



Study on the solvability of solutions for double-degeneracy problems by using the indirect BIEM/BEM

Ting-An Wu (吳庭安), Department of Harbor and River Engineering, National Taiwan Ocean University, Taiwan (0062125@mail.ntou.edu.tw)
Co-workers: Dr. Jeng-Hong Kao (高政宏), Mr. Sheng-Kai Kao (高聖凱), Distinguished Chair Prof. Jeng-Tzong Chen (陳正宗)

Abstract

In this study, the indirect boundary element method (BIEM) of the single and double layers can be employed to solve the anti-plane shear problem including the crack or rigid-line inclusion. The exact solution and numerical results for the unknown boundary density and displacement field has been solved. We discuss the solvability of solutions for four different problems by using the indirect BIEM, respectively. It is interesting to find that even the unknown boundary data does not agree with the analytical solution, the solution for the displacement field is still acceptable, for the single degeneracy of degenerate boundary (SDB) cases. The reason is explained by applying the singular value decomposition (SVD) technique. In addition, we deal with the double-degeneracy problem by using the Fichera method. It is noteworthy that the Fichera method can effectively solve the degenerate-scale problem.

Problem statement

Hole: $\sigma_{yz}^0 = S$, $\sigma_{xz}^0 = 0$, $\sigma_{xy}^0 = 0$, $\sigma_{xx}^0 = 0$, $\sigma_{yy}^0 = 0$, $\sigma_{zz}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{yz}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{xz}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{xy}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{xx}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{yy}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{zz}^0 = 0$

Rigid inclusion: $\sigma_{yz}^0 = 0$, $\sigma_{xz}^0 = S$, $\sigma_{xy}^0 = 0$, $\sigma_{xx}^0 = 0$, $\sigma_{yy}^0 = 0$, $\sigma_{zz}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{yz}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{xz}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{xy}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{xx}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{yy}^0 = 0$, $\tau_{zz}^0 = 0$

Remote anti-plane shear $u^*(x) = \frac{S}{\mu} y$, when $\sigma_{yz}^0 = S$

Boundary condition $t(x) = \frac{\partial u(x)}{\partial n_x} = 0$, $x \in B$

Indirect boundary integral formulations

Single-layer potential $u(x) = \int_B U(x,s) \alpha(s) ds$, $x \in D \dots (A)$

Double-layer potential $u(x) = \int_B U^*(x,s) \beta(s) ds$, $x \in D \dots (C)$

Fundamental solution $U(x,s) = \ln r$, $r = |x-s|$

Kernel functions $T(x,s) = \frac{\partial U(x,s)}{\partial n_x}$, $U^*(x,s) = \frac{\partial U(x,s)}{\partial n_x}$, $T^*(x,s) = \frac{\partial^2 U(x,s)}{\partial n_x \partial n_x}$

Unknown boundary densities $\alpha(s) = \frac{1}{J(\xi, \eta)} \left(a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \cos n\eta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \sin n\eta \right)$, $0 \leq \eta < 2\pi$, $s = (\xi, \eta) \in B$

$\beta(s) = c_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n \cos n\eta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n \sin n\eta$, $0 \leq \eta < 2\pi$, $s = (\xi, \eta) \in B$

Fichera formulation

$u^M(x) = \int_B U(x,s) \alpha(s) dB(s) + c$ $\dots (A')$

$\int_B \alpha(s) dB(s) = 0$ $\dots (A'')$

For degenerate scale of rigid line inclusion.

Kernel function $U(x,s)$

Unknown boundary density $\alpha(s) = \frac{1}{J(\xi, \eta)} \left(a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \cos n\eta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \sin n\eta \right)$

Results and discussions

Table 1 Solution of crack and rigid-line inclusion problems by using the single and double-layer approaches (analytical and numerical approaches).

