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#### Abstract

This article presents the formulation of an enriched macro finite element based on the trigonometric shear deformation theory for the static analysis of symmetrically laminated composite plates. Shear correction factor is not required because this theory accounts for tangential stress-free boundary conditions on the plate boundary surfaces. The macro element is obtained using the principle of virtual work and Gram-Schmidt orthogonal polynomials as enrichment functions. The implementation of the obtained algorithm is simple and efficient, and allows studying general quadrilateral plates with a single macro element. Several examples are presented to show the capability and applicability of the developed formulation.
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## 1. Introduction

Composite materials are mainly preferred in aerospace, marine, and automobile engineering because of their advanced properties and tailoring capability, and have the potential for incorporating optimum design techniques into the design process of candidate structures.

For the efficient employment of laminated plates it is necessary to use the appropriated theories and methodologies to predict accurately their structural behavior. In this sense the use of three-dimensional (3D) elasticity theory leads to a more accurate determination of transverse shear stresses. However, the employment of 3D elasticity theory increases significantly the computational cost. For this reason many equivalent single layers (ESL) plate theories [1] have been proposed to reduce the 3D problems to the 2D ones. The simplest ESL theory is the classical laminated plate theory (CLPT), which is based on Kirchhoff's hypothesis and provides reasonable results for thin plates [2]. The first-order shear deformation theory (FSDT), based on the works of Reissner [3] and Mindlin [4], assumes constant transverse shear stresses and therefore it requires the use of a shear correction factor, which may be difficult to compute because this factor varies with the loading conditions, lamination sequences, and boundary conditions [5].

In order to consider traction-free boundary conditions and transverse shear effects, avoiding the use of shear correction factors, different higher order shear deformation theories (HSDT) have been proposed [6-10].

Among many HSDT, only few higher-order shear deformation theories have been developed containing non-polynomial shape strain functions. In particular, trigonometric shear deformation theories were recently applied to composite plates by Ferreira et al. [11], Xiang et al. [12], Mantari et al. [13], among others. These theories provide continuity of displacements and
zero transverse shear stresses at top and bottom surfaces of the laminate, without the burden of extra degrees of freedom as in layer-wise formulations. As stated by Mantari et al. [13], it can be said that there are evidences of the demand of trigonometric shear deformation theories, mainly because they are richer than polynomial functions and the free surface boundary conditions can be guaranteed a priori.

On the other hand, exact solutions for deflections and stresses on arbitrary laminated plate domain, and for general boundary conditions are very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain [1]. The methods for solving the governing equations include different approaches, such as the finite element method [14-17], the finite volume method [18], or the finite difference method [19], which require mesh generations. Other methodologies called meshless methods have been developed [20]. An interesting review focusing mainly on the developments of element-free or meshless methods and their applications in the analysis of composite structures has been reported by Liew et al. [21].

A hierarchical version of finite element method (FEM) in conjunction with the trigonometric shear deformation theory has been proposed for Rango et al. [22] for the free vibration analysis of thick composite laminated plates. Here, this hierarchical version is extended, generalized, and applied for the first time to analyze the static behavior of thick composite laminated plates with general quadrilateral planform and boundary conditions. The macro finite element is formulated using the principle of virtual work and incorporating Gram-Schmidt orthogonal polynomials as enriched functions. Further major benefits of the hierarchical method are the retention of the stiffness coefficients as the order of interpolation is increased [23].

Some numerical examples are used to demonstrate the convergence and accuracy of the proposed methodology in computing global and local responses, which are fundamental to


Figure 1. General quadrilateral thick laminated plate cement in Cartesian coordinates $(x, y)$ and natural coordinates $(\xi, \eta)$.
detect potential areas of starting and propagation of damage. Comparisons with results available in the literature are also presented. After establishing the accuracy of the present formulation, benchmark results for laminated plates with different geometric planform and boundary conditions are presented.

## 2. Statement of the problem

A general quadrilateral thick laminated plate element is represented based on a four-node scheme, along with Cartesian coordinates $(x, y)$ and natural coordinates $(\xi, \eta)$ as shown in Figure 1. A symmetric laminate of uniform thickness $h$ with $N_{l}$ layers is adopted for the analysis.

According to the trigonometric shear deformation theory (TSDT) of plates [11], the in-plane displacement components: $u$ (along the $x$ direction) and $v$ (along the $y$ direction), and the transverse displacement component $w$ (along the $z$ direction) are approximated through the thickness of the plate as:

$$
\begin{align*}
u(x, y, z) & =-z \frac{\partial w_{0}(x, y)}{\partial x}+\sin \frac{\pi z}{h} \phi_{x}(x, y) \\
v(x, y, z) & =-z \frac{\partial w_{0}(x, y)}{\partial y}+\sin \frac{\pi z}{h} \phi_{y}(x, y)  \tag{1}\\
w(x, y, z) & =w_{0}(x, y)
\end{align*}
$$

where $w_{0}$ is the displacement of a generic point on the midplane $(z=0)$ and $\phi_{x}, \phi_{y}$ are the rotation components of the transverse normal about $y$ and $x$ axes, respectively. Employing Eq. (1) and based on the linear elasticity theory, the non-zero strain tensor components at an arbitrary material point of the plate become:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon=\sin \frac{\pi z}{h} \varepsilon_{s}-z \varepsilon_{\kappa}, \quad \gamma=\frac{\pi}{h} \cos \frac{\pi z}{h} \varphi \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\varepsilon_{x x} & \varepsilon_{y y} & \gamma_{x y}
\end{array}\right\}^{T} \\
& \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{s}=\left\{\frac{\partial \phi_{x}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial \phi_{y}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial \phi_{x}}{\partial y}+\frac{\partial \phi_{y}}{\partial x}\right\}^{T} \\
& \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{k}=\left\{\frac{\partial^{2} w}{\partial x^{2}} \frac{\partial^{2} w}{\partial y^{2}} 2 \frac{\partial^{2} w}{\partial x \partial y}\right\}^{T} \\
& \boldsymbol{\gamma}=\left\{\gamma_{y z} \gamma_{x z}\right\}^{T} \text { and } \boldsymbol{\varphi}=\left\{\phi_{y} \phi_{x}\right\}^{T} \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

