



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Banerjee, J. R. & Ananthapuvirajah, A. (2020). Commentary on, "Discussion on 'Free vibration of functionally graded beams and frameworks using the dynamic stiffness method' by Banerjee et al., Journal of Sound and Vibration 442 (2018) 34-47.". Journal of Sound and Vibration, 466, 114986. doi: 10.1016/j.jsv.2019.114986

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/26445/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsv.2019.114986>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Banerjee, JR and Ananthapuvirajah, A ORCID: 0000-0002-8014-8608 (2020). Commentary on, "Discussion on 'Free vibration of functionally graded beams and frameworks using the dynamic stiffness method' by Banerjee et al., Journal of Sound and Vibration 442 (2018) 34-47.". JOURNAL OF SOUND AND VIBRATION, 466, doi: 10.1016/j.jsv.2019.114986

This is the draft version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/26445/>

Link to published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsv.2019.114986>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

Sound and Vibration

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Journal of

Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: JSV-D-19-01808R1

Title: Free Vibration of functionally graded beams and frameworks using the dynamic stiffness method

Article Type: Invited Commentary

Corresponding Author: Dr. Ranjan Banerjee, PhD, DSc, CEng, FRAeS, FIStructE, AFAIAA

Corresponding Author's Institution: City University London

First Author: Ranjan Banerjee, PhD, DSc, CEng, FRAeS, FIStructE, AFAIAA

Order of Authors: Ranjan Banerjee, PhD, DSc, CEng, FRAeS, FIStructE, AFAIAA

Authors' Reply

1
2 We thank Professor Popov [1] for his interest in our work [2] and we are pleased for his
3 detailed assessment of our paper and for his alternative viewpoint. In particular, he has shown
4 that our published results in [2] computed by applying the dynamic stiffness method (DSM)
5 can be obtained by using the transfer matrix method (TMM) through the computation of
6 matrix exponentials. It is admitted that Professor Popov is correct in his assertion that both
7 DSM and TMM give accurate results. However, there are some issues regarding the
8 advantages and disadvantages of the two methods, and after careful considerations, we are
9 responding to his comments as follows.

10
11
12
13 The authors would like to point out that there are significant differences between the DSM
14 and TMM and in this respect, the following points are pertinent.

15
16
17 1) It is well recognised that the TMM relies on a sequence of matrix operations which are
18 often very extensive, requiring considerable computational efforts, even though such
19 operations are generally carried out on small matrices. Because of the applications of
20 successive matrix operations, the TMM can lead to inaccuracies and numerical ill-
21 conditioning, particularly when analysing complex structures for which the values of various
22 stiffness components of constituent structural elements can vary significantly, maybe by
23 orders of magnitude. The DSM, particularly when applied in conjunction with explicit
24 stiffness expressions [2], overcomes this difficulty and thus becomes computationally more
25 efficient and less error prone than the TMM. Although computer power is continuing to grow
26 at an ever-increasingly rapid rate, we believe that computational efficiency is still very
27 important, particularly when solving large scale problems. Computer power used without
28 responsibility can be misguided and unproductive in dealing with structural, fluid or other
29 engineering problems.

30
31
32
33
34 2) In our experience, the use of explicit dynamic stiffness expressions as opposed to using
35 successive matrix operations reduces the computational time by a huge margin. For the type
36 of problems investigated in [2] there can be at least a fifteen-fold advantage in computational
37 time when using explicit dynamic stiffness expressions as opposed to using matrix operations
38 which, of course, form the fundamental basis of the TMM. The first author of [2] made a
39 direct comparison of the CPU time by using the two independent approaches and he provided
40 this estimate of computational time saving in his earlier publication, see Table 2 of [3].

41
42
43
44 3) It is significant to note that the explicit stiffness expressions are particularly useful when
45 some but not all of the stiffness coefficients are needed.

46
47
48 4) The DSM investigation carried out in [2] will have the added advantage in carrying out
49 further optimisation studies [4] where repetitive computation of sensitivities of the objective
50 function with respect to different stiffness parameters is required. The TMM is expected to
51 perform poorly in this respect and is envisaged to be computationally expensive.
52 Furthermore, Professor Popov's approach requires the use of matrix exponentials which are
53 not straightforward to calculate although there are available tools such as MATLAB.

54
55
56 Based on the above, the authors would like to point out that in terms of computational time
57 as well as accuracy of results, the TMM or any matrix manipulation-based method would
58 perform inefficiently when compared with the DSM coupled with the application of explicit
59 analytical expressions. The first author of [2] used the TMM in an earlier investigation [5]

1 and he experienced this first-hand and became aware of the shortcomings of TMM and
2 concluded that the DSM was superior to TMM.