Trivial cases	Nontrivial cases	Degenerate boundary, $a=1.5, b=0, 100$ elements	
Crack ($\sigma_{yz}^0 = 0$ and $\sigma_{xz}^0 = S$)	Crack ($\sigma_{yz}^0 = S$ and $\sigma_{xz}^0 = 0$)	Single-layer approach Boundary density $a_n = 0$, $n=1,2,3,\dots$ b_n has no solution c_n is free, $n=1,2,3,4,\dots$ ⇒ Degenerate boundary	Field solution $\alpha(s)$ has no solution $u_2(x)$ can not be found
Rigid-line inclusion ($\sigma_{yz}^0 = S$ and $\sigma_{xz}^0 = 0$)	Rigid-line inclusion ($\sigma_{yz}^0 = 0$ and $\sigma_{xz}^0 = S$)	Single-layer approach Boundary density $b_n = \frac{Sc}{2\pi\mu}$, $n=1,2,3,\dots$ $a_n = 0$, $n=1,2,3,\dots$ c_n is free, $n=1,2,3,4,\dots$ ⇒ Degenerate boundary	Field solution $\alpha(s) = \frac{1}{J(\xi, \eta)} \left(a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \cos n\eta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \sin n\eta \right)$ $u_1(x) = 2\pi \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \cos n\eta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \sin n\eta \right)$
		Double-layer approach Boundary density c_n is free, $n=1,2,3,\dots$ $d_n = \frac{Sc}{2\pi\mu}$, $n=1,2,3,4,\dots$ $e_n = 0$, $n=2,3,4,\dots$ ⇒ Degenerate boundary	Field solution $\beta(s) = c_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n \cos n\eta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n \sin n\eta$ $u_1(x) = \frac{Sc}{\mu} \cosh \xi \sin \eta$

Table 2 Solvability of solutions for four anti-plane shear problems by using direct and indirect BIEMs.

Methods	Problems (Image)	Ordinary scale		Degenerate scale		
		Direct method	Indirect method	Direct method	Indirect method	
Direct method	Crack	Singular formula (UT formula)	Ordinary scale: ✓	Degenerate scale: X (SDB)	Ordinary scale: ✓ (SDB)	Degenerate scale: X (DD)
		Hyper-singular formula (LM formula)	Ordinary scale: ✓	Degenerate scale: X (SDB)	Ordinary scale: ✓ (SDB)	Degenerate scale: X (DD)
Indirect method	Rigid-line inclusion	Single-layer potential	Ordinary scale: ✓	Degenerate scale: X (SDB)	Ordinary scale: ✓ (SDB)	Degenerate scale: X (DD)
		Double-layer potential	Ordinary scale: ✓	Degenerate scale: ✓ (SDB)	Ordinary scale: ✓ (SDB)	Degenerate scale: X (DD)

✓: solvable, X: unsolvable, SDS: Single degeneracy of degenerate scale, SDB: Single degeneracy of degenerate boundary, DD: Double degeneracy.

Example (SDB) Table 3 The influence coefficient matrix.

$a=0.2, b=0, N=4, S=1, \mu M=1, 10$ elements.

Single-layer formula $\{u\} = [U] \{ \alpha \}$, $\{t\} = [T] \{ \alpha \}$

Double-layer formula $\{u\} = [U^*] \{ \beta \}$, $\{t\} = [T^*] \{ \beta \}$

$[U]$ matrix (10x10):

0.1894	-0.2778	-0.2138	-0.1234	-0.0389	-0.0389	-0.1234	-0.2138	-0.2778	0.1894
-0.1894	0.2778	0.2138	0.1234	0.0389	0.0389	0.1234	0.2138	0.2778	-0.1894
0.0654	-0.2222	-0.2222	-0.0654	-0.0654	-0.2222	-0.2222	-0.0654	-0.0654	0.0654
-0.0654	0.2222	0.2222	0.0654	0.0654	0.2222	0.2222	0.0654	0.0654	-0.0654
-0.0470	-0.1586	-0.2778	-0.3396	-0.3396	-0.1586	-0.2778	-0.3396	-0.1586	-0.0470
0.0470	0.1586	0.2778	0.3396	0.3396	0.1586	0.2778	0.3396	0.1586	0.0470
-0.0389	-0.1234	-0.2138	-0.2778	-0.1894	-0.1894	-0.2778	-0.2138	-0.1234	-0.0389
0.0389	0.1234	0.2138	0.2778	0.1894	0.1894	0.2778	0.2138	0.1234	0.0389
-0.0470	-0.1586	-0.2778	-0.3396	-0.3396	-0.1586	-0.2778	-0.3396	-0.1586	-0.0470
0.0470	0.1586	0.2778	0.3396	0.3396	0.1586	0.2778	0.3396	0.1586	0.0470
-0.0654	-0.2222	-0.2222	-0.0654	-0.0654	-0.2222	-0.2222	-0.0654	-0.0654	0.0654
0.0654	0.2222	0.2222	0.0654	0.0654	0.2222	0.2222	0.0654	0.0654	-0.0654
-0.1026	-0.3396	-0.2778	-0.1586	-0.0470	-0.0470	-0.1586	-0.2778	-0.3396	-0.1026
0.1026	0.3396	0.2778	0.1586	0.0470	0.0470	0.1586	0.2778	0.3396	0.1026
0.1894	-0.2778	-0.2138	-0.1234	-0.0389	-0.0389	-0.1234	-0.2138	-0.2778	0.1894

