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Abstract

Topology optimization is one of the most-used method to inversely determine the geometrical configurations of structures. In the current density method-based topology optimization, the design variable used to represent the structure was usually defined on three-dimensional domains or reduced two-dimensional planes, with the deficiency of the general two-dimensional manifolds. Therefore, this article focuses on developing the density method-based topology optimization on two-dimensional manifolds. In this developed method, material interpolation is implemented on a material parameter in the partial differential equation used to describe a physical field, when this physical field is defined on a two-dimensional manifold; the density variable is used to formulate a mixed boundary condition of a physical field and implement the penalization between two different types of boundary conditions, when this physical field is defined on a three-dimensional domain with its boundary conditions defined on the two-dimensional manifold corresponding the surface or interface of this three-dimensional domain. Based on the homeomorphic property of two-dimensional manifolds, several typical two-dimensional manifolds, e.g., sphere, torus, Möbius strip and Klein bottle, are included in the numerical tests. This method has been tested and demonstrated by the problems in the areas of soft matter, heat transfer and electromagnetics. The two-dimensional manifold and derived structural pattern composes a fiber bundle, and they are the base manifold and fiber of this fiber bundle, respectively; hence, this developed method is a topology optimization method of fiber bundles.
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1 Introduction

Topology optimization is a robust method used to inversely determine the structural configuration, which corresponds to the material distribution in a structure [1]. In contrast to designing devices by tuning a handful of structural parameters in size and shape optimization, topology optimization method utilizes the full-parameter space to design structures based on the user-desired performance. It is more flexible and robust, because of its low dependence on initial guess and implicit expression of the structures. Therefore, topology optimization can be currently regarded to be one of the most robust methodology for the inverse design of structures.
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Optimization of structural topology was investigated as early as 1904 for trusses by Michell [2]. Topology optimization was pioneered by Bendsøe and Kikuchi for elasticity [3], and then it was extended to a variety of areas, e.g., acoustics, electromagnetics, fluid dynamics and thermodynamics [4–31], to list the most prominent. Currently, the density method [6, 7] and level set method [32–35] have been widely used to implement the efficient gradient-based topology optimization. Several other methods have also been proposed and developed for the implementation of topology optimization, e.g., evolutionary techniques [36–38], moving morphable components [39, 40] and phase field method [41], to list the most prominent.

The density method was developed for design stiffness and compliance mechanisms [3–5], and it has been extended to multiple areas, e.g., acoustics, electromagnetics, fluidics, optics and thermodynamics [8–13], to list the most prominent. In those researches, the density variable used to represent the structure was usually defined on a three-dimensional (3D) domain in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) or reduced two-dimensional (2D) plane on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), with the deficiency of a general two-dimensional manifold (2-manifold), although topology optimization on 2-manifolds is significant because of the current developed additive manufacturing (e.g., 3D-printing) having effectively enlarged the structural-design space. Here, a 2-manifold is a topological space with its arbitrary interior point having a neighborhood homeomorphic to a sub-region of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \).

The level set method, pioneered by Osher and Sethian [42], accomplishes a change of topology by evolving and merging the zero contour of a level set function. This method provides a general approach to track the implicit interface between two phases, and it has been applied to shape and topology optimization [15, 32–35, 43–45], to list the most prominent. Recently, this method has been extended to implement the structural design on 2-manifolds based on the conformal geometry theory [47, 48]. One major advantage of the level set method lies in its accurate mathematical description of the structural boundary.

Compared to the level set method, the density method has the merits of efficient and robust convergency, weak dependence on the initial guess of the design variable, and capability on dealing with multiple constraints. Therefore, it is desired to implement the density method-based topology optimization on 2-manifolds.

The density method-base topology optimization on 2-manifolds can be categorized into two types: material interpolation is implemented on a material parameter in the partial differential equation (PDE) with the tangential gradient operator to describe a physical field, when this physical field is defined on a 2-manifold; the density variable is used to implement the penalization between two different types of boundary conditions and formulate a mixed boundary condition of a physical field, when this physical field is defined on a 3D domain and its boundary conditions are defined on a 2-manifold of codimension one in a 3D Euclidian space. In the second type, the 2-manifold is a boundary or interface of the 3D domain, which the definition domain of the physical field; and the density variable achieves a mixed type of the boundary condition on the 2-manifold: when the 2-manifold is the exterior surface of the 3D domain, it mixes the Dirichlet and Neumann types of boundary conditions; when the 2-manifold is an interior interface of a 3D domain, it mixes the no-jump and Dirichlet types of boundary conditions.

For the two types of topology optimization on 2-manifolds, a monolithic description of the corresponding variational problems is presented in Section 2, including the adjoint analysis and numerical implementation; to demonstrate this method, several test problems in the areas of soft matter, heat transfer and electromagnetics are constructed and implemented in Section 3. In the following, all the mathematical descriptions are performed in the Cartesian system.

### 2 Methodology

In this section, the topology optimization on 2-manifolds is implemented as follows, by using the density method.
2.1 2-manifold

According to the classification theorem [49], a 2-manifold without boundary is compact if every open cover of it has a finite subcover, and its family can be exhausted by the two infinite families \{S^2 (sphere), \mathbb{T}^2 (torus), \mathbb{T}^2 \# \mathbb{T}^2 (double torus), \cdots \} and \{\mathbb{P}^2 (projective plane), \mathbb{P}^2 \# \mathbb{P}^2 (Klein bottle), \cdots \}, where \# denotes the connected sum of two manifolds. A 2-manifold with boundary can be derived by removing an open disk from a 2-manifold without boundary. All 2-manifolds without boundary can be derived by gluing the basic 2-manifolds with boundaries (i.e. the disk, cylinder, Möbius strip). Structural surfaces usually are the orientable 2-manifolds (e.g. sphere), on which the normal vector can be defined globally; and structural interfaces can include the orientable 2-manifolds along with the non-orientable ones (e.g. Möbius strip), on which the normal vector can be defined locally instead of globally. Therefore, without losing generality, topology optimization in this article is demonstrated by implementing it on the 2-manifolds homeomorphic to sphere, torus, Möbius strip, and their connected sum or glued manifolds (Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Typical examples of 2-manifolds.](image)

2.2 Physical PDEs

In the density method-based topology optimization on a 2-manifold, a design variable, which is a relaxed binary distribution, is defined on this 2-manifold to represent the structure; and it is bounded in the typical interval \([0, 1]\), with 0 and 1 respectively representing two different material phases. A variational problem can be constructed by minimizing or maximizing a design objective used to evaluate a desired performance of the structure implicitly expressed on the 2-manifold. The physical field related with this structure can be described by a corresponding PDE. Then, this variational problem is a PDE constrained optimization problem. It is nonlinear and challenging to be solved directly. Therefore, the iterative approach is widely utilized. To ensure the monolithic convergence of the iterative approach, regularization based on a PDE filter and threshold projection is imposed on the design variable, with the projected design variable nominated as physical density. This iterative approach has the merits on tuning the feature size of the structure by controlling the filter radius and removing the gray area from the derived structural pattern.

