

# Geometric constraints for shape and topology optimization in architectural design

Charles Dapogny<sup>1</sup>, Alexis Faure<sup>2</sup>, Georgios Michailidis<sup>2</sup>, Grégoire Allaire<sup>3</sup>,  
Agnes Couvelas<sup>4</sup>, Rafael Estevez<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> CNRS & Laboratoire Jean Kuntzmann, Université Grenoble-Alpes, Grenoble, France

<sup>2</sup> SiMaP, Université Grenoble-Alpes, Grenoble, France

<sup>3</sup> CMAP, UMR 7641 École Polytechnique, Palaiseau, France

<sup>4</sup> SHAPE IKE, Kritis 13, Nea Ionia, 14231 Attiki, Greece

8<sup>th</sup> December, 2016

## 1 Foreword: shape optimization in architecture

### 2 The shape and topology optimization framework

- Shape optimization in linear elasticity
- Shape derivatives

### 3 A short detour via the signed distance function

- Properties of the isotropic signed distance function
- Extension to the anisotropic context

### 4 Geometric constraints for shape optimization


- Imposing shapes to resemble a specific design
- Imposing shapes to fit in a user-defined pattern
- Anisotropic maximum thickness

## A wee bit of history (I)

- Hooke's theorem (1675):

*"As hangs the flexible chain, so but inverted will stand the rigid arch."*


- A. Gaudi designed the church of Colònia Güell (1889-1914) by using a 3d **funicular model** to determine a stable arrangement of columns and vaults.



(Left) Experimental device of Gaudi, (right) tentative outline of Colònia Güell (Photo courtesy of <http://www.gaudidesigner.com>).

## A wee bit of history (II)

- Such techniques have been employed and improved by world-renowned architects: Heinz Isler, Gustave Eiffel, Frei Otto, etc.
- Recent **shape and topology optimization** (S&T) techniques have been used in the device of large-scale structures.




(Left) Front facade of the Qatar National Convention Center in Doha [Sasaki et al].  
(right) Design of a 288m tall high-rise in Australia by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill.

## Shape and topology optimization for architecture

Applying shape and topology optimization techniques in the field of architectural design is tentative:

- They allow to model and optimize complex criteria of the design, related to **aesthetics**, **manufacturability**, or **mechanical performance**.
- Optimal designs from the mechanical viewpoint often show 'attractive' outlines, and a strongly **organic nature** which is praised by architects.



(Left) Soap bubble foam structure devised by Frei Otto, (right) interior view of the Manheim Garden festival (*Excerpted from [La]*).

## Potential limitations

- Architects generally apply **construction rules** based on intuition to deal with the stringent requirements of stability, robustness, etc. Except when aesthetics is the priority, or in the construction of exceptional structures (skyscrapers), challenging these rules is lengthy and costly, thus inefficient.
- Results of **continuum-based** S&T optimization techniques are difficult to use directly, since real-life structures are often assembled from bars or beams.  
⇒ A costly interpretation step of the optimized designs is necessary.
- Architectural design has a lot to do with the **personal taste** of the architect. On the contrary, most S&T optimization methods only consider mechanical aspects: their results can be reproduced by anyone, and do not leave room for original creation!

## Objectives of the present work

- Propose a **simplified** theoretical and numerical S&T framework which is mechanically relevant for **conceptual architectural design**.
- Introduce **constraint functionals** for S&T optimization problems which allow the user to:
  - Encode information about its **personal taste**;
  - **Ease the interpretation** of the optimized designs as truss-like structures;
  - Deal with other **geometric problems** plaguing the optimized structures (visibility, elongated bars, etc.).

