Compliance–stress constrained mass minimization for topology optimization on anisotropic meshes

Nicola Ferro¹ · Stefano Micheletti¹ · Simona Perotto¹

Received: 7 January 2020 / Accepted: 22 May 2020 / Published online: 11 June 2020
© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

Abstract

In this paper, we generalize the SIMPATY algorithm, which combines the SIMP method with anisotropic mesh adaptation to solve the minimum compliance problem with a mass constraint. In particular, the mass of the final layout is now minimized and both a maximum compliance and a maximum stress can be enforced as either mono- or multi-constraints. The new algorithm, named MSC-SIMPATY, is able to sharply detect the material–void interface, thanks to the anisotropic mesh adaptation. The presented test cases deal with three different scenarios, with a focus on the effect of the constraints on the final layouts and on the performance of the algorithm.

Keywords Topology optimization · Stress constraint · Anisotropic mesh adaptation

1 Introduction

Topology optimization is of utmost interest in different branches of industrial design, such as biomedical, space, automotive, mechanical, architecture (see, e.g., [2, 13, 19, 23, 57]). Similar formulations can also be adopted for the optimization of structures in different contexts, from fluid–structure interaction to the tailored design of magnetic or auxetic metamaterials [26, 36, 47, 56].

One aims at minimizing (or maximizing) a quantity of interest under specific design constraints, which may be interchanged according to the considered field of application. A standard context leads to minimize the compliance of a structure for a given mass (to optimize the structure performance at a given cost) or, vice versa, to minimize the weight under a prescribed compliance (to produce a lightweight structure characterized by a desired stiffness).

Independently of the number of possible design specifications, we are led to solve a constrained optimization problem, possibly in an efficient way with a view to the manufacturing process. Several methods are available

in the literature driving topology optimization. Among these, we mention the density-based approaches [8, 10, 46], the level-set methods [5, 53], topological derivative procedures [49], phase field techniques [12, 20], evolutionary approaches [54], homogenization [4, 9], performance-based optimization [39]. We focus on the first class and, in particular, on the SIMP (Solid Isotropic Material with Penalization) method [9, 10, 46] where the material distribution is modeled via an auxiliary scalar field, referred to as density, taking values between zero (void) and one (material) in the design domain.

In some recent papers, a new algorithm, called SIMPATY (SIMP with AdaptivITy), has been proposed to offer an efficient design tool for 3D printing [43, 44]. SIMPATY algorithm combines SIMP method with an advanced mesh adaptation technique based on an a posteriori recovery-based error analysis [58, 59]. In particular, the authors employ anisotropic triangular meshes [27, 28]. This choice leads to a very cost-effective procedure, which alleviates the end user from most of the post-processing step, towards the free-form design [25, 26, 44]. The setting

✉ Nicola Ferro, nicola.ferro@polimi.it; Stefano Micheletti, stefano.micheletti@polimi.it; Simona Perotto, simona.perotto@polimi.it | ¹MOX – Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, Piazza L. da Vinci, 32, 20133 Milan, Italy.

considered in these papers addresses the minimization of the compliance under a mass constraint.

In this paper, we move to a more general framework with a view to more complex applications, by minimizing the structure mass given a maximum stress and/or a maximum compliance as a mono- or multi-constraint. The control on the stress takes into account a real requirement in many contexts, since it allows us not to overcome a maximum limit for the mechanical resistance of the material [14, 37]. The SIMPATY algorithm is here modified into the mass-stress-compliance SIMPATY (MSC-SIMPATY) procedure to tackle the new optimization setting. The numerical verification, despite preliminary, meets the expectation. The designed layouts do depend on the considered constraints, and only a bound on both compliance and stress delivers a structure that is sufficiently stiff as well as failure-free under the applied loads. Moreover, the stress constraint turns out to be more hard to deal with, since the nonlinearities involved in the corresponding definition make the convergence of SIMPATY slower. In all cases, however, the predicted layouts are characterized by sharp interfaces between void and material, with no jagged boundaries, thanks to the employment of anisotropic meshes, which are tailored to the density profile. This also makes the final layouts almost ready for 3D printing, as shown by the .STL files in Fig. 12.

The layout of the paper is the following. Section 2 details the SIMP-based topology optimization procedure, whereas Sect. 3 deals with the corresponding numerical discretization. Section 4 focuses on the MSC-SIMPATY algorithm, first by introducing the optimization algorithm and then the mesh adaptation procedure. Section 5 gathers some numerical tests, which alternate mono- with multi-constrained problems. Finally, some conclusions are drawn in the last section.

2 The mathematical model

Several methods are available in the literature to identify the topologically optimal structure, contained in the initial domain and subject to design constraints. Among these, we cite approaches based on phase-field [12, 17, 20], level set [3, 7, 15, 16], density-based methods [8, 10, 46], and more recent techniques [30, 31, 45, 51]. In this paper, we adopt the SIMP (Solid Isotropic Material with Penalization) formulation [10].

