## **Composite Lattice Reinforced Part Optimization with FEA: An Automotive Door Component Case Study**

Meghana Kamble

**SPE Automotive Composites Conference and Exhibition** 

Novi, Michigan

September 4-6, 2024





## **Outline**

- Hybrid Overmolding Rebar for Plastics®
- What are Composite Lattices & Key Terminologies
- Previous Challenges & Approach
- Altair Hypermesh Explicit Method
	- Overview
	- Explicit Method FEA Validation
	- Optimization Process Overview
- Case Study
- Summary & Future Work





## **Rebar for Plastics® — Process Overview**





### LIGHTWEIGHT STRUCTURAL **COMPOSITE PART**





- Lattice density
- Tape material

### **TUNABLE**

**Strategic** use of UD tapes in lattice provides a cost-effective and adaptable solution

### Locally optimized:

### **HANDLEABLE**

- Made of UD prepreg tapes
- Woven and welded at interface for stability
- Sheet or roll format

## **What is a Composite Lattice ?**



- **UD Tape:** a unidirectional fiber reinforced polymer tape / tow(1 in)
- **Warp Tape:** a UD tape that runs in the machine direction (Y-axis)
- Weft Tape: a UD tape that runs in the cross-machine direction (X-axis)
- **Homogenous lattice** : Centre to Centre tape (C-to-C) spacing between tapes and tape materials are constant throughout the part geometry
- **Heterogenous lattice** : C-to-C spacing between tapes and/or tape materials varies throughout the part geometry
- **Weave Density:** relative C-to-C spacing within lattice
- **Cover Factor:** % of the area covered by the tape material in a specified dimension





**Homogenous Lattice** 

**Heterogenous Lattice** 

## **Key Terminologies**

**© 2024 WEAV3D Inc.**







www.weav3d

## **Previous Approach and Challenges**

- Most commercially available FEA models are designed for ply-based composites, with fiber type, orientation, volume fraction, and weave type defined on a "per-ply" basis
- Hybrid structures, particularly lattice-reinforced hybrid structures, have additional degrees of freedom that cannot be fully captured within traditional ply-based models
- Previously ANSYS Representative Volume Elements (RVE) method was developed utilizing homogenization. While an improvement, it has limitations



www.weav3d

## **Representative Volume Elements (RVEs)**



Sub region 2

RVE in Homogenous Lattice Design RVE in Heterogenous Lattice

A RVE is defined as the smallest volume element of a material with a very accurate statistical representation of the typical material properties used in a full scale/macroscale model.

**© 2024 WEAV3D Inc.**



Sub region 2

WFAV3D





## **IMPLICIT METHOD - ANSYS RVE WORKFLOW**



Each step requires separate CAD models, effectively addresses limitations of traditional ply-based composites FEA but is labor-intensive

**© 2024 WEAV3D Inc.**



### **Submodel**

Distinguish stresses in UD tapes and overmolded plastic





### **Altair Explicit Model - FEA Workflow**



# **Altair FEA Workflow (Script Based Explicit**



• Specific tow or bulk properties assigned to elements, automated process through scripting.

- Preprocessing : A part-level CAD model needed, material data, lattice design properties
- Postprocessing : Single post-processing step to obtain deformation and stress in tows and bulk layers

![](_page_9_Picture_63.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_7.jpeg)

### **Post Process**

- Deformation Results
- Stresses in tows and plastic

![](_page_9_Picture_13.jpeg)

www.weav

## **Explicit Model Script**

### **Updated Altair HyperMesh Database:**

Explicit Model **Script** Input Output

Includes a composite stackup defining the lattice and bulk plastic

![](_page_10_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Component geometry & mesh
- Local coordinate system specifying tow origin and direction of weft and warp tows

User inputs in an ASCII Text file

• Location, width, material, thickness, and layer count (in that order) for each lattice tow

57

![](_page_10_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_4.jpeg)

## **FEA EXPLICIT MODEL VALIDATION (THREE-POINT BEND TEST)**

![](_page_11_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_98.jpeg)

# **Experiment Design for Flexure Test Samples**

![](_page_13_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_86.jpeg)

Altair's Explicit model exhibited good correlation with experimental results, overpredicting the experimental modulus by an average of 5.8 % (0.3 % - 13.5 %).