For the case with the physical field defined on a 2-manifold, the physical PDE, used to describe the structural performance, can be expressed in a typical abstract form with material parameter interpolated by the physical density:

\[
\nabla_s \cdot [p(\gamma) \mathbf{g} (\nabla_s u, u)] = c_s, \text{ in } \Sigma_S \\
[p(\gamma) \mathbf{g} (\nabla_s u, u)] \cdot \mathbf{\tau} = c_b, \text{ on } \partial \Sigma_S \\
u = u_0, \text{ at } \mathcal{P} \subset \Sigma_S
\]

(1)

where \(u\) is the physical variable; \(\Sigma_S\) is the 2-manifold; \(c_s\) and \(c_b\) are known distributions defined on \(\Sigma_S\) and \(\partial \Sigma_S\), respectively; if \(\Sigma_S\) is treated as the 2-manifold of codimension one in an 3D Euclidian space, \(\nabla_s = \nabla - (\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{n}\) is the tangential gradient operator defined on \(\Sigma_S\), with \(\mathbf{n}\) representing unitary normal vector on \(\Sigma_S\); \(\mathbf{\tau}\) perpendicular to \(\partial \Sigma_S\) is the unitary outward tangential vector of \(\Sigma_S\); \(\mathcal{P} \subset \Sigma_S\) is a finite point set with known
physical variable $u_0$; $p\left( \hat{\gamma} \right)$ is material parameter interpolated by the physical density $\hat{\gamma} \in [0, 1]$, derived from sequential filter and projection of the design variable defined on $\Sigma_S$ [50–], $g \left( \nabla_s u, u \right)$ is a vector functional of $\nabla_s u$ and $u$. Here, $\hat{\gamma} : \Sigma_S \to [0, 1]$ is the fiber of a fiber bundle with $\Sigma_S$ as its base manifold. Based on the Green’s formula with tangential gradient operator [53], the physical PDE in equation (1) can be transformed into its weak form:

$$e \left( u; \hat{\gamma} \right) := \int_{\Sigma_S} -p \left( \hat{\gamma} \right) g \left( \nabla_s u, u \right) \cdot \nabla_s \hat{u} - c_s \hat{u} \, ds + \int_{\partial \Sigma_s} c_s \hat{u} \, d\ell = 0,$$

$$\forall \hat{u} \in \mathcal{H} \left( \Sigma_S \right)$$

(2)

where $\hat{u}$ is the test function of $u$; $\mathcal{H} \left( \Sigma_S \right) = \left\{ u \in L^2 \left( \Sigma_S \right) \left| \nabla_s u \in \left( L^2 \left( \Sigma_S \right) \right)^3 \right. \right\}$ is the second-order Sobolev space on $\Sigma_S$, with $L^2 \left( \Sigma_S \right)$ representing the second-order Lebesgue integrable functional space on $\Sigma_S$; $ds$ and $d\ell$ are the corresponding Riemann metrics on $\Sigma_S$ and $\partial \Sigma_S$, respectively.

For the case with the physical field defined on a volume domain and design variable defined on the 2-manifold corresponding to the boundary surface of this volume domain, the physical PDE can be expressed in a typical abstract form as

$$\nabla \cdot \left[ p g \left( \nabla u, u \right) \right] = c_s, \text{ in } \Omega$$

$$\left[ p g \left( \nabla_s u, u \right) \right] \cdot n = \alpha \left( \hat{\gamma} \right) (u - u_d), \text{ on } \Sigma_S = \partial \Omega$$

$$u = u_0, \text{ at } P \subseteq \Omega$$

(3)

where $u_d$ is the known physical variable on the structure defined on $\Sigma_S$; $\Omega$ is the open and bounded volume domain with Lipschitz boundary; $\alpha \left( \hat{\gamma} \right)$ is the density variable-based interpolation used to implement the penalization between Neumann and Dirichlet types of boundary conditions. Based on this density variable-based interpolation, the mixed boundary condition is achieved as that in equation (3). When the physical density $\hat{\gamma}$ takes on the value 0, $\alpha$ is valued to be large enough with ensuring the dominance of the Dirichlet term $u - u_d$; meanwhile, the mixed boundary condition degenerates into a Neumann type, when $\alpha$ is valued to be 0 with $\hat{\gamma}$ taking on the value 1. Sequentially, the structural pattern can be determined with the known physical variable $u_d$ on it. The physical PDE in equation (3) can be transformed into its weak form as

$$e \left( u; \hat{\gamma} \right) := \int_{\Omega} -p g \left( \nabla u, u \right) \cdot \nabla \hat{u} \, d\Omega + \int_{\Sigma_S} \alpha \left( \hat{\gamma} \right) (u - u_d) \, \hat{u} \, ds = 0, \forall \hat{u} \in \mathcal{H} \left( \Omega \right)$$

(4)

where $\mathcal{H} \left( \Omega \right) = \left\{ u \in L^2 \left( \Omega \right) \left| \nabla u \in \left( L^2 \left( \Omega \right) \right)^3 \right. \right\}$ is the first-order Hilbert space defined on $\Omega$. In this case, when the design variable is changed to be defined on an interface of the volume domain, the typical abstract form of the physical PDE can be

$$\nabla \cdot \left[ p g \left( \nabla u, u \right) \right] = c_s, \text{ in } \Omega$$

$$\left[ p g \left( \nabla_s u, u \right) \right] \cdot n = \alpha \left( \hat{\gamma} \right) (u - u_d), \text{ on } \Sigma_S \hookrightarrow \Omega$$

$$u = u_d, \text{ at } P \subseteq \Sigma_S$$

$$u = u_0, \text{ on } \partial \Omega$$

(5)

where $\left[ \cdot \right]$ represents the local jump of a variable across $\Sigma_S$ embedded in $\Omega$. Correspondingly, the weak form of the physical PDE is

$$e \left( u; \hat{\gamma} \right) := \int_{\Omega} -p g \left( \nabla u, u \right) \cdot \nabla \hat{u} \, d\Omega + \int_{\Sigma_S} \alpha \left( \hat{\gamma} \right) (u - u_d) \, \hat{u} \, ds = 0, \forall \hat{u} \in \mathcal{H} \left( \Omega \right)$$

(6)

It is noted that the typical abstract forms of physical PDEs are expressed with divergence operator, and they can be directly transformed into the forms with curl operator in the following numerical examples of electromagnetics.
2.3 Regularization

The physical density is derived by sequentially implementing filter and projection operations of the design variable. For filter operation of the design variable, it is implemented by solving the PDE defined on the 2-manifold [50]
\[
\nabla_S \cdot (-r^2 \nabla_{S} \tilde{\gamma}) + \tilde{\gamma} = \gamma, \text{ on } \Sigma_S \\
- r^2 \nabla_{S} \tilde{\gamma} \cdot \tau = 0, \text{ at } \partial \Sigma_S
\]
with the corresponding weak form:
- find $\tilde{\gamma} \in H(\Omega)$ satisfying
\[
f(\tilde{\gamma}; \gamma) := \int_{\Sigma_S} r^2 \nabla_{S} \tilde{\gamma} \cdot \nabla_{S} \tilde{\gamma} + \tilde{\gamma}^2 - \gamma \tilde{\gamma} \, ds = 0, \forall \gamma \in H(\Sigma_S)
\]
where $\gamma \in L^2(\Sigma_S)$ is the design variable; $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the filtered design variable; $\hat{\gamma}$ is the test function for $\tilde{\gamma}$; $r$ is the radius of the PDE filter. The filtered design variable is projected by the threshold projection [51,52], to derive the physical density
\[
\hat{\gamma} = \frac{\tanh (\beta \xi) + \tanh (\beta (\tilde{\gamma} - \xi))}{\tanh (\beta \xi) + \tanh (\beta (1 - \xi))}
\]
where $\beta$ and $\xi$ are the projection parameters, and their values are chosen based on numerical experiments [52].

