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ABSTRACT

The method of asymptotic homogenization is used to develop three comprehensive micromechanical models pertaining to (i) thin smart composite plates reinforced with a network of orthotropic bars that may exhibit piezoelectric behavior; (ii) prismatic smart composite structures and (iii) three-dimensional composite structures with an embedded periodic network of isotropic reinforcements, the spatial arrangement of which renders the behavior of the given structures macroscopically anisotropic.

The models developed in this thesis allow the transformation of the original boundary value problems for the regularly non-homogeneous composite structure into simpler ones that are characterized by some effective coefficients. These coefficients are calculated from so-called ‘unit cell’ or periodicity problems and are shown to depend solely on the geometric and material characteristics of the unit cell and are completely independent of the global formulation of the problem. As such, the effective elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients are universal in nature and can be used to study a wide variety of boundary value problems associated with a structure of a given geometry. The models are illustrated by means of several examples of practical importance and it is shown that the effective properties of a given composite structure can be tailored to meet the requirements of a particular application by changing certain material or geometric parameters such as the type, size and relative orientation of the reinforcements. For models (i) and (ii), if the thermal and piezoelectric behavior of the materials is ignored and if the orthotropic nature of the constituents is reduced to that of isotropy, then the results converge to those of previous models obtained by either asymptotic homogenization, or stress-strain relationships in the reinforcements. For model (iii), if the 3-D arrangement of the reinforcements is reduced to a 2-D one then the model again is shown to converge to previous models.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Over the last few decades manufacturers, designers, and engineers recognized the ability of composite materials to produce high-quality, durable, and cost-effective advanced smart composite products. In the modern world, composites are used in many critical industrial applications such as the aerospace and military fields where weight, strength and durability are a big concern. Additionally, composite materials can also be found in our day-to-day lives, from the cars we drive, to the boats, railway coach interiors, and sporting goods.

In the present market where demands for product performance are ever increasing, composite materials have proven to be the best choice in terms of reducing costs and improving performance. Composites solve problems, raise performance levels, and enable the development of many new products.

Unlike traditional materials such as steel, composite materials have different mechanical properties in different directions, and can be custom designed to have the required strength in a specific direction. Composite properties (e.g. stiffness, thermal expansion etc.) can be varied to a high degree depending on the materials selected and the spatial orientation of the reinforcing materials within the expanse of the composite. The ability of composites to be adapted to wide range of applications often makes them the most attractive choice.
1.2. What are Composites?

A composite material may be defined as a material composed of two or more constituents combined on a macroscopic scale by mechanical and chemical bonds. The most commonly used composites, the polymeric ones, consist of a controlled distribution of reinforcing fibers in a continuous polymeric resin matrix. The fibers, by virtue of their high strength and stiffness, are the reinforcing components of the composite and are responsible for practically all the load-carrying characteristics of the composites. Due to the cohesive and adhesive characteristics of the matrix, it is responsible for holding the fibers in place and for transferring stress and strain to the reinforcing fibers. The matrix also protects the fibers from harsh environmental conditions. The fiber orientation as maintained by the matrix determines the properties of the composites.

Composites can be classified as fiber-reinforced, particle-reinforced, and laminated composites. The fiber-reinforced composites may contain continuous (long) or discontinuous (short) fibers. Composite properties such as strength and stiffness depend on the orientation and length of the reinforcements. Short fibers or whiskers can be embedded in a preferred orientation so that the composite behaves in an orthotropic fashion, or they can be randomly oriented so that the composite behaves like a quasi-isotropic material. Continuous fiber composites contain long fibers along which the stress is distributed. The continuous fibers may be all oriented in one direction or different families of fibers may be oriented in different directions. Depending on the spatial orientation of the fibers, continuous fiber composites may behave in an orthotropic, or a transversely-isotropic manner. Particle-reinforced composites consist of particles of different shape and size (spheres, flakes, rods) randomly embedded within the matrix. Due to the random nature of the dispersion of these particles in the matrix, the particle-reinforced composites are macroscopically homogeneous and quasi-isotropic. Laminated composites are those composites made of two or more layers of the reinforcements with each layer having two of its dimensions much larger than the third.
From a structural viewpoint, composites may also be classified as polymer matrix composites (PMC), metal matrix composites (MMC), ceramic matrix composites (CMC), carbon-carbon composites (CCC), intermetallic composites (IMC), or hybrid composites [Schwartz 1997a, 1997b].

1.3. Constituents

1.3.1. Reinforcing Materials

Although whiskers and particulate reinforcements are available for the manufacture of structural polymeric composites, the focus of attention in the recent years has been directed towards fibrous reinforcements. Both organic and inorganic fibers are used as reinforcements. The most common inorganic fibers include glass, and carbon, while aramid and asbestos are examples of natural/organic fibers. The type, amount, and orientation of fibers should be properly selected because they influence the following characteristics of a composite structure:

- Specific gravity
- Tensile strength and modulus
- Compressive strength and modulus
- Fatigue strength
- Electric and Thermal conductivity
- Cost

1.3.1.1. Inorganic Fibers

Inorganic fibers such as glass and carbon account for over 90% of the reinforcements used in today's composite industry.
1.3.1.1.1. Glass Fibers

Glass fibers are the most common reinforcing fibers for polymeric composites. In the 1930's the "Owens-Illinois Glass Company" developed a fiberglass manufacturing facility [Schwartz, 1992]. Glass is produced from silica sand, limestone, boric acid, and other elements. The principal advantages of glass fibers are low cost, high tensile strength, high chemical resistance, good processability, increased design flexibility and excellent insulating properties. Glass fibers are available in several types, the most common of which are E-glass, and S-glass. Typical values for the tensile modulus and strength are given in Table 1-1 [Daniel, 1994]. The main disadvantages are low tensile modulus, relatively high specific gravity, and relatively low fatigue resistance. E-glass is the cheapest of all commercially available reinforcing fibers. S-glass has the highest tensile strength among all the fibers in use. However the higher manufacturing cost of S-glass makes it unattractive for many applications and led to the manufacture of a less expensive form, S-2 glass fiber.

1.3.1.1.2. Graphite (Carbon) Fibers

The terms carbon and graphite fibers are typically used interchangeably, although graphite refers to fibers that have greater than 99% carbon composition. Carbon fibers, more than all other fibrous reinforcements, have provided the basis for the development of PMCs as advanced structural engineering materials. Carbon fibers are available with a variety of tensile moduli ranging from 207 GPa to 1035 GPa [Mallick, 1998]. Carbon fibers have high strength and stiffness, and a good resistance against stress rupture. As well, they exhibit good compressive strength and corrosion resistance. Due to their low coefficient of thermal expansion, carbon fibers are the best candidates for high temperature applications. The major limitations of this material are high cost, high thermal and electrical conductivities, and low impact resistance.
1.3.1.2. Organic Fibers

The most common organic fibers are Aramid, and Polyethylene. Table 1-2 [Mallick, 1988] illustrates some of the important physical and mechanical properties of various organic fibers. The main advantages of organic fibers include high strength, stiffness, and specific strength, excellent impact properties, and good corrosion resistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiber</th>
<th>Fiber density, g/cc</th>
<th>Tensile Strength, GPa</th>
<th>Tensile Modulus, GPa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-glass</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-glass</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyethylene</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevlar 49</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>130.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Carbon, T300</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, AS4</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.730</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, HTS</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphite, T-50</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon carbide</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.140</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silica</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.1.2.1. Aramid Fibers

DuPont first commercially introduced Aramid fibers in the early 1970's [Schwartz, 1997a]. There are a number of commercially available aramid fibers, the most common of which are Kevlar (DuPont), Twaron (Akzo) and Technora (Teijin). Among the properties that make aramid fibers attractive for a variety of engineering applications are
high impact resistance, and low thermal and electrical conductivities. The main disadvantage of aramid fibers is that they are sensitive to compression.

1.3.1.2.2. **Polyethylene Extended-Chain Fibers**

Polyethylene fibers are commercially available in many forms and trade names such as Spectra, and Dyneema [Schwartz, 1997a]. Spectra PE fibers have the highest strength-to-weight ratio of all commercial fibers available. However, they only exhibit average strength and stiffness characteristics. PE has a very low melting point (135°C) and is also susceptible to creep at temperatures above 100°C. As a consequence, PE fibers are limited to low temperature applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Specific Gravity, g/cm³</th>
<th>Typical diameter, μm</th>
<th>Tensile modulus, GPa</th>
<th>Tensile strength, GPa</th>
<th>Strain to Failure, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevlar 29</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevlar 49</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevlar 149</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectra900</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectra1000</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2. **Matrices**

The main function of the matrix in a fiber-reinforced composite is to transfer stress to and distribute stress between the fibers. The matrix also provides a barrier against adverse environmental conditions and protects the fiber surface from mechanical abrasions. It plays only a minor role in the tensile load-carrying capacity of a composite structure. However, the shear properties of a composite are largely influenced by the selection of
the matrix. As mentioned before, matrices can be of the polymeric, metallic or ceramic type.

1.3.2.1.  Polymeric Matrix

A polymer is defined as a long-chain molecule containing one or more repeating units of atoms joined together by physical or chemical bonds. These polymers are joined by a process called crosslinking. Polymers are divided into two major categories, thermoplastic and thermoset.

1.3.2.1.1.  Thermoplastic Polymers

In a thermoplastic polymer, individual molecules are linear in structure with no chemical covalent bonds between them. Instead, weak physical bonds such as Van der Waals Forces hold them together. Thermoplastics are not crosslinked. Due to these weak bonds, any application of heat and pressure will result in these bonds breaking and subsequent motion of the pertinent molecules relative to each other. When a polymer cools down, the molecules freeze in their new positions and this results in a new solid shape. Thus the characterizing feature of a thermoplastic resin is that it can be melted and reshaped in a reversible manner. Some common types of thermoplastics include polyetheretherketone (PEEK), polyphenylene sulfide (PPS), polysulfone, polyetherketoneketone (PEKK), and polyetherketone (PEK) [Matthews and Rawlings, 1994].

1.3.2.1.2.  Thermoset Polymers

In a thermoset polymer, the molecules are held together by means of strong chemical bonds, which form a cross-linked, rigid and three-dimensional network structure. Once these cross-links are formed, any application of heat or pressure cannot melt or reshape the thermoset polymer. The main advantage of thermosets is that they can be used at
higher temperatures than thermoplastics and have better creep properties. Table 1-3
[Schwartz, 1997] compares some of the properties of thermosets and thermoplastics. The
different types of thermoset resins available for composites include polyester, vinyl ester,
epoxy, polyurethane, acrylic, phenolic, polyimide, and bismaleimide [Kaw, 1997].

1.3.2.1.2.1. Polyester Resin

Polyester resins are the most common and least expensive resins used in polymeric
composite fabrication and when cured the resulting physical properties meet many of the
needs of the commercial composite industry. They generally have a low viscosity and
exhibit good processability. The most common applications of polyester resins are boat
hulls, shower stalls, bath tubs, car bodies, molded furniture, and pipes. Depending on the
chemical designation of the polymer backbone, polyester resins are categorized as
orthophthalic, isophthalic, dicycolentadiene, chlorendics, and bisphenol-A [American
Composite Manufacturers Association, 2006].

Orthophthalic acid based resins are also called general purpose resins. These resins are
generally used where high mechanical, temperature, and corrosion resistance are not
required. The main advantage of these resins is their low manufacturing cost.

Unlike orthophthalic acid based resins, their isophthalic counterparts have better
mechanical, thermal and corrosion-resistance properties. The main disadvantages of
isophthalic resins are that they have high styrene contents and are 10-20% costlier than
orthophthalic resins.

Dicycolpentadiene-based resins are generally used where cosmetic finishes are critical
and this is due to the low volumetric shrinkage. Like orthophthalic acid based resins these
resins exhibit good mechanical and corrosion-resistance behaviour. Their other positive
attribute is that the associated styrene content is usually in the 35-38% range. The main
disadvantages are that these resins tend to be very rigid and lack the toughness of other resins.

1.3.2.1.2.2. Epoxy Resin

Epoxy resins are relatively expensive and take a long time to cure but exhibit low shrinkage and have excellent resistance to chemicals and solvents. Epoxy resins have been widely used in commercial applications such as aircraft components, pressure vessels and car bodies. Other advantages of epoxy resin include good mechanical properties (strength and stiffness), excellent chemical and weather resistance, and good fatigue strength. Their less attractive attributes include poor high temperature capabilities, the associated toxicity of the unused resin and relatively high manufacturing costs.

1.3.2.1.2.3. Vinyl Ester

Vinyl ester resins have excellent chemical resistance and tensile strength. Vinyl esters are formulated by reacting epoxy resin with methacrylic acid, forming a polymer that has characteristics similar to both polyester and epoxy.

**Table 1-3: Properties of thermoset and thermoplastic polymers [Schwartz, 1997]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Thermosets</th>
<th>Thermoplastics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young’s modulus (GPa)</td>
<td>1.3-6.0</td>
<td>1.0-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile strength (MPa)</td>
<td>20-180</td>
<td>40-190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fracture toughness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{lc}$ (MPa $m^{1/2}$)</td>
<td>0.5-1.0</td>
<td>1.5-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{lc}$ (KJ $m^2$)</td>
<td>0.02-0.2</td>
<td>0.7-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum service temperature ($^\circ$C)</td>
<td>50-450</td>
<td>25-230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4. Composites Manufacturing Processes

A wide range of manufacturing processes are available for the fabrication of composite structures. The examples include hand lay-up, chopped laminate process, filament winding, compression molding, pultrusion, reinforced reaction injection molding, resin transfer molding, vacuum bag molding, vacuum infusion processing, centrifugal casting and continuous lamination.

These manufacturing techniques can be classified, depending on the volume of production, as low, medium, or high volume production. The selection of manufacturing process depends on the resin and reinforcements used, complexity of the job, volume of production and cost. In the following section, three common manufacturing processes, namely hand lay-up, filament winding and pultrusion are briefly explained.

1.4.1. Hand Lay-up

Hand lay-up is the simplest and oldest of all composite fabrication processes. Hand lay-up method is suitable for making a wide variety of composite products including tanks, trucks, boats, housing, bathware and many others. In the manufacturing process, the first step is to apply a gel coat to the mold using a spray gun for a high quality finish. Once the gel coat is cured sufficiently, the reinforcements are manually placed on the mold followed by applying resin by pouring, brushing, spraying or using a paint roller (Figure 1-1). After removing excess resin by using FRP rollers, paint rollers, or squeegees, the laminate is cured at room temperature or in an autoclave. The autoclave is a special pressure vessel wherein complex chemical reactions take place, which in turn initiate and complete the consolidation of the composites. Before the autoclave curing, the part should be carefully processed and prepared. This involves the use of special equipment such as separators, bleeders, vacuum bags and others. This process is called vacuum bagging. A typical vacuum bag assembly is shown schematically in Figure 1-2 [Gibson,
1994]. Instead of applying resin after the fibers are laid-up on the mold, it is sometimes common to use prepregs.

The major advantages of hand lay-up include low-cost tooling, simple processing, and the ability to fabricate a wide range of parts. As well, sensors or actuators can be easily embedded into the composites to produce smart composite structures. The main disadvantages of hand lay-up are that it is a low-volume and labor intensive fabrication method.

![Hand Lay-Up process](image-url)

**Figure 1-1**: Hand Lay-Up process [Design inSite, 2006]

1.4.2. Filament Winding

The basis of the filament winding method is the high-speed precise lay-down of continuous reinforcements in a predescribed pattern over a rotating mandrel. Filament winding is an automated open molding process. It is used to produce hollow cylindrical products such as chemical and fuel storage tanks, pipes, stacks, pressure vessels, and rocket motor cases. A continuous strand roving is pulled from a series of creels into a liquid resin bath containing resin, catalyst, and other ingredients (Figure 1-3). Once the
fibers exit from the bath, the resin-impregnated rovings are pulled through a wiping device that removes excessive resin from the rovings and controls resin coating thickness.

![Figure 1-2: Autoclave molding](image)

**Figure 1-2:** Autoclave molding [Gibson, 1994]

around each roving. Once the rovings are thoroughly wiped, they are subsequently placed onto a flat carrier and then positioned into a rotating mandrel. The filament is laid down in a predefined geometric pattern to provide maximum strength in the direction required.

![Figure 1-3: Filament winding process](image)

**Figure 1-3:** Filament winding process [AZoM™, 2005]
The winding speed of the mandrel and transverse speed of the carriage are controlled to create the desired winding angle pattern. After sufficient layers of fibers have been applied, the structure is cured on the mandrel. Once the composite is cured, the structure is stripped from the mandrel. The molds are available in different shapes and sizes depending on the shape of the part to be build. The molds are usually made of steel or aluminum but in some cases they are made of wax to facilitate part removal. The main advantages of this process are that it produces high strength-to-weight ratio laminates and provides a high degree of control over structural uniformity and fiber orientation. Because this process is automated, it is not as labor intense as hand lay-up.

1.4.3. Pultrusion

Pultrusion is one of the fastest and most cost effective composites manufacturing processes. It is well suited to produce prismatic products such as prestressing tendons, reinforcing bars, structural shapes, beams, channels, pipes, tubing, and fishing rods. Pultrusion produces structures with a high degree of axial reinforcement and this makes it a prime candidate for manufacturing high quality low cost components for structural engineering applications. Fiber optic and other types of sensors as well as actuators can readily be embedded in a composite part during pultrusion and this renders the process ideal for the fabrication of smart composites.

In a pultrusion process, the first step is to pull the fibers from a series of creels into a resin bath containing the liquid resin together with appropriate amounts of catalyst and promoters. These resin-impregnated fibers are subsequently guided to the pultrusion die, which has the profile of the part to be manufactured. Strip heaters attached to the die provide the necessary thermal zones needed to initiate and complete the consolidation process. The product coming out of the die cools in ambient air, or forced air, as it is continuously being pulled by a set of rollers. A schematic of the pultrusion process is
shown in Figure 1-4 [Kalamkarov et al., 2000a]. Figure 1-5 shows the overall pultrusion setup at Dalhousie University.

**Figure 1-4:** Schematic of pultrusion line for embeddement of fiber optic sensors

[Kalamkarov et al., 2000a]

**Figure 1-5:** Schematic of pultrusion setup at Dalhousie University
1.5. Advantages of Composites

Composites offer a number of advantages over traditional materials like steel. When judiciously selected, composites usually offer one or more of the following advantages:

- High Specific strength
- Ability to fabricate complex profiles
- High degree of integration with other materials
- Inherent durability
- Tailorability of mechanical and physical properties
- Excellent fatigue strength
- Excellent impact resistance
- Excellent thermal resistance
- Reduced assembly time
- Ease of fabrication and shorter fabrication time

1.6. Contributions to Research

The author’s contributions to research are as follows:

- Development of micromechanical model pertaining to prismatic smart composite structures with orthotropic reinforcements
- Development of micromechanical model pertaining to thin smart composite plates reinforced with a network of orthotropic bars
- Development of micromechanical models pertaining to general three-dimensional composite reinforced with a network of isotropic bars
2. SMART MATERIALS

2.1. Introduction

The high maintenance cost and limited service life condition often associated with traditional structural materials like concrete and steel can be significantly offset by the application of composites in the areas of civil engineering, aerospace, transportation industry, oil and gas, and marine engineering. At the same time, significant advancements in MEMS, telecommunications, and other fields, significantly facilitates the development of new and highly effective sensors and actuators. Their merge with the field of composites gave birth to the so-called smart composite materials. There are many definitions characterizing smart materials; a) adaptive structures, which incorporate sensors and actuators, b) materials which produce multiple responses to one input in a coordinate fashion, c) passive smart materials that provide information on their state and integrity, and active smart materials that can perform self-adjustment or self-repair as conditions change, d) smart materials and systems reproducing biological functions in load bearing structural systems.

The necessary characteristics of actuators and sensors have been expressed by (Jain 94) as follows: “Sensor materials should have the ability to feedback stimuli such as thermal, electrical, and magnetic signals, to the motor system in response to changes in the thermomechanical characteristics of the smart structures. On the other hand, actuator materials should have the ability to change the shape, stiffness, position, natural frequency, damping and/or other mechanical characteristics of the smart structures in response to changes in temperature, electric field and/or magnetic field. The most popular material systems being used for sensors and actuators are
1. Piezoelectric materials  
2. Magnetostrictive and Electrostrictive materials  
3. Shape memory alloys  
4. Electrorheological and Magnetorheological fluids  
5. Carbon nanotubes  
6. Optical fibers  
7. Electrochromic materials  
8. Fullerenes  
9. Smart Gels

Magnetostrictive materials, shape memory alloys, and electrorheological fluids are mostly used as actuator materials. Whereas, optical fibers are used as sensor materials. Among all these active materials, piezoelectric materials are most widely used because of their fast electromechanical responses, low power requirements, and relatively high generative forces.

In the following sections an overview of some of these smart materials is presented including definition, applications etc as reported in the literature.

2.2. Piezoelectric

The phenomenon of piezoelectricity describes the ability of the material (crystals) to generate electric voltage when subjected to mechanical stress or conversely, to get deformed when an electric field is applied. In the former case they work as sensors and in the latter case they work as actuators. Piezoelectrics have been the backbone of smart materials research since World War II and are manufactured around the world. To better understand the behavior of piezoelectric ceramics, a basic understanding of these
ceramics should not be overlooked. To this end, next section gives a brief introduction of the history, the poling process, and piezoelectric effect.

2.2.1. History of Piezoelectric ceramics

Piezoelectricity is derived from the Greek word "piezo," meaning "pressure". In 1880, Jacques and Pierre Curie discovered a group of materials that exhibit unusual characteristics: when subjected to pressure, the crystals generate an electrical charge. W. Hankel in 1881 first suggested the term "piezoelectricity" and Lipmann deduced the converse effect which states that when this crystal was exposed to an electric field it lengthens or shortens according to the polarity of the fields. The major breakthrough in this field came with the discovery of barium titanate and lead zirconate titanate (PZT) in the 1940s and 1950s which enabled designers to employ the piezoelectric and the inverse piezoelectric effect in many engineering applications. The main advantage of these materials is that the composition, shape and dimensions of piezoelectric ceramics can be tailored to meet the requirements of a specific application.

2.2.2. Poling

In the basic form, the domains within a piezoelectric material are randomly oriented and hence the effect from individual domains cancels each other out. Consequently, they exhibit no piezoelectric properties and are isotropic. Since the direction of polarization among the neighboring domains is random, ceramic elements exhibit no overall polarization characteristics. (Figure 2-1) [APC International, 1999].

Poling is the common process used to orient the domains within a piezoceramic element. In the poling process, a strong direct electric field, usually at a temperature slightly below the curie point is applied to rotate and orient the domains in the direction of electric field (Figure 2-2) [APC International, 1999]. When the electric field is removed most of the
dipoles are locked into a configuration of near alignment (Figure 2-3) [APC International, 1999] and the ceramic exhibits the piezoelectric effect. In the polarization process the element lengthens along the poling axis and contracts in both directions perpendicular to it, as a direct consequence of the piezoelectric effect.

2.2.3. Piezoelectric Effect

When mechanically stressed, poled piezoceramic elements (Figure 2-4(a)) generate a voltage. When the piezoelectric element is mechanically compressed along the direction of polarization, or stretched in the direction perpendicular to the direction of polarization, a voltage is developed across the electrodes that have the same polarity as the poling voltage (Figure 2-4(b)). If the applied load causes tension along the direction of polarization, and/or compression along the direction perpendicular to the polarization, the resulting voltage has polarity opposite to the poling voltage (Figure 2-4(c)) and this behavior is called direct piezoelectric effect. Conversely, the converse piezoelectric effect defines the change in shape of the piezoelectric elements, when a voltage is applied. When a voltage that has the same polarity as the poling voltage is applied to a piezoelectric element, the element gets stretched in the direction of poling voltage and as a consequence of Poisson's effect its diameter is reduced (Figure 2-4(d)). If a voltage of polarity opposite to that of poling voltage is applied, the piezoelectric element will become shorter in the poling direction and wider in the perpendicular direction (Figure 2-4(e)). If an alternating voltage is applied to the ceramic element, the element will lengthen and shorten cyclically, at the frequency of the applied voltage.

2.2.4. Application of Piezoelectric Ceramic

The availability of piezoelectric materials in many forms such as thin films, patches and rods, and their light weight has made them the strong candidates for smart composite
Figure 2-1: Random orientation of domains prior to polarization [APC International, 1999]

Figure 2-2: Polarization at high DC electric field [APC International, 1999]

Figure 2-3: Orientation of domains after electric field is removed [APC International, 1999]
applications. Their ability to be easily integrated into structures makes them very attractive in structural control. Recent uses of piezoelectric ceramics in numerous applications have illustrated the feasibility of these materials in improving the performance of smart structures both as sensors and actuators. Piezoelectric ceramic patches can be used as multiple sensors to detect damages in composite structures using a variety of methods. Recently, piezoelectric ceramic patches have been considered for the in-situ monitoring of strains in composite structures. Rees et al. suggested the use of piezoelectric patches as sensors to monitor the crack growth in boron/epoxy repair sites [Rees et al. 1992]. Adali et al. [2000] considered a beam problem where the maximum vertical deflection of a laminated beam is to be minimized using one pair of actuators. Bruant et al. [2001] optimized both sensor and actuator locations, but considered them separately. Bent and Hagood [1997] have considered the use of piezoelectric fiber composites for structural actuation applications. Stack actuators have been studied among others, by Flint et al. [1994]. Samak and Chopra [1994], Song and Librescu [1994], Chen and Chopra [1994], and Haverly et al. [2001], studied the active vibration control of helicopter blades using stack actuators. Other researchers who have considered the use of piezoelectric ceramic patches for the purpose of strain monitoring, actuation and active vibration control include Barboni et al. [2000], Song et al. [2002], Bob et al. [2002], Fukunaga [2002], Kevin and Liangsheng [2004], Park et al. [2005], Kim et al. [2005], Sumant and Maiti [2006], and Seunghee [2006].

Currently, piezoceramic materials are used in military (hydrophones and sonobuoys, depth sounders, targets, telephony, sonar pingers, and adaptive optics), commercial (ultrasonic cleaners, welders, degreasers, thickness gauging, flaw detection, level indicators, geophones, delay lines, ignition systems, fans, relays, ink jet printers and strain guages), medical (ultrasonic cataract removal, ultrasonic therapy, insulin pumps, flow meters, ultrasonic imaging, and vaporizers), automotive (knock sensors, wheel balancers, radio filters, seat belt buzzers, thread wear indicators, air flow, fuel atomization, tire pressure indicator, and audible alarms), and consumer (Humidifiers, gas
grill igniters, telephones, smoke detectors, microwave ovens, sneakers, cigarette lighters, lighting security, and ultrasonic sewing) products [Technical Insights, 1999].

(a) Piezoceramic fiber after polarization

(b) Disk compressed along poling direction, generated voltage has same polarity as the poling voltage

(c) Disk stretched along poling direction, generated voltage has polarity opposite to the poling voltage

(d) Applied voltage has the same polarity as poling voltage, disk gets lengthen in the direction of polarization

(e) Applied voltage has the polarity opposite to that of poling voltage, disk gets shortens in the direction of polarization

Figure 2-4: Piezoelectric effects in a cylinder of PZT material
2.3. Magnetostrictives and Electrostrictives

Magnetostriction is observed in materials which experience strain under the influence of a magnetic field, and conversely generate a magnetic field when strained. The strength of the magnetic field is proportional to the material's rate of strain [Shakeri et al. 2001]. Early magnetostrictive materials were studied extensively but few practical applications existed because the force and strain they generated were much less than piezoelectric and electrostrictive materials. This fundamental disadvantage changed drastically with the development of Terfenol-D (an alloy of iron, terbium, and dysprosium), a so-called giant magnetostrictor. These materials are capable of generating strains an order of magnitude larger than conventional piezoceramics with similar force output. Unlike piezoelectric materials, Terfenol-D has high endurance and has no time-or cycle-dependent lifetimes.

The phenomenon of magnetostriction results due to the re-orientation of small magnetic domains as a result of application of a magnetic field. With an increase in the applied field, more domains rotate and align until a magnetic saturation is reached. These magnetic domain rotations caused by the application of the external field, create internal strain in the material resulting in elongation (positive magnetostriction) or shortening (negative magnetostriction) of the material depending on the direction of the magnetic field.

Kannan and Dasgupta [1994] performed finite element analysis on the behavior of multifunctional composites with embedded magnetostrictive devices. Fenn [1994] discussed the passive damping and velocity sensing using magnetostrictive transducers. Bi and Anjanappa [1994] examined the feasibility of implementing embedded magnetostrictive miniautulators for smart-structures applications, such as control of beam vibrations. Marcelo [2000] discussed the modeling of strains generated using magnetostrictive transducers in response to an applied magnetic field. Figure 2-5 illustrates the cross-section of a prototypical Terfenol-D magnetostrictive transducer [Marcelo, 2000]. Hao et
al. [2006] studied the nonlinear constitutive model-based vibration control system for giant magnetostrictive actuators (Terfenol-D). Chen and Anjanappa discussed the method of detecting delaminations in a composite structure embedded with magnetostrictive particulate sensors. Krishnamurthy et al. [1999] considered health-monitoring of delaminations in composite materials using an excitation coil and a sensing coil. Other researchers include Trovillion et al. [1999], Saidha et al. [2003], Heyliger [2004], and Ghosh and Gopalakrishnan [2005].

![Figure 2-5: Cross section of a typical Terfenol-D magnetostrictive transducer [Marcelo, 2000]](image)

Magnetostrictive materials like Terfenol-D can be incorporated in multifunctional composites for controlling of mechanical deformations as well as for the sensing of deformations and forces. When distributing the magnetostrictive particles in a composite structure as microscale devices in a host material, they can act as distributed sensors. Alternatively, they can act as distributed actuators that are capable of vibration suppressions, micro positioning, damage mitigation, and shape control. Terfenol-D can potentially replace conventional aircraft parts and reduce weight resulting in a lower annual fuel consumption rate.
Electrostrictives are another class of materials that are similar in function to piezoelectric materials but generate more strain and have a nonlinear strain to field dependence [Technical Insights, 1999]. As well, these materials also exhibit less hysteresis which implies a more efficient actuation. The electrostrictive effect can be found in all materials although it is usually too small (approx 10E-5 to 10E-7 strain %) to utilize practically. One class of materials known as relaxor ferroelectrics exhibits the electrostrictive effect, and shows strains comparable to those pertinent to piezoelectrics (10E-1 strain %) and has already found applications in many commercial platforms. The main concern with electrostrictives is that their behavior is very dependent on operating temperature and applied stress conditions.

Electrostrictive materials produce elastic deformation or change in shape when subjected to an electric field similar to magnetostrictives where deformation is produced due to a magnetic field. Electrostrictive materials are dielectric and typical examples include ceramics like lead-magnesium-niobate (PMN). Electrostrictive materials can be used as transducers, actuators, or sensors.

2.4. Shape Memory Alloys (SMA’s)

Shape memory alloys are a unique group of inter-metallic materials that exhibit two very interesting properties, shape memory effect and pseudo-elasticity. Commonly, these materials are referred to as adaptive materials which can convert thermal energy directly to mechanical work. The shape memory effect comes in two forms; in the one-way shape memory effect the alloy is mechanically deformed at a low temperature and when heated above a critical transition temperature, it restores the original memory shape of the specimen. In the two-way shape memory effect, heating (even without application of external loads) the SMA results in one “memorized” shape while cooling results in
second different shape [Shahin et al. 1994]. The most popular and effectively used alloys include NiTi (Nickel - Titanium), CuZnAl, and CuAlNi.

The unique properties of shape memory alloys are due to the solid state phase change that is accompanied by a molecular rearrangement. In most shape memory alloys, a temperature change of only about 10°C is necessary to initiate this phase change. The SMA alloys are characterized by two distinct solid phases, a low temperature phase (martensite) and a high temperature phase called austenite. In the martensite phase these alloys can be easily bent into various shapes. To regain the original shape, these alloys should be heated to about 500°C. At this high temperature the atoms rearrange themselves into the most compact and regular pattern possible resulting in a rigid cubic arrangement known as the austenite phase. The nature of shape memory alloy can be better understood by considering the phase diagram shown in Figure 2-6. When heated, martensite starts transforming into austenite at a point called Austenitic Start Temperature (As), and completely transforms into austenite at a temperature Af, know as Austenitic Finish Temperature. Subsequent cooling of the SMA alloy transforms austenite to martensite. This process starts at a temperature Ms called Martensite Start Temperature and completely reverts to martensite at a point Mf (Martensite Finish Temperature).

Shape memory alloys have the potential to be used in a number of applications. More recently, Nagai and Oishi [2006] investigated the use of Shape memory alloys as strain sensors in composites and Ogisu et al. [2006] studied the damage in quasi-isotropic CFRP laminates with embedded pre-strained SMA foils under quasi-static uniaxial tensile loads. One of the most popular areas of application of SMA actuators is noise and vibration control. Some examples can be found in Adachi et al. [1999], Saadat et al. [2001], Humbeeck and Kustov [2005] and many others.
2.5. Electrorheological (ER) and Magnetorheological (MR) Fluids

Electrorheological and magnetorheological fluids are substances that contain micro particles suspended in an inert carrier fluid that align with an applied electric or magnetic field, respectively. When an external field is applied, these particles join to form semi-rigid chains that can significantly alter the fluid properties.

Electrorheological (ER) fluids transform from the liquid state into the gel state (Figure 2-7) with a yield stress of some kPa in milliseconds by applying an electric field. This reversible change is due to the controllable interaction between micro-sized dielectric particles within the ER suspensions. The polarization of these particles leads to configuration changes, which in turn results in significant changes in rheological properties. In the absence of an electric field, ER fluids behave like Newtonian fluids with shear stress proportional to shear strain. When a field is applied and increased, ER fluids develop a yield stress that must be overcome before there can be any motion.
between the electrodes. Because of this observed behavior, smart fluids are often modeled as Bingham plastic with a field-dependent yield stress. The main disadvantage of ER fluids is that they require large amount of electrical current to change state.

ER fluids applications can be categorized in two classes, controllable devices and adaptive structures. ER fluid-based controllable devices include valves, mounts, clutches and brakes. Adaptive structures are structures which incorporate ER fluids that have the ability to tune structural properties. Pinkos [1994] studied the utilization of ER fluids in car suspension systems. Wereley [1994] analyzed the feasibility of using ER fluids for active control of flexible rotor blades. Lee and Choi [2005] studied the dynamic properties of an ER fluid under shear and flow modes. Chen and Wei [2006] conducted experimental work on the rheological behavior of ER fluids under a variety of electric fields. ER fluids are mostly used in the automotive and aerospace industries for vibration control and variable torque transmission. Nowadays many additional avenues are being explored, for example civil engineering structures, and robotics. Other applications include residual vibration damping, servo stiffening of DC motors etc.

Figure 2-7: Particles chaining between electrodes when subjected to electric field
Similar to electrorheological fluids, magnetorheological fluids change viscosity and other properties as an external magnetic field is applied. When the magnetic field is removed they transform back to liquid. As the external magnetic field strength increases so does the magnetorheological fluid viscosity. Magnetorheological fluids are made up of very small iron particles (typically 3-5 μm) dispersed in a low volatility carrier fluid, usually a synthetic hydrocarbon. Oil, glycol, silicone and even water can be used as the MR fluid medium. Table 2-1 provides typical MR fluid properties [Technical Insights, 1999]. Applications of magnetorheological fluids can be found in automotive shocks, mounts and bushings, vibration dampers for vehicular seats and home appliances, precision lens grinding processes, pneumatic motion control systems, and seismic dampers for buildings and bridges.

