



An effective model for critically wrinkled arches

Abderrahmane Habbal

► To cite this version:

Abderrahmane Habbal. An effective model for critically wrinkled arches. RR-4546, INRIA. 2002.
inria-00072042

HAL Id: inria-00072042

<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00072042>

Submitted on 23 May 2006

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

An effective model for critically wrinkled arches

Abderrahmane HABBAL

N° 4546

Septembre 2002

_____ THÈME 4 _____



*apport
de recherche*

An effective model for critically wrinkled arches

Abderrahmane HABBAL *

Thème 4 — Simulation et optimisation
de systèmes complexes
Projet Opale

Rapport de recherche n° 4546 — Septembre 2002 — 24 pages

Abstract: Within the framework of the Koiter's linear elastic shell theory, we study the limit model of a plane arch whose mid-surface is periodically waved.

The magnitude and the period of the wavings are of the same order. To achieve the asymptotic analysis, we consider a mixed formulation, for which we perform a two-scale homogenization technique. We prove the convergence of the displacements, the rotation of the normal and the membrane strain.

From the limit formulation, we derive an effective model for critically wrinkled arches. It has a plane effective mid-surface, but exhibits a coupling between the rotation of the normal and the membrane strain.

Key-words: thin shells, linear elasticity, mixed formulation, two-scale homogenization

* Footnote for first author

Un modèle effectif pour une arche critiquement oscillante

Résumé : Dans le cadre de la théorie de Koiter des coques minces élastiques, nous étudions le modèle limite pour une arche élastique linéaire plane dont la surface moyenne subit des oscillations périodiques, l'amplitude et la fréquence des oscillations étant de même ordre. Pour ce faire, nous devons d'abord troquer la formulation directe usuelle contre une formulation mixte, permettant de donner un sens à des modèles seulement lipschitziens en forme moyenne. L'homogénéisation par la méthode de convergence à deux échelles est alors appliquée à ce modèle mixte. On prouve la convergence des déplacements globaux, de la rotation de la normale et du tenseur de déformation membranaire.

Des équations limites, nous construisons un modèle effectif d'arche oscillante en surface moyenne. Bien que de forme moyenne apparente plane, ce modèle contient un couplage non classique entre la rotation de la normale et le tenseur de déformation membranaire.

Mots-clés : coque mince, élasticité linéaire, formulation mixte, homogénéisation à deux échelles

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Classical modelling of an elastic arch	4
3	The arch is waved. A first analysis	6
4	Two-scale asymptotic analysis via a mixed formulation	8
4.1	Recall of the mixed formulation for elastic arches	8
4.2	A Two-scale limit for the mixed problem	10
5	An effective model for waved arches	18

1 Introduction

The aim of the present paper is the introduction, with a rigorous mathematical analysis, of an effective model for critically wrinkled arch structures.

In many industrial areas such as automotive or aerospace, elastic shell structures play a central role. In few words, a shell is a three-dimensional structure of small thickness. The importance of the potential applications, as well as an original and exciting mathematical modelling, combining differential geometry and continuum mechanics has led to the emergence of a fast growing discipline, the *shell theory*. A huge amount of literature is nowadays dedicated to the modelling, mathematical and numerical analysis, optimal design and active control, of shells. Among many others, starting from the seminal works of Koiter [1], some recent references are [2]-[3]-[4]-[5]-[6]-[7] and [8].

Generally, classical shells are considered with a smooth mid-surface and a bounded slowly varying curvature. Some authors have investigated the case of rapidly oscillating thickness, e.g. Kohn and Vogelius for plates in [9]. In the cited reference, the authors obtained a model of plate for a critical rate of oscillations, precisely when the magnitude and period of these are comparable.

In the present paper, we study the case where the mid-surface of the shell is waved instead of its thickness. To our knowledge, only very few authors have investigated this approach. In the situation where the magnitude is one order or more smaller than the period, the so-called moderately and slightly wrinkled cases, we refer to the works of [10] and [11]. A related work for rods has been studied in [12].

We consider a one-dimensional shell structure, that is an elastic arch. The mid-surface of the arch is waved periodically, and the magnitude and period are of the same order. We justify the need for a mixed formulation, necessary to go further in the asymptotic analysis of the waved arch. Then, to achieve the asymptotic analysis, we use the two-scale

homogenization method. The mixed formulation for the arches has been introduced by [13]. For a general introduction to the mixed formulation of variational problems, we refer to [14]. The two-scale homogenization technique, introduced by Nguetseng [15] and Allaire [16] is a simple and powerful tool to deal with periodic homogenization. We refer to these papers for the definition and an extensive study of the properties of the two-scale convergence.

2 Classical modelling of an elastic arch

An arch structure is an infinite three-dimensional cylindrical body of small thickness. We denote by L its width at the ground. Then, its geometrical description is the following :

Let be a function $\phi : [0, L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\phi(0) = \phi(L) = 0$. The function ϕ is assumed to have bounded derivatives up to the third order i.e. $\phi \in W^{3,\infty}([0, L])$.

The **surface** ω of the arch is defined by :

$$\omega = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ such that } x \in]0, L[\quad z = \phi(x) \quad y \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

Let now be a small positive parameter e (the thickness). Then, the three-dimensional arch structure Ω_e is defined by

$$\Omega_e = \{M \in \mathbb{R}^3 \quad M = m + t\vec{n}(m) \quad \text{where } m \in \omega \text{ and } t \in]-e/2, +e/2[\}$$

where $\vec{n}(m)$ denotes the unit normal vector to ω . The thickness parameter e is assumed to be small enough, compared to the curvature $1/R$ of ω , so that any point of Ω_e belongs to one and only one normal to ω . The relative ratio e/R is sometimes used as a parameter to classify shells as thin, shallow or thick [5].

The arch is now loaded, with a load assumed to be *invariant* with respect to the cylinder axis (the direction Oy for instance). From the Kirchhoff-Love thin shell theory, [17], within the linear elasticity framework, the problem reduces to a *one-dimensional* problem, set over the generic curve $z = \phi(x)$ (Figure 1).

In the following, some definitions needed for the statement of the arch equations are given.

- **The local basis** $(\vec{t}(m), \vec{n}(m))$ at a given point $m \in \omega$ of coordinates $(x, \phi(x))$ is

$$\vec{t}(m) = \vec{t}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{S(x)} \\ \frac{\phi'(x)}{S(x)} \end{pmatrix} \quad \vec{n}(m) = \vec{n}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-\phi'(x)}{S(x)} \\ \frac{1}{S(x)} \end{pmatrix}$$




Figure 1: Description of the arch geometry.

where $\vec{t}(x), \vec{n}(x)$ are respectively the unit tangent and normal vectors at the point x , $\phi' = d\phi/dx$ is the derivative of ϕ with respect to the space variable x , and $S(x) = \sqrt{1 + \phi'(x)^2}$.

- **The local displacement vector $\vec{u}(m)$ of a point m is given by**

$$\vec{u}(m) = \vec{u}(x) = u_t(x)\vec{t}(x) + u_n(x)\vec{n}(x)$$

where u_t and u_n are respectively the tangent and normal displacements.

From now on, the local displacement *variable* u will be denoted by $u = (u_t, u_n)$.

