DYNAMIC RELAXATION COUPLED WITH FINITE DIFFERENCES IN LARGE DEFLECTION OF LAMINATED DECKS PLATES USING FIRST ORDER SHEAR DEFORMATION THEORY

Dr. Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman

Nile Valley University, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, Sudan
e-mail: osamamm64@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: First – order orthotropic shear deformation equations for the nonlinear elastic bending response of rectangular decks plates are introduced. Their solution using a computer program based on finite differences implementation of the Dynamic Relaxation (DR) method is outlined. The convergence and accuracy of the DR solutions for elastic large deflection response of isotropic, orthotropic, and laminated plates are established by comparison with various exact and approximate solutions. The present Dynamic Relaxation method (DR) coupled with finite differences method shows a fairly good agreement with other analytical and numerical methods used in the verification scheme.

It was found that: The convergence and accuracy of the DR solution is dependent on several factors including boundary conditions, mesh size and type, fictitious densities, damping coefficients, time increment and applied load. Also, the DR large deflection program using uniform finite differences meshes can be employed in the analysis of different thicknesses for isotropic, orthotropic or laminated plates under uniform loads. All the comparison results for simply supported (SS4) edge conditions showed that deflection is almost dependent on the direction of the applied load or the arrangement of the layers.

KEYWORDS: Dynamic relaxation, finite differences, laminated decks plates, large deflection, first order shear deformation theory

NOTATIONS:
a, b   plate side lengths in x and y directions respectively.

$A_{ij}(i, j = 1,2,6)$ Plate in plane stiffness

A_{44}, A_{55} Plate transverse shear stiffness

$D_{ij}(i, j = 1,2,6)$ Plate flexural stiffness

$\varepsilon_x^\circ \ \varepsilon_y^\circ \ \varepsilon_{xy}^\circ$ Mid – plane direct and shear strains

$\overset{\circ}{\varepsilon}_{xz}, \overset{\circ}{\varepsilon}_{yz}$ Mid – plane transverse shear strains

E_1, E_2, G_{12} In – plane elastic longitudinal, transverse and shear moduli

G_{13}, G_{23} Transverse shear moduli in the x – z and y – z planes respectively

M_x, M_y, M_{xy} Stress couples

$\overline{M}_x, \overline{M}_y, \overline{M}_{xy}$ Dimensionless stress couples

N_x, N_y, N_{xy} Stress resultants

$\overline{N}_x, \overline{N}_y, \overline{N}_{xy}$ Dimensionless stress resultants

$\overline{q}$ Dimensionless transverse pressure

Q_x, Q_y Transverse shear resultants

u, v In – plane displacements

w Deflections

$\overline{w}$ Dimensionless deflection

x, y, z Cartesian co – ordinates

δt Time increment

ϕ, ψ Rotations of the normal to the plate mid – plane

ν_{xy} Poisson's ratio

$\ell_u, \ell_v, \ell_w, \ell_\phi, \ell_\psi$ In plane, out of plane and rotational fictitious densities

$\overset{\circ}{\varkappa}_x, \overset{\circ}{\varkappa}_y, \overset{\circ}{\varkappa}_{xz}$ Curvature and twist components of plate mid – plane

1   INTRODUCTION

Composites were first considered as structural deck materials a little more than half a century ago. From that time to now, they have received increasing attention in all aspects of material science, manufacturing technology, and theoretical analysis.

The term composite could mean almost any thing if taken at face value, since all materials are composites of dissimilar subunits if examined at close enough details. But in modern engineering materials, the term usually refers to a matrix material that is reinforced with fibers. For instance, the term "FRP" which refers to Fiber Reinforced plastic, usually indicates a thermosetting polyester matrix containing glass fibers, and this particular composite has the lion's share of today commercial market.

In the present work, a numerical method known as Dynamic Relaxation (DR) coupled with finite differences is used. The DR method was first proposed in 1960s and then passed through a series of studies to verify its validity by Turvey and Osman Refs. [4], [8] and [9] and Rushton [2], Cassel and Hobbs [10], Day [11] and Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman [12] – [16]. In this

method, the equations of equilibrium are converted to dynamic equations by adding damping and inertia terms. These are then expressed in finite difference form and the solution is obtained through iterations. The optimum damping coefficient and time increment used to stabilize the solution depend on a number of factors including the matrix properties of the structure, the applied load, the boundary conditions and the size of the mesh used.