2.6. Fiber Optic Sensors

Fiber optic sensors embedded in or attached to composites and other structures provide structural health monitoring and detect the onset of structural degradation and damage. Optical sensors have a number of specific advantages over other type of sensors which include easy embedment into host structures like composite laminates and rods, immunity to electromagnetic interference due to their dielectric nature, lightweight characteristics, corrosion resistance, high bandwidth, an enhanced resistance to environmental conditions, and low cost. The main disadvantages of these sensors are that their associated fiber leads are fragile and they also have a very small diameter which makes them difficult to handle. In addition to strain sensing, fiber optic sensors can be used to monitor a large number of other parameters such as linear and angular position, pressure, flow, liquid-level, temperature, strain, degree of cure etc. Measurements of such variables generally depend on changes in the manner that light is transmitted along the optical fiber.
Table 2-1: Typical MR Fluids Properties [Technical Insights, 1999]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Typical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Yield Strength</td>
<td>500-100 kPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Field</td>
<td>Approximately 250 kA/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic Viscosity</td>
<td>0.1-1.0 Pa-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operable Temperature Range</td>
<td>40-150°C (limited by carrier fluid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susceptibility to Contaminants</td>
<td>Highly resistant to most impurities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Time</td>
<td>A few milliseconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>3-4 g/cm³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Energy Density</td>
<td>0.1 J/cm³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Supply</td>
<td>2-25 V @ 1-2 A (2-50W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiber optic sensors are categorized into (a) intrinsic sensors and (b) extrinsic sensors. Extrinsic sensors consist of an optical fiber, which carries light to a separate device that modulates it in response to an environmental effect. Intrinsic sensors on the other hand monitor light modulation within the fiber itself. An example of an extrinsic type of sensor used extensively in structural health monitoring applications is the Fabry Perot Sensor. It works on the principle of measuring a gap shift, or cavity length, between two facing fiber ends contained in a glass capillary. As external force (stress) is applied to the sensor, the length of the air gap changes and so does the phase difference between the two reflections. The change in phase between the two reflections is represented on a read-out screen. A schematic of a Fabry Perot sensor is shown in Figure 2-8 [Kalamkarov et al., 2000] and a photograph of an actual sensor is shown in Figure 2-9. Fabry perot sensors are very attractive for smart composite applications because their small size allows them to be easily embedded in composite materials, such as pultruded glass and carbon fiber reinforced tendons [Kalamkarov et. al, 1998, 2000].
**Figure 2-8**: Fabry Perot sensor [Kalamkarov et al., 2000]

**Figure 2-9**: Fabry Perot sensor
3. INTRODUCTION TO ASYMPTOTIC HOMOGENIZATION MODELS FOR SMART COMPOSITE STRUCTURES

3.1. Introduction

Significant increase in the popularity of advanced composites and smart composites has seen their incorporation in the areas of mechanical, aerospace, civil, transportation, marine engineering, medicine, recreation and sports goods, etc. The continuous integration of these materials into new engineering platforms largely depends on the correct prediction of their mechanical properties and coefficients such as elastic, actuation, thermal conductivity, hygro-thermal expansion etc., through the development of appropriate models. The actuation coefficients characterize the intrinsic transducer nature of active smart composites that can be used to induce strains and stresses in a coordinated fashion. The micromechanical modeling of smart composite structures however, can be rather convoluted because of the inherent inhomogeneity of the composite materials themselves, and the local interaction between the different constituents. Therefore, it is important to develop mathematical models which are neither too complicated to be described and used, nor too simple to reflect the real properties and characteristics of the structures. In this thesis three different models pertaining to different structures are established and analyzed. The first model pertain to a thin smart composite plate reinforced with orthotropic bars, the second model analyses prismatic smart composite structures, and the third model developed is applied to three-dimensional network reinforced composite structures. Although the three models are fundamentally different because they deal with different structures, they all have some common features. The following sections provide a brief explanation of these features. The detailed modeling of the three structures is given in the subsequent chapters.
3.2. Micromechanical Modeling

The mathematical modeling of composite structures made up of reinforcements embedded in a matrix has been the focus of investigation for many years. Due to the multi-constituent nature of the composite structure, most micromechanical models employ some variant of an 'averaging' technique to determine their overall or 'effective' properties and predict their mechanical behavior. Hashin [1962] developed a composite spheres model to determine the effective properties of a heterogeneous medium. In this model, the inclusions are treated as spherical particles of radius 'a', and are embedded in a spherical region of matrix of radius 'b' in such a manner that the ratio of the radius of the particle to that of the encompassing matrix is constant and independent of the actual particle size. This model was developed to analyze shear and bulk moduli of macroscopically isotropic composites. Hashin and Rosen [1964] developed a composite cylinder model for the analysis of microscopically anisotropic composite materials. This model treats the reinforcing fibers as cylindrical inclusions of radius 'a' associated with a region of matrix of radius 'b'. Similar to the previous model, this model also allows the variation of the absolute size of the reinforcements in order to cover all the available continuous material, keeping however, the ratio a/b constant. Hill [1965] and Budiansky [1965] extended a self-consistent scheme previously developed for modeling the mechanical behavior of polycrystalline materials by Hershey [1954], to analyze multiphase media. Hashin and Shtrikman [1963a, 1963b] developed micromechanical models pertaining to multiphase materials, which exhibit macroscopically quasi-isotropic behavior. In this model, the authors employed a variational approach to determine upper and lower limits for the effective elastic properties as well as electric and thermal conductivity of the multiphase materials. It was discovered that if the properties of the different constituents were of comparable magnitude, then the upper and lower bonds are close to one another. Other mathematical models related to composite structures can be found in Eshelby [1957], Hill [1963], Russel [1973], Mori and Tanaka [1973], Sendeckyj [1974], Berryman [1980], Torquato and Stell [1985], and more recently in Torquato [1991], Tsai [1992], Jansson [1992], Vasiliev [1993], Kalamkarov and Liu [1998c],

The characteristics of adaptive smart structures of a periodic nature (see Figure 3-1) can be described by means of partial differential equations expressed in terms of two largely different scales; a microscopic scale (fast scale) which reflects the periodic nature of the structure and is of same order of magnitude as the size of the “unit cell” or periodicity unit (Figure 3-1), and a macroscopic scale (slow scale) which is a manifestation of the global formulation of the problem. The macroscopic scale has an order of magnitude similar to a characteristic dimension of the composite structure. The presence of two different scales in the pertinent differential equations makes their analytic or even numerical solution a very difficult task. So, we look for alternative approximate techniques. One such technique is the asymptotic homogenization method. The asymptotic homogenization decouples the microscopic and the macroscopic variations, so that each can be solved independently or sequentially. The general mathematical framework can be found in Bensoussan et al. [1978], Bakhvalov and Panasenko [1984], Sanchez-Palencia, [1980], Kalamkarov [1992], Cioranescu and Donato [1999] etc. This method is mathematically rigorous and when applied to the smart composite structures, it enables the determination of both local and global averaged properties of the structures. Many problems in the framework of elasticity and thermoelasticity have been solved using such models. Kalamkarov and Georgiades [2002a, 2002b] developed general micromechanical models pertaining to smart composite structures with homogeneous and non-homogeneous boundary conditions as well as micromechanical model for thin smart composite layers with wavy boundaries. Other works can be found in Adrianov et al. [1985], Artola and Duvaut [1977], Lene and Leguillon [1982], Caillerie [1984], Kohn and Vogelius [1984], Devries et al. [1989], Ciarlet [1990], Kolpakov and Kolpakova [1995], and Kalamkarov and Kolpakov [1997, 2001]. The main objective of asymptotic
homogenization technique is to transform a general anisotropic composite material made of a periodic array of reinforcements and other inclusions such as actuators (Figure 3-1) into a set of simpler problems, often referred to as unit cell problems. It is precisely these unit cell problems that lead to the determination of the aforementioned effective coefficients.

The three essential features characterizing asymptotic homogenization are asymptotic or perturbation expansions, two-scale expansions, and the homogenization process. These features are explained in subsequent sections.

Figure 3-1: Smart Composite with periodically arranged actuators and its periodicity cell

Before explaining these features it is worth explaining briefly what we mean by asymptotic approximations. Most of the physical problems that arise in all branches of science and engineering have some inherent characteristics associated with them that make the exact closed-form solution an impossible or very difficult task. Some examples
of these characteristics include, but are not limited to, non-linearity, geometric uncertainties, rapidly oscillating coefficients, and changing boundary conditions. The advances in computer technology helped to solve or deal with such complex problems but strictly numerical solutions come with their share of disadvantages the most important of which is that the insight often gained from exploring the relationships between a solution and the various problem parameters is lost. One way of compensating for this is to construct an approximate solution from which the analyst and designers can assess or partly assess the significance of the various parameters. It is therefore important to discuss what exactly we mean by an asymptotic approximation. The best way to explain this is to consider an example as given in Holmes [1995].

Let us consider a problem given by:

\[ f(\alpha) = \alpha^2 + \alpha^5, \text{ where } \alpha \text{ is close to zero} \]  \[3.1\]

In this problem we are interested in finding an approximation. To begin solving this problem first let us approximate the above function as:

\[ f(\alpha) \approx \alpha^2 \]  \[3.2\]

This approximation is reasonable for \( \alpha \) close to zero because \( \alpha^5 \ll \alpha^2 \). On the other hand, a lousy approximation would be

\[ f(\alpha) \approx \frac{3}{5} \alpha^2 \]  \[3.3\]
We can easily observe that the above approximation is lousy even though the error \( f(\alpha) - \frac{3}{5} \alpha^2 \) goes to zero as \( \alpha \downarrow 0 \). The problem with this approximation is that the error is of the same order of magnitude as the quantity being approximated. Thus,

"Given \( f(\alpha) \) and \( \phi(\alpha) \), we say that \( \phi(\alpha) \) is an asymptotic approximation to \( f(\alpha) \) as \( \alpha \to \alpha_0 \) whenever \( f = \phi + o(\phi) \) as \( \alpha \to \alpha_0 \). In this case, we write \( f \sim \phi \) as \( \alpha \to \alpha_0 \)."  
[Holmes, 1995]

In the above definition \( \phi(\alpha) \) serves as an approximation to \( f(\alpha) \), for \( \alpha \) close to \( \alpha_0 \), when the error is of higher order than the approximating function. In particular, \( f \sim \phi \) as \( \alpha \to \alpha_0 \) if

\[
\lim_{\alpha \to \alpha_0} \frac{f(\alpha)}{\phi(\alpha)} = 1 \tag{3.4}
\]

It is worth mentioning that the asymptotic approximation is not unique and it does not say much about the accuracy of the approximation. To overcome these disadvantages, we need to introduce more structure into the problem formulation.

### 3.3. Asymptotic Expansion

The differential equations describing the behavior of real structures or systems are often characterized by the presence of certain parameters, which even though small in relation to the other parameters and variables, may have too important of an effect to be ignored. The presence of such parameters makes the differential equations difficult to solve. A particularly useful technique is dealing with any differential equation is to non-
dimensionlise the variables in a differential equation i.e. normalize them with respect to other suitable characteristic variables so that these transformed variables are approximately of order 1. Thus in such situations, a “small” parameter say \( \varepsilon \), implies that \( \varepsilon \) is much smaller than 1 (\( \varepsilon \ll 1 \)). An approximate solution to the problem is then obtained by expanding it in terms of an infinite series in powers of the small parameter and by subsequently truncating this series after a few terms. The most common methods used to find asymptotic expansions are (a) Taylor’s theorem, (b) L’Hospital’s rule (c) Educated guess. More information on these methods can be found in Nayfeh [1993]. Typically, but not always, these series are in the form

\[
y_{\text{solution}} = y_0 + \varepsilon y_1 + \varepsilon^2 y_2 + \varepsilon^3 y_3 + \ldots
\]

where the symbol \( \ldots \) stands for higher order terms. Once the series is defined it is inserted into the governing equations and respective boundary conditions, and coefficients of like powers of \( \varepsilon \) are then grouped to obtain a series of equations for the coefficient functions, which are then solved in a sequential manner. It must be mentioned that the resulting series need not converge for any value of \( \varepsilon \); nevertheless, the solution can be still useful in approximating the given function when \( \varepsilon \) is small.

The general features of an asymptotic expansion will be illustrated by means of a simple example. Consider,

\[
\frac{dy}{dx} - y^2 = \varepsilon y
\]

\[y(0)=1\]  \hspace{1cm} [3.6]

The first step in solving this problem is to assume that the solution is expressed as:
\[ y = y_0(x) + \epsilon y_1(x) + \epsilon^2 y_2(x) + O(\epsilon^3) \]  

[3.7]

where "O" is the so called Landau symbol and means "order of". The error incurred by truncating the series after the \( \epsilon^2 \) is of order \( \epsilon^3 \). It should also be noted in Equation [3.7] that the \( y_i(x) \) terms are all functions of the independent variable \( x \), and do not depend on \( \epsilon \).

The next step in the process of solving this problem is to substitute the assumed expression into the governing equations and boundary conditions to obtain, after neglecting higher-order terms:

\[
\frac{dy_0}{dx} + \epsilon \frac{dy_1}{dx} - (y_0 + \epsilon y_1)^2 = \epsilon y_0 + \epsilon^2 y_1
\]  

[3.8a]

\[
y_0(0) + \epsilon y_1(0) + \epsilon^2 y_2(0) = 1
\]  

[3.8b]

Collecting the like powers of \( \epsilon \) gives two sets of questions:

\[
\frac{dy_0}{dx} - y_0^2 = 0
\]  

[3.9a]

\[
y_0(0) = 1
\]  

[3.9b]

\[
\frac{dy_1}{dx} - 2y_0 y_1 - y_0 = 0
\]  

[3.10a]

\[
y_1(0) = 0
\]  

[3.10b]

From Equation [3.9]
\[ y_0 = \frac{1}{1-x} \quad [3.11] \]


\[ y_1 = \varepsilon \frac{x}{2} \frac{2-x}{(1-x)^2} \quad [3.12] \]

Combining Equations [3.11] and [3.12] gives the total expression for the asymptotic solution of the problem at hand as follows:

\[ y(x) = \frac{1}{1-x} + \varepsilon \frac{x}{2} \frac{2-x}{(1-x)^2} + O(\varepsilon^2) \quad [3.13] \]

To assess the accuracy of the approximate solution obtained, one must compare with an exact solution. Thus, from Equations [3.6] and after some algebraic manipulations, the exact solution for \( x \) is given by:

\[ y(x) = \frac{\varepsilon e^{\varepsilon x}}{\varepsilon + 1 - e^{\varepsilon x}} \quad [3.14] \]

As a final step let us plot the asymptotic and analytic solutions given in Equations [3.13], [3.14] respectively. From Figure 3-2, we observe that they conform very well to one another. The value of \( \varepsilon = 0.01 \) was used for this plot.
Figure 3-2: Comparison of asymptotic and analytical solutions for the example in Equation [3.6]

3.4. Multi-Scale Expansion

The second characteristic feature of the method of asymptotic technique is the two scale expansion. Unlike matched asymptotic expansion where the solution is constructed in different regions that are then patched together to form a composite expansion [Nayfeh, 1973], the method of multiple-scale expansion essentially starts with a generalized version of a composite expansion. In doing this, one introduces separate coordinates for each region of the problem under consideration. These new variables are considered independent of one another. The result is a transformed partial differential equation which is, surprisingly perhaps, easier to solve rather than the problem described in the original ordinary differential equation.
For illustrative purposes, let us consider a weak spring-mass-damping system with a weak damping coefficient. The problem of this nature is given by the following differential equation and boundary conditions:

\[ \frac{d^2y}{dt^2} + \varepsilon \frac{dy}{dt} + y = 0 \quad [3.15a] \]

\[ y(0) = 1, \quad \dot{y}(0) = 0 \quad [3.15b] \]

Here \( \varepsilon \) is the viscous damping coefficient.

We will try to solve this problem by using a regular asymptotic expansion like the one described in Section [3.3]. We start with:

\[ y = y_0(t) + \varepsilon y_1(t) + \varepsilon^2 y_2(t) + O(\varepsilon^3) \quad [3.16] \]

Substituting Equation [3.16] into Equations [3.15a], [3.15b] gives

\[ \frac{d^2y_0}{dt^2} + \varepsilon \frac{d^2y_1}{dt^2} + \varepsilon^2 \frac{d^2y_2}{dt^2} + \varepsilon \frac{dy_0}{dt} + \varepsilon^2 \frac{dy_1}{dt} + y_0(t) + \varepsilon y_1(t) + \varepsilon^2 y_2(t) = 0 \quad [3.17a] \]

\[ y_0(0) + \varepsilon y_1(0) = 1 \quad [3.17b] \]

\[ \dot{y}_0(0) + \varepsilon \dot{y}_1(0) = 0 \quad [3.17c] \]

Equating equal powers of \( \varepsilon \) gives the following two sets of equations
\(O(0): \frac{d^2y_0}{dt^2} + y_0(t) = 0 \) \[3.18a\]

\(O(0): y_0(0) = 1 \) \[3.18b\]

\(O(0): \dot{y}_0(0) = 0 \) \[3.18c\]

\(O(\varepsilon): \frac{d^2y_1}{dt^2} + \frac{dy_0}{dt} + y_1(t) = 0 \) \[3.19a\]

\(y_1(0) = 0 \) \[3.19b\]

\(\dot{y}_1(0) = 0 \) \[3.19c\]

Solving the above equations in conjunction with boundary conditions gives the solutions for \(y_0\) and \(y_1\). Combining the two solutions gives the final expression for \(y\) as:

\[y(t) = \cos(t) + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon (\sin(t) - \cos(t)) \] \[3.20\]

Finally we will derive the analytical solution for the same problem and compare with the approximate solution calculated above. The exact solution for this problem is given by:

\[y(t) = e^{-\frac{\varepsilon t}{2}} \left( \cos \left( \frac{\sqrt{4 - \varepsilon^2}}{2} t \right) - \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{4 - \varepsilon^2}} \sin \left( \frac{\sqrt{4 - \varepsilon^2}}{2} t \right) \right) \] \[3.21\]

Figure 3-3 compares the approximate solution and the exact solution. For illustration purposes we assume that \(\varepsilon\) (viscous-damping coefficient) = 0.05. It is observed that the
approximate solution agrees with exact solution for times up to about 20 seconds and then the error becomes progressively larger. The reason is that after 20 seconds the second term in the Equation [3.20] becomes as large as first term and the approximation collapses. In any valid asymptotic expansion, each term of the series must always be a small correction to the previous term [Nayfeh, 1973, Holmes, 1995].

From the Figure 3-3 we observe that problems of this nature are actually characterized by two quite different scales. The first one is the “rapid” or fast sinusoidal scale and superimposed on that is a slow exponential scale. Thus, the actual solution decays slowly, but the asymptotic solution can only capture the fast variation in this case. In its attempt to correct the first term, the second term in the asymptotic expansion becomes progressively larger and eventually even larger than the first term. The term tcost is called a “secular” term.

![Graph showing Comparison of regular asymptotic and analytical solutions for a weakly damped spring-mass system](image)

**Figure 3-3:** Comparison of regular asymptotic and analytical solutions for a weakly damped spring-mass system
The large mismatch between two different scales means that our asymptotic expansion can only capture the slow scale and not the fast scale. One way of solving this problem is to “speed up” the slow variation by introducing a new variable $t_2 = \varepsilon t$. Thus the two variables are defined as:

$$t_1 = t$$
$$t_2 = \varepsilon t$$  \[3.22\]

In Equation [3.22], $t_1$ is commonly referred to as the fast variable and $t_2$ is referred as slow variable. Subsequently, the asymptotic expansion given in Equation [3.16] can be written as:

$$y(t_1, t_2) = y_0(t_1, t_2) + \varepsilon y_1(t_1, t_2) + \varepsilon^2 y_2(t_1, t_2) + O(\varepsilon^3)$$  \[3.23\]

The introduction of new variables transforms the ordinary differential equations to partial differential equation as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}$$  \[3.24\]


$$\frac{d}{dt} \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \varepsilon$$  \[3.25\]

and
\[
\frac{d^2}{dt^2} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1^2} + 2\varepsilon \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2} + \varepsilon^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_2^2}
\]  

[3.26]

Let us now try to solve the above problem using the asymptotic expansion given by Equation [3.23]. The procedure is similar to the one before but the only difference is that the two variables are treated separately. The differential equation and the pertinent boundary conditions now become:

\[
\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t_1^2} + 2\varepsilon \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2} + \varepsilon^2 \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t_2^2} + \varepsilon \frac{\partial y}{\partial t_1} + \varepsilon^2 \frac{\partial y}{\partial t_2} + y = 0
\]

\[
y\big|_{t_1=t_2=0} = 1
\]

[3.27]

\[
\frac{\partial y}{\partial t_1} + \varepsilon \frac{\partial y}{\partial t_2} \big|_{t_1=t_2=0} = 0
\]

It should be noted that even though Equation [3.27] is 2\textsuperscript{nd} order with respect to \(t_1\) and \(t_2\), only two initial conditions are given. These can be expanded to 4 in an infinite number of ways. To make the solution unique, one needs to impose certain restrictions so as to avoid secular terms [Holmes, 1995].

Substituting Equation [3.23] into Equation [3.27] gives two sets of problems:

\[
O(i): \frac{\partial^2 y_0}{\partial t_1^2} + y_0 = 0
\]

\[
y_0\big|_{t_1=t_2=0} = 1
\]

[3.28a]

\[
\frac{\partial y_0}{\partial t_1} \big|_{t_1=t_2=0} = 0
\]
and

$$O(\varepsilon): \frac{\partial^2 y_1}{\partial t_1^2} + y_1 = -2 \frac{\partial^2 y_0}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2} - \frac{\partial y_0}{\partial t_1}$$

$$y_1|_{t_1=t_2=0} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial y_1}{\partial t_1} + \frac{\partial y_0}{\partial t_2}|_{t_1=t_2=0} = 0$$

[3.28b]

Let us concentrate on first set of equations given by Equation [3.28a]. The solution can readily be obtained to be:

$$y_0 = A(t_2)\sin t_1 + B(t_2)\cos t_1$$

$$A(0) = 0, B(0) = 1$$

[3.29]

Substituting Equation [3.29] into Equation [3.28b] leads, after some manipulations to:

$$y_1 = D(t_2)\cos t_1 + E(t_2)\sin t_1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{dA}{dt_2} + A \right) t_1 \sin t_1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{dB}{dt_2} + B \right) t_1 \cos t_1$$

[3.30]

It is obvious that to avoid secular terms, we need to impose the following conditions on $A$ and $B$:

$$2 \frac{dA}{dt_2} + A = 0$$

$$2 \frac{dB}{dt_2} + B = 0$$

[3.31]
Solving Equation [3.31] in conjunction with Equation [3.29] leads to:

\[ A = 0 \text{ and } B = e^{-\frac{t_2}{2}} \]  \[3.32\]

Substituting values of A and B into Equation [3.28] gives the solution for \( y_0 \) as:

\[ y_0 = e^{-\frac{t_2}{2}} \cos t_1 = e^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cos t \]  \[3.33\]

Substituting Equation [3.33] into Equation [3.23] gives the final asymptotic solution as:

\[ y = e^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cos t + O(e^2) \]  \[3.34\]

Note that the procedure outlined here simply amounts to letting \( t_2 = \epsilon t \) be a new variable and substituting it into the model. The next term in the series will be of order \( \epsilon t_1 = O(e^2) \), which explains the form of Equation [3.34]. Figure 3-4 shows the plot of new asymptotic solution along with the analytic solution. The two solutions are virtually indistinguishable.

### 3.5. Asymptotic Homogenization Model

The physical behavior of a composite medium with a regular arrangement of fibers, sensors and/or actuators is governed by differential equations with rapidly oscillating coefficients. The presence of such coefficients makes the solution difficult and sometimes even impossible to solve analytically. One approach to solve such a problem is to
consider a "continuum approximation" concept that assumes the material to be continuously distributed. If the characteristic dimensions of the structural elements are small in comparison to the overall dimensions of the structure, then the original inhomogeneous body can be replaced, in an asymptotic sense, by a homogeneous structure with similar mechanical behavior. In other words, we can replace the periodically varying (inhomogeneous) composite structures with a homogeneous structure that has similar mechanical properties (to be referred to as effective properties) as the original composite structure. The problem begins with the basic differential equation and boundary conditions representing the inhomogeneous medium and reduces to a simpler set of problems called the unit cell problems representing the approximately equivalent homogeneous medium. It is precisely these unit cell problems that enable the determination of the effective coefficients.

![Graph showing comparison of asymptotic and analytical solutions](image)

**Figure 3-4:** Comparison of two-scale asymptotic and analytical solution for a weakly damped spring-mass system

To better understand the concepts of the method of homogenization, let us consider a typical fiber reinforced composite that occupies a domain $G$ with boundary
conditions $\partial G$. Figure 3-5 shows the cross-sectional view of such a composite structure. From the figure, it is evident that the composite structure can be thought of as a regular arrangement of what one might justifiably call unit cells. Let us assume that the unit cell in this case has both length and width equal to a non-dimensional parameter $\varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon$ is obviously a very small number. This can be justified from the fact that the magnitude of $\varepsilon$ is of the same order as the diameter of the reinforcing fibers or the spacing between the fibers.

![Cross-section of a composite structure](image)

**Figure 3-5:** Cross-section of a composite Structure

Assume that we are interested in finding, say, the steady state temperature distribution due to some thermal input. During our work, we will inevitably come across material properties like thermal conductivity. Let us plot the variation of thermal conductivity along direction AA or BB direction (Figure 3-5). The result is shown in Figure 3-6. From
this figure we observe that the thermal conductivity (as well as other material properties) varies from low to high with a small period $\varepsilon$ as we go from fiber to matrix. This periodic variation of material properties is a consequence of the periodic nature of the structure as discussed above. Hence, the differential equations characterizing heterogeneous media (such as composite materials) with a periodic structure, have rapidly oscillating coefficients which depend on the physical properties of the various constituents such as reinforcing fibers, actuators and matrix. In other words, these coefficients are periodic with an extremely small period $\varepsilon$ where $\varepsilon$ is of the order of the diameter of the reinforcing fibers. The dependent variables such as the stress and strain fields will consequently also have a periodic component with the same period $\varepsilon$. In addition to this periodic component however, the dependent variables have a superimposed non-periodic component as well because they depend not only on material properties, but also on external loads, boundary conditions etc. which are, in general, non-periodic. To better understand this concept, let us consider our example a little further. We assume that the upper surface of this structure (Figure 3-5) is maintained at $0^\circ$C and the lower surface is maintained at $100^\circ$C. At steady state it is natural to expect that the temperature near the lower side is higher than the temperature near the upper surface and hence temperature distribution will not be periodic. Based on these arguments, two important observations are apparent:

The material properties like thermal conductivity, elastic moduli, poisons ratios etc. are strictly periodic with a (small) period $\varepsilon$.

The dependent variables like stress, strain, temperature are characterized by both a periodic and a coupled non-periodic component.
Figure 3-6: Plot of variation of coefficients vs. distance

To illustrate these notations even further let us consider the example shown in Figure 3-7 [Sanchez-Palencia, 1980].

Figure 3-7: A periodic medium [Sanchez-Palencia, 1980]
Suppose that we are interested in finding the temperature distribution, \( T \), in the periodic composite structure of Figure 3-7. Because of the assumed periodicity, and because the points \( P_1, P_2, \) and \( P_4 \) represent corresponding points in different unit cells, the thermal conductivity at these points will be the same. However, the thermal conductivity at point \( P_3 \) will be different. Consider now points \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \). At steady state, both the periodic and the non-periodic components of the temperature are same because the two points are close to one another and macroscopically this represents a small distance. Hence the temperature at these points will be (for a very good approximation) same. For points \( P_1 \) and \( P_4 \) however, the situation is different. The periodic component of the temperature at these points will be the same, but the non-periodic component will be different because these two points are rather far apart. Consequently, the temperature at these points is different.

Thus, from the discussions so far, it is apparent that the problem of a periodic structure is characterized by two vastly different scales, a microscopic or fast scale, and, superimposed on it, a macroscopic scale. The presence of these two scales means that we can not obtain a regular perturbation expansion to our problem, much like we could not find a regular perturbation expansion to the weak spring-mass-damping system considered before. In that case, the difficulty was the mismatch between a rapidly oscillating scale and the slow exponential scale. We solved that problem by “speeding up” the slow scale. A similar technique will be employed for the case of periodic composite structures. Here we solve the problem by simply expanding the domain of the unit cell so that it is now of the same order of magnitude (i.e. \( \sim 1 \)) as the macroscopic variables. Accordingly, we introduce a new set of variables called “fast” or microscopic variables \( y_i \) (in addition to the existing macroscopic variables \( x_i \)), such that

\[
y_i = \frac{x_i}{\varepsilon}; \quad i = 1, 2, 3
\]  

[3.35]
In view of the introduction of the microscopic variables, the unit-cell now gets transformed as in Figure 3-8 and, as a consequence, the material coefficients of the composite medium will now be periodic in $y$, with period 1, the size of the transformed unit cell. This will eventually lead to the determination of effective or homogenized coefficients which as we will see later, are independent of the macroscopic scale. Once the effective coefficients are obtained, the global (macroscopic) problem can be solved. More details on the applications of the method of homogenization for the case of smart structures can be found in Kalamkarov [1992, 1997] Kalamkarov and Kolpakov [2001], Kalamkarov and Georgiades [2002a, 2002b] Kalamkarov et al., [2003a, 2003c], Georgiades and Kalamkarov [2004], Georgiades et al. [2003].

![Figure 3-8: Introduction of fast variable](image)

3.6. Developed Models

In the subsequent chapters, three different models will be presented. A number of examples were used to illustrate these models. In these examples, the materials selected are transversely isotropic simply because they are more commonly encountered. The validity of the models however is much more general and they apply without modification to orthotropic materials.
4. ASYMPTOTIC HOMOGENIZATION MODEL FOR NETWORK REINFORCED SMART COMPOSITE PLATES

4.1. Introduction

Smart composites are used in the form of plates and shells in increasingly more applications. In many cases these structures have a periodic configuration with a period much smaller than their characteristic dimensions. Consequently, asymptotic homogenization is the best candidate for analysis. For thin plates and shells where the thickness of the structure is of a similar order of magnitude as the size or spacing of the actuators/reinforcements, the modified methodology first proposed by Caillerie in his heat conduction studies (Caillerie, 1984) should be used. In this technique, two sets of ‘fast’ variables are introduced; one for the tangential directions which exhibit periodicity and one for the transverse direction for which periodicity do not apply. Such an approach has been used by Kohn and Vogelius (1984, 1985) for the problem of pure bending of a thin homogeneous plate, Kalamkarov (1992), and Kalamkarov and Kolpakov (1997) for three-dimensional elasticity and thermoelectric problems of thin curvilinear composite layers, Georgiades and Kalamkarov (2003, 2004) for piezoelectric deformations of wafer- and rib-reinforced smart composite structures and others.

In this work, a general 3-dimensional micromechanical model pertaining to smart composite layers with wavy boundaries is applied to the case of thin smart plates reinforced with a network of orthotropic bars that may also exhibit piezoelectric behavior. The method used for the development of the structural model is that of asymptotic homogenization which reduces the original boundary value problem into a set of three decoupled problems, each problem characterized by two differential equations. These three sets of differential equations, referred to as “unit cell problems”, deal, independently, with the elastic, piezoelectric, and thermal expansion behavior of the
network reinforced smart composite plates. The solution of the unit cell problems yields expressions for effective elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients which, as a consequence of their universal nature, can be used to study a wide variety of boundary value problems associated with a smart structure of a given geometry. It will be shown that these models can readily be used to tailor the effective properties of any smart network structure, to meet the requirements of any particular application by changing some material or geometric parameters such as the size or nature of the reinforcements. For illustration purposes, the methodology is applied to network-reinforced smart structures with generally orthotropic reinforcements and actuators forming spatial rectangular, triangular, or rhombic arrangements. In the limiting case of purely elastic behavior and isotropic reinforcements, the above general orthotropic model converges to results that are consistent with those of Kalamkarov (1992) who also used asymptotic homogenization and Pshenichnov (1982) who used a different approach based on stress-strain relationships in the reinforcements.

4.2. Objective and Synopsis

The objective of this work is to determine the effective elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients of thin smart composite plates with networks of bars made of orthotropic material. A simple network consisting of only one family of actuators/reinforcements is shown in Figure 4-1. A general form of composite plate with networks of more than one family of actuators/reinforcements will be considered in Section 4.5.

The micromechanical modeling of thin composite network structures begins with the basic problem formulation and model development as presented in Section 4.3, followed by the analysis of network reinforced smart composite plates in Section 4.4. Finally, the effective coefficients of the homogenized structures are obtained in sections 4.4.1, 4.4.2,
and 4.4.2. Section 4.5 considers specific examples pertaining to rectangular, triangular and rhombic configurations.

Simple network of orthotropic reinforcements which exhibit piezoelectric behavior

**Figure 4-1:** Smart composite plate with a network of orthotropic actuators/reinforcements

---

4.3. **Homogenization Model for Network and Framework Reinforced Plates**

4.3.1. **General Problem Formulation**

**Figure 4-2:** Periodic smart composite layer reinforced and its unit cell
The micromechanical model for a network-reinforced smart composite plate will be developed starting from a general model pertaining to a thin smart composite layer with wavy surfaces [Kalamkarov and Georgiades, 2004]. In this section, only the salient features of this latter model will be given in so far as they represent the starting point of the current model.

Consider a thin smart composite layer with wavy surfaces as shown in Figure 4-2. It is assumed that the thin smart composite layer containing a large number of periodically arranged actuators. This periodic structure is obtained by repeating a certain small unit cell $\Omega_0$ in the $x_1$-$x_2$ plane but not in transverse direction. All three coordinates in Figure 4-2 are assumed to have been made dimensionless by dividing the unit cell by a certain characteristic dimension of the body, $L$. The shape of the top and bottom surfaces of this structure is determined by the nature of the reinforcements used (rib or stiffener). Clearly, in the absence of any surface reinforcements, the composite layer will be flat.

The unit cell of the problem under consideration is characterized by the following inequalities:

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{c}
-\frac{\delta h_1}{2} < x_1 < \frac{\delta h_1}{2}, \\
-\frac{\delta h_2}{2} < x_2 < \frac{\delta h_2}{2}, \\
S^- < x_3 < S^+ \end{array} \right\}, \text{ where }
\]

\[
S^\pm = \pm \frac{\delta}{2} \pm \delta F^\pm \left( \frac{x_1}{\delta h_1}, \frac{x_2}{\delta h_2} \right) \tag{4.1}
\]

Here, the parameters $h_1$, and $h_2$ characterize the ratio of the tangential to thickness dimensions of the unit cell and $\delta$ represents the thickness of the plate. The functions $F^\pm$ characterize the geometric profiles of the top and bottom surfaces and are assumed to be piecewise smooth and periodic in $x_1$ and $x_2$ plane with respective periods $\delta h_1$ and $\delta h_2$. 
The elastic deformation of this smart periodic structure can be represented by means of following expressions:

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j} - P_i = 0 \quad \text{where,}
\]

\[
\sigma_{ij} = C_{ijkl} \left( \varepsilon_{kl} \right) - d_{klm}^{(r)} R_m - \alpha_{kl}^{(\theta)} T \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
e_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} \right)
\]

[4.2]

The first expression in Equation [4.2] represents the static equilibrium equation of a body subjected to surface traction and body forces. The second equation is Hooke’s law which is modified to include actuation, and thermal expansion effects. The final expression in Equation [4.2] represents the familiar stress-strain relationships.

\( C_{ijkl} \) represents the tensor of elastic coefficients, \( e_{kl} \) is the strain tensor which is a function of the displacement field \( u \), \( d_{klm}^{(r)} \) are the actuation coefficients describing the effect of a control signal \( R \) on the stress field \( \sigma_{ij} \), \( \alpha_{kl}^{(\theta)} \) are the thermal expansion coefficients, and \( T \) represents change in temperature with respect to a reference state. Finally, \( P_i \) represents body forces. It is assumed in Equation [4.2] that the elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients are periodic in \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) (with respective period’s \( \delta h_1 \) and \( \delta h_2 \)) but are not periodic in the transverse coordinate \( x_3 \). It is further assumed that the top and bottom surfaces of the plate \( S^\pm \) are subjected to surface tractions \( p_i \) (not to be confused with the body force \( P_i \)) which are related to stresses by Cauchy’s Law as [Holzapfel, 2000]

\[
\sigma_{ij} n_j = p_i
\]

[4.3]
where $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit vector normal to the surfaces $x_3 = S^\pm(x_1, x_2)$ and is given by [Kalamkarov, 1992]:

\[
n^\pm = \frac{\left(\mp \frac{\partial S^\pm}{\partial x_1}, \mp \frac{\partial S^\pm}{\partial x_2}, 1\right)}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial S^\pm}{\partial x_1}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial S^\pm}{\partial x_2}\right)^2 + 1}} \tag{4.4}
\]

4.3.2. Asymptotic Analysis, Assumptions and Unit cell Problems

As explained in Chapter 3, we cannot obtain a uniformly valid asymptotic expansion of the problem in its existing form, due to the simultaneous presence of the macroscopic and microscopic scales. Thus we need to first introduce the “fast” or “microscopic” variables as

\[
y_1 = \frac{x_1}{\delta h_1}, \quad y_2 = \frac{x_2}{\delta h_2}, \quad z = \frac{x_3}{\delta} \tag{4.5}
\]

where $\delta$ is the thickness of the composite layer. Therefore, the unit cell $\Omega_\delta$ is now defined by:

\[
\left\{-\frac{1}{2} < y_1 < \frac{1}{2}, \quad -\frac{1}{2} < y_2 < \frac{1}{2}, \quad Z^- < z < Z^+\right\}, \quad \text{where} \quad Z^\pm = \pm \frac{1}{2} \pm P^\pm(y) \tag{4.6}
\]

Similarly, the unit normal vector from Equation [4.4] now becomes:
\[ n^\pm = \left( \mp \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial F^\pm}{\partial y_1}, \mp \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial F^\pm}{\partial y_2} \right) \left[ \frac{1}{h_1^2} \left( \frac{\partial F^\pm}{\partial y_1} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{h_2^2} \left( \frac{\partial F^\pm}{\partial y_2} \right)^2 + 1 \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} [4.7]

We subsequently make the following asymptotic assumptions [Kalamkarov and Georgiades, 2002a]:

\[ p_a^\pm = \delta^2 r_a(x, y), \quad p_3^\pm = \delta^3 q_3^\pm(x, y) \] \hspace{1cm} [4.8a]

\[ p_a = \delta f_a(x, y, z), \quad p_3 = \delta^2 g_3(x, y, z) \] \hspace{1cm} [4.8b]

\[ d_{ijk}^{(0)} = \delta d_{ijk}(y, z) \] \hspace{1cm} [4.8c]

\[ d_{ij}^{(0)} = \delta d_{ij}(y, z) \] \hspace{1cm} [4.8d]

It should be noted that unless it is otherwise stated, Greek indices (\(\alpha, \beta, \ldots\)) in Equations [4.8a]-[4.8c] and in subsequent equations, range from 1 to 2 and Latin indices (i, j, \ldots) will vary from 1 to 3.

