) = [w_1(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_1), w_2(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_2), \dots, w_n(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_n)] \quad (8)$$

It should be mentioned here that the MLSA shape function obtained above does not have the Kronecker delta function properties [13].

In two dimensional linear elastic fracture mechanics, both mode-I and mode-II crack-tip fields should be considered. For mode-I deformations, the crack-tip stresses have the following formulations [21]

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{Bmatrix} = \frac{K_I}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \begin{Bmatrix} 1 - \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \\ 1 + \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

For mode-II deformations, the crack-tip stresses are [21]

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{Bmatrix} = \frac{K_{II}}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \begin{Bmatrix} -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} \left( 2 + \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \cos \frac{3\theta}{2} \\ \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \left( 1 - \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \frac{3\theta}{2} \right) \end{Bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

where  $K_I$  and  $K_{II}$  are the stress intensity factors for mode-I and mode-II dependent upon the crack length, the specimen geometry and the applied loading, and  $(r, \theta)$  are the cylindrical

coordinates of a point with the origin located at the crack-tip and the positive angle measured counterclockwise from the axis of the crack.

After using trigonometric identities, one can show that all of the functions in Equations (9) and (10) are spanned by the following four basis functions:

$$\left\{ \sqrt{r} \cos \frac{\theta}{2}, \sqrt{r} \sin \frac{\theta}{2}, \sqrt{r} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta, \sqrt{r} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta \right\} \quad (11)$$

In the application of the meshfree method to linear elastic fracture mechanics (LEFM) problems, it is advantageous to add these four basis functions in Equation (11) into the basis functions so that the stress singularity can be captured without having a very fine nodal density around the crack tip. It was first used by Fleming et al. [12] in the element free Galerkin (EFG) method and called the resulting basis as enriched basis functions.

Adding these four basis functions in Equation (11) into Equation (1), we can obtain the enriched basis functions for a two-dimensional problem:

a) with complete linear monomials

$$\mathbf{p}^T(\mathbf{x}) = \left[ 1, x, y, \sqrt{r} \cos \frac{\theta}{2}, \sqrt{r} \sin \frac{\theta}{2}, \sqrt{r} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta, \sqrt{r} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta \right] \quad (12)$$

b) with complete second-order monomials

$$\mathbf{p}^T(\mathbf{x}) = \left[ 1, x, y, x^2, xy, y^2, \sqrt{r} \cos \frac{\theta}{2}, \sqrt{r} \sin \frac{\theta}{2}, \sqrt{r} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta, \sqrt{r} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \sin \theta \right] \quad (13)$$

### 3 Discrete equations of FEM and the meshfree method

Consider the following two-dimensional problem of solid mechanics in domain  $\Omega$  bounded by  $\Gamma$  :

$$\nabla \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \mathbf{b} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (14)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  is the stress tensor, which corresponds to the displacement field  $\mathbf{u}=\{u, v\}^T$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$  is the body force vector, and  $\nabla$  is the divergence operator. The boundary conditions are given as follows:

$$\mathbf{u} = \bar{\mathbf{u}} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_u \quad (15)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \bar{\mathbf{t}} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_t \quad (16)$$

in which the superposed bar denotes prescribed boundary values and  $\mathbf{n}$  is the unit outward normal to domain  $\Omega$ .

The principle of minimum potential energy can be stated as follows: The solution of a problem in the small displacement theory of elasticity is the vector function  $\mathbf{u}$  of displacement which minimizes the total potential energy  $\Pi$  given by

$$\Pi = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \, d\Omega - \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u}^T \cdot \mathbf{b} \, d\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_t} \mathbf{u}^T \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} \, d\Gamma \quad (17)$$

with the boundary condition described in Equation (15), where  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$  is the strain.

The meshfree method and FEM use the similar global weak-form given in Equation (17). The meshfree shape functions have been given in Section 2, and the interpolation formulation of FEM can be written as [22]

$$u = \sum_{i=1}^{n_e} N_i(x) u_i \quad n_e=3,4,5,\dots \quad (18)$$

where  $n_e$  is the number of nodes in a FE element, and  $N$  is the FE shape function.

