

On the Eigenvalue Distribution for a Beam with Attached Masses

Julia Kalosha*, Alexander Zuyev*,**, and Peter Benner**

Abstract

We study a mathematical model of a hinged flexible beam with piezoelectric actuators and electromagnetic shaker in this paper. The shaker is modelled as a mass and spring system attached to the beam. To analyze free vibrations of this mechanical system, we consider the corresponding spectral problem for a fourth-order differential operator with interface conditions that characterize the shaker dynamics. The characteristic equation is studied analytically, and asymptotic estimates of eigenvalues are obtained. The eigenvalue distribution is also illustrated by numerical simulations under a realistic choice of mechanical parameters.

1 Introduction

The stabilization problem for distributed parameter mechanical systems with flexible beams has been the subject of investigations of many authors. Without any pretence to represent an exhaustive list, we just mention some of the most related works. In the monograph [1], the problem of strong asymptotic stabilization of vibration systems with Euler–Bernoulli beams has been investigated. In [2], spectral methods for the investigation of strong stability of distributed parameter systems in Hilbert spaces are presented on a common basis, and some examples of controlled beams are analyzed. The stabilization of an essentially nonlinear system consisting of a beam attached to the disc with torque control is achieved in [3].

The dynamic behavior of a non-uniform cantilever Euler–Bernoulli beam with boundary control is investigated in the paper [4]. It is emphasized that asymptotic properties of the eigenvalues of the corresponding infinitesimal generator play an important role for proving the exponential stability of the closed-loop system. A numerical scheme that preserves the exponential stability of the original continuous Euler–Bernoulli model with a clamped end and boundary control is proposed in [5] without introducing additional numerical viscosity. The Euler–Bernoulli beam with one clamped end is considered in [6] as a control system with two-dimensional input and output. It is shown that the spectrum of the generator is located in the open upper half-plane for the considered model, and asymptotic approximations of the eigenvalues are proposed. In the paper [7], the general eigenvalue problem is formulated for the Timoshenko and the Euler–Bernoulli beam models under different boundary conditions. A regularization process for the characteristic equation is discussed, and numerically stable forms of the original hyperbolic expressions are obtained.

*Institute of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Slovyansk (julykucher@gmail.com)

**Max Planck Institute for Dynamics of Complex Technical Systems, Magdeburg, Germany (zuyev@mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de, benner@mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de)

Over the last few years, stability and stabilization problems for laminated beams and beam networks have received a lot of attention due to their rich theoretical context and engineering applications (see, e.g., [8–11] and references therein). Stability conditions for elastic structures formed by serially connected flexible beams with different types of boundary conditions are obtained and illustrated by numerical examples in [12, 13]. In the paper [14], the covariance functions are computed for the transverse displacement of the Euler–Bernoulli beam under stochastic excitation. The Euler–Bernoulli model with one clamped end and another simply supported end under the action of additive white noise is studied in [15]. It is shown that there exists a global random attractor for the considered stochastic system, and the Hausdorff dimension of the global random attractors is estimated.

In contrast to the above-mentioned publications, in this work we focus on the mathematical model of a simply supported beam of length l with k piezoelectric actuators and an electromagnetic shaker described in [16]. This mathematical model is represented by the following abstract differential equation [16]:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \xi(t) = \mathcal{A}\xi(t) + \mathcal{B}y, \quad \xi(t) \in X, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}. \quad (1)$$

