A boundary-discontinuous-displacement based Fourier analysis of thick laminated beams via a robust 1D-CUF model
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**ABSTRACT**

This paper presents an analytical solution for the static analysis of thick laminated rectangular beams with clamped boundary conditions at either or both of the beam’s edges. A unified formulation known as Carrera’s Unified Formulation (CUF) is used in order to consider shear deformation theories of arbitrary order. The governing equations are obtained by using the principle of virtual work. The main novelty is the use of the boundary-discontinuous Fourier approach for laminated beams in the framework of a unified formulation. Unlike Navier-type solutions, the present development can obtain analytical solutions for beams with clamped boundary conditions. A 3D finite element solution is used to validate the obtained results. The present theory can analyze clamped beams accurately so benchmark results are provided.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Composite materials have many advantages compared to traditional metallic materials. Laminated composite beams are now widely used in aerospace and naval structures due to their lightness. However, composite beams have considerable transverse stress fields and thus require complex models to reproduce transverse stresses accurately. The classical or Euler-Bernoulli theory is inadequate to analyze these types of beams since this theory neglects transverse shear deformations. The Timoshenko beam theory is an improvement over the classical beam theory, but it requires a shear correction factor to correct the strain energy, as discussed by Hutchinson (1981), Hutchinson and Zillmer (1986) and Rychter (1987). In order to overcome the limitations of the Timoshenko beam theory, numerous higher order shear deformation theories (HSDTs) have been developed. HSDTs have nonuniform shear distribution in the beam’s cross section, which can be captured by polynomial and non-polynomial shear strain shape functions. Khdeir and Reddy (1997) studied the bending of laminated beams using the Euler-Bernoulli theory and two HSDTs. Many other deformation theories have been developed for the analysis of composite laminated beams, and some are given in Sayyad and Ghugal (2011), Shimpi and Ghugal (2001), Aydogdu (2009) and Arya et al. (2002).

A unified formulation known as Carrera’s Unified Formulation (CUF) has been developed by Carrera (2003). This formulation can analyze deformation theories of arbitrary order in a systematic manner, and it has been used to solve multifield problems (Carrera, 2005; Carrera et al., 2007, 2008). Beams are analyzed by using the one-dimensional CUF model, as presented in Carrera and Giunta (2010), Carrera et al. (2010) and Carrera and Petrolo (2012). Non-polynomial theories for beams have been developed by Carrera et al. (2013). This formulation can obtain quasi-3D solutions in many case problems. For example, accurate static (Catapano et al., 2011), free vibration (Giunta et al., 2013a; Filippi et al., 2015) and buckling analysis (Ibrahim et al., 2012) of laminated composite beams have been developed. The core of the formulation is given in Carrera et al. (2011) and Carrera et al. (2014). Special applications of 1D CUF models are given in Giunta et al. (2013b,c, 2016), Polit et al. (2015).

Analytical solutions are available for simply supported beams by using Navier-type solutions. Clamped boundary conditions can be considered in finite element solutions or by using the Ritz method, but these methods require analytical solutions to validate the results. Unlike simply supported boundary conditions, accurate analytical solutions for clamped boundary conditions are seldom developed, which represents a gap in the literature.

A method known as the boundary discontinuous Fourier method was developed by Chaudhuri (1989,2002) and it can be used to analyze beams with clamped boundary conditions. This method has been used for the analysis of cylindrical panels (Chaudhuri and Abu-Arja, 1991, Kabir and Chaudhuri, 1993), doubly-curved panels (Chaudhuri and Kabir, 1989; Kabir and

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: jmantari@utech.edu, JoseMantari@gmail.com (J.L. Mantari).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2017.04.017
0020-7683/© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
2. Analytical modeling

A beam of length \( L \), width \( b \) and a total thickness \( h \) is considered in the present analysis. The rectangular cartesian coordinate system used in the present work is shown in Fig. 1. The beam occupies the following region:

\[-b/2 \leq x \leq b/2; \quad 0 \leq y \leq L; \quad -h/2 \leq z \leq h/2\]