$[T]$ matrix (10x10):

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Explanation of correct displacement field for the boundary density including the homogeneous solution

Discretization of BIE $[U]_B \{ \alpha \}_B = \{ u^M \}_B$

$[U]_B = [U]_{B,0} + [U]_{B,h}$

$\{ \alpha \}_B = \{ \alpha \}_{B,0} + \{ \alpha \}_{B,h}$

The solution of boundary density $\{ \alpha \}_B = \{ \alpha \}_{B,0} + \{ \alpha \}_{B,h}$

Thus $\{ \alpha \}_B = [U]_{B,0} \{ \alpha \}_{B,0} + [U]_{B,h} \{ \alpha \}_{B,h}$

Based on SVD technique $[U]_{B,0} = [U]_{B,0}^+ [U]_{B,0}^- [U]_{B,0}^T$, $[U]_{B,h} = [U]_{B,h}^+ [U]_{B,h}^- [U]_{B,h}^T$

We know $\{ \alpha \}_{B,0} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \{ w_i \}_{B,0}$ and $\{ \alpha \}_{B,h} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \{ w_i \}_{B,h}$, where $w_i = [w_i]_{B,0} + [w_i]_{B,h}$, $i=1,2,\dots,10$.

Beside $w_i = \sum_{j=1}^N c_j \{ w_j \}_{B,0}$, $\{ \alpha \}_B = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j \{ w_j \}_{B,0}$.

We successfully prove that the homogeneous solution has no effect on the final displacement field. That is the reason why the unknown boundary data does not agree with the analytical solution, but the displacement field solution is still acceptable.

Therefore $[U]_{B,0} \{ \alpha \}_{B,0} = 0$.

$\{ \alpha \}_B = [U]_{B,h} \{ \alpha \}_{B,h} + [U]_{B,0} \{ \alpha \}_{B,0} = [U]_{B,h} \{ \alpha \}_{B,h}$.

Table 4 Solutions of boundary densities including the homogeneous part.

α_i	α_c	$w_1^{(U)}$	$w_2^{(U)}$	$w_3^{(U)}$	$w_4^{(U)}$	$w_5^{(U)}$
$w_1^c = 1.10915$	$w_2^c = 3.66937$	$w_3^c = 4.60846$	$w_4^c = -1.83273$	$w_5^c = 0.86656$		
$w_1^h = 5.77675$	$w_2^h = -2.09697$	$w_3^h = 0.14266$	$w_4^h = -1.04709$	$w_5^h = 1.07580$		
$w_1^c = -2.7e-05$	$w_2^c = -0.80600$	$w_3^c = 1.3e-05$	$w_4^c = -0.65756$	$w_5^c = -0.65756$		
$w_1^h = 0.02651$	$w_2^h = -0.75433$	$w_3^h = -0.00225$	$w_4^h = -0.71574$	$w_5^h = 0.00107$		

Double degeneracy

Rigid-line inclusion (10 elements) $(2N=10) (a=2.0685, b=0)$ (symmetric problem)

the forcing vector $\{u^M\}$ is symmetric.

the superscript "s" denotes symmetry, the superscript "a" denotes anti-symmetry

Table 5 The action of the matrix $[U_B]$ and its spectrum in the double degeneracy.

σ_i	$\sigma_i = 0, i=1, \dots, 6$	$\sigma_i \neq 0, i=7, \dots, 10$
$u^M \cdot \phi$	$u^M \cdot \phi^s = 0$ (Solvable, Infinitely solution)	$u^M \cdot \phi^a \neq 0$ (for symmetry excitation)
ϕ_i^a	anti-symmetry ψ_i^a : anti-symmetry	symmetry ψ_i^s : symmetry
ϕ_i^s		
ψ_i^a		

Table 6 Solution of double-degeneracy case (Fichera formulation).