It is noted that the 2-manifold and the physical density defined on it composes a fiber bundle, where $\Sigma_S$ is its base manifold and $\hat{\gamma} : \Sigma_S \to [0,1]$ is the its fiber. This fiber bundle can be expressed as $(\Sigma_S \times \hat{\gamma} (\Sigma_S), \Sigma_S, proj_1, \hat{\gamma} (\Sigma_S))$, with the natural projection $proj_1 : \Sigma_S \times \hat{\gamma} (\Sigma_S) \to \Sigma_S$ satisfying
\[
proj_1 (x, \hat{\gamma} (x)) = x, \forall x \in \Sigma_S.
\]

2.4 Variational problem

Based on the above introduction, the variational problem for topology optimization on 2-manifolds can be constructed in the form of an optimization problem constrained by PDEs defined on a 2-manifold or volume domain with this 2-manifold as its boundary or interface. It can be described in the following abstract form:

find $\gamma (\Sigma_S) \in [0,1]$, for fiber bundle $(\Sigma_S \times \gamma (\Sigma_S), \Sigma_S, proj_1, \gamma (\Sigma_S))$, to minimize $J (u; \gamma)$ constrained by
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{subject to } & e (u; \bar{\gamma}) = 0 \quad (\text{Physical PDE}) \\
f (\bar{\gamma}; \gamma) = 0 \quad (\text{PDE filter}) \\
\hat{\gamma} &= \frac{\tanh (\beta \xi) + \tanh (\beta (\bar{\gamma} - \xi))}{\tanh (\beta \xi) + \tanh (\beta (1 - \xi))} \quad (\text{Threshold projection}) \\
\int_{\Sigma_S} \frac{1}{|\Sigma_S|} \hat{\gamma} \, ds - V_f & \leq 10^{-3} \quad (\text{Area constraint})
\end{align*}
\]
where $J : H(\Sigma_S) \times H(\Sigma_S) \to \mathbb{R}$ or $H(\Omega) \times H(\Sigma_S) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded continuous mapping operator; $V_f \in (0,1)$ is the area fraction of the structure on the 2-manifold with a admissible tolerance $10^{-3}$; $|\Sigma_S|$ is the area of the 2-manifold $\Sigma_S$.

2.5 Adjoint analysis

The adjoint analysis can be implemented to derive the adjoint derivative of the variational problem and define the descent direction of the design objective for the iterative solution procedure. For the PDE used to describe a physical field, common situations are that $e$ is continuously Fréchet-differentiable; $e_u (u; \gamma)$ is a linear operator and it has the bounded inverse. According to the implicit function theorem [54], $e (u; \gamma) = 0$ locally defines a continuously Fréchet-differentiable $\gamma \mapsto u (\gamma)$ with the following Fréchet derivative:
\[
u_{\gamma} (\hat{\gamma}) = -e_u^{-1} (u; \gamma) e_{\gamma} (u; \hat{\gamma})
\]
The PDE filter defines a continuously Fréchet-differentiable \( \gamma \mapsto \tilde{\gamma}(\gamma) \) with the following Fréchet derivative:

\[
\tilde{\gamma}(\gamma) = -f_\gamma^{-1}(\tilde{\gamma}; \gamma) \quad J_\gamma
\]

Then, the Gâteaux derivative of \( J \) is

\[
(J', t)_{L^2(\Sigma_S), L^2(\Sigma_S)} = (J_u, u \tilde{\gamma} \tilde{\gamma}_t)_{H^1(\Omega), H(\Omega)} + \langle J_\gamma, \tilde{\gamma}_t \rangle_{H(\Sigma_S), H(\Sigma_S)}
\]

\[
= \langle \tilde{\gamma}_t, \tilde{\gamma}_t \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma_S), L^2(\Sigma_S)}
\]

\[
= (-f_\gamma^{-1})^* \tilde{\gamma} (e_u^{-1})^* J_u + J_\gamma, \quad J \in L^2(\Sigma_S)
\]

where * denotes the adjoint of an operator; \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) represents the dual pairing between a functional space and its dual. Under the precondition that \( J \) is Fréchet-differentiable, the weak-form adjoint equations and adjoint derivative can be derived from its Gâteaux derivative, according to the Kurash-Kuhn-Tucker condition [55].

When the physical field is defined on a 2-manifold, \( e(u; \tilde{\gamma}) \) can include the terms of surface-integrals on \( \Sigma_S \) and curve-integral on \( \partial \Sigma_S \); then, it is expressed to be the sum of the corresponding terms as

\[
e(u; \tilde{\gamma}) = e^{\Sigma_S}(u; \tilde{\gamma}) + e^{\partial \Sigma_S}(u)
\]

By setting

\[
\mu := -(e_u^{-1})^* J_u = (e_u^{\Sigma_S} + e_u^{\partial \Sigma_S})^{-1} J_u,
\]

\[
\nu := -(f_\gamma^{-1})^* \tilde{\gamma}_t J_\gamma = (f_\gamma^{-1})^* \tilde{\gamma}_t J_\gamma
\]

the adjoint equations can be obtained as:

- find \( \mu \in H(\Sigma_S) \) and \( \nu \in H(\Sigma_S) \), satisfying

\[
\langle (e_u^{\Sigma_S} + e_u^{\partial \Sigma_S}) \mu, v \rangle_{H(\Sigma_S), H(\Sigma_S)} = \langle -J_u, v \rangle_{H(\Sigma_S), H(\Sigma_S)}, \quad \forall v \in H(\Sigma_S)
\]

\[
\langle f_\gamma^\ast \nu, y \rangle_{H(\Sigma_S), H(\Sigma_S)} = \langle -J_\gamma \tilde{\gamma}_t, y \rangle_{H(\Sigma_S), H(\Sigma_S)}, \quad \forall y \in H(\Sigma_S)
\]

where \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) are the adjoint variables of \( u \) and \( \tilde{\gamma} \), respectively. And the weak-form adjoint derivative of \( J \) can be derived as

\[
(J', t)_{L^2(\Sigma_S), L^2(\Sigma_S)} = \langle f_\gamma^\ast \nu, J_\gamma \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma_S), L^2(\Sigma_S)} \quad \forall t \in L^2(\Sigma_S)
\]

with the adjoint variables \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) solved from equation 17.

When the physical field is defined on a volume domain, \( e(u; \tilde{\gamma}) \) includes the terms of volume-integral on \( \Omega \) and surface-integrals on \( \Sigma_S \); then, it is expressed to be the sum of the corresponding terms as

\[
e(u; \tilde{\gamma}) = e^\Omega(u) + e^{\Sigma_S}(u; \tilde{\gamma})
\]

By setting

\[
\mu := -(e_u^{-1})^* J_u = (e_u^{\Omega} + e_u^{\Sigma_S})^{-1} J_u \quad \text{and} \quad \nu := -(f_\gamma^{-1})^* \tilde{\gamma}_t J_\gamma
\]

the adjoint equations can be obtained as:

- find \( \mu \in H(\Omega) \) and \( \nu \in H(\Sigma_S) \), satisfying

\[
\langle (e_u^{\Omega} + e_u^{\Sigma_S}) \mu, v \rangle_{H(\Omega), H(\Omega)} = \langle -J_u, v \rangle_{H(\Omega), H(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in H(\Omega)
\]

\[
\langle f_\gamma^\ast \nu, y \rangle_{H(\Sigma_S), H(\Sigma_S)} = \langle -J_\gamma \tilde{\gamma}_t, y \rangle_{H(\Sigma_S), H(\Sigma_S)}, \quad \forall y \in H(\Sigma_S)
\]

where \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) are the adjoint variables of \( u \) and \( \tilde{\gamma} \), respectively. And the weak-form adjoint derivative of \( J \) can be derived in the same form as that in equation 18 with the adjoint variables \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) solved from equation 20.

Similarly, for \( V = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_S} \tilde{\gamma} \, ds \) in the area constraint, the weak-form adjoint derivative of \( V \) can be derived to be

\[
(V', t)_{L^2(\Sigma_S), L^2(\Sigma_S)} = \langle f_\gamma^\ast \nu, t \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma_S), L^2(\Sigma_S)}, \quad \forall t \in L^2(\Sigma_S)
\]

with the adjoint variable \( \nu \) solved from the adjoint equation in the weak form:
• find $\nu \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S)$ satisfying
  $$\langle f^*_v \nu, y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S), \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S)} = (-V_{\gamma} \tilde{\gamma}_y, y)_{\mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S), \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S)}, \forall y \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S)$$ (22)

Based on the derived adjoint derivatives with adjoint variables solved from the corresponding adjoint equations, the design variable can be iteratively updated.