Let $\Omega =]0, L[$ and denote by V the space of admissible displacements :

$$V = H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^2(\Omega) \quad \text{arch clamped at both ends} \quad (1)$$

$$V = H_0^1(\Omega) \times (H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)) \quad \text{arch simply supported at both ends} \quad (2)$$

where $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $H_0^2(\Omega)$ are the usual Sobolev spaces.

The elastic energy functional is defined by

$$a(u, v) = \int_0^L [C\Gamma(u)\Gamma(v) + DK(u)K(v)] S(x)dx, \quad \text{for all } u, v \in V \quad (3)$$

where $C = E.e$, $D = E.M$ are mechanical constants, E is the Young modulus, e the constant thickness and M the second moment of area of the cross-section.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(v) &= \frac{1}{S}v'_t + \frac{1}{R}v_n, & \text{is the membrane strain} \\
K(v) &= \frac{1}{S}\theta'(v), & \text{is the bending strain} \\
\theta(v) &= -\frac{1}{S}v'_n + \frac{1}{R}v_t, & \text{is the rotation of the normal} \\
\frac{1}{R} &= -\frac{\phi''}{S^3}, & \text{is the curvature.}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The mechanical stress distribution is given by :

$$\sigma(v)(x, t) = E(\Gamma(v)(x) + tK(v)(x)) \quad x \in [0, L], \quad t \in [-e/2, +e/2]. \tag{5}$$

In order to give a sense to the elastic energy functional, the derivatives of ϕ up to the third order (appearing in the term $K(v)$) must be bounded, whence the assumption that $\phi \in W^{3,\infty}(\Omega)$.

Now, if we denote by $f = (f_t, f_n)$ the density of the load, then the *equilibrium equation* is given in its variational form, by

$$\text{find } u \in V \text{ such that } a(u, v) = L(v), \quad \text{for all } v \in V, \tag{6}$$

where the compliance $L(v)$ is generally of the form

$$L(v) = \int_0^L (\vec{f} \cdot \vec{v}) S(x) dx.$$

It is proved in [18] that the symmetric bilinear mapping $a(.,.)$ is continuous, V-elliptic. Then, assumed that $f \in V'$, the dual space of V , there exists one and only one solution $u \in V$ satisfying equation (6).

3 The arch is waved. A first analysis

We consider a plane beam, seen as a particular arch with a mid-surface given by $\phi_p = 0$. The plane mid-surface is periodically waved into a function

$$\phi_\epsilon(x) = \epsilon^r \phi(x/\epsilon), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

The period of the waving is given by the real positive number ϵ which is intended to go to zero. The amplitude is represented by ϵ^r , the positive number r denoting the relative period/amplitude rate.

If we denote by $Y =]0, 1[$ the usual periodic unit-cell, then the function ϕ is a Y -periodic function which is smooth enough to yield a mid-surface ϕ_ϵ of global $W^{3,\infty}(\Omega)$ regularity.

From now on, the useful notation $\dot{\phi}$ stands for the derivative of the function ϕ with respect

to the microscopic variable $y = x/\epsilon$.

Now, we have a curved arch whose geometric description strongly depends on ϵ :

$$S_\epsilon(x) = \sqrt{1 + (\epsilon^{r-1} \dot{\phi}(y))^2} \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{1}{R_\epsilon} = -\epsilon^{r-2} \frac{\ddot{\phi}}{S_\epsilon^3} \quad (8)$$

$$\left(\frac{1}{R_\epsilon}\right)' = -\epsilon^{r-3} \frac{\ddot{\phi}}{S_\epsilon^3} + \epsilon^{r-2} \dots \quad (9)$$

The membrane strain $\Gamma(v)$, the rotation of the normal $\theta(v)$ and the bending strain $K(v)$ also depend on ϵ , and so is the solution to the waved arch equations (6), which we denote by u_ϵ . Our main goal is to study the convergence of the sequence of displacements (u_ϵ) when ϵ goes to zero and to state the limit or effective equation satisfied by the limit displacement. We are particularly interested in the cases where effective equations still model -waved- shells.

From a simple look at the leading terms in (7)-(8)-(9) one naturally expects the following classification :

- (a) $0 \leq r < 1$: one has $S_\epsilon \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Here, we intend to use an infinite length of material. In the limit case $r = 0$, one expects a two dimensional laminated composite behavior. The shell theory is no more valid.
- (b) $1 \leq r < 2$: one has $\frac{1}{R_\epsilon} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In this case, a Budiansky-Sanders limit model seems out of reach. However, at the rate $r = 1$ numerical experiments exhibit non-negligible effects : the plane beam displacement is affected by the waving at a macroscopic scale.
- (c) $2 \leq r < 3$: one has $\left(\frac{1}{R_\epsilon}\right)' \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. At the rate $r = 2$ numerical experiments show only negligible first order effects.
- (d) $3 < r$: one has a strong convergence to zero of the sequence (ϕ_ϵ) in the $W^{3,\infty}(\Omega)$ norm. Since the displacement solution is a smooth function of the shape, see [8] for instance, we get a strong convergence (in the H^1 norm of displacements) of the waved model to the simple plane beam.

The first case (a) is out of the scope of the present paper, which focuses on situations where the limit model is a shell one.

The last case (d) is in contrast trivial since the displacements are infinitely differentiable with respect to the arch shapes.

Considering -in the cited reference- the equation satisfied by the derivative of the displacements with respect to the mid-surface at the point $\phi_p = 0$ which is a plane beam, it is easy

to show that this derivative is identically equal to zero itself. Hence, we get a direct proof of the following first order expansion :

$$u(\phi_\epsilon) = u(\phi_p) + o(\epsilon^{r-3}) \quad (10)$$

The expansion above implies that we have a strong convergence of the local waved arch's displacements to the plane beam ones.

We shall see in the next section that both the cases (c) and (b) with $1 < r < 2$ also fit in this situation.

Thus the case $r = 1$ could be seen legitimately as a *critical* waving rate, and all the mathematical analysis done in sections 4.2 and 5 is related to this critical case.

Now, the numerical tests are clearly in contradiction with the behavior (*i.e.* divergence to infinity) of the main geometric component in shell theory, namely the curvature and its derivative. This suggests that the classical arch model is not adequate to an asymptotic analysis :

One should *relax* the dependence on the curvature, and get rid of those oscillations only due to the representation of the displacements in the local basis, which is itself rapidly varying.

This is exactly what the mixed formulation presented in the next section is dedicated to.

4 Two-scale asymptotic analysis via a mixed formulation

In the present section, we recall a mixed formulation framework for elastic arches, introduced by Lods [13], on which we perform an asymptotic analysis of the mixed formulation for waved arches by means of the two-scale homogenization technique.

