arXiv:2010.07707v1 [math-ph] 15 Oct 2020

A proof of the convexity of the set of lamination parameters

Jean-Luc AKIAN

March 17, 2024

ONERA, Université Paris Saclay F-92322 Châtillon, France
Tel: +33-1-46-73-46-41; Fax: +33-1-46-73-41-43
E-mail address: jean-luc.akian@onera.fr

Abstract

In this paper we show that the proof of the convexity of the set of lamination parameters given by J.L. Grenestedt and P. Gudmundson, which is extensively cited in the literature, is not correct. We give a proof of the convexity of this set when the class of functions which gives the layup angle as a function of the through-the-thickness coordinate is the set of step functions.

keywords: lamination parameters, convexity

1 Introduction

Lamination parameters are extensively used for the layup optimization of laminated composite structures instead of the ply thicknesses and the layup angles. These parameters are integrals through the thickness of functions of the layup angles of the different plies of the laminate and their number is small (12). A key result for layup optimization is the convexity of the set of lamination parameters. A remark is that when one speak of the convexity of the set of lamination parameters, one must specify the class of functions which gives the layup angle as a function of the through-the-thickness coordinate. For a composite laminate this function should be a step function (that is to say a piecewise constant function). The paper [1] gives a proof of the the convexity of the set of lamination parameters and is extensively cited in the literature for this proof. But the proof of this paper is not correct as will be shown in the present paper. In the present paper we give a proof of the convexity of the set of lamination parameters when the class of functions which gives the layup angle as a function of the through-the-thickness coordinate is the set of step functions.

2 Problem statement and inaccuracy of the proof in [1]

The lamination parameters are given by the formulas:

$$\xi^A_{[1,2,3,4]} = \frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^{1}[\cos 2\theta(z), \cos 4\theta(z), \sin 2\theta(z), \sin 4\theta(z)]dz, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\xi^B_{[1,2,3,4]} = \int_{-1}^{1}[\cos 2\theta(z), \cos 4\theta(z), \sin 2\theta(z), \sin 4\theta(z)]zdz, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\xi^D_{[1,2,3,4]} = \frac{3}{2}\int_{-1}^{1}[\cos 2\theta(z), \cos 4\theta(z), \sin 2\theta(z), \sin 4\theta(z)]z^2dz, \tag{2.3}$$

[1], equation (13), where z is the normalized through-the-thickness coordinate and θ: $z \in [-1,1] \mapsto \theta(z) \in \mathbb{R}$ (where $\mathbb{R}$ is the set of real numbers) is the (measurable) function which gives the layup angle as a function of z. If θ is a measurable function from $[-1,1]$ into $\mathbb{R}$, let us call $\xi[\theta]$ the family of associated lamination parameters.

In order to prove the convexity of the set of lamination parameters, one must show that if θ_1 and θ_2 are two measurable functions belonging to some class of functions from $[-1,1]$ into $\mathbb{R}$ and if $\alpha \in [0,1]$ (one can replace "$\alpha \in [0,1]$" by "$\alpha \in (0,1)$") then there exists θ belonging to the same class of functions such that

$$(1-\alpha)\xi[\theta_1] + \alpha\xi[\theta_2] = \xi[\theta]. \tag{2.4}$$

In [1], p.317, given $\alpha \in [0,1]$ and two functions θ_1 and θ_2 from $[-1,1]$ into $\mathbb{R}$, whose regularity is not specified, a sequence of functions (θ^n) is constructed such that $\xi[\theta^n] \to (1-\alpha)\xi[\theta_1] + \alpha\xi[\theta_2]$ when $n \to +\infty$. But by no means this proves the convexity of the set of lamination parameters because this does not prove the existence of a function θ such that (2.4) is satisfied. If the sequence of functions (θ^n) had a uniform limit θ on $[-1,1]$, it could be said that $\xi[\theta^n] \to \xi[\theta]$ when $n \to +\infty$ and the convexity would be proved in case where the functions θ^n and θ are in the same class of functions. But as will be proved in the sequel, the sequence θ^n has not even a simple limit on the set of $x \in [-1,1]$ such that $\theta_1(x) \neq \theta_2(x)$.

