A CONSISTENT FINITE ELEMENT FORMULATION OF NONLINEAR FRICTIONAL CONTACT PROBLEMS

ABSTRACT: A perturbed Lagrangian-based variational formulation is proposed for the finite element solution of fully nonlinear frictional contact problems. In the spirit of an operator splitting methodology, an analogy exists between the proposed treatment for the stick-slip motion and the corresponding treatment in elastoplasticity.

Within the context of discrete formulations arising from a finite element approximation, explicit expressions for the frictional consistent contact tangent stiffness and residual are derived from variational equations by using a consistent linearization procedure for both the sliding and adhesion phases. The consistent tangent operator is always non-symmetric for the case of frictional sliding owing to the nature of the Coulomb's friction law employed.

For two-dimensional applications, a three-node contact element is employed in the finite element discretization. Numerical examples are also presented that illustrate the performance of the proposed formulation.
### METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS

#### Approximate Conversions to Metric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>When You Know</th>
<th>Multiply by</th>
<th>To Find</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>inches</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft</td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yd</td>
<td>yards</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>kilometers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in²</td>
<td>square inches</td>
<td>0.0645</td>
<td>square centimeters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft²</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yd²</td>
<td>square yards</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>square meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi²</td>
<td>square miles</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>square kilometers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres</td>
<td>hectares</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oz</td>
<td>ounces</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>pounds</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(short tons)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>tonnes (1,000 kg)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Approximate Conversions from Metric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>When You Know</th>
<th>Multiply by</th>
<th>To Find</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>millimeters</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm</td>
<td>centimeters</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>meters</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>meters</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>kilometers</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm²</td>
<td>square centimeters</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>square inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m²</td>
<td>square meters</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>square yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km²</td>
<td>square kilometers</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>square miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>hectares (10,000 m²)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>grams</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>ounces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg</td>
<td>kilograms</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>tonnes (1,000 kg)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>short tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ml</td>
<td>milliliters</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>fluid ounces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>liters</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>pints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt</td>
<td>pints</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>quarts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>liters</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>cubic meters</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>cubic feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft³</td>
<td>cubic feet</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>cubic yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yd³</td>
<td>cubic yards</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>m³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Temperature (exact)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>°C</th>
<th>Fahrenheit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>32°F (after subtracting temperature)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 in = 2.54 (exactly). For other exact conversions and more detailed tables, see NBS Misc. Pub. 288, Units of Weight and Measures, Price $2.25, SD Catalog No. C13.10:288.*
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For two-dimensional applications, a three-node contact element is employed in the finite element discretization. Numerical examples are also presented that illustrate the performance of the proposed formulation.
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1. Introduction

Frictional stick-slip contact phenomena constitute important aspects of real engineering applications. The micromechanics of friction for metallic surfaces in contact has drawn significant attention in the literature during the past several decades. Basically, the contact surfaces are not smooth planes but rough, uneven surfaces composed of many asperities. Microstructurally, the asperities experience local yielding and fracture. Moreover, they determine the real area of contact as opposed to the nominal area of contact. For a review on the physical aspects of friction, see for example Tabor [1981], Oden & Martins [1985] and Oden & Pires [1984].

For a finite element solution frictionless contact problems, a perturbed Lagrangian and an augmented Lagrangian formulations have been proposed by Simo, Wriggers & Taylor [1985], and Landers & Taylor [1985], respectively. On the other hand, Duvaut & Lions [1976], Oden & Martins [1985], and Oden & Lin [1986] have proposed some regularization techniques of the Coulomb's law of friction for numerical solution of dynamic frictional contact phenomena.

In this study, a perturbed Lagrangian-based formulation is proposed for the finite element solution of fully nonlinear frictional contact problems. The stick-slip contact phenomena is accommodated by means of a nonlinear variational formulation. In view of an analogy between the Coulomb's law of friction for the stick-slip motion and the yield criterion for classical elastoplasticity (see, e.g., Michalowski & Mroz [1978]), a two-step operator splitting methodology is employed.

In the current literature, the modification of the tangent stiffness accounting for the contribution of frictional contact often takes the form of symmetric and/or non-symmetric rank-one updates inherited from the linear theory (see, e.g., Oden & Martins [1985] and Hughes et al. [1976]). In the finite element solution of geometrically nonlinear frictional contact problems, however, such simple procedures are no longer adequate. In the event of frictionless contact, a consistent tangent operator has been obtained by Wriggers & Simo [1985].