2.1 The SIMP linear elasticity equation

In a structure optimization setting, the standard mathematical model is represented by the linear elasticity problem [32], i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0} & \text{in } \Omega \\ \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} & \text{on } \Gamma_D \\ \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_R \\ \sigma(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{f} & \text{on } \Gamma_N \\ \sigma(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0} & \text{on } \Gamma_F, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathbf{u}$ is the displacement, $\sigma(\mathbf{u}) = 2\mu\epsilon(\mathbf{u}) + \lambda I : \epsilon(\mathbf{u})$ is the stress tensor for an isotropic material, with $\epsilon(\mathbf{u}) = (\nabla \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^T)/2$ the small displacement strain tensor,

$$\lambda = \frac{Ev}{(1+\nu)(1-2\nu)}, \quad \mu = \frac{E}{2(1+\nu)}$$

the Lamé coefficients, with E the Young modulus, ν the Poisson ratio and I the identity tensor, $\mathbf{f} : \Gamma_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, is the load applied to a portion Γ_N of the boundary, $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit outward normal vector to $\partial\Omega$, Γ_D is the portion of the boundary where the structure is clamped, Γ_R is the segment where a roller boundary condition is assigned, and Γ_F is the normal stress-free boundary, such that $\Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_R \cup \Gamma_N \cup \Gamma_F = \partial\Omega$.

The weak form of problem (1) is: find $\mathbf{u} \in U = \{\mathbf{v} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^2 : \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} \text{ on } \Gamma_D\}$, s.t.

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in U, \quad (2)$$

with

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \int_{\Omega} \sigma(\mathbf{u}) : \epsilon(\mathbf{v}) d\Omega, \quad \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{v}) = \int_{\Gamma_N} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} d\gamma,$$

where $\Gamma_R = \emptyset$. The SIMP method modifies the elasticity equation by weighting (2) via the density function ρ , i.e., a continuous design variable, modeling the distribution of material in the design domain. A priori, the density is assumed to be a function in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, taking values in the interval $[0, 1]$, with the understanding that $\rho = 0$ represents the void and $\rho = 1$ the full material. To avoid non-physical intermediate densities, the SIMP formulation actually resorts to a suitable power-law penalization on ρ , namely ρ^p with $p \geq \max\{2/(1-\nu), 4/(1+\nu)\}$, which promotes the extreme values, 0 and 1 [6, 10].

The SIMP linear elasticity equation is thus: find $\mathbf{u} \in U$ s.t.

$$a_\rho(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in U, \quad (3)$$

with

$$a_\rho(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \int_{\Omega} \sigma_\rho(\mathbf{u}) : \epsilon(\mathbf{v}) d\Omega, \quad (4)$$

and $\sigma_\rho(\mathbf{u}) = \rho^p [2\mu\epsilon(\mathbf{u}) + \lambda I : \epsilon(\mathbf{u})]$. Notice that the penalization modifies the material properties weighting the Lamé coefficients.

2.2 The topology optimization

To formalize the topology optimization, we have to introduce a cost functional, $\mathcal{J}$, to be minimized, as well as prescribed constraints. A standard choice for $\mathcal{J}$ is the static compliance of the structure, or the total mass of the final layout. Concerning the constraints, (3) can be used to take into account the physical model at hand, whereas other constraints are added to include design specifications, such as an upper bound on the local stresses or on the fundamental frequency of vibration. According to the application of interest, cost functional and constraints can become interchangeable.

Thus, a general topology optimization problem can be formulated as: find $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ s.t.

$$\min_{\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)} \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho) : \begin{cases} a_\rho(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in U \\ C_i(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho) \leq c_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_C \\ \rho_{\min} \leq \rho \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $C_i(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho) \leq c_i$ enforces a generic inequality constraint, with c_i the corresponding upper bound and n_C the total number of constraints, while the two-sided inequality ensures the elasticity system in (3) to be well-defined, with $0 < \rho_{\min} < 1$.

In previous works, we focused on the minimization of the compliance, $\mathcal{C}$, subject to a maximum allowable mass [25, 26, 44], so that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{C}$, $n_C = 1$, $C_1 = \mathcal{M}$, with

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{u}(\rho)) = \int_{\Gamma_N} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u}(\rho) \, d\gamma, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho) = \mathcal{M}(\rho) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \rho \, d\Omega, \quad (7)$$

the volume fraction set to a desired value c_1 .

The goal pursued in this paper is more challenging, since we are interested in solving a multi-constrained optimization problem. In particular, we set in (5) $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{M}$, $n_C = 2$, $C_1 = \mathcal{S}$ and $C_2 = \mathcal{C}$, where

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho) = \|\sigma_{VM}(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho)\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \quad (8)$$

approximates the maximum density-weighted von Mises stress

$$\sigma_{VM}(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho) = \rho^{p_s} E \sqrt{\varepsilon_{11}^2 + \varepsilon_{22}^2 - \varepsilon_{11}\varepsilon_{22} + 3\varepsilon_{12}^2},$$

γ being as large as possible [37] (for a sensitivity analysis to γ , we refer, e.g., to [55]), with ε_{ij} the ij -th component of the strain tensor, and p_s an exponent penalizing intermediate densities, but possibly different from p used in (4). Actually, several approaches are available in the literature to

formalize the dependence of the stress field on the design variable, essentially adopting different penalizations [14, 17, 18]. The choice in (8) is the most straightforward one in view of the employment of the SIMP method. Thus, problem (5) becomes: find $\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ s.t.

$$\min_{\rho \in L^\infty(\Omega)} \mathcal{M}(\rho) : \begin{cases} a_\rho(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in U \\ \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho) \leq S_{\max} \\ \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{u}(\rho)) \leq C_{\max} \\ \rho_{\min} \leq \rho \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

with $C_{\max}$ and $S_{\max}$ a maximum upper bound on the compliance and on the von Mises stress defined in (8), respectively. Problem (9) amounts to minimizing the mass of the structure while ensuring a certain stiffness and stress.