## **Results: Chord Modulus Comparison**

![](_page_14_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_112.jpeg)

## **Comparison of Methodologies: Time to Set & Solve Flexure Load Case**

Compared to the ANSYS RVE method, Altair Explicit FEA is over 50% faster in flexure tests

![](_page_15_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_11.jpeg)

# **Optimization Overview**

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

•Experimental Comparison •Set Design Targets

•50% Cover Factor •Compare Targets

•Adjust Layers count •Adjust Tow Materials & Spacing •Select Regions of reinforcement •Verify Design Targets

**© 2024 WEAV3D Inc.**

![](_page_15_Picture_6.jpeg)

### **Final Design**

### •Custom Lattice

![](_page_16_Picture_4.jpeg)

### **Case Study : Optimizing Lattice Design for an Automotive Part Using Altair's Explicit FEA Method**

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_9.jpeg)

- Baseline part material & thickness : NFPP 1700 gsm , 1.8mm thick
- Design target : Achieve weight & cost neutrality, maintaining deflection < 8.6 mm

## **Baseline FEA & Design Targets**

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

• Load =150N applied over d = 60mm at points 8, 9 & 10 individually

![](_page_18_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

# **Baseline FEA Model Validation**

### **Good experimental correlation achieved.**

![](_page_19_Picture_125.jpeg)

- To achieve cost and weight neutrality **thinner mat** (1200 & 1000 gsm ) were reinforced with WEAV3D **Lattice**
- Door inserts solely fabricated using thinner mats **exceeded** max. deflection limit

## **Optimization Strategy**

![](_page_19_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_9.jpeg)

www.weav3d.com

![](_page_20_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_7.jpeg)

## **Optimization Strategy Contd. : Review of Iteration 1 Deflection Results**

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

Iteration 1 : NFPP (1200 gsm & 1000 gsm) reinforced with homogenous single layer glass lattice, 50% cover factor, over entire part area

![](_page_21_Picture_10.jpeg)

## **Optimization Strategy Contd. : Stress Plots**

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Critical regions identified , part divided into lattice reinforced and non reinforced region (overlaid)

![](_page_21_Figure_3.jpeg)

Warp tape direction

Identified lattice reinforcement area divided into three heterogeneous sub-regions, based of stress plots

## **Summary of Iterative Optimization Strategy**

### **Focus Areas**:

Targeted regions with high deflection near allowable limits.

### **Weave Density Adjustments**:

Assigned denser lattice design to critical areas. & reduced weave density in lower deflections regions.

### **Division into Sub-Regions**:

Divided identified lattice reinforcement area into 3 homogenous sub-regions based on stress distribution observed in the baseline model

### **Unique Weft Cover Factors**:

Each sub-region assigned a specific weft cover factor.

### **Warp Tows**:

Maintained a constant cover factor of 50% to ensure stability during handling and forming

![](_page_22_Picture_14.jpeg)

www.weav3d

![](_page_23_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_8.jpeg)

## **Final Optimized Lattice Designs**

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

### **Optimized lattice pattern for NFPP 1200 gsm**

![](_page_23_Figure_3.jpeg)

### **Optimized lattice pattern for NFPP 1000 gsm**

**© 2024 WEAV3D Inc.**

O

 $\Omega$ 

 $\cap$ 

![](_page_24_Picture_8.jpeg)

# **Cost & Weight Savings**

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

**© 2024 WEAV3D Inc.**

![](_page_24_Picture_54.jpeg)

Optimized Optimized Lattice for NFPP Lattice for NFPP 1200 1000

### **Cost of lattice**

- **FEA Methodology Advancements:**
- **Allowed parameterization of tape materials, spacing, and layer counts.**
- Reduced setup and solve time by ~50%.
- **Validation through Experimental Testing:**
- FEA predictions validated against experimental data from three-point bend tests showed good correlation
- Confirmed the reliability of the explicit modeling approach
- **Optimization and Performance Enhancement:**
- Achieved up to 24% weight savings while maintaining or enhancing mechanical properties.

## **Summary**

**© 2024 WEAV3D Inc.**

![](_page_25_Picture_15.jpeg)

www.weav3d

**In Partnership with :**

![](_page_25_Picture_10.jpeg)

### **Enhanced Script Capabilities**

Expand script to handle complex part surfaces using advanced projection or draping algorithms.

- Create an implicit model in Altair for rapid goal-seek optimization of lattice patterns.
- Use implicit model to identify candidate designs for precise stress distribution verification with the explicit model.

### **Development of Implicit Model**

### **Future Work**

![](_page_26_Picture_9.jpeg)