As well, we assume the following through-the-thickness relationships for temperature, T and electric field \(R_i\):

\[ T = T^{(0)}(x) + zT^{(1)}(x) \]

\[ R_i = R_i^{(0)}(x) + zR_i^{(1)}(x) \] \hspace{1cm} [4.9]

The next step is to assume asymptotic expansions for the displacement in the form of:

\[ u_i = u_i^{(0)}(x, y, z) + \delta u_i^{(1)}(x, y, z) + \delta^2 u_i^{(2)}(x, y, z) + \ldots \] \hspace{1cm} [4.10]
for stress field as:

\[
\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}^{(0)}(x,y,z) + \delta\sigma_{ij}^{(1)}(x,y,z) + \delta^2\sigma_{ij}^{(2)}(x,y,z) + \ldots \tag{4.11}
\]

The solution of this problem is obtained from Equations [4.2], [4.5], [4.10], and [4.11] and results in an equivalent smart composite plate model, see Kalamkarov and Georgiades [2004]. The constitutive relationships of this equivalent model are obtained in terms of the stress resultants, \(N_{\alpha\beta}\), the moment resultants, \(M_{\alpha\beta}\), and the mid-surface strains, \(e_{\alpha\beta}\), and curvatures, \(\kappa_{\alpha\beta}\). They are given as:

\[
N_{\alpha\beta} = \delta \left( b_{\alpha\beta}^{k} \right) e_{k} + \delta^2 \left( b_{\alpha\beta}^{*k} \right) \tau_{k} - \delta^2 \left( d_{\alpha\beta}^{k} \right) R_{k}^{(0)} - \delta^2 \left( d_{\alpha\beta}^{*k} \right) R_{k}^{(1)} + \delta^2 \left( \Theta_{\alpha\beta} \right) T^{(0)} - \delta^2 \left( \Theta_{\alpha\beta}^{*} \right) T^{(1)} \tag{4.12}
\]

\[
M_{\alpha\beta} = \delta \left( z_{\alpha\beta}^{k} \right) e_{k} + \delta^2 \left( z_{\alpha\beta}^{*k} \right) \tau_{k} - \delta^2 \left( z_{\alpha\beta}^{*k} \right) R_{k}^{(0)} - \delta^2 \left( z_{\alpha\beta}^{*k} \right) R_{k}^{(1)} + \delta^2 \left( z_{\alpha\beta} \right) T^{(0)} - \delta^2 \left( z_{\alpha\beta}^{*} \right) T^{(1)} \tag{4.13}
\]

The quantities \(< b_{\alpha\beta}^{k} >\), \(< b_{\alpha\beta}^{*k} >\), \(< z_{\alpha\beta}^{k} >\), and \(< z_{\alpha\beta}^{*k} >\) are called the effective elastic coefficients, \(< d_{\alpha\beta}^{k} >\), \(< d_{\alpha\beta}^{*k} >\) are the effective piezoelectric coefficients, and finally, \(< \Theta_{\alpha\beta} >\), \(< \Theta_{\alpha\beta}^{*} >\) are the effective thermal expansion coefficients. The effective coefficients are obtained through integration over the entire unit cell \(\Omega_{s}\) (with volume equal to \(|\Omega|\)) according to:

\[
\langle \tilde{f}(y_1, y_2, z) \rangle = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{f}(y_1, y_2, z) dy_1 dy_2 dz \tag{4.14}
\]
Before expressions [4.12] and [4.13] can be used, the effective coefficients must first be determined from the following problems [Kalamkarov and Georgiades, 2004]:

\[
\frac{1}{h_\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\beta} b_{i*}^{\lambda u} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} b_{i*}^{\lambda u} = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \left( \frac{1}{h_\beta} n_\beta b_{i*}^{\lambda u} + n_3 b_{i*}^{\lambda u} \right) = 0 \text{ at } z = \pm \quad [4.15a]
\]

\[
\frac{1}{h_\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\beta} b_{i*}^{*u} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} b_{i*}^{*u} = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \left( \frac{1}{h_\beta} n_\beta b_{i*}^{*u} + n_3 b_{i*}^{*u} \right) = 0 \text{ at } z = \pm \quad [4.15b]
\]

\[
\frac{1}{h_\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\beta} d_{i*}^k + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} d_{i*}^k = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \left( \frac{1}{h_\beta} n_\beta d_{i*}^k + n_3 d_{i*}^k \right) = 0 \text{ at } z = \pm \quad [4.16a]
\]

\[
\frac{1}{h_\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\beta} d_{i*}^{*k} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} d_{i*}^{*k} = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \left( \frac{1}{h_\beta} n_\beta d_{i*}^{*k} + n_3 d_{i*}^{*k} \right) = 0 \text{ at } z = \pm \quad [4.16b]
\]

\[
\frac{1}{h_\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\beta} \Theta_{i*} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Theta_{i*} = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \left( \frac{1}{h_\beta} n_\beta \Theta_{i*} + n_3 \Theta_{i*} \right) = 0 \text{ at } z = \pm \quad [4.17a]
\]

\[
\frac{1}{h_\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\beta} \Theta_{i*}^* + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Theta_{i*}^* = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \left( \frac{1}{h_\beta} n_\beta \Theta_{i*}^* + n_3 \Theta_{i*}^* \right) = 0 \text{ at } z = \pm \quad [4.17b]
\]

The differential equations and pertinent boundary conditions in [4.15a]-[4.17b] are solved entirely on the domain of the unit cell and are called “unit cell problems”. It is worth noting that unlike “classical” unit cell problems [see e.g. Bakhvalov and Panasenko, 1984], those defined by Equations [4.15a]-[4.17b] do not depend on periodicity conditions in the z-direction but rather on boundary conditions.

In actual fact, the local functions \( b_{i*}^{\lambda u}, b_{i*}^{*u}, d_{i}^{k}, \) etc are not solved directly from Equation [4.15a]-[4.17b]. Instead, the following definitions
\[ b_{ij}^{lm} = \frac{1}{h_\beta} C_{ijn\beta} \frac{\partial U_n^{lm}}{\partial y_\beta} + C_{ijn3} \frac{\partial U_n^{lm}}{\partial z} + C_{ijlm} \]  
\[ b_{ij}^{*lm} = \frac{1}{h_\beta} C_{ijn\beta} \frac{\partial V_n^{lm}}{\partial y_\beta} + C_{ijn3} \frac{\partial V_n^{lm}}{\partial z} + zC_{ijlm} \]  
\[ d_{ij}^{k} = p_{ijk} - \frac{1}{h_\beta} C_{ijn\beta} \frac{\partial U_n^{k}}{\partial y_\beta} + C_{ijm3} \frac{\partial U_n^{k}}{\partial z} \]  
\[ d_{ij}^{*k} = zp_{ijk} - \frac{1}{h_\beta} C_{ijn\beta} \frac{\partial V_n^{k}}{\partial y_\beta} + C_{ijm3} \frac{\partial V_n^{k}}{\partial z} \]  
\[ \Theta_{ij} = K_{ij} - \frac{1}{h_\beta} C_{ijn\beta} \frac{\partial U_n}{\partial y_\beta} + C_{ijm3} \frac{\partial U_n}{\partial z} \]  
\[ \Theta_{ij}^{*k} = zK_{ij} - \frac{1}{h_\beta} C_{ijn\beta} \frac{\partial V_n}{\partial y_\beta} + C_{ijm3} \frac{\partial V_n}{\partial z} \]  

where

\[ P_{ijm} = C_{ijkl} d_{kl}^{(s)} ; \quad K_{ij} = C_{ijkl} \alpha_{kl}^{(s)} \]  

are used to relate the local functions with the yet unknown functions \( U_n^{lm}(y_1, y_2, z) \), \( V_n^{lm}(y_1, y_2, z) \), \( U_n^{l}(y_1, y_2, z) \), etc and the material coefficients \( C_{ijkl}, P_{ijk}, K_{ij} \). These functions are periodic in \( y_a \) but not in \( z \). Thus, [4.18a]-[4.20b] are first substituted in [4.15a] to [4.17b] to obtain functions \( U_n^{lm}(y_1, y_2, z) \), \( V_n^{lm}(y_1, y_2, z) \), \( U_n^{l}(y_1, y_2, z) \), etc and these are subsequently back substituted in [4.18a]-[4.20b] to evaluate the local \( b_{ij}^{s}, b_{ij}^{*s}, d_{ij}^{k} \) etc coefficients. Finally, the effective elastic, piezoelectric, and thermal expansion coefficients are obtained from the homogenization Equation in [4.14].

When dealing with materials that are periodic in all the three coordinates, Bakhvalov and Panasenko [1984] showed that the symmetry properties of the coefficients involved remain the same after the homogenization process. For this model (Kalamkarov, [1992], and Kalamkarov and Georgiades, [2002a]), there is no periodicity in the transverse
direction and so the symmetry properties of the elastic, piezoelectric, and thermal expansion coefficients need some consideration. Although they will not be proved here, the following symmetry relationships are true [Kalamkarov and Georgiades, 2002a]

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle b^{mn}_{ij} \rangle &= \langle b^{*ij}_{mn} \rangle, \quad \langle zb^{mn}_{ij} \rangle &= \langle zb^{*mn}_{ij} \rangle = \langle zb^{*ij}_{mn} \rangle^{[4.22]} \\
\delta\langle \theta_{mn} \rangle &= \langle \alpha_{ij}^{(\theta)} b^{mn}_{ij} \rangle, \quad \delta\langle z\theta_{mn} \rangle = \langle \alpha_{ij}^{(\theta)} b^{*mn}_{ij} \rangle, \\
\delta\langle \theta^*_{mn} \rangle &= \langle z\alpha_{ij}^{(\theta)} b^{mn}_{ij} \rangle, \quad \delta\langle z\theta^*_{mn} \rangle = \langle z\alpha_{ij}^{(\theta)} b^{*mn}_{ij} \rangle^{[4.23]} \\
\delta\langle d^k_{mn} \rangle &= \langle d^{(r)}_{ijk} b^{mn}_{ij} \rangle, \quad \delta\langle zd^k_{mn} \rangle = \langle d^{(r)}_{ijk} b^{*mn}_{ij} \rangle, \\
\delta\langle d^{*k}_{mn} \rangle &= \langle zd^{(r)}_{ijk} b^{mn}_{ij} \rangle, \quad \delta\langle zd^{*k}_{mn} \rangle = \langle zd^{(r)}_{ijk} b^{*mn}_{ij} \rangle^{[4.24]}
\end{align*}
\]

Before closing this section, it is worthwhile to note that there is a direct correspondence between the effective elastic coefficients and the extensional, \( A_{ij} \), bending, \( B_{ij} \), and coupling, \( D_{ij} \), used extensively in the classical composite laminate theory (see e.g. Gibson, [1994]; Reddy, [1997]).

These can be expressed in the following manner:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\delta(b_{11}^{11}) & \delta(b_{11}^{12}) & \delta(b_{11}^{12}) & \delta^2(zb_{11}^{11}) & \delta^2(zb_{11}^{22}) & \delta^2(zb_{11}^{12}) \\
\delta(b_{11}^{22}) & \delta(b_{22}^{12}) & \delta(b_{22}^{12}) & \delta^2(zb_{11}^{22}) & \delta^2(zb_{22}^{22}) & \delta^2(zb_{22}^{12}) \\
\delta(b_{12}^{12}) & \delta(b_{12}^{22}) & \delta(b_{12}^{22}) & \delta^2(zb_{12}^{22}) & \delta^2(zb_{22}^{22}) & \delta^2(zb_{22}^{12}) \\
\delta^2(b_{11}^{*11}) & \delta^2(b_{11}^{*22}) & \delta^2(b_{11}^{*22}) & \delta^3(zb_{11}^{*11}) & \delta^3(zb_{11}^{*22}) & \delta^3(zb_{11}^{*12}) \\
\delta^2(b_{12}^{*22}) & \delta^2(b_{22}^{*22}) & \delta^2(b_{22}^{*22}) & \delta^3(zb_{22}^{*22}) & \delta^3(zb_{22}^{*22}) & \delta^3(zb_{22}^{*12}) \\
\delta^2(b_{12}^{*12}) & \delta^2(b_{22}^{*12}) & \delta^2(b_{22}^{*12}) & \delta^3(zb_{12}^{*12}) & \delta^3(zb_{22}^{*12}) & \delta^3(zb_{22}^{*12})
\end{bmatrix}^{[4.25]}
\]

Similar relationships exist for the effective piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients.
4.4. Network Reinforced Smart Composite Plates

Consider a thin smart composite plate reinforced with N families of mutually parallel reinforcements or bars which may also exhibit piezoelectric behavior, see Figure 4-3. The members of each family are made of homogeneous orthotropic material and are oriented at an angle $\phi$ with the $y_1$ direction. Furthermore, they are assumed to be much stiffer than the surrounding matrix and as such we may neglect the contribution of the matrix in the ensuing analysis. The nature of the smart structure of Figure 4-3 is such, that it would be more efficient if we first considered a simpler type of unit cell with only a single embedded reinforcement/actuator. Having solved this, the effective elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients of more general structures with more inclusions can readily be determined by superposition. This is the subject of discussion of the next section.

Figure 4-3: Smart composite layer with three families of piezoelectric reinforcements

Before proceeding, we note that the matrices (tensors) of the elastic, piezoelectric, and thermal expansion coefficients of an orthotropic material with respect to a coordinate system which is rotated by an angle $\phi$ (in the $y_1$-$y_2$ plane) with respect to the principal
material coordinate system coincide with those of a monoclinic material and have the following form (Reddy, 1997):

\[
[C] = \begin{bmatrix}
  c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13} & 0 & 0 & c_{16} \\
  c_{12} & c_{22} & c_{23} & 0 & 0 & c_{26} \\
  c_{13} & c_{23} & c_{33} & 0 & 0 & c_{36} \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & c_{44} & c_{45} & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & c_{45} & c_{55} & 0 \\
  c_{16} & c_{26} & c_{36} & 0 & 0 & c_{66}
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

\[ [P] = \begin{bmatrix}
  0 & 0 & P_{31} \\
  0 & 0 & P_{31} \\
  0 & 0 & P_{33} \\
  P_{14} & P_{24} & 0 \\
  P_{15} & P_{25} & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & P_{36}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[ [K] = \begin{bmatrix}
  K_{11} & K_{12} & 0 \\
  K_{12} & K_{22} & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & K_{33}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

In the following sections the effective elastic, piezoelectric, and thermal expansion coefficients for a network reinforced smart composite plate are derived and specific examples are considered.
4.4.1. Effective Elastic Coefficients

4.4.1.1. Evaluation of $b_{ij}^k$ coefficients for basic unit cell structure

We will begin our analysis with the determination of the effective elastic coefficients of a unit cell with a single inclusion. Consider the unit cell of Figure 4-5 shown both before and after the introduction of the microscopic variables $y_1$, $y_2$, and $z$ defined by Equation [4.5]. After this coordinate transformation, the unit cell changes shape and the angle between the reinforcement and the $y_1$ axis changes from $\phi$ to $\phi'$ according to:

$$\phi' = \arctan \left( \frac{h_1}{h_2 \tan \phi} \right)$$  \[4.27\]

To see how Equation [4.27] is obtained we refer to Figure 4-4, which shows the unit cell in question in both the macroscopic and microscopic variables.

![Figure 4-4: Unit cell in both macroscopic and microscopic variables](image-url)
From Figure 4-4:

\[
\tan \varphi = \frac{x_2}{x_1} \quad [4.28]
\]

\[
\tan \varphi' = \frac{y_2}{y_1}
\]

Equation [4.28] gives, in view of Equation [4.5], the following expression:

\[
\tan \varphi' = \frac{h_1}{h_2} \tan \varphi \quad [4.29]
\]

Figure 4-5: Unit cell in the macroscopic and microscopic variables
To determine the effective elastic coefficients, we first solve for the local functions \( b_{ij}^{\mu} \) from Equation [4.18a]. Keeping Equation [4.26a] in mind, the \( b_{ij}^{\mu} \) functions for an off-axis orthotropic reinforcement are obtained as:

\[
\begin{align*}
    b_{11}^{\mu} &= \frac{1}{h_1} C_{11} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{12} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} + C_{13} \frac{\partial U_3^{\mu}}{\partial z} + C_{16} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} \right] + C_{11\mu} \\
    b_{22}^{\mu} &= \frac{1}{h_1} C_{12} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{22} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} + C_{23} \frac{\partial U_3^{\mu}}{\partial z} + C_{26} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} \right] + C_{22\mu} \\
    b_{33}^{\mu} &= \frac{1}{h_1} C_{13} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{23} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} + C_{33} \frac{\partial U_3^{\mu}}{\partial z} + C_{36} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} \right] + C_{33\mu} \\
    b_{12}^{\mu} &= \frac{1}{h_1} C_{16} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{26} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} + C_{36} \frac{\partial U_3^{\mu}}{\partial z} + C_{66} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} \right] + C_{12\mu} \\
    b_{13}^{\mu} &= C_{55} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial z} \right] + C_{45} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} + \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial z} \right] + C_{13\mu} \\
    b_{23}^{\mu} &= C_{45} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{\partial U_1^{\mu}}{\partial z} \right] + C_{44} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial y_2} + \frac{\partial U_2^{\mu}}{\partial z} \right] + C_{23\mu}
\end{align*}
\]

[4.30]

To reduce the order of the differential equations of the associated problems, we will now perform a coordinate transformation of the microscopic coordinates \( \{ y_1, y_2, z \} \) onto \( \{ \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \} \) as defined by Figure 4-6, so that the \( \eta_1 \) coordinate axis coincides with the longitudinal axis of the reinforcement/actuator and the \( \eta_2 \) coordinate axis is perpendicular to it (in the plane).

From Figure 4-6, the relationship between the two sets of coordinates is given by:

\[
\eta_1 = y_1 \cos \varphi + y_2 \sin \varphi
\]

[4.31a]
\[ \eta_2 = -y_1 \sin \phi' + y_2 \cos \phi' \]  

**Figure 4-6:** Coordinate transformation in the microscopic coordinates

With this choice of local coordinates, it is evident that the problem at hand is now independent of the \( \eta_1 \) coordinate and will only depend on \( \eta_2 \) and \( z \). Consequently, the order of the differential equations is reduced by one, and the analysis of the problem is simplified. Thus, the \( b_{ij}^{\lambda} \) functions from Equation [4.30] can be written as:

\[
\begin{align*}
  b_{11}^{\lambda} &= -\frac{1}{h_1} C_{11} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_1^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{12} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_2^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{13} \frac{\partial U_3^{\lambda}}{\partial z} + \\
  &+ C_{16} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_1^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_2^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_1} \right] + C_{11 \lambda i}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
  b_{22}^{\lambda} &= -\frac{1}{h_1} C_{12} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_1^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{22} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_2^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_1} + C_{23} \frac{\partial U_3^{\lambda}}{\partial z} + \\
  &+ C_{26} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_1^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_2^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_2} \right] + C_{22 \lambda i}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
  b_{33}^{\lambda} &= -\frac{1}{h_1} C_{13} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_1^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{33} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_2^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_1} + C_{33} \frac{\partial U_3^{\lambda}}{\partial z} + \\
  &+ C_{36} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_1^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_2^{\lambda}}{\partial \eta_2} \right] + C_{33 \lambda i}
\end{align*}
\]

[4.32a]
\[ b_{12}^{\mu} = -\frac{1}{h_1} C_{16} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_{1}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{26} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_{2}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{36} \frac{\partial U_{3}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial z} + \\
C_{66} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_{1}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_{2}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} \right] + C_{13\lambda \mu} \]  
\[ b_{13}^{\lambda \mu} = C_{55} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_{3}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_{1}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} \right] + C_{45} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_{3}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial U_{2}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial z} \right] + C_{13\lambda \mu} \]  
\[ b_{23}^{\lambda \mu} = C_{45} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial U_{3}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_{1}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} \right] + C_{44} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial U_{3}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial U_{2}^{\lambda \mu}}{\partial z} \right] + C_{23\lambda \mu} \]  

We subsequently turn our attention to the unit cell problem and associated boundary condition. Rewriting in terms of the coordinates \( \eta_2 \) and \( z \) we obtain

\[ -\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} b_{12}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} b_{12}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} b_{13}^{\lambda \mu} = 0 \]  
\[ \left[ n_2' \left( -\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} b_{12}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} b_{23}^{\lambda \mu} \right) + n_3' b_{13}^{\lambda \mu} \right]_{\partial} = 0 \]  

where \( n_2' \) and \( n_3' \) are the components of the unit vector normal to the lateral surface of the reinforcement with respect to the \( \{ \eta_1, \eta_2, z \} \) coordinate system, and the suffix "\( \partial \)" stands for the matrix/reinforcement interphase.

We will solve the system defined by Equation [4.33] and associated boundary condition [4.34] by assuming that the local functions \( U_{1}^{\lambda \mu} \) and \( U_{2}^{\lambda \mu} \) are linear in \( \eta_2 \) and are independent of \( z \), whereas \( U_{3}^{\lambda \mu} \) is linear in \( z \) and independent of \( \eta_2 \). That is,
\[ U_1^\mu = A^\mu \eta_2 \]
\[ U_2^\mu = B^\mu \eta_2 \]
\[ U_3^\mu = C^\mu z \]

[4.35]

where \( A^\mu, B^\mu, C^\mu \) are yet to be determined constants. It is easily seen that Equation [4.35] will automatically satisfy the unit-cell problem [4.33] in view of the relationships [4.32a] and [43.2b]. The boundary condition [4.34] will be satisfied if:

\[- \frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} b_{1i}^\mu + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} b_{12}^\mu = 0 \quad \text{and} \]
\[ b_{13}^\mu = 0 \]

[4.36]

Expanding the above equation for \( i = 1 \) to 3 gives:

\[- \frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} b_{1i}^\mu + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} b_{12}^\mu = 0 \]

\[- \frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} b_{2i}^\mu + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} b_{22}^\mu = 0 \]

[4.37]

\[ b_{13}^\mu = b_{23}^\mu = b_{33}^\mu = 0 \]

Substituting Equation [4.35] into the first, second and fourth \((b_{11}^\mu, b_{22}^\mu, b_{12}^\mu)\) expressions of Equation [4.32a] and [43.2b] and then the resulting expressions into Equation [4.37] yields the following solution for the constants \( A^\mu, B^\mu, C^\mu \) (the procedure is straightforward but algebraically tedious)
\[ A^{\lambda\mu} = \frac{(C_{12\lambda}) - b_{12}^{\lambda\mu} h_4 + (C_{11\lambda}) - b_{11}^{\lambda\mu} h_5 + (C_{22\lambda}) - b_{22}^{\lambda\mu} h_6}{a_3} \]

\[ B^{\lambda\mu} = A^{\lambda\mu} \left[ \left( \frac{C_{66}c}{h_2} - \frac{C_{16}s}{h_1} \right) - \frac{C_{36}a_1}{h_1} \right] \]

\[ - \left( \frac{C_{12\lambda}}{a_2} \right) \left[ \left( C_{12\lambda} - b_{12}^{\lambda\mu} \left( \frac{C_{12}c}{h_2} - \frac{C_{16}s}{h_1} \right) + (C_{11\lambda}) - b_{11}^{\lambda\mu} \left( \frac{C_{66}c}{h_1} - \frac{C_{26}c}{h_2} \right) \right) \right] \]

\[ C^{\lambda\mu} = \frac{-A^{\lambda\mu}(a_1)}{a_2} \left[ \left( C_{12\lambda} - b_{12}^{\lambda\mu} \left( \frac{C_{12}c}{h_2} - \frac{C_{16}s}{h_1} \right) + (C_{11\lambda}) - b_{11}^{\lambda\mu} \left( \frac{C_{66}c}{h_1} - \frac{C_{26}c}{h_2} \right) \right) \right] a_2^{-1} \]

Here, we let "c" and "s" stand for \cos \phi' and \sin \phi' respectively while the quantities \alpha_1, \alpha_2, ..., \alpha_9 are given in Appendix A. The local \( b_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} \) functions are then determined from Equations [4.32], [4.35], [4.37] and [4.38] and are:

\[ b_{11}^{\lambda\mu} = \frac{C_{12\lambda} \left[ a_4 a_7 + a_8 a_3 \right] + C_{11\lambda} \left[ a_5 a_7 - a_9 a_3 \right] + C_{22\lambda} \left[ a_6 a_7 \right] + C_{33\lambda} a_3}{\frac{h_2 s}{h_1} a_4 + \frac{h_2^2 s^2}{h_1^2 c^2} a_5 + \frac{h_2 s}{h_1} a_3 - a_9 a_3} \]

\[ b_{22}^{\lambda\mu} = \frac{C_{12\lambda} \left[ a_4 a_7 + a_8 a_3 \right] + C_{11\lambda} \left[ a_5 a_7 - a_9 a_3 \right] + C_{22\lambda} \left[ a_6 a_7 \right] + C_{33\lambda} a_3}{\frac{h_1 c}{h_2} a_4 + \frac{h_1^2 c^2}{h_2^2 s^2} a_5 \frac{h_1 c}{h_2} a_3 - a_9 a_3} \]

\[ b_{12}^{\lambda\mu} = \frac{C_{12\lambda} \left[ a_4 a_7 + a_8 a_3 \right] + C_{11\lambda} \left[ a_5 a_7 - a_9 a_3 \right] + C_{22\lambda} \left[ a_6 a_7 \right] + C_{33\lambda} a_3}{\frac{h_1 c}{h_2} a_4 + \frac{h_1^2 c^2}{h_2^2 s^2} a_5 + \frac{h_1 c}{h_2} a_3 - a_9 a_3} \]

\[ b_{13}^{\lambda\mu} = b_{23}^{\lambda\mu} = b_{33}^{\lambda\mu} = 0 \]

We will now focus on the \( b_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} \) coefficients.
4.4.1.2. Evaluation of $b_{ij}^{*\mu}$ coefficients for basic unit cell structure

From the Equation [4.18b] and the coordinate transformation [4.31a] and [4.31b], the $b_{ij}^{*\mu}$ coefficients can be expressed as follows:

$$b_{11}^{*\mu} = -\frac{1}{h_1} C_{11} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_1^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{12} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{13} \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial z} +$$

$$C_{16} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} \right] + zC_{11\lambda\mu}$$

$$b_{22}^{*\mu} = \frac{1}{h_1} C_{12} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_1^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{22} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{23} \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial z} +$$

$$C_{26} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} \right] + zC_{22\lambda\mu}$$

$$b_{33}^{*\mu} = -\frac{1}{h_1} C_{13} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_1^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{23} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{33} \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial z} +$$

$$C_{36} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} \right] + zC_{33\lambda\mu}$$

$$b_{12}^{*\mu} = -\frac{1}{h_1} C_{16} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_1^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} C_{26} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{36} \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial z} +$$

$$C_{66} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} \right] + zC_{12\lambda\mu}$$

$$b_{13}^{*\mu} = C_{55} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial V_1^{*\mu}}{\partial z} \right] + C_{45} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial z} \right] + zC_{13\lambda\mu}$$

$$b_{23}^{*\mu} = C_{45} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial V_1^{*\mu}}{\partial z} \right] + C_{44} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial V_3^{*\mu}}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial V_2^{*\mu}}{\partial z} \right] + zC_{23\lambda\mu}$$

As well, rewriting the unit cell problem and the pertinent boundary condition (Equation [4.15b]) in terms of coordinates $\eta_2$ and $z$ gives:
\[
- \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} b_{\eta_2}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} b_{\eta_2}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} b_{\eta_2}^{\lambda \mu} = 0
\]

\[
\left[ n_2 \left( - \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} b_{\eta_2}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} b_{\eta_2}^{\lambda \mu} \right) + n_3 b_{\eta_2}^{\lambda \mu} \right] = 0
\]

[4.41]

The presence of the \( z \) coordinate in the last term of each expression in Equation [4.40] means that the pertinent solution will depend on the shape of the cross-section of the reinforcing bar. This of course is expected because the \( b_{\eta_2}^{\lambda \mu} \) coefficients are associated with out-of-plane deformations. As such, let us assume that the bars have a circular cross-section. We also note from Equation [4.5] that the coordinate transformation from \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) to \( y_1 \) and \( y_2 \) will transform the circular cross-section into an ellipse (except in the special case when \( h_1 = h_2 \) when the cross-section remains circular, albeit with a different radius). The value of the eccentricity, \( e' \), of the ellipse is readily determined from Equation [4.42] below and is (derivation of eccentricity, \( e' \) is given in Appendix B):

\[
e' = \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\sin^2 \varphi' h_2^2 + \cos^2 \varphi' h_1^2}{h_1^2 h_2^2} \right) \right]^{1/2} = \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{h_1^2 \sin^2 \varphi + h_2^2 \cos^2 \varphi} \right]^{1/2}
\]

[4.42]

Furthermore, the components \( n_2' \) and \( n_3' \) (clearly \( n_1' = 0 \)) of the unit vector normal to the bars surface are (Refer to Appendix C):

\[
n_2' = \eta_2 \left[ 1 - (e')^2 \right]^{1/2}
\]

and \( n_3' = z \)

[4.43]

The presence of the \( z \) coordinate in Equation [4.40] introduces another complication to the solution of this problem. We recall that in the case of the \( b_{\eta_2}^{\lambda \mu} \) coefficients, the local
$U_{i}^{j,k}$ functions depended linearly on the $\eta_2$ and $z$ coordinates. In the case of the $b_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ coefficients however, a linear dependency of $V_{i}^{j,k}$ on $\eta_2$ and $z$ will not satisfy the boundary conditions, but instead, the functions $V_{i}^{j,k}$ must have the following functional form:

$$V_{i}^{j,k} = W_{i1}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 z + W_{i2}^{\alpha\mu} \frac{\eta_2^2}{2} + W_{i3}^{\alpha\mu} \frac{z^2}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} [4.44]$$

Here, $W_{ij}^{\alpha\mu}$ are constant coefficients which must be determined. To this end and keeping Equations [4.42] and [4.43] in mind, we first substitute Equation [4.44] into Equation [4.40] to give:

\[
\begin{align*}
    b_{11}^{\alpha\mu} & = -\frac{C_{11}}{h_1} \sin \phi' \left[W_{11}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{12}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + \frac{C_{12}}{h_2} \cos \phi \left[W_{21}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{22}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + C_{13} \left[W_{31}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 + W_{33}^{\alpha\mu} z \right] \\
    & + \frac{C_{16}}{h_1} \left[-\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} \left[W_{21}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{22}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} \left[W_{11}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{12}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] \right] + zC_{11\lambda 1} \\
    b_{22}^{\alpha\mu} & = -\frac{C_{12}}{h_1} \sin \phi' \left[W_{11}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{12}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + \frac{C_{22}}{h_2} \cos \phi \left[W_{21}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{22}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + C_{23} \left[W_{31}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 + W_{33}^{\alpha\mu} z \right] \\
    & + \frac{C_{26}}{h_1} \left[-\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} \left[W_{21}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{22}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} \left[W_{11}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{12}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] \right] + zC_{22\lambda 2} \\
    b_{33}^{\alpha\mu} & = -\frac{C_{13}}{h_1} \sin \phi' \left[W_{11}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{12}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + \frac{C_{23}}{h_2} \cos \phi \left[W_{21}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{22}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + C_{33} \left[W_{31}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 + W_{33}^{\alpha\mu} z \right] \\
    & + \frac{C_{36}}{h_1} \left[-\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} \left[W_{21}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{22}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} \left[W_{11}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{12}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] \right] + zC_{33\lambda 3} \\
    b_{12}^{\alpha\mu} & = -\frac{C_{16}}{h_1} \sin \phi' \left[W_{11}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{12}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + \frac{C_{26}}{h_2} \cos \phi \left[W_{21}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{22}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + C_{36} \left[W_{31}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 + W_{33}^{\alpha\mu} z \right] \\
    & + \frac{C_{66}}{h_1} \left[-\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} \left[W_{21}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{22}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} \left[W_{11}^{\alpha\mu} z + W_{12}^{\alpha\mu} \eta_2 \right] \right] + zC_{12\lambda 2} \\
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} & = C_{55} \left[ -\frac{\text{W}_{31}^{\mu} z + W_{32}^{\mu} \eta_2}{h_2} + \left[ W_{11}^{\lambda} \eta_2 + W_{12}^{\lambda} z \right] \right] + \\
\frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} & = C_{45} \left[ -\frac{W_{31}^{\lambda} z + W_{32}^{\lambda} \eta_2}{h_2} + \left[ W_{11}^{\lambda} \eta_2 + W_{13}^{\lambda} z \right] \right] + \\
\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} & = C_{45} \left[ -\frac{W_{31}^{\lambda} z + W_{32}^{\lambda} \eta_2}{h_2} + \left[ W_{11}^{\lambda} \eta_2 + W_{12}^{\lambda} z \right] \right] + \\
\frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} & = C_{44} \left[ -\frac{W_{31}^{\mu} z + W_{32}^{\mu} \eta_2}{h_2} + \left[ W_{21}^{\mu} \eta_2 + W_{23}^{\mu} z \right] \right] \\
\end{align*}
\]

[4.45b]

We subsequently substitute these expressions into Equation [4.41] and after comparing terms with different power combinations of \( \eta_2 \) and \( z \), we arrive at:

\[
W_{12}^{\mu} = W_{22}^{\mu} = W_{13}^{\mu} = W_{23}^{\mu} = W_{31}^{\mu} = 0 \\
\]

[4.46]

The remaining four coefficients satisfy the following relationships:

\[
\begin{align*}
- \frac{sC_{13}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda} + & \frac{cC_{23}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\mu} + C_{33} W_{33}^{\lambda} - \frac{sC_{36}}{h_1} W_{21}^{\lambda} + \frac{cC_{36}}{h_2} W_{11}^{\mu} + C_{333} = 0 \\
W_{11}^{\mu} & = \left[ \frac{s^2 C_{11} - sC_{16} h_2}{h_1 h_2} + \frac{c^2 C_{16}}{h_1 h_2} - \frac{sc C_{16}}{h_1 h_2} \right] W_{21}^{\lambda} - W_{21}^{\mu} \left[ \frac{s^2 C_{16} h_2}{h_1 h_2} + \frac{c^2 C_{26} h_1}{h_1 h_2} - \frac{sc C_{12}}{h_1 h_2} \right] \\
W_{33}^{\mu} & = \left[ \frac{cC_{36} h_1}{h_2} - \frac{sC_{13} h_2}{h_1} \right] + \frac{cC_{13} h_2}{h_1} - \frac{sC_{13} h_2}{h_1} + \\
\left[ 1 - (e) \right]^{2} & = \left[ \frac{cC_{45} h_1}{h_2} + C_{45} W_{31}^{\mu} h_1 - \frac{sC_{55} h_1}{h_2} W_{32}^{\mu} + C_{55} W_{31}^{\mu} \right] = 0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

[4.47a]
\[
W_{11}^{\lambda \mu} \left[ \frac{s^2C_{16}}{h_1^2} - \frac{scC_{66}}{h_1 h_2} + \frac{scC_{12}}{h_1^2} + \frac{c^2C_{26}}{h_2^2} \right] - W_{21}^{\lambda \mu} \left[ \frac{s^2C_{66}}{h_1^2} - 2 \frac{scC_{26}}{h_1 h_2} + \frac{c^2C_{22}}{h_2^2} \right] + \\
W_{33}^{\lambda \mu} \left[ \frac{scC_{23}}{h_2} - \frac{scC_{36}}{h_1} \right] + \frac{scC_{223 \mu}}{h_2} - \frac{scC_{12 \mu}}{h_1} + \\
\left[ 1 - (e')^2 - \frac{scC_{45}}{h_1} \right] W_{32}^{\lambda \mu} + C_{45} W_{11}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{scC_{44}}{h_2} W_{32}^{\lambda \mu} + C_{44} W_{21}^{\lambda \mu} = 0 \tag{4.47b}
\]

\[
- \frac{scC_{45}}{h_1 h_2} W_{32}^{\lambda \mu} - \frac{scC_{45}}{h_1} W_{21}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{s^2C_{55}}{h_1^2} W_{32}^{\lambda \mu} - \frac{scC_{55}}{h_1 h_2} W_{11}^{\lambda \mu} - \frac{scC_{45}}{h_1 h_2} W_{32}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{scC_{45}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda \mu} + \\
\frac{c^2C_{44}}{h_2^2} W_{32}^{\lambda \mu} + \frac{scC_{44}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda \mu} = 0
\]

where we recall the shorthand notations of "s" and "c" for \(\sin \varphi'\) and \(\cos \varphi'\) respectively. In view of Equation [4.46] the functions \(V_{i}^{jk}\) in Equation [4.44] thus reduce to:

\[
V_{1}^{\lambda \mu} = W_{11}^{\lambda \mu} \eta_2 Z \\
V_{2}^{\lambda \mu} = W_{21}^{\lambda \mu} \eta_2 Z \tag{4.48} \\
V_{3}^{\lambda \mu} = W_{32}^{\lambda \mu} \eta_2^2 + W_{33}^{\lambda \mu} \frac{Z^2}{2}
\]

The solution of the four algebraic equations in [4.47] will give the four unknown \(W_{11}^{\lambda \mu}, W_{21}^{\lambda \mu}, W_{32}^{\lambda \mu}, W_{33}^{\lambda \mu}\) functions and then from Equations [4.40] and [4.40] the desired \(b^{ki}_{ij}\) coefficients will be calculated. To derive the expressions for these coefficients in a convenient form, we proceed in the following manner. We first substitute the expressions from Equation [4.46] into Equation [4.45] to obtain:
\[
\begin{align*}
\beta_{11}^{*\lambda\mu} & = z \left[ -\frac{sC_{11}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{12}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{13} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{16}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{16}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{11\lambda\mu} \right] \\
\beta_{22}^{*\lambda\mu} & = z \left[ -\frac{sC_{12}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{22}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{23} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{26}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{26}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{22\lambda\mu} \right] \\
\beta_{33}^{*\lambda\mu} & = z \left[ -\frac{sC_{13}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{32}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{33} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{36}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{36}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{33\lambda\mu} \right] \\
\beta_{12}^{*\lambda\mu} & = z \left[ -\frac{sC_{16}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{26}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{36} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{66}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{66}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{12\lambda\mu} \right] \\
\beta_{13}^{*\lambda\mu} & = \eta_2 \left[ \frac{C_{45}}{h_2} W_{32}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{45} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{55}}{h_1} W_{32}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{55} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} \right] \\
\beta_{23}^{*\lambda\mu} & = \eta_2 \left[ -\frac{sC_{45}}{h_1} W_{32}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{45} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{44}}{h_2} W_{32}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{44} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} \right]
\end{align*}
\]

The above equations can be rewritten as

\[
\begin{align*}
\beta_{11}^{*\lambda\mu} & = zB_{11}^{\lambda\mu} ; \\
\beta_{22}^{*\lambda\mu} & = zB_{22}^{\lambda\mu} ; \\
\beta_{33}^{*\lambda\mu} & = zB_{33}^{\lambda\mu} ; \\
\beta_{12}^{*\lambda\mu} & = zB_{12}^{\lambda\mu} \\
\beta_{13}^{*\lambda\mu} & = \eta_2 B_{13}^{\lambda\mu} ; \\
\beta_{23}^{*\lambda\mu} & = \eta_2 B_{23}^{\lambda\mu}
\end{align*}
\]

where the following definitions are introduced:

\[
\begin{align*}
B_{11}^{\lambda\mu} & = -\frac{sC_{11}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{12}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{13} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{16}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{16}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{11\lambda\mu} \\
B_{22}^{\lambda\mu} & = -\frac{sC_{12}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{22}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{23} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{26}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{26}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{22\lambda\mu} \\
B_{33}^{\lambda\mu} & = -\frac{sC_{13}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{33}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{33} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{36}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{36}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{33\lambda\mu} \\
B_{12}^{\lambda\mu} & = -\frac{sC_{16}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{26}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{36} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{66}}{h_1} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{66}}{h_2} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{12\lambda\mu} \\
B_{13}^{\lambda\mu} & = \eta_2 \frac{C_{45}}{h_2} W_{32}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{45} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{sC_{55}}{h_1} W_{32}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{55} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} \\
B_{23}^{\lambda\mu} & = \eta_2 \frac{-sC_{45}}{h_1} W_{32}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{45} W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} + \frac{C_{44}}{h_2} W_{32}^{\lambda\mu} + C_{44} W_{21}^{\lambda\mu}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
B^{\lambda \mu}_{12} = -\frac{s C_{16}}{h_1} W^{\lambda \mu}_{11} + \frac{c C_{26}}{h_2} W^{\lambda \mu}_{21} + C_{36} W^{\lambda \mu}_{33} - \frac{s C_{66}}{h_1} W^{\lambda \mu}_{11} + \frac{c C_{65}}{h_2} W^{\lambda \mu}_{11} + C_{12 \lambda \mu}
\]

\[
B^{\lambda \mu}_{13} = \frac{c C_{45}}{h_2} W^{\lambda \mu}_{32} + C_{45} W^{\lambda \mu}_{21} - \frac{s C_{55}}{h_1} W^{\lambda \mu}_{32} + C_{55} W^{\lambda \mu}_{11}
\]

\[
B^{\lambda \mu}_{23} = -\frac{s C_{45}}{h_1} W^{\lambda \mu}_{32} + C_{45} W^{\lambda \mu}_{11} + \frac{c C_{44}}{h_2} W^{\lambda \mu}_{32} + C_{44} W^{\lambda \mu}_{21}
\]

Substitution of \(n_2'\) and \(n_3'\) from Equation [4.43] into [4.41] and equating equal powers of \(n_2\) and \(z\) results in the following expressions:

\[
-\frac{s}{h_1} B^{\lambda \mu}_{11} + \frac{c}{h_2} B^{\lambda \mu}_{12} + \left[1 - (e')^2\right] B^{\lambda \mu}_{13} = 0
\]

\[
-\frac{s}{h_1} B^{\lambda \mu}_{12} + \frac{c}{h_2} B^{\lambda \mu}_{22} + \left[1 - (e')^2\right] B^{\lambda \mu}_{23} = 0
\]

\[
-\frac{s}{h_1} B^{\lambda \mu}_{13} + \frac{c}{h_2} B^{\lambda \mu}_{23} = 0
\]

\[
B^{\lambda \mu}_{33} = 0
\]

From Equations [4.25] and [4.50] it can be observed that we only require \(B^{\lambda \mu}_{11}, B^{\lambda \mu}_{22}, B^{\lambda \mu}_{12}\) in order to calculate the effective elastic coefficients of the smart composite layer. Proceeding in a straightforward (although algebraically tedious) manner, we isolate a system of three equations involving only \(B^{\lambda \mu}_{11}, B^{\lambda \mu}_{22}, B^{\lambda \mu}_{12}\) from Equations [4.51] and [4.52]. In this process the four unknown \(W^{\lambda \mu}_{11}, W^{\lambda \mu}_{21}, W^{\lambda \mu}_{32}, W^{\lambda \mu}_{33}\) functions are given as,
\[ W_{21}^{\lambda\mu} = \frac{\Delta_3 h_1 h_2 (cC_{66} h_1 - sC_{16} h_2)}{(sC_{66} h_2 - cC_{26} h_1)\Delta_1 - (cC_{66} h_1 - sC_{16} h_2)\Delta_2} - \left( B_{12}^{\lambda\mu} - \frac{C_{36} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - C_{12\mu}}{cC_{66} h_1 - sc_{16} h_2} \right) h_1 h_2 \Delta_1 \]

\[ W_{11}^{\lambda\mu} = \frac{(B_{12}^{\mu} - C_{36} W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} - C_{12\mu}) h_1 h_2}{(cC_{66} h_1 - sc_{16} h_2)} \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta_1 (sC_{66} h_2 - cC_{26} h_1)}{\Delta_4} \right] + \frac{\Delta_3 h_1 h_2 (sC_{66} h_2 - sC_{26} h_1)}{\Delta_4} \]

\[ W_{33}^{\lambda\mu} = \frac{B_{11}^{\lambda\mu} - C_{114\mu}}{C_{13}} \frac{B_{12}^{\lambda\mu} - C_{12\mu}}{C_{13}} \frac{[\Delta_3]}{1 - \frac{C_{36}}{C_{13}} \Delta_5} - \frac{\Delta_3}{C_{13} \Delta_4} \left[ (sC_{66} h_2 - cC_{26} h_1)(cC_{16} h_1 - sc_{11} h_2) + (cC_{66} h_1 - sC_{16} h_2)(cC_{12} h_1 - sc_{16} h_2) \right] \]

where \( \Delta_1 - \Delta_5 \) are given in Appendix D.

