Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN COMPUTATIONAL MECHANICS

Computational Structural Mechanics and Dynamics

Practice 4 Shells

Authors: Carlos Eduardo Ribeiro Santa Cruz Mendoza Chinmay Khisti Valeria Agustina Felipe Ramudo

May 3, 2019



1 Cylindrical tank

Analyze the state of stress of the tank shown in the figure, which is submitted to an internal pressure. Suppose a continuous variation of the thickness of the spherical cupola. Use revolutions shell elements with two nodes and 3D shells elements with three nodes.



Figure 1.1: Problem geometry

1.1 Geometry

The following figure shows the model used:



Figure 1.2: Geometry.

In the figure on the right (a) we can see the geometry defined for the model, in the figure on the left (b) it can be seen the four types of materials used in the dome to simulate the change in thickness.

In the next graph (Figure 1.3) it is possible to see the boundary conditions and applied loads. The figure (a) shows the constraints applied in the model and figure (b) shows the direction and position of the applied loads.



Figure 1.3: Boundary conditions and applied loads.

1.2 Post-processing

The following figures present the post-processed results for this analysis.











Figure 1.10: Momentum in the theta-direction



Contour Fill of Ntheta (N/m). Figure 1.12: Axial force in the theta-direction



Figure 1.13: Tractions in the y-direction

2 3D Analysis

2.1 Geometry

A 3D model of the problem was built using COMPASS RamSeries.

In the Figure 2.1 (a) the geometry of the model is shown and in the Figure 2.1 (b) the constraints used to comply with the boundary conditions.



Figure 2.1

Figure 2.2 (a) shows the discretization used with 3-noded shell elements.

Analogously to what was done in the 2D model, the changes of the thickness in the dome were simulated with the use of different materials. This can be seen in the figure 2.2 (b)



Figure 2.2

2.2 Post-processing

The contours of the displacement distributions are represented in the Figure 2.3 and Figure 2.4.







Figure 2.4

If we compare with the results of Figure 1.4, Figure 1.5 and, Figure 1.6 it can be seen that the results are equivalent.



Figure 2.5



Figure 2.6