The constitutive relations of the $k$ th layer having any fiber orientation in the plane $(x, y)$ can be obtained in the global $(x, y, z)$ coordinate system from:

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\sigma_{x x}  \tag{4}\\
\sigma_{y y} \\
\tau_{x y} \\
\tau_{x z} \\
\tau_{y z}
\end{array}\right\}^{(k)}=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
\bar{Q}_{11} & \bar{Q}_{12} & \bar{Q}_{16} & 0 & 0 \\
\bar{Q}_{12} & \bar{Q}_{22} & \bar{Q}_{26} & 0 & 0 \\
\bar{Q}_{16} & \bar{Q}_{26} & \bar{Q}_{66} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \bar{Q}_{55} & \bar{Q}_{45} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \bar{Q}_{45} & \bar{Q}_{44}
\end{array}\right]^{(k)}\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\varepsilon_{x x} \\
\varepsilon_{y y} \\
\gamma_{x y} \\
\gamma_{x z} \\
\gamma_{y z}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

where $\bar{Q}_{i j}$ are the elastic constants of the $k$ th layer with respect to the global Cartesian axes and their detailed definitions can be found in [1].

## 3. Derivation of flexure laminated plate equations

Considering the static version of the principle of virtual work, the following expressions can be obtained:

$$
\begin{align*}
0= & \int_{R}\left\{\int _ { - h / 2 } ^ { h / 2 } \left[\sigma_{x x}^{(k)} \delta \varepsilon_{x x}+\sigma_{y y}^{(k)} \delta \varepsilon_{y y}+\tau_{x y}^{(k)} \delta \gamma_{x y}+\tau_{x z}^{(k)} \delta \gamma_{x z}\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.+\tau_{y z}^{(k)} \delta \gamma_{y z}\right] d z\right\} d x d y-\int_{R} q \delta w d x d y \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

where $q$ is the distributed transverse load and $R$ is the midplane plate domain in the $(x, y)$ Cartesian coordinates.

Substituting the virtual strains obtained from Eq. (2) and integrating along $z$ axis, the following expression in matrix form is found:

$$
\begin{align*}
0= & \int_{R}\left(\delta \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{s}^{T} \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{s}+\delta \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\kappa}^{T} \mathbf{D} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\kappa}-\delta \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\kappa}^{T} \mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{s}-\delta \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{s}^{T} \mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\kappa}+\delta \boldsymbol{\varphi}^{T} \mathbf{A}^{S} \boldsymbol{\varphi}\right) d x d y \\
& -\int_{R} q(x, y) \delta w d x d y \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbf{A}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{16} \\
A_{12} & A_{22} & A_{26} \\
A_{16} & A_{26} & A_{66}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{H}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
H_{11} & H_{12} & H_{16} \\
H_{12} & H_{22} & H_{26} \\
H_{16} & H_{26} & H_{66}
\end{array}\right] \\
& \mathbf{D}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
D_{11} & D_{12} & D_{16} \\
D_{12} & D_{22} & D_{26} \\
D_{16} & D_{26} & D_{66}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{A}^{S}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
A_{44}^{S} & A_{45}^{S} \\
A_{45}^{S} & A_{55}^{S},
\end{array}\right] \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

being:

$$
\begin{align*}
& A_{i j}=\int_{-h / 2}^{h / 2} \bar{Q}_{i j} \sin ^{2}\left(\frac{\pi z}{h}\right) d z, \quad A_{i j}^{S}=\left(\frac{\pi}{h}\right)^{2} \int_{-h / 2}^{h / 2} \bar{Q}_{i j} \cos ^{2}\left(\frac{\pi z}{h}\right) d z \\
& H_{i j}=\int_{-h / 2}^{h / 2} \bar{Q}_{i j} z \sin \left(\frac{\pi z}{h}\right) d z, \quad D_{i j}=\int_{-h / 2}^{h / 2} \bar{Q}_{i j} z^{2} d z \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

## 4. Macro finite element formulation

Due to complexity of the laminated plate geometry and the presence of couplings in the governing equations, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain closed form solutions of the corresponding equations, particularly under arbitrary boundary conditions. Hence, approximated methods should be employed to solve the problem. In this work a macro finite element is formulated for the global static behavior analysis of laminated plates. This methodology follows the general approach of reference [22] and it has been shown that it has a simple formulation, low computational cost, and good accuracy. In addition, the macro element is free of shear locking phenomenon that occurs in the conventional finite element method.

To obtain the macro finite element, first the material points of the quadrilateral plates in the physical domain (Cartesian coordinates) are transformed into the computational domain (natural coordinates) as shown in Figure 1. The mapping process follows the standard procedure [24], i.e.:

$$
\begin{equation*}
x=\sum_{i=1}^{4} M_{i}(\xi, \eta) x_{i}, \quad y=\sum_{i=1}^{4} M_{i}(\xi, \eta) y_{i} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left(x_{i}, y_{i}\right), i=1, \ldots, 4$ are the coordinates of the four corners of the quadrilateral region $R$ and $M_{i}(\xi, \eta)$ are the interpolation functions of the serendipity family [24].