3 The numerical discretization

We resort to a standard finite element approximation in order to numerically solve problem (9). This yields the discrete formulation: find $\rho_h \in V_h^r$ s.t.

$$\min_{\rho_h \in V_h^r} \mathcal{M}(\rho_h) : \begin{cases} a_\rho(\mathbf{u}_h(\rho_h), \mathbf{v}_h) = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{v}_h) \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in U_h^s \\ \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{u}_h(\rho_h), \rho_h) \leq S_{\max} \\ \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{u}_h(\rho_h)) \leq C_{\max} \\ \rho_{\min} \leq \rho_h \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where it is understood that $\mathbf{u}_h(\rho_h) \in U_h^s$, and U_h^s and V_h^r are the finite element spaces of vector and scalar functions of degree s and r , respectively, associated with a conforming triangular tessellation, $\mathcal{T}_h$, of the domain Ω [22].

Formulation (10) usually exhibits some drawbacks, the two main being the dependency of the optimal layout on the computational mesh and the presence of checkerboards, namely, of alternating solid and void elements in a checkerboard pattern [10, 48]. The first issue is a consequence of the non-uniqueness of the solution to the optimization problem, while the second one depends on the two-field (density–displacement) formulation. Explicit limitations and filtering of the density distribution mitigate these two concerns [11, 38]. Another possible solution to checkerboards consists in using higher order finite elements for the displacement with respect to the density (i.e., we set $s \geq r$ in (10)). On the contrary, the non-uniqueness of the solution remains an issue, whatever the selected discretization.

Other minor issues of formulation (10) are grayscale (presence of intermediate densities) and staircase (jagged boundaries at the void–material interfaces) effects, and the geometric complexity of the final design (thin struts hard to be 3D-printed).

In [44], a new method is proposed to tackle the two last issues. The authors prove the effectiveness of SIMPATY

algorithm, which merges the SIMP approach with an anisotropic mesh adaptation. SIMPATY provides a mesh fitting the sharp gradients of the density, possibly without any filtering. This allows us to drastically reduce any post-processing before manufacturing [43], in contrast to standard topology optimization software. Moreover, mesh adaptation admits the employment of linear finite elements for the $(\mathbf{u}(\rho), \rho)$ pair, without giving rise to undesirable check-boards. Finally, this new design paradigm enables us to move towards a free-form design, both at a macro- and at a micro-scale [25, 26, 44].

4 The MSC-SIMPATY algorithm

The mass-stress-compliance (MSC) variant of the SIMPATY algorithm alternates a minimization and a mesh adaptation step, separately detailed in the next two sections.

4.1 The optimization procedure

Two recurrent numerical methods to tackle problem (10) are the Interior Point OPTimizer (IPOPT) [52] and the MMA [50] algorithms. We choose IPOPT, being directly embedded in the software FreeFem++ [34], which is a very handy tool both to discretize variational formulations and to efficiently manage metric-based mesh adaptation procedures.

IPOPT is a large-scale nonlinear optimization package, which includes both equality and inequality constraints via suitable slack variables. With reference to the generic problem (5), the main parameters to be passed to IPOPT are the functional $\mathcal{J}$, the quantities $C_i, c_i, \rho_{\min}$, involved in the constraints, the gradient of the functional and of the constraints with respect to ρ , the initial guess, ρ_h^0 , together with the maximum number, `Mit`, of iterations and the tolerance, `TOPT`, for the built-in stopping criterion. Actually, at this stage, all the involved functionals have to be meant as functions of ρ , and the SIMP linear elastic equation in (5)₁ is taken into account explicitly, so that $\rho \mapsto \mathbf{u}(\rho)$ identifies the solution map. Concerning the computation of the gradients, we have adopted the standard Lagrangian approach [10]. In particular, we exploit the derivation in [44] for the compliance and in [14] for the stress. On the discrete level, all of these gradients are approximated by continuous piecewise affine finite elements. Thus, the basic command syntax for IPOPT is

$\text{IPOPT}(\mathcal{J}, \nabla_{\rho} \mathcal{J}, C_i, \nabla_{\rho} C_i, \rho_h^0, \rho_{\min}, c_i, \text{Mit}, \text{TOPT}, \dots)$.

Other parameters can be added to this basic call (we refer to [52] for further details). The output of IPOPT is the optimal density.

4.2 The anisotropic mesh adaptation procedure

The adapted anisotropic mesh is generated by a metric-based procedure [29], driven by an a posteriori error estimator [1]. In particular, we resort to an anisotropic variant of the Zienkiewicz–Zhu estimator, η , to efficiently estimate the H^1 -seminorm of the discretization error, $\|\nabla \rho - \nabla \rho_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, associated with the density [58]. The rationale behind this choice is that we do expect large values for the H^1 -seminorm of such an error where the density exhibits steep gradients, i.e., across the material–void interfaces. It is well known that anisotropic meshes are an ideal tool to detect sharp directional features [21, 33]. Moreover, recovery-based error estimators are very cheap to implement and quite general, depending only on the density and not on the target criteria.