- 1 Foreword: shape optimization in architecture
- 2 The shape and topology optimization framework
  - Shape optimization in linear elasticity
  - Shape derivatives
- 3 A short detour via the signed distance function
  - Properties of the isotropic signed distance function
  - Extension to the anisotropic context
- 4 Geometric constraints for shape optimization
  - Imposing shapes to resemble a specific design
  - Imposing shapes to fit in a user-defined pattern
  - Anisotropic maximum thickness

# Shape optimization of linear elastic shapes (I)

A **shape** is a bounded domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , which is


- **fixed** on a part  $\Gamma_D$  of its boundary,
- submitted to **surface loads**  $g$ , applied on  $\Gamma_N \subset \partial\Omega$ ,  $\Gamma_D \cap \Gamma_N = \emptyset$ .
- submitted to **body forces**  $f$ .

The displacement vector field  $u_\Omega : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is governed by the **linear elasticity system**:


$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(Ae(u_\Omega)) &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ u_\Omega &= 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D \\ Ae(u_\Omega)n &= g \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N \\ Ae(u_\Omega)n &= 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \end{cases},$$

where  $e(u) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla u^T + \nabla u)$  is the **strain tensor**, and  $A$  is the **Hooke's law** of the material:

$$\forall e \in \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbb{R}), \quad Ae = 2\mu e + \lambda \operatorname{tr}(e)I.$$



A 'Cantilever'



The deformed cantilever

## Shape optimization of linear elastic shapes (II)

**Goal:** Optimize the **compliance**  $C(\Omega)$  of shapes

$$C(\Omega) = \int_{\Omega} A e(u_{\Omega}) : e(u_{\Omega}) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f \cdot u_{\Omega} \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot u_{\Omega} \, ds,$$

under **constraints**, modelled by a shape functional  $P(\Omega)$  (e.g.  $P(\Omega) = \text{Vol}(\Omega)$ ).

Depending on the particular situation, this setting gives rise to two different kinds of optimization problems:

- **Unconstrained** optimization problems

$$\min_{\Omega} \mathcal{L}(\Omega), \text{ where } \mathcal{L}(\Omega) = C(\Omega) + \ell P(\Omega),$$

where the objective criterion  $C(\Omega)$  is **penalized** by the constraint  $P(\Omega)$ .

- **Constrained** optimization problems of the form:

$$\min_{\Omega \text{ s.t. } P(\Omega) \leq \alpha} C(\Omega).$$


- 1 Foreword: shape optimization in architecture
- 2 The shape and topology optimization framework
  - Shape optimization in linear elasticity
  - Shape derivatives
- 3 A short detour via the signed distance function
  - Properties of the isotropic signed distance function
  - Extension to the anisotropic context
- 4 Geometric constraints for shape optimization
  - Imposing shapes to resemble a specific design
  - Imposing shapes to fit in a user-defined pattern
  - Anisotropic maximum thickness

## Differentiation with respect to the domain: Hadamard's method

Hadamard's boundary variation method describes variations of a reference, Lipschitz domain  $\Omega$  of the form:

$$\Omega \rightarrow \Omega_\theta := (I + \theta)(\Omega),$$

for 'small'  $\theta \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ .



### Definition 1.

Given a smooth domain  $\Omega$ , a function  $F(\Omega)$  of the domain is **shape differentiable** at  $\Omega$  if the function

$$W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \ni \theta \mapsto F(\Omega_\theta)$$

is Fréchet-differentiable at 0, i.e. the following expansion holds around 0:

$$F(\Omega_\theta) = F(\Omega) + F'(\Omega)(\theta) + o(||\theta||_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)}) .$$

## Differentiation with respect to the domain: Hadamard's method

Techniques from optimal control theory make it possible to calculate shape gradients; in the case of 'many' functionals of the domain  $J(\Omega)$ , the shape derivative has the particular **structure**:

$$J'(\Omega)(\theta) = \int_{\Gamma} v_{\Omega} \theta \cdot n \, ds,$$

where  $v_{\Omega}$  is a scalar field depending on  $u_{\Omega}$ , and possibly on an **adjoint state**  $p_{\Omega}$ .