Here

$$X = \{\xi = (u, v, p, q)^T \mid u \in \mathring{H}^2(0, l), \quad v \in L^2(0, l), \quad p, q \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

is the Hilbert space with the inner product

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ v_1 \\ p_1 \\ q_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} u_2 \\ v_2 \\ p_2 \\ q_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_X = \int_0^l (E(x)I(x)u_1''(x)\bar{u}_2''(x) + \rho(x)v_1(x)\bar{v}_2(x)) dx + \varkappa p_1 \bar{p}_2 + m q_1 \bar{q}_2,$$

and $y = (F, M_1, \dots, M_k)^T$ is considered as the control. The components of y have the following physical meaning [16]: F is the control force applied by the shaker to the beam at a point $x = l_0$, $l_0 \in (0, l)$, and M_j characterizes the action of the j -th piezoelectric actuator, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Here $\rho(x) > 0$, $E(x)I(x) \in C^2[0, l]$, $E(x)I(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (0, l)$, m and \varkappa are assumed to be positive constants. Throughout the text, the prime stands for the derivative with respect to the spatial variable x . The Sobolev spaces $\mathring{H}^k(0, l)$ consist of all functions $u \in H^k(0, l)$ such that $u(0) = u(l) = 0$.

The linear differential operator \mathcal{A} with the domain

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) = \left\{ \xi = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ p \\ q \end{pmatrix} \in X : \begin{array}{l} u \in H^4(0, l_0) \cap H^4(l_0, l), \\ u''(0) = u''(l) = 0, \\ u''(l_0 - 0) = u''(l_0 + 0), \\ v \in \mathring{H}^2(0, l), \\ p = u(l_0), \quad q = v(l_0) \end{array} \right\}$$

is defined by the following rule:

$$\mathcal{A} : \xi = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ p \\ q \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \mathcal{A}\xi = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ -\frac{1}{\rho}(EIu'')'' \\ q \\ -\frac{1}{m} \left\{ \varkappa p - (EIu'')' \Big|_{l_0-0} + (EIu'')' \Big|_{l_0+0} \right\} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

The linear operator $\mathcal{B} : \mathbb{R}^{k+1} \rightarrow X$ is given by its matrix

$$\mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\rho}\psi_1'' & \dots & \frac{1}{\rho}\psi_k'' \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \frac{1}{m} & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where $\psi_j \in C^2(0, l)$ is the shape function of the j -th piezoelectric actuator such that $\text{supp } \psi_j \cap \{0, l_0, l\} = \emptyset$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. A state feedback law $y = \mathcal{K}\xi$ has been proposed in [16] such that $\mathcal{K} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ is a bounded linear operator,

$$\xi = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ p \\ q \end{pmatrix} \in X \mapsto \mathcal{K}\xi = - \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_0 q \\ \alpha_1 \int_0^l \psi_1''(x)v(x)dx \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_k \int_0^l \psi_k''(x)v(x)dx \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}, \quad (4)$$

and $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ are positive tuning parameters. We refer to the following stability result for the closed-loop system (1) with $y = \mathcal{K}\xi(t)$.

Theorem 1. [16] *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}\mathcal{K}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow X$, where the operators \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} , and \mathcal{K} are given by (2)–(4), and let $\alpha_j > 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$. Then the abstract Cauchy problem*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\xi(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}\xi(t), \quad (5)$$

$$\xi(0) = \xi_0 \in X \quad (6)$$

is well-posed on $t \geq 0$, and the solution $\xi = 0$ of the closed-loop system (5) is stable in the sense of Lyapunov.

Note that the above theorem does not guarantee asymptotic stability of the equilibrium $\xi = 0$ as the limit behavior of trajectories is determined by invariant subsets of the set $M = \{\xi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \mid \dot{E}(\xi) = 0\}$, where $E(\xi)$ is the weak Lyapunov functional constructed in [16]. As it is well-known, the analysis of such invariant subsets is related to spectral properties of the infinitesimal generator (see, e.g., [17] and references therein).

Moreover, the distribution of eigenvalues is one of the crucial characteristics of distributed parameter systems related to their controllability, observability, and stabilizability properties because of the Ingham-type theorems [18] with important applications to one-dimensional wave-like equations [19, 20]. Thus, the goal of our present paper is to study the spectral problem for \mathcal{A} and analyze the distribution of roots of the corresponding frequency equation. In Section 2, we derive an approximate frequency equation and prove its equivalence to the exact one in the sense of limit behavior of the roots. An estimate of the growth rate of eigenfrequencies is obtained in Section 3. We will present the results of numerical simulations to illustrate the behavior of the roots of both equations. For the sake of simplicity, we will assume E and I to be positive constants in the sequel.