3 Professor Papov's TMM formulation [1] is primarily based on his Eq. (5) which considers
4 the effect of rotatory inertia of the beam, i.e. it is for a Rayleigh beam. He stated [1] that his
5 results matched perfectly with those of Lee and Lee [6] (Ref. [30] of [2]). It should be noted
6 that Lee and Lee [6] made it clear in the title of their paper that their free vibration analysis
7 for functionally graded beams was carried out by using Bernoulli-Euler theory through the
8 application of the TMM and there was no suggestion from the title that they were embarking
9 on the Rayleigh beam theory. It was therefore, not expected that Professor Papov would get a
10 perfect match. This prompted an additional inquiry into the matter, and upon further
11 inspection of [6], it appears that Lee and Lee [6] have eventually used Rayleigh's theory as
12 opposed to Bernoulli-Euler theory even though the title of their paper suggests otherwise and
13 thus, a perfect match with Professor Popov's results [1] becomes possible.
14
15
16
17

18 However, Professor Popov has made a perfectly valid and legitimate point that at the
19 beginning of section 2.1 of our paper [2] it is clearly stated that we have used Bernoulli-Euler
20 theory, but our governing differential equation (Eq. (3) of [2]) contains Rayleigh's rotatory
21 inertia terms. Surely, there is an anomaly here and Professor Popov's misunderstanding or
22 rather misgiving is totally understandable. We apologise for the confusion we have caused.
23 We have essentially used Bernoulli-Euler theory by cutting out the rotatory inertia terms in
24 Eq. (3) of [2] when developing our computer programs and subsequently obtaining our
25 numerical results. This was well suspected by Professor Popov and he is right. With hindsight
26 we should have made it clearer in our paper that all rotatory inertia terms were dropped when
27 obtaining the results. The comparative values of the first five natural frequencies shown in
28 Table 1 of [2] show that our results are slightly higher than those of Lee and Lee [6]
29 (maximum discrepancy being around 4%) which is qualitatively anticipated because the
30 effect of rotatory inertia is expected to diminish the natural frequencies.
31
32
33
34
35

36 Professor Popov is certainly right that the accuracy of our plotted mode shapes in Fig.4 of
37 [2] is not so great, particularly when satisfying the zero-slope boundary condition for the
38 clamped end. We understand Professor Popov's concern. However, the illustrative mode
39 shapes are not merely sketches, but they are intended to demonstrate the bending and axial
40 deformation dominated modes of the functionally graded beams for different boundary
41 conditions. The authors were conscious of consuming not too excessive journal space when
42 writing the paper and particularly, when presenting the mode shapes. They showed four sets
43 of mode shapes (Fig.4 of [2]) as concisely as possible, i.e. within the confines of one single
44 page. This would not have been possible if the mode shapes were presented too accurately.
45 Nevertheless, they take Professor Popov's point on board and perhaps on second thought,
46 they should have presented the mode shapes more accurately.
47
48
49
50

51 About the second illustrative example given in Table 2 of [2] for which the data as well as
52 comparative results were taken from [7] (Ref. [41] of [2]), Professor Popov is right in his
53 comment that we did not provide enough data in [2] for the reconstruction of our results. This
54 was simply an inadvertent risk and we anticipated that readers of our paper [2] would find
55 without much difficulty the required data in [7] which was referred to in our paper. In
56 retrospect, it was probably advisable to duplicate the data of [7] in [2] in order to make our
57 paper completely self-contained. The results of Table 2 in [2] were computed using the
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Bernoulli-Euler theory as was the case with Table 1 in [2]. We thank Professor Popov for his
2 care.
3
4

5 **References**

- 6
- 7 1. A.A. Popov, Comments on “Free vibration of functionally graded beams and
8 frameworks using the dynamic stiffness method, *J. Sound Vib.* 422 (2018) 34-47.”
- 9 2. J.R. Banerjee, A. Ananthapuvirajah, Free vibration of functionally graded beams and
10 frameworks using the dynamic stiffness method, *J. Sound Vib.* 422 (2018) 34-47.
- 11 3. J.R. Banerjee, F.W. Williams, Exact dynamic stiffness matrix for composite
12 Timoshenko beams with applications, *J. Sound Vib.* 194 (1996) 573-585.
- 13 4. M. Lillico, R. Butler, S. Guo, J.R Banerjee, Aeroelastic optimisation of composite
14 wings using the dynamic stiffness method, *Aero J.* 101 (1997) 77-86.
- 15 5. H. Su, J.R Banerjee, Exact natural frequencies of structures consisting of two-part
16 beam-mass systems, *Struct. Eng. Mech.* 19 (2005) 551-566.
- 17 6. J.W. Lee, J.Y. Lee, Free vibration analysis of functionally graded Bernoulli-Euler
18 beams using an exact transfer matrix expression, *Int. J. Mech. Sci.* 122 (2017) 1-17.
- 19 7. N. Wattanasakulpong, J. Charoensuk, Vibration characteristics of stepped beams
20 made of FGM using differential transformation method, *Meccanica.* 50 (2015) 1089-
21 1101.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 J.R. Banerjee and A, Ananthapuvirajah
36 *Department of Mechanical Engineering and Aeronautics*
37 *School of mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering*
38 *City, University of London*
39 *Northampton Square*
40 *London EC1V 0HB*
41 *United Kingdom*
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65