2.1. Elastic stress-strain relations

A general displacement vector is introduced:

\[\mathbf{u}(x, y, z) = \begin{bmatrix} u_x & u_y & u_z \end{bmatrix}^T\] (1)

The cross-sectional plane of the beam is denoted by \( \Omega \). The stress and strain vectors are expressed as follows:

\[\sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{xx} & \sigma_{xz} & \sigma_{zx} & \sigma_{yy} & \sigma_{yz} & \sigma_{zy} \end{bmatrix}^T\]

\[\varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{xx} & \varepsilon_{xz} & \varepsilon_{zx} & \varepsilon_{yy} & \varepsilon_{yz} & \varepsilon_{zy} \end{bmatrix}^T\] (2)

The constitutive equation can be written as follows:

\[\sigma = \tilde{C}\varepsilon\] (3)

where \( \tilde{C} \) is a matrix of stiffness coefficients. For an orthotropic material, it is given by:

\[
\tilde{C} = \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{C}_{11} & \tilde{C}_{12} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{C}_{13} \\
\tilde{C}_{12} & \tilde{C}_{22} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{C}_{23} \\
0 & 0 & \tilde{C}_{44} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{C}_{55} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{C}_{66} & 0 \\
\tilde{C}_{13} & \tilde{C}_{23} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{C}_{33}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (4)

The orientation of the laminas is defined using the Y axis as a reference. Only laminated materials with cross-ply layups, i.e. with laminas oriented at 0 or 90° from the Y axis, can be analyzed using the present boundary-discontinuous method. The limitation is similar as for Navier-type solutions. For ease of development, the stress and strain vectors in Eq. (2) are partitioned:

\[\sigma_p = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{zz} & \sigma_{xx} & \sigma_{xy} \end{bmatrix}^T, \sigma_p = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{zz} & \varepsilon_{xx} & \varepsilon_{xy} \end{bmatrix}^T\]

\[\sigma_n = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{xy} & \sigma_{yy} \end{bmatrix}^T, \sigma_n = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{xy} & \varepsilon_{yy} \end{bmatrix}^T\] (5)

Considering small amplitude displacements, the strain are given by:

\[\varepsilon_p = \mathbf{D}_p\mathbf{u}\]

\[\varepsilon_n = \mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{D}_{n\Omega} + \mathbf{D}_{ny})\mathbf{u}\] (7)

The subscript “p” stands for terms lying on planes orthogonal to the cross-section, while the subscript “n” stands for terms lying on the cross section. The linear differential operators \( \mathbf{D}_p \), \( \mathbf{D}_{n\Omega} \) and \( \mathbf{D}_{ny} \) are given by:

\[
\mathbf{D}_p = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} & 0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial x}
\end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{D}_{n\Omega} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial z} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\] (8)

\[
\mathbf{D}_{ny} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\
0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial y} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The constitutive equation, given by Eq. (3), can be split by using the partition of the stress and strain vectors given in Eq. (5):

\[\sigma_p = \tilde{C}_{pp}\varepsilon_p + \tilde{C}_{pn}\varepsilon_n\]

\[\sigma_n = \tilde{C}_{np}\varepsilon_p + \tilde{C}_{nn}\varepsilon_n\] (9)

The matrices \( \tilde{C}_{pp}, \tilde{C}_{pn}, \tilde{C}_{np} \) and \( \tilde{C}_{nn} \) are obtained as partitions of Eq. (4), and are given by:
Table 1
MacLaurin’s polynomials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>( F_r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( F_1 = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>( F_3 = x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>( F_6 = x^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>( F_{10} = x^3 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{C}_{11} & \tilde{C}_{12} & 0 \\
\tilde{C}_{21} & \tilde{C}_{22} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \tilde{C}_{33}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(10)

The coefficients \( \tilde{C}_{ij} \) depend on the material properties. They can be found in standard texts of laminated materials, as presented in Reddy (2004).