2 Spectral Problem

In order to obtain the characteristic equation, we consider the spectral problem

$$\mathcal{A}\xi = \lambda\xi, \quad \xi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \quad (7)$$

where $\lambda = i\omega$. This problem reduces to the following set of equations with respect to the components of ξ :

$$\begin{aligned} v &= \lambda u, \\ \frac{EI}{\rho} \frac{d^4 u}{dx^4} + \lambda v &= 0, \\ q &= \lambda p, \\ L - \kappa p &= \lambda m q, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and the condition $\xi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} u(0) &= u(l) = 0, \\ u''(0) &= u''(l) = 0, & u^{(j)}(l_0 - 0) - u^{(j)}(l_0 + 0) &= 0, \quad j = \overline{0, 2}, \\ v(0) &= v(l) = 0, & EI(u'''(l_0 - 0) - u'''(l_0 + 0)) &= L, \\ p &= u(l_0), \quad q = v(l_0). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Let us first consider the second equation in (8) with respect to $u(x)$:

$$\frac{d^4 u}{dx^4} - \mu^4 u = 0, \quad x \neq l_0, \quad (10)$$

where $\mu = \left(\frac{\rho}{EI}\omega^2\right)^{1/4}$ is treated as the new spectral parameter of problem (7), (9). The general solution of (10) can be represented in the intervals of continuity of $u(x)$ as

$$u(x) = C_1 e^{-\mu x} + C_2 e^{\mu x} + C_3 \sin \mu x + C_4 \cos \mu x, \quad x \neq l_0.$$

Let us denote

$$U(x) = \begin{pmatrix} u_0(x) \\ u_1(x) \\ u_2(x) \\ u_3(x) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u(x) \\ u'(x) \\ u''(x) \\ u'''(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

then the differential equation that defines the eigenfunctions of (7), (9) can be written for $x \in (0, l_0) \cup (l_0, l)$ as

$$\frac{d}{dx} U(x) = MU(x), \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \mu^4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

The general solution of (11) is represented by the matrix exponential as follows:

$$U(x) = \begin{cases} e^{xM} U(0), & x \in (0, l_0), \\ e^{(x-l)M} U(l), & x \in (l_0, l), \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where

$$e^{xM} = \begin{pmatrix} z_1(x) & z_2(x) & z_3(x) & z_4(x) \\ \mu^4 z_4(x) & z_1(x) & z_2(x) & z_3(x) \\ \mu^4 z_3(x) & \mu^4 z_4(x) & z_1(x) & z_2(x) \\ \mu^4 z_2(x) & \mu^4 z_3(x) & \mu^4 z_4(x) & z_1(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$z_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\cosh \mu x + \cos \mu x), \quad z_2(x) = \frac{1}{2\mu}(\sinh \mu x + \sin \mu x),$$

$$z_3(x) = \frac{1}{2\mu^2}(\cosh \mu x - \cos \mu x), \quad z_4(x) = \frac{1}{2\mu^3}(\sinh \mu x - \sin \mu x).$$

The constants of integration $u_0(0)$, $u_2(0)$, $u_0(l)$, $u_2(l)$ are equal to zero due to the boundary conditions of the spectral problem, while the other four can be obtained from the interface conditions at the point $x = l_0$. These conditions may be represented as the system of linear algebraic equations $\mathcal{M}(u_1(0), u_3(0), u_1(l), u_3(l))^T = 0$, whose matrix is