Substituting the expression of  $\mathbf{u}$  given in Equations (5) and (18), and using the stationary condition for Equation (17) yields

$$\mathbf{K}_{(FE)} \mathbf{U}_{(FE)} = \mathbf{F}_{(FE)} \quad (19)$$

$$\mathbf{K}_{(MM)} \mathbf{U}_{(MM)} = \mathbf{F}_{(MM)} \quad (20)$$

where  $\mathbf{K}_{(\text{FE})}$ ,  $\mathbf{U}_{(\text{FE})}$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{(\text{FE})}$ ,  $\mathbf{K}_{(\text{MM})}$ ,  $\mathbf{U}_{(\text{MM})}$ , and  $\mathbf{F}_{(\text{MM})}$  are stiffness matrices, the displacement vectors, and the force vectors for FEM and the meshfree method. Now, we have

$$\mathbf{K}_{(\text{FE})ij} = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{B}_{(\text{FE})i}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{B}_{(\text{FE})j} d\Omega \quad (21)$$

$$\mathbf{K}_{(\text{MM})ij} = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{B}_{(\text{MM})i}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{B}_{(\text{MM})j} d\Omega \quad (22)$$

$$\mathbf{F}_{(\text{FE})i} = \int_{\Gamma_t} N_i \bar{\mathbf{t}} d\Gamma + \int_{\Omega} N_i \mathbf{b} d\Omega \quad (23)$$

$$\mathbf{F}_{(\text{MM})i} = \int_{\Gamma_t} \phi_i \bar{\mathbf{t}} d\Gamma + \int_{\Omega} \phi_i \mathbf{b} d\Omega \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathbf{D}$  is the matrix of material constants, and

$$\mathbf{B}_{(\text{FE})i} = \begin{bmatrix} N_{i,x} & 0 \\ 0 & N_{i,y} \\ N_{i,y} & N_{i,x} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}_{(\text{MM})i} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{i,x} & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_{i,y} \\ \phi_{i,y} & \phi_{i,x} \end{bmatrix} \quad (25)$$

## 4 Coupling of the meshfree method and FEM

### 4.1 Transition condition

As shown in Figure 2, consider a two-dimensional problem domain with a crack. A sub-domain,  $\Omega_{(\text{MM})}$ , including the crack is discretized by the meshfree nodes and the other sub-domain,  $\Omega_{(\text{FE})}$ , uses FEM. These two domains are joined by a transition domain  $\Omega_{(\text{T})}$  that possesses displacement compatibility and force equilibrium in coupling  $\Omega_{(\text{MM})}$  and  $\Omega_{(\text{FEM})}$ .

This means that

$$\mathbf{u}_{(\text{MM})k} = \mathbf{u}_{(\text{FE})k} \quad (26)$$

$$\mathbf{f}_{(\text{MM})k} + \mathbf{f}_{(\text{FE})k} = 0 \quad (27)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}_{(\text{MM})k}$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_{(\text{FE})k}$ ,  $\mathbf{f}_{(\text{MM})k}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{(\text{FE})k}$  are displacements and forces at a transition particle  $k$  obtained by the meshfree method in  $\Omega_{(\text{MM})}$  and FEM in  $\Omega_{(\text{FE})}$ , respectively.

It will be ideal to satisfy both the displacement compatibility and the force equilibrium conditions, in which the displacement compatibility Equation (26) is the most important and must be satisfied. In addition, because the meshfree MLSA shape functions lack the delta function properties, it is difficult to directly connect these two domains.

To satisfy the displacement compatibility condition, two combination techniques, using the hybrid displacement shape function algorithm [16] and the modified variational form algorithm [17], have been developed. However, in these techniques, as shown in Figure 1, a common interface (a curve in the two-dimensional problem) is used between  $\Omega_{(\text{FE})}$  and  $\Omega_{(\text{MM})}$ . The meshfree nodes and the FEM nodes along this interface coincide with each other, and are dependent on each other. It will increase the computational cost and make difficulty for some problems. In addition, because only an interface curve is used, it is difficult to ensure the compatibility (especially the high-order continuity). In the following, we will develop a new transition technique to ensure a smooth transition between  $\Omega_{(\text{FE})}$  and  $\Omega_{(\text{MM})}$ , which has been successfully used in the macro/micro/nano multiscale analysis [23].