Numerical techniques other than the DR include finite element method, which widely used in the present studies i.e. of Damodar R. Ambur et al [17], Ying Qing Huang et al [18], Onsy L. Roufaeil et al [19], and Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman [20] – [22] … etc. In a comparison between the DR and the finite element method, Aalami [23] found that the computer time required for finite element method is eight times greater than for DR analysis, whereas the storage capacity for finite element analysis is ten times or more than that for DR analysis. This fact is supported by Putcha and Reddy [24] who noted that some of the finite element formulations require large storage capacity and computer time. Hence, due to less computations and computer time involved in the present study. The DR method is considered more efficient than the finite element method. In another comparison Aalami [23] found that the difference in accuracy between one version of finite element and another may reach a value of 10% or more, whereas a comparison between one version of finite element method and DR showed a difference of more than 15%. Therefore, the DR method can be considered of acceptable accuracy. The only apparent limitation of DR method is that it can only be applied to limited geometries. However, this limitation is irrelevant to rectangular plates which are widely used in engineering applications.

The Dynamic Relaxation (DR) program used in this paper is designed for the analysis of rectangular plates irrespective of material, geometry, edge conditions. The functions of the program are to read the file data; compute the stiffness of the laminate, the fictitious densities, the velocities and displacements and the mid – plane deflections and stresses; check the stability of the numerical computations, the convergence of the solution, and the wrong convergence; compute through – thickness stresses in direction of plate axes; and transform through – thickness stresses in the lamina principal axes.

The convergence of the DR solution is checked at the end of each iteration by comparing the velocities over the plate domain with a predetermined value which ranges between 10^{-9} for small deflections and 10^{-6} for large deflections. When all velocities are smaller than a predetermined value, the solution is deemed converged and consequently the iterative procedure is terminated. Sometimes DR solution converges to an invalid solution. To check for that the profile of the variable is compared with an expected profile over the domain. For example, when the value of the function on the boundaries is zero, and it is expected to increase from edge to center, then the solution should follow a

similar profile. When the computed profile is different from the expected values, the solution is considered incorrect and can hardly be made to converge to the correct value by altering the damping coefficients and time increment. Therefore, the boundary conditions should be examined and corrected if they are improper.

The errors inherent in the DR technique include the discretization error which is due to the replacement of a continuous function with a discrete function, and there is an additional error because the discrete equations are not solved exactly due to the variations of the velocities from the edge of the plate to the center. Finer meshes reduce the discretization error, but increase the round – off error due to the large number of calculations involved.

2   LARGE DEFLECTION THEORY

The equilibrium, strain, constitutive equations and boundary conditions are introduced below without derivation

2.1 Equilibrium equations

$$\frac{\partial N_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial N_{xy}}{\partial y} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial N_{xy}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial N_y}{\partial y} = 0$$

$$N_x \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} + 2N_{xy} \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x \partial y} + N_y \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial Q_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial Q_y}{\partial y} + q = 0 \qquad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial M_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial M_{xy}}{\partial y} - Q_x = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial M_{xy}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial M_y}{\partial y} - Q_y = 0$$

2.2 Strain equations

The large deflection strains of the mid – plane of the plate are as given below:

$$\varepsilon_x^\circ = \frac{\partial u^\circ}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial x}\right)^2 + z\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}$$

$$\varepsilon_y^\circ = \frac{\partial v^\circ}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial y}\right)^2 + z\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y}$$

$$\varepsilon_{xy}^{\circ} = \frac{\partial u^{\circ}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial v^{\circ}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} + z\left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}\right) \qquad (2)$$

$$\varepsilon_{xz}^{\circ} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} + \psi$$

$$\varepsilon_{yz}^{\circ} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} + \phi$$

2.3 The constitutive equations

The laminate constitutive equations can be represented in the following form:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} N_i \\ M_i \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{ij} & B_{ij} \\ B_{ij} & D_{ij} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_j^{\circ} \\ \chi_j^{\circ} \end{Bmatrix}$$

$$(3)$$

$$\begin{Bmatrix} Q_y \\ Q_x \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{44} & A_{45} \\ A_{45} & A_{55} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_{yz}^{\circ} \\ \varepsilon_{xz}^{\circ} \end{Bmatrix}$$

Where N_i denotes N_x, N_y, N_{xy} and M_i denotes M_x, M_y and M_{xy}.