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} z_2(l_0) & z_4(l_0) & -z_2(l_0 - l) & -z_4(l_0 - l) \\ z_1(l_0) & z_3(l_0) & -z_1(l_0 - l) & -z_3(l_0 - l) \\ \mu^4 z_4(l_0) & z_2(l_0) & -\mu^4 z_4(l_0 - l) & -z_2(l_0 - l) \\ \mu^4 z_3(l_0) - \hat{\mu} z_2(l_0) & z_1(l_0) - \hat{\mu} z_4(l_0) & -\mu^4 z_3(l_0 - l) & -z_1(l_0 - l) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\hat{\mu} = \frac{\kappa}{EI} - \frac{m}{\rho} \mu^4$. The last equality can be obtained from the conditions $\kappa p + \lambda m q = EI(u_3(l_0 - 0) - u_3(l_0 + 0))$, $q = \lambda p$. The value of p is treated as the limit of $u_0(x)$ at $x = l_0$. Thus, we obtain the following frequency equation:

$$\det \mathcal{M} = 0, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \det \mathcal{M} = & \frac{m}{4\mu\rho} \{(\cosh \mu(l - 2l_0) - \cosh \mu l) \sin \mu l + (\cos \mu(l - 2l_0) - \cos \mu l) \sinh \mu l\} \\ & - \frac{\sin \mu l \sinh \mu l}{\mu^2} + \frac{\kappa}{4EI\mu^5} \{(\cosh \mu l - \cosh \mu(l - 2l_0)) \sin \mu l \\ & - (\cos \mu(l - 2l_0) + \cos \mu l) \sinh \mu l\}. \end{aligned}$$

If μ satisfies the above equation, then $\text{rank } \mathcal{M} \leq 3$ and it is possible to choose a non-zero set of values $u_1(0)$, $u_3(0)$, $u_1(l)$, $u_3(l)$. Let us take, for instance $u_3(l) = 1$, then the other boundary values can be found from the following system of linear algebraic equations:

$$\mathcal{M}_3(u_1(0), u_3(0), u_1(l))^T = (z_4(l_0 - l), z_3(l_0 - l), z_2(l_0 - l))^T, \quad (14)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} z_2(l_0) & z_4(l_0) & -z_2(l_0 - l) \\ z_1(l_0) & z_3(l_0) & -z_1(l_0 - l) \\ \mu^4 z_4(l_0) & z_2(l_0) & -\mu^4 z_4(l_0 - l) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, solution (12) of equation (11) contains the function $u(x)$ of the following form:

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} z_2(x)u_1(0) + z_4(x)u_3(0), & x \in (0, l_0), \\ z_2(x - l)u_1(l) + z_4(x - l), & x \in (l_0, l), \end{cases}$$

and the set of boundary values is determined uniquely by system (14), provided that

$$\det \mathcal{M}_3 = \frac{\sinh \mu l_0 \sin \mu l + \sin \mu l_0 \sinh \mu l}{2\mu^2} \neq 0. \quad (15)$$

Then the rest of the components of ξ are determined by system (8). This completes the procedure of solving the spectral problem (7).

3 Frequency Analysis

The determinant of \mathcal{M} in (13) admits the following asymptotic representation for $\mu \rightarrow +\infty$:

$$\det \mathcal{M} = \frac{me^{\mu l}}{8\rho\mu} (\Phi_0(\mu) + o(1)),$$

where

$$\Phi_0(\mu) = 2 \sin \mu(l - l_0) \sin \mu l_0 - \sin \mu l.$$

Thus, equation (13) is equivalent to the following one if $\mu \neq 0$:

$$\Phi_0(\mu) + \Phi_1(\mu) = 0, \quad (16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1(\mu) = & e^{-\mu l} \{ 2 \sinh \mu l \cos \mu(l - 2l_0) - 2 \sinh \mu l \cos \mu l - 2 \cosh \mu l \sin \mu l \\ & + 2 \sin \mu l \cosh \mu(l - 2l_0) + e^{\mu l} (\cos \mu l + \sin \mu l - \cos \mu(l - 2l_0)) - \frac{8}{m\mu} \rho \sinh \mu l \sin \mu l \} \\ & + \frac{2\kappa\rho e^{-\mu l}}{EI m \mu^4} \{ (\cosh \mu l - \cosh \mu(l - 2l_0)) \sin \mu l + (\cos \mu l - \cos \mu(l - 2l_0)) \sinh \mu l \}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\Phi_1(\mu) \rightarrow 0$ as $\mu \rightarrow +\infty$. Note that the distribution of the roots of $\Phi_0(\mu)$ is determined by the length parameters l and l_0 only. We will show below that the roots of (16) can be approximated by the roots of

$$\Phi_0(\mu) = 0, \quad (17)$$

provided that $\mu > 0$ is large enough.