4.1 Recall of the mixed formulation for elastic arches

We start by remarking that any virtual displacement *vector* $\vec{v}$ over a generic arch structure $\psi \in W^{3,\infty}(\Omega)$ can be written in the local basis of tangent-normal unit vectors $(\vec{t}(\psi), \vec{n}(\psi))$ as well as in the global $(\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2)$ one :

$$\vec{v} = \beta(\psi, v)\vec{e}_1 + \gamma(\psi, v)\vec{e}_2 = v_1\vec{t}(\psi) + v_2\vec{n}(\psi) \quad (11)$$

The key-point of the mixed formulation is the following identity, which *eliminates the curvature term*. It relates the rotation of the normal $\theta(\psi, v)$ and the membrane strain $\Gamma(\psi, v)$ given by the formulas (4) to the global components $(\beta(\psi, v), \gamma(\psi, v))$ of the displacement :

Lemma 4.1 *Using the notations above, we have the following :*

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(\psi, v) &= \frac{1}{S(\psi)^2}(\psi' \beta'(\psi, v) - \gamma'(\psi, v)) \\ \Gamma(\psi, v) &= \frac{1}{S(\psi)^2}(\beta'(\psi, v) + \psi' \gamma'(\psi, v))\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

or, in an equivalent form :

$$\begin{aligned}\beta'(\psi, v) &= \psi' \theta(\psi, v) + \Gamma(\psi, v) \\ \gamma'(\psi, v) &= -\theta(\psi, v) + \psi' \Gamma(\psi, v)\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

The equalities hold in $L^2(\Omega)$.

See [13] for the proof.

In the following, we introduce or recall some useful notations and functional spaces :

$$\begin{aligned}v_m &= (\beta, \gamma, \theta, \mu) \in V_m & \text{where } V_m &= H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \\ q_m &= (q_1, q_2) \in Q_m & \text{where } Q_m &= L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

Next, we define the bilinear mappings :

$$\begin{aligned}b_m(\psi; \cdot, \cdot) &: V_m \times Q_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ b_m(\psi; v_m, q_m) &= \int_{\Omega} (\beta' - \psi' \theta - \mu) q_1 + (\gamma' + \theta - \psi' \mu) q_2 dx\end{aligned}$$

and -with obvious notations-

$$\begin{aligned}a_m(\psi; \cdot, \cdot) &: V_m \times V_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ a_m(\psi; v_m^1, v_m^2) &= C \int_{\Omega} \mu^1 \mu^2 S(\psi) dx + D \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{S(\psi)} \theta^1 \theta^2 dx\end{aligned}$$

The continuous bilinear mapping b_m expresses via a duality viewpoint that the relations (13) are seen as constraints, while a_m is simply a reformulation of the elastic energy of the arch formerly given by (3).

The right-hand side modeling the external forces is written (in the global coordinates system) as :

$$L_m(\psi; v_m) = \int_{\Omega} (f_1 \beta + f_2 \gamma) S(\psi) dx\tag{15}$$

Now, we are ready to set up the mixed formulation :

Find $(u_m, p_m) \in V_m \times Q_m$ such that :

$$\begin{cases} \forall v_m \in V_m & a_m(\psi; u_m, v_m) + b_m(\psi; v_m, p_m) = L_m(\psi; v_m) \\ \forall q_m \in Q_m & b_m(\psi; u_m, q_m) = 0. \end{cases}\tag{16}$$

The existence and uniqueness of $(u_m, p_m) \in V_m \times Q_m$ solution to the mixed problem above is proved in Lods [13] by application of the Brezzi's theorem [14]. To this end, the following assumptions, also known as the BBL conditions, are shown to hold :

(Ha) The continuous bilinear mapping $a_m(\psi; \cdot, \cdot)$ is elliptic on the kernel of b_m , that is the space

$$V_m^\psi = \{v_m \in V_m \text{ such that } \forall q_m \in Q_m \quad b_m(\psi; v_m, q_m) = 0.\} \quad (17)$$

(Hb) The continuous bilinear mapping $b_m(\psi; \cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies the condition :

$$\inf_{\substack{q_m \in Q_m \\ \|q_m\|=1}} \sup_{\substack{v_m \in V_m \\ \|v_m\|=1}} b_m(\psi; v_m, q_m) > 0.$$

The equivalence of the two problems (16) and (6) holds when the mid-surface $\psi \in W^{3,\infty}(\Omega)$. In the case of Lipschitzian arches i.e. $\psi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, then the mixed formulation yields a *generalized* model for arch structures.

From now on, we shall consider exclusively the generalized Lipschitzian arch model. We shall omit the subscript "m" standing for "mixed" in the present section.

In the next section, we use the two properties (Ha) and (Hb) to get a priori estimates of the mixed solution for the waved arch. These estimates are used as a preamble to the two-scale homogenization technique. Then, we derive a limit mixed problem for which we prove that corresponding (Ha) and (Hb) hold.

4.2 A Two-scale limit for the mixed problem

First, we recall a few results from the two-scale homogenization [16].

We denote by $\mathcal{C}_\#^\infty(Y)$ the space of infinitely differentiable functions in $\mathbb{R}$ which are Y -periodic. The space $\mathcal{D}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_\#^\infty(Y))$ denotes the space of infinitely differentiable functions of compact support in Ω with values in $\mathcal{C}_\#^\infty(Y)$.

Definition 4.1 *A sequence (u_ϵ) of $L^2(\Omega)$ is said to two-scale converge if there exists a subsequence still denoted by u_ϵ , and a function $u_0(x; y) \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ such that*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} u_\epsilon(x) v(x; x/\epsilon) dx = \int_{\Omega \times Y} u_0(x; y) v(x; y) dx dy \quad (18)$$

for any $v(x; y) \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_\#^\infty(Y))$.

We shall denote by $u_\epsilon \rightharpoonup u_0$ when u_ϵ two-scale converges to u_0 .

We shall also use the standard notation $\langle v \rangle = \int_Y v(x; y) dy$ which stands for the mean-value of a Y -periodic function v .

We have the following :

- (P1) Bounded sequences of $L^2(\Omega)$ two-scale converge ;
- (P2) If $u_\epsilon \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ then $u_\epsilon \rightharpoonup \langle u_0 \rangle$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ weakly ;
- (P3) Bounded sequences (u_ϵ) of $H^1(\Omega)$ two-scale converge :
there exists $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $u_1 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_\#(Y)/\mathbb{R})$ such that $u_\epsilon \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^1(\Omega)$ weakly
and $u'_\epsilon \rightharpoonup u' + u_1$.

Now, let us first rapidly conclude in the case where the wavings are of the form

$$\phi_\epsilon(x) = \epsilon^r \phi(x/\epsilon), \quad r > 1.$$

We shall denote by (u^ϵ, p^ϵ) and (u^p, p^p) the respective solutions in $V \times Q$ of the mixed problem (16) set for $\psi = \phi_\epsilon$ and for $\psi = \phi_0 = 0$ (i.e. the plane beam).

It is then proved in [19] that under the assumptions :

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_\epsilon, \phi_0 &\in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \\ \|\phi_\epsilon\|_{W^{1,\infty}} &\text{ is uniformly bounded w.r.t. } \epsilon, \\ \|\phi_\epsilon - \phi_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\rightarrow 0 \text{ with } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \\ L(\phi_\epsilon; \cdot) &\rightarrow L(\phi_0; \cdot) \text{ with } \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ in the dual space } V' \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

then one has the strong convergences :

$$u^\epsilon \rightarrow u^p \text{ in } V, \tag{20}$$

$$p^\epsilon \rightarrow p^p \text{ in } Q \tag{21}$$

The latter assumptions obviously hold for our sequence of periodic functions $\phi_\epsilon(x)$ with $r > 1$. Thus, the limit model is simply the plane beam one.
This result is an evidence which corroborates the criticality of the case $r = 1$.