The macro finite element equations are obtained by means of a hierarchical version of FEM [22, 25-27]. The convergence in the $h-p$ version of FEM is sought by simultaneously refining the mesh and increasing the degree of the elements. As it has been demonstrated by the authors in previous works [22, 27], a very good convergence can be obtained increasing the amount of hierarchy Gram-Schmidt orthogonal polynomials and using a single quadrilateral element.

The unknown functions $w, \phi_{x}, \phi_{y}$ in Eq. (1) are approximated by the product of the shape functions in the natural coordinates $(\xi, \eta)$, by the respective generalized displacements:

$$
\begin{align*}
& w(\xi, \eta)=\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} p_{i}^{(w)}(\xi) q_{j}^{(w)}(\eta) c_{i j}^{(w)}=\left\{N^{(w)}\right\}\left\{c^{(w)}\right\}, \\
& \phi_{x}(\xi, \eta)=\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} p_{i}^{(\phi)}(\xi) q_{j}^{(\phi)}(\eta) c_{i j}^{\left(\phi_{x}\right)}=\left\{N^{(\phi)}\right\}\left\{c^{\left(\phi_{x}\right)}\right\},  \tag{10}\\
& \phi_{y}(\xi, \eta)=\sum_{i, j=1}^{m} p_{i}^{(\phi)}(\xi) q_{j}^{(\phi)}(\eta) c_{i j}^{\left(\phi_{y}\right)}=\left\{N^{(\phi)}\right\}\left\{c^{\left(\phi_{y}\right)}\right\} .
\end{align*}
$$

The first polynomials in $\left\{N^{(\bullet)}\right\}=\mathbf{N}^{(\bullet)},(\bullet)=w, \phi$ are the Hermite cubic polynomials for $p_{i}{ }^{(w)}(\xi), q_{j}{ }^{(w)}(\eta)$ $(i, j=1 \ldots 4)$, and Hermite linear polynomials for $p_{i}{ }^{(\phi)}(\xi)$, $q_{j}{ }^{(\phi)}(\eta) \quad(i, j=1,2)$. Then, an adequate number of Gram-Schmidt polynomials are added to formulate a
polynomially-enriched plate macro element: $p_{i}{ }^{(w)}(\xi), q_{j}{ }^{(w)}(\eta)$ $(i, j=5 \ldots n)$ and $p_{i}{ }^{(\phi)}(\xi), q_{j}{ }^{(\phi)}(\eta)(i, j=3 \ldots m)$. The degree of the first Gram-Schmidt polynomial in both natural coordinates is four (4) for the transversal displacement $w$ and two (2) for the rotations $\phi_{x}, \phi_{y}$. The members of the set of characteristic orthogonal polynomials are obtained following the procedure described in [27-29] as briefly described in Appendix A.

This way, the hierarchical modes contribute only to the internal displacement of the element, and do not therefore affect the displacement along the element edges or at the element nodes. Nevertheless, products obtained between any of the GramSchmidt (GS) characteristics orthogonal polynomials and the Hermite polynomials will constitute what amounts to edge freedoms along the element boundaries.

Replacing the expressions of Eq. (9) in conjunction with the chain rules to change the first- and second-order derivatives given in Appendix B, and the approximating functions [Eq. (10)] into the virtual work formulation [Eq. (6)], the following equation system is obtained:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{0}= & \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1}\left(\delta \mathbf{c}^{T} \mathbf{B}^{(1)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^{(1)^{T}} \mathbf{c}+\delta \mathbf{c}^{T} \mathbf{B}^{(2)} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{B}^{(2)^{T}} \mathbf{c}-\delta \mathbf{c}^{T} \mathbf{B}^{(2)} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{B}^{(1)^{T}} \mathbf{c}\right. \\
& \left.-\delta \mathbf{c}^{T} \mathbf{B}^{(1)} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{B}^{(2)^{T}} \mathbf{c}+\delta \mathbf{c}^{T} \mathbf{B}^{(3)} \mathbf{A}^{S} \mathbf{B}^{(3)^{T}} \mathbf{c}-\delta \mathbf{c}^{T} \mathbf{B}^{(4)} q\right)|\mathbf{J}| d \xi d \eta \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{B}^{(1)}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
\mathbf{A 1} & 0 & \mathbf{A 2} \\
0 & \mathbf{A 2} & \mathbf{A 1}
\end{array}\right] ; \quad \mathbf{B}^{(2)}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{A} \mathbf{3} & \mathbf{A 4} & \mathbf{2 A 5} \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right] ; \\
\mathbf{B}^{(3)}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
0 & 0 \\
0 & \mathbf{N}^{(\phi)} \\
\mathbf{N}^{(\phi)} & 0
\end{array}\right] ; & \mathbf{B}^{(4)}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{N}^{(w)} \\
0 \\
0
\end{array}\right] \tag{12}
\end{array}
$$

with

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{A} 1= & \frac{J_{22}}{|\mathbf{J}|} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(\phi)}}{\partial \xi}-\frac{J_{12}}{|\mathbf{J}|} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(\phi)}}{\partial \eta}, \quad \mathbf{A} 2=-\frac{J_{21}}{|\mathbf{J}|} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(\phi)}}{\partial \xi}+\frac{J_{11}}{|\mathbf{J}|} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(\phi)}}{\partial \eta} \\
\mathbf{A} 3= & a_{1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \xi^{2}}+a_{2}^{\prime} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \eta^{2}}-a_{3}^{\prime} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \xi \partial \eta} \\
& +\sum_{i=1}^{3} a_{i}^{\prime}\left(\alpha_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \xi}+\beta_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \eta}\right) \\
\mathbf{A 4 =}= & b_{1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \xi^{2}}+b_{2}^{\prime} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \eta^{2}}-b_{3}^{\prime} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \xi \partial \eta} \\
& +\sum_{i=1}^{3} b_{i}^{\prime}\left(\alpha_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \xi}+\beta_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \eta}\right) \\
\mathbf{A 5}= & -c_{1}^{\prime} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \xi^{2}}-c_{2}^{\prime} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \eta^{2}}+c_{3}^{\prime} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \xi \partial \eta} \\
& \left.-\sum_{i=1}^{3}{c_{i}^{\prime}}^{\left(\alpha_{i}^{\prime}\right.} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \xi}+\beta_{i}^{\prime} \frac{\partial \mathbf{N}^{(w)}}{\partial \eta}\right), \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