A_{ij}, B_{ij} and D_{ij} $(i, j = 1,2,6)$ are respectively the membrane rigidities, coupling rigidities and flexural rigidities of the plate.

χ_j° denotes $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y}$ and $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}$. A_{44}, A_{45} and A_{55} denote the stiffness

Coefficients and are calculated as follows: -

$$A_{ij} = \sum_{k-1}^{n} k_i k_j \int_{z_k}^{z_{k+1}} c_{ij} \, dz, (i, j = 4,5)$$

Where c_{ij} the stiffness of a lamina is referred to the plate principal axes, and k_i, k_j are the shear correction factors.

2.4 Boundary conditions

Four sets of simply supported boundary conditions are used in this paper, and are denoted as SS1, SS2, SS3, and SS4 as has been shown in Figure 1 below.

x

$N_{xy} = N_y = w = M_{xy} = M_y = 0$

$N_x = 0$
$N_{xy} = 0$
$w = 0$
$M_x = 0$
$M_{xy} = 0$

b

a

$N_x = 0$
$N_{xy} = 0$
$w = 0$
$M_x = 0$
$M_{xy} = 0$

y

$N_{xy} = N_y = w = M_{xy} = M_y = 0$

SS1

x

$u = N_y = w = \phi = M_y = 0$

$N_x = 0$
$v = 0$
$w = 0$
$M_x = 0$
$\psi = 0$

b

a

$N_x = 0$
$v = 0$
$w = 0$
$M_x = 0$
$\psi = 0$

y

$u = N_y = w = \phi = M_y = 0$

SS2

x

$N_{xy} = v = w = \phi = M_y = 0$

$u = 0$
$N_{xy} = 0$
$w = 0$
$M_x = 0$
$\psi = 0$

b

a

$u = 0$
$N_{xy} = 0$
$w = 0$
$M_x = 0$
$\psi = 0$

y

$N_{xy} = v = w = \phi = M_y = 0$

SS3

Figure 1. Simply supported boundary conditions

3   DYNAMIC RELAXATION OF THE PLATE EQUATIONS

An exact solution of the plate equations is obtained using finite differences coupled with dynamic relaxation method. The damping and inertia terms are added to equations (1). Then the following approximations are introduced for the velocity and acceleration terms:

$$\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{\partial \alpha^a}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \alpha^b}{\partial t}\right]$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial t^2} = \left(\frac{\partial \alpha^a}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial \alpha^b}{\partial t}\right)/\partial t$$

$$(4)$$

In which $\alpha \equiv u, v, w, \phi, \psi$. Hence equations (1) become:

$$\frac{\partial u^a}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{1+k_u^*}\left[\left(1-k_u^*\right)\frac{\partial u^b}{\partial t} + \frac{\delta t}{\ell u}\left(\frac{\partial N_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial N_{xy}}{\partial y}\right)\right]$$

$$\frac{\partial v^a}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{1+k_v^*}\left[\left(1-k_v^*\right)\frac{\partial v^b}{\partial t} + \frac{\delta t}{\ell u}\left(\frac{\partial N_{xy}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial N_y}{\partial y}\right)\right]$$

$$\frac{\partial w^a}{\partial t} =$$

$$\frac{1}{1+k_w^*}\left[\left(1-k_w^*\right)\frac{\partial w^b}{\partial t}+\frac{\delta t}{\ell_w}\left(N_x\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2}+2N_{xy}\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x\,\partial y}+N_y\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2}+\frac{\partial Q_x}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial Q_y}{\partial y}+q\right)\right] \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi^a}{\partial t}=\frac{1}{1+k_\phi^*}\left[\left(1-k_\phi^*\right)\frac{\partial \phi^b}{\partial t}+\frac{\delta t}{\ell_\phi}\left(\frac{\partial M_y}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial M_{xy}}{\partial y}-Q_x\right)\right]$$