### 2.6 Numerical implementation

By using an iterative approach, the design variable is penalized and evolved into a binary distribution on the 2-manifold. The iterative approach is implemented as outlined by the pseudo codes in Table 1. The surface finite element method is utilized to solve the relevant PDEs and corresponding adjoint equations defined on a 2-manifold [56]. And it can be implemented by choosing the a software-package including a surface finite element solver. In this iterative approach, the projection parameter $\beta$ with initial value 1 is doubled after every 30 iterations, and $\xi$ is set to be 0.5; the loop for solving the variational problem in equation (11) is stopped when the maximal iteration number is reached, or the averaged variation of the design objective in continuous 5 iterations and the residual of the area constraint are simultaneously less than the specified tolerance $10^{-3}$; and the design variable is updated using the method of moving asymptotes [57], which has the merits on dealing with multiple integral constraints and bound constraint of the design variable.

Table 1: Pseudo codes for the iterative solution of topology optimization on 2-manifolds.

| Choose $r, V_f, n_{sub}^{max}$ and the other related parameters; |
| Set $i \leftarrow 1, \gamma \leftarrow V_f, n_{sub} \leftarrow 1, \xi \leftarrow 0.5$ and $\beta \leftarrow 1; |
| loop |
| Derive $\bar{\gamma}$ by filtering and projecting $\gamma$, and evaluate $V$; |
| Solve $u$ from physical PDE, evaluate $J$, and set $J_{n_{sub}} \leftarrow J$; |
| Solve $\mu$ and $\nu$ from adjoint equations for design objective, and evaluate $J'$; |
| Solve $\nu$ from the adjoint equation for area constraint, and evaluate $V'$; |
| Update $\gamma$ based on $J'$ and $V'$; |
| if $\text{mod}(n_{sub}, n_{upt}) = 0$ |
| $\beta \leftarrow 2\beta$; |
| end(if) |
| if $(n_{sub} = n_{max}^{sub})$ or $(\beta = 2^{10}, \frac{1}{5} \sum_{m=0}^{4} |J_{n_{sub}} - J_{n_{sub} - m}| / J_0 \leq 10^{-3},$ and $|V - V_f| \leq 10^{-3})$ |
| break; |
| end(if) |
| $n_{sub} \leftarrow n_{sub} + 1$ |
| end(loop) |

In the loop, $n_{sub}$ is the loop-index, $n_{sub}^{max}$ is the maximal value of $n_{sub}$, $n_{upt}$ is the updating interval of the projection parameter $\beta$, and $J_{n_{sub}}$ is the objective value corresponding to the loop-index $n_{sub}$.

### 3 Test problems

In this section, the first type of topology optimization on 2-manifolds is demonstrated by the micro-textures used to achieve the robust Cassie-Baxter wettability on the surfaces in the form of 2-manifolds; and the second type is demonstrated by topology optimization of heat-sink patterns for heat transfer and perfect-conductor patterns for electromagnetics.
3.1 Microtextures for Cassie-Baxter wettability

Wettability is an important aspect of soft matter. Constructing artificial microtextures on a solid surface with complicated geometries can be interesting and attractive for stable hydrophobic wettability. Recently, a novel and efficient mathematical method has been introduced to inversely design microtextures on a flat solid surface, based on topology optimization instead of bio-inspiration and physical-intuition. On a solid surface, the microtextures can support two modes of hydrophobic performance, i.e. Wenzel mode with the liquid completely filling the microtextures and Cassie-Baxter mode with vapour pockets trapped in the microtextures. The Cassie-Baxter mode can be changed to the Wenzel mode, when the liquid is physically pressed. Therefore, it is desired to use reasonable microtextures to keep the Cassie-Baxter mode from transition and enhance the stability of hydrophobic wettability. On the surface of a solid with complicated geometry, the micro-texture patterns are defined on a corresponding 2-manifold. In this case, the mean curvature of the liquid/vapor interface supported by the micro-textures can be regarded to be a physical field defined on the 2-manifold. In this case, the mean curvature of the liquid/vapor interface supported by the micro-textures on the 2-manifold can be described by the dimensionless Young-Laplace equation:

\[ \nabla_s \cdot \left( \frac{\nabla_s \bar{z}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{L}{z_0}\right)^2 + |\nabla_s \bar{z}|^2}} \right) = 1 - 2\bar{\sigma}_l \kappa, \quad \text{in } \Sigma_S \]
\[ \bar{\sigma} \frac{\nabla_s \bar{z}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{L}{z_0}\right)^2 + |\nabla_s \bar{z}|^2}} \cdot \tau = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial \Sigma_S \]
\[ \bar{z} = 0, \quad \text{at } P \]

where \( \bar{z} = z/z_0 \) is the normalized displacement of the liquid/vapor interface relative to the 2-manifold \( \Sigma_S \), with \( z_0 \) representing the magnitude of the original displacement \( z \); \( L \) is the characteristic size of a particle; \( \bar{\sigma} = \sigma/(LP) \) is the dimensionless surface tension, with \( \sigma \) representing the surface tension and \( P \) representing the static pressure at the liquid/vapor interface; \( \bar{\sigma}_l \) is the dimensionless surface tension of the liquid; \( \kappa \) is the mean curvature of the 2-manifold \( \Sigma_S \). To ensure the uniqueness of the solution, the liquid/vapor interface is constrained at a specified point set \( P \) localized on the 2-manifold.

For the wetting behavior in the Cassie-Baxter mode with the liquid/vapor interface, the reasonability of the micro-textures can be measured by the robustness of the liquid/vapor interface. Equivalently, this robustness can be measured by the liquid-bulge volume enclosed by the convex liquid/vapor interface and untextured particle-surface. Therefore, the topology optimization of the micro-textures is implemented by minimizing the normalized liquid-bulge volume expressed to be

\[ J = \frac{1}{|\Sigma_S|^2} \int_{\Sigma_S} \bar{z}^2 \, ds \]

which is constrained by an area constraint with the specified area fraction \( V_f \). In this topology optimization, the physical density is used to interpolate the dimensionless surface tension as

\[ \bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma}_l + (\bar{\sigma}_s - \bar{\sigma}_l) \frac{1 - \bar{\gamma}}{1 + 10^4 \bar{\gamma}} \]

where \( \bar{\sigma}_s \) is set to be \( 10^5 \sup_{x \in \Sigma_S} [1 - 2\bar{\sigma}_l \kappa(x)] \) to approximate the liquid/solid interface.