Finally, for arbitrary values of virtual displacements, Eq. (11) reduces to:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{K c}=\mathbf{F}, \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Table 1. Square isotropic plate SSSS.

|  | $a / h$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 |  | 20 |  | 50 |  | 100 |  |
|  | $\bar{w}$ | $\bar{\sigma}_{x x}$ | $\bar{w}$ | $\bar{\sigma}_{x x}$ | $\bar{w}$ | $\bar{\sigma}_{x x}$ | $\bar{w}$ | $\bar{\sigma}_{x x}$ |
| Exact analytical solution Reddy [6] | 4.7910 | 0.2762 | 4.6250 | 0.2762 | 4.5790 | 0.2762 | 4.5720 | 0.2762 |
| Ferreira et al. [11] | 4.7883 | 0.2779 | 4.6158 | 0.2765 | 4.5781 | 0.2763 | 4.5715 | 0.2762 |
| Present TSDT $m=4$ | 4.7910 | 0.2762 | 4.6250 | 0.2762 | 4.5790 | 0.2762 | 4.5720 | 0.2762 |

where $\mathbf{c}$ is the unknown displacement vector given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{c}=\left\{\mathbf{c}^{(w)^{T}} \mathbf{c}^{\left(\phi_{x}\right)^{T}} \mathbf{c}^{\left(\phi_{y}\right)^{T}}\right\} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

The stiffness matrix $\mathbf{K}$ and the load vector $\mathbf{F}$ are respectively given by:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{K}= & \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1}\left(\mathbf{B}^{(1)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^{(1)^{T}}+\mathbf{B}^{(2)} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{B}^{(2)^{T}}-\mathbf{B}^{(2)} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{B}^{(1)^{T}}\right. \\
& \left.-\mathbf{B}^{(1)} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{B}^{(2)^{T}}+\mathbf{B}^{(3)} \mathbf{A}^{S} \mathbf{B}^{(3)^{T}}\right)|\mathbf{J}| d \xi d \eta  \tag{16}\\
\mathbf{F}= & \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1} q \mathbf{B}^{(4)}|\mathbf{J}| d \xi d \eta \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

Different boundary conditions may be applied to the laminated plate, removing from the stiffness matrix $\mathbf{K}$ and load vector $\mathbf{F}$ the rows and columns that correspond to the degrees of freedom associated with the corresponding support conditions.

## 5. Numerical results and discussion

The macro finite element solutions of quadrilateral laminated plates under uniform distributed load $q$ obtained by a TSDT are presented in this section. The model developed herein is validated by comparing the results with other available solutions. For describing the boundary conditions of the plates analyzed, the following designation is employed: C for a clamped edge and $S$ for a simply supported edge.

### 5.1. Square isotropic and laminated plates

The first example corresponds to a simply supported square isotropic plate (side length $a$ and thickness $h$ ) with Poisson's ratio $v=0.3$. The normalized transverse displacement $\bar{w}$ and normal $x$-stress $\bar{\sigma}_{x x}$ are obtained as:

$$
\bar{w}=\frac{100 E h^{3}}{q a^{4}} w\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}, 0\right), \bar{\sigma}_{x x}=\frac{h^{2}}{q a^{2}} \sigma_{x x}\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}, \frac{h}{2}\right) .
$$

In Table 1 the numerical results obtained with the present approach are compared with exact analytical ones from Reddy [6] and with those of Ferreira et al. [11], who used for the first time the TSDT for modeling symmetric composite plates discretized by a meshless method. It can be observed that the results

Table 2. Square laminated plate (0/90/90/0) SSSS.

| $a / h$ |  | $\bar{w}$ | $\bar{\sigma}_{x x}$ | $\bar{\sigma}_{y y}$ | $\bar{\tau}_{x y}$ | $\bar{\tau}_{x z}$ | $\bar{\tau}_{y z}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 3D-FEM [30] | 0.7794 | 0.8207 | 0.4870 | 0.0444 | 0.6040 | 0.4738 |
|  | HSDT-MQ [30] | 0.7506 | 0.8100 | 0.4775 | 0.0405 | 0.9200 | 0.3925 |
|  | HSDT (NS) [31] | 0.7966 | 0.8251 | 0.4144 | 0.0469 | 0.6940 | 0.3934 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=3$ | 0.7569 | 0.8243 | 0.4178 | 0.0422 | 0.5775 | 0.4042 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=4$ | 0.7566 | 0.8226 | 0.4180 | 0.0425 | 0.5688 | 0.3906 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=5$ | 0.7565 | 0.8224 | 0.4172 | 0.0428 | 0.5737 | 0.3975 |
| 10 | 3D-FEM [30] | 1.0576 | 0.8201 | 0.5605 | 0.0577 | 0.5781 | 0.4980 |
|  | HSDT-MQ [30] | 0.9730 | 0.8020 | 0.5380 | 0.0478 | 0.8790 | 0.4390 |
|  | HSDT (NS) [31] | 1.1184 | 0.8331 | 0.5495 | 0.0615 | 0.6534 | 0.4274 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=3$ | 1.0765 | 0.8228 | 0.5604 | 0.0540 | 0.5351 | 0.4430 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=4$ | 1.0738 | 0.8152 | 0.5603 | 0.0538 | 0.5206 | 0.4313 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=5$ | 1.0737 | 0.8160 | 0.5595 | 0.0548 | 0.5245 | 0.4343 |
| 5 | 3D-FEM [30] | 2.1044 | 0.8995 | 0.7386 | 0.0991 | 0.5340 | 0.4487 |
|  | HSDT-MQ [30] | 1.8100 | 0.8400 | 0.6600 | 0.0696 | 0.7780 | 0.4960 |
|  | HSDT (NS) [31] | 2.1936 | 0.9202 | 0.8287 | 0.0900 | 0.5846 | 0.5086 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=3$ | 2.1548 | 0.8963 | 0.8542 | 0.0848 | 0.4329 | 0.5347 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=4$ | 2.1355 | 0.8588 | 0.8507 | 0.0802 | 0.4193 | 0.5160 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=5$ | 2.1352 | 0.8622 | 0.8504 | 0.0842 | 0.4220 | 0.5105 |