$$\frac{\partial \psi^a}{\partial t}=\frac{1}{1+k_\psi^*}\left[\left(1-k_\psi^*\right)\frac{\partial \psi^b}{\partial t}+\frac{\delta t}{\ell_\psi}\left(\frac{\partial N_{xy}}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial M_y}{\partial y}-Q_y\right)\right]$$

The superscripts a and b in equations (4) and (5) refer respectively to the values of velocities after and before the time increment δt and $k_\alpha^*=\frac{1}{2}k_\alpha\,\delta t\,\ell_\alpha^{-1}$.

The displacements at the end of each time increment, δt, are evaluated using the following integration procedure:

$$\alpha^a=\alpha^b+\delta t\,\frac{\partial \alpha^b}{\partial t} \quad (6)$$

Thus equations (5), (6), (2) and (3) constitute the set of equations for solution. The DR procedure operates as follows:
    (1) Set initial conditions.
    (2) Compute velocities from equations (5).
    (3) Compute displacement from equation (6).
    (4) Apply displacement boundary conditions.
    (5) Compute strains from equations (2).
    (6)   Compute stress resultants and stress couples from equations (3).
    (7) Apply stress resultants and stress couples' boundary conditions.
    (8) Check if velocities are acceptably small (say 10^{-6}).
    (9) Check if the convergence criterion is satisfied, if it is not repeat the steps from 2 to 8.
It is obvious that this method requires five fictitious densities and a similar number of damping coefficients so as the solution will be converged correctly.

4   VERIFICATION OF THE DYNAMIC RELAXATION (DR) METHOD USING LARGE DEFLECTION THEORY

Table 1 shows deflections, stress resultants and stress couples in simply supported in – plane free (SS2) isotropic plate. The present results have been computed with 6×6 uniform meshes. These results are in a fairly good

agreement with those of Aalami et al [1] using finite difference method (i.e. for deflections, the difference ranges between 0.35% at $\bar{q} = 20.8$ and 0 % as the pressure is increased to 97). A similar comparison between the two results is shown in Table 2 for simply supported (SS3) condition. It is apparent that the center deflections, stress couples and stress resultants agree very well. The mid – side stress resultants do not show similar agreement whilst the corner stress resultants show considerable differences. This may be attributed to the type of mesh used in each analysis. A set of thin plate results comparisons presented here with Rushton [2] who employed the DR method coupled with finite oilifferences. The present results for simply supported (SS4) square plates were computed for two thickness ratios using a 8×8 uniform mesh is listed in table 3. In this instant, the present results differ slightly from those found in Ref. [2]. Another comparison for simply supported (SS4) square isotropic plates subjected to uniformly distributed loads are shown in Tables 4 and 5 respectively for deflection analysis of thin and moderately thick plates. In this comparison, it is noted that, the center deflection of the present DR analysis, and those of Azizian and Dawe [3] who employed the finite strip method are in fairly good agreement (i.e. with a maximum error not exceeding 0.09%).

A large deflection comparison for orthotropic plates was made with the DR program. The results are compared with DR results of Turvey and Osman [4], Reddy's [5], and Zaghloul et al results [6]. For a thin uniformly loaded square plate made of material I which its properties are stated in Table 6 and with simply supported in – plane free (SS2) edges. The center deflections are presented in Table 7 where DR showed a good agreement with the other three. A large deflection comparison for laminated plates was made by recomposing sun and chin's results [7] for [$90_4^{\circ}/0_4^{\circ}$] using the DR program and material II which its properties are cited in Table 6. The results were obtained for quarter of a plate using a 5×5 square mesh, with shear correction factors $k_4^2 = k_5^2 = 5/6$. The analysis was made for different boundary conditions and the results were shown in Tables 8, and 9 as follows: The present DR deflections of two layer antisymmetric cross – ply simply supported in – plane fixed (SS4) are compared with DR results of Turvey and Osman [8] and with sun and chin's values for a range of loads as shown in Table 8. The good agreement found confirms that for simply supported (SS4) edge conditions, the deflection depends on the direction of the applied load or the arrangement of the layers. Table 9 shows a comparison between the present DR, and DR Ref. [8] results, which are approximately identical. The difference between laminates $\left[0^{\circ}/90^{\circ}\right]$ and $\left[90^{\circ}/0^{\circ}\right]$ at $b/a = 5$ is 0.3% whilst it is 0% when $b/a = 1$.