2.2. Displacement field

The displacement field is expressed within the framework of the CUF:

\[
u(x, y, z) = F_r(x, z)u_r(y) \quad \tau = 1, 2, \ldots, M
\]

where \( F_r \) are functions of the coordinates \( x \) and \( z \) on the cross-section, \( M \) stands for the number of terms used in the expansion, \( u_r \) is the vector of the generalized displacements, and the repeated subscript \( \tau \) indicates summation. A Taylor-type expansion is used to determine the functions \( F_r \), consisting on MacLaurin series that uses the 2D polynomials \( x^\tau y^\sigma \) as base. Table 1 shows \( M \) and \( F_r \) as functions of the order expansion \( N \). For example, the displacement field of the second-order \( (N=2) \) Taylor-type expansion model can be expressed as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\nu_x &= u_{x1} + xu_{x2} + xu_{x3} + x^2u_{x4} + xzu_{x5} + z^2u_{x6} \\
\nu_y &= u_{y1} + xu_{y2} + u_{y3} + x^2u_{y4} + xzu_{y5} + z^2u_{y6} \\
\nu_z &= u_{z1} + xu_{z2} + u_{z3} + x^2u_{z4} + xzu_{z5} + z^2u_{z6}
\end{align*}
\]

(12)

2.3. Principle of virtual work

The static version of the principle of virtual work is applied:

\[
\delta L_{\text{ext}} = \int_{\{\Omega\}} \delta \tilde{C}_{ij} \delta \nu \tilde{\nu} dV = \delta L_{\text{ext}}
\]

(13)

where \( \delta \) stands for the virtual variation operator, \( L_{\text{ext}} \) stands for the strain energy, and \( L_{\text{ext}} \) is the external virtual work. Substituting Eqs. (7) and (9) in Eq. (13) the following expression is obtained:

\[
\begin{align*}
\delta L_{\text{ext}} &= \int_{\{\Omega\}} \left[ (\tilde{C}_{ij} \delta \nu \tilde{\nu}) \right] \left[ \tilde{C}_{pq} D_p q + \tilde{C}_{pq} (D_{pq} + D_{qp}) \right] u \\
&+ (D_{pq} + D_{qp}) \tilde{\nu} \left[ \tilde{C}_{pq} \tilde{\nu} + \tilde{C}_{pq} (D_{pq} + D_{qp}) \right] u \right] d\Omega d\nu \\
&= \delta L_{\text{ext}}
\end{align*}
\]

(14)

Substituting Eqs. (11) and (10) in Eq. (14) and integrating by parts results in the following:

\[
\delta L_{\text{ext}} = \int_{\{\Omega\}} \delta \nu \begin{bmatrix} K^{\tau \tau} & K^{\tau \nu} \\
K^{\nu \tau} & K^{\nu \nu} \end{bmatrix} u \right] \right|_{\nu=0} = \delta L_{\text{ext}}
\]

(15)

where \( K^{\tau \tau} \) is the stiffness matrix and \( \Pi^{\tau \nu} \) is the matrix of the natural boundary conditions. The components of \( K^{\tau \tau} \) are provided as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
K^{\tau \tau}_{(11)} &= E_{x1}^2 + E_{x2}^4 + E_{x3}^6 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \\
K^{\tau \tau}_{(12)} &= E_{x1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - E_{x2}^6 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\
K^{\tau \tau}_{(13)} &= E_{x1}^2 + E_{x2}^4 \\
K^{\tau \tau}_{(21)} &= E_{x1}^6 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - E_{x2}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\
K^{\tau \tau}_{(22)} &= E_{x1}^5 + E_{x2}^6 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \\
K^{\tau \tau}_{(23)} &= E_{x1}^5 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - E_{x2}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\
K^{\tau \tau}_{(31)} &= E_{x1}^2 + E_{x2}^4 \\
K^{\tau \tau}_{(32)} &= E_{x1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - E_{x2}^5 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \\
K^{\tau \tau}_{(33)} &= E_{x1}^1 + E_{x2}^4 - E_{x3}^5 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}
\end{align*}
\]

