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Abstract

Lattice-based mechanical metamaterials can be tailored for a wide variety of applications by modifying the underlying mesostructure. However, most existing lattice patterns take symmetry as a starting point. We show that asymmetric lattice patterns can be more likely to have certain mechanical properties than symmetric lattice patterns. To directly compare the effects of asymmetric versus symmetric lattice arrangements, a constrained design space is defined. A generative design process is used to randomly generate both symmetric and asymmetric lattice patterns within the design space. Asymmetric lattice patterns are shown to be more likely to have higher shear stiffness values, as well as a broader range of axial stiffness values and Poisson’s ratios. Key design features are identified that are present predominantly in asymmetric lattice patterns. We show that asymmetric lattice patterns with two of these features (arrows and spider nodes) are more likely to induce a broader range of axial stiffness values and Poisson’s ratios, in addition to larger shear stiffness values, compared to lattice patterns without these features. In addition, some of these features also have an impact on symmetric lattice patterns. This work provides insights into the benefits of using asymmetric lattice patterns in select metamaterial design applications.
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1. Introduction

Mechanical metamaterials have mechanical properties governed by modifying the geometry of a material’s mesostructure in addition to its intrinsic material properties (Surjadi et al., 2019; Mir et al., 2014; Christensen et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2012). This “properties by mesostructure” concept is widespread in natural materials such as sponges, bone, and bamboo (Gibson and Ashby, 1997; Gibson, 2005; Wegst et al., 2015; Habibi and Lu, 2014; Habibi et al., 2015; Libonati and Buehler, 2017). Synthetically-produced mechanical metamaterials have deliberately-arranged structures that can be tailored for desirable mechanical characteristics such as high stiffness-to-density ratios, negative Poisson’s Ratios, or tunable vibration control (Yu et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2017; Kadic et al., 2012; Vogiatzis et al., 2017). The most significant catalyst for mechanical metamaterial development in recent years has been advances in additive manufacturing. These advances mean additive manufacturing can accommodate features as small as nanometers, and utilize a wide range of constituent materials, enabling the creation of structural metamaterials with a variety of mesostructure patterns (Truby and Lewis, 2016; Yang et al., 2019; Berger et al., 2017; Wang, 2018; Morita et al., 2021).

Lattices are one of the most prominent mechanical metamaterial patterns. Metamaterials with lattice patterns offer a large degree of customizability within a single unit cell (Yu et al., 2018; Adhikari, 2021; Jia et al., 2020). The building blocks of most lattice structures are slender members that connect to each other at junctions. The properties of a metamaterial with a lattice structure is set by varying the number, size, shape, and connection points of these members. Plate- and shell-lattice patterns, which use a similar basic layout to member-based lattices, are less common since their larger local geometries offer fewer modes of customizability than member-based lattice patterns (Queheillalt and Wadley, 2005; Wang, 2018; Bonatti and Mohr, 2019a; Evans et al., 2015). The versatility of member-based lattice metamaterials is prominent in design optimization studies; the relatively low volumes of individual members allow for sufficient space to optimize the member geometries and locations (Asadpoure and Valdevit, 2015; Wang, 2018). The high degree of flexibility in the arrangements of member-based lattices means that lattice metamaterials allow for a broad design space even if only a few design variables are used (Abdeljaber et al., 2016; Abdelhamid and Czekanski, 2018). This flexibility means that lattice patterns can easily be used to realize graded properties (Turco et al., 2017; Jenett et al., 2017).
Additionally, the modularity of member-based lattice patterns can allow unit cells with different patterns to be assembled together, making them widely useful and even capable of forming hierarchical structures (Vangelatos et al., 2019; Mizzi and Spaggiari, 2020; Kaur et al., 2017).