## 4.2 Coupling technique

As shown in Figure 2, there is a transition (or bridge) region,  $\Omega_{(\text{T})}$ , between the FEM and meshfree domains. The generalized displacement of a point in the transition domain at  $\mathbf{x}$  can be defined as

$$\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{u}_{(\text{MM})}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{u}_{(\text{FE})}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (28)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}_{(\text{MM})}(\mathbf{x}_k)$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{(\text{FE})}(\mathbf{x}_k)$  are the displacements of a point  $\mathbf{x}$ , obtained by the interpolations using the meshfree nodes and the FEM element, respectively, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{u}_{(\text{MM})}(\mathbf{x}_k) = \sum_I \Phi_I(\mathbf{x}_k) \mathbf{u}_{(\text{MM})I} \quad (29)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{(\text{FE})}(\mathbf{x}_k) = \sum_J \mathbf{N}_J(\mathbf{x}_k) \mathbf{u}_{(\text{FE})J} \quad (30)$$

A sub-functional is introduced to enforce the displacement compatibility condition given in Equation (26) by means of Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda$  in the transition domain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{(T)} &= \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \lambda \cdot \mathbf{g} d\Omega = \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \lambda \cdot [\mathbf{u}_{(MM)} - \mathbf{u}_{(FE)}] d\Omega \\
&= \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \lambda \cdot \mathbf{u}_{(MM)} d\Omega - \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \lambda \cdot \mathbf{u}_{(FE)} d\Omega \\
&= \Pi_{(T)}^{(MM)} - \Pi_{(T)}^{(FE)}
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

In which,  $\Pi_{(T)}^{(MM)}$  and  $\Pi_{(T)}^{(FE)}$  are the sub-functional for the meshfree part and the FEM part.

Substituting  $\Pi_{(T)}^{(MM)}$  and  $\Pi_{(T)}^{(FE)}$  separately into Equation (17) for the meshfree method and FEM, generalized functional forms can be written as

$$\Pi_{(MM)} = \int_{\Omega_{(MM)}} \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} d\Omega - \int_{\Omega_{(MM)}} \mathbf{u}^T \cdot \mathbf{b} d\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_{(MM)'}} \mathbf{u}^T \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} d\Gamma + \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \lambda \cdot \mathbf{u}_{(MM)} d\Omega \tag{32}$$

$$\Pi_{(FE)} = \int_{\Omega_{(FE)}} \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} d\Omega - \int_{\Omega_{(FE)}} \mathbf{u}^T \cdot \mathbf{b} d\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_{(FE)'}} \mathbf{u}^T \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} d\Gamma - \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \lambda \cdot \mathbf{u}_{(FE)} d\Omega \tag{33}$$

In these variational formulations, the domains of  $\Omega_{(FE)}$  and  $\Omega_{(MM)}$  are connected via Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda$ , which can be given by the interpolation functions  $\Lambda$  and the nodal value of  $\lambda_i$

$$\lambda = \sum_i \Lambda_i \cdot \lambda_i \tag{34}$$

$\Lambda$  is the selected interpolation for  $\lambda_i$  and it can be the FEM shape function.

Substituting Equations (5) and (34) into Equation (32), and using the stationary condition based on the displacement, the following meshfree equations can be obtained

$$[\mathbf{K}_{(MM)} \quad \mathbf{B}_{(MM)}] \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{(MM)} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda} \end{Bmatrix} = \{\mathbf{F}_{(MM)}\} \tag{35}$$

where  $\mathbf{K}_{(MM)}$  and  $\mathbf{F}_{(MM)}$  have been defined in Equations (22) and (24),  $\mathbf{B}_{(MM)}$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{B}_{(MM)} = \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \Lambda \boldsymbol{\Phi}^T d\Omega \tag{36}$$

Substituting Equations (18) and (34) into Equation (33), and using the stationary condition based on the displacement, lead to the following FEM equations

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{(FE)} & -\mathbf{B}_{(FE)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{(FE)} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{(FE)} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (37)$$

where  $\mathbf{K}_{(FE)}$  and  $\mathbf{F}_{(FE)}$  have been defined in Equations (21) and (23),  $\mathbf{B}_{(FE)}$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{B}_{(FE)} = \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{N}^T d\Omega \quad (38)$$