The comparison made between DR and alterative techniques show a good agreement and hence the present DR large deflection program using uniform finite difference meches can be employed with confidence in the analysis of

moderately thick and thin flat isotropic, orthotropic or laminated plates under uniform loads. The program can be used with the same confidence to generate small deflection results.

Table 1. Comparison of present DR, Aalami and Chapman's [1] large deflection results for simply supported (SS2) square isotropic plate subjected to uniform pressure $(h/a = 0.02, v = 0.3)$

$\overline{q}$	S	$\overline{w}_c$	$\overline{M}_x(1)$ $\overline{M}_y(2)$	$\overline{N}_x(1)$ $\overline{N}_y(2)$
20.8	1	0.7360	0.7357	0.7852
	2	0.7386	0.7454	0.8278
41.6	1	1.1477	1.0742	1.8436
	2	1.1507	1.0779	1.9597
63.7	1	1.4467	1.2845	2.8461
	2	1.4499	1.2746	3.0403
97.0	1	1.7800	1.4915	4.1688
	2	1.7800	1.4575	4.4322

S (1): present DR results (6×6 uniform mesh over quarter of the plate)
S (2): Ref. [1] results (6×6 graded mesh over quarter of the plate)

$$(1) x = y = \frac{1}{2} a , z = 0$$

Table 2. Comparison of present DR, Aalami and Chapman's [1] large deflection results for simply supported (SS3) square isotropic plate subjected to uniform pressure $(h/a = 0.02, v = 0.3)$

$\overline{q}$	S	$\overline{w}_c$	$\overline{M}_x(1)$ $\overline{M}_y(1)$	$\overline{N}_x(1)$ $\overline{N}_y(1)$	$\overline{N}_x(2)$ $\overline{N}_y(3)$	$\overline{N}_x(3)$ $\overline{N}_y(2)$	$\overline{N}_x(4)$ $\overline{N}_y(4)$
20.8	1	0.5994	0.6077	1.0775	0.2423	1.1411	0.1648
	2	0.6094	0.6234	1.0714	0.2097	1.1172	0.2225
41.6	1	0.8613	0.8418	2.2435	0.5405	2.4122	0.3177
	2	0.8783	0.8562	2.2711	0.4808	2.4084	0.4551
63.7	1	1.0434	0.9930	3.3151	0.8393	3.6014	0.4380
	2	1.0572	1.0114	3.3700	0.7564	3.6172	0.6538
97.0	1	1.2411	1.1489	4.7267	1.2604	5.1874	0.5706
	2	1.2454	1.1454	4.8626	1.1538	2.2747	0.9075

S (1): present DR results (6×6 uniform mesh over quarter of the plate)
S (2): Ref. [1] results (6×6 graded mesh over quarter of the plate)

$$(1) x = y = \frac{1}{2} a, z = 0; (2) x = \frac{1}{2} a, y = z = 0; (3) x = 0, y = \frac{1}{2} a, z = 0; (4) x = y = z = 0$$

Table 3 Comparison of present DR, and Rushton's [2] large deflection results for simply supported (SS4) square isotropic plate subjected to uniform pressure $(v = 0.3)$

$\overline{q}$	S	$\overline{w}_c$	$\overline{\sigma}_1(1)$
8.2	1	0.3172	2.3063
	2	0.3176	2.3136
	3	0.2910	2.0900
29.3	1	0.7252	5.9556
	2	0.7249	5.9580
	3	0.7310	6.2500
91.6	1	1.2147	11.3180
	2	1.2147	11.3249
	3	1.2200	11.4300
293.0	1	1.8754	20.749
	2	1.8755	20.752
	3	1.8700	20.820