Assume that θ_1 and θ_2 are two measurable functions from $[-1,1]$ into $\mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Let us recall the construction of the sequence (θ^n) in [1]. If n is an integer ≥ 1 (that is $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, where $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers, and $\mathbb{N}^* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$), consider the sequence of $n+1$ points $x^n_i = -1 + 2i/n$, $i = 0, \ldots, n$ of the interval $[-1,1]$ and the sequence of n intervals (of the same length $2/n$) $J_i = (x^n_i, x^n_{i+1})$, $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, on each interval J_i, θ^n is defined by $\theta^n(x) = \theta_1(x)$ if $x \in (x^n_i, x^n_i + 2\alpha/n)$ and $\theta^n(x) = \theta_2(x)$ if $x \in (x^n_i + 2\alpha/n, x^n_{i+1})$, $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$. The function θ^n is not defined for other points of the interval $[-1,1]$ (in finite number), that is the points x^n_i $(i = 0, \ldots, n)$ and $x^n_i + 2\alpha/n$ $(i = 0, \ldots, n-1)$.

If $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we shall denote by $[x]$ the integer part of x, that is the unique integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (where $\mathbb{Z}$ is the set of integers) such that $n \leq x < n+1$ and by (x) the fractional part of x defined by $(x) = x - [x]$.

If $x \in (-1,1)$, for all integer $n \geq 1$, there exists a unique integer i, $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, such that

$$x_i^n \leq x < x_{i+1}^n. \tag{2.5}$$

If we set $y = (x+1)/2$, these relations are equivalent to

$$0 \leq ny - i < 1 \tag{2.6}$$

or $i = [ny]$. Similarly for $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$, the conditions

$$x_i^n < x < x_i^n + 2\alpha/n \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$x_i^n + 2\alpha/n < x < x_{i+1}^n \tag{2.8}$$

are equivalent to

$$0 < ny - i < \alpha \, (\Leftrightarrow 0 < (ny) < \alpha) \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\alpha < ny - i < 1 \, (\Leftrightarrow \alpha < (ny) < 1). \tag{2.10}$$

Let us recall Kronecker's Theorem: if θ is an irrational number (that is $\theta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, where $\mathbb{Q}$ is the set of rational numbers), the set of fractional values $(n\theta) = n\theta - [n\theta]$ of $n\theta$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is dense in $[0,1]$ ([2], p.502, Theorem 439). This means that for all $z \in [0,1]$, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|z - (n\theta)| < \epsilon$. We begin with the following lemma.

Lemme 2.1: *Let $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that p and q are relatively prime and $0 < p < q$. Then there exists an infinity of n and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $n \geq q-1 \geq 1$, $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $np - qi = 1$. Moreover for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq j \leq q-1$, there exists an infinity of n', $i' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n' \geq j(q-1) \geq 1$, $0 \leq i' \leq n'-1$ and $n'p - qi' = j$.*

We have $p \geq 1$, $q \geq 2$, $p \leq q-1$. Since p and q are relatively prime, Bezout's Theorem shows that there exists n_0 and $i_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $n_0 p - q i_0 = 1$. If n_0, $i_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a particular solution of the equation $np - qi = 1$, the other solutions of this equation are under the form $n = n_0 + kq$, $i = i_0 + kp$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists an infinity of n and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $n \geq q-1$ and $np - qi = 1$. If $np - qi = 1$ then $i = (np-1)/q$ and $i \geq (n-1)/q \geq 0$, $i \leq (n(q-1)-1)/q \leq n - (n+1)/q \leq n-1$. If $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq j \leq q-1$, multiply the relation $np - qi = 1$ by j and set $n' = nj$, $i' = ij$. We get $n' \geq j(q-1)$, $0 \leq i' \leq j(n-1)$ $\leq n'-1$ and $n'p - qi' = j$. □

The following lemma shows that for all $x \in [-1,1]$ such that $\theta_1(x) \neq \theta_2(x)$, the sequence $\theta^n(x)$ has no limit when $n \to +\infty$.