**Example:** If  $J(\Omega) = C(\Omega) = \int_{\Omega} f \cdot u_{\Omega} \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} g \cdot u_{\Omega} \, ds$  is the **compliance**,  
 $v_{\Omega} = -Ae(u_{\Omega}) : e(u_{\Omega})$  is the (negative) elastic energy density.

## The generic algorithm

This shape gradient provides a natural **descent direction** for  $J(\Omega)$ : *for instance*, defining  $\theta$  as

$$\theta = -v_\Omega n$$

yields, for  $t > 0$  sufficiently small (*to be found numerically*):

$$J((I + t\theta)(\Omega)) = J(\Omega) - t \int_{\Gamma} v_\Omega^2 ds + o(t) < J(\Omega)$$

**Gradient algorithm:** For  $n = 0, \dots$  until convergence,

1. Compute the solution  $u_{\Omega^n}$  (and  $p_{\Omega^n}$ ) of the elasticity system on  $\Omega^n$ .
2. Compute the shape gradient  $J'(\Omega^n)$  thanks to the previous formula, and infer a descent direction  $\theta^n$  for the cost functional.
3. **Advect** the shape  $\Omega^n$  according to  $\theta^n$ , so as to get  $\Omega^{n+1} := (I + \theta^n)(\Omega^n)$ .

- 1 Foreword: shape optimization in architecture
- 2 The shape and topology optimization framework
  - Shape optimization in linear elasticity
  - Shape derivatives
- 3 A short detour via the signed distance function
  - Properties of the isotropic signed distance function
  - Extension to the anisotropic context
- 4 Geometric constraints for shape optimization
  - Imposing shapes to resemble a specific design
  - Imposing shapes to fit in a user-defined pattern
  - Anisotropic maximum thickness


## The signed distance function

### Definition 2.

The *signed distance function*  $d_\Omega$  to a bounded domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is defined by:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \begin{cases} -d(x, \partial\Omega) & \text{if } x \in \Omega \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \partial\Omega \\ d(x, \partial\Omega) & \text{if } x \in {}^c\bar{\Omega} \end{cases},$$

where  $d(x, \partial\Omega) = \min_{y \in \partial\Omega} |x - y|$  is the usual Euclidean distance function to  $\partial\Omega$ .



Graph of the signed distance function to a union of two disks (in black)

## Definition 3.

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a Lipschitz, bounded open set;

- Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ; the **set of projections**  $\Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x)$  of  $x$  onto  $\partial\Omega$  is:

$$\Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) = \{y \in \partial\Omega, d(x, \partial\Omega) = |x - y|\}.$$


- When this set is a singleton,  $p_{\partial\Omega}(x)$  is **the projection** of  $x$  onto  $\partial\Omega$ .
- The **skeleton**  $\Sigma$  of  $\partial\Omega$  is:

$$\Sigma := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, d_{\Omega}^2 \text{ is not differentiable at } x\}.$$

- For  $x \in \partial\Omega$ , the **ray** emerging from  $x$  is:

$$\text{ray}_{\partial\Omega}(x) := p_{\partial\Omega}^{-1}(x).$$

## Signed distance function and geometry (II)



$x$  has a unique projection over  $\partial\Omega$ , whereas  $x'$  has two such points  $y_1, y_2$ .

### Proposition 1.

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a Lipschitz, bounded open set;


- A point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  has a unique projection point  $p_{\partial\Omega}(x)$  iff  $x \notin \Sigma$ . In such a case,  $d_\Omega$  is differentiable at  $x$ , and its gradient reads:

$$\nabla d_\Omega(x) = \frac{x - p_{\partial\Omega}(x)}{d_\Omega(x)}.$$

In particular,  $|\nabla d_\Omega(x)| = 1$  wherever it makes sense.

- If  $\Omega$  is of class  $C^1$ , this last quantity equals  $\nabla d_\Omega(x) = n(p_{\partial\Omega}(x))$ .
- If  $\Omega$  is of class  $C^k$ ,  $k \geq 2$ , then  $d_\Omega$  is also of class  $C^k$  on a neighborhood of  $\partial\Omega$ .