Proposition 1. *Assume that the number l_0/l is rational. Let $\bar{\mu}_1 < \bar{\mu}_2 < \dots$ be the positive roots of equation (17). Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an $M > 0$ such that for every $\bar{\mu}_j > M$ there exists a unique root $\mu_j \in I_j = (\bar{\mu}_j - \varepsilon; \bar{\mu}_j + \varepsilon)$ of (16).*

It means that every root of equation (16) is located in an ε -neighborhood of the corresponding root of equation (17), and this neighborhood does not contain any other root of (16). Besides, it is important to ensure that there are no “large” roots of equation (16) outside the ε -neighborhoods mentioned above, as stated in the next proposition.

Proposition 2. *Let the assumptions of Proposition 1 be satisfied, and let*

$$S = (M; +\infty) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} (\mu_j - \varepsilon; \mu_j + \varepsilon).$$

Then $\Phi_0(\mu) + \Phi_1(\mu) \neq 0$ for all $\mu \in S$.

Proof of Propositions 1 and 2. In case when the numbers l_0 and l are commensurable, the function $\Phi_0(\mu)$ is periodic and its zeros $0 < \bar{\mu}_1 < \bar{\mu}_2 < \dots$ are simple, $\Phi'_0(\mu_j) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that a number $\varepsilon > 0$ is chosen small enough so that $\varepsilon < (\bar{\mu}_{j+1} - \bar{\mu}_j)/2$ (the intervals I_j and I_{j+1} are disjoint) for all $j \geq 1$, and

$$\inf_{|\mu - \bar{\mu}_j| \leq \varepsilon, j \geq 1} |\Phi'_0(\mu)| \geq K \quad (18)$$

with some constant $K > 0$. By construction, all positive roots of the equation $\Phi_0(\mu) = 0$ are contained in the open set $I = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} I_j$. Hence, $\Phi_0(\mu) \neq 0$ at each $\mu \in S_0 = [0, +\infty) \setminus$

I. By exploiting the periodicity and continuity of Φ_0 , we conclude from the Weierstrass extreme value theorem that there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|\Phi_0(\mu)| \geq \delta \quad \text{for all } \mu \in S_0. \quad (19)$$

From the mean value theorem, we know that

$$\Phi_0(\mu) = \Phi'_0(\chi)(\mu - \bar{\mu}_j), \quad (20)$$

where $\chi = \bar{\mu}_j + \Theta(\mu - \bar{\mu}_j)$, $\Theta \in (0, 1)$. Then (18) and (20) imply that

$$|\Phi_0(\mu_j \pm \varepsilon)| \geq K\varepsilon \text{ and } \Phi_0(\mu_j - \varepsilon)\Phi_0(\mu_j + \varepsilon) < 0 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, 2, \dots. \quad (21)$$

Since $\Phi_1(\mu) \rightarrow 0$ and $\Phi'_1(\mu) \rightarrow 0$ as $\mu \rightarrow +\infty$, we take an $M > 0$ such that

$$|\Phi_1(\mu)| < \min\{K\varepsilon, \delta\} \text{ and } |\Phi'_1(\mu)| < K/2 \quad \text{for all } \mu > M - \varepsilon. \quad (22)$$

From (21) and (22), it follows that the continuous function $\Phi(\mu) = \Phi_0(\mu) + \Phi_1(\mu)$ has values of opposite sign at $\bar{\mu}_j \pm \varepsilon$, provided that $\bar{\mu}_j > M$. Then there exists a $\mu_j \in I_j = (\bar{\mu}_j - \varepsilon; \bar{\mu}_j + \varepsilon)$ such that $\Phi(\mu_j) = 0$ by the intermediate value theorem.