Based on the adjoint analysis method introduced in Section 2.5, the adjoint derivative of \( J \) is derived as

\[ \langle J', t \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma_S), L^2(\Sigma_S)} = -\int_{\Sigma_S} \bar{\gamma}_a t \, ds, \quad \forall t \in L^2(\Sigma_S) \]

with the adjoint variable \( \bar{\gamma}_a \) of \( \bar{\gamma} \) derived from the following adjoint equations:
• find \( \hat{z}_a \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S) \) with \( \hat{z}_a = 0 \) at \( \mathcal{P} \), satisfying

\[
\int_{\Sigma_S} \frac{2}{|\Sigma_S|^2} \hat{z}_a \cdot \nabla x \hat{z}_a - \sigma \left( \frac{\nabla_s \hat{z}_a \cdot \nabla_s \hat{z}_a}{(L/z_0)^2 + |\nabla_s \hat{z}|^2} + \sigma \frac{(\nabla_s \hat{z} \cdot \nabla_s \hat{z}_a) (\nabla_s \hat{z} \cdot \nabla_s \hat{z}_a)}{(L/z_0)^2 + |\nabla_s \hat{z}|^2} \right) ds = 0,
\]

\[\forall \hat{z}_a \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S)\]  

(27)

• find \( \hat{\gamma}_a \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S) \), satisfying

\[
\int_{\Sigma_S} -r^2 \nabla_s \hat{\gamma}_a \cdot \nabla_s \hat{\gamma}_a + \hat{\gamma}_a \hat{\gamma}_a - \sigma \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \gamma} \frac{\nabla_s \hat{\gamma} \cdot \nabla_s \hat{\gamma}_a}{(L/z_0)^2 + |\nabla_s \hat{\gamma}|^2} \hat{\gamma}_a ds = 0,
\]

\[\forall \hat{\gamma}_a \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S)\]  

(28)

where \( \hat{z}_a \) is the adjoint variable of \( \bar{z} \). For \( V = \frac{1}{|\Sigma_S|} \int_{\Sigma_S} \hat{\gamma} ds \) in the area constraint, the adjoint derivative is

\[
\langle V', t \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma_S), L^2(\Sigma_S)} = -\int_{\Sigma_S} \hat{\gamma}_a \cdot t ds, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Sigma_S)
\]

(29)

with the adjoint variable \( \hat{\gamma}_a \) derived from:

• find \( \hat{\gamma}_a \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S) \), satisfying

\[
\int_{\Sigma_S} \frac{1}{|\Sigma_S|} \frac{\partial \hat{\gamma}_a}{\partial \gamma} ds + r^2 \nabla_s \hat{\gamma}_a \cdot \nabla_s \hat{\gamma}_a + \hat{\gamma}_a \hat{\gamma}_a ds = 0, \quad \forall \hat{\gamma}_a \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_S).
\]

(30)

After adjoint analysis, the topology optimization problem is solved by the numerical implementation procedure introduced in Section 2.6.

In the numerical examples, the micro-texture optimization is firstly performed for the sphere- and torus-shaped surfaces. By setting the relevant parameters to be characteristic size \( L = 10 \mu m \), the dimensionless surface tension \( \sigma_1 = 10^2 \), vertical-coordinate magnitude \( z_0 = 1 \mu m \), area fraction \( V_f = 0.2 \), the maximal iteration number \( n_{\text{max}} = 315 \) and updating interval \( n_{\text{updt}} = 30 \), the micro-textures are derived for different choices of points in the point set \( \mathcal{P} \). For the sphere, the surface is divided by regular spherical-triangles (Figure 2i) and spherical-quadrangles (Figure 3i), with \( \mathcal{P} \) set as the central points of these spherical-polygons. For the torus, the surface is divided by two sets of circles (Figure 2d and 3d), with \( \mathcal{P} \) set as the intersection points of these circles. Then, the patterns of the micro-textures are derived as shown in Figure 2b and 3b, with their corresponding supported liquid/vapor interfaces shown in Figure 2c and 3c. In Figure 2i and 3i, the derived patterns and their supporting liquid/vapor interfaces are demonstrated deformedly. The convergent histories of the normalized optimization objective and area constraints are shown in Figure 2 and 3, including the iterative snapshots for the physical density. From those convergent histories and iterative snapshots, one can confirm the robust performance of the topology optimization procedures. To further demonstrate the flexibility of this method, the 2-manifold is set to be a Möbius ring, derived by gluing three Möbius strips (Figure 4i), where the point set \( \mathcal{P} \) is set as the six points demonstrated in the cutaway view (Figure 4b); and the micro-textures are derived as shown in Figure 4c, with their supporting liquid/vapor interface shown in Figure 4l.

In Table 2, the liquid-bulge volumes are cross compared for the derived micro-textures on the sphere and torus surfaces respectively for the cases with dimensionless surface tension \( 10^2 \) and \( 10^3 \), where the point set \( \mathcal{P} \) is set to be the same as that in Figure 2 and 3. From a cross comparison of the values in every row of the sub-tables in Table 2, one can confirm the improvement of the micro-textures corresponding to the derived patterns.

When a solid object enclosed by a 2-manifold is textured using a pattern derived by the outlined topology optimization method, the three-phase contact lines of the liquid/vapour interface can be anchored at the geometrically singular corners formed by the top and side walls of the micro-textures. This anchoring effect is because of the hysteresis of contact angle. Then, the supported liquid/vapor interface is in the
Figure 2: (a-c) Stereo and vertical views of the sphere surface divided by regular spherical-triangles, topology optimized pattern of the micro-textures, and normalized displacement of the liquid/vapor interface supporting by the topology optimized micro-textures; (d-e) deformed demonstration of the derived patterns and their supporting liquid/vapor interfaces; (f) convergent histories of the normalized optimization objective and area constraint, including the iterative snapshots for the physical density.

Figure 3: (a-c) Stereo and vertical views of the sphere surface divided by regular spherical-quadrangles, topology optimized pattern of the micro-textures, and normalized displacement of the liquid/vapor interface supporting by the topology optimized micro-textures; (d-e) deformed demonstration of the derived patterns and their supporting liquid/vapor interfaces.
Figure 4: (a-c) Stereo, vertical and front views of the torus surface divided by the demonstrated circles, topology optimized pattern of the micro-textures, and normalized displacement of the liquid/vapor interface supporting by the topology optimized micro-textures; (d-e) deformed demonstration of the derived patterns and their supporting liquid/vapor interfaces; (f) convergent histories of the normalized optimization objective and area constraint, including the iterative snapshots for the physical density.

Figure 5: (a-c) Stereo, vertical and front views of the torus surface divided by the demonstrated circles, topology optimized pattern of the micro-textures, and normalized displacement of the liquid/vapor interface supporting by the topology optimized micro-textures; (d-e) deformed demonstration of the derived patterns and their supporting liquid/vapor interfaces.
Figure 6: (a) Sketch for gluing three Möbius strips to derive a Möbius ring; (b) demonstration of the points in the point set \( P \), from the cutaway view of the Möbius ring; (c-d) deformed demonstration of the derived patterns on the Möbius ring and their supporting liquid/vapor interfaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Sphere</th>
<th>(b) Torus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{\sigma}_l = 10^2 )</td>
<td>( 2.97 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>( 9.78 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{\sigma}_l = 10^3 )</td>
<td>( 9.43 \times 10^{-8} )</td>
<td>( 2.04 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{\sigma}_l = 10^2 )</td>
<td>( 1.27 \times 10^{-5} )</td>
<td>( 1.13 \times 10^{-4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{\sigma}_l = 10^3 )</td>
<td>( 4.55 \times 10^{-8} )</td>
<td>( 1.10 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Liquid-bulge volumes of the liquid/vapor interface supported by the derived micro-textures on the sphere and torus surfaces respectively for the cases with dimensionless surface tension \( 10^2 \) and \( 10^3 \), where the optimal entries for the derived micro-textures are noted in bold.
Cassie-Baxter mode. In this mode, vapor pockets are enclosed in the micro-textures. Therefore, the suspension of a textured particle can be achieved by a small effective density corresponding to a reasonable texture height.

If the difference between the static pressure inside and outside the liquid is large enough to make the contact angle between the liquid/vapour interface and side wall of the micro-textures reach its critical advancing value, the liquid/vapour interface will burst and transition will occur from the Cassie-Baxter mode to the Wenzel mode. As the contact angle evolves towards its critical advancing value, the robustness of the Cassie-Baxter mode will be weakened; simultaneously, the liquid/vapour interface supported by the micro-textures will become more convex, and the liquid-bulge volume held by the liquid/vapour interface will become larger. This will increase the effective density of the textured particle and weaken the suspension robustness. Therefore, reasonable micro-textures on a rough surface can keep the Cassie-Baxter mode from transition, enhance the stability of particle-suspension by reducing the convexity of the liquid/vapour interface, by keeping the contact angle aloof of its crucial advancing value, and by achieving a corresponding lower effective density.