Within the context of finite element discrete approximation, explicit expressions for the frictional contact tangent stiffness and the residual are derived in this paper from variational equations by using a consistent linearization procedure for both the sliding and adhesion phases. It is shown that for the case of frictional stick the consistent tangent operator is symmetric only when numerical convergence is achieved. On the other hand, the consistent tangent operator is always non-symmetric for the case of frictional sliding owing to the nature of the Coulomb’s friction law employed. Not surprisingly, these expressions degenerate to the classical rank-one corrections of the stiffness matrices in the limiting case of infinitesimal deformations. It is emphasized that, in the presence of nonlinear contact kinematics, use of the consistent contact tangent stiffness is essential in preserving the quadratic rate of asymptotic convergence of Newton’s method.

For two-dimensional applications, a three-node contact element is employed in the finite element discretization. The 'perturbed Lagrangian'-based computational algorithm is capable
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of performing a one-pass or two-pass contact slide-line logic. A number of numerical examples are presented in Sec. 3 that illustrate the performance of the proposed variational formulation.

2. Discrete variational formulation

Within the framework of the finite element method, the governing variational equations involving fully nonlinear kinematics are considered in this section for both adhesive and sliding contact problems. In what follows, for simplicity, attention is focused on the two-dimensional (planar) geometry. The extension to three-dimensional geometry is complicated by geometric considerations only.

2.1. Finite element discretization

Throughout the remaining part of this report, we employ the bilinear isoparametric elements for "parent" contacting bodies. Concerning the contact segment characterization, the "master-slave" slide-line contact logic is adopted (see Hallquist [1983]). In particular, a three-node contact element, consisting of two "master" nodes and one "slave" node, is used, see Figure 1. With reference to Figure 1, the tangent and normal vectors are defined as follows:

\[ \mathbf{t} = \frac{\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1}{|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1|} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

\[ \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{e}_3 \times \mathbf{t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

where \( \mathbf{e}_3 \) denotes the unit base vector normal to the plane of the three-node element and \( \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{X}_1 + \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{X}_2 + \mathbf{u}_2 \) signify the current positions of the master nodes (\( \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2 \) for reference coordinates and \( \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \) for current nodal displacements). In addition, we define the current "surface coordinate" \( a \) as follows:

\[ a = \frac{(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_1)}{|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_1|} \times \mathbf{t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

in which \( \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{u}_i \) denotes the current position of the slave node. The normal and tangential gaps (penetrations) associated with a typical three-node element are defined as

\[ g_n = (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_1) \times \mathbf{n} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

\[ g_t = (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_1) \times a' \times |\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1| \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

where \( a' \) is the (old) surface coordinate at the last time step (known). The variations (increments) of the normal and tangent vectors due to nonlinear kinematics can be shown to be (see Wriggers & Simo [1985])

\[ \delta \mathbf{n} = \frac{-1}{|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1|} (\mathbf{t} \otimes \mathbf{n} \otimes (\mathbf{\eta}_2 - \mathbf{\eta}_1)) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

\[ \delta \mathbf{t} = \frac{-1}{|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1|} (\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n} \otimes (\mathbf{\eta}_2 - \mathbf{\eta}_1)) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)
where $\eta$ is the variation (increment) of $u$. Furthermore, for convenience, we define the following abbreviations (operators)

\[ (\ast) \equiv (\ast)_1 - (1 - a) (\ast)_2 - a (\ast)_1 \]  
\[ (\overline{\ast}) \equiv (\ast)_2 - (\ast)_1 \]  

(2.8a)  
(2.8b)

With the above notations at hand, we now give the variational derivation.

2.2. Frictional stick

For the case of frictional stick (no-slip), we consider the following perturbed Lagrangian functional for bodies in contact:

\[ \Pi_u(u, \Lambda_n, \Lambda_t) = \Pi(u) + \Delta_n^T G_n - \frac{1}{2\omega_n} \Delta_n^T \Delta_n + \Delta_t^T G_t - \frac{1}{2\omega_t} \Delta_t^T \Delta_t \]  
(2.9)

Here $u$ designates the vector of nodal displacements, $\Lambda_n$ ($\Lambda_t$) the vector of normal (tangential) nodal contact forces, $G_n$ ($G_t$) the vector of normal (tangential) nodal gaps, and $\omega_n$ ($\omega_t$) the normal (tangential) penalty parameters. Moreover, $\Pi(u)$ stands for the total potential energy of the bodies in contact.