Finally, the solution of this system is given as:

\[ B_{11}^{\mu} = \frac{\Lambda_5 \Lambda_6 - \Lambda_2 \Lambda_3}{\Lambda_1 \Lambda_2 - \Lambda_4 \Lambda_5} \]

\[ B_{22}^{\mu} = \frac{\Lambda_3 \Lambda_4 - \Lambda_1 \Lambda_6}{\Lambda_1 \Lambda_2 - \Lambda_4 \Lambda_5} \]

\[ B_{12}^{\mu} = \frac{sh_2}{2h_1 c} B_{11}^{\mu} + \frac{ch_1}{2sh_2} B_{22}^{\mu} \]

The quantities \( \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_6 \) in Equation [4.54] depend on the geometric parameters of the unit cell and the material properties of the orthotropic reinforcement. The explicit
expressions for \( \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ldots, \Lambda_6 \) are provided in Appendix D. It is worth reiterating that in Equations [4.30]-[4.54], as well as in the expressions in the appendices, the elastic coefficients \( C_{ijkl} \) are referenced to the \( \{x_i\} \) or \( \{y_i\} \) coordinate system, see Figure 4-5. The relation between these coefficients and the coefficients referred to the principal material coordinate system of the reinforcing bar is expressed by means of the familiar tensor transformation equation for a 4\textsuperscript{th}-order tensor,

\[
C_{ijkl} = a_{in}a_{jn}a_{kp}a_{lq}C_{mnop}^{(p)}
\]  

[4.55]

where \( C_{ijkl}^{(p)} \) represent the elastic coefficients of the reinforcements with respect to their principal material coordinate system and the \( a_{ij} \) coefficients are the elements of the transformation tensor \( T \) shown in Equation [4.56].

\[
[T] = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \phi & \sin \phi & 0 \\
-\sin \phi & \cos \phi & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

[4.56]

### 4.4.1.3. Calculation of effective elastic coefficients

The effective moduli for the reinforced composite plate of Figure 4-5 can be calculated by means of Equations [4.39], [4.50], [4.54] and the homogenization Equation [4.14]. Let \( \delta^3 V \) be the volume of the reinforcing bar in the unit cell of Figure 4-5. Then, the effective coefficients are (complete derivation is given in Appendix E):

\[
\langle b_{ij}^{\nu} \rangle = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} b_{ij}^{\nu} dv = \frac{V}{h_1 h_2} b_{ij}^{\nu}
\]  

[4.57a]
\[ \langle zb^\mu \rangle = \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_{\partial Q} zb^\mu \, dv = 0 \]

\[ \langle b^\mu \rangle = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} [4.57b]

\[ \langle zb^\mu \rangle = \frac{V}{16h_1h_2} B^\mu \]

The corresponding results for composites reinforced by more than one family of bars can be obtained from Equation [4.57] by superposition. In doing so, we accept the error incurred due to stress concentrations and other complications at the regions of overlap of the reinforcements. However, this error is small and will not contribute significantly to the integral over the volume of the unit cell. Various examples of network reinforced composite plates will be considered at the end of this chapter.

4.4.1.4. Convergence of model for the particular case of isotropic reinforcements

In the case of isotropic reinforcements, the results converge to those of Kalamkarov [1992] who used the asymptotic homogenization technique and Pshenichnov [1982] who used a different approach based on stress-strain relationships in the reinforcements. The non-vanishing results are:

\[ \langle b_{11}^i \rangle = \frac{V}{h_1h_2} E \cos^4 \phi; \quad \langle b_{22}^{12} \rangle = \frac{V}{h_1h_2} E \sin \phi; \quad \langle b_{11}^{12} \rangle = \frac{V}{h_1h_2} E \cos^3 \phi \sin \phi; \]

\[ \langle b_{22}^{12} \rangle = \frac{V}{h_1h_2} E \cos \phi \sin^3 \phi; \quad \langle b_{11}^{22} \rangle = \langle b_{12}^{12} \rangle = \frac{V}{h_1h_2} E \cos^2 \phi \sin^2 \phi; \]  \hspace{1cm} [4.58a]
\[ \langle zb_{11}^{*1} \rangle = \frac{V}{16h_1h_2} \frac{E}{1 + \nu} \cos^2 \varphi \left[ \sin^2 \varphi + \cos^2 \varphi (1 + \nu) \right] \]
\[ \langle zb_{11}^{*2} \rangle = \frac{V}{16h_1h_2} \frac{E}{1 + \nu} \cos^2 \varphi \sin^2 \varphi \]
\[ \langle zb_{12}^{*2} \rangle = \frac{V}{16h_1h_2} \frac{E}{1 + \nu} \cos \varphi \sin \varphi \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \sin^2 \varphi - \cos^2 \varphi \right) + \cos^2 \varphi (1 + \nu) \right] \]
\[ \langle zb_{12}^{*2} \rangle = \frac{V}{16h_1h_2} \frac{E}{2(1 + \nu)} \cos \varphi \sin \varphi \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \cos^2 \varphi - \sin^2 \varphi \right) + 2 \cos^2 \varphi \sin^2 \varphi (1 + \nu) \right] \]
\[ \langle zb_{22}^{*2} \rangle = \frac{V}{16h_1h_2} \frac{E}{1 + \nu} \cos \varphi \sin \varphi \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \cos^2 \varphi - \sin^2 \varphi \right) + \sin^2 \varphi (1 + \nu) \right] \]
\[ \langle zb_{22}^{*2} \rangle = \frac{V}{16h_1h_2} \frac{E}{1 + \nu} \sin^2 \varphi \left[ \cos^2 \varphi + \sin^2 \varphi (1 + \nu) \right] \]

In Equation [4.58], E and \( \nu \) are the Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio respectively of the reinforcement.

4.4.2. Effective Piezoelectric Coefficients

4.4.2.1. Solution of piezoelectric (\( d_{ij}^{\phi} \)) coefficients for simple unit cell structures

We will continue our analysis with the determination of the effective piezoelectric coefficients of the unit cell shown in Figure 4-5. Here we assume that the reinforcements/actuators exhibit piezoelectric characteristics. We recall that this coordinate transformation distorts the shape of the unit cell (since \( h_1 \) is not necessarily equal to \( h_2 \) and both \( h_1 \) and \( h_2 \) are larger than unity) and changes the orientation of the orthotropic inclusion from \( \varphi \) to \( \varphi' \) according to Equation [4.27]. We also recall that we are dealing with an off-axis orthotropic reinforcement/actuator. Accordingly, the matrix of piezoelectric coefficients coincides with that of a monoclinic material (see [4.26b]).
Thus the $d^k_i$ coefficients from Equation [4.19a] becomes:

\[
\begin{align*}
d^k_{11} &= P^k_{11k} - \frac{1}{h_1} C_{11} \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial y_1} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{12} \frac{\partial U^k_2}{\partial y_2} - C_{13} \frac{\partial U^k_3}{\partial z} - C_{16} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U^k_2}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial y_2} \right] \\
d^k_{22} &= P^k_{22k} - \frac{1}{h_1} C_{12} \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial y_1} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{22} \frac{\partial U^k_2}{\partial y_2} - C_{23} \frac{\partial U^k_3}{\partial z} - C_{26} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U^k_2}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial y_2} \right] \\
d^k_{33} &= P^k_{33k} - \frac{1}{h_1} C_{13} \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial y_1} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{23} \frac{\partial U^k_2}{\partial y_2} - C_{33} \frac{\partial U^k_3}{\partial z} - C_{36} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U^k_2}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial y_2} \right] \\
d^k_{12} &= P^k_{12k} - \frac{1}{h_1} C_{16} \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial y_1} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{26} \frac{\partial U^k_2}{\partial y_2} - C_{36} \frac{\partial U^k_3}{\partial z} - C_{66} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U^k_2}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial y_2} \right] \\
d^k_{13} &= P^k_{13k} - C_{55} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U^k_3}{\partial y_1} + \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial z} \right] - C_{45} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U^k_3}{\partial y_2} + \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial z} \right] \\
d^k_{23} &= P^k_{23k} - C_{45} \left[ \frac{1}{h_1} \frac{\partial U^k_3}{\partial y_1} + \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial z} \right] - C_{44} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \frac{\partial U^k_3}{\partial y_2} + \frac{\partial U^k_1}{\partial z} \right]
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly to the elastic coefficients, we perform the further coordinate transformation of the microscopic coordinates \{y_1, y_2, z\} onto \{\eta_1, \eta_2, z\} as shown in Figure 4-6, so that the \eta_1 coordinate axis coincides with the direction of the piezoelectric reinforcement. The relationship between the two sets of coordinates is expressed in Equation [4.31].

The pertinent unit cell problem from Equation [4.16a] becomes:

\[
\begin{align*}
- \frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} d^k_{11} + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} d^k_{12} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} d^k_{13} &= 0 \\
\left[ n_2 \left( - \frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} d^k_{11} + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} d^k_{12} \right) + n_3' d^k_{13} \right]_3 &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

As well, the $d^k_i$ coefficients from Equation [4.59] become:
\[ d_{11}^k = P_{11k} + \frac{1}{h_1} C_{16} \sin \phi \frac{\partial U_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{12} \cos \phi \frac{\partial U_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} - C_{13} \frac{\partial U_3^k}{\partial z} - C_{17} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi \frac{\partial U_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi \frac{\partial U_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} \right] \]

\[ d_{22}^k = P_{22k} + \frac{1}{h_1} C_{26} \sin \phi \frac{\partial U_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{22} \cos \phi \frac{\partial U_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} - C_{23} \frac{\partial U_3^k}{\partial z} - C_{27} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi \frac{\partial U_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi \frac{\partial U_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} \right] \]

\[ d_{33}^k = P_{33k} + \frac{1}{h_1} C_{36} \sin \phi \frac{\partial U_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{32} \cos \phi \frac{\partial U_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} - C_{33} \frac{\partial U_3^k}{\partial z} - C_{37} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi \frac{\partial U_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi \frac{\partial U_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} \right] \]

\[ d_{ij}^k = P_{ij,k} - C_{ij} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi \frac{\partial U_3^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi \frac{\partial U_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} \right] - C_{45} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi \frac{\partial U_3^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial U_2^k}{\partial z} \right] \]

We will solve Equation [4.61] and associated boundary condition [4.60] by assuming that the local functions \( U_1^k \) and \( U_2^k \) are linear in \( \eta_2 \) and independent of \( z \) while \( U_3^k \) is linear in \( z \) and independent of \( \eta_2 \). Thus:

\[ U_1^k = A \eta_2; \quad U_2^k = B \eta_2; \quad U_3^k = C z; \]

\[ [4.62] \]
where $A^k$, $B^k$, $C^k$ are the algebraic constants to be calculated in the sequel. Substituting Equation [4.62] into [4.61] and the resulting expressions in second of Equation [4.60] results in three algebraic equations for these constants:

\[
d_{11}^{k} = P_{11k} + A^k \left( \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} C_{11} - \frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} C_{16} \right) + B^k \left( -\frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} C_{12} + \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} C_{16} \right) - C_{13} C^k
\]

\[
d_{22}^{k} = P_{22k} + A^k \left( \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} C_{12} - \frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} C_{26} \right) + B^k \left( -\frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} C_{22} + \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} C_{26} \right) - C_{23} C^k
\]  \hspace{1cm} [4.63]

\[
d_{12}^{k} = P_{12k} + A^k \left( \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} C_{16} - \frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} C_{66} \right) + B^k \left( -\frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} C_{26} + \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} C_{66} \right) - C_{36} C^k
\]

Solving for these constants and back substituting into [4.61] results in the following expressions for the piezoelectric $d_{11}^{k}$ coefficients:

\[
d_{11}^{k} = \frac{P_{12k} \left[ a_4 a_7 + a_8 a_3 \right] + P_{11k} \left[ a_5 a_7 - a_9 a_3 \right] + P_{22k} \left[ a_6 a_7 \right] + P_{33k} a_3}{\alpha_7 \left[ \frac{h_2 s}{h_1 c} a_4 + \frac{h_2 s^2}{h_1 c^2} a_6 \right] + \frac{h_2 s}{h_1 c} a_8 a_3 - a_9 a_3}
\]

\[
d_{22}^{k} = \frac{P_{12k} \left[ a_4 a_7 + a_8 a_3 \right] + P_{11k} \left[ a_5 a_7 - a_9 a_3 \right] + P_{22k} \left[ a_6 a_7 \right] + P_{33k} a_3}{\alpha_7 \left[ \frac{h_1 c}{h_2 s} a_4 + \frac{h_1 c^2}{h_2 s^2} a_5 + a_6 \right] + \frac{h_1 c}{h_2 s} a_8 a_3 - \frac{h_1 c^2}{h_2 s^2} a_9 a_3}
\]  \hspace{1cm} [4.64]

\[
d_{12}^{k} = \frac{P_{12k} \left[ a_4 a_7 + a_8 a_3 \right] + P_{11k} \left[ a_5 a_7 - a_9 a_3 \right] + P_{22k} \left[ a_6 a_7 \right] + P_{33k} a_3}{\alpha_7 \left[ a_4 + \frac{h_1 c}{h_2 s} a_5 + \frac{h_2 s}{h_1 c} a_6 \right] + \frac{h_1 c}{h_2 s} a_8 a_3 - \frac{h_1 c}{h_2 s} a_9 a_3}
\]

\[
d_{13}^{k} = d_{23}^{k} = d_{33}^{k} = 0
\]

where constants $\alpha_1$ - $\alpha_9$ can be found in Appendix A.
4.4.2.2. Solution of $d_{ij}^{*k}$ coefficients for simple unit cell structure

On account of Equation [4.31], unit cell problem Equation [4.16b] becomes,

$$
-\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} d_{i1}^{*k} + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} d_{i2}^{*k} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} d_{i3}^{*k} = 0
$$

[4.65]

$$
\left[ n_2 \left( -\frac{\sin \phi'}{h_1} d_{i1}^{*k} + \frac{\cos \phi'}{h_2} d_{i2}^{*k} \right) + n_3 d_{i3}^{*k} \right] = 0
$$

where,

$$
d_{i1}^{*k} = zP_{11k} + \frac{1}{h_1} C_{11} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial V_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{12} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial V_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} - C_{13} \frac{\partial V_3^k}{\partial z}
$$

$$
C_{16} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial V_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial V_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} \right]
$$

$$
d_{i2}^{*k} = zP_{22k} + \frac{1}{h_1} C_{12} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial V_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{22} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial V_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} - C_{23} \frac{\partial V_3^k}{\partial z}
$$

$$
C_{26} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial V_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial V_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} \right]
$$

$$
d_{i3}^{*k} = zP_{33k} + \frac{1}{h_1} C_{13} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial V_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{23} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial V_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} - C_{33} \frac{\partial V_3^k}{\partial z}
$$

$$
C_{36} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial V_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial V_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} \right]
$$

$$
d_{i2}^{*k} = zP_{12k} + \frac{1}{h_1} C_{16} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial V_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} - \frac{1}{h_2} C_{26} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial V_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} - C_{36} \frac{\partial V_3^k}{\partial z}
$$

$$
C_{66} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi' \frac{\partial V_2^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi' \frac{\partial V_1^k}{\partial \eta_2} \right]
$$

[4.66a]
\[
d_{13}^* = z P_{13k} - C_{55} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi \frac{\partial \nu_{13}^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial \nu_{13}^k}{\partial z} \right] - C_{45} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi \nu_{13}^k \frac{\partial \nu_{13}^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial \nu_{13}^k}{\partial z} \right]
\]
\[
d_{23}^* = z P_{23k} - C_{45} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \phi \frac{\partial \nu_{23}^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial \nu_{23}^k}{\partial z} \right] - C_{44} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \phi \nu_{23}^k \frac{\partial \nu_{23}^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial \nu_{23}^k}{\partial z} \right]
\]
[4.66b]

As with the elastic coefficients, the presence of the \( z \) coordinate in Equation [4.66a] and [4.66b] means that unlike the case of the \( d_{ij}^k \) coefficients, the determination of their \( d_{ij}^* \) counterparts will depend on the nature of the cross-section of the piezoelectric reinforcement. Let us now assume that the cross-section of the inclusions is circular. Assume, next that

\[
v_{i}^k = W_{i1}^k \eta_2 z + W_{i2}^k \eta_2^2 + W_{i3}^k z^2
\]
[4.67]

where constants \( W_{ij} \) must be determined. To this end, we substitute [4.67] into [4.65] and compare terms with like powers of \( \eta_2 \) and \( z \) to arrive at:

\[
W_{12}^k = W_{22}^k = W_{13}^k = W_{23}^k = W_{31}^k = 0
\]
[4.68]

The remaining four coefficients satisfy:

\[
W_{11}^k \left[ \frac{s^2 c_{11}^k}{h_1^2} + \frac{c_{16}^k}{h_1 h_2} + \frac{c_{16}^k}{h_1 h_2} - \frac{c_{66}^k}{h_2^2} \right] - W_{21}^k \left[ \frac{s^2 c_{16}^k}{h_1^2} - \frac{c_{26}^k}{h_2^2} + \frac{c_{12}^k}{h_1 h_2} + \frac{c_{66}^k}{h_2^2} \right] -
\]
\[
W_{33}^k \left[ \frac{c_{36}^k}{h_2} - \frac{c_{13}^k}{h_1} \right] + \frac{c_{12}^k}{h_1 h_2} - \frac{c_{36}^k}{h_1 h_2} -
\]
\[
\left[ 1 - (c)^2 \right] \left[ \frac{c_{45}^k}{h_2} + c_{45}^k W_{21}^k - \frac{sc_{55}^k}{h_1} W_{32}^k + c_{55}^k W_{11}^k \right] = 0
\]
[4.69a]
\[ W_{11}^k \left[ -\frac{s^2 c_{16}}{h_1^2} + \frac{csc_{66} h_1 + csc_{12} h_2}{h_1 h_2} - \frac{c^2 c_{26}}{h_2^2} \right] - W_{21}^k \left[ \frac{s^2 c_{66}}{h_1^2} - 2 \frac{csc_{26}}{h_1 h_2} + \frac{c^2 c_{22}}{h_2^2} \right] - \]
\[ W_{33}^k \left[ \frac{c_{23} h_2}{h_1} - \frac{c_{36}}{h_1} \right] + \frac{cP_{22k}}{h_1} - \frac{sP_{12k}}{h_1} \]
\[ \left[ 1 - (E')^2 \right] \frac{sc_{45}}{h_1} W_{32}^k + c_{45} W_{11}^k + \frac{c_{44}}{h_2} W_{32}^k + c_{44} W_{21}^k = 0 \]  

\[ \frac{csc_{45}}{h_1 h_2} W_{32}^k + \frac{cs_{45}}{h_1} W_{21}^k - \frac{s^2 c_{45}}{h_1^2} W_{32}^k + \frac{cs_{55}}{h_1} W_{11}^k + \frac{csc_{45}}{h_1 h_2} W_{32}^k - \frac{cc_{45}}{h_2} W_{11}^k - \]
\[ \frac{c^2 c_{44}}{h_2} W_{32}^k - \frac{cc_{44}}{h_2} W_{21}^k = 0 \]
\[ \frac{sc_{13}}{h_1} W_{11}^k - \frac{cc_{23}}{h_2} W_{21}^k - C_{33} W_{33}^k + \frac{sc_{36}}{h_1} W_{21}^k - \frac{cc_{36}}{h_2} W_{11}^k + P_{33k} = 0 \]

Equation [4.69a] and [4.69b] contains four linear algebraic equations in the remaining four unknowns \( W_{11}^k, \ W_{21}^k, \ W_{32}^k, \) and \( W_{33}^k \). Solving for these unknowns and substituting back in Equation [4.67] and then in the expressions in Equation [4.66] gives the following results for the piezoelectric \( d_{ij}^k \) coefficients,

\[ d_{11}^k = zD_{11}^k; \ d_{22}^k = zD_{22}^k; \ d_{33}^k = zD_{33}^k; \ d_{12}^k = zD_{12}^k \]
\[ d_{13}^k = zP_{13k} - \eta_2 D_{13}^k; \ d_{23}^k = zP_{23k} - \eta_2 D_{23}^k \]  

where,

\[ D_{11}^k = \frac{\Lambda_5 \Lambda_6 - \Lambda_2 \Lambda_3}{\Lambda_1 \Lambda_2 - \Lambda_4 \Lambda_5} \]
\[ D_{22}^k = \frac{\Lambda_3 \Lambda_4 - \Lambda_1 \Lambda_6}{\Lambda_1 \Lambda_2 - \Lambda_4 \Lambda_5} \]
\[ D_{12}^k = \frac{2h_2}{2h_1} D_{11}^k + \frac{c_{12}}{2sh_2} D_{22}^k \]  

\[ \text{[4.71]} \]
Explicit expressions for the quantities $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ldots, \Lambda_6$ which depend on the geometric parameters of the unit cell and the elastic and piezoelectric properties of the inclusions can be found from Appendix D by making the following substitution

$$C_{ijkl} \rightarrow P_{ijk} \quad [4.72]$$

We emphasize here, that the elastic and piezoelectric coefficients in [4.30]-[4.72] as well as in the expressions in Appendices A and D, are a consequence of the basic formulation in [4.2], i.e. are referenced with respect to the $\{x_i\}$ coordinate system, see Figure 4-5. As such, they are, in general, not the principal material coefficients (except in the special case when the actuator/reinforcement is oriented along the $x_1$ or $x_2$ directions). The relationship between the two sets of the elastic coefficients is expressed in Equation [4.55] and of the piezoelectric coefficients is expressed in terms of the tensor transformation equation for 3rd order cartesian tensors, i.e.,

$$P_{ijk} = a_{in} a_{jm} a_{kp} P^{(p)}_{nmp} \quad [4.73]$$

where the superscript $(p)$ denotes the principal material coefficients, and $a_{ij}$ are the elements of the transformation matrix $[T]$ (see also Figure 4-5) as given in Equation [4.56].

4.4.2.3. **Effective Piezoelectric Coefficients**

The effective piezoelectric coefficients for the smart composite structure of Figure 4-5 can be calculated from [4.64], [4.71] and the homogenization procedure [4.14]. Similar to elastic coefficients, letting the volume of the orthotropic inclusion in Figure 4-5 be $\delta^3V$, the expressions for the effective piezoelectric coefficients are given by:
\[ \langle d_{ij}^k \rangle = \frac{1}{|Y|} \int_{Y} d_{ij}^k dv = \frac{V}{h_1 h_2} d_{ij}^k \]

\[ \langle zd_{ij}^k \rangle = \frac{V}{16 h_1 h_2} D_{ij}^k \]

\[ \langle zd_{ij}^k \rangle = \langle a_{ij}^k \rangle = 0 \]

These results clearly pertain to thin smart composite plates with a single family of actuators/reinforcements. For structures with more than one family, the results can easily be deduced from Equation [4.74] by means of superposition.

4.4.3. Effective Thermal Expansion Coefficients

4.4.3.1. Solution of \( \Theta_{ij} \) coefficients for simple unit cell structure

We will now calculate the effective thermal expansion coefficients for the basic unit cell of Figure 4-5. On account of the coordinate transformation [4.31], the unit cell problem in Equation [4.17a] becomes:

\[ - \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} \Theta_{i1} + \frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} \Theta_{i2} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Theta_{i3} = 0 \]

\[ n_2 \left( - \frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} \Theta_{i1} + \frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} \Theta_{i2} \right) + n_3 ' \Theta_{i3} \right]_3 = 0 \]

As well, the \( \Theta_{ij} \) coefficients from Equation [4.20a] are given by:
\[ \Theta_{ii} = K_{ii} + \frac{1}{h_1} c_{i1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial \eta_1} - \frac{1}{h_2} c_{i2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial \eta_2} - c_{i3} \frac{\partial U_3}{\partial z} + c_{i6} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial \eta_2} \right], \text{ no summation on } i \]

\[ \Theta_{12} = K_{12} + \frac{1}{h_1} c_{i1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial \eta_1} - \frac{1}{h_2} c_{i2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial \eta_2} - c_{i6} \frac{\partial U_3}{\partial z} + c_{i6} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial \eta_2} \right] \quad [4.76] \]

\[ \Theta_{a3} = K_{13} - c_{13a3} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi \frac{\partial U_3}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial z} \right] - c_{23a3} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi \frac{\partial U_3}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial z} \right] \]

Assume next that functions \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) depend only on \( \eta_2 \) and \( U_3 \) depends only on \( z \), i.e.

\[ U_1 = \lambda_1 \eta_2; \quad U_2 = \lambda_2 \eta_2; \quad U_3 = \lambda_3 z; \quad [4.77] \]

Substitution of [4.77] into [4.76] and the resulting expressions into second expression of Equation [4.75] will yield the results for the constants \( \lambda_i \). Back substituting the latter into [4.76] results in the following expressions for the \( \Theta_{ij} \) coefficients:

\[ \Theta_{11} = K_{12} \left[ a_4 a_7 + a_6 a_3 \right] + K_{11} \left[ a_5 a_7 - a_6 a_3 \right] + K_{22} \left[ a_6 a_7 \right] + K_{33} a_3 \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\frac{a_7}{h_1 c} \left[ \frac{h_2 s}{a_4} + \frac{h_2 s^2}{a_5 + a_6} \right] + \frac{h_2 s}{h_1 c} \left[ a_8 a_3 \right] - a_9 a_3
\end{align*} \]

\[ \Theta_{22} = \frac{K_{12} \left[ a_4 a_7 + a_6 a_3 \right] + K_{11} \left[ a_5 a_7 - a_6 a_3 \right] + K_{22} \left[ a_6 a_7 \right] + K_{33} a_3}{\frac{a_7}{h_2 s} \left[ \frac{h_1 c}{a_4 + \frac{h_1^2 c^2}{a_5 + a_6}} \right] + \frac{h_2 s}{h_1 c} \left[ a_8 a_3 \right] - \frac{h_1^2 c^2}{h_2 s} a_9 a_3} \quad [4.78] \]

\[ \Theta_{12} = \frac{K_{12} \left[ a_4 a_7 + a_6 a_3 \right] + K_{11} \left[ a_5 a_7 - a_6 a_3 \right] + K_{22} \left[ a_6 a_7 \right] + K_{33} a_3}{a_7 \left[ a_4 + \frac{h_1 c}{h_2 s} a_5 + \frac{h_2 s}{h_1 c} a_6 \right] + a_8 a_3 - \frac{h_1 c}{h_2 s} a_9 a_3} \]

\[ \Theta_{13} = \Theta_{23} = \Theta_{33} = 0 \]

The explicit expressions for constants \( \alpha_1-\alpha_9 \) are given in Appendix A.
4.4.3.2. Solution of $\Theta^*_i$ coefficients for simple unit cell structure

On account of [4.32], unit cell problem [4.17b] becomes,

$$
\begin{align*}
-\frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} \Theta^*_{i1} + \frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} \Theta^*_{i2} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Theta^*_{i3} &= 0 \\
\left[ n_2 \left( -\frac{\sin \varphi'}{h_1} \Theta^*_{i1} + \frac{\cos \varphi'}{h_2} \Theta^*_{i2} \right) + n_3 \Theta^*_{i3} \right]_{z_3} &= 0
\end{align*}
$$

[4.79]

As well, the $\Theta^*_i$ coefficients from Equation [4.20b] and [4.31] become:

$$
\Theta^*_{i1} = zK_{i1} + \frac{1}{h_1} c_{i1} \sin \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_1}{\partial \eta_2} - \frac{1}{h_2} c_{i2} \cos \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_2}{\partial \eta_2} - c_{i3} \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_3}{\partial z} + \text{c}_{i6} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_2}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_1}{\partial \eta_2} \right]
$$

[no summation on $i$]

$$
\Theta^*_{i2} = zK_{i2} + \frac{1}{h_1} c_{16} \sin \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_1}{\partial \eta_2} - \frac{1}{h_2} c_{26} \cos \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_2}{\partial \eta_2} - c_{36} \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_3}{\partial z} + \text{c}_{66} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_2}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_1}{\partial \eta_2} \right]
$$

[4.80]

$$
\Theta^*_{i3} = zK_{i3} - c_{13a} \left[ -\frac{1}{h_1} \sin \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_3}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_1}{\partial z} \right] - c_{23a} \left[ \frac{1}{h_2} \cos \varphi' \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_3}{\partial \eta_2} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{V}_2}{\partial z} \right]
$$

As in Section 4.4.2.2, we will assume a parabolic variation of the pertinent $\mathcal{V}_i$ functions in the variables $\eta_2$ and $z$, i.e.

$$
\mathcal{V}_i = W_{i1} \eta_2 z + W_{i2} \frac{\eta_2^2}{2} + W_{i3} \frac{z^2}{2}
$$

[4.81]
We subsequently substitute [4.81] into [4.79] and compare terms with like powers of \( \eta_2 \) and \( z \) to arrive at a set of linear algebraic equations in the constants \( W_{ij} \). Solving for the latter gives, on account of [4.80], the following expressions for the thermal expansion \( \Theta^*_{ij} \) coefficients,

\[
\Theta^*_{11} = zT_{11} ; \quad \Theta^*_{22} = zT_{22} ; \quad \Theta^*_{33} = zT_{33} \\
\Theta^*_{12} = zT_{12} \\
\Theta^*_{13} = zK_{13} - \eta_2 T_{13} ; \quad \Theta^*_{23} = zK_{23} - \eta_2 T_{23}
\]

where,

\[
T_{11} = \frac{\Lambda_5 \Lambda_6 - \Lambda_2 \Lambda_3}{\Lambda_1 \Lambda_2 - \Lambda_4 \Lambda_5} \\
T_{22} = \frac{\Lambda_3 \Lambda_4 - \Lambda_1 \Lambda_6}{\Lambda_1 \Lambda_2 - \Lambda_4 \Lambda_5} \\
T_{12} = \frac{\text{sh}_2}{2h_1 c} T_{11} + \frac{\text{ch}_1}{2\text{sh}_2} T_{22}
\]

Explicit expressions for the quantities \( \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ldots, \Lambda_6 \) which depend on the geometric parameters of the unit cell and the elastic and thermal expansion coefficients of the reinforcements be found directly from Appendix D by making the following substitutions:

\[
C_{ijkl} \rightarrow K_{ij}
\]

We note again that the thermal expansion coefficients given in this chapter are referenced with respect to the \( \{x_i\} \) coordinate system shown in Figure 4-5, and will therefore differ
from the principal material coefficients. The relationship between the two sets of coefficients is expressed by the following tensor transformation law,

\[ K_{ij} = a_{im} a_{jn} K_{mn}^{(p)} \]  \[4.85\]

### 4.4.3.3. Effective thermal expansion coefficients

Similarly to Section 4.4.2.3, the effective thermal expansion coefficients for the basic smart structure of Figure 4-5 are given by:

\[
\langle \Theta_{ij} \rangle = \frac{1}{V} \int \Theta_{ij} \, dv = \frac{V}{h_1 h_2} \Theta_{ij}
\]

\[
\langle z\Theta_{ij}^* \rangle = \frac{V}{16 h_1 h_2} T_{ij}
\]  \[4.86\]

\[
\langle z\Theta_{ij} \rangle = \langle \Theta_{ij}^* \rangle = 0
\]

The effective thermal expansion coefficients of smart structures with more than one family of reinforcements can be readily obtained from Equation [4.86] using superposition.

### 4.5. Examples and Discussion – Thin networks with orthotropic reinforcements

For illustration purposes we will consider several examples of network reinforced composite plates. Without loss of generality we will assume that all reinforcements have the same (circular) cross-section area and are made of the same material. If desired however, the model allows for each reinforcement family to have unique geometrical and
material properties. For the ensuing examples, we will assume that the reinforcements have properties given in Table 4-1 (Gibson, [1994]).

**Table 4-1: Reinforcement Properties (Gibson, [1994])**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_1$</td>
<td>152 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_2=E_3$</td>
<td>4.1 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{12}=G_{13}$</td>
<td>2.9 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{23}$</td>
<td>1.5 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{12}=v_{13}=v_{23}$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1. Example 1. Rectangular arrangement

![Network-reinforced smart composite structure](image)

**Figure 4-7**: Thin smart composite plate with rectangular arrangement of actuators/reinforcements (S1)
The first example to be considered consists of two mutually perpendicular families of orthotropic reinforcements ($\phi = 0^\circ$ and $\phi = 90^\circ$) forming a rectangular arrangement as shown in Figure 4-7. The figure also shows the unit cell of the structure. For convenience, this composite plate will be referred to in the sequel as S1. The effective elastic, piezoelectric, thermal expansion coefficients of S1 are readily determined from Equations [4.39], [4.54], [4.57], [4.64], [4.71], [4.74], [4.78], [4.83], and [4.86]. Although the resulting expressions are too lengthy to be reproduced here, some of the effective coefficients will be presented graphically in the next section.

4.5.2. Example 2. Triangular arrangement

The second example (structure S2) represents a composite plate reinforced with three families of orthotropic bars ($\phi = 30^\circ$, $\phi = 90^\circ$, $\phi = 150^\circ$) which intersect to form equilateral triangles as shown in Figure 4-8. The effective coefficients are calculated as for the previous example and some representative results will be shown in the following Sections.

![Network-reinforced smart composite structure](image)

**Figure 4-8:** Thin smart composite plate with triangular arrangement of actuators/reinforcements (S2)
4.5.2. Example 3. Rhombic arrangement

Figure 4-9: Thin smart composite plate with rhombic arrangement of actuator/reinforcements (S3)

The final example (structure S3) pertains to the reinforced plate of Figure 4-9 which consists of two families of reinforcements ($\varphi = 30^\circ$, $\varphi = 150^\circ$). Some of the effective coefficients will be shown in the following sections where a comparison will be made of all three structures, S1, S2, and S3.