Following [41], the error estimator coincides with $\eta^2 = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \eta_K^2$, with

$$\eta_K^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda_{1,K} \lambda_{2,K}} \sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_{i,K}^2 \left(\mathbf{r}_{i,K}^T G_{\Delta_K} (E_{\nabla}) \mathbf{r}_{i,K} \right), \quad (11)$$

where $\lambda_{i,K}$ and $\mathbf{r}_{i,K}$ represent the anisotropic information required to build the adapted mesh. In particular, $\lambda_{i,K}$, with $\lambda_{1,K} \geq \lambda_{2,K}$, measure the lengths of the semi-axes of the ellipse circumscribed to the generic element K of $\mathcal{T}_h$, while $\mathbf{r}_{i,K}$ provide the direction of the corresponding axes. The lengths $\lambda_{i,K}$ can be employed to measure the deformation of K , i.e., the aspect ratio $s_K = \lambda_{1,K} / \lambda_{2,K} \geq 1$. Moreover, $E_{\nabla} = [P(\nabla \rho_h) - \nabla \rho_h]_{\Delta_K}$ denotes the recovered error, i.e., the mismatch between the exact discrete gradient, $\nabla \rho_h$, and the recovered gradient,

$$P(\nabla \rho_h)|_{\Delta_K} = |\Delta_K|^{-1} \sum_{T \in \Delta_K} |T| \nabla \rho_h|_T,$$

coinciding with the area-weighted average of the discrete gradient on the patch Δ_K of the elements sharing at least a vertex with K [24, 41, 42]. Finally, $G_{\Delta_K}(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ is a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix with entries

$$[G_{\Delta_K}(\mathbf{w})]_{ij} = \sum_{T \in \Delta_K} \int_T w_i w_j dT \quad \text{with } i, j = 1, 2, \quad (12)$$

for any vector-valued function $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2)^T \in [L^2(\Omega)]^2$.

The local estimator, η_K , is now used in a predictive way to compute an optimal metric, minimizing the cardinality, $\#\mathcal{T}_h$, of the new mesh, and satisfying an error equidistribution criterion,

$$\eta_K^2 \simeq \frac{\text{TAD}^2}{\#\mathcal{T}_h}, \quad (13)$$

with TAD the desired accuracy on the global estimator η . These two requirements lead to solve an elementwise constrained optimization problem, which admits a unique explicit solution [41, 42],

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_{1,K}^{\text{opt}} = g_2^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\text{TAD}^2}{2\#\mathcal{T}_h |\hat{\Delta}_K|} \right)^{1/2}, \\ \lambda_{2,K}^{\text{opt}} = g_1^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\text{TAD}^2}{2\#\mathcal{T}_h |\hat{\Delta}_K|} \right)^{1/2}, \\ \mathbf{r}_{1,K}^{\text{opt}} = \mathbf{g}_2, \quad \mathbf{r}_{2,K}^{\text{opt}} = \mathbf{g}_1, \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

with $|\hat{\Delta}_K| = |\Delta_K|/(\lambda_{1,K} \lambda_{2,K})$, $\{\mathbf{g}_i, \mathbf{g}_i\}_{i=1,2}$ the eigen-pairs associated with the scaled matrix $G_{\Delta_K}(E_V)/|\Delta_K|$, with $g_1 \geq g_2 > 0$, $\{\mathbf{g}_i\}_{i=1,2}$ orthonormal vectors. The optimal quantities, $\lambda_{i,K}^{\text{opt}}$ and $\mathbf{r}_{i,K}^{\text{opt}}$ with $i = 1, 2$, represent the input to a metric-based mesh generator since they describe the distribution of lengths and directions (i.e., the metric) of the new adapted mesh. FreeFem++ turns out to be an ideal tool for this purpose [34].

Thus, in general, we distinguish two phases, i.e., the metric computation,

$$[\lambda_1^{\text{opt}}, \lambda_2^{\text{opt}}, \mathbf{r}_1^{\text{opt}}, \mathbf{r}_2^{\text{opt}}] = \text{metric}(\mathcal{T}_h, \rho_h, \text{TAD});$$

and the mesh adaptation

$$\mathcal{T}_h^{\text{opt}} = \text{adaptmesh}(\mathcal{T}_h, \lambda_1^{\text{opt}}, \lambda_2^{\text{opt}}, \mathbf{r}_1^{\text{opt}}, \mathbf{r}_2^{\text{opt}}).$$

Function `metric` computes elementwise the optimal quantities in (14), so that $\lambda_i^{\text{opt}}|_K = \lambda_{i,K}^{\text{opt}}$ and $\mathbf{r}_i^{\text{opt}}|_K = \mathbf{r}_{i,K}^{\text{opt}}$, while function `adaptmesh` generates the adapted mesh matching the metric just computed [29, 40].

4.3 The whole algorithm

The MSC-SIMPATY algorithm combines, in a sequential manner, the optimization with the anisotropic mesh adaptation. This algorithm represents a variant of the one proposed in [44] and filed in the pending patent [43]. Algorithm 1 shows the pseudo code of MSC-SIMPATY.

Fig. 1 L-shaped bracket domain

Algorithm 1 MSC-SIMPATY algorithm

Input : TOPT, TAD, CTOL, kmax, $C_{\max}$, $S_{\max}$, $\rho_{\min}$, $\mathcal{T}_h^0$