Lemme 2.2: *Let $x \in [-1,1]$ and set $y = (x+1)/2 \in [0,1]$. Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$.*

If $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 < (ny) < \alpha$ and there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha < (ny) < 1$. If $\theta_1(x) \neq \theta_2(x)$, $\theta^n(x)$ has no limit when $n \to +\infty$.

If $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\theta^n(x)$ is not defined.

Moreover, if $x \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (-1,1)$, then $y = (x+1)/2 \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)$ can be written under the form $y = p/q$ where $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, p and q are relatively prime and $0 < p < q$. If q is such that $1/q < \alpha$ and $1/q < 1-\alpha$, there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 < (ny) < \alpha$ and there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha < (ny) < 1$. If $\theta_1(x) \neq \theta_2(x)$, $\theta^n(x)$ has no limit when $n \to +\infty$.

It follows that for all $x \in [-1,1]$ such that $\theta_1(x) \neq \theta_2(x)$, $\theta^n(x)$ has no limit when $n \to +\infty$.

Proof The case $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ follows from Kronecker's Theorem.

If $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, then x can be written under the form $x = p/q$ where $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, p and q are relatively prime and $-q \leq p \leq q$. If we set $n = k(2q)$ and $i = k(p+q)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, then $n \geq 1$, $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $x = x_i^n$, so that $\theta^n(x)$ is not defined.

Let $x \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (-1,1)$. Then $y = (x+1)/2 \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)$ can be written under the form $y = p/q$ where $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$, p and q are relatively prime and $0 < p < q$. From Lemma 2.1 for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 \leq j \leq q-1$, there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ such that $ny - i = j/q$. In other words for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 \leq j \leq q-1$, there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$ such that $(ny) = j/q$. Now assume that q is such that $1/q < \alpha$ and $1/q < 1-\alpha$. Then there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$ such that $(ny) = 1/q$ and an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$ such that $(ny) = 1 - 1/q$. Since $0 < 1/q < \alpha$ and $\alpha < 1 - 1/q$, it follows that there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 < (ny) < \alpha$ and there exists an infinity of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha < (ny) < 1$. □

3 Proof of the convexity of the set of lamination parameters

We shall prove the convexity of the set of lamination parameters when the functions θ are in the class of step functions. Recall that a function θ: $z \in [-1,1] \mapsto \theta(z) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a step function if there exists a sequence $(a_i)_{i=0,\ldots,N}$, $a_0 = -1$, $a_N = 1$, $a_i < a_{i+1}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N-1$ such that θ is constant in each of the intervals (a_i, a_{i+1}), $i = 0, \ldots, N-1$.

Let θ_1 and θ_2 be two step functions on $[-1,1]$. One can find a sequence $(a_i)_{i=0,\ldots,N}$, $a_0 = -1$, $a_N = 1$, $a_i < a_{i+1}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N-1$ such that the two step functions θ_1 and θ_2 are constant in each of the intervals (a_i, a_{i+1}), taking the values θ_1^i and θ_2^i, $i = 0, \ldots, N-1$.

The lamination parameters are all under the form

$$\int_{-1}^{1} f(\theta(z)) z^j dz,\ j = 0, 1, 2 \tag{3.11}$$

where f is a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$. We have

$$\int_{-1}^{1} f(\theta_k(z)) z^j dz = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} f(\theta_k^i) \int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} z^j dz,\ k = 1, 2,\ j = 0, 1, 2. \tag{3.12}$$

Then if $\alpha \in [0,1]$, $j = 0, 1, 2$,

$$(1-\alpha) \int_{-1}^{1} f(\theta_1(z)) z^j dz + \alpha \int_{-1}^{1} f(\theta_2(z)) z^j dz = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} [(1-\alpha) f(\theta_1^i) + \alpha f(\theta_2^i)] \int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} z^j dz. \tag{3.13}$$