It should be mentioned here that it is impossible to solve Equations (35) and (37) separately. To obtain the unique solution for the global problem, Using the stationary condition of Equations (35) and (37) based on the of Lagrange multiplier and considering the compatibility condition,, we can obtain the following relationship,

$$\mathbf{B}_{(MM)}^T \mathbf{U}_{(MM)} - \mathbf{B}_{(FE)}^T \mathbf{U}_{(FE)} = \mathbf{0} \quad (39)$$

Because the meshfree and FEM domains are connected through the transition domain, the assembly of Equations (35), (37) and (39) yields a linear system of the following form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{(MM)} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B}_{(MM)} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{K}_{(FE)} & -\mathbf{B}_{(FE)} \\ \mathbf{B}_{(MM)}^T & -\mathbf{B}_{(FE)}^T & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{(MM)} \\ \mathbf{U}_{(FE)} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{(MM)} \\ \mathbf{F}_{(FE)} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (40)$$

Solving Equation (40) together with the displacement boundary condition, given in Equation (15) , we can obtain the solution for the problem considered.

To satisfy the force equilibrium condition, the generalized derivative at a point  $\mathbf{x}$  can be written as

$$\mathbf{g}_{(x)} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{(MM)}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{(FE)}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \quad (41)$$

Using Lagrange multiplier  $\gamma$  , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{(T)(\mathbf{x})} &= \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{g} \, d\Omega \\
&= \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{(MM)}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \, d\Omega - \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{(FE)}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \, d\Omega \\
&= \Pi_{(T)(\mathbf{x})}^{(MM)} - \Pi_{(T)(\mathbf{x})}^{(FE)}
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Following the similar procedure from Equation (32) to Equation (40), we can obtain the coupling equations to satisfy the high-order continuity

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{K}_{(MM)} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B}_{(MM)} & \mathbf{A}_{(MM)} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{K}_{(FE)} & -\mathbf{B}_{(FE)} & -\mathbf{A}_{(FE)} \\
\mathbf{B}_{(MM)}^T & -\mathbf{B}_{(FE)}^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{A}_{(MM)}^T & -\mathbf{A}_{(FE)}^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{Bmatrix}
\mathbf{U}_{(MM)} \\
\mathbf{U}_{(FE)} \\
\boldsymbol{\lambda} \\
\boldsymbol{\gamma}
\end{Bmatrix}
=
\begin{Bmatrix}
\mathbf{F}_{(MM)} \\
\mathbf{F}_{(FE)} \\
\mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0}
\end{Bmatrix} \tag{43}$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}_{(MM)} = \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \boldsymbol{\Psi} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Phi}^T}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \, d\Omega, \tag{44}$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{(FE)} = \int_{\Omega_{(T)}} \boldsymbol{\Psi} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^T}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \, d\Omega \tag{45}$$

In which  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$  is the interpolation functions for  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ .

### 4.3 Numerical implementations

#### a) The size of transition region

The size of transition region will affect the performance of the coupled method. If the size is too small, it will decrease the accuracy of the transition, especially for the high order compatibility. If the size is too big, it will significantly increase the computational cost. For many problems, it is reasonable to use the following size of transition region:

$$h_t \cong (3 \sim 5) \cdot d_{FE} \text{ or } (3 \sim 5) \cdot d_{MM} \tag{46}$$

where  $d_{FE}$  and  $d_{MM}$  are equivalent sizes of FEM element and meshfree nodal space.

#### b) The transition particles

To get  $\mathbf{B}_{(MM)}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_{(FEM)}$  numerically, the transition region can be divided into regular background cells, which are similar of those used in the meshfree method. However, these cells are totally independent of the FE elements and the meshfree background cells. In the practical computation, to simplify the integration and reduce the “meshing” cost, several layers of transition particles, which are regularly distributed, can be inserted in the transition domain  $\Omega_{(T)}$ . The displacement compatibility between FEM and meshfree nodes is achieved through these transition particles.

The advantages of using these transition particles are clear. First, they allow the meshfree nodes in  $\Omega_{(MM)}$  to have an arbitrary distribution and become independent of the distributions of the FEM nodes in  $\Omega_{(FE)}$ . Second, the compatibility conditions in the transition domain can be conveniently controlled through the adjustment of the number and distribution of the transition particles. For some sub-transition domains with stronger compatibility requirement, a finer transition particle distribution can be arranged. Third, the compatibility of higher order derivatives can be easily satisfied.