(16)

where a cross-sectional moment parameter has been used, and a generic term is defined below:

\[
E_{\nu \nu}^{\text{eff}} = \int_{\Omega} \tilde{C}_{\nu \nu} F_r y F_r y d\Omega
\]

(17)

The components of \( \Pi^{\tau \nu} \) are provided as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Pi^{\tau \nu}_{(11)} &= E_{x1}^6 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \quad \Pi^{\tau \nu}_{(12)} = E_{x2}^6 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \quad \Pi^{\tau \nu}_{(13)} = 0 \\
\Pi^{\tau \nu}_{(21)} &= E_{x2}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \quad \Pi^{\tau \nu}_{(22)} = E_{x1}^5 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \quad \Pi^{\tau \nu}_{(23)} = E_{x1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\
\Pi^{\tau \nu}_{(31)} &= 0 \quad \Pi^{\tau \nu}_{(32)} = E_{x2}^5 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \quad \Pi^{\tau \nu}_{(33)} = E_{x2}^5 \frac{\partial}{\partial y}
\end{align*}
\]

(18)

Letting \( P_r = (P_{x1}, P_{x2}, P_{x3}) \) define a vector of generalized forces, the natural boundary conditions can be obtained by substituting Eq. (18) in Eq. (15):

\[
\begin{align*}
\delta u_{x1} &= P_{x1} = E_{x1}^6 u_{x1,y} + E_{x2}^6 u_{y} \\
\delta u_{y} &= P_{y} = E_{x1}^3 u_{x1,y} + E_{x2}^5 u_{x1} \\
\delta u_{z} &= P_{z} = E_{x2}^5 u_{y} + E_{x2}^5 u_{x1}
\end{align*}
\]

(19)

2.4. Boundary discontinuous solution

Geometric boundary conditions for simply supported beams, in terms of the displacement variables given in Eq. (11), are expressed as:

\[
\begin{align*}
u_{x1}(0) &= u_{x1}(0) = u_{y}(0) = 0 \\
u_{x1}(L) &= u_{x1}(L) = u_{y}(L) = 0
\end{align*}
\]

(20)

Geometric boundary conditions for clamped – clamped beams, in terms of the displacement variables given in Eq. (11) are additional constraints to those given in Eq. (20):

\[
\begin{align*}
u_{y}(0) &= 0 \\
u_{y}(L) &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

(21)
The displacement variables are assumed as follows:

\[ u_x = \sum_{m=1}^{p} U_{xrm} \sin (\alpha_m y) \quad 0 \leq y \leq L \quad (22a) \]

\[ u_y = \sum_{m=0}^{p} U_{yrm} \cos (\alpha_m y) \quad 0 < y < L \quad (22b) \]

\[ u_z = \sum_{m=1}^{p} U_{zrm} \sin (\alpha_m y) \quad 0 \leq y \leq L \quad (22c) \]

where \( m \) is the wave number of the trigonometric term and \( p \) the number of trigonometric terms of the series. The coefficient \( \alpha_m \) is given by:

\[ \alpha_m = \frac{m\pi}{L} \quad (23) \]

The total number of unknown Fourier coefficients introduced in Eqs. (22) is \( M(3p + 1) \). The assumed solution satisfies the simply supported boundary condition given in Eq. (20). However, the clamped support boundary condition, given in Eq. (21), is not satisfied. In order to obtain analytical solution for clamped beams, the boundary discontinuous method is used. The details of the procedure are given in Refs. [Chaudhuri, 1989, 2002].

The boundary discontinuous method introduces boundary Fourier coefficients arising from discontinuities of the solution at the edges \( y = 0, L \). The displacement variable \( u_y \), as defined by Eq. (22b), does not satisfy the boundary condition for clamped supports given in Eq. (21). Therefore, it is forced to vanish at these edges. The partial derivative \( u_{y, \tau} \) is seen to vanish at the edges, thus violating the complementary boundary constraint or boundary discontinuities at these edges; see [Chaudhuri, 1989, 2002]. For further differentiation, \( u_{y, \tau} \) is expanded in a Fourier series in order to satisfy the complementary boundary constraint. It is important to note that the derivative of the Fourier series of a given function is not necessarily the same as the Fourier series of the derivative of the function when this function has discontinuities.