Modeling of lattice-based metamaterials is conducted through a variety of methods. Metamaterials are typically modeled on the scale of a single unit cell, treating the single unit cell as if it resides within a broader continuum composed of the same unit cells. The least computationally intensive method of modeling lattice patterns is through an analytical model. These models represent the relationship between geometric parameters (such as member thickness or angles between members) and desired metamaterial properties for a specific lattice pattern (Yu et al., 2018; Nicolaou and Motter, 2012; Naghavi Zadeh et al., 2021). Analytical models are useful in determining the degree to which individual input parameters influence desired metamaterial properties (Cabras and Brun, 2016; Karathanasopoulos et al., 2017; Morita et al., 2021). However, the accuracy of a particular analytical model will depend on details of the lattice, and a single model may not be appropriate for a wide range of lattice patterns. On the other end of the spectrum, high-fidelity finite element analysis (FEA) methods are the most accurate and most computationally intensive method for determining the mechanical properties of lattice patterns. Due to their use of 3D elements, these models are especially useful when studying lattice patterns with members of low length-to-thickness aspect ratios wherein the interaction of members at junctions has a significant effect on overall deformation characteristics (Tancogne-Dejean and Mohr, 2018; Tancogne-Dejean et al., 2019). However, high-fidelity FEA models are unnecessary when modeling metamaterials with sufficiently high length-to-thickness aspect ratios. Reduced-order FEA models are more computationally efficient than high-fidelity models, and can be easily parameterized to work within a broad design space. In such models, beam elements can accurately represent the behavior of the overall unit cell and the kinematics of junctions while sacrificing detail regarding the interaction of members at these junctions (Asadpoure and Valdevit, 2015; Abdelhamid and Czekanski, 2018; Adhikari, 2021; Vangelatos et al., 2020; Jamshidian et al., 2020). Such beam elements are assumed to sustain normal and transverse loads, moments, and torques at junctions (Bluhm et al., 2020; Mizzi and Spaggiari, 2020; Liu et al., 2019). In situations where the enhanced accuracy due to the additional degrees of freedom present in beam
elements is not as critical as reducing computational expense, truss elements can instead be used in reduced-order models (Javadi et al., 2012; Asadpour and Valdevit, 2015).

In terms of unit cell geometry, broadly speaking, metamaterial designs are either symmetric or asymmetric. Symmetric lattice patterns are often based on existing, well-known arrangements of lattice members that offer predictable stiffness-to-density ratios. Furthermore, many of these patterns have been studied with a variety of constituent materials, aspect ratios, and in combination with other lattice patterns (Turco et al., 2017; Mizzi and Spaggiari, 2020; Abdelhamid and Czekanski, 2018; Vangelatos et al., 2020). As such, the behavior of symmetric lattices is thoroughly documented in existing metamaterial design work. However, many symmetric lattice patterns are limited to offering cubic characteristics (Berger et al., 2017; Asadpour and Valdevit, 2015; Spadoni and Ruzzene, 2012; Wang and Sigmund, 2020). Asymmetric lattice patterns are required to realize anisotropic properties. Current work in asymmetric lattice patterns is limited to distortions of existing symmetric patterns. These distortions are most often manifested as changes to the thickness of specific members, members with variable cross-sections, curved members, or a distortion of the entire unit cell (Tancogne-Dejean and Mohr, 2018; Portela et al., 2020; Bonatti and Mohr, 2019b; Wang et al., 2021). However, the range of elastic moduli of such asymmetric patterns are not likely to reflect the entire possible anisotropic metamaterial property space (Xu et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2019; Grima et al., 2008). A more general form of asymmetry, such as asymmetric arrangement of lattice members, would allow for lattice patterns that are more likely to represent a broader range of anisotropy. Current literature has yet to explore the benefits of an asymmetric design space of this nature.

In this study, the stiffness tensors of symmetric and asymmetric 2D lattice patterns with the same unit cell size are compared to determine the extent to which asymmetric lattice patterns allow for combinations of mechanical properties that are distinct from those offered by symmetric lattice structures. First, random symmetric and asymmetric lattice patterns are generated. The effective elastic stiffness tensor and volume fraction of all the lattice patterns are then calculated using a reduced-order finite element model. The symmetric and asymmetric design spaces are presented and analyzed. Designs in the asymmetric design space are shown to have distinct stiffness tensors from those in the symmetric design space. The presence of certain design features is identified in many of the evaluated designs; these
features are shown to have a statistically significant impact on the metamaterial properties of designs that contain them.

2. Methods

Figure 1: Definitions of the design spaces in this study. The distribution of junctions are shown within the (a) 3x3 and (b) 5x5 design spaces. Shown in (c) is an example of a unit cell design that satisfies the feasibility criteria. Shown in (d) is an example of a unit cell design that does not satisfy the feasibility criteria. The violating members are shown in red. The first of these members intersects another member at a point outside of the junction grid, while the second of these does not connect to the other half of the unit cell.