## Signed distance function and geometry (IV)




*Some level sets of  $d_\Omega$  are depicted in color;  $d_\Omega$  is as smooth as the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  on the shaded area (at least).*

# Shape differentiability of the signed distance function (I)

## Lemma 2.

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a  $C^1$  bounded domain, and  $x \notin \Sigma$ . The function  $\theta \mapsto d_{\Omega_\theta}(x)$ , from  $W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  is Gâteaux-differentiable at  $\theta = 0$ , with derivative:

$$d'_\Omega(\theta)(x) = -\theta(p_{\partial\Omega}(x)) \cdot n(p_{\partial\Omega}(x)).$$



- 1 Foreword: shape optimization in architecture
- 2 The shape and topology optimization framework
  - Shape optimization in linear elasticity
  - Shape derivatives
- 3 A short detour via the signed distance function
  - Properties of the isotropic signed distance function
  - Extension to the anisotropic context
- 4 Geometric constraints for shape optimization
  - Imposing shapes to resemble a specific design
  - Imposing shapes to fit in a user-defined pattern
  - Anisotropic maximum thickness

## The anisotropic signed distance function (I)

Let  $M \in \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbb{R})$  be a **metric tensor**, i.e. a symmetric, positive definite matrix.  $M$  accounts for another way of evaluating the distance between points:

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, |x - y|_M^2 := \langle Mx, y \rangle.$$

### Definition 4.

- The **anisotropic (unsigned) distance function**  $d^M(\cdot, K)$  to a compact subset  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is defined by:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, d^M(x, \partial\Omega) = \inf_{y \in K} |x - y|_M.$$

- The **anisotropic signed distance function**  $d_\Omega^M$  to a bounded domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is defined by:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, d_\Omega^M(x) = \begin{cases} -d^M(x, \partial\Omega) & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \partial\Omega, \\ d^M(x, \partial\Omega) & \text{if } x \in {}^c\bar{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

## The anisotropic signed distance function (II)


All the previous concepts extend from the isotropic to the anisotropic context, in particular as regards:

- The connections between  $d_{\Omega}^M$  and the notions of projection set  $\Pi_{\partial\Omega}^M(x)$ , or unique projection point  $p_{\partial\Omega}^M(x)$ , for a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,
- The differentiability of  $x \mapsto d_{\Omega}^M$  outside the (anisotropic) skeleton  $\Sigma^M$ ,
- The results about the shape differentiability of  $\Omega \mapsto d_{\Omega}^M(x)$ ,

... up to giving an 'anisotropic flavour' to the previous formulae for the isotropic case.

## Isotropic vs. anisotropic signed distance functions

The anisotropic signed distance function  $d_{\Omega}^M(x)$  primarily evaluates the distance from  $x$  to  $\partial\Omega$  in the direction of the smallest eigenvalue of  $M$ .



Projections  $p_{\partial\Omega}(x)$ ,  $p_{\partial\Omega}^{M_1}(x)$  and  $p_{\partial\Omega}^{M_2}(x)$  of a point  $x \in \Omega$  onto  $\partial\Omega$  respectively associated to the metrics  $I$ ,  $M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.01 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

- 1 Foreword: shape optimization in architecture
- 2 The shape and topology optimization framework
  - Shape optimization in linear elasticity
  - Shape derivatives
- 3 A short detour via the signed distance function
  - Properties of the isotropic signed distance function
  - Extension to the anisotropic context
- 4 Geometric constraints for shape optimization
  - **Imposing shapes to resemble a specific design**
  - Imposing shapes to fit in a user-defined pattern
  - Anisotropic maximum thickness

## Imposing shapes to resemble a specific design

- Our goal is to impose the **resemblance** of the optimized design with a user-defined **target design**  $\Omega_T$ .
- We rely on a functional used in the previous work [DeBDaFreyNa].