S (1): present DR results ($h / a = 0.02; 8 \times 8$ uniform mesh over quarter of the plate)

S (2): present DR results ($h / a = 0.01; 8 \times 8$ uniform mesh over quarter of the plate)

S (3): Ref. [2] results (thin plate 8×8 uniform mesh over quarter of the plate)

$$(1) x = y = \frac{1}{2} a, z = \frac{1}{2} h$$

Table 4. Comparison of the present DR, and Azizian and Dawe's [3] large deflection results for thin shear deformable simply supported (SS4) square isotropic plate subjected to uniform pressure $(h / a = 0.01, v = 0.3)$

$\overline{q}$	S	$\overline{w}_c$
9.2	1	0.34693
	2	0.34677
36.6	1	0.80838
	2	0.81539
146.5	1	1.45232
	2	1.46250
586.1	1	2.38616
	2	2.38820

S (1): present DR results (6×6 uniform mesh over quarter of the plate)

S (2): Azizian and Dawe [3] results.

Table 5. Comparison of the present DR, and Azizian and Dawe's [3] large deflection results for moderately thick shear deformable simply supported (SS4) square isotropic plates subjected to uniform pressure $(h/a = 0.05, v = 0.3)$

$\overline{q}$	S	$\overline{w}_c$
0.92	1	0.04106
	2	0.04105
4.6	1	0.19493
	2	0.19503
6.9	1	0.27718
	2	0.27760
9.2	1	0.34850
	2	0.34938

S (1): present DR results (6×6 uniform mesh over quarter of the plate)
S (2): Azizian and Dawe [3] results.

Table 6. Material properties used in the orthotropic and laminated plate comparison analysis

Material	E_1/E_2	G_2/E_2	G_{13}/E_2	G_{23}/E_2	v_{12}	SCF $\left(k_4^2 = k_5^2\right)$
I	2.345	0.289	0.289	0.289	0.32	$5/6$
II	14.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.3	$5/6$

Table 7. Comparison of present DR, DR results of Ref. [4], finite element results Ref. [5] and experimental results Ref. [6] for a uniformly loaded simply supported (SS2) square orthotropic plate made of material I $(h/a = 0.0115)$

$\overline{q}$	$\overline{w}_c(1)$	$\overline{w}_c(2)$	$\overline{w}_c(3)$	$\overline{w}_c(4)$
17.9	0.5859	0.5858	0.58	0.58
53.6	1.2710	1.2710	1.30	1.34
71.5	1.4977	1.4977	1.56	1.59
89.3	1.6862	1.6862	1.74	1.74

S (1): present DR results (5×5 uniform non – interlacing mesh over quarter of the plate).
S (2): DR results of Ref. [4].
S (3): Reddy's finite element results [5].
S (4): Zaghloul's and Kennedy's Ref. [6] experimental results as read from graph.

Table 8. Deflection of the center of a two – layer anti symmetric cross ply
simply supported in – plane fixed (SS4) strip under uniform pressure
$(b/a = 5, h/a = 0.01)$

$\overline{q}$	S	$\overline{w}_1[0°/90°]$	$\overline{w}_2[90°/0°]$	$\overline{w}_。(B_{ij}=0)$	% (1)	% (2)	% (3)
18	1	0.6851	0.2516		131.4	- 15.0	172.3
	2	0.6824	0.2544	0.2961	130.5	- 14.1	168.2
	3	0.6800	0.2600				
36	1	0.8587	0.3772		88.1	- 17.4	127.7
	2	0.8561	0.3822	0.4565	87.5	- 16.3	124.0
	3	0.8400	0.3900				
72	1	1.0453	0.5387		61.0	- 17.0	94.0
	2	1.0443	0.5472	0.6491	60.9	- 15.7	90.8
	3	1.0400	0.5500				
108	1	1.1671	0.6520		50.0	- 16.2	79.0
	2	1.1675	0.6630	0.7781	50.0	- 14.8	76.1
	3	1.1500	0.6600				