A standardized design space is used to study the difference between symmetric and asymmetric lattice patterns, such that the sole difference between symmetric and asymmetric patterns is in the arrangement of members. To facilitate visual identification of design traits, the design spaces used herein are restricted to 2D lattice patterns. The underlying platform for all unit cell designs considered in this study is a grid of evenly-spaced junctions arranged in a square. Two such design spaces are considered: a 3x3 grid and a 5x5
grid, as shown in Figures 1a and b respectively. Lattice members can span any two points on the grid, and all members are straight and have circular cross-sections with the same fixed radii. The design space is constrained by four requirements to ensure that lattice patterns will form a continuous material, without any dangling members, that only has member intersections at junctions:

1. Designs cannot have any intersecting or overlapping members.
2. Designs cannot have any isolated members or groups of members.
3. Designs must be connected to neighboring unit cells, to ensure that the design can tessellate.
4. All used junctions in a design should be connected to at least two other junctions in the grid.

Two types of symmetry are considered in this study: double-mirror and mirror. Unit cells with double-mirror symmetry appear identical when observed from all four sides. Unit cells with mirror symmetry appear identical when observed from opposite sides — either vertically or horizontally — but the horizontal and vertical views are different from each other. Mirror symmetry does not necessarily result in a cubic stiffness tensor. For this study, a design that satisfies neither of these definitions of symmetry is considered to be asymmetric.
A generative design approach was used to develop sets of symmetric and asymmetric designs. Generative design is an emerging approach, especially in the Computer Aided Design (CAD) community (Krish, 2011). The combination of generative design with additive manufacturing has been of great interest recently (Wu et al., 2019) with the incorporation of surrogate modeling methods into the generative design framework explored in recent literature (Oh et al., 2019; Yuan and Moghaddam, 2020; Kallioras and Lagaros, 2020).

Valid designs in the dataset must satisfy the previously-discussed constraints on the design space. Random assignment of members to the 2D grid space to generate the design dataset would result in the majority of designs not satisfying the constraints. In contrast, a generative design approach provides the necessary design independence to generate feasible designs. Here, designs are generated by randomly adding feasible (non-intersecting and non-overlapping) members. Additional reflected members are added as appropriate to account for symmetry (double-mirror or mirror). Each subsequent feasible member to be added is chosen randomly from a set of feasible members connected to the previously added member, with tessellation of the unit cell in all directions considered in identifying these members. In general, all members are assigned equal probability of selection. However, there is an additional provision to bias towards the selection of only short members (members connected by nodes which are closest to each other in the vertical, horizontal or diagonal directions). This toggle is utilized in generating 40% of all generated designs, in order to reduce bias towards designs with longer members in the dataset. In case no feasible members can be found connected to the previously added member, a feasible member is chosen from a set of feasible members connected to the node with the least number of connections. This approach makes it likely that satisfactory designs (designs that satisfy all design space constraints) will be generated. After a satisfactory design is achieved, design sets are created by adding feasible members to the satisfactory design until no more feasible members can be added. Then, a random subset of designs is chosen to incorporate into the final dataset in order to overcome the bias towards sparse designs. Additionally, each generated design is also rotated in-plane by 90 degrees and included in the design set, provided it is not a repetition of an existing design.

The effective metamaterial elastic properties are determined for each design. These elastic properties are “effective” values because they represent the stiffness of an architected material rather than a homogeneous material. The 2D stiffness tensor, found by modeling a single unit cell within an array
of self-repeats, is shown in Equation 1:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\sigma_{11} \\
\sigma_{22} \\
\sigma_{12}
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
C_{11} & C_{12} & C_{16} \\
C_{21} & C_{22} & C_{26} \\
C_{61} & C_{62} & C_{66}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\varepsilon_{11} \\
\varepsilon_{22} \\
\varepsilon_{12}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (1)

where \(C_{11}\) and \(C_{22}\) are the two normal stiffness values and \(C_{66}\) is the shear stiffness value.

The compliance tensor is calculated from the stiffness tensor as shown in Equation 2:

\[

S = C^{-1} =
\begin{bmatrix}
S_{11} & S_{12} & S_{16} \\
S_{21} & S_{22} & S_{26} \\
S_{61} & S_{62} & S_{66}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (2)

The Poisson’s ratios \(\nu_{12}\) and \(\nu_{21}\) are then calculated by Equations 3 and 4, assuming the relative orthotropy of the unit cells under small deformation.

\[
\nu_{12} = -S_{12} \cdot C_{22},
\] (3)

\[
\nu_{21} = -S_{21} \cdot C_{11}.
\] (4)

In addition to the stiffness tensor, the volume fraction of each unit cell is calculated by finding the summed volume of all lattice members and dividing by the volume of a square panel taking up the same overall space as a single unit cell. To explicitly account for the overlap caused by two members intersecting at a junction, the volume of a single overlap is approximated as the largest spherical wedge that can fit inside the space occupied by two members. The angle of this wedge is defined as the span angle between the two intersecting members. These overlap volumes are calculated for each intersection in a design, then cumulatively subtracted from the total volume of all lattice members in a design.