#### c) Lagrange multipliers

The above Lagrange multiplier method is accurate and the physical meaning is also very clear. However, it will increase the computational cost (especially when the number of transition particles is large) because new variables (Lagrange multipliers) are added. Hence, we can use the constant Lagrange multipliers to yield the so-called penalty method, i.e., the common Lagrange multiplier method can be used to obtain a range of penalty coefficients, and then use them as constants for this problem and other similar problems to improve computational efficiency.

## 5 The relay model

With the use of node based interpolation techniques, meshfree methods offer great opportunities to handle problems of complex geometry including cracks. However, there is general discontinuity of displacements across a crack, and the interpolation domain used for the construction of meshfree shape functions can contain numerous irregular boundary fragments and the computation of nodal weights based on physical distance can be erroneous. This issue will become more serious in dealing with the fracture problems, especially for the multi-cracking problems. Several techniques have been reported on the construction of meshfree approximations with discontinuities and non-convex boundaries, including the visibility method [2], the diffraction method [24], and the transparency method [24]. However, these methods are only effective for problems with relatively simple domains (e.g. with one or two cracks, or not many non-convex portions on the boundaries), but not effective for domains with highly irregular boundaries (e.g., with many cracks). Liu and Tu [25] have developed a relay model to determine the domain of influence of a node in a complex problem domain.

The relay model is motivated by the way of a radio communication system composed of networks of relay stations. Consider an interpolation domain containing a large number of irregular boundary fragments (or cracks) as shown in Figure 3, in which  $O$  is the interpolation point,  $P$  is the field node, and  $R$  is the relay point. The field node, e.g.,  $P_2$ , first radiates its influence in all directions equally, like a radio signal being broadcasted at a radio station, until the contained boundaries are encountered. Then its influence is relayed through relay points, e.g.,  $R_{2-1}$  and  $R_{1-1}$ , to reach the interpolation point  $O$ . The distance (called equivalent distance) between the interpolation point and the field node can then be calculated. In addition, the weight parameter used in MLSA is measured by the equivalent distance that can

be computed based on the relay region defined by a circle involute. The details for the relay model can be found in Liu [20] and Liu and Tu [25].

## 6 Numerical results and discussions

Several cases of two-dimensional fracture problems have been studied in order to examine the present coupled MM/FE method. Except when mentioned, the units are taken as standard international (SI) units in the following examples.

### 6.1 Cantilever beam

The coupled method is first verified by a two-dimensional cantilever beam problem, because its analytical solution is available and can be found in textbooks e.g., Timoshenko and Goodier[26]. Consider a beam, as shown in Figure 4(a), with length  $L$  and height  $D$  subjected to a parabolic traction at the free end. The parameters of the beam are taken as  $E=3.0\times 10^7$ ,  $\nu=0.3$ ,  $D=12$ ,  $L=48$ , and  $P=1000$ . The beam has a unit thickness and a plane stress problem is considered.

As shown in Figure 4(b), the beam is divided into two parts. FEM using the triangular elements is used in the left part where the essential boundary condition is included. The meshfree method is used in the right part where the traction boundary condition is included. These two parts are connected through a transition region that is discretized by 54 regularly distributed transition particles. Figure 5 illustrates the comparison between the shear stress calculated analytically and by the coupled method at the cross-section of  $x=L/2$ , which shows an excellent agreement between the analytical and numerical results.

## 6.2 Near-tip crack field

A well-known near-tip field, which is subjected to mode-I displacement field at its edges, is analyzed. As shown in Figure 6, an edge-cracked square plate is subjected to the following displacement field for a model-I crack [1].

$$\begin{Bmatrix} u \\ v \end{Bmatrix} = \frac{K_I}{2\mu} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\pi}} \begin{Bmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \left[ \kappa - 1 + 2 \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \right] \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \left[ \kappa + 1 - 2 \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \right] \end{Bmatrix} \quad (47)$$

Hence, the analytical solution for the stress field is given in Equation (9).