4.5.4. Plots of effective elastic properties

The mathematical model and methodology presented in Section 4.4 can be used in analysis and design to tailor the effective elastic coefficients of any structure to meet the criteria of a particular application, by selecting the type, number, orientation and size of the reinforcements. In this section typical effective elastic properties of structures S1, S2, and S3 will be computed and plotted. The effective coefficients will be plotted vs. the ratio ($R$) of the volume of one bar within the unit cell to the volume of the unit cell itself. This ratio equals:
\[ R = \frac{\delta^3 V}{\delta^3 h_1 h_2} = \frac{V}{h_1 h_2} \]  

\[ [4.87] \]

Figure 4-10: Plot of \( \left< b_{11}' \right> \) elastic coefficient vs. \( V/h_1 h_2 \) for structures S1, S2 and S3

Figure 4-10 shows the variation of \( \left< b_{11}' \right> \) with R for S1, S2, and S3. It can be observed that the stiffness in the \( y_1 \) direction is the same for S2 and S3 because of the same number, size and arrangement of reinforcements in that direction. The presence of the extra reinforcements in S2 does not affect the stiffness in the \( y_1 \) direction because these reinforcements are oriented entirely in the \( y_2 \) direction as shown in Figure 4-8. Both S2 and S3 are stiffer than S1 in the \( y_1 \) direction because the former have more reinforcements (even though they are oriented at an angle to \( y_1 \)) that affect the stiffness in that direction than the latter which only has a single reinforcement which affects the stiffness in the \( y_1 \) direction.
Figure 4-11, which is a plot of $\langle b_{22}^{32} \rangle$, shows that S2 is significantly stiffer than S3 in the $y_2$ direction due to the presence of the extra two reinforcements in the former. For similar reasons, the $\langle b_{22}^{32} \rangle$ value for S1 is larger than that of S3 and smaller than that of S2.

$$\langle b_{22}^{32} \rangle \text{ MPa}$$

$R = V/h_1h_2$

**Figure 4-11:** Plot of $\langle b_{22}^{32} \rangle$ elastic coefficient vs. $V/h_1h_2$ for structures S1, S2 and S3

Finally, Figure 4-12 shows the variation of the $\langle zb_{11}^{11} \rangle$ coefficient with $R$. We note from Equation [4.13] that this coefficient characterizes the bending stiffness of the composite plate in the $y_1-z$ plane. Since the reinforcing bars which are oriented entirely in the $y_2$ direction do not affect the bending stiffness in the $y_1-z$ plane, then the value of $\langle zb_{11}^{11} \rangle$ for structures S2 and S3 is the same. As expected, both structures have a higher bending stiffness than S1. Similar considerations apply to the other effective coefficients. It is evident however, that all of these trends and characteristics can easily be modified by changing the size, type, angular orientation, etc. of the reinforcements so that the desirable elastic coefficients are obtained.
4.5.5. Plots of effective piezoelectric coefficients and discussion

We reiterate that the model derived in this paper can be used to tailor the effective coefficients of a network-reinforced smart composite plate (to meet the particular requirements of a given application) by changing some material or geometric parameters of interest such as type or angular orientation of the actuators/reinforcements. For illustration purposes, let us assume that the pertinent material properties are those given in Table 4-2 [Cote et al. 2002]. As well, the effective coefficients will be plotted vs. the ratio (R) of the volume of a single bar within the unit cell to the volume of the unit cell itself as given by Equation [4.87].

Figure 4-13 shows the variation of $\left\langle d^i_{11} \right\rangle$ with R for S1, S2, and S3. It can be observed that the value of this piezoelectric coefficient is the same for S2 and S3 because they both have the same number, size and arrangements of actuators/reinforcements in the $y_1$ direction. The presence of the extra elements in S2 does not affect the results because these elements are oriented entirely in the $y_2$ direction and do not affect the piezoelectric
Table 4-2: Thermopiezoelectric properties of PZT-5A [Cote et al. 2002]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_{11}^{(p)} = C_{22}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>119899.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{33}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>109892.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{12}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>74732.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{13}^{(p)} = C_{23}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>74429.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{44}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>21052.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{66}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>22573.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{13}^{(p)} = p_{23}^{(p)}$ (C/mm²)</td>
<td>-5.45E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{33}^{(p)}$ (C/mm²)</td>
<td>1.56E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{42}^{(p)} = p_{31}^{(p)}$ (C/mm²)</td>
<td>2.46E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{11}^{(p)} = \alpha_{22}^{(p)}$ ($^\circ$/C)</td>
<td>-1.704E-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{33}^{(p)}$ ($^\circ$/C)</td>
<td>3.732E-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph](image)

Figure 4-13: Plot of $\langle d_{11}^3 \rangle$ piezoelectric coefficient vs. $V/h_1 h_2$ for structures S1, S2 and S3
behavior in the $y_1$ direction. Both S2 and S3 have larger $\langle d_{11}^3 \rangle$ values than S1 because the former have more actuators (even though they are inclined at angle) that affect the behavior in the $y_1$ direction than S1 which only has a single actuator in that direction.

Figure 4-14 is a plot of $\langle d_{22}^3 \rangle$ vs. R for the three smart structures. It is seen that S2 exhibits the highest value because it has the largest number of actuators/reinforcements in the $y_2$ direction. For similar considerations, the $\langle d_{22}^3 \rangle$ piezoelectric coefficient is a higher for S1 than S2.

![Plot of $\langle d_{22}^3 \rangle$ vs. $R = V/h_1h_2$](image)

**Figure 4-14:** Plot of $\langle d_{22}^3 \rangle$ piezoelectric coefficient vs. $V/h_1h_2$ for structures S1, S2 and S3

Figure 4-15 shows the variation of $\langle zd_{11}^{i3} \rangle$ vs. R for the three structures. We recall that the $\langle zd_{ij}^{ik} \rangle$ coefficients are related to out-of-plane deformations. Since the actuators oriented in the $y_2$ direction do not contribute to the deformation in the $y_1$ direction, the value of $\langle zd_{11}^{i3} \rangle$ for S2 is the same as that of S3 (all other parameters being the same). As expected, both structures exhibit a higher value than S1.
**Figure 4-15:** Plot of $\langle zd_{11}^2 \rangle$ piezoelectric coefficient vs. $V/h_1 h_2$ for structures S1, S2 and S3

4.5.6. **Plot of effective thermal expansion coefficients**

Similar considerations apply to the case of thermal expansion coefficients. Figure 4-16 is a plot of $\langle \Theta_{11} \rangle$ vs. R and Figure 4-17 a plot of $\langle z\Theta_{22} \rangle$ vs. R. The reasons for the trends displayed in both figures should be apparent from the discussion above.

**Figure 4-16:** Plot of $\langle \Theta_{11} \rangle$ thermal coefficient vs. $V/h_1 h_2$ for structures S1, S2 and S3
Figure 4-17: Plot of \( \langle z\Theta^*_{22} \rangle \) thermal coefficient vs. \( V/h_1h_2 \) for structures S1, S2 and S3

4.6. Brief Synopsis

The method of asymptotic homogenization was used to obtain the effective coefficients of thin smart composite plates reinforced with a network of orthotropic cylindrical bars. The micromechanical models derived were illustrated by means of several examples which showed that the effective properties can easily be customized to satisfy any application requirements by changing certain geometric and/or material parameters. As such they are useful in design and analysis of smart composite structures.
5. MODELING OF THE THERMOPIEZOElastic behavior of prismatic smart composite structures made of orthotropic materials

5.1. Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to determine the effective elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients of prismatic smart composite structures with orthotropic characteristics. Examples of structures of interest are shown in Figure 5-1.

![Figure 5-1: Examples of prismatic smart composite structures](image)

Following this section, the basic problem formulation is given in Section 5.2.1 and the important features of the solution methodology are explained in Section 5.2.2. Section 5.2.3 develops the local or unit cell problems. Section 5.3 derives the general model of interest and then uses it to analyze and discuss various practical examples and compare the effective moduli and coefficients of the different smart structures. It is shown in this section that the model developed can be used to tailor the effective properties of any smart structure to meet the specific design criteria pertinent to a particular application.
5.2. Asymptotic Homogenization for Smart Structures

5.2.1. General Model

The general model pertaining to three-dimensional smart composite structure has been previously developed by the authors [Kalamkarov and Georgiades, 2002a]. Here, we summarize the important features of the model in so far as they represent the starting point for the current model. Consider a smart composite structure representing an inhomogeneous solid occupying domain \( G \) with boundary \( \partial G \) that contains a large number of periodically arranged actuators as shown in Figure 5-2.

\[ \begin{align*}
X_2 & \quad \text{Reinforcement with actuating elements} \\
X_1 & \quad \text{Unit Cell} \\
X_3 & \\
\varepsilon & \\
Y_2 & \\
Y_1 & \\
Y_3 & 
\end{align*} \]

**Figure 5-2:** Smart composite with periodically arranged actuators and its periodicity cell

The elastic deformation of this smart structure can be described by means of the following system:
\[
\frac{\partial \sigma^e_{ij}(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon})}{\partial x_j} = f_i \text{ in } G \\
u^e(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) = 0 \text{ on } \partial G
\]

\[
\sigma^e_0(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) = C_{ijkl} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) e^e_{kl} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) - P_{ijk} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) R_k(x) - K_{ij} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \Theta(x)
\]

\[
e^e_{ij} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \right]
\]

Although the variables appearing in Equations [5.1]-[5.3] have been defined before, they will also be given here for the sake of convenience. \(C_{ijkl}\) is the tensor of the elastic coefficients, \(e_{kl}\) is the strain tensor, \(P_{ijk}\) is a tensor of actuation coefficients describing the effect of a control signal \(R\) on the stress field \(\sigma\), and \(K_{ij}\) is the thermal expansion tensor. Finally, \(\Theta\) represents changes in temperature with respect to some initial state. It is assumed in Equation [5.2] that the \(C_{ijkl}\), \(P_{ijk}\), and \(K_{ij}\) coefficients are all periodic with a unit cell \(Y\) of characteristic dimension \(\varepsilon\), the characteristic distance between the reinforcements (or actuators) as shown in Figure 5-2. Consequently, the smart structure in Figure 5-2 is seen to be made up of a large number of “unit cells” periodically arranged within the domain \(G\).

Substituting Equation [5.3] in [5.2] and interchanging the dummy variables \(k\) and \(l\), and recalling the symmetry properties of the elastic coefficients gives:

\[
\sigma^e_{ij} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) = C_{ijkl} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \left(\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_l} \right) - P_{ijk} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) R_k(x) - K_{ij} \left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \Theta(x)
\]
Let us also mention here that, if the physical dimensions of the unit cell in Figure 5-1 are, say, \(2\varepsilon\) microns in the \(x_1\) direction, \(\varepsilon\) microns in the \(x_2\) direction, and \(3\varepsilon\) microns in the \(x_3\) direction then upon introduction of the fast variable \(y\), the dimensions of the unit cell become 2 in the \(y_1\) direction, 1 in the \(y_2\) direction, and 3 in the \(y_3\) direction. One may refer to the problem as being 2-periodic in \(y_1\), 1-periodic in \(y_2\) and 3-periodic in \(y_3\), or collectively \(Y_i\)-periodic in \(y_i\) where it is understood that \(Y_i\) may have unequal components.

### 5.2.2. Two-Scale Asymptotic Expansion

As with the previous model, the nature of the smart structure in Figure 5-2 means that any associated boundary-value problem will be characterized by two different scales, a macroscopic (or slow) scale, \(x_i\), which depends on the global formulation of the problem, and a microscopic (or fast) scale which depends entirely on the structure and geometry of the unit cell. Thus, periodic smart composites of this nature are amenable to treatment by asymptotic homogenization techniques. The first step is to define a new microscopic (fast) variable \(y_i\) according to:

\[
y_i = \frac{x_i}{\varepsilon}
\]

[5.5]

We subsequently expand the displacement and stress fields into infinite series of powers of the small parameter \(\varepsilon\) as shown below.

\[
u^\varepsilon(x,y) = u^{(0)}(x,y) + \varepsilon u^{(1)}(x,y) + \varepsilon^2 u^{(2)}(x,y) + \ldots
\]

[5.6]
\[ \sigma_0^e(x,y) = \sigma_0^{(0)}(x,y) + \varepsilon \sigma_0^{(1)}(x,y) + \varepsilon^2 \sigma_0^{(2)}(x,y) + \ldots \]  

[5.7]

Similar to previous chapter, the introduction of the fast variable \( y \) necessitates the transformation of the derivatives as follows:

\[ \frac{d}{dx_i} \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \]  

[5.8]

so that in view of Equation [5.5] we arrive at:

\[ \frac{d}{dx_i} \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \]  

[5.9]

Thus

\[ \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^e}{dx_j} \rightarrow \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^e}{\partial x_j} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^e}{\partial y_j} \]  

[5.10]

\[ \frac{\partial u_k^e}{dx_i} \rightarrow \frac{\partial u_k^e}{\partial x_i} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial u_k^e}{\partial y_i} \]

Accordingly, Equations [5.1] and [5.4] transform to:

\[ \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^e}{dx_j} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^e}{\partial y_j} = f_i \quad \text{in } G \]  

[5.11]

\[ u^e(x,y) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial G \]

and
\[ \sigma_{ij}^\varepsilon (x, y) = C_{ijkl} \left( \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_1} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial y_1} \right) - P_{ijk} R_k (x) - K_{ij} \Theta (x) \quad [5.12] \]

The substitution of Equation [5.12] into first expression of Equation [5.11] and a consideration of Equation [5.6] reveals that the first term in the asymptotic expansion for the displacement field is independent of \( y \).

With this results in mind, Equation [5.6] becomes:

\[ u^\varepsilon (x, y) = u^{(0)} (x) + \varepsilon u^{(1)} (x, y) + \varepsilon^2 u^{(2)} (x, y) + \ldots \quad [5.13] \]

Subsequently, substituting Equation [5.7] into Equation [5.11] and equating equal powers of \( \varepsilon \) results in a series of expressions, the first two of which are:

\[ \frac{\partial \sigma^{(0)}_{ij} (x, y)}{\partial y_j} = 0 \quad [5.14] \]

\[ \frac{\partial \sigma^{(1)}_{ij} (x, y)}{\partial y_j} + \frac{\partial \sigma^{(0)}_{ij} (x, y)}{\partial x_j} = f_i \]

where,

\[ \sigma^{(0)}_{ij} = C_{ijkl} \left( \frac{\partial u_k^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial u_k^{(1)}}{\partial y_1} \right) - P_{ijk} R_k - K_{ij} \Theta \quad [5.15] \]

\[ \sigma^{(1)}_{ij} = C_{ijkl} \left( \frac{\partial u_k^{(1)}}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial u_k^{(2)}}{\partial y_1} \right) \]
5.2.3. Governing equations, unit-cell problems and effective coefficients

Substitution of the first expression in Equation [5.15] into the first expression of Equation [5.14] gives:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left( C_{ijkl}(x, y) \frac{\partial u^{(1)}_k(x, y)}{\partial y_1} \right) = \frac{\partial p_{ik}}{\partial y_j} R_k(x) + \frac{\partial K_{ij}}{\partial y_j} \Theta(x) - \frac{\partial C_{ijkl}(y)}{\partial y_j} \frac{\partial u^{(0)}_k(x)}{\partial x_1}
\]  

[5.16]

The separation of variables in each term on the right-hand-side of [5.16] enables us to write down its solution in the following form,

\[
u_n^{(1)}(x, y) = R_k(x) N_n^k(y) + \Theta(x) N_n(y) + \frac{\partial u^{(0)}_k(x)}{\partial x_1} N_n^l(y)
\]  

[5.17]

where

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left( C_{ijkl}(y) \frac{\partial N_m^k(y)}{\partial y_1} \right) = \frac{\partial p_{ik}}{\partial y_j}
\]  

[5.18]

In Equation [5.17] we ignore the homogeneous part of the solution because it does not affect the ensuing analysis. It is observed that the differential equations in Equation [5.18] depend entirely on the fast variable \( y \) and are thus solved on the domain \( Y \) of the unit cell remembering at the same time that all of \( C_{ijkl}, P_{ik}, K_{ij}, N_m^k, N_m, N_m \), are periodic
in \( y_i \) (with some period \( Y_i \)). Thus, the differential equations in [5.18] are appropriately referred to as unit cell problems.

Having determined the first two terms in the asymptotic expression for displacement we will now turn our attention to determine the stress field. To this end, we substitute Equation [5.17] into Equation [5.15] and the resulting expression into Equation [5.14] to get:

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^{(1)}(x,y)}{\partial y_j} + C_{ijkl}(y) \frac{\partial^2 u_k^{(0)}(x)}{\partial x_j \partial x_l} + C_{ijmn}(y) \left[ \frac{\partial N_m^k(y) \partial R_k(x)}{\partial y_n \partial x_j} + \frac{\partial M_m^k(y) \partial \Theta(x)}{\partial y_n \partial x_j} \right] 
\]

\[-P_{jk} \frac{\partial R_k(x)}{\partial x_j} - K_{ij} \frac{\partial \Theta(x)}{\partial x_j} = f_i \]

Equation [5.19] will be used to obtain the governing equations of the problem by averaging over the domain of the unit cell. This is the homogenization procedure and it results in:

\[
\frac{1}{|Y|} \int_Y \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^{(1)}(x,y)}{\partial y_j} \, dv + \langle C_{ijkl} \rangle \frac{\partial^2 u_k^{(0)}(x)}{\partial x_j \partial x_l} - \langle P_{jk} \rangle \frac{\partial R_k(x)}{\partial x_j} - \langle K_{ij} \rangle \frac{\partial \Theta(x)}{\partial x_j} = f_i \]

[5.20]

where

\[
\langle C_{ijkl} \rangle = \frac{1}{|Y|} \int_Y \left( C_{ijkl}(y) + C_{ijmn}(y) \frac{\partial N_m^k(y)}{\partial y_n} \right) \, dv
\]

\[
\langle P_{jk} \rangle = \frac{1}{|Y|} \int_Y \left( P_{jk}(y) - C_{ijmn}(y) \frac{\partial N_m^k(y)}{\partial y_n} \right) \, dv
\]

[5.21]

\[
\langle K_{ij} \rangle = \frac{1}{|Y|} \int_Y \left( K_{ij}(y) - C_{ijmn}(y) \frac{\partial N_m^k(y)}{\partial y_n} \right) \, dv
\]
Here \( \langle C_{ijkl}, \langle P_{ijk}, \langle K_{ij} \rangle \) denote the averaged or homogenized coefficients. Let us now consider the first term in Equation [5.20]. By applying the divergence theorem, it can be written as:
\[
\int_Y \frac{\partial \sigma^{(1)}_{ij}(x, y)}{\partial y_j} \, dv = \int_Y \text{div} \sigma^{(1)} \, dv = \int_{\partial Y} \sigma^{(1)}(x, y) \mathbf{n} \, dA
\]  

[5.22]

where \( \mathbf{n} \) is the unit vector normal to the boundary surface \( \partial Y \) of the unit cell. Owing to the periodicity of \( \sigma^{(1)}(x, y) \), its value at the corresponding points on opposite side of the unit cell are the same but with opposite sign. Hence, the integral vanishes identically, and we are left with:
\[
\langle C_{ijkl} \rangle \frac{\partial^2 u^{(0)}_k(x)}{\partial x_j \partial x_l} - \langle P_{ijk} \rangle \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}_k(x)}{\partial x_j} - \langle K_{ij} \rangle \frac{\partial \mathbf{\Theta}(x)}{\partial x_j} = f_i
\]  

[5.23]

Similarly, substitution of Equation [5.17] into first expression of Equation [5.15] and then integrating the resulting expression over the domain of the unit cell yields:
\[
\langle \sigma^{(0)}_{ij} \rangle = \frac{1}{|Y|} \int_Y \sigma^{(0)}_{ij}(y) \, dv = \langle C \rangle \frac{\partial u^{(0)}_k}{\partial x_l} - \langle P_{ijk} \rangle \mathbf{R}_k - \langle K_{ij} \rangle \mathbf{\Theta}
\]  

[5.24]

Equations [5.23] and [5.24] represent the homogenized equations for the displacement and stress fields respectively. The coefficients \( \langle C_{ijkl}, \langle P_{ijk}, \langle K_{ij} \rangle \rangle \) will be referred to as the homogenized or effective elastic, piezoelectric, and thermal expansion coefficients. It is observed that these effective coefficients are free from the periodicity complications that characterize the actual material coefficients, and as such, are more amenable to analytical and numerical treatment. They are universal in nature and can be used to study
a wide variety of boundary value problems associated with a given smart structure. It should be mentioned at this point that the analysis applies without modification to materials that exhibit magnetostrictive or other effects rather than piezoelectric effects. In fact, the equations derived should be considered to hold equally well if the material in question is associated with some general transduction characteristics that can be used to induce strains and stresses. In that case, the coefficients $\langle P \rangle_{ijk}$ represent the appropriate homogenized material constants (rather than the piezoelectric constants).

In summary, Equations [5.18], [5.21] and [5.23] represent the governing equations of the homogenized model of a smart composite structure with periodically arranged reinforcements and actuators. Equation [5.18] represents the unit cell problems, formulae [5.21] define the effective coefficients, and expression [5.23] provides an asymptotic formula for the local displacement field.

5.3. Prismatic Smart Structures - Current Model

In order to calculate the effective coefficients of the smart structures, the unit cell problems [5.18] must be solved and formulae [5.21] must be applied. We will consider prismatic smart composite structures made of orthotropic material (see Figure 5-1).

5.3.1. Problem Formulation

We begin by introducing the following notations:
\[ b_{ij}^k = C_{ijkl} \frac{\partial N_{m}^{kl}(y)}{\partial y_i} + C_{ijkl}(y) \]
\[ b_{ij}^k = P_{ijk}(y) - C_{ijkl} \frac{\partial N_{m}^{k}(y)}{\partial y_i} \]
\[ b_{ij} = K_{ij}(y) - C_{ijkl} \frac{\partial N_{m}^{l}(y)}{\partial y_i} \]  

[5.25]

With these definitions in mind the unit cell problems in Equation [5.18] become:

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \{ b_{ij}^u \} = 0 \]
\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \{ b_{ij}^k \} = 0 \]
\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \{ b_{ij} \} = 0 \]  

[5.26]

The structures of interest consist of reinforcing/actuating elements embedded in a matrix. As such, it is necessary to consider the interface conditions that exist between the different constituents of the unit cell. In the sequel, the letters “r”, “m”, and “s” will denote the inclusion, matrix and inclusion/matrix interface, respectively.

On account of the continuity of the functions \( N_{m}^{kl}(y) \), \( N_{m}^{k}(y) \), and \( N_{m}(y) \) one naturally arrives at the following set of interface conditions:

\[ N_{n}^{kl}(r) \big|_{ls} = N_{n}^{kl}(m) \]
\[ N_{n}^{k}(r) \big|_{ls} = N_{n}^{k}(m) \]
\[ N_{n}(r) \big|_{ls} = N_{n}(m) \]  

[5.27]
As well, from continuity of the displacement field $u_k^{(0)}$, control signal $R_k$, and the temperature $\theta$, at the interface, one readily obtains

$$b_i^k n_j|_r = b_i^k n_j|_m$$
$$b_i^k n_j|_r = b_i^k n_j|_m$$
$$b_i^k n_j|_r = b_i^k n_j|_m$$

[5.28]

where $n_j$ refer to the components of the unit normal vector at the interface. We will further assume that the structure of interest consists of high modulus reinforcements and "soft" matrix ie $E_1^{\prime}$, $E_2^{\prime}$ and $E_3^{\prime} >> E^m$. Also, we'll assume that the matrix itself exhibits negligible piezoelectric behaviour. As such $b_i^k (m) \approx 0$, $b_i^k (m) \approx 0$ and $b_i (m) \approx 0$.

(Clearly, the above relationships become exact for the case of "lattice" structures which do not have any matrix or binder material in the region between the reinforcements).

Thus, the interface conditions [5.28] become:

$$b_i^k n_j|_s = 0$$
$$b_i^k n_j|_s = 0$$
$$b_i^k n_j|_s = 0$$

[5.29]

In summary, the final problems that must be solved for smart structures similar to those of Figure 5-1 are:
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left\{ b_{ij} \right\} = 0, \quad b_{ij}^n n_j \big|_s = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left\{ \phi_k \right\} = 0, \quad b_{ij}^k n_j \big|_s = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left\{ b_{ij} \right\} = 0, \quad b_{ij} n_j \big|_s = 0
\]  \hspace{2cm} [5.30]

5.3.2. Coordinate Transformation

In the ensuing examples, we will be primarily concerned with orthotropic materials. As well, the problems in Equation [5.30] will be solved on each inclusion separately, and then the results will be superimposed. Consequently, the analysis will become easier if we define a new coordinate system, \{\eta\}, so that an arbitrary inclusion will be oriented along one of the coordinate axes of this system. Due to the nature of the smart structures of interest in this chapter, the pertinent rotation will be performed about the \(y_3\) axis as shown in Figure 5-3.

![Figure 5-3: Original and rotated coordinate systems](image)

The pertinent transformation matrix \([T]\) is,
\[
[T] = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \varphi & \sin \varphi & 0 \\
-\sin \varphi & \cos \varphi & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\] [5.31]

and the relationship between the two sets of coordinates is given by:

\[
\eta_1 = \cos \varphi y_1 + \sin \varphi y_2
\]
\[
\eta_2 = -\sin \varphi y_1 + \cos \varphi y_2
\] [5.32]

From Equation [5.32], the derivatives transform according to:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} = \cos \varphi \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_1} - \sin \varphi \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} = \sin \varphi \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_1} + \cos \varphi \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2}
\] [5.33]

5.3.3. Effective Elastic Coefficients for Prismatic Smart Structures

We are now in a position to solve for the effective elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients of the structures of interest. As shown in Figure 5-1, these structures may consist of many different families of orthotropic reinforcements/actuators, each family oriented in a different direction. As mentioned before, for a given unit cell, we will solve the appropriate differential equations in each reinforcement separately (see Figure 5-4), and then superimpose the results. In doing so, stress concentrations and other complications that arise at the joints will be ignored because they are highly localized and do not contribute significantly to the integrals over the entire unit cell.
Figure 5-4: Basic unit cell with single arbitrarily-oriented orthotropic inclusion

Due to these considerations, it is prudent to first consider a simpler type of unit cell consisting of only a single arbitrarily oriented inclusion. Referring to Figure 5-4, we begin by rewriting first expression of Equation [5.30] (noting that $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_3} = 0$) as:

$$\frac{\partial b_{11}^{kl}}{\partial y_1} + \frac{\partial b_{12}^{kl}}{\partial y_2} = 0,$$

$$b_{11}^{kl} n_1 + b_{12}^{kl} n_2 \bigg|_{\eta_5} = 0$$

[5.34]

Since the inclusion is oriented along the $\eta_1$ direction, then the problem becomes independent of the $\eta_1$ coordinate, and the overall solution is simplified. Accordingly, Equation [5.33] is reduced to:
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} = -\sin \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2} = \cos \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2}
\]

Rewriting Equation [5.34] in terms of the new coordinates \( \eta_2 \) and \( z \) gives:

\[
-\sin \phi \frac{\partial b^{kl}_{il}}{\partial \eta_2} + \cos \phi \frac{\partial b^{kl}_{il}}{\partial \eta_2} = 0
\]

\[
\sin \phi \ b^{kl}_{il} - \cos \phi \ b^{kl}_{il} \bigg|_{z} = 0 \quad \text{[5.36]}
\]

As well, from Equation [5.25], the elastic coefficients, \( b^{kl}_{il} \), become (after coordinate transformation):

\[
b^{kl}_{il} = -\sin \phi \ C^{kl}_{ijm1} \frac{\partial N^{kl}_m}{\partial \eta_2} + \cos \phi \ C^{kl}_{ijm2} \frac{\partial N^{kl}_m}{\partial \eta_2} + C^{ijkl}_{ij}
\]

\[
\text{[5.37]}
\]

It is worthwhile to reiterate here that as with the model presented in the previous chapter, when an orthotropic material is not referred to its principal material coordinate system, the number and location of the non-zero terms in the matrix of elastic coefficients coincide with those of a monoclinic material. This matrix has the form shown in Equation [4.30a], where \( C_{ijkl} \) are the stiffness values referred to the original \( \{y_i\} \) coordinate system.

On account of Equation [4.30a], Equation [5.37] can be expanded as:
\[ b_{11}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{1111} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{1121} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{1112} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{1122} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + C_{11kl} \]

\[ b_{22}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{2211} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{2221} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{2212} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{2222} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + C_{22kl} \]

\[ b_{12}^{kl} = b_{21}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{2111} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{2121} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{2112} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{2122} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + C_{21kl} \]

\[ b_{13}^{kl} = b_{31}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{3111} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{3121} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{3112} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{3122} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + C_{31kl} \]

\[ b_{23}^{kl} = b_{32}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{3211} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{3221} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{3212} \frac{\partial N_{1}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{3222} \frac{\partial N_{2}^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} \right) + C_{32kl} \]

[5.38]

We will subsequently assume a linear variation of the \( N_{i}^{kl} \) functions in Equation \([5.38]\), i.e.

\[ N_{1}^{kl} = \lambda_{1}^{kl} \eta_2 \]
\[ N_{2}^{kl} = \lambda_{2}^{kl} \eta_2 \]
\[ N_{3}^{kl} = \lambda_{3}^{kl} \eta_2 \]

[5.39]

where \( \lambda_{i}^{kl} \) are constants, which will be determined in the sequel. Thus, the elastic coefficients in Equation \([5.38]\) can be expressed in terms of these constants as:

\[ b_{11}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{1111} \lambda_{1}^{kl} + C_{1162} \lambda_{2}^{kl} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{1161} \lambda_{1}^{kl} + C_{1122} \lambda_{2}^{kl} \right) + C_{11kl} \]
\[ b_{22}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{2211} \lambda_{1}^{kl} + C_{2262} \lambda_{2}^{kl} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{2212} \lambda_{1}^{kl} + C_{2222} \lambda_{2}^{kl} \right) + C_{22kl} \]
\[ b_{12}^{kl} = b_{21}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{2111} \lambda_{1}^{kl} + C_{66} \lambda_{2}^{kl} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{2112} \lambda_{1}^{kl} + C_{2222} \lambda_{2}^{kl} \right) + C_{21kl} \]
\[ b_{13}^{kl} = b_{31}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{3111} \lambda_{1}^{kl} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{3112} \lambda_{2}^{kl} \right) + C_{31kl} \]
\[ b_{23}^{kl} = b_{32}^{kl} = -\sin \varphi \left( C_{3211} \lambda_{3}^{kl} \right) + \cos \varphi \left( C_{3212} \lambda_{3}^{kl} \right) + C_{32kl} \]

[5.40]
After introducing the following definitions,

\[
A_1 = -C_{11}\sin\phi + C_{16}\cos\phi, \quad A_2 = -C_{16}\sin\phi + C_{12}\cos\phi, \quad A_3 = C_{11kl}
\]

\[
A_4 = -C_{12}\sin\phi + C_{26}\cos\phi, \quad A_5 = -C_{26}\sin\phi + C_{22}\cos\phi, \quad A_6 = C_{22kl}
\]

\[
A_7 = -C_{16}\sin\phi + C_{66}\cos\phi, \quad A_8 = -C_{66}\sin\phi + C_{26}\cos\phi, \quad A_9 = C_{12kl}
\]

\[
A_{10} = -C_{55}\sin\phi + C_{45}\cos\phi, A_{11} = C_{13kl}
\]

\[
A_{12} = -C_{45}\sin\phi + C_{44}\cos\phi, A_{13} = C_{23kl}
\]

Equation [5.40] becomes:

\[
b_{11}^{kl} = \lambda_1 A_1 + \lambda_2 A_2 + A_3
\]

\[
b_{22}^{kl} = \lambda_1 A_4 + \lambda_2 A_5 + A_6
\]

\[
b_{12}^{kl} = b_{21}^{kl} = \lambda_1 A_7 + \lambda_2 A_8 + A_9
\]

\[
b_{13}^{kl} = b_{31}^{kl} = \lambda_3 A_{10} + A_{11}
\]

\[
b_{23}^{kl} = b_{32}^{kl} = \lambda_3 A_{12} + A_{13}
\]

Expanding the interface conditions for \(i = 1, 2, \) and 3 in second expression of Equation [5.36], one obtains:

\[
\sin\phi \ b_{11}^{kl} - \cos\phi \ b_{12}^{kl} = 0
\]

\[
\sin\phi \ b_{21}^{kl} - \cos\phi \ b_{22}^{kl} = 0
\]

\[
\sin\phi \ b_{31}^{kl} - \cos\phi \ b_{32}^{kl} = 0
\]

Solving Equations [5.42] and [5.43], for \(\lambda_i^{kl}\), is straight forward and results in:
\[ \lambda_1 = \frac{(s C_{12kl} - c C_{22kl})(sC_{12} + scC_{66} - s^2 C_{16} - c^2 C_{25})}{(sC_{11kl} - cC_{12kl})(2scC_{26} - s^2 C_{66} - c^2 C_{22})} \]

\[ \lambda_2 = \frac{(s C_{12kl} - c C_{22kl})(2scC_{16} - s^2 C_{11} - c^2 C_{66})}{(sC_{11kl} - cC_{12kl})(scC_{12} + scC_{66} - s^2 C_{16} - c^2 C_{26})} \]

\[ \lambda_3 = \frac{(sC_{13kl} - cC_{23kl})}{(2scC_{45} - s^2 C_{55} - c^2 C_{44})} \]

Here we use the shorthand notations of "s" and "c" to denote \(\sin \phi\) and \(\cos \phi\) respectively. For an inclusion oriented in a given direction \(\phi\), one calculates \(\lambda_1\), \(\lambda_2\), \(\lambda_3\). The results are then substituted in Equation [5.40] to calculate \(b_{ij}^{kl}\). This is repeated for each inclusion in the unit cell and finally the effective elastic coefficients for the entire structure are obtained from Equation [5.21]. Some examples will be considered next.

5.3.3.1. Examples of Structures; Effective Elastic Coefficients

5.3.3.1.1. Example 1

This example pertains to the first smart structure of Figure 5-1. Isometric and top views of this structure are shown in Figure 5-5. The unit cell for this structure is shown in Figure 5-6. The unit cell problem will be solved approximately for each element \(\Omega_1\) and \(\Omega_2\) of the unit-cell and then the results will be superimposed.
Figure 5-5: Isometric and top view of smart structure with orientations in 0° and 90°

Figure 5-6: Smart structure with orientation of reinforcements in 0° and 90°
(a) \textbf{Region }\Omega_1 (\varphi = 0^\circ)::$

Solving for $\lambda_i^{kl}$ from Equation [5.44] gives,

$$
\lambda_1 = -\frac{C_{12kl}}{C_{66}}, \quad \lambda_2 = -\frac{C_{22kl}}{C_{22}}, \quad \lambda_3 = -\frac{C_{33kl}}{C_{44}} \quad [5.45]
$$

and then substituting the results in Equation [5.40] gives the following expressions for the non-vanishing elastic coefficients:

$$
b_{11}^{11} = C_{11} - \frac{C_{12}^2}{C_{22}}; \quad b_{33}^{11} = C_{13} - \frac{C_{23}C_{12}}{C_{22}}; \quad b_{33}^{33} = C_{33} - \frac{C_{23}^2}{C_{22}}; \quad b_{13}^{13} = C_{55} \quad [5.46]
$$

(b) \textbf{Region }\Omega_2 (\varphi = 90^\circ):$

Repeating the procedure results in:

$$
b_{22}^{22} = C_{22} - \frac{C_{12}^2}{C_{11}}; \quad b_{33}^{22} = C_{23} - \frac{C_{13}C_{12}}{C_{11}}; \quad b_{33}^{33} = C_{33} - \frac{C_{13}^2}{C_{11}}; \quad b_{23}^{23} = C_{44} \quad [5.47]
$$

We are now ready to compute the effective elastic coefficients. To this end, we note from Figure 5-6 that the volumes of elements $\Omega_1$, $\Omega_2$ and the entire unit cell are $\varepsilon^2 F_2 h_1 h_3$, $\varepsilon^2 F_1 h_2 h_3$ and $\varepsilon^2 h_1 h_2 h_3$ respectively, where $\varepsilon F_1$ and $\varepsilon F_2$ are the thicknesses of the reinforcements $\Omega_2$ and $\Omega_1$. Thus, from Equation [5.21] the effective elastic coefficients for this structure are computed as:
\[
\langle C_{ijkl} \rangle = \frac{1}{|Y|} \int_{|Y|} b^i_{kl} dv
\]
\[= \frac{F_2}{h_2} b_{ij}^{kl} \bigg|_{\Omega_1} + \frac{F_1}{h_1} b_{ij}^{kl} \bigg|_{\Omega_2}
\]

Before we can express these elastic coefficients in terms of the engineering constants, we need to make use of the familiar tensor transformation equation for a 4th-order tensor,

\[C_{ijkl} = a_{im} a_{jn} a_{kp} a_{iq} C^{(p)}_{mnqp}\]

where the \(a_{ij}\) coefficients are the elements of the transformation matrix in Equation [5.31] and \(C^{(p)}_{mnqp}\) represent the elastic coefficients of the reinforcements with respect to their principal material coordinate system. Equation [5.49b] and [5.49c] below is the expanded form of Equation [5.49a].

\[
C_{11} = C^{(p)}_{11} c^4 - 4C^{(p)}_{16} c^3 s + 2\left( C^{(p)}_{12} + 2C^{(p)}_{26} \right) c^2 s^2 - 4C^{(p)}_{26} cs^3 + C^{(p)}_{22} s^4
\]
\[
C_{12} = C^{(p)}_{12} c^4 + 2\left( C^{(p)}_{16} - C^{(p)}_{26} \right) c^3 s + \left( C^{(p)}_{11} + C^{(p)}_{22} - 4C^{(p)}_{66} \right) c^2 s^2 + 2C^{(p)}_{26} - C^{(p)}_{16} \right) cs^3 + C^{(p)}_{12} s^4
\]
\[
C_{13} = C^{(p)}_{13} c^2 - 2C^{(p)}_{36} cs + C^{(p)}_{23} s^2
\]
\[
C_{16} = C^{(p)}_{16} c^4 + \left( C^{(p)}_{11} - C^{(p)}_{12} - 2C^{(p)}_{66} \right) c^3 s + 3\left( C^{(p)}_{26} - C^{(p)}_{16} \right) c^2 s^2 + 2C^{(p)}_{66} + C^{(p)}_{12} - C^{(p)}_{22} \right) cs^3 - C^{(p)}_{26} s^4
\]
\[
C_{22} = C^{(p)}_{22} c^4 + 4C^{(p)}_{26} c^3 s + 2\left( C^{(p)}_{12} + 2C^{(p)}_{66} \right) c^2 s^2 + 4C^{(p)}_{16} cs^3 + C^{(p)}_{11} s^4
\]
\[
C_{23} = C^{(p)}_{23} c^2 - 2C^{(p)}_{36} cs + C^{(p)}_{13} s^2
\]
\[
C_{26} = C^{(p)}_{26} c^4 + \left( C^{(p)}_{12} - C^{(p)}_{22} - 2C^{(p)}_{66} \right) c^3 s + 3\left( C^{(p)}_{16} - C^{(p)}_{26} \right) c^2 s^2 + C^{(p)}_{11} - 2C^{(p)}_{66} - C^{(p)}_{12} \right) cs^3 - C^{(p)}_{16} s^4
\]
\[ C_{33} = C^{(p)}_{33} \]
\[ C_{36} = (C^{(p)}_{13} - C^{(p)}_{23}) \theta s + C^{(p)}_{36} (c^2 - s^2) \]
\[ C_{66} = 2(C^{(p)}_{16} - C^{(p)}_{26}) c^3 s + \left( C^{(p)}_{11} + C^{(p)}_{22} - 2C^{(p)}_{12} - 2C^{(p)}_{66} \right) c^2 s^2 + 2(C^{(p)}_{26} - C^{(p)}_{16}) c s^3 + \]
\[ C^{(p)}_{66} (c^4 + s^4) \]  \[ [5.49c] \]
\[ C_{44} = C^{(p)}_{44} c^2 + C^{(p)}_{55} s^2 + 2C^{(p)}_{44} c s \]
\[ C_{45} = C^{(p)}_{45} (c^2 - s^2) + \left( C^{(p)}_{55} - C^{(p)}_{44} \right) c s \]
\[ C_{55} = C^{(p)}_{55} c^2 + C^{(p)}_{44} s^2 - 2C^{(p)}_{44} c s \]

Next, assuming (without loss of generality) that both reinforcements are made of the same orthotropic material, the non-vanishing effective elastic coefficients for the smart structure of Figure 5-6 are obtained from Equations [5.48] and [5.49a] and are:

\[ \langle C_{11} \rangle = \frac{F_2}{h_2} \left( \frac{E_1^{(p)}}{1 - \nu_{13}^{(p)} \nu_{31}^{(p)}} \right) \]
\[ \langle C_{22} \rangle = \frac{F_1}{h_1} \left( \frac{E_1^{(p)}}{1 - \nu_{13}^{(p)} \nu_{31}^{(p)}} \right) \]
\[ \langle C_{13} \rangle = \langle C_{31} \rangle = \frac{F_2}{h_2} \left( \frac{\nu_{13}^{(p)} E_3^{(p)}}{1 - \nu_{13}^{(p)} \nu_{31}^{(p)}} \right) \]
\[ \langle C_{23} \rangle = \langle C_{32} \rangle = \frac{F_1}{h_1} \left( \frac{\nu_{13}^{(p)} E_3^{(p)}}{1 - \nu_{13}^{(p)} \nu_{31}^{(p)}} \right) \]
\[ \langle C_{33} \rangle = \frac{F_2}{h_2} \left( \frac{E_3^{(p)}}{1 - \nu_{13}^{(p)} \nu_{31}^{(p)}} \right) + \frac{F_1}{h_1} \left( \frac{E_3^{(p)}}{1 - \nu_{13}^{(p)} \nu_{31}^{(p)}} \right) \]
\[ \langle C_{44} \rangle = \frac{F_1}{h_1} G_{13}^{(p)} \]
\[ \langle C_{55} \rangle = \frac{F_2}{h_2} G_{13}^{(p)} \]  \[ [5.50] \]
Here, $E_i^{(p)}$, $G_{ij}^{(p)}$, and $\nu_{ij}^{(p)}$ represent the principal elastic moduli, shear moduli, and Poisson’s ratios for the reinforcement. We also note that in arriving at Equation [5.50] we made use of the well-known relationships between the $C_{ijkl}$ coefficients and the engineering constants, see e.g. Reddy [1997].