We take a reduced-order modeling approach to simulate a single unit cell of each lattice design as it would act within an array of self-repeats. Two-node Timoshenko beam elements are used to represent each member. This model is written in the ANSYS Parametric Design Language (APDL) \(\text{ANSYS, 2010}\) and run in ANSYS Mechanical™. All members have a radius \(\frac{1}{40}\)th the outer dimension of each square unit cell. The number of junctions in the grid and the connectivity array of the design — describing the position of each lattice member by which two junctions they connect — are also inputs. Periodic boundary conditions (PBCs) are used to simulate the behavior of
a single unit cell within a larger continuum. The PBCs are implemented through the use of dummy nodes, which are linked to points on the boundary of each unit cell. The outputs of each simulation are the reaction forces at these dummy nodes, which are used to determine the effective stress on the unit cell. Three simulations with different applied strains are run to achieve the 9 components of the stiffness tensor for each lattice pattern. The output result for each design is the metamaterial stiffness tensor, which is normalized relative to a constituent material Young’s modulus. MATLAB™ is used to pre- and post-process the inputs and outputs for each design, and interfaces directly with ANSYS (Zhan, 2018). All of our scripts are available on Github (Srivatsa et al., 2021).

Probability density plots are used to evaluate the distributions of individual components of stiffness tensors, in order to compare the metamaterial property spaces of designs with different types of symmetry. These probability distributions cannot be assumed as normal if they fail a one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test, with a null hypothesis that each distribution can be represented by a normal distribution (Pratt and Gibbons, 1981). Non-normal distributions cannot be fully characterized using mean and variance. Therefore, such distributions are plotted as kernel distributions with bandwidths calculated using the Sheather and Jones method to account for any multimodality present (Hall et al., 1991). To recognize any differences between these kernel distributions, two-sample K-S tests are used with the null hypothesis that two probability distributions are from the same continuous distribution (Pratt and Gibbons, 1981, Ibrahim et al., 2009). Two distributions that satisfy the null hypothesis of a two-sample K-S test can be recognized as distinct from each other, but cannot otherwise be quantified relative to each other. Differences between two distinct distributions are thus discussed qualitatively.

3. Results and Discussion

In both the 3x3 and 5x5 design space, the symmetry-defined subsets of designs need to be large enough to draw quantifiable conclusions regarding the distributions of metamaterial properties. The size of each subset was determined by iteratively increasing the size of each subset by 10 designs until the metamaterial property space for each subset did not appear to change significantly. Then, repeated designs were removed to create each final symmetry subset. In the 3x3 design space, only 22 unique double-mirror
symmetric designs exist, so this population was sampled completely. Only 92 unique mirror symmetric designs were found before a significant number of repeated designs were created by the generative design algorithm. The asymmetric 3x3 design set consists of 783 designs. The 5x5 design space is large enough to facilitate a significantly larger number of double-mirror and mirror symmetric designs. A 5x5 design set was generated consisting of 319 double-mirror symmetric designs, 656 mirror symmetric designs, and 1468 asymmetric designs.

3.1. Metamaterial Properties as a Function of Symmetry

![Figure 3: Vertical and horizontal normal stiffness values compared against each other for (a) the 3x3 design space and (b) the 5x5 design space.](image)

After finding the stiffness tensors for all designs, the normal stiffness values are examined. The vertical and horizontal normal stiffness values for each design are plotted against each other in Figure 3. As expected, double-mirror symmetric designs have the same horizontal and vertical normal stiffness. Additionally, some asymmetric designs in both design spaces also have normal stiffness values that are similar to each other. Also evident from the 5x5 design space is that double-mirror symmetric designs are the most capable of achieving the highest normal stiffness values. Asymmetric and mirror symmetric designs are confined to a region of the property space wherein both normal stiffness values do not exceed 0.3, whereas the double-mirror symmetric designs reach 0.4.
The normal stiffness values of designs are plotted against their volume fractions in Figure 4. As expected, the higher resolution of 5x5 designs results in these designs achieving higher volume fractions than 3x3 designs. The most prominent result in both design spaces is the positive correlation between volume fraction and normal stiffness – for all design sets the slopes of linear fits range from 0.22 to 0.43. This is expected, as unit cells with more members are generally expected to be stiffer. However, designs with similar volume fractions can vary significantly in normal stiffness, beyond even an order of magnitude; R-squared values of the linear fits range from 0.09 to 0.26 (with the exception of the 3x3 double-mirror symmetric design set, which has a relatively high R-squared value of 0.66 due to the limited design space). In the 5x5 design space, double-mirror symmetric designs have the smallest range of volume fractions. This indicates that symmetry constraints limit the potential arrangements of members in double-mirror symmetric designs.