The plate is divided into two parts: the meshfree method is used for the central part, in which the crack embedded, and FEM is used for other parts. The computational model is plotted in Figure 7: 441 irregularly distributed nodes are used in the meshfree domain, 578 triangular FEM elements are used in the FEM domain, and 210 regularly distributed transition particles are used in the transition domains. Figure 8 shows the stress distribution along the crack axis (when  $\theta=0^\circ$ ). Clearly, the prediction of the new developed method matches the analytical solution very well.

It should be mentioned that the sole FEM will lead to worse accuracy for this problem, especially for the stress distributions around the crack tip, because FEM without the enriched basis function usually has bad accuracy and is difficult to capture the stress singularity near the crack tip. Although using the high-order FEM elements can partly solve this issue, FEM still has technical difficulty for the fracture problems (especially the dynamic fracture problems). It has also been proven [12] that the sole meshfree method has much better accuracy for the crack problem. However, the computational efficiency will be worse if the sole meshfree method is used. Our studies show that the present coupled method can keep the good accuracy of the meshfree method for the crack tip field, and, at the same time, it can

save much computational cost because of the use of FEM in the regions far away from the crack tip.

### 6.3 Two edge-cracked plates loaded in tension

An edge-cracked square plate subjected to a uniform tension of  $f = 1.0$ , as shown in Figure 9, is studied. The plane strain case is considered, and  $E = 1000, \nu = 0.25$ . The analytical results for  $K_I$  had been given by Gdoutos [28] and Ching and Batra [27]. For these parameters used here, the analytical  $(K_I)_{analytical} = 11.2$ .

The computational model is the same as that used in Section 6.2 and shown in Figure 7. Stress intensity factors were computed using the domain form of the J-integral. Our study found that the coupled method using the MLSA with the enriched basis functions makes the J-integral almost domain independent, given to  $(K_I)_{numerical} = 11.31$ . Compared with the analytical solution, the coupled method leads to a stable and accurate result.

A square plate with double edge-cracks shown in Figure 10 is also studied. The computational model in Figure 11 contains 705 irregularly distributed nodes in the meshfree domain, 538 triangular FEM elements in the FEM domain, and 210 regularly distributed transition particles in the transition domains. Ching and Batra [27] studied the same problem and the analytical  $K_I$  given by Gdoutos [28] is  $(K_I)_{analytical} = 4.65$ . Using the J-integral, the present coupled method gives  $(K_I)_{numerical} = 4.75$ . The coupled method leads to a very accurate result.

### 6.4 Shear edge crack

In this example, a clamped plate with an edged crack and subjected to shear traction is considered. The parameters have been shown in Figure 12. The material constants used are  $E = 3.0 \times 10^6$  units and  $\nu = 0.25$ . A plane strain state of deformation is assumed. The

reference solution for the stress intensity factors has been given by Fleming et al. ([12] and Ching and Batra [27] with  $K_I = 34$  and  $K_{II} = 4.55$ . Our computational model in Figure 13 has 284 irregularly distributed nodes in the meshfree domain, 280 bi-linear FEM elements in the FEM domain, and 180 regularly distributed transition particles in the transition domains. The present coupled method works well for this problem and the computational errors are less than 2% for both  $K_I$  and  $K_{II}$ .

### 6.5 Cracks in a complex shaped plate

Let us now consider a plate of complex shape with a “C” shaped crack. The material constants used are  $E = 3.0 \times 10^7$  and  $\nu = 0.3$ . One edge of the plate is fixed, one edge is subjected to uniformly distributed tension load, and the rest are traction free. As shown in Figure 14, the plate is divided into two parts. The meshfree method is used in the central part including the crack, and FEM is used for other parts. The computational model shown in Figure 15 contains 595 irregularly distributed nodes in the meshfree domain, 660 triangular FEM elements in the FEM domain, and 560 regularly distributed transition particles in the transition domains. As a reference solution, this problem is also analyzed by the sole meshfree method (the software of MFree 2D: Liu [20]) with very fine nodal distribution. Figure 16 shows the distribution of stress,  $\sigma_{xx}$ . It is almost identical with the meshfree method result. Table 1 lists the comparison of displacements and stress of four points shown in Figure 14.

Figure 17 shows the stress distribution along  $y$ -axis, and, again, very good agreement is obtained between the coupled method and the purely meshfree method. The stress concentrations on the crack tips have been clearly shown with the stress concentration factor around 3.3.