The Fourier series of the partial derivative \( u_{y, \tau} \) is given by:

\[ u_{y, \tau} = \sum_{m=1}^{p} U_{yrm, \tau} \sin (\alpha_m y) \quad 0 < y < L \quad (24a) \]

\[ U_{yrm, \tau} = \frac{2}{L} \int_{0}^{L} u_{y, \tau} \sin (\alpha_m y) dy \quad (24b) \]

where \( U_{yrm, \tau} \) is the Fourier term associated with the Fourier series of the function \( u_{y, \tau} \). Integrating Eq. (24b) by parts and using the vanishing boundary conditions given in Eq. (21):

\[ U_{yrm, \tau} = \frac{2}{L} \int_{0}^{L} u_{y, \tau} \sin (\alpha_m y) dy - \frac{2}{L} \int_{0}^{L} u_{y, \tau} \alpha_m \cos (\alpha_m y) dy \]

\[ U_{yrm, \tau} = -\alpha_m \frac{2}{L} \int_{0}^{L} u_{y, \tau} \cos (\alpha_m y) dy \]

The Fourier term \( U_{yrm, \tau} \) of the Fourier series of the function \( u_{y, \tau} \) is recognized:

\[ U_{yrm, \tau} = -\alpha_m U_{yrm} \quad (26) \]

Thus, the first partial derivative can be obtained through term-by-term differentiation. The Fourier series of the second partial derivative \( u_{y, \tau y} \) is given by:

\[ u_{y, \tau y} = \frac{1}{2} a_{\tau} + \sum_{m=1}^{p} U_{yrm, \tau y} \cos (\alpha_m y) \quad 0 < y < L \quad (27a) \]

\[ U_{yrm, \tau y} = \frac{1}{L} \int_{0}^{L} u_{y, \tau y} \cos (\alpha_m y) dy \quad (27b) \]

where \( U_{yrm, \tau y} \) is the Fourier series of the function \( u_{y, \tau y} \) and \( a_\tau \) is a Fourier coefficient. Integrating Eq. (27b) by parts, the following expression is obtained:

\[ U_{yrm, \tau y} = \frac{2}{L} \int_{0}^{L} u_{y, \tau} \cos (\alpha_m y) dy \quad (28) \]

Note that the function \( u_{y, \tau} \) does not necessarily vanish at the edges (contrary to what may be suggested by Eq. (22b)) since discontinuities are introduced at \( y = 0, L \). Substituting Eqs. (24b) and (26) in Eq. (28) the Fourier term is obtained as:

\[ U_{yrm, \tau y} = \frac{2}{L} \left[ (-1)^m U_{y, \tau r}(L) - U_{y, \tau r}(0) \right] - \alpha_m U_{yrm} \quad (29) \]

Substituting Eq. (29) in Eq. (27a) the following expression is obtained:

\[ u_{y, \tau y} = \frac{1}{2} a_{\tau} + \sum_{m=1}^{p} \left( -\alpha_m^2 U_{yrm} + \gamma_m a_{\tau} + \psi_m b_{\tau} \right) \cos (\alpha_m y) \quad (30) \]

where the Fourier coefficients \( a_\tau \) and \( b_\tau \) introduce 2M new unknowns. These coefficients are given by:

\[ a_{\tau} = \frac{2}{L} \left[ U_{y, \tau r}(L) - U_{y, \tau r}(0) \right] \quad (31a) \]

\[ b_{\tau} = -\frac{2}{L} \left[ U_{y, \tau r}(L) + U_{y, \tau r}(0) \right] \quad (31b) \]

and \( \gamma_m, \psi_m \) are defined as:

\[ (\gamma_m, \psi_m) = \begin{cases} (1, 0), & m = \text{even} \\ (0, 1), & m = \text{odd} \end{cases} \quad (32) \]