Next the Poisson’s ratios are examined. Because asymmetric and mirror symmetric designs are likely to have different horizontal and vertical normal stiffness values, it is likely that the two Poisson’s ratios for a given design are different. Figure 5 shows the Poisson’s ratio associated with deformation transverse to the plotted normal stiffness direction. Within the design space sampled, the boundaries of the metamaterial property space exhibit an inverse relationship between the normal stiffness of a design and the mag-
Figure 5: Normal stiffness compared against Poisson’s ratio for (a) the 3x3 design space and (b) the 5x5 design space.

The magnitude of the associated Poisson’s ratio. In the 3x3 design space, the range of Poisson’s ratios in asymmetric and mirror symmetric designs are similar (1.996 and 1.739, respectively) but the skewing of mirror symmetric designs towards positive Poisson’s ratios is seen from the means of these two design sets (0.012 and 0.078, respectively). A Wilcoxon rank sum test (Wilcoxon, 1945) conducted to determine whether these distributions have statistically distinct medians returned a p-value of 0.0140, indicating that they are distinct since this is less than a significance level of 0.05. Additionally, as expected, no double-mirror symmetric designs achieve a negative Poisson’s ratio. The limitations of the 3x3 design space, compounded by the enforcement of double-mirror symmetry through repeated members, constrains the metamaterial property space of such designs. In the 5x5 design space, the minimum-to-maximum ranges of Poisson’s ratios in asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric designs are 1.759, 1.658, and 1.770, respectively (Fig. 5b). Furthermore, the mean Poisson’s ratios of these three subsets (0.133, 0.181, and 0.117, respectively) indicate that none of these design sets is significantly skewed away from the other two. These results demonstrate that, compared to the 3x3 design space, the additional resolution of the 5x5 design space reduces the impact of symmetry on achievable Poisson’s ratios.

Shown in Figure 6 is the shear stiffness of each design plotted against its
normal stiffness. Designs of any symmetry type are only slightly more likely to have a larger shear stiffness if they have a larger normal stiffness. This weak positive correlation is supported by the relatively low slopes (varying from 0.04 to 0.08) and R-squared values (varying from 0.10 to 0.21). Interestingly, the largest shear stiffness of any of the designs is approximately \( \frac{1}{5} \) the largest normal modulus, which is much less than the \( \frac{1}{3} \) minimum ratio for an isotropic solid. Asymmetric designs have the largest shear stiffness of the three symmetry sets, which is due to the lack of symmetry constraints in asymmetric designs; this will be explored further in Section 3.3. A Wilcoxon rank sum test (Wilcoxon, 1945) to compare the shear stiffness values of asymmetric designs to mirror and double-mirror symmetric designs returns p-values of 0.00582 and 0.0026, respectively, in the 3x3 space and 0.020(10^{-9}) and 0.0567(10^{-10}), respectively, in the 5x5 space. All of these values are less than a significance level of 0.05/3 (adjusted using a Bonferroni correction to mitigate the sampling of the same distribution for multiple tests (Bonferroni, 1936)), indicating that the population of asymmetric designs has a distinct median shear stiffness from the populations of mirror and double-mirror symmetric designs. Given the relative magnitudes of the p-values, this is especially true in the 5x5 design space. Additionally, the prominent clustering metamaterial properties in only the 3x3 design space demonstrates the more diverse property space enabled by the additional resolution of the 5x5 design space.
Figure 7: Probability density plots comparing normal stiffness, Poisson’s ratios, and normalized shear stiffness of asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric designs in the (a) 3x3 and (b) 5x5 design spaces. Shear stiffness values are normalized by the average normal stiffness of that design.