$$P_m(\Omega) = \int_{\Omega} d_{\Omega_T} dx.$$

**Intuition:** If  $\Omega_T$  is connected, it is the unique (local and global) minimizer of  $P_m(\Omega)$ .

### Theorem 3.

*The function  $\Omega \mapsto P_m(\Omega)$  is shape differentiable and its derivative reads:*



$$P'_m(\Omega) = \int_{\Gamma} d_{\Omega_T} \theta \cdot n ds.$$

## Example: optimization of the design a 2d bridge (I)

We consider the optimization of a **2d bridge** under a volume constraint:

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min_{\Omega} & C(\Omega), \\ \text{s.t.} & \text{Vol}(\Omega) \leq V_T,\end{array}$$

where  $C(\Omega)$  is the **compliance**, and the maximum volume is  $V_T = 0.163|D|$ .



(Top) Setting of the 2d bridge test case, and (bottom) resulting optimized shape.

## Example: optimization of the design a 2d bridge (II)

We would like to impose that the optimized design **resembles** the target shape  $\Omega_T$ , which has unfortunately **very poor mechanical performance**.



*Target shape in the functional  $P_m(\Omega)$  for the optimization of the 2d bridge.*

We now solve the problem:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{\Omega} & \mathcal{L}(\Omega) \\ \text{s.t.} & \text{Vol}(\Omega) \leq V_T, \end{array} \quad \text{where } \mathcal{L}(\Omega) := t \frac{C(\Omega)}{C(\Omega_T)} + (1 - t) \frac{P_m(\Omega)}{P_m(\Omega_T)},$$

and  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

## Example: optimization of the design a 2d bridge (III)



(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)

Optimized 2d bridges for: (a)  $t = 0.35$ , (b)  $t = 0.45$ , (c)  $t = 0.55$ , (d)  $t = 0.70$ .

- 1 Foreword: shape optimization in architecture
- 2 The shape and topology optimization framework
  - Shape optimization in linear elasticity
  - Shape derivatives
- 3 A short detour via the signed distance function
  - Properties of the isotropic signed distance function
  - Extension to the anisotropic context
- 4 Geometric constraints for shape optimization
  - Imposing shapes to resemble a specific design
  - **Imposing shapes to fit in a user-defined pattern**
  - Anisotropic maximum thickness

## Fitting in a user-defined pattern

- Our aim is to **influence** the design of a structure  $\Omega$  with a **pattern**.
- The pattern is supplied as the 0 level set of a function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .
- We rely on the constraint functional

$$P_p(\Omega) = \int_{\partial\Omega} |n_\Omega - n_g|^2 ds,$$

where  $n_g(x) = \frac{\nabla g(x)}{|\nabla g(x)|}$  is the normal vector field to the isolines of  $g$ .

### Theorem 4.

The functional  $\Omega \mapsto P_p(\Omega)$  is shape differentiable, and:


$$P'_p(\Omega)(\theta) = 2 \int_{\partial\Omega} (\kappa - \operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega}(n_g)) \theta \cdot n ds,$$

where  $\operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega} V := \operatorname{div}(V) - \langle \nabla V n, n \rangle$  is the tangential divergence of a smooth vector field  $V : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ .

## Example: optimization of the design of a 2d mast

We aim to optimize the shape of a column, while influencing its outline by the pattern function  $g$  defined by:

$$\forall x = (x_1, x_2) \in D, \quad g(x) = x_1 - \frac{L_1}{10} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi x_2}{3L_2}\right), \quad L_1 = 1, \quad L_2 = 2.$$




(Left) Boundary conditions for the column example, (right) isovalue contours of the pattern  $g$ .

## Example: optimization of the design of a 2d mast

We now solve the problem:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{\Omega} & \mathcal{L}(\Omega) \\ \text{s.t.} & \text{Vol}(\Omega) \leq V_T, \end{array} \quad \text{where } \mathcal{L}(\Omega) := tC(\Omega) + (1-t)P_p(\Omega)$$



(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

(e)

(f)

Optimized columns for: (a)  $t = 1.0$ ; (b)  $t = 0.90$ ; (c)  $t = 0.60$ ; (d)  $t = 0.45$ ; (e)  $t = 0.35$ ; (f)  $t = 0.15$ .