2.5. Virtual work of the load

The external work of the uniform load \( q_0 \) applied in the surface \( z = h/2 \) (see Fig. 1) is given by:

\[ \delta W_{ext} = \int_{0}^{h/2} \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} q_0 \delta u_z |_{z = h/2} dx dy \quad (33) \]

Substituting Eq. (11) in Eq. (33):

\[ \delta W_{ext} = \int_{0}^{L} \left[ \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} q_0 F_u |_{z = h/2} dx \right] dy \]

The load is expressed using a Fourier series:

\[ q_0 = \sum_{m=1}^{p} Q_m \sin (\alpha_m y) \quad Q_m = \frac{1}{L} \int_{0}^{L} q_0 \sin (\alpha_m y) dy \quad (35) \]

where \( Q_m \) is a Fourier coefficient associated with the Fourier series of the load. Other types of loads can be analyzed in a similar manner, see Ref. [Carrera and Giunta, 2010].

2.6. Governing equations

Substituting Eqs. (22) and their appropriate partial derivatives in Eq. (15), in conjunction with Eqs. (16), (30), (34) and (35), the following expressions are obtained:

\[ \sum_{m=1}^{p} \sin (\alpha_m y) \left( \left( E^{(2)}_{tzz} + E^{(4)}_{tzz} + E^{(6)}_{tzz} \alpha_m^2 \right) U_{xrm} \right. \]

\[ + \left( -E^{(2)}_{tzz} \alpha_m + E^{(6)}_{tzz} \alpha_m \right) U_{yrm} \left( E^{(2)}_{tzz} + E^{(4)}_{tzz} \right) U_{zrm} \right) = 0 \quad (36a) \]
\[
\sum_{m=1}^{p} \cos(\alpha_m y) \left\{ \left( E_{12}^0 \alpha_{m} - E_{11}^0 \alpha_{m} \right) U_{yrm} + \left( E_{22}^0 + E_{11}^0 \alpha_{m} \right) U_{zrm} - E_{13}^0 \left( \gamma_m a_T + \psi_m b_T \right) \right\} = 0
\]  
(36b)

\[
\sum_{m=1}^{p} \sin(\alpha_m y) \left\{ \left( E_{12}^0 + E_{11}^0 \alpha_{m} \right) U_{yrm} + \left( -E_{13}^0 \alpha_{m} \right) U_{zrm} - E_{13}^0 \left( \gamma_m a_T + \psi_m b_T \right) \right\} = 0
\]  
(37c)

Equating the coefficients of the trigonometric functions of Eqs. (36) and (37) to zero yields to \(M(3p + 1)\) linear algebraic equations. Additional equations are supplied by the geometric boundary conditions relating to vanishing of the displacement variables \(u_{yrm}\) at the edges \(y = 0, L\) (due to the clamped boundary conditions). Using Eq. (22b):

\[
u_{yrm}(0) = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \sum_{m=0}^{p} U_{yrm} = 0
\]  
(38a)

\[
u_{yrm}(L) = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \sum_{m=-1}^{p} (-1)^m U_{yrm} = 0
\]  
(38b)

These equations can be expressed in a more convenient form, as in Oktem and Chaudhuri (2007c):

\[
u_{yrm} + \sum_{m=2}^{p} U_{yrm} = 0
\]  
(39a)

\[
u_{yrm} = 0
\]  
(39b)

This step generates 2M additional equations, resulting in a total of \(M(3p + 3)\) linear algebraic equations in as many unknowns.