In order to compare the metamaterial properties of asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric designs, probability density distributions of these properties were generated (Figure 7). All of these distributions were found to not be normal, and were thus represented using kernel distributions. The statistical tests used to determine non-normality, as well as the bandwidths of the kernel distributions in Figure 7, are included in the Supplementary Information. Two-sample K-S tests were used to compare asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric distributions to each other for distributions of normal stiffness, shear stiffness normalized by normal stiffness, and Poisson’s ratio. Shown in Table 1 are the p-values associated with each K-S test; the significance level is again 0.05/3 due to the Bonferroni correction required for multiple statistical tests performed on the same set (Bonferroni, 1936). These results show that the properties of the asymmetric design space are consistently distinct from the double-mirror symmetric design space. Neither the asymmetric design space, nor the double-mirror symmetric design space, is entirely distinct from the mir-
Table 1: Two-Sample K-S Test results comparing asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric designs to each other in terms of normal stiffness, Poisson’s ratio, and shear stiffness normalized by the respective design’s average normal stiffness. Values shown are the p-values associated with each test. A p-value less than 0.05/3, indicating rejection of the null hypothesis, is marked with an asterisk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Space</th>
<th>Metamaterial Property</th>
<th>Asymmetric vs Mirror Symmetric</th>
<th>Asymmetric vs Double-mirror Symmetric</th>
<th>Mirror vs Double-mirror Symmetric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3x3</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>0.1056</td>
<td>2.856(10^{-2}) *</td>
<td>0.0307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>0.0033 *</td>
<td>1.640(10^{-12}) *</td>
<td>5.114(10^{-6}) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>0.0076 *</td>
<td>0.00326 *</td>
<td>0.0678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>8.095(10^{-1}) *</td>
<td>2.787(10^{-3}) *</td>
<td>1.907(10^{-6}) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>2.282(10^{-1}) *</td>
<td>0.0070 *</td>
<td>2.112(10^{-6}) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>0.0514</td>
<td>1.384(10^{-15}) *</td>
<td>2.058(10^{-11}) *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ror symmetric design space. The plots show that the extent of this distinction varies with the property and design space. Despite double-mirror symmetric designs achieving higher normal stiffness values than asymmetric designs, the probability distributions reveal that few double-mirror symmetric designs occupy that portion of the metamaterial property space. Asymmetric designs are more likely to have larger or smaller normal stiffness values than double-mirror symmetric designs. Asymmetric designs are also more likely to have a Poisson’s ratio farther from zero than double-mirror symmetric designs.

3.2. Design Features

To better understand the differences in these design spaces and what mechanisms are responsible for the distinctions between property probability distributions, four recurring design features were identified from observing the generated designs (Figure 8). These four features are pivot points, arrows, spider nodes, and stacked members. A pivot point is defined as a single node about which one portion of a design can rotate relative to the rest of the design, if the lattice pattern were to consist of pin joints and rigid members. Even though the members have fully bonded intersections at junctions, the length-to-radius ratio of the members is large enough to promote member bending and thus the lattice patterns are flexible enough to experience nonaffine deformations if pivot points are present. Arrows have been documented as a versatile lattice shape to achieve negative Poisson’s ratios (Qiao and Chen, 2015; Wang et al., 2018). These shapes are defined as a grouping of four members that form a quadrilateral, with three acute angles and
one angle over 180 degrees. Similar to pivot points, arrows allow for relative movement within a lattice unit cell. The third type of feature present, spider nodes, are defined as junctions that have at least 6 connecting members as well as at least one pair of adjacent connecting members with no more than 45 degrees between them. Stacked members are defined as a group of at least three members that deviate in angle from each other no more than 10 degrees, and are contained between two endpoints. Spider nodes and stacked members indicate a concentration of members that are at an angle, which
could potentially contribute to increasing the shear stiffness of a given design. We find the probability distributions of metamaterial properties for designs with and without these features to help assess to what extent, if any, these features impact the metamaterial property space.

Figure 9: Average frequency of design features in asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric designs with (a) 3x3 and (b) 5x5 nodal grids. In each subset of designs divided by type of symmetry, the frequency of design features was found for 15 random sets, then averaged over all sets.

Designs were first divided by their type of symmetry (asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric), and then each of these symmetry-defined subsets was further divided into 15 random groups. Within each of these 45 groups, which vary in size due to the varying sizes of symmetry-defined subsets, the proportion of designs with each design feature was calculated. Binary functions were written to determine whether at least one of each design feature is present in each design. Within each symmetry subset, the mean and variance of all 15 proportions was then found (Figure 9). The only design features seen in double-mirror symmetric designs in the 3x3 design space are pivot points. For all features except spider nodes and stacked members in the 5x5 design space, both asymmetric and mirror symmetric designs have similar proportions of each design feature, with fewer for the
double-mirror symmetric designs. For spider nodes and stacked members in 5x5 designs, there is greater representation in the mirror symmetry design space than in the other two spaces. These findings indicate that asymmetry is generally more conducive to the inclusion of these four features than double-mirror symmetry, but not as conducive as mirror symmetry. Given the lack of symmetry constraints in asymmetric designs, it is expected that the asymmetric space generally has more space for members to form design features. However, the mirror symmetric space is also expected to be accommodating of design features: the required reflection of members about a single axis can force a higher density of members and well-connected junctions, while still allowing sufficient degrees of freedom for these features to exist.