| $a / h=10$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\alpha$ | Method | $\bar{w}^{A}$ | $\begin{gathered} \bar{\sigma}_{x x}^{A} \\ \left(z=\frac{h}{2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \bar{\tau}_{y z}^{B} \\ (z=0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \bar{\tau}_{y z}^{B} \\ \left(z=\frac{h}{6}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\bar{w}^{A}$ | $\begin{gathered} \bar{\sigma}_{x x}^{A} \\ \left(z=\frac{h}{2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \bar{\tau}_{y z}^{B} \\ (z=0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \bar{\tau}_{y z}^{B} \\ \left(z=\frac{h}{6}\right) \end{gathered}$ |
| $30^{\circ}$ | Chakrabarti et al. [32] | 0.8814 | 0.7125 | - | 0.2145 | 1.6811 | 0.8589 | - | 0.2331 |
|  | Ramesh et al. [33] | 0.8666 | 0.6934 | 0.4662 | 0.1563 | 1.6713 | 0.7909 | 0.4951 | 0.1855 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=4$ | 0.8441 | 0.6753 | 0.4383 | 0.1518 | 1.6346 | 0.7456 | 0.4686 | 0.1623 |
| $45^{\circ}$ | Chakrabarti et al. [32] | 0.5742 | 0.4861 | - | 0.2119 | 1.1790 | 0.5920 | - | 0.2013 |
|  | Ramesh et al. [33] | 0.5745 | 0.4744 | 0.4765 | 0.1518 | 1.0980 | 0.5387 | 0.4475 | 0.1666 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=4$ | 0.5605 | 0.4594 | 0.4611 | 0.1597 | 1.0513 | 0.5173 | 0.4426 | 0.1533 |
| $60^{\circ}$ | Chakrabarti et al. [32] | 0.2481 | 0.2201 | - | 0.1623 | 0.5196 | 0.2906 | - | 0.1383 |
|  | Ramesh et al. [33] | 0.2541 | 0.2173 | 0.3735 | 0.1195 | 0.5185 | 0.2598 | 0.3126 | 0.1265 |
|  | Present TSDT $m=4$ | 0.2360 | 0.2164 | 0.3435 | 0.1190 | 0.4653 | 0.2622 | 0.3010 | 0.1043 |

obtained with the present formulation are in excellent agreement with exact solutions.

The second example corresponds to a simply supported four layer 0/90/90/0 square laminated plate. The normalized displacement and stresses of the plate are defined as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{w} & =\frac{100 E_{2} h^{3}}{q a^{4}} w\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}, 0\right), \bar{\sigma}_{x x}=\frac{h^{2}}{q a^{2}} \sigma_{x x}\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}, \frac{h}{2}\right), \\
\bar{\sigma}_{y y} & =\frac{h^{2}}{q a^{2}} \sigma_{y y}\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}, \frac{h}{4}\right), \bar{\tau}_{x y}=\frac{h^{2}}{q a} \tau_{x y}\left(0,0, \frac{h}{2}\right), \\
\bar{\tau}_{x z} & =\frac{h}{q a} \tau_{x z}\left(0, \frac{a}{2}, 0\right), \bar{\tau}_{y z}=\frac{h}{q a} \tau_{y z}\left(\frac{a}{2}, 0,0\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

For this case, the material properties are $E_{1} / E_{2}=25, G_{12}=$ $G_{13}=0.5 E_{2}$.

In Table 2 center point deflections and stresses are presented for three length-to-thickness ratios: $a / h=5,10,20$ and for three to five polynomials of Gram-Schmidt, in order to show
the convergence of results obtained with the present formulation. The present solutions are compared with results derived from the Multiquadric (MQ) function using meshless local Petrov-Galerkin solution based on HSDT and 3D-FEM solution [30] and results obtained with a numerical procedure based on node-based smoothed discrete shear gap method associated with HSDT [31]. It can be seen that all results show a good convergence and they are in very good agreement with the results published by the mentioned authors.

### 5.2. Skew laminated plates

In this section, simply supported 0/90/0 skew plates for various skew angles $\alpha$ and length-to-thickness ratios $a / h$ are considered using four polynomials of Gram-Schmidt $(m=4)$. The material properties and the normalized displacement and stresses are the same of the example depicted in the previous section. The results obtained by means of the present approach are compared
a)

$a$
b)


Figure 2. (a) Geometry of rhomboidal plate and (b) geometry of general quadrilateral plate.

| $a / h=10$ | $0 / \beta / 0$ | $M_{x x}$ | $M_{y y}$ | $M_{x y}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CCCC | $0 / 30 / 0$ |  |  |  |
|  | $0 / 60 / 0$ |  |  |  |
|  | $0 / 90 / 0$ |  | $-1.20 \quad+0.50$ $M_{y y}\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{6}\right)=0.4513$ |  |
| SSCC | $0 / 30 / 0$ |  |  |  |
|  | $0 / 60$ / 0 |  |  |  |
|  | $0 / 90$ / 0 |  |  |  |

Figure 3. Contour plots of bending and twisting moments for general quadrilateral plates.