3.2 Heat sink for heat transfer problem

The heat transfer problem has been investigated by the topology optimization method to find the layout of the heat conductive materials [64–66] and optimal match of the structural topology and heat source [67]. It is still deficient to find a pattern on a general 2-manifold of heat sink to satisfy a desired heat transfer performance. Then, this section is focused on the solution of such deficiency by implementing topology optimization on 2-manifolds. For a heat transfer problem, the temperature distribution in a 3D domain can be mathematically described to be

\[-\nabla \cdot (k \nabla T) = Q, \text{ in } \Omega\]

\[T = T_d, \text{ on } \Gamma_d\]

\[-k \nabla T \cdot n = 0, \text{ on } \Gamma_n\]

\[T = T_0, \text{ at } \mathcal{P}\]  \hspace{1cm} (31)

where \(k\) is the thermal conductivity; \(T\) is temperature; \(Q\) is the heat source; \(\Gamma_d\) is heat sink with known temperature \(T_d\) and it is attributed to the Dirichlet type; \(\Gamma_n\) is the insulation boundary, attributed to the Neumann type; \(\Gamma_d\) and \(\Gamma_n\) satisfy \(\Gamma_d \cup \Gamma_n = \Sigma_M\); \(\Omega\) is the domain enclosed by \(\Sigma_M\); \(T_0\) is the known temperature at the points in the point set \(\mathcal{P}\). When the design domain is set to be \(\Sigma_S = \Sigma_M\), the topology optimization problem is to determine the heat-sink distribution \(\Gamma_d (\gamma = 0)\) and insulation distribution \(\Gamma_n (\gamma = 1)\) on \(\Sigma_S\). Then, the material interpolation is implemented on \(\Sigma_S\) defined with the mixed boundary condition:

\[-k \nabla T \cdot n = \alpha (\tilde{\gamma}) (T - T_d), \text{ on } \Sigma_S\]  \hspace{1cm} (32)

where \(\alpha (\tilde{\gamma})\) is the penalization function of the physical density, and it is expressed as

\[\alpha (\tilde{\gamma}) = \alpha_{\text{max}} \frac{q (1 - \tilde{\gamma})}{q + \tilde{\gamma}}\]  \hspace{1cm} (33)

with \(\alpha_{\text{max}}\) and \(q\) respectively representing the penalization parameter and the parameter used to tune the convexity of the penalization. The value of \(\alpha_{\text{max}}\) should be chosen to be large enough to ensure the domination of the term \(T - T_d\) in equation 32, when the physical density takes on the value 0; meanwhile, equation 32 degenerates into the insulation boundary condition, when the physical density takes on the value 1. Based on numerical experiments, \(\alpha_{\text{max}}\) and \(q\) are set to be \(10^4\) and \(10^{-6}\), respectively. Then, the weak form of the physical PDE in the variational problem (equation 11) is:

- find \(T \in \mathcal{H} (\Omega)\) with \(T = T_0\) at \(\mathcal{P}\), satisfying

\[\int_{\Omega} k \nabla T \cdot \nabla \tilde{T} - Q \tilde{T} \, dv + \int_{\Sigma_S} \alpha (T - T_d) \tilde{T} \, ds = 0, \forall \tilde{T} \in \mathcal{H} (\Omega)\]  \hspace{1cm} (34)

where \(\tilde{T}\) is the test function of \(T\); \(\mathcal{H} (\Omega)\) is the second order Sobolev space on \(\Omega\).
The distribution of the heat sink on $\Sigma_S$ is to minimize the thermal compliance

$$J = \int_{\Omega} k \nabla T \cdot \nabla T \, d\Omega \quad (35)$$

Based on the adjoint analysis method introduced in Section 2.5, the adjoint derivative of $J$ is derived as

$$\langle J', t \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma_S), L^2(\Sigma_S)} = -\int_{\Sigma_S} \tilde{\gamma}_a t \, ds, \ \forall t \in L^2(\Sigma_S) \quad (36)$$

with the adjoint variable $\tilde{\gamma}_a$ derived by sequentially solving the following adjoint equations:

- find $T_a \in H(\Omega)$ with $T_a = 0$ on $\mathcal{P}$, satisfying
  $$\int_{\Omega} 2k \nabla T \cdot \nabla \tilde{T}_a + k \nabla T_a \cdot \nabla \tilde{T}_a \, dv + \int_{\Sigma_S} a T_a \tilde{T}_a \, ds = 0, \ \forall \tilde{T}_a \in H(\Omega) \quad (37)$$

- find $\tilde{\gamma}_a \in H(\Sigma_S)$ satisfying
  $$\int_{\Sigma_S} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \gamma} \tilde{\gamma}_a \, ds + r^2 \nabla_s \tilde{\gamma}_a \cdot \nabla_s \tilde{\gamma}_a + \tilde{\gamma}_a d(T - T_d) \tilde{T}_a \, ds = 0, \ \forall \tilde{T}_a \in H(\Sigma_S) \quad (38)$$

where $T_a$ is the adjoint variables of $T$. For the area constraint, the adjoint derivative and adjoint equation are the same as that in equations 29 and 30.

Based on the numerical implementation procedure in Section 2.6, the heat sink is designed by implementing topology optimization on 2-manifolds. At first, the computational domain $\Omega$ is set to be the volume domains respectively with the genus 0 and 1, where the corresponding typical 2-manifolds are sphere and torus (Figure 1a and 1b). The coordinate basis is set at the centers of the sphere and torus, where the radius of the sphere is 1, the inner radius and outer radii of the torus are respectively 3 and 4. For these two 2-manifolds, the thermal conductivity is set to be 1, the temperature of the heat sink $T_d$ and known point-temperature $T_0$ are set to be 0, the heat source is set to be $Q = 1/\left(1 + x^2\right)$, the area fractions are respectively set to be 0.75 and 0.7. For the sphere, the point set $\mathcal{P}$ is set to be the vertexes of a cube with its center localized at the sphere center and a vertex at $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$; for the torus, it is set to be $\{(-1.65, 0, 0), (0, 1.25, 0.4), (0.85, 0, 0), (0, -1.25, -0.4)\}$. Then, by setting the maximal iteration number $n_{\text{max}}^{\text{sub}} = 200$ and updating interval $n_{\text{up}} = 40$, the topology optimized patterns of the heat sink are derived as shown in Figure 7 and 8, including their corresponding convergent histories and snapshots for the evolution of the physical density. From the convergent histories, the robustness of the topology optimization on 2-manifolds can be confirmed for the heat transfer problem. The temperature distribution in the cross-sections of the volume domains are shown in Figure 2 and 3. The results show that the heat insulations are localized at the parts of the manifolds closest to the zero-temperature points and the heat sinks distribute around the heat insulations. Such distribution of the heat sinks and insulations can preserve the thermal energy in the regions around the zero-temperature points and reduce the temperature gradient with achieving the minimization of the thermal compliance.