3.3. Influence of Design Features on Metamaterial Mechanical Properties

Having identified the asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric designs with each type of design feature, the correlation of these features with metamaterial mechanical properties can be assessed. Normal stiffness values, normalized shear stiffness values, and Poisson’s ratios were grouped based on whether or not a design had a given design feature. This grouping resulted in two probability distributions for each metamaterial property. Kernel distributions were used to represent each subset, as none of the subsets were found to be normally-distributed. Each pair of distributions were compared using two-sample K-S tests, with the null hypothesis that these two distributions are from the same continuous distribution. By conducting this process for each of the four design features, all three types of symmetry, and in both the 3x3 and 5x5 design spaces, a total of 72 pairs of probability distributions were generated and compared to each other.

The results of all 72 two-sample K-S tests are shown in Table 2. None of the three types of symmetry have metamaterial property spaces wherein normal stiffness, Poisson’s ratio, and shear stiffness are all influenced to a statistically significant degree by all four features. However, there are more pairs of distinct distributions in the asymmetric design space than there are in the mirror symmetric space. Likewise, the mirror symmetric space contains more distinct distributions than the double-mirror symmetric space. In addition to the asymmetric and mirror symmetric design spaces being more conducive to the mere presence of features than the double-mirror design spaces, these results indicate that features in these two design spaces are more likely to have an influence on metamaterial properties. There is only
Table 2: Two-Sample K-S Test results. Values shown are the p-values associated with each test. A p-value less than 0.05, indicating rejection of the null hypothesis, is marked with an asterisk. Arrows, spider nodes, and stacked members are not present in double-mirror symmetric designs in the 3x3 design space. Cells without a K-S test result are for distributions where the design space does not contain any of the stated features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Space</th>
<th>Design Feature</th>
<th>Mechanical Property</th>
<th>Asymmetric</th>
<th>Mirror Symmetric</th>
<th>Double-Mirror Symmetric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Pivots</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>0.0247 *</td>
<td>0.0559</td>
<td>2.568(10^-4) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Pivots</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>0.0269 *</td>
<td>0.2391</td>
<td>0.0963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Pivots</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>2.210(10^-2) *</td>
<td>3.599(10^-4) *</td>
<td>0.2755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Arrows</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>9.887(10^-22) *</td>
<td>0.0386 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Arrows</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>5.134(10^-4) *</td>
<td>0.0318 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Arrows</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>1.426(10^-1) *</td>
<td>0.0157 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Spiders</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>4.328(10^-5) *</td>
<td>0.0638</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Spiders</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>4.778(10^-20) *</td>
<td>0.0022 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Spiders</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>6.359(10^-7) *</td>
<td>0.1259</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Stacks</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>0.0762</td>
<td>0.3854</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Stacks</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>0.0267 *</td>
<td>0.0079 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x3 Stacks</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>4.546(10^-6) *</td>
<td>0.0344 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Pivots</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>0.4404</td>
<td>0.0273 *</td>
<td>0.2039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Pivots</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>9.941(10^-4) *</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.6952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Pivots</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>0.4686</td>
<td>0.8840</td>
<td>0.0915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Arrows</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>1.375(10^-5) *</td>
<td>1.329(10^-4) *</td>
<td>2.058(10^-4) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Arrows</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>0.0298 *</td>
<td>0.03401 *</td>
<td>0.0133 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Arrows</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>9.408(10^-6) *</td>
<td>3.378(10^-7) *</td>
<td>2.470(10^-7) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Spiders</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>3.274(10^-11) *</td>
<td>3.636(10^-12) *</td>
<td>0.0305 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Spiders</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>5.279(10^-4) *</td>
<td>0.2251</td>
<td>0.8772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Spiders</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>0.00046 *</td>
<td>0.00129 *</td>
<td>1.947(10^-5) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Stacks</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>1.244(10^-4) *</td>
<td>0.0012 *</td>
<td>0.0867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Stacks</td>
<td>Poisson’s</td>
<td>0.0085 *</td>
<td>0.0189 *</td>
<td>0.0573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x5 Stacks</td>
<td>Shear</td>
<td>0.0860</td>
<td>0.0171 *</td>
<td>2.706(10^-3) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

one case, the implementation of stacked members in the 5x5 design space, wherein the distributions for asymmetric designs are not distinct while the distributions for mirror symmetric and double-mirror symmetric designs are distinct. It was thought that the lack of design constraints due to asymmetry would facilitate large, populated groups of stacked members that would be capable of increasing the shear stiffness of a design. However, the results indicate that stacked members do not sufficiently influence shear stiffness in the asymmetric 5x5 design space. This lack of influence is potentially because other dense groups of members (that would not count as a group of stacked members) can still impact shear stiffness in a similar manner to groups of stacked members. Below we focus our discussion on two sets of distributions - the 5x5 design space for arrows and spider nodes; the remainder of the
distributions are included in the Supplementary Information.