From now on, we consider the waved mid-surfaces described by functions

$$\phi_\epsilon(x) = \epsilon \phi(x/\epsilon),$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is the period as well as the magnitude of the waving, $x \in \Omega$ is a macroscopic space variable.

The function ϕ belongs to a set Λ defined by :

$$\Lambda = \{\psi \in W^{1,\infty}(Y), \quad \psi \text{ is } Y\text{-periodic}, \psi(0) = \psi(1)\} \tag{22}$$

Thanks to the definition of Λ , the functions ϕ_ϵ belong to the space $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and are admissible generalized arch mid-surfaces.

The mechanical unknowns which describe the behavior of the loaded waving elastic arch are now the mixed variables

$$u^\epsilon = (\beta^\epsilon, \gamma^\epsilon, \theta^\epsilon, \mu^\epsilon) \in V, \quad p^\epsilon = (p_1^\epsilon, p_2^\epsilon) \in Q$$

solution to the mixed problem :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall v = (\beta, \gamma, \theta, \mu) \in V \\ C \int_{\Omega} \mu^\epsilon \mu S(\phi_\epsilon) dx + D \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{S(\phi_\epsilon)} (\theta^\epsilon)' \theta' dx \\ + \int_{\Omega} (\beta' - (\phi_\epsilon)' \theta - \mu) p_1^\epsilon + (\gamma' + \theta - (\phi_\epsilon)' \mu) p_2^\epsilon dx = \int_{\Omega} (f_1^\epsilon \beta + f_2^\epsilon \gamma) S(\phi_\epsilon) dx \\ \forall q = (q_1, q_2) \in Q \quad \int_{\Omega} ((\beta^\epsilon)' - (\phi_\epsilon)' \theta^\epsilon - \mu^\epsilon) q_1 + ((\gamma^\epsilon)' + \theta^\epsilon - (\phi_\epsilon)' \mu^\epsilon) q_2 dx = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (23)$$

For the waved arch structures, it is natural to assume that the external forces $f^\epsilon = (f_1^\epsilon, f_2^\epsilon)$ are periodic. For instance, this is the case of the pressure, self-weight and snow loadings which are common loadings for arch structures.

We shall assume that the loading is of the form $f^\epsilon(x) = f(x; x/\epsilon)$. The function $f(x; y)$ belongs to the space $L^2(\Omega; C_\#(Y))$ of measurable and square integrable functions, with values in the space of continuous Y -periodic functions.

For such functions f^ϵ in $L^2(\Omega; C_\#(Y))$, one has : $\|f^\epsilon(x)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|f(x; y)\|_{L^2(\Omega \times Y)}$.

We recall that by convention $\dot{\phi}(x; y)$ denotes the derivative of a function $\phi(x; y)$ with respect to the microscopic variable $y \in Y$.

Now, we are ready to state the following convergence theorem :

Theorem 4.1 *Let $u^\epsilon = (\beta^\epsilon, \gamma^\epsilon, \theta^\epsilon, \mu^\epsilon) \in V$ and $p^\epsilon = (p_1^\epsilon, p_2^\epsilon) \in Q$ be the unique solutions to the waved arch problem (23). Then, we have*

- (i) *There exist -unique- functions $\beta^0, \gamma^0, \theta^0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\mu^0 \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ and $\beta_c, \gamma_c, \theta_c \in L^2(\Omega; H_\#^1(Y)/\mathbb{R})$ such that :*

The functions $\beta^\epsilon, \gamma^\epsilon$ and θ^ϵ weakly converge in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ respectively to $\beta^0, \gamma^0, \theta^0$, and

$$\begin{cases} (\beta^\epsilon)' \rightharpoonup (\beta^0)' + \dot{\beta}_c \\ (\gamma^\epsilon)' \rightharpoonup (\gamma^0)' + \dot{\gamma}_c \\ (\theta^\epsilon)' \rightharpoonup (\theta^0)' + \dot{\theta}_c \\ \mu^\epsilon \rightharpoonup \mu^0 \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Moreover, the function μ^ϵ weakly converges in $L^2(\Omega)$ to $(\beta^0)'$.

(ii) There exists a unique function $p^0 \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)^2$ such that $p^\epsilon \rightharpoonup p^0$.

(iii) The functions $\beta^0, \gamma^0, \theta^0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\mu^0 \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$, $\beta_c, \gamma_c, \theta_c \in L^2(\Omega; H_\#^1(Y)/\mathbb{R})$ and $p^0 = (p_1^0, p_2^0) \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)^2$ are solution to the well-posed limit mixed formulation :

$$\begin{cases} \forall \beta, \gamma, \theta \in H_0^1(\Omega) ; \beta_1, \gamma_1, \theta_1 \in L^2(\Omega; H_\#^1(Y)/\mathbb{R}) ; \mu \in L^2(\Omega \times Y) \\ C \int_{\Omega \times Y} \mu^0 \mu S(\phi(y)) dx dy + D \int_{\Omega \times Y} \frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} [(\theta^0)' + \dot{\theta}_c](\theta' + \dot{\theta}_1) dx dy \\ + \int_{\Omega \times Y} (\beta' + \dot{\beta}_1 - \dot{\phi}\theta - \mu)p_1^0 + (\gamma' + \dot{\gamma}_1 + \theta - \dot{\phi}\mu)p_2^0 dx dy \\ = \int_{\Omega \times Y} (f_1(x; y)\beta + f_2(x; y)\gamma)S(\phi(y)) dx dy \\ \forall q_1, q_2 \in L^2(\Omega \times Y) \\ \int_{\Omega \times Y} ((\beta^0)' + \dot{\beta}_c - \dot{\phi}\theta^0 - \mu^0)q_1 + ((\gamma^0)' + \dot{\gamma}_c + \theta^0 - \dot{\phi}\mu^0)q_2 dx dy = 0. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Proof of the theorem.

The sequence (u^ϵ) is uniformly bounded w.r.t. ϵ in V so that it two-scale converges :

Zeine has proved in [20] that the continuous bilinear mappings $a(\phi_\epsilon; \cdot, \cdot)$ are uniformly elliptic with respect to the parameter $\epsilon > 0$ over the spaces V^{ϕ_ϵ} defined by (17), provided that one has a uniform bound : $\|\phi_\epsilon\|_{1,\infty} \leq C$. In our case, we have $\|\phi_\epsilon\|_{1,\infty} = \epsilon\|\phi\|_\infty + \|\dot{\phi}\|_\infty$ which ensures the needed uniform upper-bound.

From other part, since $a(\phi_\epsilon; \cdot, \cdot)$ depends on ϕ_ϵ through only its first derivative, the bilinear mapping is also uniformly continuous. We conclude by the classical arguments of a priori estimates for elliptic problems that :

$\|u^\epsilon\| \leq C\|f^\epsilon(x)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\|f(x; y)\|_{L^2(\Omega \times Y)}$ uniformly.