The uniqueness of the root μ_j in I_j can be proved by contradiction. Let $\mu_j^* \in I_j$ be such that

$$\Phi_0(\mu_j^*) = -\Phi_1(\mu_j^*), \quad \mu_j^* \neq \mu_j. \quad (23)$$

On the one hand, the integral representations

$$\Phi_0(\mu_j^*) = \Phi_0(\mu_j) + \int_{\mu_j}^{\mu_j^*} \Phi'_0(\zeta) d\zeta, \quad \Phi_1(\mu_j^*) = \Phi_1(\mu_j) + \int_{\mu_j}^{\mu_j^*} \Phi'_1(\zeta) d\zeta$$

together with the condition $\Phi_0(\mu_j) = -\Phi_1(\mu_j)$ yields

$$\int_{\mu_j}^{\mu_j^*} (\Phi'_0(\zeta) + \Phi'_1(\zeta)) d\zeta = 0. \quad (24)$$

On the other hand, inequalities (18) and (22) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mu_j}^{\mu_j^*} (\Phi'_0(\zeta) + \Phi'_1(\zeta)) d\zeta \right| &\geq |\mu_j - \mu_j^*| \inf_{\zeta \in I_j} |\Phi'_0(\zeta) + \Phi'_1(\zeta)| \geq \\ &\geq |\mu_j - \mu_j^*| \left(\inf_{\zeta \in I_j} |\Phi'_0(\zeta)| - \sup_{\zeta \in I_j} |\Phi'_1(\zeta)| \right) \geq \frac{K|\mu_j - \mu_j^*|}{2} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality contradicts (24); hence, μ_j is the only zero of $\Phi(\mu)$ in I_j , which proves Proposition 1.

By taking into account (19) and (22), we conclude that $|\Phi_0(\mu)| > |\Phi_1(\mu)|$ whenever $\mu \in S_0$ and $\mu > M$. The latter implies the assertion of Proposition 2. \square

Table 1: Modal frequencies under the choice of parameters (25)

j	$\bar{\mu}_j$	μ_j	$\bar{\nu}_j$	ν_j	j	$\bar{\mu}_j$	μ_j	$\bar{\nu}_j$	ν_j
1	2.616	2.552	4.767	4.537	12	20.648	20.988	297.075	306.918
2	4.714	4.573	15.485	14.570	13	22.711	22.846	359.376	363.683
3		5.618		21.994	14	24.732	24.734	426.184	426.273
4	6.553	6.608	29.921	30.427	15	25.803	26.084	463.925	474.083
5	7.460	8.198	38.774	46.830	16	27.318	27.554	519.992	528.997
6	9.309	9.721	60.378	65.850	17	29.411	29.497	602.735	606.252
7	11.407	11.494	90.661	92.061	18	31.318	31.325	683.413	683.723
8	13.013	13.142	117.997	120.342	19	32.238	32.533	724.138	737.484
9	14.018	14.501	136.914	146.510	20	34.007	34.172	805.799	813.665
10	16.009	16.226	178.565	183.445	21	36.107	36.158	908.419	910.975
11	18.085	18.113	227.881	228.610	22	37.814	37.863	996.296	998.922

4 Numerical Simulation Results

Let $0 < \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_N$ be the first N positive roots of equation (13). Then the corresponding eigenvalues λ_j of (7) and the modal frequencies ν_j in Hz are expressed as

$$\lambda_j = i \sqrt{\frac{EI}{\rho}} \mu_j^2, \quad \nu_j = \frac{\sqrt{EI}}{2\pi\sqrt{\rho}} \mu_j^2, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