- 1: Set: $\rho_h^0 = 1$, $k = 0$, $\text{errM} = 1 + \text{CTOL}$
- 2: **while** ($\text{errM} > \text{CTOL}$ & $k < \text{kmax}$) **do**
- 3: $\rho_h^{k+1} = \text{IPOPT}(\mathcal{M}, \nabla_{\rho} \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}, \nabla_{\rho} \mathcal{C}, \nabla_{\rho} \mathcal{S}, \rho_h^k, \rho_{\min}, C_{\max}, S_{\max}, \text{Mit}^k, \text{TOPT}, \dots)$;
- 4: $[\lambda_{1,K}^{k+1}, \lambda_{2,K}^{k+1}, \mathbf{r}_{1,K}^{k+1}, \mathbf{r}_{2,K}^{k+1}] = \text{metric}(\mathcal{T}_h^k, \rho_h^{k+1}, \text{TAD})$;
- 5: $\mathcal{T}_h^{k+1} = \text{adaptmesh}(\mathcal{T}_h^k, \lambda_{1,K}^{k+1}, \lambda_{2,K}^{k+1}, \mathbf{r}_{1,K}^{k+1}, \mathbf{r}_{2,K}^{k+1})$;
- 6: $\text{errM} = |\#\mathcal{T}_h^{k+1} - \#\mathcal{T}_h^k| / \#\mathcal{T}_h^k$;
- 7: $k = k + 1$;

The main input parameters are: the tolerance for the optimization, TOPT, and for the mesh adaptation, TAD; the tolerance CTOL and the maximum number of iterations, kmax, to stop the whole algorithm when the mesh cardinality does not change appreciably or the maximum number of iterations is reached; the upper bounds for the compliance and the stress, $C_{\max}$ and $S_{\max}$, respectively; the minimum value, $\rho_{\min}$, for the density, and the initial mesh $\mathcal{T}_h^0$. We observe that parameter Mit^k may change throughout the iterations. In particular, in the next section, Mit^k is set to a large value only on the first iteration so that IPOPT gets very close to the optimal solution on the initial mesh. On the contrary, a smaller value is expected to suffice for the successive iterations to strike a balance between quality of the solution and non-optimality of the mesh.

5 Verification of MSC-SIMPATY

We focus on a benchmark test case to assess Algorithm 1. We consider the topology optimization of the L-shaped bracket in Fig. 1. In particular, we solve problem (1) in the domain Ω coinciding with the L-shaped region $(0, 10]^2 \setminus [4, 10]^2$, whose internal corner has been rounded via a quarter of a circumference, centered at (4.05, 4.05) with radius 0.05. This regularization has been applied to avoid the standard corner singularity for the stress [37]. Concerning the other data, $\Gamma_D = \{(x, y) : x \in [0, 0.1], y = 10\}$, $\Gamma_R = \{(x, y) : x \in (0.1, 4], y = 10\}$, $\Gamma_N = \{(x, y) : x = 10, |y - 2| \leq 0.5\}$, $\Gamma_F = \partial\Omega \setminus (\Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N)$ and $\mathbf{f} = [0, 6(y - 1.5)(y - 2.5)]^T$. The parabolic profile of the load prevents any discontinuity along the right side and ensures that $\int_{\Gamma_N} \mathbf{f} \, dy = [0, -1]^T$. The elastic parameters are set to $E = 1$ and $\nu = 0.3$, whereas we choose $p = 3$ in (4), and $\gamma = 10$ and $p_s = 0.5$ in (8).

We consider three different scenarios:

1. only the compliance constraint in (10) is active;
2. only the stress constraint in (10) is switched on;
3. both the constraints in (10) are considered.

The next sections are devoted to analyze these three settings, separately. Obviously, the input parameters as well as the IPOPT syntax will be modified accordingly in the case of a mono-constrained problem.

5.1 Compliance-constrained topology optimization

We run MSC-SIMPATY algorithm, with the following input parameters: $\text{TOPT} = 10^{-4}$, $\text{TAD} = 0.15$, $\text{CTOL} = 0.10$, $\text{kmax} = 10$, $C_{\max} = 2C_0$, $C_0 = 107.13$ being the compliance associated with the full structure (i.e., $\rho = 1$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$), $\rho_{\min} = 10^{-3}$. We employ an initial uniform mesh, $\mathcal{T}_h^0$, consisting of 9266 triangles, which has been isotropically refined around the inner corner over a circular region of radius 0.25 with a mesh size equal to 0.05. This local refinement is maintained throughout all the MSC-SIMPATY iterations as well as in all the numerical assessment. Moreover, the parameter Mit^k in IPOPT is set to 180 for $k = 0$ and to 10 for $k > 0$.

MSC-SIMPATY algorithm converges after 6 iterations, with $\text{errM} = 0.049$ and a final adapted mesh with 32,381 elements. Figure 2 shows the corresponding density, ρ_h^6 , which exhibits a layout characterized by several struts hinged at the inner corner, analogously to [14, 37]. This is standard for a minimum-compliance problem, where the stiffness of the configuration is increased with the introduction of substructures. The optimal layout is

Fig. 2 Compliance-constrained optimization: density distribution

Fig. 3 Compliance-constrained optimization: anisotropic adapted mesh

characterized by a remarkable mass reduction, the volume fraction being $\mathcal{M} = 0.383$, and the compliance constraint is satisfied, being $\mathcal{C} = 197.12 \leq C_{\max} = 214.26$.

The benefits due to the anisotropic mesh adaptation are evident from the sharp material/void interface. Figure 3 shows the final adapted mesh, characterized by a maximum aspect ratio $s_K^{\max} = \max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} s_K = 480.92$.

Finally, in Fig. 4, we show the results of a structural analysis, based on the von Mises yield criterion. It is evident that the maximum stress is attained around the inner

Fig. 4 Compliance-constrained optimization: von Mises stress distribution

corner. Notice that, in this and, analogously, in Figs. 7 and 10, the values are scaled to the maximum pointwise value, $\sigma_{VM}^{\max} = 24.93$. We consider as reference, the value for S associated with the full structure, i.e., $S_0 = 4.17$. The value for S on the optimized structure is 11.77. This suggests that the introduction of a stress-constraint is advisable with a view to a resistant structure.