The discrete variational equations are then obtained by taking the variations with respect to $u$, $\Lambda_n$, and $\Lambda_t$, respectively:

\[ \delta u \Pi_u(u, \Lambda_n, \Lambda_t) = 0 \]  
(2.10a)

\[ \delta \Lambda_n^T \left( - \frac{1}{\omega_n} \Delta_n + G_n \right) = 0 \]  
(2.10b)

\[ \delta \Lambda_t^T \left( - \frac{1}{\omega_t} \Delta_t + G_t \right) = 0 \]  
(2.10c)

From (2.10b,c), we obtain that $\Delta_n = \omega_n G_n$ and $\Delta_t = \omega_t G_t$ as the normal and tangential penalty contact forces.

The variation of a typical nodal normal gap $g_n \in G_n$ takes the form (see Wriggers & Simo [1985])

\[ \delta g_n \equiv \eta^T c_n = \{ \eta_1 - (1 - a) \eta_1 - a \eta_2 \} \bullet n \equiv \overline{n} \bullet n \]  
(2.11)

where $c_n \equiv D_n(\delta g_n)$ ($D$ is the directional derivative operator). Alternatively, we can write

\[ c_n = \overline{n} \]  
(2.12)

with the 'bar' quantity defined in (2.8a). We shall give the matrix representation, within the context of three-node contact elements, of $\overline{n}$ later in this section.

Similarly, the variation of a typical nodal tangential gap $g_t \in G_t$ can be obtained according to

\[ \delta g_t = (\eta_1 - \eta_2) \bullet t + (x_i - x_j) \bullet \delta t - a'' \delta \left| x_2 - x_1 \right| \]
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\[ t \cdot \vec{n}_{s} - \frac{g_{n}}{|x_{2} - x_{1}|} (n \cdot \vec{n}) \equiv \eta^{T} c_{i} \]  
(2.13)

where

\[ \vec{n}_{s} = \vec{n} |_{a \cdot a} = \eta_{s} - (1 - a^{0}) \eta_{1} + a^{0} \eta_{2} \]  
(2.14)

and

\[ c_{i} = D_{\eta} (\delta g_{i}) = \Gamma^{0} + \frac{g_{n}}{|x_{2} - x_{1}|} \vec{n} \]  
(2.15)

Moreover, the residual vector \( R_{B} \) and tangent stiffness \( K_{B} \) associated with the total potential energy of the contacting bodies simply read

\[ R_{B} = D_{\eta} (\Pi (u)) \]  
(2.16)

\[ K_{B} = D_{\eta} (R_{B}) \]  
(2.17)

In the case of inelasticity, \( R_{B} \) and \( K_{B} \) are deduced from a (Galerkin) variational functional \( \Pi \) involving constitutive relations and boundary conditions.

The variational equations (2.10a,b,c) can now be stated as

\[ \eta^{T} \left[ R_{B} + \sum_{s=1}^{S} \left( \lambda_{n}^{(s)} c_{n}^{(s)} + \lambda_{t}^{(s)} c_{t}^{(s)} \right) \right] = 0 \]  
(2.18a)

\[ \delta \Delta_{n} T \left( - \frac{1}{\omega_{n}} \Delta_{n} + G_{n} \right) = 0 \]  
(2.18b)

\[ \delta \Delta_{t} T \left( - \frac{1}{\omega_{t}} \Delta_{t} + G_{t} \right) = 0 \]  
(2.18c)