- 1 Foreword: shape optimization in architecture
- 2 The shape and topology optimization framework
  - Shape optimization in linear elasticity
  - Shape derivatives
- 3 A short detour via the signed distance function
  - Properties of the isotropic signed distance function
  - Extension to the anisotropic context
- 4 Geometric constraints for shape optimization
  - Imposing shapes to resemble a specific design
  - Imposing shapes to fit in a user-defined pattern
  - Anisotropic maximum thickness

## Constraining the anisotropic maximum thickness of shapes (I)

We rely on the modelling of thickness of shapes introduced in [AlJouMi].

### Definition 5.

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded domain,  $M$  be metric tensor. Then,

- $\Omega$  has **maximum thickness** smaller than  $\delta > 0$  if:

$$\forall x \in \Omega, d_\Omega(x) \geq -\delta/2.$$

- $\Omega$  has **anisotropic maximum thickness** smaller than  $\delta > 0$  if:


$$\forall x \in \Omega, d_\Omega^M(x) \geq -\delta/2.$$

**Goal:** Devise a constraint functional for imposing a bound  $\delta > 0$  on the values of the anisotropic maximum thickness of  $\Omega$ .

## Constraining the anisotropic maximum thickness of shapes (II)

Recall that  $d_{\Omega}^M$  'sees' the distance from  $x$  to  $\partial\Omega$  in the direction of the **smallest eigenvalue** of  $M$ .

**Example:** If  $M = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , a constraint on the anisotropic maximum thickness of shapes concerns the horizontal length of their features.



(Left) One shape  $\Omega$  (in black); (middle) isolines of the isotropic distance function  $d_{\Omega}$ ; (right) isolines of the anisotropic distance function  $d_{\Omega}^M$ .

## Constraining the anisotropic maximum thickness of shapes (III)

- The maximum thickness constraint reads:  $\forall x \in \Omega, d_{\Omega}^M(x) \geq -\delta/2$ .
- This can be equivalently formulated using an **integral penalty function**:

$$P(\Omega) = 0, \text{ where } P(\Omega) = \int_{\Omega} (d_{\Omega}^M - \delta/2)_-^2 dx,$$

where  $t_- = \max(0, -t)$ .


- In practice, we use the **relaxed version** of the constraint:

$$P_a^M(\Omega) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}, \text{ where } P_a^M(\Omega) = \left( \frac{1}{\int_{\Omega} h(d_{\Omega}^M) dx} \int_{\Omega} h(d_{\Omega}^M) (d_{\Omega}^M)^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

and  $h$  is a regularized characteristic function:  $\begin{cases} h(t) \approx 1 & \text{if } |t| \geq \delta/2, \\ h(t) \approx 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

## Application 1: Ease the interpretation of the optimized design (I)

- We consider the optimal design of a three-dimensional bridge.




- We solve the simple compliance minimization problem:

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min_{\Omega} & C(\Omega), \\ \text{s.t.} & \text{Vol}(\Omega) \leq V_T,\end{array} \quad \text{where } V_T = 0.1|D|.$$

## Application 1: Ease the interpretation of the optimized design (I)



The optimized design contains **extended regions** in the  $(yz)$ -plane, which makes difficult its interpretation as a realistic truss structure.



## Application 1: Ease the interpretation of the optimized design (III)

To alleviate this problem, we solve instead


$$\begin{array}{ll}\min_{\Omega} & C(\Omega), \\ \text{s.t.} & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Vol}(\Omega) \leq V_T, \\ P_a^M(\Omega) \leq \delta/2, \end{array} \right. \text{ where } M = \begin{pmatrix} m & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{array}$$



Optimal bridges obtained with the coefficient (left)  $m = 0.1$ , and (right)  $m = 0.01$ .