In order to prove the convexity of the set of lamination parameters, one must find a step function θ on $[-1,1]$ such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}[(1-\alpha)f(\theta_1^i)+\alpha f(\theta_2^i)]\int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} z^j dz = \int_{-1}^{1} f(\theta(z))z^j dz,\ j=0,1,2. \tag{3.14}$$

Let us search θ such that in each interval (a_i, a_{i+1}), θ takes the values θ_1^i (resp. θ_2^i) on a (disjoint) union of open intervals E_1^i (resp. E_2^i): $\forall i = 0,\ldots,N-1$,

$$\theta(z) = \theta_1^i 1_{E_1^i}(z) + \theta_2^i 1_{E_2^i}(z),\ z \in (a_i, a_{i+1}), \tag{3.15}$$

$$\overline{E}_1^i \cup \overline{E}_2^i = [a_i, a_{i+1}],\ E_1^i \cap E_2^i = \emptyset. \tag{3.16}$$

In (3.15), we have used the following notation: if E is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$, 1_E is the indicator function of the subset E, that is the function such that $1_E(x) = 1$ if $x \in E$ and $1_E(x) = 0$ if $x \notin E$. Equations (3.15) and (3.16) imply

$$\int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} f(\theta(z))z^j dz = f(\theta_1^i)\int_{E_1^i} z^j dz + f(\theta_2^i)\int_{E_2^i} z^j dz,\ i=0,\ldots,N-1,\ j=0,1,2. \tag{3.17}$$

It is sufficient to find E_1^i (and then E_2^i) such that

$$[(1-\alpha)f(\theta_1^i)+\alpha f(\theta_2^i)]\int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} z^j dz = f(\theta_1^i)\int_{E_1^i} z^j dz + f(\theta_2^i)\int_{E_2^i} z^j dz,\ j=0,1,2. \tag{3.18}$$

It is enough to verify

$$(1-\alpha)\int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} z^j dz = \int_{E_1^i} z^j dz,\ i=0,\ldots,N-1,\ j=0,1,2 \tag{3.19}$$

and

$$\alpha\int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} z^j dz = \int_{E_2^i} z^j dz,\ i=0,\ldots,N-1,\ j=0,1,2. \tag{3.20}$$

But if E_1^i and E_1^i verify (3.16) then for all $i = 0,\ldots,N-1$, $j = 0,1,2$,

$$\int_{E_1^i} z^j dz + \int_{E_2^i} z^j dz = \int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} z^j dz = (1-\alpha)\int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} z^j dz + \alpha\int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} z^j dz, \tag{3.21}$$

thus it suffices to find E_1^i verifying (3.19) and (3.20) will be necessarily verified. The answer to this problem is given by the following lemma:

Lemme 3.1: *Let A, $B \in \mathbb{R}$, $A < B$ and let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then there exists an union of intervals $\subset (A,B)$ (denoted E) such that*

$$\alpha\int_A^B z^j dz = \int_E z^j dz,\ j=0,1,2. \tag{3.22}$$

Proof Since E must meet the three conditions (3.22), we seek E under the form $E = (a,b)\cup(c,d)$ with $a,b,c,d \in \mathbb{R}$, $A < a < b < c < d < B$ and from the begining we enforce the condition $b-a = d-c$ (denoted e), so that E will depend on three parameters to be determined. One must verify the conditions:

$$\alpha\int_A^B z^j dz = \int_a^b z^j dz + \int_c^d z^j dz,\ j=0,1,2, \tag{3.23}$$

that is

$$\alpha(B-A) = b - a + d - c = 2e, \tag{3.24}$$

$$\alpha(B^2 - A^2) = b^2 - a^2 + d^2 - c^2, \tag{3.25}$$

$$\alpha(B^3 - A^3) = b^3 - a^3 + d^3 - c^3. \tag{3.26}$$

Equation (3.24) makes it possible to determine e: $e = \alpha(B-A)/2$. Setting $X = (a+b)/2$ and $Y = (c+d)/2$, we get