2.7. Extension to other boundary conditions

In addition to the clamped – clamped boundary condition, a beam with clamped – simply supported boundary conditions can also be analyzed by the present method. A clamped edge is considered at \(y = 0\) and a simply supported edge at \(y = L\). Since the boundary condition given in Eq. (21b) has been relaxed, the function \(u_{y}\) is no longer forced to vanish at \(y = L\) and Eq. (38b) is no longer needed. This step reduces the available equations in \(M\) compared to the clamped – clamped case. In addition, \(u_{y, yr, \gamma, \psi}\) no longer has a discontinuity at \(y = L\) and it is equal to zero at this point. By substituting \(u_{yrm}(L) = 0\) in Eqs. (31), the following relation is obtained:

\[a_T = b_T
\]  
(40)

This step eliminates \(M\) unknowns, and thus the system remains determinate. For a simply supported beam, Eqs. (38a) and (38b) are no longer required, reducing the available equations in 2M compared to the clamped – clamped case. In addition, \(u_{y, yr, \gamma, \psi}\) no longer has discontinuities at \(y = 0, L\) and it is equal to zero at these points. By substituting \(u_{yrm}(0) = u_{yrm}(L) = 0\) in Eqs. (31), the following relation is obtained:

\[a_T = b_T = 0
\]  
(41)

This step eliminates 2M unknowns, and thus the system remains determinate. The remaining governing equations, given by Eqs. (36a–c), are the same as for a Navier-type solution. Consequently, the present method can be considered a generalization of the Navier solution.

3. Numerical results and discussion

3.1. Material properties and normalization

An orthotropic \((0/90^\circ)\) laminated square beam subjected to a uniform load is considered in the following numerical examples. The following material properties are used:

\[
\frac{E_z}{E_x} = 25, \quad \frac{G_{xy}}{E_x} = 1, \quad \frac{G_{xy}}{E_x} = 0.5
\]  
(42)

\[
\frac{G_{xy}}{E_x} = 0.2, \quad \nu_{xy} = 0.01, \quad \nu_{xz} = \nu_{yz} = 0.25
\]

where \(E_i\) are the Young’s modulus of elasticity, \(\nu_{ij}\) are the Poisson’s ratios and \(G_{ij}\) are the shear modulus of elasticity. The subscripts indicate the axes of the elastic constants. The displacement, stresses and geometric parameters are expressed in the following non-dimensional form:

\[
\bar{u}_z = 10^2 \times \frac{E_z h^3}{q_0 L^4} u_z, \quad \bar{u}_y = 10^3 \times \frac{E_y h^3}{q_0 L^4} u_y
\]

\[
\bar{\sigma}_{yy} = 10^{-1} \times \frac{\sigma_{yy}}{q_0}, \quad \bar{\sigma}_{zz} = \frac{\sigma_{zz}}{q_0}, \quad \bar{\sigma}_{yz} = \frac{\sigma_{yz}}{q_0}
\]

\[\text{Aspectratio} = \frac{L}{h}, \quad \bar{z} = \frac{z}{h}
\]  
(43)
The boundary conditions are denoted by the letters C and S. For example, C – S indicates a beam clamped at y = 0 and simply supported at y = L. Fig. 2 shows the location of the points of evaluation of the displacements and stresses provided in this paper.

3.2. Convergence analysis

Figs. 3 and 4 show the transverse displacement and axial stress of a C – C (0/90°) laminated beam as the number of trigonometric terms in the Fourier series is increased. The beam has an aspect ratio L/h = 10 and is subjected to uniform load in z = h/2. The discontinuities introduced in the displacement functions slow down the convergence of the Fourier series. For this reason, the convergence is much slower compared to an ordinary Navier-type solution. The order expansion N does not seem to greatly influence the speed of convergence, only the final result. Table 2 presents
numerical results for the displacements and stresses as the number of terms in the Fourier series is increased for N=4. The transverse normal stress $\tilde{\sigma}_{zz}$ is seen to converge slowly. At least 4 significant figures can be expected from the numerical results when the number of trigonometric terms is $p=10000$, except for the transverse stress $\tilde{\sigma}_{zz}$, and this number of terms is further used in the manuscript.