Those test problems can be extended to minimize the thermal compliance on 2-manifolds imbedded in a block-shaped 3D domain $\Omega$ enclosed by insulation boundaries, where the center of $\Omega$ is localized at the coordinate basis. In such cases, the optimization objective is to minimize

$$J = \int_{\Sigma_S} k \nabla_s T \cdot \nabla_s T \, ds. \quad (39)$$

where the 2-manifold $\Sigma_S$ is an interface in $\Omega$. Then, the material interpolation implemented on $\Sigma_S$ is the mixture of Dirichlet ($T = T_d$) and no-jump ($-k \nabla T \cdot n = 0$) boundary conditions:

$$-k \nabla T \cdot n = \alpha (\gamma) (T - T_d), \ \text{on} \ \Sigma_S. \quad (40)$$

Correspondingly, the adjoint equation in equation 37 is changed to be:
Figure 7: (a) Stereo, vertical and front views of the derived heat-sink pattern on a sphere surface; (b) temperature distribution in the cross-sections of the spherical domain; (c) convergent histories of the normalized optimization objective and area constraint, including the iterative snapshots for the physical density.
Figure 8: (a) Stereo and lateral views of the derived heat-sink pattern on a torus surface; (b) temperature distribution in the cross-sections of the torus domain; (c) convergent histories of the normalized optimization objective and area constraint, including the iterative snapshots for the physical density.
find $T_a \in \mathcal{H}(\Omega)$ with $T_a = 0$ at $\mathcal{P}$, satisfying

$$
\int_{\Omega} k \nabla T_a \cdot \nabla \hat{T}_a \, dv + \int_{\Sigma_S} 2k \nabla_s T \cdot \nabla_s \hat{T}_a + \alpha T_a \hat{T}_a \, ds = 0, \quad \forall \hat{T}_a \in \mathcal{H}(\Omega).
$$

By setting the area fraction to be 0.6 and without changing the other parameters, the topology optimization of the heat sink are implemented on a Möbius strip and Klein bottle derived by gluing two Möbius strips (Figure 9a). Because these two 2-manifolds are non-orientable, the unitary normal vector $n$ is defined locally. The patterns of the heat sink corresponding to different point set $\mathcal{P}$ (Figure 9b) are derived as shown in Figure 10 and 11 where the temperature distribution on these 2-manifolds is included. From the temperature distribution, one can confirm the performance of the derived heat-sink patterns on minimizing the thermal compliance expressed in equation (39). On the derived heat-sink patterns, the temperature is $T_d = 0$ uniformly; meanwhile, such heat-sink patterns adjust the temperature distribution in the volume domain $\Omega$ with the tendency to reduce or remove the temperature gradient on the remained part of the interface $\Sigma_S$.

To check the optimality, the thermal compliance is cross-compared as listed in Table 3 for the derived heat-sink patterns in Figure 10a1, 10b1, 11a1 and 11b1. From a cross comparison of the values in every row of the sub-tables in Table 3, one can confirm the optimized performance of the derived heat-sink patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Möbius strip</th>
<th>(b) Klein bottle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_3$</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Thermal-compliance values corresponding to the heat-sink patterns on the Möbius strip and Klein bottle for different point set $\mathcal{P}$, where the optimal entries for the derived patterns are noted in bold.

### 3.3 Perfect conductor for electromagnetics

In electromagnetics, perfect conductor condition is widely used to approximate a completely conductive and thin metal layer [68]; then, topology optimization on the 2-
Figure 10: The derived heat-sink pattern and corresponding temperature distribution on the Möbius strip: (a1-a2) the case with the fixed-temperature point set $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1\}$; (b1-b2) the case with $\mathcal{P} = \{P_2\}$. $P_1$ and $P_2$ are demonstrated in Figure 9.

Figure 11: Stereo and cutaway views of the derived heat-sink pattern and corresponding temperature distribution on the Klein bottle: (a1-a2) the case with the fixed-temperature point set $\mathcal{P} = \{P_3\}$; (b1-b2) the case with $\mathcal{P} = \{P_4\}$. $P_3$ and $P_4$ are demonstrated in Figure 9.
manifolds can be demonstrated by implementing it to determine the layouts of perfect conductor layers and maximize the scattering energy of an incident field. The scattering field of the conductor layer can be described by the wave equation with its electric field without tangential components on a 2-manifold interface imbedded in a truncated 3D domain. For electromagnetic waves, the scattering field is described by the wave equation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla \times \left[ \mu_r^{-1} \nabla \times (E_s + E_i) \right] - k_0^2 \varepsilon_r (E_s + E_i) &= 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega \\
\nabla \cdot (\varepsilon_r (E_s + E_i)) &= 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega
\end{align*}
\]  

(42)

where \(E_s\) and \(E_i\) are the scattering and incident fields, respectively; the electric field \(E = E_s + E_i\) is the total field; the second equation is the divergence-free condition of the electric displacement; \(\Omega\) is a cuboid-shaped wave propagating domain. The incident wave in equation (42) is the electromagnetic wave propagating in the background. The infinite computational space is truncated by the perfectly matched layers (PMLs), which are implemented by solving the wave equations with the complex-valued coordinate transformation [69][70]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla_{x'} \times (\mu_r^{-1} \nabla_{x'} \times E_s) - k_0^2 \varepsilon_r E_s &= 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_P \\
\nabla_{x'} \cdot E_s &= 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_P
\end{align*}
\]  

(43)

where \(x'\) is the complex-valued coordinate transformed from the original Cartesian coordinate in \(\Omega_P\); \(E_s\) in the PMLs satisfies the divergence-free condition described in the original Cartesian coordinate system, because the fields are source-free in the PMLs; \(\nabla_{x'}\) is the gradient operator in the PMLs with transformed coordinates; \(\Omega_P\) is the union of the PML domains. The transformed coordinates and the original Cartesian coordinates satisfy the transformation

\[
x' = T x, \quad \forall x \in \Omega_P
\]  

(44)

with \(T\) and \(x\) respectively representing the transformation matrix and the original Cartesian coordinate. The transformation matrix is [69]

\[
T = \begin{cases} 
\text{diag} ((1-j) \lambda/d, 1, 1), & \text{in } \Omega_{fb} \\
\text{diag} (1, (1-j) \lambda/d, 1), & \text{in } \Omega_r \\
\text{diag} (1, 1, (1-j) \lambda/d), & \text{in } \Omega_{td} \\
\text{diag} (1, (1-j) \lambda/d, (1-j) \lambda/d), & \text{in } \Omega_{fbc} \\
\text{diag} ((1-j) \lambda/d, 1, (1-j) \lambda/d), & \text{in } \Omega_{rce} \\
\text{diag} ((1-j) \lambda/d, (1-j) \lambda/d, 1), & \text{in } \Omega_{lde} \\
\text{diag} ((1-j) \lambda/d, (1-j) \lambda/d, (1-j) \lambda/d), & \text{in } \Omega_{c}
\end{cases}
\]  

(45)

where \(\lambda\) the incident wavelength in the truncated background; \(d\) the thickness of the PMLs; \(\Omega_{fb}, \Omega_r\) and \(\Omega_{td}\) are the PMLs attached on the surfaces of \(\Omega\) with normal vector parallel to \(x\)-axis, \(y\)-axis and \(z\)-axis, respectively; \(\Omega_{fbc}, \Omega_{rce}\) and \(\Omega_{lde}\) are the PMLs attached on the edges of \(\Omega\) with tangential vector perpendicular to \(yOz\)-plane, \(zOx\)-plane and \(xOy\)-plane, respectively; \(\Omega_c\) are the PMLs attached on the vertexes of \(\Omega\). The no-jump boundary condition for the scattering field is imposed on the interface \(\partial \Omega\) between \(\Omega_P\) and \(\Omega\):

\[
\mu_r^{-1} (\nabla \times E_s - \nabla_{x'} \times E_s) \times n = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega
\]  

(46)

The perfect electric conductor condition \(n \times E_s = 0\) is imposed on the external boundaries \(\Gamma_D = \partial (\Omega \cup \Omega_P)\) of the PMLs.