5.2 Stress-constrained topology optimization

The input parameters to MSC-SIMPATY are now: $TOPT = 10^{-4}$, $TAD = 0.12$, $CTOL = 0.10$, $k_{\max} = 10$, $S_{\max} = 5S_0$, with S_0 defined as in the previous section, $\rho_{\min} = 10^{-3}$, and $\mathcal{T}_h^0$ as in the previous scenario. Parameter Mit^k is set to $Mit^0 = 430$, and $Mit^k = 10$ for $k > 0$. The initial large value for this parameter is justified by the much slower convergence of the algorithm with respect to a compliance-constrained optimization, due to the nonlinearity associated with the stress definition.

Convergence of Algorithm 1 is achieved after 4 iterations, with the final layout characterized by a volume fraction, $\mathcal{M}$, equal to 0.350 (see Fig. 5). Although this value is comparable with the one in the compliance-constrained case, we remark the different material distribution in the design domain. In particular, this new structure is characterized by less and thicker struts and some material removal around the inner corner [35, 55].

Figure 6 shows the anisotropic adapted mesh consisting of 11,026 elements, with a maximum aspect ratio $s_K^{\max} = 147.86$, and a corresponding stagnation error $errM = 0.084$, while Fig. 7 displays the von Mises stress distribution. On comparing qualitatively Figs. 4 and 7,

Fig. 5 Stress-constrained optimization: density distribution

we can appreciate that, in the second figure, the stress is more localized around the inner corner, together with a more homogeneous stress distribution along the side $\{(x, y) : x = 4, y \in [4, 10]\}$. The maximum von Mises stress is $\sigma_{VM}^{\max} = 16.87$.

From a quantitative viewpoint, the value for S is 8.34, which coincides with the specified bound, 8.34. Concerning the compliance, we have that $\mathcal{C} = 404.95 > \mathcal{C}_{\max}$.

A cross-comparison between a compliance-constrained and a stress-constrained settings confirms that to design a structure sufficiently resistant and stiff the two constraints have to be enforced simultaneously.

Fig. 6 Stress-constrained optimization: anisotropic adapted mesh

Fig. 7 Stress-constrained optimization: von Mises stress distribution

Fig. 8 Compliance- and stress-constrained optimization: density distribution

5.3 Compliance- and stress-constrained topology optimization

We perform the last run of Algorithm 1 by selecting the following input data: $\text{TOPT} = 10^{-4}$, $\text{TAD} = 0.15$, $\text{CTOL} = 0.10$, $\text{kmax} = 10$, $C_{\max} = 2C_0$, $S_{\max} = 5S_0$, with C_0 and S_0 defined as above, $\rho_{\min} = 10^{-3}$, and the same initial mesh, $\mathcal{T}_h^0$, as in the two previous sections. Parameter Mit^k for IPOPT is fixed to 180 and 10 for the first and the successive iterations, respectively.

MSC-SIMPATY algorithm converges after 6 iterations with $\text{errM} = 0.022$. The optimized layout shown in Fig. 8 is characterized by a volume fraction $\mathcal{M}$ equal to 0.380, which is very close to the value obtained in the compliance-constrained case. This structure exhibits a topology essentially comparable with the one in Fig. 2.

The constraint on the compliance is fully satisfied, being $\mathcal{C} = 195.59 \leq 214.26$, whereas the check on the stress yields $S = 8.42$, which is very close to the bound $S_{\max} = 8.34$.

Figure 9 shows the final anisotropic adapted mesh, which is characterized by 35,132 elements and by a maximum aspect ratio $s_K^{\max} = 294.83$. We observe that, for the same accuracy, TAD, the mesh associated with the stress-constrained problem requires about one third elements with respect to the other configurations.

Fig. 9 Compliance- and stress-constrained optimization: anisotropic adapted mesh

Concerning the stress distribution in Fig. 10, we obtain the value $\sigma_{VM}^{\max} = 16.87$. We observe that the inclusion of the stress constraint considerably improves the structure performance both in terms of $\sigma_{VM}^{\max}$ and of S , when compared with the compliance-constrained setting.

Fig. 10 Compliance- and stress-constrained optimization: von Mises stress distribution

Fig. 11 Compliance- and stress-constrained optimization: convergence history of the volume fraction

Finally, in Fig. 11, we plot the trend of the volume fraction throughout the iterations. The vertical bars highlight the steps where mesh adaptation occurs. We observe that a large number of iterations is required to reduce the volume fraction from 1 to about 0.38 on the initial fixed mesh. In the successive small windows the algorithm tries to explore other configurations, which are then ruled out, likely because unfeasible.

Table 1 MSC-SIMPATY algorithm: quantitative comparison among the three optimization procedures

	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{S}$	$\mathcal{C} + \mathcal{S}$
$\mathcal{M}$	0.383	0.350	0.380
$\mathcal{C}$	197.12	404.95	195.59
$\mathcal{S}$	11.77	8.34	8.42
$\sigma_{VM}^{\max}$	24.93	16.87	17.31
Iterations	6	4	6
$\#\mathcal{T}_h$	32,381	11,026	35,132
$s_K^{\max}$	480.92	147.86	294.83

Fig. 12 MSC-SIMPATY algorithm: extruded 3D structures converted in the STL file format

6 Conclusions

SIMPATY algorithm has been challenged on more realistic settings with respect to the ones in [25, 44], the structure mass being now minimized under a single- as well as a multi-constrained context. In particular, we have selected the compliance and the von Mises stress as the quantities to be controlled. This generalization led to the new MSC-SIMPATY algorithm, which preserves the advantages characterizing the original procedure. Among these, we cite the capability to sharply and smoothly capture the material/void interface and the possibility to avoid any post-processing.