To test the approximation of μ_j by solutions of the truncated equation (17), we also compute numerically the roots $\bar{\mu}_j$ of the transcendent equation $\Phi_0(\bar{\mu}) = 0$ and the corresponding frequency parameters $\bar{\nu}_j = \frac{\sqrt{EI}}{2\pi\sqrt{\rho}} \bar{\mu}_j^2$ for $N = 22$. These numerical results are summarized in Table 1 for the following realistic values of mechanical parameters:

$$l = 1.905 \text{ m}, \quad l_0 = 1.4 \text{ m}, \quad \rho_0 = 2700 \text{ kg/m}^3, \quad S = 2.25 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2, \quad \rho = \rho_0 S,$$

$$E = 6.9 \cdot 10^{10} \text{ Pa}, \quad I = 1.6875 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}^4, \quad m = 0.1 \text{ kg}, \quad \varkappa = 7 \text{ N/mm}. \quad (25)$$

The above mechanical parameters correspond to the experimental setup described in [21].

Note that the truncated frequency equation (17) has an additional positive root $\bar{\mu}_0 \approx 0.9949$ that does not correspond to any root of equation (13), and there is the root μ_3 of (13) while the equation (17) does not have any root in the corresponding interval. These features are observed in low frequency range. But for large values of μ , the agreement between solutions of the frequency equations (13) and (17) is quite good, as seen in Table 1 and predicted by Propositions 1 and 2.

In the particular case $l = 2l_0$, it is easy to write the positive roots of the transcendent equation (17) explicitly:

$$\bar{\mu}_j = \frac{\pi}{l} \left(\left\{ \frac{j}{2} \right\} + 2 \left[\frac{j}{2} \right] \right), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots \quad (26)$$

The above formula together with Propositions 1 and 2 implies that the spectral parameters μ_j grow linearly with j , i.e. the modal frequencies ν_j and the eigenvalues λ_j of (7) grow quadratically with j for large j in the considered case. The growth rate of μ_j and $\bar{\mu}_j$ in the case of mechanical parameters (25) is shown in Fig. 1.

To illustrate the behavior of the corresponding eigenvectors $\xi^1, \xi^2, \dots, \xi^N$ of (7), we plot the graphs of their u -component in Figs. 2 and 3. Note that condition (15) holds for each $\mu = \mu_j$ in the considered case; thus, each ξ^j is uniquely defined up to normalization. As the function $w^j(x)$ describe the transverse displacement of the beam




Figure 1: Spectral parameters μ_j and $\bar{\mu}_j$

corresponding to the spectral parameter μ_j , we will refer to $w^j(x)$ as the j -th eigenmode of vibration. The presented eigenmodes correspond to the choice of $l_0 = 1.4$ m in Fig. 2 and $l_0 = l/2$ in Fig. 3, respectively, for $N = 4$. In both figures, the functions $w^j(x)$ are normalized in the sense of L^2 -norm on $[0, l]$.

5 Conclusion

The approximation results of Section 3 together with the linear growth condition of the form (26) generalize known asymptotic properties of eigenvalues of the standard Euler–Bernoulli beam (cf. [1, Chapter 4]) to the model with attached masses. In future work, we expect to apply Propositions 1 and 2 for the analysis of the limit behavior of trajectories to characterize attractors of the infinite-dimensional closed-loop system (5) for different values of tuning parameters of the feedback law (4). The results obtained in this paper are planned to be extended to other classes of elastic structures, particularly, to the rotating Timoshenko beam with attached masses [22] and beam systems with passive joints [23].