Since

$$\|u^\epsilon\|^2 = \|\beta_\epsilon\|_{H_0^1}^2 + \|\gamma_\epsilon\|_{H_0^1}^2 + \|\theta_\epsilon\|_{H_0^1}^2 + \|\mu_\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2,$$

we apply the two-scale compactness result **(P3)** to get the weak convergence of the functions in H_0^1 and the two-scale convergence in $L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ of the derivatives.

The last point in the assertion (i) comes from the remark that since u^ϵ belongs to the space V^{ϕ_ϵ} we have : $\mu_\epsilon = (\beta_\epsilon)' - (\phi_\epsilon)'\theta_\epsilon$; Using property **(P2)** and noticing that $(\phi_\epsilon)' \rightharpoonup \langle \dot{\phi} \rangle = 0$, we have

$$\mu_\epsilon \rightharpoonup \langle (\beta_0)' + \dot{\beta}_c - (\dot{\phi})\theta_0 \rangle = (\beta^0)'.$$

The sequence (p^ϵ) is uniformly bounded w.r.t. ϵ in Q so that it two-scale converges :

It is proved in [13] that the bilinear mapping $b(\phi_\epsilon; \cdot, \cdot)$ enjoys the following property : There exists a positive constant C such that , for any given $q \in Q$, there exists a function $v \in V$ such that

$$b(\phi_\epsilon; v, q) = \|q\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\| \leq C(\|\phi_\epsilon\|_{1,\infty} + 1)\|q\|, \quad (26)$$

the constant $C > 0$ being independent of ϕ_ϵ . We shall denote by w^ϵ the corresponding function obtained thanks to the property above when we set $q = p^\epsilon$.

Now, from the equation (23) we have :

$$\|p^\epsilon\|^2 = b(\phi_\epsilon; w^\epsilon, p^\epsilon) = -a(\phi_\epsilon; u^\epsilon, w^\epsilon) + L(\phi_\epsilon; w^\epsilon).$$

Then, using the uniform continuity of $a(\phi_\epsilon; \cdot, \cdot)$ and $L(\phi_\epsilon; \cdot)$ with respect to ϵ we get :

$$\|p^\epsilon\|^2 \leq \{C(\phi)\|u^\epsilon\| + \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega \times Y)}\}\|w^\epsilon\|$$

We replace now $\|w^\epsilon\|$ by its upper-bound given by (26) and simplify the inequality above by $\|p^\epsilon\|$. The proof ends by remarking that from above, $\|u^\epsilon\|$ is itself uniformly bounded.

Since the sequence (p^ϵ) is bounded uniformly with respect to ϵ , there exists a subsequence which two-scale converges to a limit $p^0 \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)^2$. The convergence of the whole sequence comes from the uniqueness of the limit, and is proved below.

We pass to the two-scale limit in the mixed equation (23) :

First, we choose test functions of the form :

$$\begin{aligned} v &= (\beta(x) + \epsilon\beta_1(x; x/\epsilon); \gamma(x) + \epsilon\gamma_1(x; x/\epsilon); \theta(x) + \epsilon\theta_1(x; x/\epsilon); \mu(x; x/\epsilon)) \\ &\quad \beta, \gamma, \theta \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) ; \mu, \beta_1, \gamma_1, \theta_1 \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega; C_\#^\infty(Y)) \\ q &= (q_1(x; x/\epsilon), q_2(x; x/\epsilon)) \quad q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega; C_\#^\infty(Y)) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

(Here, the usual notation $\mathcal{D}$ stands for the space of infinitely differentiable functions with compact support, and a standard density argument of such spaces in L^2 and H_0^1 is used.)

Then, applying the definition of the two-scale convergence, we can pass to the limit in ϵ in each of the terms of equation (23).

As an illustrating example, considering the test function

$$w(x; y) = \frac{1}{S(\phi(y))}(\theta'(x) + \dot{\theta}_1(x; y))$$

we get

$$\int_{\Omega} (\theta^\epsilon)' w(x; x/\epsilon) dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{S(\phi_\epsilon)} (\theta^\epsilon)' (\theta + \epsilon \theta_1(x; x/\epsilon))' dx + O(\epsilon) \quad (28)$$

so that

$$\int_{\Omega} (\theta^\epsilon)' w(x; x/\epsilon) dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega \times Y} \frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} [(\theta^0)' + \dot{\theta}_c] (\theta' + \dot{\theta}_1) dx dy$$

for the bending term, and

$$\int_{\Omega} ((\beta^\epsilon)' - (\phi_\epsilon)' \theta^\epsilon - \mu^\epsilon) q_1 dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega \times Y} ((\beta^0)' + \dot{\beta}_c - \dot{\phi} \theta^0 - \mu^0) q_1 dx dy$$

for the first term of the duality functional.

The limit mixed formulation given by (25) is then straightforward.

The limit mixed formulation is well-posed :

In order to make the expository as clear as possible, we again introduce adapted notations and functional spaces :

$$\begin{aligned} v^0 &= (\beta, \gamma, \theta, \mu) \in V^0 & \text{where } V^0 &= H_0^1(\Omega)^3 \times L^2(\Omega \times Y) \\ v^c &= (\beta_1, \gamma_1, \theta_1) \in V^c & \text{where } V^c &= L^2(\Omega; H_{\#}^1(Y)/\mathbb{R})^3 \\ v^H &= (v^0, v^c) \in V^H & \text{where } V^H &= V^0 \times V^c \\ q^H &= (q_1, q_2) \in Q^H & \text{where } Q^H &= L^2(\Omega \times Y) \times L^2(\Omega \times Y) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The space V^H is endowed with the norm :

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^H\|^2 &= \|\beta'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\gamma'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\theta'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mu\|_{L^2(\Omega \times Y)}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\dot{\beta}_1\|_{L^2(\Omega \times Y)}^2 + \|\dot{\gamma}_1\|_{L^2(\Omega \times Y)}^2 + \|\dot{\theta}_1\|_{L^2(\Omega \times Y)}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

while the space Q^H is endowed with its natural L^2 norm.

The limit bilinear mappings are defined by :

$$\begin{aligned} b^H(\phi; \cdot, \cdot) &: V^H \times Q^H \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ b^H(\phi; v^H, q^H) &= \int_{\Omega \times Y} (\beta' + \dot{\beta}_1 - \dot{\phi} \theta - \mu) q_1 + (\gamma' + \dot{\gamma}_1 + \theta - \dot{\phi} \mu) q_2 dx dy \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

and (with obvious notations)

$$\begin{aligned}
 a^H(\phi; \cdot, \cdot) &: V^H \times V^H \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\
 a^H(\phi; (v^H)^1, (v^H)^2) &= C \int_{\Omega \times Y} \mu^1(x; y) \mu^2(x; y) S(\phi(y)) dx dy \\
 &+ D \int_{\Omega \times Y} \frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} [(\theta^1)' + \dot{\theta}_c^1] ((\theta^2)' + \dot{\theta}_c^2) dx dy
 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

We shall also need to define the kernel of b^H by

$$V^{H,\phi} = \{v^H \in V^H \text{ such that } \forall q^H \in Q^H \quad b^H(\phi; v^H, q^H) = 0\}. \tag{33}$$

The limit right-hand side is easily obtained as being :

$$L^H(\phi; v^H) = \int_{\Omega \times Y} (f_1(x; y)\beta + f_2(x; y)\gamma) S(\phi(y)) dx dy \tag{34}$$

We denote by $u^H = (\beta^0, \gamma^0, \theta^0, \mu^0; \beta_c, \gamma_c, \theta_c)$ and $p^H = p^0 = (p_1^0, p_2^0)$.