5.3.3.1.2. Example 2

This example pertains to the second smart structure of Figure 5-1. Figure 5-7 shows the enlarged isometric view of this structure. The unit cell for this structure is shown in Figure 5-8. This structure is composed of three families of reinforcements, each family oriented in a different direction. Each reinforcement can be made of a different orthotropic material and can have a different thickness. The distance between the two neighboring reinforcements of the same family is $ea$.

Figure 5-7: Isometric view of Smart structure with reinforcements at $30^\circ$, $90^\circ$, and $150^\circ$
Following the same methodology as for the previous example, the elastic $b_{\theta i}^k$ constants are readily calculated. Here, we provide the final values for $\lambda_i^{kl}$ and $b_{\theta i}^0$ constants.

(a) Region $\Omega_1 (\varphi = 90^\circ)$:

The elastic coefficients for the region 1 are given in the Equation [5.47], and will not be repeated.

![Smart Structure (Top View)](image1)

![Unit Cell (Top View)](image2)

Figure 5-8: Smart structure with reinforcements at 30°, 90°, and 150°

(b) Region $\Omega_2 (\varphi = 30^\circ)$:

From Equation [5.44]; $\lambda$'s are calculated as:
\[
\lambda_1 = \frac{(0.5 \text{C}_{12kl} - 0.866 \text{C}_{22kl})(-0.25 \text{C}_{16} - 0.75 \text{C}_{26} + 0.433 \text{C}_{12} + 0.433 \text{C}_{66})}{(0.5 \text{C}_{11kl} - 0.866 \text{C}_{12kl})(-0.25 \text{C}_{66} - 0.75 \text{C}_{22} + 0.866 \text{C}_{26})}
\]

\[
\lambda_2 = \frac{(0.5 \text{C}_{12kl} - 0.866 \text{C}_{22kl})(-0.25 \text{C}_{11} - 0.75 \text{C}_{66} + 0.866 \text{C}_{16})}{(0.5 \text{C}_{11kl} - 0.866 \text{C}_{12kl})(-0.25 \text{C}_{16} - 0.75 \text{C}_{26} + 0.433 \text{C}_{12} + 0.433 \text{C}_{66})}
\]

\[
\lambda_3 = -\frac{(0.5 \text{C}_{13kl} - 0.866 \text{C}_{23kl})}{(-0.25 \text{C}_{55} - 0.75 \text{C}_{44} + 0.866 \text{C}_{45})}
\]

[5.51]

Subsequently, the elastic coefficients for the region \(\Omega_2\) are:

\[
b_{11}^{11} = \frac{(-0.5 \text{C}_{11} + 0.866 \text{C}_{16})(0.5 \text{C}_{16} - 0.866 \text{C}_{12})(-0.25 \text{C}_{16} - 0.75 \text{C}_{26} + 0.433 \text{C}_{12} + 0.433 \text{C}_{66})}{\text{\Delta}}
\]

\[
-(-0.5 \text{C}_{16} + 0.866 \text{C}_{12})(0.5 \text{C}_{16} - 0.866 \text{C}_{12})(-0.25 \text{C}_{11} - 0.75 \text{C}_{66} + 0.866 \text{C}_{16})
\]

\[
\Delta
\]

[5.52a]

\[
b_{11}^{22} = \frac{(-0.5 \text{C}_{12} + 0.866 \text{C}_{16})(0.5 \text{C}_{26} - 0.866 \text{C}_{22})(-0.25 \text{C}_{16} - 0.75 \text{C}_{26} + 0.433 \text{C}_{12} + 0.433 \text{C}_{66})}{\text{\Delta}}
\]

\[
-(-0.5 \text{C}_{16} + 0.866 \text{C}_{12})(0.5 \text{C}_{26} - 0.866 \text{C}_{22})(-0.25 \text{C}_{11} - 0.75 \text{C}_{66} + 0.866 \text{C}_{16})
\]

\[
\Delta
\]

\[\text{\Delta} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\rho_{11}^{12} &= \frac{(-0.5C_{11} + 0.866C_{16}) \left(0.5C_{36} - 0.866C_{23} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} + 0.433C_{12} + 0.433C_{66}\right)}{(0.5C_{16} - 0.866C_{66} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{26} - 0.75C_{22} + 0.866C_{26})} \\
\rho_{11}^{23} &= \frac{(-0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{12}) \left(0.5C_{36} - 0.866C_{23} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{14} - 0.75C_{66} + 0.866C_{16}\right)}{(0.5C_{13} - 0.866C_{26} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{28} + 0.433C_{12} + 0.433C_{66})} + C_{13} \\
\rho_{11}^{13} &= \rho_{11}^{11} = 0 \\
\rho_{11}^{23} &= \rho_{11}^{23} = 0 \\
\rho_{11}^{12} &= \frac{(-0.5C_{11} + 0.866C_{16}) \left(0.5C_{36} - 0.866C_{26} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} + 0.433C_{12} + 0.433C_{66}\right)}{(0.5C_{16} - 0.866C_{66} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{26} - 0.75C_{22} + 0.866C_{26})} \\
\rho_{22}^{12} &= \frac{(-0.5C_{26} + 0.866C_{22}) \left(0.5C_{26} - 0.866C_{22} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} + 0.433C_{12} + 0.433C_{66}\right)}{(0.5C_{12} - 0.866C_{26} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{22} + 0.866C_{26})} + C_{22} \\
\rho_{22}^{13} &= \rho_{22}^{13} = 0 \\
\rho_{22}^{22} &= \rho_{22}^{22} = 0 \\
\rho_{22}^{12} &= \frac{(-0.5C_{12} + 0.866C_{26}) \left(0.5C_{36} - 0.866C_{26} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} + 0.433C_{12} + 0.433C_{66}\right)}{(0.5C_{16} - 0.866C_{66} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{26} - 0.75C_{22} + 0.866C_{26})} \\
\rho_{33}^{12} &= \frac{(-0.5C_{13} + 0.866C_{36}) \left(0.5C_{36} - 0.866C_{26} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} + 0.433C_{12} + 0.433C_{66}\right)}{(0.5C_{12} - 0.866C_{26} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{22} + 0.866C_{26})} + C_{32} \\
\rho_{33}^{22} &= \frac{(-0.5C_{36} + 0.866C_{32}) \left(0.5C_{36} - 0.866C_{26} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} + 0.433C_{12} + 0.433C_{66}\right)}{(0.5C_{32} - 0.866C_{26} \bar{X} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{22} + 0.866C_{26})} + C_{32}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{b}_{33}^{33} &= \frac{(-0.5 C_{36} + 0.866 C_{36})}{\Delta} \left( 0.5 C_{36} - 0.866 C_{36} \right) \left( -0.25 C_{16} - 0.75 C_{26} + 0.433 C_{12} + 0.433 C_{66} \right) - \\
&\quad + \frac{-(-0.5 C_{36} + 0.866 C_{36})}{\Delta} \left( 0.5 C_{36} - 0.866 C_{36} \right) \left( 0.5 C_{16} - 0.866 C_{66} \right) \left( -0.25 C_{16} - 0.75 C_{26} + 0.433 C_{12} + 0.433 C_{66} \right) + C_{33} \\
\bar{b}_{13}^{13} &= \bar{b}_{13}^{33} = 0 \\
\bar{b}_{33}^{23} &= \bar{b}_{23}^{33} = 0 \\
\bar{b}_{13}^{12} &= \frac{(-0.5 C_{36} + 0.866 C_{36})}{\Delta} \left( 0.5 C_{66} - 0.866 C_{26} \right) \left( -0.25 C_{16} - 0.75 C_{26} + 0.433 C_{12} + 0.433 C_{66} \right) - \\
&\quad + \frac{-(-0.5 C_{36} + 0.866 C_{36})}{\Delta} \left( 0.5 C_{16} - 0.866 C_{66} \right) \left( -0.25 C_{16} - 0.75 C_{26} + 0.433 C_{12} + 0.433 C_{66} \right) + C_{36} \\
\bar{b}_{12}^{12} &= \frac{(-0.5 C_{16} + 0.866 C_{66})}{\Delta} \left( 0.5 C_{66} - 0.866 C_{26} \right) \left( -0.25 C_{16} - 0.75 C_{26} + 0.433 C_{12} + 0.433 C_{66} \right) - \\
&\quad + \frac{-(-0.5 C_{16} + 0.866 C_{66})}{\Delta} \left( 0.5 C_{16} - 0.866 C_{66} \right) \left( -0.25 C_{16} - 0.75 C_{26} + 0.433 C_{12} + 0.433 C_{66} \right) + C_{66} \\
\bar{b}_{23}^{23} &= -\frac{(0.5 C_{45} - 0.866 C_{44})}{(-0.25 C_{55} - 0.75 C_{44} + 0.866 C_{45})} (-0.5 C_{45} + 0.866 C_{44}) + C_{44} \\
\bar{b}_{23}^{13} &= -\frac{(0.5 C_{55} - 0.866 C_{45})}{(-0.25 C_{55} - 0.75 C_{44} + 0.866 C_{45})} (-0.5 C_{45} + 0.866 C_{44}) + C_{45} \\
\bar{b}_{23}^{12} &= \bar{b}_{23}^{13} = 0 \\
\bar{b}_{13}^{23} &= -\frac{(0.5 C_{45} - 0.866 C_{44})}{(-0.25 C_{55} - 0.75 C_{44} + 0.866 C_{45})} (-0.5 C_{55} + 0.866 C_{45}) + C_{45} \\
\bar{b}_{13}^{13} &= -\frac{(0.5 C_{55} - 0.866 C_{45})}{(-0.25 C_{55} - 0.75 C_{44} + 0.866 C_{45})} (-0.5 C_{55} + 0.866 C_{45}) + C_{55} \\
\bar{b}_{12}^{12} &= \bar{b}_{13}^{13} = 0
\end{align*}
\]

where
\[ \Delta = 0.0625C_{11}C_{66} + 0.1875C_{11}C_{22} - 0.2165C_{11}C_{26} + 0.5625C_{66}C_{22} - \\
0.6495C_{16}C_{22} + 0.375C_{16}C_{26} - 0.0625C_{16}^2 + 0.2165C_{16}C_{12} - \\
0.5625C_{26}^2 + 0.6495C_{12}C_{26} - 0.1875C_{12}^2 - 0.375C_{12}C_{66} \]  \[5.52d\]

(c) Region \( \Omega_3 (\varphi = 150^\circ) \):

Similarly, the \( \lambda \)'s for the region 3 are calculated as given below

\[
\lambda_1 = \frac{(0.5\ C_{12kl} + 0.866\ C_{22kl})(-0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26}) - \\
(0.5C_{11kl} + 0.866C_{12kl})(-0.25C_{26} - 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26})}{0.0625C_{11}C_{66} + 0.1875C_{11}C_{22} + 0.2165C_{11}C_{26} + 0.5625C_{66}C_{22} + \\
0.6495C_{16}C_{22} + 0.375C_{16}C_{26} - 0.0625C_{16}^2 - 0.2165C_{16}C_{12} - \\
-0.5625C_{26}^2 - 0.6495C_{12}C_{26} - 0.1875C_{12}^2 - 0.375C_{12}C_{66}} \]  \[5.53\]

\[
\lambda_2 = \frac{(0.5\ C_{12kl} + 0.866\ C_{22kl})(-0.25C_{11} - 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16}) - \\
(0.5C_{11kl} + 0.866C_{12kl})(-0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26})}{-0.0625C_{11}C_{66} - 0.1875C_{11}C_{22} - 0.2165C_{11}C_{26} - 0.5625C_{66}C_{22} - \\
0.6495C_{16}C_{22} - 0.375C_{16}C_{26} + 0.0625C_{16}^2 + 0.2165C_{16}C_{12} + \\
+0.5625C_{26}^2 + 0.6495C_{12}C_{26} + 0.1875C_{12}^2 + 0.375C_{12}C_{66}} \]

\[ \lambda_3 = \frac{(0.5C_{13kl} + 0.866C_{23kl})}{(-0.25C_{55} - 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45})} \]

And the elastic coefficients are given as

\[
\kappa_1^I = \frac{-(0.5C_{11} + 0.866C_{16})(0.5\ C_{16} + 0.866\ C_{12})(-0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26})}{\Delta^*} \]  \[5.54a\]

\[
+ (0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{12})(0.5\ C_{16} + 0.866\ C_{12})(-0.25C_{11} - 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16})}{\Delta^*} + C_{11} \]
\[ b_{11}^{22} = \frac{-(0.5C_{11} + 0.866C_{16}) \left( (0.5C_{26} + 0.866C_{22}) \chi - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right)}{(0.5C_{12} + 0.866C_{26}) \chi - 0.25C_{66} - 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26})} + \frac{(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{12}) \left( (0.5C_{36} + 0.866C_{22}) \chi - 0.25C_{11} - 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16} \right)}{(0.5C_{13} + 0.866C_{26}) \chi - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26})} \] + C_{12}

\[ b_{11}^{33} = \frac{-(0.5C_{11} + 0.866C_{16}) \left( (0.5C_{36} + 0.866C_{23}) \chi - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right)}{(0.5C_{13} + 0.866C_{26}) \chi - 0.25C_{66} - 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26})} + \frac{(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{12}) \left( (0.5C_{36} + 0.866C_{23}) \chi - 0.25C_{11} - 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16} \right)}{(0.5C_{13} + 0.866C_{26}) \chi - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26})} + C_{13} \]

\[ b_{11}^{13} = b_{13}^{11} = 0 \]

\[ b_{11}^{23} = b_{23}^{11} = 0 \]

\[ [5.54b] \]
\[ b_{12}^{22} = \frac{-(0.5C_{12} + 0.866C_{26}) \left[ \left( 0.5C_{66} + 0.866C_{26} \right) \left( -0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right) - \right]}{(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{26}) \left( -0.25C_{66} - 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26} \right)} \]

\[ + \frac{(0.5C_{26} + 0.866C_{22}) \left[ \left( 0.5C_{66} + 0.866C_{26} \right) \left( -0.25C_{11} - 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16} \right) - \right]}{(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{66}) \left( -0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right)} + C_{26} \]

\[ b_{33}^{13} = \frac{-(0.5C_{13} + 0.866C_{36}) \left[ \left( 0.5C_{26} + 0.866C_{22} \right) \left( -0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right) - \right]}{(0.5C_{12} + 0.866C_{66}) \left( -0.25C_{66} - 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26} \right)} \]

\[ + \frac{(0.5C_{36} + 0.866C_{23}) \left[ \left( 0.5C_{26} + 0.866C_{22} \right) \left( -0.25C_{11} - 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16} \right) - \right]}{(0.5C_{12} + 0.866C_{26}) \left( -0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right)} + C_{32} \]

\[ b_{33}^{13} = b_{12}^{33} = 0 \]

\[ b_{33}^{23} = b_{13}^{33} = 0 \]

\[ b_{12}^{13} = \frac{-(0.5C_{13} + 0.866C_{36}) \left[ \left( 0.5C_{66} + 0.866C_{26} \right) \left( -0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right) - \right]}{(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{66}) \left( -0.25C_{66} - 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26} \right)} \]

\[ + \frac{(0.5C_{36} + 0.866C_{23}) \left[ \left( 0.5C_{26} + 0.866C_{22} \right) \left( -0.25C_{11} - 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16} \right) - \right]}{(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{66}) \left( -0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right)} + C_{36} \]

\[ b_{12}^{13} = \frac{-(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{66}) \left[ \left( 0.5C_{66} + 0.866C_{26} \right) \left( -0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right) - \right]}{(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{66}) \left( -0.25C_{66} - 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26} \right)} \]

\[ + \frac{(0.5C_{66} + 0.866C_{26}) \left[ \left( 0.5C_{26} + 0.866C_{22} \right) \left( -0.25C_{11} - 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16} \right) - \right]}{(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{66}) \left( -0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66} - 0.25C_{16} - 0.75C_{26} \right)} + C_{66} \]

\[ b_{23}^{13} = \frac{(0.5C_{45} + 0.866C_{44})}{(-0.25C_{55} - 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45})} \left( 0.5C_{45} + 0.866C_{44} \right) + C_{44} \]
\[ b_{23}^{13} = \frac{(0.5C_{45} + 0.866C_{44})}{(-0.25C_{55} - 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45})} (0.5C_{45} + 0.866C_{44}) + C_{45} \]

\[ b_{12}^{13} = b_{13}^{23} = 0 \]

\[ b_{13}^{23} = \frac{(0.5C_{45} + 0.866C_{44})}{(-0.25C_{55} - 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45})} (0.5C_{55} + 0.866C_{45}) + C_{55} \]

\[ b_{13}^{13} = \frac{(0.5C_{55} + 0.866C_{45})}{(-0.25C_{55} - 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45})} (0.5C_{55} + 0.866C_{45}) + C_{45} \]

\[ b_{13}^{13} = b_{13}^{13} = 0 \]

where \( \Delta^* \) is defined by

\[ \Delta^* = 0.0625C_{11}C_{16} + 0.1875C_{11}C_{22} + 0.2165C_{11}C_{26} + 0.5625C_{66}C_{22} + 0.6495C_{16}C_{22} + 0.375C_{16}C_{26} - 0.0625C_{16}^2 - 0.2165C_{16}C_{12} - 0.5625C_{26}^2 - 0.6495C_{12}C_{26} - 0.1875C_{12}^2 - 0.375C_{12}C_{66} \]

Inspection of Figure 5-8 reveals that the volume of the unit cell is \( (4\sqrt{3}/3)a^2h \) and the volumes of the reinforcements \( \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \) and \( \Omega_3 \) are \( (4\sqrt{3}/3)e^2aF_1h, \) \( (4\sqrt{3}/3)e^2aF_2h, \) and \( (4\sqrt{3}/3)e^2aF_3h \) respectively, where \( eF_1, eF_2 \) and \( eF_3 \) are the corresponding thicknesses.

The effective elastic coefficients for this structure are calculated as:

\[ \langle C_{ijkl} \rangle = \frac{F_1}{a} b_{ijk}^{kl} \bigg|_{\Omega_1} + \frac{F_2}{a} b_{ijk}^{kl} \bigg|_{\Omega_2} + \frac{F_3}{a} b_{ijk}^{kl} \bigg|_{\Omega_3} \]

The expressions for the elastic coefficients in terms of the engineering constants are too lengthy to be reproduced here (although straightforward). For illustration purposes, let us consider a material with properties given in Table 5-1 [Daniel, 1994].
Table 5-1: Properties of E-glass/Epoxy [Daniel, 1994]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>E-Glass/epoxy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_1$ (MPa)</td>
<td>39000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_2$ (MPa)</td>
<td>8600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{12}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{11}$ ($10^{-6}$/C)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{22}$ ($10^{-6}$/C)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{33}$ ($10^{-6}$/C)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effective elastic coefficients (in GPa) are then calculated to be:

\[
\langle C_{11} \rangle = 22.3 \frac{F_{1}}{a} + 22.3 \frac{F_{2}}{a}; \langle C_{12} \rangle = 7.4 \frac{F_{1}}{a} + 7.4 \frac{F_{2}}{a}; \langle C_{13} \rangle = 1.9 \frac{F_{1}}{a} + 1.9 \frac{F_{2}}{a}; \\
\langle C_{16} \rangle = 12.9 \frac{F_{1}}{a} - 12.9 \frac{F_{2}}{a}; \langle C_{22} \rangle = 2.5 \frac{F_{1}}{a} + 2.5 \frac{F_{2}}{a} + 39.7 \frac{F_{3}}{a}; \\
\langle C_{26} \rangle = 4.3 \frac{F_{1}}{a} - 4.3 \frac{F_{2}}{a}; \langle C_{36} \rangle = 1.1 \frac{F_{1}}{a} - 1.1 \frac{F_{2}}{a}; \langle C_{23} \rangle = 0.6 \frac{F_{1}}{a} + 0.6 \frac{F_{2}}{a} + 2.4 \frac{F_{3}}{a}; \\
\langle C_{33} \rangle = 9.0 \frac{F_{1}}{a} + 9.0 \frac{F_{2}}{a} + 8.8 \frac{F_{3}}{a}; \langle C_{44} \rangle = 1.0 \frac{F_{1}}{a} + 1.0 \frac{F_{2}}{a} + 3.8 \frac{F_{3}}{a}; \\
\langle C_{45} \rangle = 1.6 \frac{F_{1}}{a} - 1.6 \frac{F_{2}}{a}; \langle C_{55} \rangle = 2.8 \frac{F_{1}}{a} + 2.8 \frac{F_{2}}{a}; \langle C_{66} \rangle = 7.4 \frac{F_{1}}{a} + 7.4 \frac{F_{2}}{a}; \tag{5.56}
\]

5.3.3.1.3. Example 3

Let us now consider a prismatic structure with a rhombic configuration, as shown in Figure 5-9. The prismatic structure is composed of two families of mutually parallel orthotropic reinforcements. The distance between the two neighboring reinforcements of the same family is $\varepsilon a$. The effective elastic coefficients for this structure can be easily derived from those of the previous example and will not be repeated here.
5.3.3.2. Plots of Effective Properties and Discussion

The mathematical model and methodology presented in Section 5.3.3 can be used in analysis and design to tailor the effective elastic coefficients of any structure to meet the criteria pertaining to a particular application, by selecting the type, number, orientation and size of the reinforcements. In this section typical elastic properties of the structures in Section 5.3.3.1 will be computed and plotted vs. some geometrical parameters of interest. For the sake of efficiency the structures in Figure 5-6, Figure 5-8 and Figure 5-9 will be referred to as S1, S2 and S3 respectively. We will assume in each case that the reinforcements have the same thickness and are made of the same material with properties given in Table 5-1 [Daniel, 1994]. In the first case we will compare the elastic coefficients for the three smart structures by varying the lengths of the unit cell and keeping the thickness F of the reinforcements fixed. That is, we will take \( \varepsilon h_1 = \varepsilon h_2 = \) constant value in S1, S2, and S3. Figure 5-10 and Figure 5-11 show plots of the variation of \( \langle C_{11} \rangle \) and \( \langle C_{22} \rangle \) vs. \( \varepsilon h_1 \) or \( \varepsilon h_2 \). We note again that the 1, 2, 3 indices in \( \langle C_{ij} \rangle \) refer to the \( y_1, y_2 \) and \( y_3 \) directions respectively, see Figure 5-2.
Figure 5-10: Plot of the $\langle C_{11}\rangle$ effective coefficient vs. $\varepsilon h_1/\varepsilon F$ for S1, S2, S3

It can be observed in Figure 5-10 that the stiffness in the $y_1$ direction is the same for S2 and S3 because of the same number, size and arrangement of reinforcements in that direction. The presence of the extra reinforcements in S2 does not affect the stiffness in the $y_1$ direction because these reinforcements are oriented entirely in the $y_2$ direction. Both S2 and S3 are a little stiffer than S1 in the $y_1$ direction because the former have more reinforcements (even though they are oriented at an angle to $y_1$) that affect the stiffness in that direction than the latter which only has a single reinforcement which affects the stiffness in the $y_1$ direction.

Figure 5-11 shows that S2 is significantly stiffer than S3 in the $y_2$ direction due to the presence of the extra 2 reinforcements in the former. For similar reasons, the $\langle C_{22}\rangle$ value for S1 is larger than that of S3 and smaller than that of S2. Of course, all of these trends and characteristics can easily be modified by changing the thickness, type, etc. of the reinforcements so that the desirable elastic coefficients are obtained.
Figure 5-11: Plot of the \( \langle C_{22} \rangle \) effective coefficient vs. \( \varepsilon h_1/\varepsilon F \) for S1, S2, S3

In the second case we will vary the thickness of the inclusion keeping the length of the unit cell constant and assume that the thickness of the all the inclusions are the same. That is, we will take \( \varepsilon F_1 = \varepsilon F_2 = \varepsilon a \) in S1, S3 and \( = 0.5 \varepsilon a \) in S2. Figure 5-12 and Figure 5-13 show plots of the variation of \( \langle C_{11} \rangle \) and \( \langle C_{22} \rangle \) vs. \( \varepsilon F/\varepsilon h \).

For reasons explained above, we observed in Figure 5-12 that the stiffness in the \( y_1 \) direction is the same for S2 and S3 and is a little higher than S1. Figure 5-13 shows that S2 is significantly stiffer than S3 and S1 in the \( y_2 \) direction due to the presence of the extra two reinforcements in the former, than in the latter two structures.
Figure 5-12: Plot of the $\langle C_{11} \rangle$ effective coefficient vs. $\varepsilon F/\mu h$ for S1, S2, S3

Figure 5-13: Plot of the $\langle C_{22} \rangle$ effective coefficient vs. $\varepsilon F/\mu h$ for S1, S2, S3
5.3.4. Effective Piezoelectric Coefficients for Prismatic Smart Structures

We now turn our attention to smart structures reinforced with stiffeners that also exhibit piezoelectric behavior.

Referring to Figure 5-4, we begin by rewriting the pertinent unit cell problem given by second expression in Equation [5.30] in terms of the new coordinates (see Figure 5-3) \( \eta_2 \) and \( z \) as,

\[
-\sin\varphi \frac{\partial b_{i1}^k}{\partial \eta_2} + \cos\varphi \frac{\partial b_{i2}^k}{\partial \eta_2} = 0
\]
\[\text{[5.57]}\]

\[
\sin\varphi \ b_{i1}^k - \cos\varphi \ b_{i2}^k \bigg|_a = 0
\]

where the piezoelectric coefficients as given by Equations [5.25] and [5.33] are:

\[
b_{ij}^k = P_{ijk} + \sin\varphi \ C_{ijm1} \frac{\partial N_m^k}{\partial \eta_2} - \cos\varphi \ C_{ijm2} \frac{\partial N_m^k}{\partial \eta_2}
\]
\[\text{[5.58]}\]

We note again that the matrix of the piezoelectric coefficients of an orthotropic material with respect to a coordinate system rotated by an arbitrary angle \( \varphi \) (in the \( y_1-y_2 \) plane) from the principle material system has the following form [Reddy, 1997].
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & P_{113} \\
0 & 0 & P_{223} \\
0 & 0 & P_{333} \\
P_{231} & P_{232} & 0 \\
P_{311} & P_{312} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & P_{123}
\end{bmatrix} = 
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & P_{13} \\
0 & 0 & P_{23} \\
0 & 0 & P_{33} \\
P_{41} & P_{42} & 0 \\
P_{51} & P_{52} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & P_{63}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

[5.59]

Next, we assume a linear dependency of \( N_i^k \) functions on \( \eta_2 \), i.e.

\[
N_i^k = \mu_i^k \eta_2
\]

[5.60]

Substituting Equation [5.58] into the three interface conditions in Equation [5.57] gives three linear algebraic equations in the constants \( \mu_i^k \), the solution of which is given by:

\[
\mu_1^k = \frac{(sP_{21k} - cP_{22k})(s^2C_{16} + c^2C_{26} - scC_{12} - scC_{66})}{(sP_{31k} - cP_{32k})(s^2C_{66} + c^2C_{22} - 2scC_{26})}
\]

\[
+s^4C_{11}C_{66} + s^2c^2C_{11}C_{22} - 2s^3cC_{11}C_{26} + c^4C_{66}C_{22} - 2sc^3C_{16}C_{22} + 2s^2c^2C_{16}C_{26}
\]

\[
-s^4C_{16}^2 + 2s^3cC_{16}C_{12} - c^4C_{26}^2 + 2sc^3C_{12}C_{26} - s^2c^2C_{12}^2 - 2s^2c^2C_{12}C_{66}
\]

[5.61]

\[
\mu_2^k = \frac{(sP_{21k} - cP_{22k})(s^2C_{11} + c^2C_{26} - 2scC_{16})}{(sP_{31k} - cP_{32k})(s^2C_{16} + c^2C_{22} - scC_{12} - scC_{66})}
\]

\[
+s^4C_{11}C_{66} - s^2c^2C_{11}C_{22} + 2s^3cC_{11}C_{26} - c^4C_{66}C_{22} + 2sc^3C_{16}C_{22} - 2s^2c^2C_{16}C_{26}
\]

\[
+s^4C_{16}^2 - 2s^3cC_{16}C_{12} + c^4C_{26}^2 - 2sc^3C_{12}C_{26} + s^2c^2C_{12}^2 + 2s^2c^2C_{12}C_{66}
\]

\[
\mu_3^k = \frac{(sP_{31k} - cP_{32k})}{(s^2C_{55} + c^2C_{44} - 2scC_{45})}
\]

As with the elastic coefficients, for an actuator oriented in a given direction \( \phi \), one calculates \( \mu_1^k, \mu_2^k, \mu_3^k \). The results are then substituted in Equation [5.58] to calculate \( b_\theta^k \).

This is repeated for each inclusion in the unit cell and finally the effective piezoelectric
coefficients for the entire structure are obtained from second expression of Equation [5.21]. Some examples will be considered next.

5.3.4.1. Examples of Structures; Effective Piezoelectric Coefficients

5.3.4.1.1. Example 1

This example pertains to structure S1 in Figure 5-6. Solving for $\mu_1^k$ from Equation [5.61] and then substituting the results in Equation [5.58] gives the following expressions for the non-vanishing piezoelectric coefficients for actuator $\Omega_1$:

$$b_{11}^3 = p_{31} - \frac{C_{12}^2 p_{32}}{C_{22}}, \quad b_{31}^1 = p_{13}, \quad b_{31}^2 = p_{25}, \quad b_{31}^3 = p_{33} - \frac{C_{23}^2 p_{32}}{C_{22}}$$  \[5.62\]

Repeating the procedure for actuator $\Omega_2$ results in:

$$b_{22}^3 = p_{32} - \frac{C_{12}^2 p_{32}}{C_{11}}, \quad b_{33}^3 = p_{33} - \frac{C_{13}^2 p_{33}}{C_{11}}, \quad b_{32}^1 = p_{14}, \quad b_{32}^2 = p_{24}$$  \[5.63\]

With these results, the effective piezoelectric coefficients are given from Equation [5.21] as:

$$\left\langle p_{ik} \right\rangle = \frac{F_{2}}{h_2} b_{i}^k \bigg|_{\Omega_1} + \frac{F_{3}}{h_1} b_{i}^k \bigg|_{\Omega_2}$$  \[5.64\]
In order to express these coefficients in terms of the piezoelectric constants referred to the principal material coordinate system, (to be identified, as before, with a superscript \( \text{"p"} \)) we need to make use of Equation \([5.49a]\) as well as the tensor transformation law for a 3\(^{rd}\)-order tensor,

\[
P_{ijk} = a_{im} a_{jn} a_{kp} P_{nmp}^{(p)} \tag{5.65a}
\]

which when written in full has the form:

\[
\begin{align*}
P_{13} &= P_{13}^{(p)} c^2 + P_{23}^{(p)} s^2 \\
P_{23} &= P_{13}^{(p)} s^2 + C_{23}^{(p)} c^2 \\
P_{33} &= P_{33}^{(p)} c \\
P_{41} &= -P_{51}^{(p)} sc + P_{42}^{(p)} cs \\
P_{42} &= P_{51}^{(p)} s^2 + P_{42}^{(p)} c^2 \\
P_{51} &= P_{51}^{(p)} c^2 + P_{42}^{(p)} s^2 \\
P_{52} &= -P_{51}^{(p)} sc + P_{42}^{(p)} cs \\
P_{63} &= -P_{13}^{(p)} sc + P_{23}^{(p)} cs
\end{align*}
\tag{5.65b}
\]

Next, assuming (without loss of generality) that both actuators are made of the same orthotropic material, the non-vanishing effective piezoelectric coefficients for the smart structure of Figure 5-6 are obtained from Equations \([5.62]-[5.65a]\) and are:
\[
\begin{align*}
\langle p_{13} \rangle &= \frac{F_2}{h_2} \left( p_{31}^{(p)} - \frac{(v_{21}^{(p)} + v_{32}^{(p)} v_{23}^{(p)}) E_1^{(p)}}{(1 - v_{13}^{(p)} v_{31}^{(p)}) E_2^{(p)}} \right) p_{32}^{(p)} \\
\langle p_{23} \rangle &= \frac{F_2}{h_2} \left( p_{31}^{(p)} - \frac{(v_{21}^{(p)} + v_{32}^{(p)} v_{23}^{(p)}) E_1^{(p)}}{(1 - v_{13}^{(p)} v_{31}^{(p)}) E_2^{(p)}} \right) p_{32}^{(p)} \\
\langle p_{33} \rangle &= \frac{F_2}{h_2} \left( p_{33}^{(p)} - \frac{(v_{23}^{(p)} + v_{21}^{(p)} v_{13}^{(p)}) E_3^{(p)}}{(1 - v_{13}^{(p)} v_{31}^{(p)}) E_2^{(p)}} \right) p_{32}^{(p)} + \frac{F_1}{h_1} \left( p_{33}^{(p)} - \frac{(v_{23}^{(p)} + v_{21}^{(p)} v_{13}^{(p)}) E_3^{(p)}}{(1 - v_{13}^{(p)} v_{31}^{(p)}) E_2^{(p)}} \right) p_{32}^{(p)} \\
\langle p_{24} \rangle &= \frac{F_1}{h_1} p_{15}^{(p)}, \quad \langle p_{15} \rangle = \frac{F_2}{h_2} p_{15}^{(p)} 
\end{align*}
\]  

[5.66]

5.3.4.1.2. Example 2

We will now consider the structure S2 of Figure 5-8. Following the same methodology as for the previous example, the piezoelectric constants in each actuator region are determined as:

(a) Region $\Omega_1$:

The piezoelectric coefficients for the region 1 ($\varphi = 90^\circ$) are given in Equation [5.63].