Table 4. Rhomboidal laminated plate (5.3) SSSS

|  | $\beta$ | $a / h=5$ |  | $a / h=10$ |  | $a / h=20$ |  | $a / h=100$ |  | $a / h=1000$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\bar{w}^{A}$ | $\bar{M}_{x x}^{A}$ | $\bar{w}^{A}$ | $\bar{M}_{x x}^{A}$ | $\bar{w}^{A}$ | $\bar{M}_{x x}^{A}$ | $\bar{w}^{A}$ | $\bar{M}_{x x}^{A}$ | $\bar{w}^{A}$ | $\bar{M}_{x x}^{A}$ |
| Nallim et al. [28] | $0^{\circ}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4.3042 | 4.7543 |
| Present TSDT $m=4$ |  | 6.9413 | 4.8138 | 4.9777 | 4.7388 | 4.4194 | 4.6931 | 4.2248 | 4.6725 | 4.2165 | 4.6715 |
| Nallim et al. [28] | $15^{\circ}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4.3980 | 4.9629 |
| Present TSDT $m=4$ |  | 6.3590 | 5.1574 | 4.8845 | 4.9939 | 4.4624 | 4.9179 | 4.3078 | 4.8848 | 4.3010 | 4.8833 |
| Nallim et al. [28] | $30^{\circ}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4.8641 | 4.8825 |
| Present TSDT $m=4$ |  | 7.0847 | 5.0566 | 5.4339 | 4.9267 | 4.9621 | 4.8612 | 4.7931 | 4.8323 | 4.7858 | 4.8310 |
| Nallim et al. [28] | $45^{\circ}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.4583 | 4.5766 |
| Present TSDT $m=4$ |  | 7.9498 | 4.7744 | 6.1304 | 4.6473 | 5.6037 | 4.5798 | 5.4152 | 4.5502 | 5.4071 | 4.5489 |
| Nallim et al. [28] | $60^{\circ}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.8797 | 4.0422 |
| Present TSDT $m=4$ |  | 8.6177 | 4.2936 | 6.6593 | 4.1466 | 6.0738 | 4.0652 | 5.8592 | 4.0280 | 5.8498 | 4.0263 |
| Nallim et al. [28] | $75^{\circ}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.9731 | 3.5619 |
| Present TSDT $m=4$ |  | 8.9255 | 3.8319 | 6.8506 | 3.6790 | 6.2067 | 3.5915 | 5.9639 | 3.5502 | 5.9532 | 3.5482 |
| Nallim et al. [28] | $90^{\circ}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.5124 | 3.5819 |
| Present TSDT $m=4$ |  | 7.9531 | 4.0169 | 6.2764 | 3.7361 | 5.7237 | 3.6181 | 5.4980 | 3.5661 | 5.4876 | 3.5636 |

with those of Chakrabarti and Sheikh [32] who employed a sixnoded triangular finite element with a refined HSDT and with those of Ramesh et al. [33] who used a higher-order triangular plate element based on the third-order shear deformation theory. It can be observed from Table 3 that the results obtained from the present formulation using four Gram-Schmidt polynomials are in good agreement with the solutions reported by other authors.

### 5.3. Rhomboidal laminated plates

In this section, results for rhomboidal laminates (Figure 2a) are presented. Four-ply E-glass/epoxy laminates are considered, with the following material properties:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E_{1}=60.7 \mathrm{GPa}, \quad E_{2}=24.8 \mathrm{GPa}, \quad G_{12}=12 \mathrm{GPa}, \\
& G_{13}=0.5 E_{2}, \quad G_{23}=0.2 E_{2}, \quad v_{12}=0.23
\end{aligned}
$$

and with 5.3 stacking sequence. As shown in Table 4, SSSS boundary conditions and length-to-thickness ratios $a / h=$ $5,10,20,100,1000$ are considered. The angle of fiber orientation ranges from $\beta=0^{\circ}$ to $\beta=90^{\circ}$. In this table, $\beta=0^{\circ}$ and $\beta=90^{\circ}$ mean cross-ply laminates with stacking sequences $0 / 90 / 90 / 0$ and 90/0/0/90, respectively. Deflections and bending moments in point A (Figure 2a) of the rhomboidal plate are normalized as:

$$
\bar{w}^{A}=\frac{100 E_{1} h^{3}}{q a^{4}} w^{A}, \quad \bar{M}_{x x}^{A}=\frac{100}{q a^{2}} M_{x x}^{A} .
$$

Particularly, the results corresponding to the case of $a / h=$ 1000 are compared with those obtained by Nallim et al. [28], who studied arbitrary quadrilateral anisotropic thin plates using a formulation based on the Ritz method in conjunction with natural coordinates and CLPT. When thin plate is considered, it can be seen that the present formulation is free of shear-locking phenomenon and then results for $a / h=1000$ approach to those obtained by CLPT.

### 5.4. General quadrilateral laminated plates

The developed formulation has been further applied to the static analysis of laminated plates with general quadrilateral planforms (Figure 2 b ), stacking sequence $0 / \beta / 0$, length-to-thickness ratio $a / h=10$, and boundary conditions CCCC and SSCC. The terminology SSCC means that edges (1) and (2) are simply supported and edges (3) and (4) are clamped (see Figure 2b).