Then the limit equation reads in the classical mixed formulation

Find $(u^H, p^H) \in V^H \times Q^H$ such that :

$$\begin{cases} \forall v^H \in V^H & a^H(\phi; u^H, v^H) + b^H(\phi; v^H, p^H) = L^H(\phi; v^H) \\ \forall q^H \in Q^H & b^H(\phi; u^H, q^H) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

The continuity of the mappings $a^H(\phi; \cdot, \cdot)$, $L^H(\phi; \cdot)$ and $b^H(\phi; \cdot, \cdot)$ over their respective spaces is straightforward. In order to prove that the problem (35) above is well-posed, it is enough to prove that the BBL conditions hold :

- (a) ellipticity of the limit mixed energy $a^H(\phi; \cdot, \cdot)$ over the space $V^{H,\phi}$
- (b) the inf-sup condition for the limit bilinear mapping $b^H(\phi; \cdot, \cdot)$

We shall use the generic element $v^H = (\beta, \gamma, \theta, \mu; \beta_1, \gamma_1, \theta_1)$ of V^H .

(a) the continuous bilinear mapping $a^H(\phi; \cdot, \cdot)$ is elliptic over the space $V^{H,\phi}$ defined by (33) :

First, remark that since θ_1 is Y -periodic, one has immediately

$$a^H(\phi; v^H, v^H) \geq A \int_{\Omega \times Y} \mu^2 dx dy + B \int_{\Omega \times Y} (\theta' + \dot{\theta}_1)^2 dx dy \tag{36}$$

$$\geq A \int_{\Omega \times Y} \mu^2 dx dy + B \int_{\Omega} (\theta')^2 dx + B \int_{\Omega \times Y} (\dot{\theta}_1)^2 dx dy \tag{37}$$

Secondly, since the function v^H belongs to the space $V^{H,\phi}$, we have :

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta)' + \dot{\beta}_1 &= \dot{\phi}\theta + \mu \\ (\gamma)' + \dot{\gamma}_1 &= -\theta + \dot{\phi}\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Now, using the identities above, the Poincaré inequality for θ and the Y -periodicity of β_1 and γ_1 it is an easy exercise, left to the reader, to derive the ellipticity of $a^H(\phi; \cdot, \cdot)$ in the -induced- norm of $V^{H,\phi}$.

(b) The inf-sup condition :

A classical method to prove the inf-sup condition (Hb) is to explicitly construct for any given $q^H \in Q^H$, a function $v^H \in V^H$ such that

$$b^H(\phi; v^H, q^H) = \|q^H\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|v^H\| \leq C \|q^H\|, \quad (39)$$

the constant $C > 0$ being independent of q^H .

Given any arbitrary function $q^H = (q_1, q_2)$ in Q^H , one has to yield a function $v^H \in V^H$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} q_1(x; y) &= (\beta)' + \dot{\beta}_1 - \dot{\phi}\theta - \mu \\ q_2(x; y) &= (\gamma)' + \dot{\gamma}_1 + \theta - \dot{\phi}\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

One could easily check that the following candidates work :

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x; y) &= - \int_{\Omega \times Y} q_1(x; y) dx dy \\ \theta(x) &= 4 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left| \frac{1}{2} - x \right| \right) \int_{\Omega \times Y} q_2(x; y) dx dy \\ \beta(x) &= \int_0^x (\langle q_1(s; \cdot) \rangle + \langle \mu(s; \cdot) \rangle) ds \\ \gamma(x) &= \int_0^x (\langle q_2(s; \cdot) \rangle - \theta(s)) ds \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1(x; y) &= \int_0^y (q_1(x; t) + \mu(x; t) + \dot{\phi}(t)\theta(x) - \beta'(x)) dt + Constant \\ \gamma_1(x; y) &= \int_0^y (q_2(x; t) - \theta(x) + \dot{\phi}(t)\mu(x; t) - \gamma'(x)) dt + Constant \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

It is straightforward from this explicit construction that the upper-bound required in (39) is fulfilled. Moreover, the constant C can be chosen independent of the parameter ϕ . Q.E.D.

We have then established the existence and uniqueness of the limits u^H and p^H solutions to the limit mixed problem (35). As a consequence, we also have proved the convergence of the whole sequences (u^ϵ) and (p^ϵ) .

5 An effective model for waved arches

The limit mixed formulation obtained in the previous section has the advantage to precisely describe the two scales of behavior, the macroscopic and the microscopic (also called hidden scale) one. For numerical purpose nevertheless, this advantage becomes a drawback, since it implies a dramatical increasing in the complexity of the calculations.

Mainly for this reason, computational mechanicians are always interested in models where one can get rid of the microscopic variable and functions (e.g. first order correctors). When possible, one tries to obtain a so called effective or homogenized model which is set in the macroscopic variable/functions only.

In the sequel, we build in three steps such an effective model for the present case of periodically waved arches.

First step. In the limit equation (25), we make $\beta = \gamma = \theta = \mu = 0$ and $\theta_1 = 0$. We obtain that for all $\beta_1, \gamma_1 \in L^2(\Omega; H_{\#}^1(Y)/\mathbb{R})$,

$$\int_{\Omega \times Y} (\dot{\beta}_1 p_1^0 + \dot{\gamma}_1 p_2^0) dx dy = 0. \quad (43)$$

A simple integration by parts yields that the function p^0 does not depend on the microscopic variable y :

$$p_1^0(x; y) = p_1^0(x) \quad p_2^0(x; y) = p_2^0(x)$$

Thus, thanks to the periodicity of the functions β_1, γ_1 and ϕ , the dual term $b^H(\phi; v^H, p^H)$ reduces to :

$$b^H(\phi; v^H, p^H) = \int_{\Omega} ((\beta^0)' - \langle \mu \rangle) p_1^0 + ((\gamma^0)' + \theta - \langle \dot{\phi} \mu \rangle) p_2^0 dx. \quad (44)$$

Then we consider test functions q^H which themselves do not depend on the variable y . Hence the dual equation in (25) reads :

$$\forall q_1, q_2 \in L^2(\Omega) \quad \int_{\Omega} ((\beta^0)' - \langle \mu^0 \rangle) q_1 + ((\gamma^0)' + \theta^0 - \langle \dot{\phi} \mu^0 \rangle) q_2 dx = 0. \quad (45)$$

Remark that β_1, γ_1 as well as β_c, γ_c have completely disappeared from equations (44) and (45) above.

Second step. Now, we focus our attention on the bending term, namely :

$$\mathcal{I}_{bending} = \int_{\Omega \times Y} \frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} [(\theta^0)' + \dot{\theta}_c](\theta' + \dot{\theta}_1) dx dy \quad (46)$$

First, by setting in (25) $\beta = \gamma = \theta = \mu = 0$ and $\beta_1 = \gamma_1 = 0$, we derive the equation :

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dy} \left(\frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} \{ (\theta^0)' + \dot{\theta}_c \} \right) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \times Y \\ y \rightarrow \theta_c(x; y) \text{ is } Y\text{-periodic.} \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

Now, we have to handle a classical homogenized equation for which, the *cell equations* technique can be used.