It should be mentioned here that for this problem the coupled method uses less computational cost than the pure meshfree method, because we only apply the meshfree

method in a very small region (about 10% of the problem domain) and FEM is used in other area when FEM has a better computational efficiency than the meshfree method (Liu and Gu [13]). Hence, the advantage of the present coupled method has been proven by this example.

**Table 1 The displacements and stresses for four points in this plate**

		Displacement		Stress		
		$u(\times 10^{-7})$	$v(\times 10^{-7})$	$\sigma_{xx}$	$\sigma_{yy}$	$\tau_{xy}$
Point A	MFree 2D	4.1	3.4	2.31	-0.02	-0.03
	The coupled method	3.9	3.2	2.27	-0.017	-0.028
Point B	MFree 2D	4.9	2.8	-0.57	-1.6	-0.45
	The coupled method	4.7	2.9	-0.61	-1.72	-0.55
Point C	MFree 2D	5.3	4.2	-0.56	-1.05	0.36
	The coupled method	5.2	4.0	-0.54	-1.01	0.32
Point D	MFree 2D	4.5	4.3	3.51	1.13	1.37
	The coupled method	4.2	4.2	3.34	1.08	1.32

## 7 Concluding remarks

FEM often has experiences difficulties in fracture mechanics problems because of difficulty in the re-meshing. Meshfree methods are effective for these crack problems, but they usually have worse computational efficiency. In the analysis of crack problems, we can find that a crack region usually occupies only a small part in the whole problem domain. It is desirable and beneficial to combine the meshfree methods with FEM in order to exploit their advantages while evading their disadvantages.

A novel coupled meshfree/FEM method has been developed in this paper for the analysis of crack problems. In this coupled method, the meshfree method is used only in a sub-domain including the crack and FEM is employed in the remaining part. Several numerical techniques are developed to ensure the effectiveness for this coupled method, including:

a) The transition particles are inserted in the transition domain. Through these particles, a Lagrange multiplier method is used to ensure the compatibility of displacements and their gradients in the transition.

b) The relay model is used for the effective construction of meshfree interpolation domains considering the discontinuous boundaries.

Numerical examples have been studied to demonstrate effectiveness of the present coupled method for crack problems, and very good results have been obtained. The coupled method holds the advantages of both the FEM and meshfree methods including: 1) a lower computation cost; 2) a good accuracy; 3) the enhanced compatibility in the transition domain between the FEM domain and meshfree domain. Hence, it has been proven that the new coupled method is effective and robust for the analysis of fracture mechanics problems, and it has very good potential to become a powerful numerical tool.

## **Acknowledgement**

This work was supported by an ARC Discovery Grant.

## **References**

- [1] Gingold RA and Moraghan JJ (1977), Smooth particle hydrodynamics: theory and applications to non spherical stars. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 181, 375-389.
- [2] Belytschko T, Lu YY and Gu L (1994), Element-Free Galerkin Methods. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 37:229-256.
- [3] Liu WK, Jun S, Zhang Y (1995), Reproducing kernel particle methods. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 20: 1081-1106.
- [4] Liew KM, Wu YC, Zou GP, Ng TY (2002). Elasto-plasticity revisited: numerical analysis via reproducing kernel particle method and parametric quadratic programming. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Engng*, 55:669–683.

- [5] Atluri SN and Shen SP (2002), The Meshfree Local Petrov-Galerkin (MLPG) method. Tech Science Press. Encino USA.
- [6] Atluri SN and Zhu T (1998), A new meshfree local Petrov-Galerkin (MLPG) approach in computational mechanics. *Computational Mechanics*, 22: 117-127.
- [7] Gu YT and Liu GR (2001a), A meshfree local Petrov-Galerkin (MLPG) method for free and forced vibration analyses for solids, *Computational Mechanics*, 27 (3): 188-198.
- [8] Gu YT and Liu GR (2001b), A local point interpolation method for static and dynamic analysis of thin beams, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 190: 5515-5528.
- [9] Liu GR and Gu YT (2001b), A local radial point interpolation method (LR-PIM) for free vibration analyses of 2-D solids. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 246(1): 29-46.
- [10] Wang QX, Lam KY, et al. (2003). Analysis of microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) by meshless Local Kriging (LoKriging) method. *Journal of Chinese Institute of Engineers*; 27 (4): 573-583.
- [11] Liew KM and Chen XL (2004), Mesh-free radial point interpolation method for the buckling analysis of Mindlin plates subjected to in-plane point loads, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 60(11): 1861-1877.
- [12] Fleming, M.; Chu, Y.; Moran, B.; Belytschko, T.(1997): Enriched element-free Galerkin methods for crack tip fields. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 40: 1483-1504.
- [13] Liu GR and Gu YT (2005), An introduction to meshfree methods and their programming. Springer Press, Berlin.
- [14] Belytschko T, Organ D (1995) Coupled finite element-element-free Galerkin method. *Computational Mechanics*, 17:186-195
- [15] Hegen D (1996), Element-free Galerkin methods in combination with finite element approaches. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 135: 143-166.
- [16] Gu YT and Liu GR(2001c), A coupled element free Galerkin/Boundary element method for stress analysis of two-dimensional solids, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 190/34: 4405-4419.