In (2.18a), (scalars) \( \lambda_{n}^{(s)} \in \Lambda_{n} \), \( \lambda_{t}^{(s)} \in \Lambda_{t} \), and \( \bar{H} \) represents an assembly operation over all three-node contact elements in consideration (\( S = \) total number of slave nodes in contact = total number of conditions of constraints). To apply the Newton's iteration scheme, consistent linearization of Eq. (2.18a,b,c) at \( (u, \Lambda_{n}, \Lambda_{t}) \) is performed and leads to

\[ \left[ \eta^{T}, \delta \Delta_{n}^{T}, \delta \Delta_{t}^{T} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} K_{B} + \bar{H} \left[ K_{n}^{(s)} + K_{t}^{(s)} \right] & \bar{H} c_{n}^{(s)} & \bar{H} c_{t}^{(s)} \\ \bar{H} c_{n}^{(s)T} & - \frac{1}{\omega_{n}} I & 0 \\ \bar{H} c_{t}^{(s)T} & 0 & - \frac{1}{\omega_{t}} I \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Delta u \\ \Delta \Lambda_{n} \\ \Delta \Lambda_{t} \end{array} \right] \]  

\[ R_{B} = \bar{H} \left[ \lambda_{n}^{(s)} c_{n}^{(s)} + \lambda_{t}^{(s)} c_{t}^{(s)} \right] \]  
(2.19)

\[ = \left. \left[ - \frac{1}{\omega_{n}} \Lambda_{n} + G_{n} \right] \right|_{t} \]
where (after some algebra)
\[
\eta^T K_n^{(s)} \Delta u = -\frac{\lambda_n^{(s)}}{x_2 - x_1} \left[ \Delta \bar{u} \ast (t \otimes n) \ast \bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta} \ast (t \otimes n) \ast \Delta \bar{u} \right] + \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} \Delta \bar{u} \ast (n \otimes n) \ast \bar{\eta} \right)^{(s)}
\]
\[
\eta^T K_i^{(s)} \Delta u = -\frac{\lambda_i^{(s)}}{x_2 - x_1} \left[ \bar{\eta} \ast (n \otimes n) \ast \Delta \bar{u} + \bar{\eta} \ast (n \otimes n) \ast \Delta \bar{u} \right] + \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} \bar{\eta} \ast (n \otimes n + t \otimes n) \ast \Delta \bar{u} \right)^{(s)}
\]

2.2.1. Matrix representation. To facilitate finite element implementation of the above derived tangent stiffness operators and residuals, matrix formulations are given as follows. For simplicity, we will drop the superscript \((s)\) and focus on a typical single three-node element. Let us start by introducing the following vectors

\[
N_n^0 = [n, -(1 - a^0) n, -a^0 n]^T \tag{2.22a}
\]
\[
N_j = c_n \equiv \bar{n} \equiv [n, -(1 - a) n, -a n]^T \tag{2.22b}
\]
\[
T_i = [t, -(1 - a) t, -a t]^T \tag{2.22c}
\]
\[
T \equiv t \equiv [0, -t, t]^T \tag{2.22d}
\]
\[
N \equiv \bar{n} \equiv [0, -n, n]^T \tag{2.22e}
\]
\[
\Delta u = [\Delta u_1, \Delta u_2]^T \tag{2.22f}
\]
\[
c_i \equiv [t, -(1 - a^0) t - \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} n, -a^0 t + \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} n]^T \tag{2.22g}
\]

where the unified order of components in all vectors has been: slave node - master node 1 - master node 2. By using these matrix notations, Eq. (2.20) and (2.21) can be rephrased as

\[
K_n = -\frac{\lambda_n}{x_2 - x_1} \left[ N T_i^T + T_i N^T + \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} N N^T \right] \tag{2.23}
\]
\[
K_i = \frac{\lambda_i}{x_2 - x_1} \left[ N_i^0 N^T + N N_i^T - \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} (N T_i^T + T_i N^T) \right] \tag{2.24}
\]

In addition, from Eq. (2.19) together with the fact that \(\lambda_n = \omega_n g_n\) and \(\lambda_i = \omega_i g_i\), the contact residual vector (due to contact only) for a single element is

\[
R_C = -[\omega_n g_n c_n + \omega_i g_i c_i] \tag{2.25}
\]

The linearization of Eq. (2.25) with respect to \(u\) in conjunction with Eq. (2.19) then leads to the following perturbed Lagrangian contact tangent stiffness matrix

\[
K_c = \omega \left[ [N, N_i^T - c_i, c_i^T] - \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} [N T_i^T - T_i N_i^T - \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} N N_i^T] \right]
\]
Here $\lambda_0 = \lambda = \lambda$ (penalty parameter) has been assumed. Finally, the total tangent stiffness matrix and residual vector of the bodies in contact take the form

$$K = K_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{B}} H_i K_i^{(u)}$$

and

$$R = - \left[ R_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{B}} H_i \left( g_i n_i + g_i e_i^{(u)} \right) \right]$$

Remark 2.1. From Eq. (2.23), we observe that $K_n$ is symmetric. By contrast, from (2.24), $K_r$ and hence $K_r$ in (2.26) is non-symmetric as long as $N_0 \neq N_1$. That is, only when $a = a$ will $K_r$ be symmetric. This situation arises only when the final numerical convergence is achieved for the frictional non-slip case.

