

Assessing the Accuracy of Different Remapping Methods in Adaptive Mesh Refinement

B. Marques¹ • D. Neto¹ • J.L. Alves²

¹ University of Coimbra, CEMMPRE, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Portugal

² University of Minho, CMEMS, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Portugal

ESAFORM 2022 25th International Conference on Material Forming 27th-29th April 2022 Braga, Portugal

Selective Laser Melting (SLM)

- Parts are built by **successively adding material in a layer wise fashion**.
- Capable of **building parts with complex geometry**.



Selective Laser Melting (SLM)

- Powder material is deposited.
- A laser is used to selectively melt powder material (powder \rightarrow liquid).
- The liquid material cools down and solidifies (liquid \rightarrow solid).



SLM numerical modelling

Micro-scale

- SLM presents multiphysics phenomena across multiple scales.
 - Micro-scale modelling the interactions between the laser and powder particles.
 - Meso-scale modelling sub-regions of the process (typically scan vectors).
 - Macro-scale modelling at part scale.



Macro-scale



Finite element method (FEM)

- Typically used in the meso and macro-scale.
- The numerical solution accuracy and the computational time are strongly dependent on the adopted finite element mesh.

Temperature field



Temp

Non-conforming meshes

Advantages:

- Allow high mesh size gradients.
- Hierarchical definition of the mesh.
- Disadvantages:
 - Presence of hanging nodes.





Hanging nodes

- Regularly occur when two elements of different refinement levels are neighbors.
- Node of an element not shared by an adjacent element.
- These nodes require special treatment to ensure the continuity at the interelement boundaries.
 - Penalty method
 - Lagrangian method
 - Augmented lagrangian method



Mesh balance

- Creates smoother mesh size gradients.
- Reduces the number of hanging nodes at expense of a higher element count.
- **Face balance** ensures no more than 1 hanging node per face.
- Corner balance ensures no more than 1 hanging node per face and edge.







Unbalanced

Face balanced

Corner balanced

Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR)

- Static AMR Mesh remains unchanged during simulation.
- **Dynamic AMR** Mesh is changed during simulation.



Static nonconforming mesh

Dynamic nonconforming mesh

Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR)

• **Dynamic AMR** requires variable remapping.



• Remapping of all numerical variables

- Nodal variables: displacement, temperature, etc.
- State variables: stress, strain, density, etc.

Remapping algorithms

Inverse isoparametric mapping



Remapping algorithms

• Dual Kriging (DK)



$$f(x, y, z) = \cos(\pi x) \times \cos(\pi y) \times \cos(\pi z)$$

- x, y and z range between -1 and 1.
- The state variable is always in the range [-1, 1].
- The error is defined as the difference between the approximated and the analytical value.



- Coarsening procedure (Initial mesh → Coarsened mesh)
 - > DK with cubic spline covariance function presents negligible error.
 - > DK with linear spline covariance function increases the error to about 0.02
 - IIM method provides the worse solution (error about 10 times larger than DK (linear))



- Refinement procedure (Initial mesh → Refined mesh)
 - DK (linear) provides the worse estimative.
 - IIM develops identical element average error to DK (cubic)
 - > In IIM, most of the GP (87.5%) have error values close to zero





Error propagation

- > IIM performance was independent of the analyzed cycle.
- DK (linear) and DK (cubic) displayed error propagation.
- > DK (cubic) presents the lowest maximum error value.



Tensile test

- 1/8 of a standard flat specimen is modelled. Symmetry conditions are applied.
- Refinement criteria: strain gradient.



- The accuracy of each remapping method was evaluated both in the refinement and coarsening stages.
- The accuracy of the remapping methods was lower in the refinement in comparison with the coarsening.
- The effect of the covariance function on the DK method has a significant impact on the accuracy.
- **DK with cubic spline** covariance function **performed better** than the **DK with linear spline** covariance function.
- Error in the approximation of the state variable is lower using the DK method compared with the IIM method.
- The **IIM method**, unlike the DK method, **does not suffer from error propagation**.
- The simulation of a **tensile test** showed **similar performance** when comparing both remapping methods.

Acknowledgements

This research work was sponsored by national funds from the **Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT)** under the project with reference **PTDC/EME-EME/31657/2017** and by European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) through the Portugal 2020 program and the Centro 2020 Regional Operational Programme (CENTRO-01-0145-FEDER-031657) under the project MATIS (CENTRO-01-0145-FEDER-000014) and UID/EMS/00285/2020.

The first author is also grateful to the FCT for the PhD grant with reference 2020.05267.BD.



Projetos Cofinanciados pela UE:





UNIÃO EUROPEIA

Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional



Thank you for watching!