- [17] Gu YT and Liu GR(2003), Hybrid boundary point interpolation methods and their coupling with the element free Galerkin method. *Engineering Analysis with Boundary Elements*, 27(9): 905-917.
- [18] Liu GR and Gu YT(2000), Meshfree Local Petrov-Galerkin (MLPG) method in combination with finite element and boundary element approaches. *Computational Mechanics*, 26(6): 536-546.
- [19] Gu YT and Liu GR (2005), Meshfree methods coupled with other methods for solids and structures. *Tsinghua Science and Technology*, 10 (1): 8-15.
- [20] Liu GR (2002), *Mesh Free Methods: Moving Beyond the Finite Element Method*. CRC press, USA
- [21] Anderson, T. L. (1991): *Fracture Mechanics: Fundamental and Applications* (1st Ed.) CRC Press.
- [22] Zienkiewicz OC and Taylor RL (2000), *The Finite Element Method*. 5th edition, Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford, UK.
- [23] Gu YT and Zhang LC (2006), A concurrent multiscale method for structures based on the combination of the meshfree method and the molecular dynamics. *Multiscale Modeling and Simulation: A SIAM Interdisciplinary Journal*, 5 (4): 1128-1155.
- [24] Organ DJ, Fleming M, Belytschko T (1996): Continuous meshfree approximations for nonconvex bodies by diffraction and transparency. *Computational Mechanics*, 18: 225-235.
- [25] Liu GR and Tu, ZH(2002), An Adaptive Procedure Based on Background Cells for Meshfree Methods, *Comput. Methods in Appl. Mech. and Engrg.*, 191: 1923-1943.
- [26] Timoshenko SP and Goodier JN (1970), *Theory of Elasticity*, 3rd Edition. McGraw-hill, New York.
- [27] Ching HK and Batra RC (2001), Determination of Crack Tip Fields in Linear Elastostatics by the Meshfree Local Petrov-Galerkin (MLPG) Method. *CMES*, 2(2): 273-289
- [28] Gdoutos, E. E. (1993): *Fracture Mechanics: an Introduction*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

### Figure Caption:

Figure 1 The coupled techniques using the interface boundary

Figure 2 The coupled analysis for the crack problem using the new transition technique

Figure 3 Relay model for an irregular domain with discontinuous boundaries

Figure 4(a) A cantilever beam subjected to a parabolic traction at the free end

Figure 4(b) The computational model for the two-dimensional cantilever beam

Figure 5 Shear stress distributions on the cross-section of the beam at  $x=L/2$

Figure 6 A cracked square plate subjected to Mode-I displacement boundary conditions

Figure 7 The computational model for the edge cracked plate

Figure 8 The distribution of  $\sigma_{yy}$  along the axis of the crack ( $\theta=0$ )

Figure 9 An edge square plate subjected to the tension loading

Figure 10 A double-edge square plate subjected to the tension loading

Figure 11 The computational model for the plate with two edge cracks

Figure 12 An edge-cracked plate subjected to the shear loading

Figure 13 The computational model for the edge-cracked plate subjected to the shear loading

Figure 14 A plate with a “C” shaped center crack

Figure 15 The computational model for the plate with the “C” shaped center crack

Figure 16 The distribution of  $\sigma_{xx}$

Figure 17 The distribution of  $\sigma_{xx}$  and  $\sigma_{yy}$  along the  $y$  axis