Remark 2.2. If one drops the nonlinear terms $(K_n, K_r)$ from (2.26), then the linearized theory is recovered. In other words, only the rank-one-update term $\omega [N_i N_i^T + e_i e_i^T]$ remains.

2.3. Frictional slip

For the case of frictional slide, use of the Coulomb's law of friction renders

$$A_n = \mu A_n$$

where $\mu$ denotes the coefficient of friction. Similar to the development in Sec. 2.2, characteristic variational equations are:

$$\delta \Pi(u) - A_n^{(u)} \delta A_n = 0 \quad (2.29a)$$

$$\delta A_n^{(u)} \left( -\frac{1}{\omega} A_n + G_n \right) = 0 \quad (2.29b)$$

in which $\omega$ is a penalty parameter. Note that in Eq. (2.29a) the virtual work done by the frictional force is always negative. Furthermore, Eq. (2.29b) yields $A_n = \omega G_n$ as the normal penalty contact force.

By taking the variations at $(u, A_n)$, Eq. (2.29a,b) now read (see (2.18a,b,c))

$$\eta \left[ R_0 - H \left( N_i^{(u)} c_i + \mu N_i^{(u)} e_i^{(u)} \right) \right] = 0 \quad (2.30a)$$

$$\delta A_n^{(u)} \left( -\frac{1}{\omega} A_n + G_n \right) = 0 \quad (2.30b)$$

The consistent linearization of (2.30a,b) at $(u, A_n)$ then yields the following expressions (see (2.19a))

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_0 - H [K_n - \mu H [e_i^{(u)} - \mu c_i]] \\ H e_i + \mu H e_i^{(u)} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{\delta u}{\delta A_n}$$
Here, $K_n$ is the same as Eq. (2.20) and (2.23), whereas $K_r$ takes the following matrix form (for a single element)

$$K_r = - \left( \frac{\mu \lambda_n}{x_2 - x_1} \right) \left[ N_0^T N^T + N N^T - \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} (N T^T + T N^T) \right]$$

(2.32)

It is noted that Eq. (2.32) can be obtained by simply replace $\lambda_i$ in Eq. (2.24) by $[\mu \lambda_n]$, as a direct consequence of the Coulomb's friction law.

Remark 2.3. If the surface coordinate $a = a^0$ (i.e., approximately unchanged), then $N_0^T \approx N_1$ and $K_r$ is almost symmetric.

Since $\lambda_n = \omega g_n$, the contact residual for one element is

$$R_c = - \omega g_n [c - \mu c_i]$$

(2.33)

The linearization of (2.33) at $u$ together with Eq. (2.31),(2.32),(2.23) then yield the contact tangent stiffness for frictional slip:

$$K_C = \omega \left\{ \left[ N_1 N_1^T - \mu c_i N_i^T \right] - \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} \left[ N T_1^T + T_1 N^T + \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} N N^T \right] \right\}$$

\begin{align*}
&= - \left( \frac{\mu g_n}{x_2 - x_1} \right) \left[ N_0^T N^T + N N^T - \frac{g_n}{x_2 - x_1} (N T^T + T N^T) \right] (N T^T + T N^T) \right) \right) \right) \right)
\end{align*}

(2.34)

Therefore, the total tangent stiffness matrix and residual vector associated with the contacting bodies are

$$K = K_B + \sum_{i=1}^{S} K_r^{i}$$

(2.35)

$$R = - \left[ R_B + \sum_{i=1}^{S} \omega g_n (c_i - \mu c_i)^{(i)} \right]$$

(2.36)

Remark 2.4. It is seen from Eq. (2.34) that the contact tangent stiffness for the case of frictional sliding is always non-symmetric due to the nature of the Coulomb's friction law. Even in the event of linearized kinematics (i.e., by neglecting nonlinear terms $K_n$ and $K_r$), this is still the case (see also Oden & Martins [1985]).