(b) Region $\Omega_2$:

The piezoelectric coefficients for the reinforcement/inclusion in the $\varphi = 30^\circ$ direction is given as:

\[
\begin{align*}
b_{11}^{(1)} &= 0 \\
b_{11}^{(2)} &= 0 \\
\end{align*}
\]  

[5.67a]
\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta & = \\
&= \left( \frac{(0.5C_{11} - 0.866C_{16}) (0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}) (0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66})}{(0.5P_{13} - 0.866P_{36}) (0.25C_{66} + 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26})} \right) \\
&- \left( \frac{(0.5C_{16} - 0.866C_{12}) (0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}) (0.25C_{11} + 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16})}{(0.5P_{13} - 0.866P_{36}) (0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66})} \right) + P_{31} \\
&= b_{11}^1 = b_{22}^1 = 0 \\
&= \left( \frac{(0.5C_{12} - 0.866C_{26}) (0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}) (0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66})}{(0.5P_{13} - 0.866P_{36}) (0.25C_{66} + 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26})} \right) \\
&- \left( \frac{(0.5C_{26} - 0.866C_{22}) (0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}) (0.25C_{11} + 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16})}{(0.5P_{13} - 0.866P_{36}) (0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66})} \right) + P_{32} \\
&= b_{12}^2 = b_{21}^2 = 0 \\
&= \left( \frac{(0.5C_{16} - 0.866C_{66}) (0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}) (0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66})}{(0.5P_{13} - 0.866P_{36}) (0.25C_{66} + 0.75C_{22} - 0.866C_{26})} \right) \\
&- \left( \frac{(0.5C_{66} - 0.866C_{26}) (0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}) (0.25C_{11} + 0.75C_{66} - 0.866C_{16})}{(0.5P_{13} - 0.866P_{36}) (0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66})} \right) + P_{36} \\
&= b_{24}^1 = b_{12}^2 = 0 \\
&= \left( \frac{(0.5C_{55} - 0.866C_{45}) (0.5P_{15} - 0.866P_{14})}{0.25C_{55} + 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45}} \right) - \left( \frac{(0.5C_{55} - 0.866C_{45}) (0.5P_{25} - 0.866P_{24})}{0.25C_{55} + 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45}} \right) \\
&= b_{31}^2 = b_{32}^2 = 0 \\
&= \left( \frac{(0.5C_{45} - 0.866C_{44}) (0.5P_{15} - 0.866P_{14})}{0.25C_{55} + 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45}} \right) - \left( \frac{(0.5C_{45} - 0.866C_{44}) (0.5P_{25} - 0.866P_{24})}{0.25C_{55} + 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45}} \right) \\
&= b_{31}^1 = b_{32}^1 = 0 \\
&= b_{33}^2 = b_{33}^1 = 0
\end{align*}

[5.67b]
\[ b_{33}^1 = \frac{(0.5C_{13} - 0.866C_{36}) \left( 0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)(0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66})}{\Delta} \]

\[ -(0.5C_{36} - 0.866C_{23}) \left( 0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)(0.25C_{11} + 0.75C_{46} - 0.866C_{16})}{\Delta} + p_{33} \]

\[ [5.67c] \]

Where \( \Delta \) is given by the Equation [5.52d]

\( (c) \) Region \( \Omega_3 \):

Similarly the piezoelectric coefficients for reinforcements in \( \varphi = 150^0 \) are given by:

\[ b_{11}^1 = 0 \]

\[ b_{11}^2 = 0 \]

\[ b_{11}^1 = \frac{(0.5C_{11} + 0.866C_{16}) \left( 0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)(0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66})}{\Delta^*} \]

\[ -(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{12}) \left( 0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)(0.25C_{11} + 0.75C_{46} - 0.866C_{16})}{\Delta^*} + p_{31} \]

\[ [5.68a] \]

\[ b_{22}^1 = b_{22}^2 = 0 \]

\[ b_{22}^1 = \frac{(0.5C_{12} + 0.866C_{26}) \left( 0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)(0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{66})}{\Delta^*} \]

\[ -(0.5C_{26} + 0.866C_{22}) \left( 0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)(0.25C_{11} + 0.75C_{46} - 0.866C_{16})}{\Delta^*} + p_{32} \]

\[ b_{21}^1 = b_{21}^2 = 0 \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{b}_{21} &= \frac{\left(0.5C_{16} + 0.866C_{66}\right)\left(0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)\left(0.25C_{26} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{26}\right)}{\Delta^*} - \frac{\left(0.5C_{46} + 0.866C_{26}\right)\left(0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)\left(0.25C_{11} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.866C_{16}\right)}{\Delta^*} + P_{36} \\
\mathbf{b}_{31} &= P_{15} - (0.5C_{55} + 0.866C_{45})\left(\frac{0.5P_{15} - 0.866P_{14}}{0.25C_{55} + 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45}}\right) \\
\mathbf{b}_{31} &= P_{25} - (0.5C_{55} + 0.866C_{45})\left(\frac{0.5P_{25} - 0.866P_{24}}{0.25C_{55} + 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45}}\right) \\
\mathbf{b}_{31} &= 0 \\
\mathbf{b}_{32} &= P_{14} - (0.5C_{45} + 0.866C_{44})\left(\frac{0.5P_{15} - 0.866P_{14}}{0.25C_{55} + 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45}}\right) \\
\mathbf{b}_{32} &= P_{24} - (0.5C_{45} + 0.866C_{44})\left(\frac{0.5P_{25} - 0.866P_{24}}{0.25C_{55} + 0.75C_{44} - 0.866C_{45}}\right) \\
\mathbf{b}_{32} &= 0 \\
\mathbf{b}_{33} &= \mathbf{b}_{33} = 0 \\
\mathbf{b}_{33} &= \frac{\left(0.5C_{13} + 0.866C_{36}\right)\left(0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)\left(0.25C_{16} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.433C_{12} - 0.433C_{26}\right)}{\Delta^*} - \frac{\left(0.5C_{66} + 0.866C_{23}\right)\left(0.5P_{36} - 0.866P_{32}\right)\left(0.25C_{11} + 0.75C_{26} - 0.866C_{16}\right)}{\Delta^*} + P_{33}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\Delta^*\) is given by Equation [5.54e]. The results are finally superimposed according to the second expression of Equation [5.21] and are:

\[
\langle P_{\epsilon k} \rangle = \frac{F_1}{a} b_0^k \bigg|_{\Omega_1} + \frac{F_2}{a} b_0^k \bigg|_{\Omega_2} + \frac{F_3}{a} b_0^k \bigg|_{\Omega_3} \quad \text{[5.69]}
\]
Since the general expressions for the effective coefficients in terms of the principal piezoelectric constants are too lengthy to be reproduced here, we will present them numerically for a specific example, namely the material PZT-5A with properties shown in Table 5-2 [Cote et al. 2002]. Assuming that all reinforcements are made of the same orthotropic material, the effective piezoelectric coefficients (in c/mm²) are calculated to be:

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle P_{13} \rangle &= -1.6 \times 10^{-6} \left( \frac{F_1}{a} + \frac{F_2}{a} \right) \\
\langle P_{23} \rangle &= -5.5 \times 10^{-7} \left( \frac{F_1}{a} + \frac{F_2}{a} \right) - 2.1 \times 10^{-6} \frac{F_3}{a} \\
\langle P_{63} \rangle &= -9.4 \times 10^{-7} \left( \frac{F_1}{a} + \frac{F_2}{a} \right) \\
\langle P_{51} \rangle &= -1.8 \times 10^{-5} \left( \frac{F_1}{a} + \frac{F_2}{a} \right) \\
\langle P_{22} \rangle &= 1.1 \times 10^{-5} \left( \frac{F_1}{a} - \frac{F_2}{a} \right) \\
\langle P_{42} \rangle &= 6.1 \times 10^{-6} \left( \frac{F_1}{a} + \frac{F_2}{a} \right) + 2.5 \times 10^{-5} \frac{F_3}{a} \\
\langle P_{33} \rangle &= 1.8 \times 10^{-5} \left( \frac{F_1}{a} + \frac{F_2}{a} \right) + 1.9 \times 10^{-5} \frac{F_3}{a}
\end{align*}
\]

5.3.4.1.3. Example 3

The effective piezoelectric coefficients of the smart structure S3 of Figure 5-9 can be derived from those of S2 and will not be given here. However, some of these coefficients will be presented graphically in the next section when a comparison between all three structures is made.

5.3.4.2. Plots of Effective Properties and Discussion

The mathematical models derived in Sections 5.3.3 and 5.3.4 can be used in the design of a smart structure with a desirable combination of elastic and piezoelectric properties by carefully selecting the type, orientation, and geometric characteristics of the
actuators/reinforcements. In Section 5.3.3.2, some of the effective elastic coefficients pertaining to structures S1-S3 were plotted and compared. In this section we will repeat this for the case of the piezoelectric coefficients.

**Table 5-2: Piezoelastic properties of PZT-5A [Cote et al. 2002]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_{11}^{(p)} = C_{22}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>119899.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{33}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>109892.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{12}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>74732.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{23}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>74429.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{13}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>74429.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{24}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>21052.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{35}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>21052.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{66}^{(p)}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>22573.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{13}^{(p)}$ (C/mm²)</td>
<td>-5.45E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{23}^{(p)}$ (C/mm²)</td>
<td>-5.45E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{33}^{(p)}$ (C/mm²)</td>
<td>1.56E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{43}^{(p)}$ (C/mm²)</td>
<td>2.46E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{51}^{(p)}$ (C/mm²)</td>
<td>2.46E-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5-14: Plot of the $\langle P_{13} \rangle$ effective coefficient vs. $\varepsilon h_1/\varepsilon F$ for S1, S2, S3

Without loss of generality we will assume that the actuators have the same thickness and are made of the same material with properties given in Table 5-2 [Cote et al. 2002]. As in Section 5.3.3.2, we will vary the lengths of the unit cell for all the three structures and keep the thickness F of the reinforcements fixed. That is, we will take $\varepsilon h_1 = \varepsilon h_2$ = constant value in S1, S2, and S3. Figure 5-14, and Figure 5-15, show plots of the variation of $\langle P_{13} \rangle$, and $\langle P_{51} \rangle$ vs. $\varepsilon h_1$ or $\varepsilon h_2$. Figure 5-14 shows the variation of $\langle P_{13} \rangle$ vs. $h_1$.

It is observed that this coefficient has the same magnitude for S2 and S3 because of the same number, size and arrangement of the actuators in the $y_1$ direction. As expected, the presence of the extra actuators in S2 does not affect the value of $\langle P_{13} \rangle$ because these actuators are oriented in the $y_2$ direction and do not contribute to the $y_1$ direction. The magnitude of $\langle P_{13} \rangle$ is larger for S2 and S3 than S1 because the former have more actuators that affect the strain/stress in the $y_1$ direction (even though they are oriented at an angle to $y_1$) than the latter which only has a single actuator in the $y_1$ direction. Similar considerations apply for the $\langle P_{51} \rangle$ coefficient shown in Figure 5-15.
Figure 5-15: Plot of the \( \langle P_{51} \rangle \) effective coefficient vs. \( \varepsilon h_1/\varepsilon F \) for S1, S2, S3

As a further illustration, we will allow the thickness \( F \) of the actuators to vary but keep the length of the unit cell fixed. This means that \( \varepsilon h_1 = \varepsilon h_2 = \varepsilon \alpha \) in S1 and \( S3 = 2\varepsilon \alpha \) in S2 = constant. Figure 5-16 shows the variation of \( \langle P_{13} \rangle \) vs. \( \varepsilon F/\varepsilon h \). Similar to the above case, we observe that the magnitude of the coefficients for S2 and S3 is larger than for S1. Finally Figure 5-17 shows the variation of \( \langle P_{51} \rangle \) vs. \( \varepsilon F/\varepsilon h \).

Figure 5-16: Plot of effective elastic coefficients vs \( \varepsilon F/\varepsilon h \) for Structures S1, S2 and S3
5.3.5. Effective Thermal Expansion Coefficients for Prismatic Smart Structures

We will finally consider the thermal expansion coefficients. Referring to Figure 5-4, we begin by rewriting the appropriate unit cell problem given Equation [5.30] in terms of the new coordinates $\eta_2$ and $z$ as,

\[-\sin \varphi \frac{\partial b_{1l}}{\partial \eta_2} + \cos \varphi \frac{\partial b_{1l}}{\partial \eta_2} = 0 \quad [5.71]\]

\[\sin \varphi \ b_{1l} - \cos \varphi \ b_{1l} |_{s} = 0\]

where the thermal expansion coefficients as given by third expression of Equation [5.25] are:
\[ b_{ij} = K_{ij} + \sin \varphi \ C_{ijm1} \frac{\partial N_m}{\partial \eta_2} - \cos \varphi \ C_{ijm2} \frac{\partial N_m}{\partial \eta_2} \]  

[5.72]

We note that the matrix of the thermal expansion coefficients of an orthotropic material with respect to a coordinate system rotated by an arbitrary angle \( \varphi \) in the \( y_1-y_2 \) plane from the principle material system has the following form [Reddy, 1997].

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
K_{11} & K_{12} & 0 \\
K_{12} & K_{22} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & K_{33}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
K_{11} \\
K_{22} \\
K_{33}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
K_1 \\
K_2 \\
K_3
\end{bmatrix}
\]

[5.73]

Next, we assume a linear dependency of \( N_i \) function on \( \eta_2 \), i.e.

\[ N_i = \xi_i \eta_2 \]

[5.74]

Substituting Equations [5.72] and [5.74] into the interface conditions in Equation [5.71] gives three linear algebraic equations in the constants \( \xi_i \), the solution of which is given by the following equations:
$$\xi_1 = \frac{(sK_6 - cK_2)(s^2C_{16} + c^2C_{26} - scC_{12} - scC_{66}) - (sK_1 - cK_6)(s^2C_{16} + c^2C_{26} - 2scC_{26})}{(s^4C_{11} + s^2c^2C_{11}C_{22} - 2s^2cC_{11}C_{26} + c^4C_{66}C_{22} - 2sc^2C_{16}C_{26} + 2s^2c^2C_{16}C_{26}) - s^4C_{16}^2 + 2s^3cC_{16}C_{12} - c^4C_{26}^2 + 2sc^3C_{12}C_{26} - s^2c^2C_{12}^2 - 2s^2c^2C_{12}C_{66}}$$

$$\xi_2 = \frac{(sK_6 - cK_2)(s^2C_{11} + c^2C_{66} - 2scC_{16}) - (sK_1 - cK_6)(s^2C_{16} + c^2C_{26} - scC_{12} - scC_{66})}{(s^4C_{11}C_{66} - s^2c^2C_{11}C_{22} + 2s^3cC_{11}C_{26} - c^4C_{66}C_{22} + 2sc^3C_{16}C_{22} - 2s^2c^2C_{16}C_{26} + s^4C_{16}^2 - 2s^3cC_{16}C_{12} + c^4C_{26}^2 - 2sc^3C_{12}C_{26} + s^2c^2C_{12}^2 + 2s^2c^2C_{12}C_{66})}$$

$$\xi_3 = -\frac{(sK_3 - cK_4)}{(s^2C_{55} + c^2C_{44} - 2scC_{45})}$$

As with the elastic and piezoelectric coefficients, for a reinforcement/actuator oriented in a given direction $\varphi$, one calculates $\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3$. The results are then substituted in Equation [5.72] to calculate $b_{ij}$. This is repeated for each inclusion in the unit cell and finally the effective thermal expansion coefficients for the entire structure are obtained from third expression of Equation [5.21]. Some examples will be considered next.

### 5.3.5.1. Examples of Structures; Effective Thermal Expansion Coefficients

#### 5.3.5.1.1. Example 1

We will again consider structure S1 in Figure 5-6. Solving for $\xi_i$ from Equation [5.75] and then substituting the results in Equation [5.72] gives the following expressions for the non-vanishing thermal expansion coefficients for reinforcement $\Omega_1$

$$b_{11} = K_1 - \frac{C_{12}K_2}{C_{22}}; \quad b_{33} = K_{33} - \frac{C_{23}K_2}{C_{22}}$$

[5.76]
Repeating the procedure for reinforcement $\Omega_2$ results in the following:

$$b_{22} = K_2 - \frac{C_{12}K_1}{C_{11}}; \quad b_{33} = K_{33} - \frac{C_{13}K_1}{C_{11}}$$ [5.77]

With these results, the effective thermal expansion coefficients as given from Equation [5.21] are:

$$\langle K_y \rangle = \frac{F_2}{h_2} b_0 \bigg|_{\Omega_1} + \frac{F_1}{h_1} b_0 \bigg|_{\Omega_2}$$ [5.78]

We will now express these coefficients in terms of the thermal expansion constants referred to the principal material coordinate system using the familiar tensor transformation law:

$$K_{ij} = a_{im}a_{jn}K_{mn}^{(p)}$$ [5.79]

Assuming that both reinforcements are made of the same orthotropic material, the non-vanishing effective thermal expansion coefficients for S1 are:

$$\langle K_1 \rangle = \frac{F_2}{h_2} \left( K_1^{(p)} - \frac{v_1^{(p)} + v_1^{(p)}u_1^{(p)}}{1 - u_1^{(p)}u_1^{(p)}} E_1^{(p)} - K_2^{(p)} \right)$$

$$\langle K_2 \rangle = \frac{F_1}{h_1} \left( K_2^{(p)} - \frac{v_1^{(p)} + v_1^{(p)}u_1^{(p)}}{1 - u_1^{(p)}u_1^{(p)}} E_2^{(p)} - K_2^{(p)} \right)$$ [5.80]

$$\langle K_3 \rangle = \frac{F_1}{h_1} \left( K_3^{(p)} - \frac{v_1^{(p)} + v_1^{(p)}u_1^{(p)}}{1 - u_1^{(p)}u_1^{(p)}} E_2^{(p)} - K_2^{(p)} \right)$$
5.3.5.1.2. Example 2

Let us now consider structure S2 of Figure 5-8. Following the same methodology as before, the effective thermal expansion coefficients in each reinforcement region are determined and the results are finally superimposed according to third expression of Equation [5.21]:

\[
\langle P_{ik} \rangle = \frac{F_1}{a} b_{i1} |_{\alpha_1} + \frac{F_2}{a} b_{i2} |_{\alpha_2} + \frac{F_3}{a} b_{i3} |_{\alpha_3}
\]  

[5.81]

As for the case of the elastic and piezoelectric coefficients, the expressions for the effective thermal expansion coefficients in terms of the material (principal) constants are too lengthy to be conveniently shown here, and as such, we will evaluate them numerically for a specific material. Thus, assuming all reinforcements are made of E-glass/Epoxy with properties given in Table 5-1 [Daniel, 1994] the effective thermal expansion coefficients (in MPa/°C) are calculated to be:

\[
\langle K_1 \rangle = 0.14 \frac{F_1}{a} + 0.14 \frac{F_2}{a} ; \langle K_2 \rangle = 0.23 \frac{F_1}{a} + 0.23 \frac{F_2}{a} + 0.33 \frac{F_3}{a}
\]

\[
\langle K_6 \rangle = 0.08 \frac{F_1}{a} - 0.08 \frac{F_2}{a} ; \langle K_3 \rangle = 0.19 \frac{F_1}{a} + 0.19 \frac{F_2}{a} + 0.20 \frac{F_3}{a}
\]  

[5.82]

5.3.5.1.3. Example 3

The effective thermal expansion coefficients of the structure S3 of Figure 5-9 can easily be derived from those of S2. Some of these coefficients will be presented graphically in the next section when a comparison between all three structures is made.
5.3.5.2. Plots of Effective Properties and Discussion

As was done previously for the case of elastic and piezoelectric coefficients, we will now compare typical effective thermal expansion coefficients for structures S1, S2 and S3. We will assume that the reinforcements have the same thickness and are made of the same material with properties given in Table 5-1 [Daniel, 1994].

Similar to the above examples, in the first case we will vary the length of the unit cell keeping thickness constant. Figure 5-18 and Figure 5-19 plot the variation of $\langle K_1 \rangle$ and $\langle K_2 \rangle$ vs. $\varepsilon h_l/\varepsilon F$ respectively. The trends in these plots should be clear on account of the discussion in sections 5.3.3.2 and 5.4.3.2. Similarly, considerations apply to Figure 5-20 and Figure 5-21 which plot, respectively, $\langle K_1 \rangle$ and $\langle K_2 \rangle$ vs. $\varepsilon F/\varepsilon h_l$ respectively.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 5-18**: Plot of $\langle K_1 \rangle$ effective coefficients vs $\varepsilon h_l/\varepsilon F$ for Structures S1, S2 and S3
Figure 5-19: Plot of the $\langle K_2 \rangle$ effective coefficient vs. $\varepsilon h_1 / \varepsilon F$ for S1, S2, S3

Figure 5-20: Plot of $\langle K_1 \rangle$ effective coefficients vs $\varepsilon F / \varepsilon h$ for Structures S1, S2 and S3
Figure 5-21: Plot of the $\langle K_2 \rangle$ effective coefficient vs. $\varepsilon F/\varepsilon h$ for S1, S2, S3

5.4. Conclusions

The method of asymptotic homogenization was used to analyze a prismatic smart composite structure with orthotropic constituents, through the development of a suitable micromechanical model.

The derived model was applied to three different structures of practical interest (with rectangular, hexagonal, and rhombic configurations) consisting of orthotropic reinforcements and/or actuators. The effective elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients for these structures were determined and then compared graphically for the three structures. The usefulness of the presented methodology lies in the fact that the derived model can be used in design and analysis to tailor the effective coefficients of any structure to meet the engineering criteria pertaining to a particular application, by selecting the type, number, orientation, and size of the reinforcements.
6. ASYMPTOTIC HOMOGENIZATION MODEL FOR THREE-DIMENSIONAL NETWORK REINFORCED COMPOSITE STRUCTURES

6.1. Introduction

The present chapter develops a novel asymptotic homogenization model for three-dimensional network reinforced composite structures (Figure 6-1). In this model, the composite structure is made of periodically arranged families of isotropic reinforcements and, if desired, each family may have different mechanical properties.

The rest of the chapter is organized as follows: The basic problem formulation and model development is presented in Section 6.2. Section 6.3 derives the general model for three-dimensional network reinforced composite structures and uses it to analyze and discuss various examples. Finally section 6.4 gives a brief conclusion.

![Figure 6-1: Three-Dimensional Network Reinforced Composite Structure](image)
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6.2. Homogenization Model for Three-Dimensional Structures

6.2.1. General Model

The micromechanical model for a three-dimensional network reinforced composite structure will be developed from the general model (modified slightly since no actuation or thermal expansion effects will be considered here) presented in the previous chapter. For the sake of convenience the main results of that model will be repeated here since they provide the motivation for the development of the new model of interest.

Consider a general composite structure representing an inhomogeneous solid occupying domain $G$ with boundary $\partial G$ that contains a large number of periodically arranged reinforcements as shown in Figure 6-2.

![Figure 6-2: Three-Dimensional composite structure with its periodicity (unit) cell](image)

The elastic deformation of this structure can be described by means of the following set of equations:
\[ \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^\varepsilon}{\partial x_j} = f_i \text{in } G \]
\[ u^\varepsilon(x) = 0 \text{ on } \partial G \]  \[6.1\]

where,

\[ \sigma_{ij}^\varepsilon(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) = C_{ijkl} \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) e_{kl}^\varepsilon \left( x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \]  \[6.2\]

\[ e_{ij}^\varepsilon \left( x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} \left( x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} \left( x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \right] \]  \[6.3\]

The various field variables in Equations [6.1]-[6.3] have been defined in sections 4.3.1. and 5.2.1. The periodic composite structure in Figure 6-2 is seen to be made up of a large number of “unit cell” periodically arranged with the domain G.

6.2.2. Asymptotic expansion, Governing equation, and unit cell problem

In view of the introduction of “fast” variable \( y \) according to,

\[ y_i = \frac{x_i}{\varepsilon} \]  \[6.4\]

the boundary value problem in Equation [6.1] transforms to:
\[ \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^\varepsilon}{\partial x_j} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^\varepsilon}{\partial y_j} = f_i \quad \text{in } G \quad \text{[6.5]} \]

\[ u^\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial G \]

The displacement and stress fields are subsequently expressed as infinite power series in terms of the small parameter \( \varepsilon \),

\[ u^\varepsilon(x, y) = u^{(0)}(x) + \varepsilon u^{(1)}(x, y) + \varepsilon^2 u^{(2)}(x, y) + \ldots \quad \text{[6.6]} \]

\[ \sigma_{ij}^\varepsilon(x, y) = \sigma_{ij}^{(0)}(x, y) + \varepsilon \sigma_{ij}^{(1)}(x, y) + \varepsilon^2 \sigma_{ij}^{(2)}(x, y) + \ldots \quad \text{[6.7]} \]

where,

\[ \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^{(0)}}{\partial y_j} = 0 \quad \text{[6.8]} \]

\[ \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^{(1)}}{\partial y_j} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}^{(0)}}{\partial x_j} = f_i \]

and

\[ \sigma_{ij}^{(0)} = C_{ijkl} \left( \frac{\partial u_k^{(0)}}{\partial x_l} + \frac{\partial u_k^{(1)}}{\partial y_l} \right) \quad \text{[6.9]} \]

\[ \sigma_{ij}^{(1)} = C_{ijkl} \left( \frac{\partial u_k^{(1)}}{\partial x_l} + \frac{\partial u_k^{(2)}}{\partial y_l} \right) \]

while,

\[ u_n^{(1)}(x, y) = V_n(x) + \frac{\partial u_k^{(0)}(x)}{\partial x_1} N_{n}^{kl}(y) \quad \text{[6.10]} \]
Functions $N_{m}^{kl}$ in Equation [6.10] are periodic in $y$ and they satisfy the following equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left( C_{ijkl}(y) \frac{\partial N_{m}^{kl}(y)}{\partial y_n} \right) = - \frac{\partial C_{ijkl}}{\partial y_j}$$  \[6.11\]

It is seen that Equation [6.11] depends entirely on the fast variable $y$ and is thus solved on the domain $Y$ of the unit cell remembering at the same time the periodicity of $C_{ijkl}, N_{m}^{kl}$ in $y_i$. Consequently, Equation [6.11] is appropriately referred to as the "unit-cell" problem.

Finally, from Equations [6.8]-[6.11] and after averaging over the domain $Y$ of the unit cell with volume $|Y|$ (homogenization process) we arrive at:

$$\bar{C}_{ijkl} \frac{\partial^2 u_{k}^{(0)}(x)}{\partial x_j \partial x_l} = f_i$$  \[6.12\]

where

$$\bar{C}_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{|Y|} \int_Y \left( C_{ijkl}(y) + C_{ijmn}(y) \frac{\partial N_{m}^{kl}}{\partial y_n} \right) dv$$  \[6.13\]

The coefficients $\bar{C}_{ijkl}$ are of-course the effective elastic coefficients. We reiterate that the effective elastic coefficients are free from the periodicity complications that characterize their actual material counterparts, $C_{ijkl}$, and as such, are more amenable to analytical and numerical treatment.
6.3. Three-Dimensional Network Reinforced Composite Structures

For the problem at hand, we turn our attention to a general macroscopically anisotropic three-dimensional composite structure reinforced with \( N \) families of reinforcements or bars, see for example Figure 6-1, where a particular case of 3 families of reinforcements is shown. The members of each family are made of generally different isotropic materials and are oriented at angles \( \varphi_1^n, \varphi_2^n, \varphi_3^n \) (where \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \)) with the \( y_1, y_2, y_3 \) axes respectively. Furthermore, they are assumed to be much stiffer than the surrounding matrix so that we are justified in neglecting the contribution of the latter in the ensuing analysis. For the particular case of framework or lattice network structures the surrounding matrix is absent and this is modeled by assuming zero matrix rigidity. The nature of the network structure of Figure 6-1 is such that it would be more efficient if we first considered a simpler type of unit cell made of only a single reinforcement as shown in Figure 6-3. Having solved this, the effective elastic coefficients of more general structures with several families of reinforcements can readily be determined by superposition of solution for each family found separately. In doing so, we accept of course the error incurred at the regions of intersection between the reinforcements, but this error is localized and will not add significantly to the integral over the unit cell. In order to calculate the effective coefficients for the simpler structure of Figure 6-3, one must first solve the unit cell problem Equation [6.11] and then apply the formula in Equation [6.13].

6.3.1. Problem Formulation

We begin the problem formulation for the structure of Figure 6-3 by introducing the following notation:
\[ b_{ij}^{kl} = C_{ijkl}(y) \frac{\partial N_m^{kl}(y)}{\partial y_n} + C_{ijkl} \] [6.14]

With this definition in mind, the unit cell problem of Equation [6.11] becomes:

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \{ b_{ij}^{kl} \} = 0 \] [6.15]

**Figure 6-3**: Unit cell of composite network reinforced with a single reinforcement family

Because of the multiconstituent nature of the network structures under consideration, it is prudent to also consider the interfacial conditions that exist between the matrix and the reinforcements. The first such condition is a direct consequence of the continuity of the \( N_m^{kl}(y) \) functions and may be stated as:

\[ N_n^{kl}(r)_{ls} = N_n^{kl}(m) \] [6.16]
Furthermore, continuity of the displacement field leads to:

\[ b_{ij}^{kl} n_j \big|_r = b_{ij}^{kl} n_j \big|_m \]  \hspace{1cm} [6.17]

In Equation [6.16] and [6.17] the suffixes "s", "r" and "m" stand for "interface", "reinforcement" and "matrix" respectively. As well, \( n_j \) are the components of the unit normal vector to the interface. As mentioned earlier on, we will further assume that the structure of interest is made of high modulus reinforcements and "soft" matrix. As such, we may take \( b_{ij}^s(m) \approx 0 \) and thus, condition [6.17] becomes:

\[ b_{ij}^{kl} n_j \big|_s = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} [6.18]

In summary, the final problem that must be solved for the three-dimensional network structure reinforced with a single family of isotropic bars is:

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \{b_{ij}^{kl}\} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} [6.19]

\[ b_{ij}^{kl} n_j \big|_s = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} [6.20]

### 6.3.2. Coordinate Transformation

Before proceeding to the solution of the unit cell problem given in Equations [6.19] and [6.20], we perform a coordinate transformation of the microscopic coordinates \( \{y_1, y_2, y_3\} \) onto \( \{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3\} \) as shown in Figure 6-4. The coordinate transformation is carried out in
such a way that the $\eta_1$ coordinate axis coincides with the direction of the reinforcement and $\eta_2$, $\eta_3$ are perpendicular to the reinforcement (and each other).

![Diagram of unit cell in original and rotated macroscopic coordinates]

**Figure 6-4:** Unit cell in original and rotated macroscopic coordinates

Thus, derivatives transform according to:

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} = q_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_i} \quad [6.21]
$$

where $q_{ij}$ are the components of the matrix of direction cosines characterizing the axis rotation.

With this choice of coordinate system, it is evident that the problem [6.19]-[6.20] will be independent of $\eta_1$ and will only depend on $\eta_2$ and $\eta_3$. Consequently, the order of the differential equations is reduced by one, and the analysis of the problem is simplified.
6.3.3. Determination of Elastic Coefficients

With reference to Figure 6-4, we begin by rewriting Equations [6.19] and [6.20] in terms of the \( \eta_i \) coordinates to get:

\[
b_{ij}^{kl} = C_{ijkl} q_{np} \frac{\partial N_m^{kl}}{\partial \eta_p} + C_{ijkl} \]

\[
b_{ij}^{kl} q_{i2} \eta_2' + b_{ij}^{kl} q_{i3} \eta_3' \bigg|_s = 0 \tag{6.22}
\]

Here, \( \eta_i' \) represent the components of the unit normal vector expressed in terms of the new coordinates. Expanding first expression of Equation [6.22] remembering at the same time the independency of the problem on \( \eta_l \) gives:

\[
b_{ij}^{kl} = C_{ijkl} + C_{ij1} q_{21} \frac{\partial N_m^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{ij2} q_{22} \frac{\partial N_m^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} + C_{ij3} q_{23} \frac{\partial N_m^{kl}}{\partial \eta_2} +
\]

\[+ C_{ij1} q_{31} \frac{\partial N_m^{kl}}{\partial \eta_3} + C_{ij2} q_{32} \frac{\partial N_m^{kl}}{\partial \eta_3} + C_{ij3} q_{33} \frac{\partial N_m^{kl}}{\partial \eta_3} \tag{6.23}
\]

It is possible to solve the system [6.22] by assuming a linear variation of the \( N_i^{kl} \) functions in \( \eta_2 \) and \( \eta_3 \), i.e.

\[
N_1^{kl} = \lambda_1 \eta_2 + \lambda_2 \eta_3 \]
\[
N_2^{kl} = \lambda_3 \eta_2 + \lambda_4 \eta_3 \]
\[
N_3^{kl} = \lambda_5 \eta_2 + \lambda_6 \eta_3 \tag{6.24}
\]

where \( \lambda_i \) are constants to be determined from the boundary conditions. From Equations [6.23] and [6.24], the elastic \( b_{ij}^{kl} \) coefficients may be written as follows:
\[
\begin{align*}
\beta_{11}^k &= C_{11kl} + C_{11q21\lambda_1} + C_{11q31\lambda_2} + C_{12q22\lambda_3} + C_{12q32\lambda_4} + C_{13q23\lambda_5} + C_{13q33\lambda_6} \\
\beta_{22}^k &= C_{22kl} + C_{12q21\lambda_1} + C_{12q31\lambda_2} + C_{22q22\lambda_3} + C_{22q32\lambda_4} + C_{23q23\lambda_5} + C_{23q33\lambda_6} \\
\beta_{33}^k &= C_{33kl} + C_{13q21\lambda_1} + C_{13q31\lambda_2} + C_{23q22\lambda_3} + C_{23q32\lambda_4} + C_{33q23\lambda_5} + C_{33q33\lambda_6} \\
\beta_{23}^k &= C_{23kl} + C_{44q23\lambda_3} + C_{44q33\lambda_4} + C_{44q22\lambda_5} + C_{44q33\lambda_6} \\
\beta_{13}^k &= C_{13kl} + C_{55q23\lambda_1} + C_{55q33\lambda_2} + C_{55q21\lambda_4} + C_{55q31\lambda_6} \\
\beta_{12}^k &= C_{12kl} + C_{66q22\lambda_1} + C_{66q32\lambda_2} + C_{66q21\lambda_3} + C_{66q31\lambda_6}
\end{align*}
\] [6.25]

Here \( C_{ij} \) are the elastic coefficients of the reinforcements in the contacted notation (see e.g. Reddy, 1997). Substituting Equation [6.25] into the second expression of Equation [6.22] and letting \( j \) take on the values 1, 2, 3 results in 6 linear algebraic equations in \( \lambda_i \), \( i=1, 2, \ldots, 6 \):

\[
\begin{align*}
A_1\lambda_1 + A_2\lambda_2 + A_3\lambda_3 + A_4\lambda_4 + A_5\lambda_5 + A_6\lambda_6 + A_7 &= 0 \\
A_8\lambda_1 + A_9\lambda_2 + A_{10}\lambda_3 + A_{11}\lambda_4 + A_{12}\lambda_5 + A_{13}\lambda_6 + A_{14} &= 0 \\
A_{15}\lambda_1 + A_{16}\lambda_2 + A_{17}\lambda_3 + A_{18}\lambda_4 + A_{19}\lambda_5 + A_{20}\lambda_6 + A_{21} &= 0 \\
A_{22}\lambda_1 + A_{23}\lambda_2 + A_{24}\lambda_3 + A_{25}\lambda_4 + A_{26}\lambda_5 + A_{27}\lambda_6 + A_{28} &= 0 \\
A_{29}\lambda_1 + A_{30}\lambda_2 + A_{31}\lambda_3 + A_{32}\lambda_4 + A_{33}\lambda_5 + A_{34}\lambda_6 + A_{35} &= 0 \\
A_{36}\lambda_1 + A_{37}\lambda_2 + A_{38}\lambda_3 + A_{39}\lambda_4 + A_{40}\lambda_5 + A_{41}\lambda_6 + A_{42} &= 0
\end{align*}
\] [6.26]

where \( A_i \) are constants which depend on the direction of the reinforcement as well as its mechanical properties. The explicit expressions for these constants are given in Appendix F. Once the system of Equations [6.26] is solved, the determined \( \lambda_i \) coefficients are substituted back into Equation [6.25] to solve for the \( \beta_{ij}^k \) coefficients. In turn, these are used to calculate the effective elastic coefficients of the structure of Figure 6-3 by integrating over the volume of the unit cell as explained below in Section 6.3.4.
6.3.4. **Effective Elastic Coefficients**

The effective elastic coefficients of the network composite structure of Figure 6-3 are obtained by means of Equation [6.13], which, on account of notation [6.14] becomes:

\[
\bar{C}_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{V} \int_V b_{ij}^{kl} dv
\]  

**[6.27]**

Assuming that the length (within unit cell) and cross-sectional area of the reinforcement in coordinates \(\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}\) are \(L\) and \(A\) respectively, and that the volume of the unit cell is \(V\) in the same coordinates \(\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}\), then the effective elastic coefficients are,

\[
\bar{C}_{ijkl} = \frac{AL}{V} b_{ij}^{kl} = V_f b_{ij}^{kl}
\]  

**[6.28]**

where \(b_{ij}^{kl}\) is constant and \(V_f\) is the volume fraction of the reinforcement within the unit cell.

For network structures with more than a single family of reinforcements, the effective coefficients can be determined by superposition ignoring stress concentration and other local complications at the regions of intersections. For example, for a network composite structure with \(N\) families of isotropic reinforcements, the effective elastic coefficients will be given by,

\[
\bar{C}_{ijkl} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} V_f^{(n)} b_{ij}^{(n)kl}
\]  

**[6.29]**

where the superscript \((n)\) represents the \(n^{th}\) reinforcement family.
6.3.5. **Examples of network structures**

Let us now apply above developed theory to the analysis of some examples.

6.3.5.1. **Example 1- Convergence of Model for the Case of 2D Composite Network**

For the purposes of the first example, we will verify the validity of our model for the case of 2D network structures whereby the reinforcements lie entirely in the \( Y_1 - Y_2 \) plane. The pertinent unit cell for such a structure is shown in Figure 6-5.

Solving Equation [6.26] for \( \lambda_i \) and substituting the results into Equation [6.25] gives the following expressions for the non-zero elastic coefficients.

\[
\begin{align*}
  b_{11}^{11} &= E \cos^4 \theta, \quad b_{11}^{17} = E \cos^3 \theta \sin \theta, \quad b_{12}^{22} = b_{12}^{12} = E \cos^2 \theta \sin^2 \theta \\
  b_{22}^{12} &= E \cos \theta \cos^3 \theta, \quad b_{22}^{22} = E \sin^4 \theta, \quad b_{ij}^{4i} = b_{ij}^{5i}
\end{align*}
\]  

[6.30]

Here, \( E \) stands for the Young's Modulus of the reinforcing material. These results are the same as those obtained earlier by Kalamkarov [1992] who developed an asymptotic homogenization model for a thin flat network-reinforced composite plates.

6.3.5.2. **Example 2**

The second example pertains to the cubic structure of Figure 6-6. This composite structure has three families of reinforcements, each family oriented along one of the coordinate axes.
Figure 6-5: Unit cell for (2D) structure with reinforcements in the Y₁-Y₂ plane

Figure 6-6: Cubic network structure with reinforcements in Y₁, Y₂, Y₃ directions

Noting that $q_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$, where $\delta_{ij}$ are the components of the identity tensor, the values of $\lambda_i$ for the reinforcement in the Y₁ direction are readily obtained from Equation [6.26] to be as follows:
\[ \lambda_1 = \frac{-C_{12k}}{C_{66}}, \lambda_2 = \frac{-C_{13k}}{C_{55}}, \lambda_3 = \frac{C_{33} C_{23k} - C_{23} C_{33k}}{C_{23}^2 - C_{22} C_{33}}, \]
\[ \lambda_4 + \lambda_5 = \frac{-C_{23k}}{C_{44}}, \lambda_6 = \frac{C_{22} C_{33k} - C_{23} C_{22k}}{C_{23}^2 - C_{22} C_{33}}. \]  [6.31]

From Equation [6.25], the \( b_{ij}^k \) coefficients are given by:

\[ b_{11}^k = C_{11k} + \frac{[C_{12} C_{33} - C_{13} C_{23}] C_{23k} + [C_{13} C_{22} - C_{12} C_{23}] C_{33k}}{C_{23}^2 - C_{22} C_{33}}. \]  [6.32]

After substituting expressions for elastic coefficients we obtain:

\[ b_{11}^{11} = E \]
\[ b_{12}^{22} = b_{11}^{33} = b_{11}^{23} = b_{11}^{13} = b_{11}^{12} = 0 \]
\[ b_{22}^{k1} = b_{33}^{k1} = b_{23}^{k1} = b_{13}^{k1} = b_{12}^{k1} = 0 \]  [6.33]

Repeating the procedure for the reinforcement in the \( Y_2 \) direction yields:

\[ b_{22}^{22} = E \]
\[ b_{11}^{22} = b_{22}^{33} = b_{22}^{23} = b_{22}^{13} = b_{22}^{12} = 0 \]
\[ b_{11}^{k1} = b_{33}^{k1} = b_{23}^{k1} = b_{13}^{k1} = b_{12}^{k1} = 0 \]  [6.34]

Finally, for the reinforcement in the \( Y_3 \) direction, the results are:

\[ b_{33}^{33} = E \]
\[ b_{33}^{11} = b_{33}^{22} = b_{33}^{33} = b_{33}^{23} = b_{33}^{12} = 0 \]
\[ b_{11}^{k1} = b_{22}^{k1} = b_{23}^{k1} = b_{13}^{k1} = b_{12}^{k1} = 0 \]  [6.35]
We are now ready to compute the effective elastic coefficients of the cubic network structures shown in Figure 6-6. Let the length (within unit cell) and cross-sectional area of the \( i^{th} \) reinforcement in the \( Y_i \) direction be \( L_i \) and \( A_i \) respectively (in coordinates \( y_1, y_2, \) \( y_3 \)). Also let us assume that \( E_i \) is the Young’s modulus of the reinforcement in the \( Y_i \) direction. Then, for a unit cell of volume \( V \), the corresponding volume fraction \( v_i \) is given by \( v_i = A_i L_i / V \). Thus, from Equations [6.29], [6.33] and [6.35] the non-zero effective elastic coefficients for the composite network structure of Figure 6-6 are,

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{C}_{11} &= \frac{A_1 L_1}{V} E_{(1)} = v_1 E_{(1)}; \\
\tilde{C}_{22} &= \frac{A_2 L_2}{V} E_{(2)} = v_2 E_{(2)}; \\
\tilde{C}_{33} &= \frac{A_3 L_3}{V} E_{(3)} = v_3 E_{(3)}
\end{align*}
\]

[6.36]

where \( E_{(i)} \) is the young’s modulus of the \( i^{th} \) reinforcement. In the case where the reinforcements have the same material properties (namely Young’s modulus, \( E \)) the expression in Equation [6.36] become,

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{C}_{11} &= \frac{A_1}{V} E = v_1 E; & \tilde{C}_{22} &= \frac{A_2}{V} E = v_2 E; & \tilde{C}_{33} &= \frac{A_3}{V} E = v_3 E
\end{align*}
\]

[6.37]

6.3.5.3. Example 3

This example pertains to a composite network structure with a conical arrangement of isotropic reinforcements. In this example (to be referred to as structure \( S_1 \)) the unit cell is made of three reinforcements oriented as shown in Figure 6-7. The expressions for the effective coefficients are readily determined from Equation [6.25], [6.26] and [6.29].
Although the expressions are too lengthy to be reproduced here, some of these coefficients will be presented graphically in the next section.