Figure 10: Probability density distributions of (a) Poisson’s ratio for designs with and without arrows, and (b) shear stiffness normalized by normal stiffness for designs with and without spider nodes. Both sets of distributions are in the 5x5 design space. All pairs of distributions are statistically distinct according to the two-sample K-S test.

Shown in Figure 10a are the probability distributions of Poisson’s ratio for designs with and without arrows, for all three types of symmetry in the 5x5 design space. The pairs of distributions for all three types of symmetry are statistically distinct, but still within the same order of magnitude as the significance level of 0.05. In all three of these plots, the distribution for designs with arrows is broader and has a lower peak than the distribution for designs without arrows. This means that a design with arrows in any of these three design subsets is more likely to have a Poisson’s ratio farther from zero than a design without these features, which supports the hypothesis that arrows are capable of inducing a larger absolute Poisson’s ratio by introducing relative movement within a unit cell.

Figure 10b shows the probability distributions of normalized shear stiffness for designs with and without spider nodes. The pairs of distributions are statistically distinct for all three types of symmetry, and at least an order of magnitude less than the 0.05 significance level. For mirror and double-mirror symmetric designs, the distribution of designs with spider nodes has a peak
farther to the right than the equivalent peak in the distribution of designs without spider nodes. The peak of the distribution with spider nodes is not significantly shifted compared to the peak of the distribution without spider nodes for asymmetric designs, but the peak of the former is higher than that of the latter. Additionally, the distribution with spider nodes is not significantly shifted compared to the distribution without spider nodes for most shear stiffness values above the peak shear stiffness values (both approximately 0.13); the opposite is true for most shear stiffness values below 0.13. These results indicate that designs with spider nodes are more likely to have a higher normalized shear stiffness value than designs without spider nodes. As such, an increased concentration of members connecting at a point does indeed increase the normalized shear stiffness of a design.

4. Conclusions

In this study, we examined the mechanical properties of asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric lattice-based metamaterial designs to reveal the expanded options for metamaterial mechanical properties when deviating from full symmetry. We defined a standardized design space in order to study differences between fully asymmetric, mirror symmetric, and double-mirror symmetric lattice metamaterial patterns. We then employed a generative design process to create sets of designs for each type of symmetry. The composition of these sets are representative of each symmetry-defined design subspace. The stiffness tensor of each design was then found using a reduced-order finite element model, and the volume fraction of each design was calculated analytically. We quantified the differences among the design spaces using probability distributions of normal stiffness, Poisson’s ratio, and normalized shear stiffness. These distributions indicate that asymmetric designs are likely to have distinct metamaterial properties from double-mirror symmetric designs, but that mirror symmetric designs are not inherently likely to have distinct metamaterial properties from the other two design spaces.

Four design features were identified in the design spaces: pivot points and arrows were specifically thought to influence Poisson’s ratio, while spider nodes and stacked members were expected to influence shear stiffness. These features were found to be more common in asymmetric and mirror symmetric designs than in double-mirror-symmetric designs, which was expected as the double-mirror symmetric design space was thought to be less accommodating
of these features than the other two types of symmetry. Probability distributions were then generated to determine the correlation of these features with the metamaterial property space. As anticipated, designs with *arrows* were more likely to have a Poisson’s ratio farther from zero than designs without *arrows*, regardless of the type of symmetry of the design. Similarly, designs of any symmetry type with *spider nodes* were more likely to have a larger normalized shear stiffness than designs without *spider nodes*. All four design features were found to impact metamaterial properties as expected, with the exception of stacked members in the 5x5 asymmetric design space.

The behavior of these four features in the asymmetric and mirror symmetric design spaces can be used to inform the identification and characterization of additional features in lattice patterns, with the goal of further differentiating the symmetric and asymmetric lattice design spaces. As such, this study provides a framework for leveraging asymmetry to identify novel lattice patterns with properties beyond the metamaterial property space associated with full symmetry.
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