References

- [1] Luo, Z.-H., Guo, B.-Z., Morgul O.: Stability and Stabilization of Infinite Dimensional Systems with Applications. Springer, London (1999)
- [2] Oostveen, J.: Strongly Stabilizable Distributed Parameter Systems. SIAM, Philadelphia (2000)
- [3] Coron, J.-M.: Control and Nonlinearity. AMS, Providence (2007)




Figure 2: Eigenmodes for $l_0 = 1.4$ m




Figure 3: Eigenmodes for $l_0 = l/2$

- [4] Guo, B.-Z.: Riesz basis property and exponential stability of controlled Euler–Bernoulli beam equations with variable coefficients. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **40**, 1905–1923 (2002)
- [5] Liu, J., Guo, B.-Z.: A novel semi-discrete scheme preserving uniformly exponential stability for an Euler–Bernoulli beam. *Systems & Control Letters* **134**, 1–18 (2019) doi: 10.1016/j.sysconle.2019.104518
- [6] Shubov, M. A.: Location of eigenmodes of Euler-Bernoulli beam model under fully non-dissipative boundary conditions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **475**, 1–20 (2019) doi: 10.1098/rspa.2019.0544
- [7] Khasawneh, F. A., Segalman, D.: Exact and numerically stable expressions for Euler–Bernoulli and Timoshenko beam modes. *Applied Acoustics* **151**, 215–228 (2019)
- [8] Liu, W., Luan, Y., Liu, Y., Li, G.: Wellposedness and asymptotic stability to a laminated beam in thermoelasticity of type III. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences* **43**, 3148–3166 (2019) doi: 10.1002/mma.6108
- [9] Apalara, T. A., Raposo, C. A., Nonato, C. A. S.: Exponential stability for laminated beams with a frictional damping. *Archiv der Mathematik* **114**, 471–480 (2020). doi: 10.1007/s00013-019-01427-1
- [10] Apalara, T. A.: On the stability of a thermoelastic laminated beam. *Acta Mathematica Scientia* **39**, 1517–1524 (2019)
- [11] Mustafa, M. I.: On the stabilization of viscoelastic laminated beams with interfacial slip. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik* **69**. (2018) doi: 10.1007/s00033-018-0928-7.
- [12] Chen, G., Delfour, M., Krall, A., Payre, G.: Modeling, stabilization and control of serially connected beams. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **25**, 526–546 (1987)

- [13] Lagnese, J.E., Leugering, G., Schmidt, E.J.P.G.: Modeling, Analysis and Control of Dynamic Elastic Multi-Link Structures. Birkhäuser, Boston (1994)
- [14] niady, P., Podworna, M., Idzikowski, R.: Stochastic vibrations of the Euler–Bernoulli beam based on various versions of the gradient nonlocal elasticity theory. Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics **56**, 27–34 (2019)
- [15] Chen, H., Guirao, J., Cao, D.Q., Jiang, J., Fan, X.: Stochastic Euler–Bernoulli beam driven by additive white noise: Global random attractors and global dynamics. Nonlinear Analysis **185**, 216–246 (2019)
- [16] Zuyev, A., Kucher, J.: Stabilization of a flexible beam model with distributed and lumped controls (in Russian). Dynamical Systems. **3**(31), 25–35 (2013)
- [17] Zuyev, A.L.: Partial Stabilization and Control of Distributed Parameter Systems with Elastic Elements. Springer, Cham (2015)
- [18] Baiocchi, C., Komornik, V., Loreti, P.: Ingham-Beurling type theorems with weakened gap conditions. Acta Math. Hungar. **97**, 55–95 (2002)
- [19] Krabs, W.: On Moment Theory and Controllability of One-Dimensional Vibrating Systems and Heating Processes. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1992)
- [20] Krabs, W., Sklyar, G.M.: On Controllability of Linear Vibrations. Nova Science Publishers (2002)
- [21] Dullinger, C., Schirrer, A., Kozek, M.: Advanced control education: Optimal & robust MIMO control of a flexible beam setup. IFAC Proceedings Volumes **47**(3), 9019–9025 (2014)
- [22] Zuyev, A., Sawodny, O.: Stabilization and observability of a rotating Timoshenko beam model. Mathematical Problems in Engineering **2007**, 1–19 (2007) doi: 10.1155/2007/57238
- [23] Zuyev, A., Sawodny, O.: Stabilization of a flexible manipulator model with passive joints. IFAC Proceedings Volumes **38**, 784–789 (2005)