S (1): present DR results
S (2): DR results Ref. [8].
S (3): Values determined from sun and chin's results Ref. [7].
(1): $100 \times (\overline{w}_1 - \overline{w}_。)/\overline{w}_。$
(2): $100 \times (\overline{w}_2 - \overline{w}_。)/\overline{w}_。$
(3): $100 \times (\overline{w}_1 - \overline{w}_2)/\overline{w}_2$

Table 9. Center deflection of two – layer anti – symmetric cross – ply simply
supported in – plane free (SS1) plate under uniform pressure and with different
aspect ratios $(h/a = 0.01; \overline{q} = 18)$

b/a	S	$\overline{w}_1[0°/90°]$	$\overline{w}_2[90°/0°]$	$\overline{w}_。(B_{ij}=0)$	% (1)	% (2)	% (3)
2.5	1	0.8325	0.8422	0.3907	113.1	115.6	- 1.15
	2	0.8328	0.8424	0.3907	113.2	115.6	- 1.1
2.0	1	0.7707	0.7796	0.3807	102.4	104.8	- 1.14
	2	0.7712	0.7799	0.3807	102.6	104.9	- 1.1
1.75	1	0.7173	0.7248	0.3640	97.0	99.1	- 1.0
	2	0.7169	0.7251	0.3640	97.0	99.2	- 1.1
1.5	1	0.6407	0.6460	0.3335	92.1	93.7	- 0.82
	2	0.6407	0.6455	0.3325	92.7	94.1	- 0.70
1.25	1	0.5324	0.5346	0.2781	91.4	92.2	- 0.4
	2	0.5325	0.5347	0.2782	91.4	92.2	- 0.4
1.0	1	0.3797	0.3797	0.1946	95.1	95.1	0.0
	2	0.3796	0.3796	0.1949	94.8	94.8	0.0

S (1): present DR results
S (2): DR results Ref. [8].

(1): $100 \times \left(\overline{w}_1 - \overline{w}_\circ \right) / \overline{w}_\circ$
(2): $100 \times \left(\overline{w}_2 - \overline{w}_\circ \right) / \overline{w}_\circ$
(3): $100 \times \left(\overline{w}_1 - \overline{w}_2 \right) / \overline{w}_2$

5 CONCLUSIONS

A Dynamic relaxation (DR) program based on finite differences has been developed for large deflection analysis of rectangular laminated plates using first order shear deformation theory (FSDT). The displacements are assumed linear through the thickness of the plate. A series of new results for uniformly loaded thin, moderately thick, and thick plates with simply supported edges have been presented. Finally, a series of numerical comparisons have been undertaken to demonstrate the accuracy of the DR program. These comparisons show the following: -

1. The convergence of the DR solution depends on several factors including boundary conditions, meshes size, fictitious densities and applied load.
2. The DR large deflection program using uniform finite differences meshes can be employed with confidence in the analysis of moderately thick and flat isotropic, orthotropic or laminated plates under uniform loads.
3. The DR program can be used with the same confidence to generate small deflection results.
4. The time increment is a very important factor for speeding convergence and controlling numerical computations. When the increment is too small, the convergence becomes tediously slow; and when it is too large, the solution becomes unstable. The proper time increment in the present study is taken as 0.8 for all boundary conditions.
5. The optimum damping coefficient is that which produces critical motion. When the damping coefficients are large, the motion is over – damped and the convergence becomes very slow. At the other hand when the coefficients are small, the motion is under – damped and can cause numerical instability. Therefore, the damping coefficients must be selected carefully to eliminate under – damping and over – damping.

REFERENCES

[1] Aalami, B. and Chapman J.C. 'large deflection behavior of rectangular orthotropic plates under transverse and in – plane loads', proceedings of the institution of civil Engineers, (1969), 42, pp. (347 – 382).

[2] Rushton K. R., 'large deflection of variable – thickness plates', International journal of mech. Sciences, vol. 10, (1968), pp. (723 – 735).

[3] Azizian Z. G. and Dawe D.J., 'Geometrically Non – linear analysis of rectangular Mindlin plates using the finite strip method', computers and structures, vol.22, No.3, (1985), pp. (523 – 436).

