ACCURACY ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENDED FINITE ELEMENT METHOD: ADAPTIVITY, COMPARISON WITH COMPETING METHODS, INDUSTRIALISATION

STEPHANE P. BORDAS*, MARC DUFLOT AND

PIERRE-OLIVIER BOUCHARD ††

* University of Glasgow, Civil Engineering Rankine Building, Glasgow, G12 8LT bordas AT civil DOT gla DOT ac DOT uk http://www.civil.gla.ac.uk/~bordas

[†]CENAERO, Belgium

††ENSPM, Sofia Antipolis, France

KEY WORDS: XFEM, ACCURACY, A POSTERIORI ERROR ESTIMATES, ADAPTIVITY, INDUSTRIAL APPLICATIONS, COMPETITIVE METHODS

ABSTRACT

The extended finite element method has become a competitive tool for the solution of problems with evolving discontinuities and singularities. In the field of structural reliability and failure, it has quickly been embraced by industry, with several existing and ongoing implementations in commercial software packages.

The nature of the method, its elegance and relative closeness to the well-established finite element method have made it a competitive tool for industrial fracture mechanics [1]. Nonetheless, little work has been done to assess the dis-cretisation error associated with extended finite elements or other partition of unity methods with extrinsic enrichment. The rapid uptake of such methods by industry will soon require adequate error estimation tools to be available to the analysts.

The approximation error should be evaluated and adaptive strategies developed. Moreover, the extended finite element method should be fully compared, both on the computational cost point of view and on that of accuracy, to alternate approximation tools (FEM with remeshing, meshfree methods, interface elements, discrete and lattice models, Trefftz formulations), which all have distinct advantages and drawbacks depending on the application. This minisymposium aims at increasing the community's understanding of the accuracy of extended finite element methods, with a particular emphasis on (but not a restriction to) fracture mechanics applications. The development of a posteriori error estimates and adaptive strategies [2-6], for instance is of key interest.

The second goal of the minisymposium is to show industrial applications of the **XFEM** [1] and evaluate the **accuracy** of the results and propose improvements of the **XFEM** to ease its industrial development.

The third objective is to provide comparative studies that will contribute to increasing our understanding of the relationships between **XFEM** and its competitors.

For any further request, please contact Stephane P. Bordas bordas AT civil DOT gla DOT ac DOT uk

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Bordas and B. Moran. Enriched finite elements and level sets for damage tolerance assessment of complex structures. Engineering Fracture Mechanics, 73:1176–1201, (2006).
- [2] S. Bordas, M. Duflot, and P. Le. A simple a posteriori error estimator for the extended finite element method. *Communications in Numerical Methods in Engineering*, in press (2007) [bib | .pdf | Abstract]
- [3] S. Bordas and M. Duflot. Derivative recovery and a posteriori error estimation in extended finite element methods. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, submitted, in presss (2007) [bib|.pdf|Abstract]
- [4] M. Duflot and S. Bordas. An extended global recovery procedure for a posteriori error estimation in extended finite element methods. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, submitted, (2007) [bib | .pdf | Abstract]
- [5] F. B. Barros, S. P. B. Proenca, and C. S. de Barcellos. Generalized finite element method in structural nonlinear analysis adaptive strategy. Computational Mechanics, 33:95–107, (2004).
- [6] F. B. Barros, S. P. B. Proenca, and C. S. de Barcellos. On error estimator and p-adaptivity in the generalized finite element method. International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 60:2373–2398, (2004).