3. Numerical implementation and examples

In this section, implementation of the proposed formulation within the context of the finite element method is described. Some numerical examples are also presented.
3.1. Finite element implementation

The "master-slave" slide-line contact logic is employed, which features both the "one-pass" and "two-pass" algorithms (see, e.g., Hallquist [1983]). For the planar three-node contact element under consideration, explicit vector-component expressions (6 d.o.f.) for the notations defined in Eq. (2.22a-g) can be obtained. For example,

$$
N_i \equiv e_i = \begin{bmatrix}
-s \\
 c \\
(1-a)s \\
-(1-a)c \\
a s \\
-a c
\end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
c_i = \begin{bmatrix}
c \\
s \\
-(1-a^0)c + \frac{g_n}{|x_2-x_1|} s \\
-(1-a^0)s - \frac{g_n}{|x_2-x_1|} c \\
-a^0 c - \frac{g_n}{|x_2-x_1|} s \\
-a^0 s + \frac{g_n}{|x_2-x_1|} c
\end{bmatrix},
$$

where $s$, $c$ denote $\sin \theta$, $\cos \theta$, respectively (see Fig. 1).

In the spirit of operator splitting methodology for the Coulomb's law of friction, each load (time) step is decomposed into two parts: (i) By assuming a sticking condition, a "stick trial" step is first performed (similar to the "elastic trial" step in classical elastoplasticity). If the trial is successful, the contacting bodies are considered to be in a state of frictional sticking. Otherwise, (ii) a "slip correction" step is performed (similar to the "plastic return mapping" step in elastoplasticity) and the bodies in contact are viewed to be in a state of frictional sliding. This operator split treatment separates the no-slip and slip conditions and renders the transition from stick to slip (or vice versa) exactly the same way as the corresponding case in classical elastoplasticity. The analogy between the Coulomb's law of friction (for stick-slip contact problems) and yield criterion (for elastoplasticity) is noted.

In all numerical examples that follow, standard Newton's method is used for solution procedure. It is emphasized that line search plays no role in numerical simulations presented in this section.

3.2. Example 1: frictional stick

This section is concerned with a (rigid or deformable) punch into an elastic foundation under the circumstance of frictional stick. See Figure 2 for (plane strain) finite element mesh and dimensions.

Case 1. Rigid punch. The material properties employed in the computation are: $E_{punch} = 10^4$ (assumed rigid), $\nu_{punch} = 0$, $E_{foundation} = 10^5$, $\nu_{foundation} = 0.3$, and $\omega = 10^7$ (penalty value). The one-pass algorithm is used in this example. The finite element solutions converge quadratically within 4 iterations; see Table 1 for numerical performance. The deformed mesh is displayed in Figure 3, in which the deformation is enlarged 1000 times the real scale in...
order to fully see the details.

Table 1. Residual & energy norms for iterates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>.245e+4</td>
<td>.299e+3</td>
<td>.719e-1</td>
<td>.173e-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>.552e+2</td>
<td>.151e+0</td>
<td>.692e-10</td>
<td>.727e-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case 2. Elastic punch. The punching block is now a deformable body. The material properties involved in the computation are: $E_{\text{punch}} = 10^4$, $\nu_{\text{punch}} = 0.3$, $E_{\text{found}} = 10^3$, $\nu_{\text{found}} = 0.3$, and $\omega = 10^7$ (penalty value). The one-pass algorithm is adopted in this example. Once again, the finite element solutions converge quadratically within 3 iterations; see Table 2 for numerical performance. The deformed mesh is displayed in Figure 4 (to scale).

Table 2. Residual & energy norms for iterates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>.245e+4</td>
<td>.528e+2</td>
<td>.155e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>.682e+4</td>
<td>.217e-4</td>
<td>.116e-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Example 2: frictional slide

Attention is now focused on the event of frictional stick-slip motion. The transition from stick to slip (or vice versa) is accounted for in this example. We once more consider an elastic punch on top of an elastic foundation made of same materials. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions are the same as Sec. 3.2 (see Fig. 2). Moreover, the material properties used in the simulation are: $E = 10^4$, $\nu = 0$, and $\omega = 10^5$, $\mu = 0.1$ (coefficient of friction).