As far as the structural analysis is concerned, the proposed algorithm is capable of delivering mechanically reliable structures in terms of both maximum stress and compliance, as confirmed by the quantities gathered in Table 1.

Next steps include the generalization to a 3D setting together with an extensive validation. As a preliminary attempt towards a 3D-printing process, we show in Fig. 12 the 3D structures obtained by extrusion starting from the density distribution in Figs. 2, 5 and 8, respectively and saved in an STL file, which is the standard format required by 3D printers. Although these are very preliminary results, we can appreciate the high smoothness of the structures and the sharp definition of their boundaries.

Acknowledgements The financial support of INDAM-GNCS Projects 2020 is gratefully acknowledged. Moreover, Nicola Ferro thanks Fondazione Fratelli Confalonieri for the awarded Grant.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- Ainsworth M, Oden JT (2000) A posteriori error estimation in finite element analysis. Wiley, New York
- Alaimo G, Auricchio F, Conti M, Zingales M (2017) Multi-objective optimization of nitinol stent design. *Med Eng Phys* 47:13–24
- Allaire G, de Gournay F, Jouve F, Toader AM (2005) Structural optimization using topological and shape sensitivity via a level set method. *Control Cybern* 34(1):59–80
- Allaire G, Jouve F, Maillot H (2004) Topology optimization for minimum stress design with the homogenization method. *Struct Multidisc Optim* 28:87–98
- Allaire G, Jouve F, Toader A (2004) Structural optimization using sensitivity analysis and level set-method. *J Comput Phys* 194:363–393
- Amstutz S (2011) Connections between topological sensitivity analysis and material interpolation schemes in topology optimization. *Struct Multidisc Optim* 43(6):755–765
- Amstutz S, André H (2006) A new algorithm for topology optimization using a level-set method. *J Comput Phys* 216(2):573–588
- Bendsøe MP (1995) Optimization of structural topology, shape, and material. Springer, Berlin
- Bendsøe MP, Kikuchi N (1988) Generating optimal topologies in structural design using a homogenization method. *Comput Methods Appl Mech Eng* 71(2):197–224
- Bendsøe MP, Sigmund O (2003) Topology optimization: theory, methods and applications. Springer, Berlin
- Bourdin B (2001) Filters in topology optimization. *Int J Numer Methods Eng* 50(9):2143–2158
- Bourdin B, Chambolle A (2003) Design-dependent loads in topology optimization. *ESAIM Control Optim Calc Var* 9:19–48
- Bruggi M, Cinquini C (2011) Topology optimization for thermal insulation: an application to building engineering. *Eng Optim* 43(11):1223–1242
- Bruggi M, Duysinx P (2012) Topology optimization for minimum weight with compliance and stress constraints. *Struct Multidisc Optim* 46(3):369–384
- Burger M, Hackl B, Ring W (2004) Incorporating topological derivatives into level set methods. *J Comput Phys* 194(1):344–362
- Burger M, Osher SJ (2005) A survey on level set methods for inverse problems and optimal design. *Eur J Appl Math* 16(2):263–301
- Burger M, Stainko R (2006) Phase-field relaxation of topology optimization with local stress constraints. *SIAM J Control Optim* 45(4):1447–1466
- Cai S, Zhang W (2015) Stress constrained topology optimization with free-form design domains. *Comput Methods Appl Mech Eng* 289:267–290
- Collet M, Bruggi M, Duysinx P (2017) Topology optimization for minimum weight with compliance and simplified nominal stress constraints for fatigue resistance. *Struct Multidisc Optim* 55(3):839–855
- Dedè L, Borden MJ, Hughes TJR (2012) Isogeometric analysis for topology optimization with a phase field model. *Arch Comput Methods Eng* 19(3):427–465
- Dompierre J, Vallet MG, Bourgault Y, Fortin M, Habashi WG (2002) Anisotropic mesh adaptation: towards user-independent, mesh-independent and solver-independent CFD. III. Unstructured meshes. *Int J Numer Methods Fluids* 39(8):675–702
- Ern A, Guermond JL (2004) Theory and practice of finite elements, vol 159. Springer, New York
- Eschenauer HA, Olhoff N (2001) Topology optimization of continuum structures: a review. *Appl Mech Rev* 54(4):331–390
- Farrell PE, Micheletti S, Perotto S (2011) An anisotropic Zienkiewicz–Zhu-type error estimator for 3D applications. *Int J Numer Methods Eng* 85(6):671–692
- Ferro N, Micheletti S, Perotto S (2019) POD-assisted strategies for structural topology optimization. *Comput Math Appl* 77(10):2804–2820
- Ferro N, Micheletti S, Perotto S (2020) Density-based inverse homogenization with anisotropically adapted elements. In: Corsini A, Perotto S, Rozza G, van Brummelen H (eds) Lecture notes in computational science and engineering, proceedings of the 19th international conference on finite elements in flow problems. Springer, Berlin
- Formaggia L, Micheletti S, Perotto S (2002) Anisotropic mesh adaption with application to CFD problems. In: Mang H, Rammerstorfer F, Eberhardsteiner J (eds) Proceedings of WCCM V, 5th world congress on computational mechanics, pp 1481–1493
- Formaggia L, Perotto S (2001) New anisotropic a priori error estimates. *Numer Math* 89(4):641–667
- Frey PJ, George PL (2008) Mesh generation. Application to finite elements, 2nd edn. ISTE/Wiley, Hoboken/London