The assumed material properties are the same as those used in Section 5.1 as well as the normalized displacement and stresses of the plate. Table 5 lists the deflections and the stresses at different points as computed with the methodology developed in this article. Results are for three stacking sequences and for two different boundary conditions.

For each laminated plate, Figure 3 shows the contour plots of bending moments ( $M_{x x}, M_{y y}$ ) and twisting moment ( $M_{x y}$ ) and also includes values of normalized moments in a specific point that can be used for comparison purposes. By comparing the contour plots, the influence of fiber orientation angles and boundary conditions in the results can be observed. It can be seen that the most remarkable differences occur in twisting

Table 5. General quadrilateral laminated plate $(0 / \beta / 0)$

|  | $0 / \beta / 0$ | $\bar{w}\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{6}\right)$ | $\bar{\sigma}_{x x}\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{6}, \frac{h}{2}\right)$ | $\bar{\sigma}_{y y}\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{6}, \frac{h}{2}\right)$ | $\bar{\tau}_{x y}\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{6}, \frac{h}{2}\right)$ | $\bar{\tau}_{x z}\left(\frac{a}{3}, \frac{a}{6}, 0\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CCCC | $0 / 30 / 0$ | 0.0918 | 0.0761 | 0.0231 | 0.0020 | 0.1173 |
|  | $0 / 60 / 0$ | 0.0833 | 0.0620 | 0.0213 | 0.0025 | 0.0667 |
| SSCC | $0 / 90 / 0$ | 0.0744 | 0.0511 | 0.0180 | 0.0025 | 0.0560 |
|  | $0 / 30 / 0$ | 0.1386 | 0.1366 | 0.0373 | 0.0026 | 0.1966 |
|  | $0 / 60 / 0$ | 0.1262 | 0.1131 | 0.0342 | 0.0229 |  |
|  | $0 / 90 / 0$ | 0.117 | 0.0964 | 0.0294 | 0.0572 |  |



Figure 4. Variation of bending and twisting moments for general quadrilateral plates along $x$-axis.
moments. Figure 4 presents the variation of bending and twisting moments for $y=a / 6$, along a line parallel to $x$-axis. It can be observed that for the two analyzed boundary conditions, the bending moment $M_{x x}$ takes larger values for staking sequence $0 / 30 / 0$, while for the bending moments $M_{y y}$ and for the twisting moments $M_{x y}$ the maximum values are obtained for stacking sequence $0 / 90 / 0$ and $0 / 60 / 0$, respectively.


Figure 5. Effect of length-to-thickness ratio on normalized transverse displacement $\bar{w}$ (a) and normalized bending moment $M_{x x}$ (b) of the CCCC general quadrilateral plate $0 / \beta / 0$ for different angles of fiber orientation $\beta$ and $a / h$ ratios.

Finally, Figures 5, 6, and 7 show the variation of normalized transverse displacement $\bar{w}$ and normalized bending moment $\bar{M}_{x x}$ of CCCC, SSCC, and SSSS general quadrilateral plates, respectively, for stacking sequence $0 / \beta / 0$ with different angles of fiber orientation $\beta$ and $a / h$ ratios. Once again it can be observed that this formulation is free from shear-locking phenomenon.


Figure 6. Effect of length-to-thickness ratio on normalized transverse displacement $\bar{w}$ (a) and normalized bending moment $\bar{M}_{x x}$ (b) of the SSCC general quadrilateral plate $0 / \beta / 0$ for different angles of fiber orientation $\beta$ and $a / h$ ratios.


Figure 7. Effect of length-to-thickness ratio on normalized transverse displacement $\bar{w}$ (a) and normalized bending moment $\bar{M}_{x x}$ (b) of the SSSS general quadrilateral plate $0 / \beta / 0$ for different angles of fiber orientation $\beta$ and $a / h$ ratios.

## 6. Conclusions

A hierarchical macro finite element based on the trigonometric shear deformation theory has been developed for the static analysis of general quadrilateral laminated composite plates. In the TSDT, shear stresses free boundary conditions at the top and bottom surfaces of the plates are satisfied and hence shear correction factors are ignored. A weak form of the static model for laminated composite plates based on the principle of virtual work is derived. The macro finite element is obtained considering Hermite polynomials as locally supported functions, enriched with orthogonal polynomials generated by the GramSchmidt procedure. The accuracy of results obtained using the present formulation is demonstrated by comparing some results to the 3D elasticity solution and those available in the literature. Obtained results show high reliability for all test cases from the thin to thick plates. The examples demonstrate the ability of enriched macro element in handling general quadrilateral geometries. Good convergence is found using Gram-Schmidt polynomials in each plane plate direction, so the present method constitutes an effective alternative for the analysis of laminated composite plates in practical applications.

In the developed formulation only symmetric laminated plates are considered, so the bending and in-plane deformations are uncoupled, and just three components of the displacement field were approximated in the presented approach (i.e., $\left.w, \phi_{x}, \phi_{y}\right)$. Following a similar procedure, the present method can be easily extended to consider nonsymmetric laminated plates.
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## Appendix A