![Spatial arrangement of reinforcements as viewed from the top](image)

**Figure 6-7:** Unit cell for composite network structure with conical arrangement of isotropic reinforcements (Structure S₁)

### 6.3.5.4. Example 4

In this example let us consider a general unit cell (S₂) as shown in Figure 6-8. The general unit cell consists of three reinforcements two of which span from different corners of the unit cell to the diametrically opposite ones and the third reinforcement is oriented from the middle of the bottom edge to the middle of the top edge on the opposite face.

The effective coefficients for this structure are calculated in the same manner as for the ones in the previous examples. The resulting expressions are too lengthy to be reproduced here. However as an illustration some of the effective coefficients are plotted vs. the height of the unit-cell in the following section.
6.3.6. Plots of Effective properties and discussion

The mathematical model and methodology presented in Sections 6.3-6.3.4 can be used in analysis and design to tailor the effective elastic coefficients of any three-dimensional composite network structure by changing the material, number, orientation and/or cross-sectional area and material selection of the reinforcements. In this Section typical effective coefficients will be computed and plotted. For illustration purposes, we will assume that the reinforcements have a Young’s Modulus and Poisson’s Ratio equal to 200 GPa and 0.3, respectively.

We will begin with the plot of some of the effective coefficients for the structure S1 shown in Figure 6-7. The effective coefficients will be plotted vs. the total volume fraction of the reinforcements within the unit cell. As expected, the effective coefficients increase with an increase in the overall reinforcement volume fraction, as shown in Figure 6-9 and Figure 6-10.
Figure 6-9: Plot of $\tilde{C}_{11}$ vs. reinforcement volume fraction for structure $S_1$

Figure 6-10: Plot of $\tilde{C}_{55}$ vs. reinforcement volume fraction for structure $S_1$
Figure 6-11: Plot of the $\tilde{C}_{11}$ effective coefficient vs. inclination of reinforcements with the $Y_3$ axis pertaining to structure $S_1$ for reinforcement volume fractions equal to 0.03, 0.045, and 0.06

It would also be of interest to plot the variation of some of the effective coefficients of structure $S_1$ with the angle of inclination of the reinforcements to the $Y_3$ axis. As this angle increases, the reinforcements are oriented progressively closer to the $Y_1$ and $Y_2$ axis and the stiffness in these directions is expected to increase. Indeed a reference to Figure 6-11 and Figure 6-12 shows precisely that. On the contrary, (see Figure 6-13) at the same time as the stiffness in the $Y_1$ and $Y_2$ directions increases, the corresponding value in the $Y_3$ direction decreases because the reinforcements are oriented further away from the $Y_3$ axis.
Figure 6-12: Plot of the $\bar{C}_{22}$ effective coefficient vs. inclination of reinforcements with the $Y_3$ axis pertaining to structure $S_1$ for reinforcement volume fractions equal to 0.03, 0.045, and 0.06.

Figure 6-13: Plot of the $\bar{C}_{33}$ effective coefficient vs. inclination of reinforcements with the $Y_3$ axis pertaining to structure $S_1$ for reinforcement volume fractions equal to 0.03, 0.045, and 0.06.
We now turn our attention to the $S_2$ composite structure (Figure 6-8) and plot some of the effective coefficients by varying the height of the unit cell but keeping the other dimensions as well as the cross-sectional area of the reinforcements constant. It is noted that as the height of the unit cell is varied, the lengths and orientations of the reinforcements change.

Figure 6-14 shows a plot of the effective coefficients $\tilde{C}_{11}$, $\tilde{C}_{22}$, $\tilde{C}_{33}$, and $\tilde{C}_{55}$ vs. the height of the unit cell. As the height of the unit-cell increases, the volume fraction of the reinforcements decreases and at the same time the reinforcements are oriented closer to the $Y_3$ axis and further away from $Y_1$, and $Y_2$ axis. Both of these effects contribute to the stiffness in the $Y_1$, and $Y_2$ direction decreasing. However, $\tilde{C}_{33}$ increases because the increase in stiffness due to a smaller angle of inclination with the $Y_3$ axis dominates the decrease in stiffness due to the reinforcements volume fraction decreasing.

![Graph showing effective coefficients vs. height of unit cell](image)

**Figure 6-14:** Plot of $\tilde{C}_{11}$, $\tilde{C}_{22}$, $\tilde{C}_{33}$, and $\tilde{C}_{55}$ effective coefficient vs. height of the unit cell for $S_2$ structure shown in Figure 6-8
Finally, we are interested in comparing the effective coefficients of structures \( S_1 \) (Figure 6-7) and \( S_2 \) (Figure 6-8) by varying the volume fraction. The volume fraction for structure \( S_1 \) is varied by varying the reinforcement cross-sectional properties and for structure \( S_2 \) by varying the height (h) of the unit cell. From the Figure 6-15 we see that \( \tilde{C}_{33} \) for \( S_1 \) increases as the volume fraction increases and at the same time for \( S_2 \) it decreases because the fibers in the latter are oriented progressively further away from the \( Y_3 \) axis as the volume fraction increases. Beyond a certain volume fraction, \( S_1 \) is stiffer in the \( Y_3 \) direction. Of course these trends can be easily changed. For example, if the volume fraction of the reinforcements of \( S_2 \) is changed by keeping all dimensions of unit cell constant (i.e. direction cosines pertinent to reinforcements unchanged) and changing its cross-sectional properties then, increasing the volume fractions would increase \( \tilde{C}_{33} \), and the relative stiffness between the two structures would be different than that depicted in Figure 6-15. What’s important is to realize that the model allows for complete flexibility in designing a structure with desirable mechanical and geometrical characteristics.

![Plot of \( \tilde{C}_{33} \) vs. total volume fraction for structures \( S_1 \) (Figure 6-7) and \( S_2 \) (Figure 6-8)](image)

**Figure 6-15:** Plot of \( \tilde{C}_{33} \) vs. total volume fraction for structures \( S_1 \) (Figure 6-7) and \( S_2 \) (Figure 6-8)
6.4. Conclusions

A general three-dimensional micromechanical model pertaining to globally anisotropic periodic composite structures reinforced with a spatial network of isotropic reinforcements is developed. The derived model is illustrated by means of different composite structures with cubic or conical configurations of reinforcements. The usefulness of this work lies in the fact that the model can be used to tailor the effective coefficients of any three-dimensional composite structure to meet the requirements of a particular application by changing such geometric or material parameters as the type, number, cross-sectional dimensions, and relative angular orientation of the reinforcements.
7. CONCLUSIONS

The first mathematical model developed applied a general 3-dimensional micromechanical model pertaining to smart composite layers with wavy boundaries to the case of thin smart plates reinforced with a network of generally orthotropic bars that may also exhibit piezoelectric behavior. The method used for the development of the model is that of asymptotic homogenization which reduces the original boundary value problem into a set of three decoupled problems each problem characterized by two differential equations. These three sets of differential equations, referred to as "unit cell problems", deal, separately, with the elastic, piezoelectric, and thermal expansion behavior of the network reinforced smart composite plates. The solution of the unit cell problems yields expressions for effective elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients. These coefficients are universal in nature and can be used to study a wide variety of boundary value problems associated with a smart structure of a given geometry.

The developed model is illustrated by means of three different smart structures, with orthotropic actuators/reinforcements oriented in a rectangular, triangular or rhombic manner. The effective coefficients pertinent to these structures were calculated and presented graphically. It is shown in this work that the effective coefficients of any network-reinforced smart composite plate can be customized to meet the requirements of a particular application by changing certain material or geometric parameters of interest such as size, type, angular orientation, etc. of the actuators/reinforcements so that the desirable properties are obtained.

The second mathematical model developed was used to analyze a prismatic smart composite structure with orthotropic constituents. The original boundary value problem which is characterized by rapidly oscillating material coefficients and is therefore difficult to solve, is transformed to a similar problem with effective coefficients which are independent of the microscopic variables. Consequently, this problem is much more amenable to analytical (or numerical) techniques.
Once the general model is derived and the governing equations including the appropriate interface conditions are determined, the effective elastic, actuation, and thermal expansion coefficients can be calculated. The actuation coefficients characterize the intrinsic transducer nature of active smart materials that can be used to induce strains and stresses in a controlled manner. The analysis presented was applied to piezoelectric materials, but the equations derived should be considered to hold equally well if the material in question exhibits for example magnetostrictive characteristics, or is associated with some general transduction characteristics that can be used to induce residual strains and stresses.

The derived model was applied to three different structures of practical interest (with rectangular, hexagonal, or rhombic configurations) consisting of orthotropic reinforcements and/or actuators. The effective elastic, piezoelectric and thermal expansion coefficients for these structures were determined and then compared graphically for the three structures. The usefulness of the presented methodology lies in the fact that the derived models can be used in design and analysis to tailor the effective coefficients of any structure to meet the engineering criteria pertaining to a particular application, by selecting the type, number, orientation, and size of the reinforcements.

The third and final mathematical model developed is used to analyze 3-D globally anisotropic periodic composite structures reinforced with a spatial network of isotropic reinforcements is developed. The model, which is developed using the asymptotic homogenization technique, transforms the original boundary value problem into a simpler one that is characterized by some effective elastic coefficients. The effective coefficients are shown to depend only on the pertinent geometric and material characteristics of the periodicity cell and are therefore independent of the global formulation of the problem.

The derived model is illustrated by means of different composite structures with cubic or conical configurations of reinforcements. As with the previous model, the usefulness of this work lies in the fact that the model can be used to tailor the effective coefficients of any three-dimensional composite structure to meet the requirements of a particular
application by changing such geometric or material parameters as the type, number, cross-sectional dimensions, and relative angular orientation of the reinforcements. In the particular case in which the reinforcements form only a two-dimensional (planar) network, the results are shown to converge to previous models developed by Kalamkarov (1992) who also used the asymptotic homogenization technique and Pshenichnov (1982) who used stress-strain relationships in the reinforcements.
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APPENDIX

Appendix A. Quantities that enter Equation [4.39], [4.64], and [4.78]

We give here the expressions for the constants \( \alpha_1 - \alpha_9 \) that are needed to calculate the elastic \( (b^{\mu}_{\nu}) \), piezoelectric \( (d^{\nu}_{\mu}) \) and thermal expansion coefficients \( (\Theta_{ij}) \) for the unit cell of Figure 4-6. They are:

\[
\alpha_1 = \frac{sc_{11}c_{26}}{h_1 h_2} - \frac{s^2 c_{11}c_{66}}{h_1^2 h_2} - \frac{c^2 c_{16}c_{26}}{h_1 h_2^2} + \frac{sc_{12}c_{16}}{h_1^2 h_2} + \frac{c^2 c_{12}c_{66}}{h_1^2 h_2} + \frac{s^2 c_{16}^2}{h_1^2}
\]

\[
\alpha_2 = c_{36} \left( \frac{c c_{12}}{h_2} - \frac{s c_{16}}{h_1} \right) - c_{13} \left( \frac{c c_{26}}{h_2} - \frac{s c_{66}}{h_1} \right)
\]

\[
\alpha_3 = -\frac{c_{26}^2 c_{11}c_{23}}{c_{66} h_1 h_2^2} + \frac{2s c_{11}c_{26}c_{23}}{h_1^2 h_2} + \frac{c c_{11}c_{26}c_{36}c_{22}}{c_{66} h_1 h_2^2} - \frac{s c_{11}c_{26}^2 c_{36}}{c_{66} h_1^2 h_2}
\]

\[
-\frac{s^2 c_{11}c_{66}c_{23}}{ch_1^3} - \frac{s c_{11}c_{36}c_{22}}{h_1^2 h_2} + \frac{s^2 c_{11}c_{36}c_{26}}{ch_1^3} + \frac{c^2 c_{26}^2 c_{16}c_{23}}{s c_{66} h_2^3}
\]

\[
-\frac{c c_{16}c_{26}c_{23}}{h_1 h_2^2} - \frac{c^2 c_{16}c_{26}c_{36}c_{22}}{c_{66} h_1 h_2^2} + \frac{c c_{12}c_{16}c_{23}c_{26}}{s c_{12} c_{16} c_{23}} - \frac{s c_{12} c_{16} c_{23}}{h_1^2 h_2}
\]

\[
+ \frac{s c_{12} c_{16} c_{36} c_{26}}{C_{66} h_1^2 h_2} - \frac{c^2 c_{12} c_{23} c_{26}}{s c_{66} h_2^3} + \frac{c c_{12} c_{66} c_{23}}{C_{66} h_1 h_2^2} - \frac{c c_{12} c_{36} c_{26}}{h_1 h_2^2}
\]

\[
- \frac{s^2 c_{16} c_{23} c_{26}}{C_{66} h_1 h_2^2} + \frac{s^2 c_{16} c_{23}}{ch_1^3} + \frac{c c_{12} c_{26} c_{13}}{C_{66} h_1 h_2^2} - \frac{2 s c_{12} c_{26} c_{13}}{h_1 h_2^2} - \frac{c c_{12} c_{26} c_{36}}{C_{66} h_1 h_2^2}
\]

\[
+ \frac{s^2 c_{12} c_{66} c_{13}}{ch_1^3} + \frac{s c_{12} c_{36}}{h_1 h_2^2} + \frac{s^2 c_{12} c_{36} c_{16}}{ch_1^3} - \frac{c^2 c_{13} c_{26} c_{23}}{s c_{66} h_2^3} + \frac{c c_{13} c_{26}}{h_1 h_2^2}
\]

\[
+ \frac{s^2 c_{26}^2 c_{16} c_{12}}{s c_{66} h_2^3} - \frac{c c_{22} c_{16} c_{13} c_{26}}{c_{66} h_1 h_2^2} - \frac{s c_{22} c_{16} c_{13}}{h_1 h_2^2} - \frac{c c_{22} c_{13} c_{26}}{s c_{66} h_2^3}
\]

\[
- \frac{c c_{22} c_{66} c_{13}}{h_1 h_2^2} + \frac{c c_{22} c_{36} c_{16}}{C_{66} h_1 h_2^2} - \frac{s^2 c_{26}^2 c_{16} c_{13}}{ch_1^3}
\]

\[\text{[A.1a]}\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_4 &= \frac{c_{23}c_{26}c_{12}}{s_{66}h_2^2} - \frac{c_{12}c_{23}c_{16}c_{23}c_{26}}{h_1h_2} + \frac{s_{16}c_{23}c_{26}}{c_{66}h_1h_2} - \frac{c_{22}c_{13}c_{26}}{s_{66}h_2^2} + \frac{c_{22}c_{13}}{h_1h_2} \\
&\quad + \frac{s_{26}c_{13}}{c_{66}h_1h_2} - \frac{s_{26}c_{13}}{h_1h_2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_5 &= -\frac{c_{26}^2c_{23}}{c_{66}h_2^2} + \frac{c_{26}c_{23}}{h_1h_2} + \frac{c_{26}c_{22}c_{36}}{s_{h_2^2}c_{66}} - \frac{c_{26}^2c_{36}}{c_{66}h_1h_2} + \frac{c_{23}c_{26}}{h_1h_2} - \frac{s_{23}c_{66}}{c_{66}h_1h_2} \\
&\quad - \frac{c_{22}c_{36}}{h_1h_2} + \frac{s_{26}c_{36}}{c_{66}h_1h_2} - \frac{c_{23}c_{36}}{h_1h_2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_6 &= \frac{c_{26}^2c_{13}}{c_{66}h_2^2} - \frac{c_{13}c_{26}}{h_1h_2} - \frac{c_{26}c_{36}c_{12}}{s_{66}h_2^2} + \frac{c_{26}c_{36}c_{16}}{c_{66}h_1h_2} - \frac{c_{13}c_{26}}{h_1h_2} + \frac{s_{13}c_{66}}{c_{66}h_1h_2} \\
&\quad + \frac{c_{36}c_{12}}{h_1h_2} - \frac{s_{36}c_{16}}{c_{66}h_1h_2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_7 &= \left(\frac{c_{36}}{h_2} - \frac{s_{13}}{h_1}\right) + \left(\frac{c_{23}}{c_{66}} - \frac{s_{36}}{c_{26}}\right) \left[\left(\frac{c_{66}}{h_2} - \frac{s_{16}}{h_1}\right) - \frac{c_{36}}{\alpha_2}\right] - \frac{c_{33}}{\alpha_2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_8 &= \left(\frac{c_{23}}{h_2} - \frac{s_{36}}{h_1}\right) - \frac{c_{36}}{\alpha_2} \left(\frac{s_{66}}{h_1} - \frac{c_{26}}{h_2}\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{c_{36}}{\alpha_2} \left(\frac{s_{66}}{h_1} - \frac{c_{26}}{h_2}\right)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_9 &= \frac{c_{36}^2}{\alpha_2} + \frac{s_{36}^2}{\alpha_2} - \frac{c_{36}c_{26}}{\alpha_2}
\end{align*}
\]
Appendix B. Derivation of eccentricity, $e'[4.42]$

Figure A-1: Cross-sectional view of reinforcement/actuators

From the above figure, coordinates of the radius in the $x_1$, $x_2$, and $x_3$ direction are:

$$
x_{1} = rsin\phi',

x_{2} = rcos\phi',

x_{3} = r.

[A.2]

According to the microscopic scale, the above equation transforms into:

$$
ry_{1} = \frac{rsin\phi'}{\delta h_{1}},

ry_{2} = \frac{rcos\phi'}{\delta h_{2}},

ry_{3} = \frac{r}{\delta}.

[A.3]

and the minor radius is calculated as:

$$
(r')^2 = \frac{r^2sin^2\phi'}{\delta^2 h_{1}^2} + \frac{r^2cos^2\phi'}{\delta^2 h_{2}^2}

[A.4]$$
We recall that the coordinate transformation from $x_1$ and $x_2$ to $y_1$ and $y_2$ will transform the circular cross-section into an ellipse and the minor axis to major axis is given by:

$$\left(\frac{\text{minor}}{\text{major}}\right)^2 = \sqrt{1 - e'^2} \quad [A.5]$$

From Equations [A.4] and [A.5] the eccentricity of an ellipse can be determined as:

$$e' = \left[ 1 - \frac{\left(\sin^2 \varphi' h_2^2 + \cos^2 \varphi' h_1^2\right)}{h_1^2 h_2^2} \right]^{1/2} \quad [A.6]$$

Appendix C. Derivation of Equation [4.43]

Equation [4.43] will be derived in a rather heuristic manner, ignoring some of the formal mathematical details.

![Diagram](image)

Figure A-2: Cross-sectional view of reinforcement/actuators after coordinate transformation
The equation of ellipse in terms of coordinates $\eta_1, \eta_2, z$ is given by

$$\frac{\eta_2^2}{r_1^2} + \frac{z^2}{r_2^2} = 1 \tag{A.7}$$

Let

$$\mu = \frac{\eta_2^2}{r_1^2} + \frac{z^2}{r_2^2} \tag{A.8}$$

where $\mu$ is constant anywhere on the circumference of the ellipse. From chain rule, we write,

$$d\mu = \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial z} dz + \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \eta_2} d\eta_2 = 0 \tag{A.9}$$

which may be expressed as:

$$d\mu = \left(\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \eta_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial z} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2}\right) (d\eta_2 \bar{e}_1 + dz \bar{e}_2) = 0 \tag{A.10}$$

Here,

$$\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \eta_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \bar{e}_1 + \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial z} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_2} \bar{e}_2 \text{ is a vector tangent to circumference} \tag{A.11}$$

and

$$\partial \eta_2 \bar{e}_1 + \partial z \bar{e}_2 \text{ is a vector normal to circumference.} \tag{A.12}$$
Thus, from Equation [A.12] the unit normal vector is calculated as:

\[
\vec{n} = \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta_2} \vec{e}_1 + \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta_2} \vec{e}_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta_2} \vec{e}_1 + \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta_2} \vec{e}_2\right)^2}} = \frac{2\eta_2}{\eta_2^2 + 2\eta_2^2} \frac{\vec{e}_1 + \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta_2} \vec{e}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{4\eta_2^2}{r_1^4} + \frac{4\eta_2^2}{r_2^4}}}
\]

[A.13]

After some algebraic manipulations we get:

\[
\vec{n} = \frac{\eta_2 \vec{e}_1 + \eta_2 \vec{e}_2}{\sqrt{\eta_2^2 + \eta_2^2 z^2}}
\]

[A.14]

Solving the above equation in accordance to the relationship \( \left(\frac{r_1}{r_2}\right)^2 = 1 - \epsilon'^2 \) and for \( r_2 = 0.5 \) gives

\[
n_2' = \eta_2 \left[1 - (\epsilon')^2\right]^{1/2}, \text{ and } n_3' = z
\]

[A.15]

**Appendix D. Quantities that enter Equation [4.54], [4.71], and [4.83]**

We give here the expressions for the constants \( \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_6 \) that are needed to calculate the \( b_{0}^{\mu} \) functions for the unit cell of Figure 4-3. They are:
\[ \Lambda_1 = -\frac{s^2 \sigma_1}{\hbar_1^2 \hbar_2} + \Delta_7 A_1 + A_2 \Delta_7 + \frac{\Delta_8 A_3}{\Delta_4} + \left[ A_4 \Delta_7 - A_5 \Delta_9 \right] A_6 + \]
\[ \frac{2scC_{33} \Delta_1}{C_{13} \Delta_4 \Delta_{13}} \left[ A_4 \Delta_7 - A_5 \Delta_9 \right] \]

\[ \Lambda_2 = A_8 \Delta_{10} - A_9 \Delta_{10} - \frac{\Delta_{11} A_{10}}{\Delta_4} + \left[ A_4 \Delta_{10} - A_5 \Delta_{11} \right] A_{11} - \frac{C_{33} \Delta_{12}}{\hbar_2} \]

\[ \Lambda_3 = A_{13} \Delta_7 - A_{14} \Delta_7 + A_{15} \Delta_9 + A_{16} \Delta_9 - \left[ A_{17} \Delta_7 - A_{18} \Delta_9 \right] A_{19} \]

\[ \Lambda_4 = \Delta_{10} A_1 + A_2 \Delta_{10} + \frac{\Delta_{11} A_3}{\Delta_4} + \left[ A_4 \Delta_{10} - A_5 \Delta_{11} \right] A_{11} - \frac{C_{33} \Delta_2}{\hbar_1} + \]
\[ \frac{2scC_{23} \Delta_{12}}{C_{13} \Delta_4 \Delta_{13}} \left[ A_4 \Delta_{10} - A_5 \Delta_{11} \right] - \frac{2scC_{23} \Delta_{12}}{C_{13} \Delta_4 \Delta_{13}} \left[ \frac{C_{33}}{\hbar_1 \hbar_2} \right] \]

\[ \Lambda_5 = A_8 \Delta_7 - A_9 \Delta_7 - \frac{\Delta_8 A_{10}}{\Delta_4} + \left[ A_4 \Delta_7 - A_5 \Delta_9 \right] A_{11} + \frac{c^3}{\hbar_2} \]

\[ \Lambda_6 = \Delta_{10} A_{13} - A_{14} \Delta_{10} + A_{15} \Delta_{11} + A_{16} \Delta_{11} - \left[ A_{17} \Delta_{10} - A_{18} \Delta_{11} \right] A_{19} \]
\[ + \frac{2scC_{33} A_{19}}{\hbar_1 \hbar_2} + \frac{2scC_{33s}}{\hbar_1 \hbar_2} \]

where

\[ \Delta_1 = C_{23} \left( cC_{16} h_1 - sC_{11} h_2 \right) - C_{13} \left( cC_{26} h_1 - sC_{12} h_2 \right) \]
\[ \Delta_2 = C_{23} \left( cC_{12} h_1 - sC_{16} h_2 \right) - C_{13} \left( cC_{22} h_1 - sC_{26} h_2 \right) \]
\[ \Delta_3 = C_{23} B_{11} - C_{13} B_{22} - C_{23} C_{11} - C_{13} C_{22} \]
\[ \Delta_4 = \Delta_1 \left( sC_{66} h_2 - cC_{26} h_1 \right) + \Delta_2 \left( cC_{66} h_1 - sC_{16} h_2 \right) \]
\[ \Delta_5 = \frac{cC_{16} h_1 - sC_{11} h_2}{cC_{66} h_1 - sC_{16} h_2} - \frac{\Delta_1 \left( sC_{66} h_2 - cC_{26} h_1 \right) \left( cC_{16} h_1 - sC_{11} h_2 \right)}{\Delta_4 \left( cC_{66} h_1 - sC_{16} h_2 \right)} - \frac{\Delta_1 \left( cC_{12} h_1 - sC_{16} h_2 \right)}{\Delta_4} \]
\[ \Delta_6 = \frac{scC_{45}}{h_1h_2} + \frac{s^2C_{55}}{h_1^2} - \frac{scC_{45}}{h_1h_2} + \frac{c^2C_{44}}{h_2^2} \]

\[ \Delta_7 = \left[ \left( \frac{scC_{45}h_1 - scC_{45}h_2}{h_1^2h_2^2} \right) \left( \frac{sC_{55}h_2 - cC_{45}h_1}{\Delta_6} \right) \right] \left[ 1 - (e')^2 \right] \]

\[ \Delta_8 = \frac{1 - \Delta_1(sC_{66}h_2 - cC_{26}h_1)}{\Delta_4} \]

\[ \Delta_9 = \left[ \left( \frac{scC_{45}h_1 - scC_{55}h_2}{h_1^2h_2^2} \right) \left( \frac{sC_{45}h_2 - cC_{44}h_1}{\Delta_6} \right) \right] \left[ 1 - (e')^2 \right] \]

\[ \Delta_{10} = \frac{cC_{36}h_1 - scC_{13}h_2}{h_1h_2} ; \quad \Delta_{11} = \frac{cC_{23}h_1 - scC_{36}h_2}{h_1h_2} \]

\[ \Delta_{12} = (sC_{66}h_2 - cC_{26}h_1)(cC_{16}h_1 - sc_{11}h_2) + (cC_{66}h_1 - scC_{16}h_2)(cC_{12}h_1 - sc_{10}h_2) \]

\[ \Delta_{13} = 1 - \frac{c_{36}h_2}{c_{13}} ; \quad \Delta_{14} = sC_{66}h_2 - cC_{26}h_1 ; \quad \Delta_{15} = cC_{66}h_1 - scC_{16}h_2 \]

\[ A_1 = \frac{s^2h_2\Delta_8}{h_1\Delta_{15}} ; \quad A_2 = \frac{2scC_{23}\Delta_{14}}{\Delta_4} ; \quad A_3 = \frac{2scC_{23}\Delta_{15} - s^2\Delta_1h_2}{h_1} ; \]

\[ A_4 = \frac{C_{36}\Delta_8}{\Delta_{15}} \]

\[ A_5 = \frac{C_{36}\Delta_1}{\Delta_4} ; \quad A_6 = \frac{s^2h_2\Delta_5}{h_1C_{13}\Delta_{13}} - \frac{2sc}{C_{13}\Delta_{13}} ; \quad A_7 = \frac{s^2\Delta_5}{h_1C_{13}\Delta_{13}} - \frac{2sc}{h_2C_{13}\Delta_{13}} \]

\[ A_8 = \frac{c^2h_1\Delta_5}{h_2\Delta_{15}} ; \quad A_9 = \frac{2scC_{13}\Delta_{14}}{\Delta_4} ; \quad A_{10} = 2scC_{13}\Delta_{15} + \frac{c^2\Delta_1h_1}{h_2} \]

\[ A_{11} = \frac{c^2\Delta_1h_1}{h_2C_{13}\Delta_{13}} - \frac{2sc\Delta_{12}}{C_{13}\Delta_4} ; \quad A_{12} = \frac{c^2\Delta_5}{h_2C_{13}\Delta_{13}} - \frac{2sc\Delta_{12}}{h_1C_{13}\Delta_{13}} \]

\[ A_{13} = \frac{-C_{23}C_{11}\mu + C_{13}C_{22}\mu}{h_4} \frac{2sc\Delta_{14}}{\Delta_4} ; \quad A_{14} = \frac{2sc\Delta_8C_{12}\mu}{\Delta_{15}} \]

\[ A_{15} = \frac{-C_{23}C_{11}\mu + C_{13}C_{22}\mu}{h_4} \frac{2sc\Delta_{15}}{\Delta_4} ; \quad A_{16} = \frac{2sc\Delta_1C_{12}\mu}{\Delta_4} \]
\[ A_{17} = \frac{2sc\Delta_8 C_{36}}{\Delta_{15}} \]
\[ A_{18} = \frac{2sc\Delta_1 C_{36} \Delta_4}{\Delta_{13}} ; \quad A_{19} = -\frac{C_{11\mu\nu}}{C_{13}\Delta_1} \frac{\Delta_5 C_{22\mu\nu}}{C_{13}\Delta_1} + \frac{(C_{23} C_{11\mu\nu} - C_{13} C_{22\mu\nu})\Delta_1}{C_{13}\Delta_4\Delta_1} \]  
[A.17c]

Appendix E. Derivation of Equation [4.57], [4.74], and [4.86]

The effective coefficients of the homogenized plate are obtained through the integration over the volume of the entire unit cell \( \Omega_\delta \) (with volume equal to \( |\Omega| \)) according to Equation [4.14]. Let \( \delta^3 V \) be the volume of the reinforcing bar within the unit cell (Figure 4-5). The volume of the unit cell can be readily calculated from Figure 4-5 as \( \delta^3 h_1 h_2 \). Then, the \( \langle b_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} \rangle \) effective coefficients are calculated from:

\[ \langle b_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} \rangle = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} b_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} dv \]  
[A.18]

where \( \int_{\Omega} b_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} dv \) is the volume of the reinforcing bar. Substituting the volume of the unit cell and reinforcing bar in the above equation gives

\[ \langle b_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} \rangle = \frac{V}{h_1 h_2} b_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} \]  
[A.19]

Note that due to the symmetry of the circular cross-section with respect to the shell middle surface, the skew-symmetrical coefficients \( \langle zb_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} \rangle \), \( \langle b_{ij}^{\gamma\mu} \rangle \) vanishes.
Let us now derive the equation to find the effective coefficients for \( \langle z_{b_{ij}}^{*,\mu} \rangle \) problem. The \( \langle z_{i_{ij}}^{*,\mu} \rangle \) effective can be calculated from

\[
\langle z_{b_{ij}}^{*,\mu} \rangle = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} z_{b_{ij}}^{*,\mu} d\nu = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \left[ \int_{\Omega} z_{b_{ij}}^{*,\mu} d\nu \right]
\]  \[\text{[A.20]}\]

First we will consider the term within the bracket of Equation [A.20]. Rewriting this term in terms of length (L) of the fiber and area gives:

\[
B_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} L \int_{\text{area}} z^2 \, da, \text{ where } L = \frac{4\delta V}{\Pi}
\]  \[\text{[A.21]}\]

Substituting Equation [A.21] into [A.20] results in:

\[
\langle z_{b_{ij}}^{*,\mu} \rangle = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \frac{4\delta V}{\Pi} B_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} \int_{\text{area}} z^2 \, da
\]  \[\text{[A.22]}\]

The above equation can be rewritten using Equation [4.5] as:

\[
\langle z_{b_{ij}}^{*,\mu} \rangle = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \frac{4V}{\Pi \delta} B_{ij}^{\lambda\mu} \int_{0}^{\delta/2} \int_{0}^{\Pi} r^2 \sin^2 \theta (rdrd\theta)
\]  \[\text{[A.23]}\]

Solving Equation [A.23] gives the effective coefficients as:

\[
\langle z_{b_{ij}}^{*,\mu} \rangle = \frac{V}{16h_1 h_2} B_{ij}^{\lambda\mu}
\]  \[\text{[A.24]}\]
Appendix F. Quantities that enter Equation [6.26]

\[ A_1 = q_{21}^2 C_{11} + q_{22}^2 C_{66} + q_{23}^2 C_{55} \]
\[ A_2 = q_{21} q_{31} C_{11} + q_{22} q_{32} C_{66} + q_{23} q_{33} C_{55} \]
\[ A_3 = q_{21} q_{22} C_{12} + q_{21} q_{22} C_{66} \]
\[ A_4 = q_{21} q_{32} C_{12} + q_{22} q_{31} C_{66} \]
\[ A_5 = q_{21} q_{23} C_{13} + q_{21} q_{23} C_{55} \]
\[ A_6 = q_{21} q_{33} C_{13} + q_{23} q_{31} C_{55} \]
\[ A_7 = q_{21} C_{11kl} + q_{22} C_{12kl} + q_{23} C_{13kl} \]
\[ A_8 = q_{21} q_{31} C_{11} + q_{22} q_{32} C_{66} + q_{23} q_{33} C_{55} \]
\[ A_9 = q_{31}^2 C_{11} + q_{32}^2 C_{66} + q_{33}^2 C_{55} \]
\[ A_{10} = q_{31} q_{22} C_{12} + q_{21} q_{32} C_{66} \]
\[ A_{11} = q_{31} q_{32} C_{12} + q_{32} q_{31} C_{66} \]
\[ A_{12} = q_{31} q_{23} C_{13} + q_{21} q_{33} C_{55} \]
\[ A_{13} = q_{31} q_{33} C_{13} + q_{33} q_{31} C_{55} \]
\[ A_{14} = q_{31} C_{11kl} + q_{32} C_{12kl} + q_{33} C_{13kl} \]
\[ A_{15} = q_{21} q_{22} C_{66} + q_{21} q_{22} C_{12} \]
\[ A_{16} = q_{21} q_{32} C_{66} + q_{22} q_{31} C_{12} \]
\[ A_{17} = q_{21}^2 C_{66} + q_{22}^2 C_{22} + q_{23}^2 C_{44} \]
\[ A_{18} = q_{21} q_{31} C_{66} + q_{22} q_{32} C_{22} + q_{23} q_{33} C_{44} \]
\[ A_{19} = q_{22} q_{23} C_{23} + q_{22} q_{23} C_{44} \]
\[ A_{20} = q_{22} q_{33} C_{23} + q_{23} q_{32} C_{44} \]
\[ A_{21} = q_{21} C_{12kl} + q_{22} C_{22kl} + q_{23} C_{23kl} \]
\[ A_{22} = q_{31} q_{22} C_{66} + q_{21} q_{32} C_{12} \]
\[ A_{23} = q_{31} q_{32} C_{66} + q_{32} q_{31} C_{12} \]
\[ A_{24} = q_{21} q_{31} C_{66} + q_{22} q_{32} C_{22} + q_{23} q_{33} C_{44} \]
\[ A_{25} = q_{31}^2 C_{66} + q_{32}^2 C_{22} + q_{33}^2 C_{44} \]
\[ A_{26} = q_{32} q_{23} C_{23} + q_{22} q_{33} C_{44} \]
\[ A_{27} = q_{32} q_{33} C_{23} + q_{33} q_{32} C_{44} \]
\[ A_{28} = q_{31} C_{12kl} + q_{32} C_{22kl} + q_{33} C_{23kl} \]
\[ A_{29} = q_{21} q_{23} C_{55} + q_{21} q_{23} C_{13} \]
\[ A_{30} = q_{21} q_{33} C_{55} + q_{23} q_{31} C_{13} \]
\[ A_{31} = q_{22}q_{23}C_{44} + q_{22}q_{23}C_{23} \]
\[ A_{32} = q_{22}q_{33}C_{44} + q_{23}q_{32}C_{23} \]
\[ A_{33} = q_{21}^2C_{55} + q_{22}^2C_{44} + q_{23}^2C_{33} \]
\[ A_{34} = q_{21}q_{31}C_{55} + q_{22}q_{32}C_{44} + q_{23}q_{33}C_{33} \]
\[ A_{35} = q_{21}C_{13kl} + q_{22}C_{23kl} + q_{23}C_{33kl} \]
\[ A_{36} = q_{31}q_{23}C_{55} + q_{21}q_{33}C_{13} \]
\[ A_{37} = q_{31}q_{33}C_{55} + q_{33}q_{31}C_{13} \]
\[ A_{38} = q_{23}q_{32}C_{44} + q_{22}q_{33}C_{23} \]
\[ A_{39} = q_{32}q_{33}C_{44} + q_{33}q_{32}C_{23} \]
\[ A_{40} = q_{21}q_{31}C_{55} + q_{22}q_{32}C_{44} + q_{23}q_{33}C_{33} \]
\[ A_{41} = q_{31}^2C_{55} + q_{32}^2C_{44} + q_{33}^2C_{33} \]
\[ A_{42} = q_{31}C_{13kl} + q_{32}C_{23kl} + q_{33}C_{33kl} \]