30. Giacomini M, Pantz O, Trabelsi K (2017) Volumetric expressions of the shape gradient of the compliance in structural shape optimization. [arXiv:1701.05762](https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.05762)
31. Gomes AA, Suleman A (2006) Application of spectral level set methodology in topology optimization. *Struct Multidiscip Optim* 31(6):430–443
32. Gould PL (1994) Introduction to linear elasticity. Springer, New York
33. Habashi WG, Dompierre J, Bourgault Y, Ait-Ali-Yahia D, Fortin M, Vallet MG (2000) Anisotropic mesh adaptation: towards user-independent, mesh-independent and solver-independent CFD. I. General principles. *Int J Numer Methods Fluids* 32(6):725–744
34. Hecht F (2012) New development in FreeFem++. *J Numer Math* 20(3–4):251–265
35. Holmberg E, Torstenfelt B, Klarbring A (2013) Stress constrained topology optimization. *Struct Multidiscip Optim* 48(1):33–47
36. Huang X, Xie YM, Jia B, Li Q, Zhou SW (2012) Evolutionary topology optimization of periodic composites for extremal magnetic permeability and electrical permittivity. *Struct Multidiscip Optim* 46(3):385–398
37. Jensen KE (2016) Solving stress and compliance constrained volume minimization using anisotropic mesh adaptation, the method of moving asymptotes and a global p-norm. *Struct Multidiscip Optim* 54(4):831–841
38. Lazarov BS, Sigmund O (2011) Filters in topology optimization based on Helmholtz-type differential equations. *Int J Numer Methods Eng* 86(6):765–781
39. Liang Q (2005) Performance-based optimization of structures. Theory and applications. Spon Press, London
40. Micheletti S, Perotto S (2006) Reliability and efficiency of an anisotropic Zienkiewicz–Zhu error estimator. *Comput Methods Appl Mech Eng* 195(9–12):799–835
41. Micheletti S, Perotto S (2010) Anisotropic adaptation via a Zienkiewicz–Zhu error estimator for 2D elliptic problems. In: Kreiss G, Lötstedt P, Målqvist A, Neytcheva M (eds) Numerical mathematics and advanced applications. Springer, Berlin, pp 645–653
42. Micheletti S, Perotto S, Farrell PE (2010) A recovery-based error estimator for anisotropic mesh adaptation in CFD. *Bol Soc Esp Mat Apl (SEMA)* 50:115–137
43. Micheletti S, Perotto S, Soli L (2017) Ottimizzazione topologica adattativa per la fabbricazione stratificata additiva. Italian patent application no. 102016000118131, filed on November 22, 2016 (extended as Adaptive topology optimization for additive layer manufacturing. International patent application PCT No. PCT/IB2017/057323)
44. Micheletti S, Perotto S, Soli L (2019) Topology optimization driven by anisotropic mesh adaptation: towards a free-form design. *Comput Struct* 214:60–72
45. Munk DJ, Vio GA, Steven GP (2015) Topology and shape optimization methods using evolutionary algorithms: a review. *Struct Multidiscip Optim* 52(3):613–631
46. Rozvany GIN (2009) A critical review of established methods of structural topology optimization. *Struct Multidiscip Optim* 37:217–237
47. Schwerdtfeger J, Wein F, Leugering G, Singer RF, Körner C, Stingl M, Schury F (2011) Design of auxetic structures via mathematical optimization. *Adv Mater* 23(22–23):2650–2654
48. Sigmund O, Petersson J (1998) Numerical instabilities in topology optimization: a survey on procedures dealing with checkerboards, mesh-dependencies and local minima. *Struct Optim* 16(1):68–75
49. Sokolowski J, Zochowski A (1999) On the topological derivative in shape optimization. *SIAM J Control Optim* 37:1251–1272
50. Svanberg K (1987) The method of moving asymptotes—a new method for structural optimization. *Int J Numer Methods Eng* 24(2):359–373
51. Villanueva CH, Maute K (2017) CutFEM topology optimization of 3D laminar incompressible flow problems. *Comput Methods Appl Mech Eng* 320:444–473
52. Wächter A, Biegler LT (2006) On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming. *Math Program* 106(1, Ser A):25–57
53. Wang M, Wang X, Guo D (2003) A level set method for structural topology optimization. *Comput Methods Appl Mech Eng* 192(1–2):227–246
54. Xie Y, Steven G (1993) A simple evolutionary procedure for structural optimization. *Comput Struct* 49:885–896
55. Yang D, Liu H, Zhang W (2018) Stress-constrained topology optimization based on maximum stress measures. *Comput Struct* 198:23–39
56. Yoon GH (2010) Structural topology optimization for frequency response problem using model reduction schemes. *Comput Methods Appl Mech Eng* 199(25–28):1744–1763
57. Zargham S, Ward T, Ramli R, Badruddin I (2016) Topology optimization: a review for structural designs under vibration problems. *Struct Multidiscip Optim* 53(6):1157–1177
58. Zienkiewicz OC, Zhu JZ (1987) A simple error estimator and adaptive procedure for practical engineering analysis. *Int J Numer Methods Eng* 24:337–357
59. Zienkiewicz OC, Zhu JZ (1992) The superconvergent patch recovery and a posteriori error estimates. II: error estimates and adaptivity. *Int J Numer Methods Eng* 33:1365–1382

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.