3.3. Clamped – clamped laminated beam

In order to assess the validity of the results, a 3D finite element solution for the static analysis of the laminated beam has been obtained using ANSYS commercial code. The 20-node brick element is used to model the beam. The mesh is such that doubling the elements yields a change lower than 0.05% in $(\tilde{\sigma}_y)_{\text{max}}$. 350,000 elements were used in order to obtain sufficiently accurate results. Table 3 presents values of displacements and stresses at the specified points of a C–C (0/90°) laminated beam by using the present model, and the corresponding results obtained by the 3D finite element solution. For a beam with $L/h=10$, close agreement is obtained for the transverse displacement, axial stress and axial displacement. Slightly higher deviation in transverse normal stress results between 3D finite element solution and the present model are observed. The accuracy of the transverse normal stress is higher for a beam with $L/h=5$ than for $L/h=10$. On the other hand, the axial stress has higher deviations for thicker beams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L/h</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\tilde{u}_z$</th>
<th>$\tilde{\sigma}_y$</th>
<th>$\tilde{\sigma}_{zz}$</th>
<th>$\tilde{u}_x$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FEM 3D</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>7.452</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>6.966</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>7.324</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>1.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=4</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>7.406</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>1.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>7.431</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>7.434</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>1.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>7.443</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>1.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FEM 3D</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>2.090</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>3.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>2.226</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>3.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=4</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td>2.052</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>4.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>2.285</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>4.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>2.288</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>4.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>2.081</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>4.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5 shows the distribution of transverse displacement across the thickness of a C–C (0/90°) beam with $L/h=5$ and 10. The order expansion is given by N and the corresponding 3D finite element solution is also plotted. As expected, more accurate solutions are obtained by using a higher order expansion. Fig. 6 shows the distribution of the axial displacement across the thickness of a C–C
C (0/90°) beam. In this case, accurate distributions are obtained by using an order expansion N = 5 or higher. Fig. 7 shows the distribution of the axial stress across the thickness of a C – C (0/90°) beam. For a beam with L/h = 10, accurate axial stresses are obtained for N = 4. On the other hand, for a thicker beam with L/h = 5 the error increases, and higher order expansions are required.

Fig. 8 shows the distribution of the transverse normal stress across the thickness of a C – C (0/90°) beam. While the other stresses and displacements are obtained more accurately for beams with higher aspect ratio, i.e. slender beams, accurate results for the transverse normal stress are obtained for beams with lower aspect ratio, i.e. for L/h = 5. Close agreement is obtained by using an order expansion N = 7. Fig. 9 shows the distribution of the transverse shear stress across the thickness of a C – C (0/90°) beam. The maximum shear stress is predicted accurately by using an order expansion N = 7.

3.4. Clamped – simply supported laminated beam

Table 4 presents values of displacement and stresses at certain points of a C – S (0/90°) laminated beam for different aspect ratios, as obtained by the present model and by a 3D finite element solution. Close agreement is obtained for the transverse and axial displacements, as well as for the axial stress. Figs. 10 and 11 show the distribution of the transverse displacement and transverse normal stress across the thickness of a C – S (0/90°). Similar trends as for C – C beams are observed, with the transverse normal stress in close agreement with the 3D finite element solution for a beam with L/h = 5.
4. Conclusions

An analytical solution for the bending of thick laminated beams with clamped boundary conditions at either of the beam's edges has been presented. Deformation theories of arbitrary order are considered using Carrera Unified Formulation (CUF). The governing equations are obtained by employing the principle of virtual work. In order to account for clamped or mixed boundary conditions at the beam's edges, the boundary discontinuous Fourier approach is used. The results are compared with a 3D finite element solution for validation.

The important conclusions that emerge from this paper can be summarized as follows:

(a) Accurate values of the axial and transverse displacement for clamped laminated beams can be obtained by the present model.
(b) The transverse normal stresses obtained by the present theory are not very accurate for long, slender beams. If required, these stresses can be obtained via the equations of equilibrium.
(c) The boundary discontinuous method can be considered a generalization of the Navier solution, being able to obtain analytical solutions for beams with clamped edges. For simply supported edges, the governing equations of the present method reduce to those of a Navier solution.
(d) In the case of clamped beams, the boundary discontinuous method requires a higher computational effort compared to Navier-type solutions, but it is much lower than the effort required for a 3D finite element solution.

Further studies need to be performed to assess the accuracy of the present model for the analysis of functionally graded and thin-walled beams.
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