[4] Turvey G.J. and Osman M.Y., 'large deflection analysis of orthotropic Mindlin plates', proceedings of the 12th Energy resources technical conference and exhibition, Houston, Texas (1989), pp. (163 – 172).

[5] Reddy J.N., 'Energy and variation methods in applied mechanics', John Wiley and sons, New York, (1984), pp. (379 – 387).

[6] Zaghloul S.A. and Kennedy J.B., 'Nonlinear behavior of symmetrically laminated plates', Journal of applied mechanics, vol.42, (1975), pp. (234 – 236).

[7] Sun C.T. and Chin H., 'on large deflection effects in unsymmetrical cross – ply composite laminates', Journal of composite materials, vol.22 (1988), pp. (1045 – 1059).

[8] Turvey G.J. and Oman M. Y., 'large deflection effects in anti symmetric cross – ply laminated strips and plates', I.H. Marshall, composite strictures, vol.6, paisley college, Scotland, Elsevier science publishers, (1991), pp. (397 – 413).

[9] Turvey G. J. and Osman M. Y., 'Elastic large deflection analysis of isotropic rectangular Mindlin plates', International journal of mechanical sciences, vol. 22, (1990). pp. (1 – 14).

[10] Cassel A.C. and Hobbs R.E., 'Numerical Stability of dynamic relaxation analysis of nonlinear structures',

[11] Day A.S., 'An Introduction to dynamic relaxation', the engineer, vol. 219, No. 5668, (1965), pp. (218 - 221).

[12] Osama Mohammed Elmardi, 'Verification of dynamic relaxation (DR) method in isotropic, orthotropic and laminated plates using small deflection theory', International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology, volume 72; (2014), pp. 37 – 48.

[13] Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman, 'Nonlinear analysis of rectangular laminated plates using large deflection theory', International Journal of Emerging Technology and Research, volume 2, issue 5; (2015), pp. (26 – 48).

[14] Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman, 'Validation of Dynamic Relaxation (DR) Method in Rectangular Laminates using Large Deflection Theory', International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science and Software Engineering, volume 5, issue 9; September (2015), pp. (137 – 144).

[15] Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman, 'Nonlinear analysis of rectangular laminated plates', Lap Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany, and ISBN: (978-3-659-76787-6) ;(2015).

[16] Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman, 'Text Book on Dynamic Relaxation Method', Lap Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany, and ISBN: (978-3-659-94751-3) ;(2016).

[17] Damodar R. Ambur, Navin Jounky, Mark Hilburger, Carlos G. Davila,' Progressive failure analysis of compression loaded composite Curved panels with and without Cutouts,' composite structures, vol.65, (2004), pp. (143 – 155).

[18] Ying Qing Huang, Shenglin Di, Chang Chun Wu, and Huiya Sun, 'Bending analysis of composite laminated plates using a partially hybrid stress element with interlaminar continuity', computer and structures, vol.80, (2002), pp. (403 – 410).

[19] Onsy L. Roufaeil, Thanh Tran – Cong,' finite strip elements for laminated composite plates with transverse shear strain discontinuities', composite structure, vol. 56, (2002) , pp. (249 – 258).

[20] Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman, 'Introduction and Literature Review on Buckling of Composite Laminated Plates', Lap Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany, and ISBN:

(978-3-659-86387-5) ;(2016).

[21] Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman, 'Bibliography and Literature Review on Buckling of Laminated Plates', International Journal of Science and Engineering, volume 2, issue 8; August (2016), pp. (104 – 112).

[22] Osama Mohammed Elmardi Suleiman, 'Literature review on imperfection of composite laminated plates', Journal of Microscopy and Ultrastructure, Vol.03, 5 (2017), pp. (119 – 122).

[23] Aalami B., 'Large deflection of elastic plates under patch loading', Journal of structural division, ASCE, vol. 98, No. ST 11, (1972), pp. (2567 – 2586).

[24] Putcha N.S. and Reddy J.N., 'A refined mixed shear flexible finite element for the non – linear analysis of laminated plates,' computers and structures, vol. 22, No. 4, (1986), pp. (529 – 538).