The punch is first vertically loaded into the elastic foundation, then move horizontally to the right by displacement controlled loading condition (vertical loads still remain). During the initial vertical loading, three bottom nodes of the punch are in contact with the foundation. In particular, the two (outer) edge nodes of the punch undergo frictional slip while the central node experiences frictional stick. The solutions converge in 7 iterations with a residual norm less than $10^{-3}$. Within the proposed formulation and implementation, tangential motion across element boundaries does not impose numerical difficulties.
Finite element formulation of frictional contact problems

Before the first contact node (the rightmost contact node) of the punch reaches the right edge of the foundation, a typical iteration count for numerical convergence is 6 or 7. After the first punch element begins to overhang, the contact area is not constant and the number of contacting nodes changes. At 5% overhang (of the first punch element), the convergence takes 7 iterations. See Fig. 5 for deformed configuration (to scale). At 50% overhang, 8 iterations are taken before convergence is achieved. At 80% overhang, 11 iterations are recorded. At 90% overhang, 13 iterations are required. Finally, at 98% and 100% overhang, 15 iterations are observed. See Figures 6, 7 for deformed meshes (to scale). After the first punch element completely overhangs, the solutions diverge which corresponds to the physical drop-off process of the punch. For this simulation, it is crucial to use the two-pass algorithm for a solution to converge. The one-pass algorithm works only before the punch overhangs. This example provides a severe test for finite element formulation of frictional contact problems.

To assess the significance of the proposed consistent tangent stiffness, we repeat the above numerical experiment by using the linearized tangent (i.e., employing only the rank-one-update terms). Before the first punch element overhangs, numerical convergence typically takes 8 or 9 iterations. At 5% overhang, the convergence takes 9 iterations. At 50% overhang, 11 iterations are observed before convergence is achieved. At 80% overhang, 19 iterations are recorded. At 90% overhang, 25 iterations are required. Finally, at 100% overhang, 33 iterations are observed. The significance of the proposed formulation versus linearized theory is clearly demonstrated.

4. Conclusion

On the basis of an operator split, the proposed formulation accommodates the frictional stick-slip motion in a variational framework. By a consistent linearization procedure, explicit expressions for the consistent contact tangent stiffness and residual have been obtained. The analogy between the proposed treatment for the stick-slip motion and the corresponding treatment in classical elasto-plasticity is noteworthy. In addition, for infinitesimal deformations (as a special case), the proposed formulation reduces to the linearized theory involving only rank-one-update terms in the tangent matrices.

To illustrate the numerical performance of the proposed formulation, some numerical examples have been presented in Sec. 3. The significant role of the proposed tangent stiffness is fully demonstrated.
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Figure 1. Geometry and definition of a typical three-node contact element.
Figure 2. Finite element mesh (including boundary conditions and loads) for a punch on top of a foundation.
Figure 3. Deformed mesh for a rigid punch into an elastic foundation. The deformation is enlarged 1000 times for clarity.
Figure 4. Deformed mesh for an elastic punch into an elastic foundation.
Figure 5. Deformed mesh corresponding to 5% overhang of the first (right) element of the punch.
Figure 6. Deformed mesh corresponding to 98% overhang of the first punch element.
Figure 7. Deformed mesh corresponding to 100% overhang of the first punch element.
DISTRIBUTION LIST

DTIC Alexandria, VA
GIDEP OIC, Corona, CA
NAVFAEENGCOM Code 05, Alexandria, VA
NAVFAEENGCOM - CHES DIV Code FPO-IPL, Washington, DC
NAVFAEENGCOM - LANT DIV. Library, Norfolk, VA
NAVFAEENGCOM - NORTH DIV. Code 04AL, Philadelphia, PA
NAVFAEENGCOM - PAC DIV. Library, Pearl Harbor, HI
NAVFAEENGCOM - SOUTH DIV. Library, Charleston, SC
NAVFAEENGCOM - WEST DIV Library (Code 04AU22), San Bruno, CA
PWC Code 101 (Library), Oakland, CA; Code 123-C, San Diego, CA; Code 420, Great Lakes II Library
(Code 124), Pearl Harbor, HI; Library, Guam, Marianas Islands; Library, Norfolk, VA Library Pensacola
FL, Library, Yokosuka J.A. Tech Library, Subic Bay RP
END
5-81
DTIC