$\nabla^2 u = 0$	An elliptical case	
$u^M(x) = \frac{S}{\mu} y$	Single-layer Formulation	Fichera Formulation
Given BC	$u^M(x) = \frac{S}{\mu} y = \int_B \alpha(s) ds$	$u^M(x) = \int_B U(x,s) \alpha(s) dB(s) + c$
Unknown Boundary Density	$\alpha(s) = \frac{1}{J(\xi, \eta)} \left(a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \cos n\eta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \sin n\eta \right)$	$\int_B \alpha(s) dB(s) = 0$
Formulation	$u^M(x) = \int_B U(x,s) \alpha(s) dB(s)$	$u^M(x) = \int_B U(x,s) \alpha(s) dB(s) + c$
$U(x,s)$	$U(\xi, \eta; \xi', \eta') = \ln r + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{n} \cos n\eta \cos n\eta' + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{n} \sin n\eta \sin n\eta'$	$U(\xi, \eta; \xi', \eta') = \ln r + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{n} \cos n\eta \cos n\eta' + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{n} \sin n\eta \sin n\eta'$
BIE for boundary point	$\int_B U(x,s) \alpha(s) dB(s) = \frac{S}{\mu} y$	$\int_B U(x,s) \alpha(s) dB(s) + c = \frac{S}{\mu} y$
Unknown Fourier Coefficient & undetermined coefficient, C	$a_0 = \frac{Sc}{2\pi\mu}$, $n=1$ $a_n = 0$, $n=2,3,\dots$ $b_n = 0$, $n=1,2,3,4,\dots$	$a_0 = 0, C = 0$ $a_n = \frac{Sc}{2\pi\mu}$, $n=1$ $a_n = 0$, $n=2,3,\dots$ $b_n = 0$, $n=1,2,3,4,\dots$
The field solution of well-posed BVP	$u^M(\xi, \eta) = \frac{Sc}{\mu} \cosh \xi \sin \eta$	$u^M(\xi, \eta) = \frac{Sc}{\mu} \cosh \xi \sin \eta$
Final displacement	$u(\xi, \eta) = \frac{Sc}{\mu} \cosh \xi \sin \eta$	$u(\xi, \eta) = \frac{Sc}{\mu} \cosh \xi \sin \eta$

Conclusions

The solvability of solutions for the anti-plane shear problem, including a crack or a rigid-line inclusion, was investigated by using the direct and indirect BIEM/BEMs. The role of single-layer and double-layer approaches for solving double-degenerate BVPs was thoroughly examined. A rigid-line inclusion under the anti-plane shear $\sigma_{yz}^0 = S$ can be solved by using the single-layer potential approach only, and a crack under the anti-plane shear $\sigma_{xz}^0 = S$ can be solved by using the double-layer potential approach only. It is interesting to find that even though the influence matrix is rank-deficient due to the degenerate boundary, but we still can use only the single-layer or double-layer approach to solve the corresponding problem. Also, it is worth noting that even the unknown boundary data does not agree with the analytical solution, the solution of displacement field may still be obtained. We can explain it by using the SVD technique, the spectrum of boundary density can be decomposed into two parts, one is symmetric part and the other is anti-symmetric part. And according to the singular value of the influence matrix, one of the parts with a corresponding zero singular value will have no impact on the field solution. However, the problem of double degeneracy for symmetric cases cannot be solved by using the single-layer potential approach alone because of the degenerate scale. To overcome this problem, the Fichera formulation can be employed. Finally, the numerical results were compared with the exact solution to see the validity of our approach.

References

1. Wu TA, Kao JH, Chou YT, Chen JT, How to get the correct solution by using the indirect BIE for the degenerate-boundary problem, TwSIAM 10th, 2022.
2. 吳庭安, 直接法與間接法之解空間之等價性——以反平面剪力含橢圓孔洞線裂縫/橢圓剛性夾雜/線剛性夾雜為例, 科技部大專生專題結果報告, 111-2813-C-019-033-E, 2022.
3. Chen JT, Kao JH, Kao SK, Shao CH, Tai WC, On the role of singular and hypersingular BIEs for the BVPs containing a degenerate boundary, Eng Anal Bound Elem 2001;133:214-235.
4. Fichera G, Boundary problems in differential equations, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison (WT) 1959.
5. Chen JT, Kao SK, Tai WC, Kao JH, An indirect BIE free of degenerate scales, CPAA 2022;21(6):1969-1985.