The first Gram-Schmidt polynomials in $\xi$ natural coordinate, for $\omega$ and $\phi$ are given by:

$$
p_{1}^{(w)}(\xi)=1-2 \xi^{2}+\xi^{4}, \quad p_{1}^{(\phi)}(\xi)=-1+\xi^{2}
$$

The higher members are constructed by employing the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p_{2}^{(\bullet)}(\xi)=\left(\xi-B_{2}^{(\bullet)}\right) p_{1}^{(\bullet)}(\xi) \\
& p_{k}^{(\bullet)}(\xi)=\left(\xi-B_{k}^{(\bullet)}\right) p_{k-1}^{(\bullet)}(\xi)-C_{k}^{(\bullet)} p_{k-2}^{(\bullet)}(\xi) \quad(\bullet)=w, \phi
\end{aligned}
$$

where
$B_{k}^{(\bullet)}=\frac{\int_{-1}^{1} \xi\left(p_{k-1}^{(\bullet)}(\xi)\right)^{2} d \xi}{\int_{-1}^{1}\left(p_{k-1}^{(\bullet)}(\xi)\right)^{2} d \xi}, C_{k}^{(\bullet)}=\frac{\int_{-1}^{1} \xi p_{k-1}^{(\bullet)}(\xi) p_{k-2}^{(\bullet)}(\xi) d \xi}{\int_{-1}^{1}\left(p_{k-2}^{(\bullet)}(\xi)\right)^{2} d \xi}$.
The coefficients of the polynomials are chosen in such a way as to make the polynomials orthonormal, $\int_{-1}^{1}\left(p_{k}^{(\bullet)}(\xi)\right)^{2}=1$. The polynomials along the $\eta$ direction are also generated using the same procedure.

## Appendix B

The transformation equation (9) maps a point $(\xi, \eta)$ in the master plate onto a point $(x, y)$ in the real plate domain and vice versa if the Jacobian determinant of the transformation is given by:

$$
|\mathbf{J}|=\frac{\partial x}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial y}{\partial \eta}-\frac{\partial x}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial y}{\partial \xi},
$$

is positive.
Applying the chain rule of differentiation it can be shown that the first derivatives of a function in both spaces are related by:

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial y}
\end{array}\right]=\mathbf{J}^{-1}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{J_{22}}{|J|} & -\frac{J_{12}}{|J|} \\
-\frac{J_{21}}{|J|} & \frac{I_{11}}{|J|}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where $\mathbf{J}$ is the Jacobian given by:

$$
\mathbf{J}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
J_{11} & J_{12} \\
J_{21} & J_{22}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\sum x_{i} M_{i, \xi} & \sum y_{i} M_{i, \xi} \\
\sum x_{i} M_{i, \eta} & \sum y_{i} M_{i, \eta}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

The elemental area $d x d y$ in the Cartesian domain $R$ is transformed into $|\mathbf{J}| d \xi d \eta$.

Applying again the chain rule of differentiation in Eq. (14), results in:

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\partial^{2} w}{\partial x^{2}} \\
\frac{\partial^{2} w}{\partial y^{2}} \\
\frac{\partial^{2} w}{\partial x \partial y}
\end{array}\right]=\left[O p^{(1)}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\partial^{2} w}{\partial \xi^{2}} \\
\frac{\partial^{2} w}{\partial \eta^{2}} \\
\frac{\partial^{2} w}{\partial \xi \partial \eta}
\end{array}\right]+\left[O p^{(2)}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\partial w}{\partial \xi} \\
\frac{\partial w}{\partial \eta}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where the elements of the matrices $\left[O p^{(1)}\right]$ and $\left[O p^{(2)}\right]$ are given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[O p^{(1)}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
a_{1}^{\prime} & a_{2}^{\prime} & -a_{3}^{\prime} \\
b_{1}^{\prime} & b_{2}^{\prime} & -b_{3}^{\prime} \\
-c_{1}^{\prime}-c_{2}^{\prime} & c_{3}^{\prime}
\end{array}\right]} \\
& {\left[O p^{(2)}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\sum_{i=1}^{3} a_{i}^{\prime} \alpha_{i}^{\prime} & \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_{i}^{\prime} \beta_{i}^{\prime} \\
\sum_{i=1}^{3} b_{i}^{\prime} \alpha_{i}^{\prime} & \sum_{i=1}^{3} b_{i}^{\prime} \beta_{i}^{\prime} \\
-\sum_{i=1}^{3} c_{i}^{\prime} \alpha_{i}^{\prime}-\sum_{i=1}^{3} c_{i}^{\prime} \beta_{i}^{\prime}
\end{array}\right]}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{1}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{22}^{2}}{|\mathbf{J}|^{2}}, \quad a_{2}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{12}^{2}}{|\mathbf{J}|^{2}}, \quad a_{3}^{\prime}=2 \frac{J_{12} J_{22}}{|\mathbf{J}|^{2}} \\
& b_{1}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{21}^{2}}{|\mathbf{J}|^{2}}, \quad b_{2}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{11}^{2}}{|\mathbf{J}|^{2}}, \quad b_{3}^{\prime}=2 \frac{J_{11} J_{21}}{|\mathbf{J}|^{2}} \\
& c_{1}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{21} J_{22}}{|\mathbf{J}|^{2}}, \quad c_{2}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{11} J_{12}}{|\mathbf{J}|^{2}}, \quad c_{3}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{11} J_{22}+J_{12} J_{21}}{|\mathbf{J}|^{2}} \\
& \alpha_{1}^{\prime}=\frac{-J_{11, \xi} J_{22}+J_{12, \xi} J_{21}}{|\mathbf{J}|} \quad \alpha_{2}^{\prime}=\frac{-J_{21, \eta} J_{22}+J_{22, \eta} J_{21}}{|\mathbf{J}|}, \\
& \alpha_{3}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{11, \eta} J_{22}-J_{22, \xi} J_{21}}{|\mathbf{J}|} \\
& \beta_{1}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{11, \xi} J_{12}-J_{12, \xi} J_{11}}{|\mathbf{J}|}, \quad \beta_{2}^{\prime}=\frac{J_{21, \eta} J_{12}-J_{22, \eta} J_{11}}{|\mathbf{J}|}, \\
& \beta_{3}^{\prime}=\frac{-J_{11, \eta} J_{12}+J_{22, \xi} J_{11}}{|\mathbf{J}|}
\end{aligned}
$$