One defines the function $w_\theta \in H_\#^1(Y)/\mathbb{R}$ by:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dy} \left(\frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} \{ 1 + \dot{w}_\theta \} \right) = 0 \text{ in } Y \\ y \rightarrow w_\theta(y) \text{ is } Y\text{-periodic.} \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

Then, one can easily show that $\theta_c(x; y) = (\theta^0)'(x)w_\theta(y)$. Then, setting $\theta_1(x; y) = \theta'(x)z_\theta(y)$ where $z_\theta \in H_\#^1(Y)/\mathbb{R}$ one gets

$$\mathcal{I}_{bending} = \int_\Omega (\theta^0)' \theta' \int_Y \frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} (1 + \dot{w}_\theta) dy dx \quad (49)$$

It is also easy to get from equation (48) that $\int_Y \frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} (1 + \dot{w}_\theta) dy = \frac{1}{\langle S \rangle}$, which reduces the term $\mathcal{I}_{bending}$ to :

$$\mathcal{I}_{bending} = \frac{1}{\langle S \rangle} \int_\Omega (\theta^0)' \theta' dx. \quad (50)$$

The -nearly- effective equation for the waved arch model can then be stated as follows : Find $\beta^0, \gamma^0, \theta^0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\mu^0 \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ and $p^0 = (p_1^0, p_2^0) \in L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \forall \beta, \gamma, \theta \in H_0^1(\Omega) ; \forall \mu \in L^2(\Omega \times Y) \\ C \int_{\Omega \times Y} \mu^0 \mu S(\phi(y)) dx dy + D \frac{1}{\langle S \rangle} \int_\Omega (\theta^0)' \theta' dx \\ + \int_\Omega ((\beta)' - \langle \mu \rangle) p_1^0 + ((\gamma)' + \theta - \langle \dot{\phi} \mu \rangle) p_2^0 dx \\ = \int_\Omega (\langle f_1 S(\phi) \rangle \beta + \langle f_2 S(\phi) \rangle \gamma) dx \\ \forall (q_1, q_2) \in L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \\ \int_\Omega ((\beta^0)' - \langle \mu^0 \rangle) q_1 + ((\gamma^0)' + \theta^0 - \langle \dot{\phi} \mu^0 \rangle) q_2 dx = 0. \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

The Brezzi conditions for this mixed formulation are fulfilled. The proof is slightly the same than the one of the limit problem (35). Hence, $(\beta^0, \gamma^0, \theta^0; \mu^0; p^0)$ is the unique mixed

solution of both equations (35) and (51).

Third step. Notice that (51) is only a semi-effective mixed formulation because $\mu_0(x; y)$ shows. As a matter of fact, one cannot expect that the mean-value $\langle \mu^0 \rangle$ be the effective unknown for membrane strain, since in the problem above $\langle \dot{\phi} \mu^0 \rangle$ cannot be expressed as a linear function of the latter.

So, in order to go on in the homogenization process, we set $\beta = \gamma = \theta = 0$ in equation (51), which reduces to :

$$\forall \mu \in L^2(\Omega \times Y) \quad C \int_{\Omega \times Y} \mu^0 \mu S(\phi(y)) dx dy = \int_{\Omega \times Y} (p_1^0 + \dot{\phi} p_2^0) \mu dx dy \quad (52)$$

This equality in $L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ proves that μ^0 can be written :

$$C \mu^0(x; y) S(\phi(y)) = p_1^0(x) + \dot{\phi}(y) p_2^0(x)$$

It is then legitimate to take test functions $\mu \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ of the same form :

$$\mu(x; y) = \frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} \mu_1(x) + \frac{\dot{\phi}(y)}{S(\phi(y))} \mu_2(x)$$

with μ_1, μ_2 generic elements of the space $L^2(\Omega)$.

Thus, the homogenized membrane strain μ^0 is uniquely described by the pair $(\mu_1^0, \mu_2^0) \in L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ such that $\mu^0(x; y) = \frac{1}{S(\phi(y))} \mu_1^0(x) + \frac{\dot{\phi}(y)}{S(\phi(y))} \mu_2^0(x)$.

Finally, using these new expressions for μ and μ^0 , we put them in the mixed formulation (51) in order to get, this time, a completely effective equation.

We have the following result :

Theorem 5.1 *The global displacements $(\beta^\epsilon, \gamma^\epsilon) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, the rotation of the normal $\theta^\epsilon \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, the membrane strain $\mu^\epsilon \in L^2(\Omega)$ and the Lagrange multipliers $(p_1^\epsilon, p_2^\epsilon) \in L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ which are the solution to the mixed waved arch problem (23) weakly converge in their spaces respectively to $(\beta^0, \gamma^0) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\theta^0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\mu^E = \left(\langle \frac{1}{S} \rangle \mu_1^0 + \langle \frac{\dot{\phi}}{S} \rangle \mu_2^0 \right) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $(p_1^0, p_2^0) \in L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$.*

The limit, or effective, functions above are the unique solution of the following effective mixed formulation :

Find $\beta^0, \gamma^0, \theta^0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}^0 = (\mu_1^0, \mu_2^0)^T \in L^2(\Omega)^2$ and $p^0 = (p_1^0, p_2^0) \in L^2(\Omega)^2$ such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall \beta, \gamma, \theta \in H_0^1(\Omega) ; \forall \boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2)^T \in L^2(\Omega)^2 \\ C \int_{\Omega} (A^E \boldsymbol{\mu}^0) \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu} dx + D \int_{\Omega} B^E (\theta^0)' \theta' dx \\ + \int_{\Omega} ((\beta^0)' - A_1^E \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}) p_1^0 + ((\gamma^0)' + \theta^0 - A_2^E \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}) p_2^0 dx \\ = \int_{\Omega} (\langle f_1 S \rangle \beta + \langle f_2 S \rangle \gamma) dx \\ \\ \forall (q_1, q_2) \in L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \\ \int_{\Omega} ((\beta^0)' - A_1^E \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}^0) q_1 + ((\gamma^0)' + \theta^0 - A_2^E \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}^0) q_2 dx = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (53)$$

where the effective material properties are given by :

$$A^E = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \frac{1}{S} \rangle & \langle \frac{\dot{\phi}}{S} \rangle \\ \langle \frac{\dot{\phi}}{S} \rangle & \langle \frac{(\dot{\phi})^2}{S} \rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B^E = \frac{1}{\langle S \rangle} \quad (54)$$

The dot $\cdot$ denotes the canonical scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and A_1^E, A_2^E are the first and second columns of the symmetric positive matrix A^E , which is always definite except for the trivial case of the non-waved plane beam.

Proof of the theorem.

We already know that the candidates $\beta^0, \gamma^0, \theta^0, p^0$ and μ_1^0, μ_2^0 (through the function $\mu^0 = \frac{1}{S} \mu_1^0 + \frac{\dot{\phi}}{S} \mu_2^0$) are the unique functions which satisfy equation (51). It is then sufficient to prove that the mixed formulation (53) has a unique solution, or in other words, that it fulfills the BBL conditions. If so, we can conclude that the two problems (51) and (53) are equivalent. Theorem 4.1 completes the proof.