$$a = X - e/2,\ b = X + e/2,\ c = Y - e/2, d = Y + e/2, \tag{3.27}$$

$$\alpha(B^2 - A^2) = \alpha(B-A)(B+A) = 2e(A+B), \tag{3.28}$$

$$b^2 - a^2 + d^2 - c^2 = (b-a)(a+b) + (d-c)(c+d) = 2e(X+Y). \tag{3.29}$$

Equations (3.25), (3.28), (3.29) give

$$X + Y = A + B. \tag{3.30}$$

On the other hand

$$b^3 - a^3 = (X + e/2)^3 - (X - e/2)^3 = 2[3X^2(e/2) + (e/2)^3] = e(3X^2 + e^2/4), \tag{3.31}$$

$$d^3 - c^3 = (Y + e/2)^3 - (Y - e/2)^3 = 2[3Y^2(e/2) + (e/2)^3] = e(3Y^2 + e^2/4), \tag{3.32}$$

$$A = (A+B)/2 - (B-A)/2 = (X+Y)/2 - e/\alpha, \tag{3.33}$$

$$B = (A+B)/2 + (B-A)/2 = (X+Y)/2 + e/\alpha, \tag{3.34}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &B^3 - A^3 = [(X+Y)/2 + e/\alpha]^3 - [(X+Y)/2 - e/\alpha]^3 = \\ &2[3((X+Y)/2)^2(e/\alpha) + (e/\alpha)^3] = 2e/\alpha[3/4(X+Y)^2 + (e/\alpha)^2]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

Then equation (3.26) can be written

$$2e[3/4(X+Y)^2 + (e/\alpha)^2] = e(3X^2 + e^2/4) + e(3Y^2 + e^2/4) \tag{3.36}$$

that is

$$2[3/4(X+Y)^2 + (e/\alpha)^2] = 3(X^2 + Y^2) + e^2/2 \tag{3.37}$$

or

$$3[X^2 + Y^2 - (X+Y)^2/2] = e^2(2/\alpha^2 - 1/2) \tag{3.38}$$

and

$$(X-Y)^2 = (e^2/3)(4/\alpha^2 - 1). \tag{3.39}$$

Since $4/\alpha^2 - 1 > 0$, let us set

$$\beta = (e/\sqrt{3})\sqrt{4/\alpha^2 - 1} > 0. \tag{3.40}$$

Since $Y > X$, from (3.30) and (3.39) we get

$$Y - X = \beta, \tag{3.41}$$

$$X = [A + B - \beta]/2, \tag{3.42}$$

$$Y = [A + B + \beta]/2. \tag{3.43}$$

One must now verify that the solution a, b, c, d we have obtained (see formulas (3.27)) is suitable, that is $A < a < b < c < d < B$. This amounts to show that $Y - X > e$ and $Y - X + e < B - A$. Since $0 < \alpha < 1$, then $Y - X = \beta > e$. On the other hand the relation $Y - X + e < B - A$ is equivalent to

$$(e/\sqrt{3})\sqrt{4/\alpha^2 - 1} + e < 2e/\alpha \tag{3.44}$$

that is

$$\sqrt{4/\alpha^2 - 1} < \sqrt{3}(2/\alpha - 1) \tag{3.45}$$

or

$$4/\alpha^2 - 1 < 3(2/\alpha - 1)^2. \tag{3.46}$$

Equation (3.46) is equivalent to the condition

$$\alpha^2 - 3\alpha + 2 > 0 \tag{3.47}$$

which is verified since if $0 < \alpha < 1$ then $\alpha^2 - 3\alpha + 2 = (1 - \alpha)(2 - \alpha) > 0$. □

References

[1] J.L. Grenestedt and P. Gudmundson. Layup optimization of composite material structures. In P. Pedersen, editor, *Optimal Design with Advanced Materials*, pages 311–336. Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993.

[2] G.H. Hardy and E.M. Wright. *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*. OUP Oxford, 2009.