The perfect conductor layer is attached on the 2-manifold \(\Sigma_S\) immersed in \(\Omega\). The design variable is used to indicate the no-jump boundary \(\mu_r^{-1} \left[ \nabla \times (E_s + E_i) \right] \times n = 0\) and perfect conductor \((n \times E = 0)\) parts of \(\Sigma_S\). The corresponding material interpolation is implemented as

\[
\mu_r^{-1} \left[ \nabla \times (E_s + E_i) \right] \times n = \alpha (\bar{\gamma}) \left[ n \times (E_s + E_i) \right], \quad \text{on } \Sigma_S
\]  

(47)
where $\alpha (\gamma)$ is the penalization function in equation 33. For $\alpha (\gamma)$, $\alpha_{\text{max}}$ with a large value ensures the domination of the term $n \times (E_s + E_i)$ corresponding to perfect conductor boundary, when the physical density takes on the value 0; meanwhile, equation 47 degenerates into the no-jump boundary condition, when the physical density takes on the value 1. Based on numerical tests, $\alpha_{\text{max}} = 1 \times 10^4$ and $q = 1 \times 10^9$ are chosen for the numerical examples in this section.

The perfect conductor layer is topologically optimized to maximize the scattering field as

$$J = \int_{\Omega} E_s \cdot E_s^* \, d\Omega$$

(48)

Based on the self-consistent adjoint analysis method presented in [71], the adjoint derivative is derived with the same form as that in equation 36. And the adjoint variables are derived from the adjoint equations in their weak forms:

- find $E_{sa}$ with $Re \left( \langle E_{sa} \rangle \right) \in V_E$, $Im \left( \langle E_{sa} \rangle \right) \in V_E$ and $n \times E_{sa} = 0$ on $\Gamma_D$, satisfying
  
  $$\int_{\Omega} 2E_s^* \cdot E_{sa} + \mu r^{-1} (n \times E_{sa}) \cdot \left( \nabla \times E_{sa} \right) - k_0^2 \epsilon_r E_{sa}^* \cdot \hat{E}_{sa} \, d\Omega +$$
  $$\int_{\Omega_p} \mu r^{-1} (T \nabla \times E_{sa}^*) \cdot \left( T \nabla \times E_{sa} \right) |T|^{-1} - k_0^2 \epsilon_r E_{sa}^* \cdot \hat{E}_{sa} \cdot |T| \, d\Omega = 0, \forall E_{sa} \in V_E$$

(49)

- find $\tilde{\gamma}_a \in H(\Sigma_s)$ satisfying
  
  $$\int_{\Sigma_s} r^2 \nabla \tilde{\gamma}_a \cdot \nabla \tilde{\gamma}_a + \tilde{\gamma}_a \cdot \nabla \tilde{\gamma}_a + \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \gamma} \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial \gamma} \left[ Re \left( \langle n \times (E_s + E_i) \rangle \right) \cdot \left( \langle n \times E_{sa} \rangle \right) + Im \left( \langle n \times (E_s + E_i) \rangle \right) \cdot Im \left( \langle n \times E_{sa} \rangle \right) \right] \tilde{\gamma}_a \, d\Sigma = 0, \forall \tilde{\gamma}_a \in H(\Sigma_s)$$

(50)

where $Re$ and $Im$ are operators used to extract the real part and imaginary part of a complex; $E_{sa}$ is the adjoint variables of $E_s$; $V_E$ is the functional space $\{ u \in H'(curl; \Omega \cup \Omega_P) | \nabla \cdot u = 0 \}$ with $H'(curl; \Omega \cup \Omega_P) = \{ u \in \left( L^2(\Omega \cup \Omega_P) \right)^3 | \nabla \times u \in \left( L^2(\Omega \cup \Omega_P) \right)^3 \}$ and $L^2(\Omega \cup \Omega_P)$ representing the second order Lebesque space for the real functionals defined on $\Omega \cup \Omega_P$.

Based on the numerical implementation in section 2.6 the topology optimization of perfect conductor layer is implemented on the torus and Möbius strip (Figure 12a and 12b). Those 2-manifolds are immersed into the volume domain $\Omega$, a brick enclosed by the PMLs. The size of $\Omega$ is $2.4 \times 2.4 \times 0.96$ (in the unit of m), discretized by the cubic elements with size 0.08. The coordinate basis is set at the centers of $\Omega$. For those two 2-manifolds, the area fraction in the area constraint is set to be 0.5. The point set $P$ is set as shown in Figure 12a and 12b. Then, by setting the maximal iteration number $n_{\text{max}} = 315$ and updating interval $n_{\text{up}} = 30$, the optimized topologies of the perfect conductor layer are derived as shown in Figure 13a and 13b for the incident waves propagating in the $+z$ direction with wavelength equal to 0.8m and three different polarizations. The evolution snapshots for the physical density are shown in Figure 15a and 15b for the circular polarization cases. From the evolution snapshots, the robustness of the topology optimization on 2-manifolds can be confirmed for the electromagnetics.

The performance of the derived perfect conductor layer on maximizing scattering field can be confirmed from the vector distribution of the scattering field compared with that of the incident field (Figure 17 and 18). The vector-distribution comparison demonstrates that the perfect layers can enhance the scattering-field energy by effectively reflecting and disturbing the incident waves.

To check the optimality, the optimized topologies in Figure 13a and 13b are cross-compared by setting incident waves with different polarizations, where the other parameters are kept without change. From a cross comparison of the values in every row of the sub-tables in Table 3, one can confirm the scattering performance of the perfect conductor layers with optimized topologies on Torus and Möbius strip.

## 4 Conclusions

This article has presented the density method-based topology optimization implemented on two-dimensional manifolds. When a physical field is defined on a two-dimensional
Figure 12: (a-b) Demonstration of the torus and Möbius strip immersed in the volume domain Ω; (c-d) demonstration of the two different point sets $\mathcal{P}$ on the torus and Möbius strip, respectively.

Figure 13: Topology optimized perfect-conductor patterns on a torus: (a), (b) and (c) respectively correspond to the incident waves polarized linearly in $x$-direction, $y$-direction and right-circularly in $xOy$-plane.

Figure 14: Topology optimized perfect-conductor patterns on a Möbius strip: (a), (b) and (c) respectively correspond to the incident waves polarized linearly in $x$-direction, $y$-direction and right-circularly in $xOy$-plane.
Figure 15: Evolution snapshots for the physical density in topology optimization of perfect-conductor pattern on a torus, with the right-circularly polarized incident wave.

Figure 16: Evolution snapshots for the physical density in topology optimization of perfect-conductor pattern on a Möbius strip, with the right-circularly polarized incident wave.

Figure 17: Vector distribution of the scattering field (red arrows) and incident field (blue arrows) respectively for the three cases in Figure 13.
Figure 18: Vector distribution of the scattering field (red arrows) and incident field (blue arrows) respectively for the three cases in Figure 14.

Table 4: Scattering-field energy corresponding to the perfect-conductor patterns on the torus and Möbius strip for the incident waves with different polarizations, where the optimal entries for the derived patterns are noted in bold.
manifold, this method is implemented by interpolating a material parameter in the partial differential equation used to describe the physical field, and this case has been demonstrated by topology optimization of micro-textures on a particle surface; when the physical field is defined on a three-dimensional domain and its boundary conditions are defined on a two-dimensional manifold, the density variable is used to formulate a mixed boundary condition of the physical field and achieve a penalization between two different types of boundary conditions, and this case has been demonstrated by topology optimization of heat-sink patterns to minimize thermal compliance and perfect-conductor patterns to maximize electromagnetic scattering energy. Typical two-dimensional manifolds, e.g., sphere, torus, Mōbius strip and Klein bottle, have been included in the numerical examples.

Based on the homeomorphic property of two-dimensional manifolds, it can be concluded that this method can be implemented on any compact two-dimensional manifolds. Therefore, this method can effectively enlarge the structural design space of the density method-based topology optimization. Its significance confirmed by the current development of additive manufacturing, which has effectively enlarged the structural design space. Because the 2-manifold and the derived structural pattern on it composes a fiber bundle and topology optimization is a typical inverse design method, this developed topology optimization method is an inverse design method of fiber bundles. Further, we predict that this method can be extended into the cases with two-dimensional manifolds defined in the phase space.
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