Now, we claim that Brezzi conditions hold for the mixed formulation (53) above. Indeed, the continuity of the involved bilinear (and linear) forms is straightforward. The inf-sup condition for the dual bilinear mapping is also fulfilled. The proof is done by exhibiting candidates that fulfill the property (39) -updated for our mixed problem-. It can be easily shown that such candidates exist, using the same techniques than those of (41) (42). As a hint, one should seek for candidates μ_1^0, μ_2^0 which are constant, solution to the simple 2×2 linear system : $A^E \boldsymbol{\mu}^0 = (\int_{\Omega} q_1(x) dx, 0)^T$.

It remains to prove the ellipticity condition (over the relevant space, roughly speaking the kernel space of the dual mapping). This is also straightforward as soon as we can state that the matrix A^E is symmetric positive definite. This property of A^E is obtained through the simple Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\left(\int_Y \frac{\dot{\phi}}{\sqrt{S}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \right)^2 \leq \int_Y \frac{1}{S} \int_Y \frac{(\dot{\phi})^2}{S}$$

yielding that the matrix A^E has a positive determinant, which is equal to zero if and only if the waving ϕ is itself equal to zero (thanks to the periodicity condition $\phi(0) = \phi(1)$). Q.E.D.

Remark 5.1 *For the plane arch, the membrane strain and rotation of the normal are given by*

$$\mu^P = (\beta^P)' \quad \theta^P = -(\gamma^P)' \quad (55)$$

while we have shown that for the limit model of the waved arch, one has

$$\mu^E = (\beta^0)' \quad \theta^0 = -(\gamma^0)' + A_2^E \cdot \mu^0. \quad (56)$$

This coupling between the rotation and the membrane strain shows that the limit structure is completely different from a plane beam with new effective mechanical constants (as comes from the homogenization of a plane beam with periodic thickness).

As a conclusion, we emphasize that theorem 5.1 introduces a new elastic arch model, of plane effective mid-surface but showing a coupling between bending and membrane effects. It is still well suited to numerical implementation, using classical mixed finite element methods, like the one presented in [13] where the displacements are approximated by P1 polynomials, the membrane strain and the Lagrange multipliers by piecewise constant polynomials and the rotation of the normal by P3 Lagrange-Hermite polynomials. However, one should be careful when developing finite element methods for this model. It is of course a shell of parabolic type, which still exhibits inextensional fields which are known to be responsible for numerical locking phenomena.

A possible development is the extension of the critical wrinkling to the general thin shells. To this end, for standard mixed formulations, we unfortunately cannot get rid of the curvature. But a similar study to ours should be possible for the case of axisymmetric models, an important class of the hyperbolic shells [21].

References

- [1] W.T. Koiter and J.G. Simmonds. Foundations of shell theory. *Theor. appl. Mech., Proc. 13th internat. Congr., Moscow*, page 150, 1972.

-
- [2] Jacqueline Sanchez-Hubert and Evariste Sanchez-Palencia. *Coques élastiques minces. Propriétés asymptotiques. (Thin elastic shells. Asymptotic properties)*. Recherches en Mathématiques Appliquées. Paris: Masson. xix, 376 p. (1997).
 - [3] Philippe G. Ciarlet. Justification des equations des coques minces lineairement elastiques. (Justification of linear elastic equations of thin shells.). *ESAIM, Proc.*, 6:13–17, 1999.
 - [4] Adel Blouza, Franco Brezzi, and Carlo Lovadina. Sur la classification des coques linéairement élastiques. (On the classification of linearly elastic shells). *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. I, Math.* 328, No.9, 831–836 (1999). [ISSN 0764-4442].
 - [5] P. Destuynder. A classification of thin shell theories. *Actae Applicata Mathematicae*, 4:15–63, 1985.
 - [6] P. Destuynder and Th. Nevers. Some numerical aspects of mixed finite elements for bending plates. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 78:73–87, 1990.
 - [7] Chenais D. Discrete gradient and discretized continuum gradient in shape optimization of shells. *Mechanics of Structures and Machines*, 22(10):73–115, 1994.
 - [8] Rousselet B. Benedict R., Chenais D. Design sensitivity for arch structures. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 58(2):225–239, August 1988.
 - [9] Robert V. Kohn and Michael Vogelius. A new model for thin plates with rapidly varying thickness. *Int. J. Solids Struct.*, 20:333–350, 1984.
 - [10] I. Aganovic, E. Marusic-Paloka, and Z. Tutek. Slightly wrinkled plate. *Asymptotic Anal.*, 13(1):1–29, 1996.
 - [11] I. Aganovic, M. Jurak, E. Marusic-Paloka, and Z. Tutek. Moderately wrinkled plate. *Asymptotic Anal.*, 16(3-4):273–297, 1998.
 - [12] M. Jurak and Z. Tutek. Wrinkled rod. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 9(5):665–692, 1999.
 - [13] Veronique Lods. A new formulation for arch structures. Application to optimization problems. *RAIRO, Modélisation Math. Anal. Numér.*, 28(No.7):873–902, 1994.
 - [14] Franco Brezzi and Michel Fortin. *Mixed and hybrid finite element methods*. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics. 15. New York. Springer-Verlag. ix, 350 p. (1991). [ISBN 0-387-97582-9].
 - [15] Gabriel Nguetseng. A general convergence result for a functional related to the theory of homogenization. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 20(3):608–623, 1989.

- [16] Grégoire Allaire. Homogenization and two-scale convergence. *SIAM J. Math. Analysis*, 23(6):1482–1518, 1992.
- [17] Sanders J.L. Budiansky B. On the best first order linear shell theory. *Progress in Applied Mechanics*, pages 129–140, 1967. Mac Millan, New York.
- [18] Ciarlet P.G. *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, Holland,, 1980.
- [19] Veronique Lods and Ould M. Zeine. Comportement du déplacement d’une arche qui devient singulière. (Behavior of the displacement of an arch that becomes singular). *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Serie I.*, 322(2):191–196, 1996.
- [20] O.M. Zeine. *Contributions Theoriques en Optimisation et Modelisation des Structure*. PhD thesis, Universite de Nice-Sophia Antipolis, 1995.
- [21] S. Moriano. *Optimisation de Forme de Coques*. PhD thesis, Universite de Nice, France., 1988.



Unité de recherche INRIA Sophia Antipolis
2004, route des Lucioles - BP 93 - 06902 Sophia Antipolis Cedex (France)
Unité de recherche INRIA Lorraine : LORIA, Technopôle de Nancy-Brabois - Campus scientifique
615, rue du Jardin Botanique - BP 101 - 54602 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex (France)
Unité de recherche INRIA Rennes : IRISA, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu - 35042 Rennes Cedex (France)
Unité de recherche INRIA Rhône-Alpes : 655, avenue de l'Europe - 38330 Montbonnot-St-Martin (France)
Unité de recherche INRIA Rocquencourt : Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt - BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)

Éditeur
INRIA - Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt, BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)
<http://www.inria.fr>
ISSN 0249-6399