## Application 2: Enhance the visibility of shapes (I)

- We aim to optimize the design of a three-dimensional short cantilever.




- To this end, we solve the two-load compliance minimization problem:

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min_{\Omega} & C_1(\Omega) + C_2(\Omega), \\ \text{s.t.} & \text{Vol}(\Omega) \leq V_T,\end{array} \quad \text{where } V_T = 0.1|D|.$$

and  $C_i(\Omega)$  is the compliance of  $\Omega$  with respect to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  load case.

## Application 2: Enhance the visibility of shapes (I)


The optimized shape presents an extended surface in the  $(xy)$ -plane, which hinders the path of light.



To alleviate this problem, we add one or several constraints of the form

$$P_a^M(\Omega) \leq \delta/2, \text{ where } M = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

## Application 2: Enhance the visibility of shapes (III)




Optimized short cantilevers using different metric tensors  $M$ : (top-left)  $m_1 = 0.01$ ; (top-right)  $m_1 = 0.01, m_2 = 0.01$ ; (bottom-left) one constraint with  $m_1 = 0.01, m_2 = 1.0$  and a second one with  $m_1 = 1.0, m_2 = 0.01$ ; (bottom-right)  $m_3 = 0.01$ .

## Application 3: penalization of the appearance of long bars (I)

In order to optimize a 2d MBB beam, we minimize the volume  $\text{Vol}(\Omega)$  of shapes, under a compliance constraint:

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min_{\Omega} & \text{Vol}(\Omega), \\ \text{s.t.} & C(\Omega) \leq C_T,\end{array} \quad \text{where } C_T = 150.$$



(Left): Setting of the MBB beam example, and (right) resulting optimized shape.

## Application 3: penalization of the appearance of long bars (II)

- The optimized shape shows long, horizontal bars.
- In practical realizations, these are assembled by joining two (or more) smaller bars together, constructing strong connections between them.



*Example of a junction between two HEA beams.*

- Besides the increased cost of such connections, the final beam may not behave mechanically in the predicted way.  
⇒ Structural engineers generally wish to **avoid such features**.



### Application 3: penalization of the appearance of long bars (III)

To prevent the appearance of such bars, we solve:

$$\min_{\Omega} \text{Vol}(\Omega) \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} C(\Omega) \leq C_T \\ P_a^M(\Omega) \leq \delta/2. \end{cases},$$

with a threshold value  $\delta = 1.0$ , and where the anisotropy is dictated by the metric tensor:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$



*Optimized shapes in the MBB beam example with a constraint on the anisotropic maximum thickness, and parameters (left)  $m_1 = 0.1$ ; (right)  $m_1 = 0.01$ .*

Thank you !

Thank you for your attention!

## References |

-  [AlJouMi] G. Allaire, F. Jouve, and G. Michailidis, *Thickness control in structural optimization via a level set method*, (to appear in SMO), HAL preprint: hal-00985000v1, (2014).
-  [AlJouToa] G. Allaire, F. Jouve and A.M. Toader, *Structural optimization using shape sensitivity analysis and a level-set method*, J. Comput. Phys., 194 (2004) pp. 363–393.
-  [DeBDaFreyNa] M. de Buhan, C. Dapogny, P. Frey, C. Nardoni, *An optimization method for elastic shape matching*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris; Ser. I 354 (2016) pp. 783-787.
-  [DaFaMi] C. Dapogny, A. Faure, G. Michailidis, G. Allaire, A. Couvelas and R. Estevez, *Geometric constraints for shape and topology optimization in architectural design*, submitted, (2016).

## References II

- [La] A. B. Larena, *Shape design methods based on the optimisation of the structure. historical background and application to contemporary architecture*, in Proceedings of the third international congress on construction history, 2009.
- [OSe] S. J. Osher and J.A. Sethian, *Front propagating with curvature dependent speed: algorithms based on Hamilton-Jacobi formulations*, J. Comp. Phys. **78** (1988) pp. 12-49